EDGE MAPPINGS OF GRAPHS: TURÁN TYPE PARAMETERS

YAIR CARO, BALÁZS PATKÓS, ZSOLT TUZA, AND MÁTÉ VIZER

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we address problems related to parameters concerning edge mappings of graphs. The quantity h(n,G) is defined to be the maximum number of edges in an n-vertex graph H such that there exists a mapping $f: E(H) \to E(H)$ with $f(e) \neq e$ for all $e \in E$ and further in all copies G' of G in H there exists $e \in E(G')$ with $f(e) \in E(G')$. Among other results, we determine h(n,G) when G is a matching and n is large enough.

As a related concept, we say that H is unavoidable for G if for any mapping $f: E(H) \to E(H)$ with $f(e) \neq e$ there exists a copy G' of G in H such that $f(e) \notin E(G')$ for all $e \in E(G)$. The set of minimal unavoidable graphs for G is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(G)$. We prove that if F is a forest, then $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is finite if and only if F is a matching, and we conjecture that for all non-forest graphs G, the set $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is infinite.

Several other parameters are defined with basic results proved. Lots of open problems remain.

1. Introduction

Set-mappings or alternatively edge-mappings were first studied systematically by Erdős and Hajnal [12] who were mostly interested in and motivated by mappings between infinite sets. Yet they also offered, under the influence of Ramsey's theorem, the first instance of such problems in the finite case. Nevertheless, while this line of research captured much attention and interest in the infinite case, only modest attention was given to the finite case. The latter was reconsidered more systematically in the 1980s [2, 3, 5, 7], but then the subject was again dormant for nearly 35 years (with few exceptions like [4]) until recent interest in these types of problems was renewed by Conlon, Fox, and Sudakov [9, 10, 11].

Here, we start a more systematic study of problems about edge mappings in the context of graphs. The present manuscript focuses on parameters that are analogous to Turán-type problems, and a parallel manuscript [6] addresses Ramsey-type parameters. We hope to raise various, simple to state yet perhaps not so simple to solve open problems regarding the parameters and functions that capture the essence of edge-mappings in parallel to those parameters and functions in Turán problems.

In order to present our main results we introduce the necessary definitions and notation.

- 1.1. **Definitions.** Let $E_n = E(K_n)$ denote the edge set of the complete graph K_n on n vertices, and let $f: E_n \to E_n$. A subgraph G of K_n is called
 - f-free, if $f(e) \notin E(G)$ for all $e \in E(G)$, and

Research of Patkós, Tuza, and Vizer is partially supported by NKFIH grants SNN 129364 and FK 132060.

• f-exclusive, if $|f(e) \cap V(G)| = 0$ for all $e \in E(G)$.

Let us introduce some notation for edge mappings. Let $F_n := \{f : E_n \to E_n\}$.

- For d = 0, 1 let $F_{n,d} := \{ f : E_n \to E_n \text{ such that } | f(e) \cap e | \le d \text{ for every } e \in E_n \};$
- for d = 0, 1 and $0 \le m \le \binom{n}{2}$ let

 $F_{n,m,d} := \{ f : E_n \to E_n \text{ such that for at least } m \text{ edges } e \in E_n, |f(e) \cap e| \leq d \};$

• for d = 0, 1 and a graph H let

$$F_{H,d} := \{ f : E(H) \to E(H) \text{ such that for every } e \in E(H), |f(e) \cap e| \le d \}.$$

Now we introduce further parameters related to Turán numbers of graphs, that we will focus on during our investigations.

First, let us recall that for $n \ge 1$ and a graph F, the $Tur\'{a}n \ number \ ex(n, F)$ is the maximum number of edges that an n-vertex graph can have without containing F as a subgraph.

We consider the following further extremal functions.

- For a given graph G, d = 0, 1 and $n \ge 3$ let
 - $q(n,d,G) := \max\{m : \exists f \in F_{n,m,d}, \text{ with no } f\text{-free copy of G in } K_n\}.$

We abbreviate q(n, 1, G) to q(n, G).

• For a given graph G, d = 0, 1 and $n \ge 3$ let

$$h(n,d,G) := \max\{m : \exists H, |V(H)| = n, |E(H)| = m, \text{ and } \exists f \in F_{H,d} \}$$

with no f -free copy of G in H .

We abbreviate h(n, 1, G) to h(n, G).

• For a given graph G, and $n \geq 4$ let

$$s(n,G) := \max\{m : \exists H, |V(H)| = n, |E(H)| = m, \text{ and } \exists f \in F_{H,0} \}$$

with no f-exclusive copy of G in H}.

All these definitions naturally extend to families \mathcal{G} of graphs by requiring no f-free / f-exclusive copies for any $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Further notation on graph operations. For any pair G, H of graphs, $G \cup H$ denotes their vertex-disjoint union, G+H their join, and for an integer k we denote by kG the vertex-disjoint union of k copies of G.

In Sections 3 and 4, we prove several upper and lower bounds on h(n, G) and s(n, G) for specific graphs. Here we state a theorem that determines the value of h(n, G) for matchings.

Theorem 1.

- (1) We have $h(n, 2K_2) = n$ for $n \ge 7$, and for smaller vales of n we have $h(4, 2K_2) = 6$ and $h(5, 2K_2) = h(6, K_2) = 7$.
- (2) For any $t \geq 3$ there exists n_t such that if $n \geq n_t$, then

$$h(n, tK_2) = \exp(n, tK_2) + t - 1 = (t - 1)(n - t + 1) + {t - 1 \choose 2} + (t - 1).$$

The following notion naturally arises in the study of h(n, G). Given a graph H we say that G is f-free unavoidable for H or unavoidable for H, if for every $f \in F_{G,1}$, there exists an f-free copy of H. Observe that if G is unavoidable for H and G is a subgraph of G, then G is also unavoidable for G, as for any G is a copy of G and obtain an G-free copy of G. (If G is G is G is even better, or formally we can then let G is G is even better, or consider G is even better, or consider G is minimal G is even better, or consider G is minimal G is minimal unavoidable for G if it does not contain a proper subgraph G which is unavoidable for G.

Let $\mathcal{M}(H)$ denote the set of minimal unavoidable graphs for H. The next observation establishes a connection between the function h and the Turán number.

Proposition 2. For any graph H we have $h(n, H) = ex(n, \mathcal{M}(H))$.

We determine the families $\mathcal{M}(P_3)$ and $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. In the general setting, our main result on $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is the following theorem.

Theorem 3. If F is a forest, then $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is finite if and only if $F = tK_2$.

We prove Theorem 3 in Section 5 along with other statements on $\mathcal{M}(G)$ for non-forest G. We believe that Theorem 3 is valid not only for forests.

Conjecture 4. $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is finite if and only if $G = tK_2$.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we establish some general connections between the parameters of interest, in particular, we prove Proposition 2. Proofs of results on h(n, G), s(n, G) and $\mathcal{M}(G)$ are contained in Sections 3, 4, and 5, respectively, while Section 6 is devoted to some concluding remarks and open problems.

2. Preliminaries and general connections between parameters

Alon and Caro [2] proved the following sandwich theorem for Turán numbers and the function h.

Theorem A (Alon, Caro [2]). For any family \mathcal{G} of graphs, we have

$$ex(n, \mathcal{G}) \le h(n, \mathcal{G}) \le 3 \cdot ex(n, \mathcal{G}).$$

Moreover, for graphs G with $\chi(G) \geq 3$, we have $h(n,G) = (1+o(1)) \exp(n,G)$.

Next, we examine whether equality is possible in the inequalities $ex(n, \mathcal{G}) \leq h(n, \mathcal{G}) \leq 3 \cdot ex(n, \mathcal{G})$. The following example shows that the upper bound in Theorem A is attainable.

Example 5. Motivated by the term of "delta-systems" we use the notation $\Delta(r,t) = \{K_{1,r}, tK_2\}$. It is known [8] that $\operatorname{ex}(n,\Delta(r,t)) = (r-1)(t-1)$ if $r \geq 2t+1$. We claim that $h(n,\Delta(r,t)) = 3(r-1)(t-1)$ holds. As the upper bound is given by Theorem A, we only need to see the lower bound. We take $G = (t-1)K_{1,3(r-1)}$. As it does not contain tK_2 , we only need to define a mapping $f \in F_{G,1}$ with no f-free $K_{1,r}$. If in the ith star the edges are $e_{3i-2}, e_{3i-1}, e_{3i}$, then for any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r-1$ and j = 1, 2 we let $f(e_{3i-j}) = e_{3i-j+1}$ and $f(e_{3i}) = e_{3i-2}$.

On the other hand, the next proposition shows that the lower bound in Theorem A is never attained (except for the trivial case of $G = K_2$).

Proposition 6. For any graph G with at least two edges, we have h(n, G) > ex(n, G) for all $n \ge |V(G)|$.

Proof. Let H be an n-vertex G-free graph with ex(n, G) edges, and let $H_{e^*} = H \cup \{e^*\}$ for any $e^* \notin E(H)$. Finally, set $f(e) = e^*$ for every $e \in E(H)$ and $f(e^*) = e'$ for some $e' \in E(H)$. Clearly $f \in F_{H_{e^*},1}$, and by the G-free property of H, any copy of G in H_{e^*} must contain e^* , but as there exists another edge in G, it cannot be f-free. \Box

Proposition 7. For any graph G we have q(n, G) = h(n, G).

Proof. Clearly by definition $q(n,G) \ge h(n,G)$ as a function realizing h(n,G) is a function allowed for q(n,G).

Suppose f is a function realizing q(n,G) and let H be the graph whose edges are those for which $f(e) \neq e$. Suppose for some $e \in E(H)$ we have $f(e) = e_1 \notin E(H)$. Choose an edge $e^* \in E(H) \setminus \{e\}$ and change f to f^* by defining $f^*(e) := f(e)$ for all edges of H except that $f(e) = e^*$.

If there is an f^* -free copy of G in H, then this is an f-free copy of G as well, as e_1 is not in E(H) hence not in E(G). So we can replace all edges that are mapped out of E(H) to non-fixed edges that are mapped into E(H) not creating f-free copies of G.

Proof of Proposition 2. Let G be any graph realizing h(n, H). Then G cannot contain any member of $\mathcal{M}(H)$, because if G contains $G^* \in \mathcal{M}(H)$, then G is also unavoidable for H and so for any $f \in F_{G,1}$ there exists an f-free copy of H. Hence $h(n, H) \leq \operatorname{ex}(n, \mathcal{M}(H))$.

On the other hand, let G be any $\mathcal{M}(H)$ -free graph having $\operatorname{ex}(n, \mathcal{M}(H))$ edges. Then G contains no member of $\mathcal{M}(H)$, and so it is not unavoidable for H, hence there exists an edge mapping $f \in F_{G,1}$ with no f-free copy of H. Thus $h(n, H) \geq \operatorname{ex}(n, \mathcal{M}(H))$.

We finish this section with a simple lemma. Part (1) is from [2] (Lemma 2.3), but as we will use it multiple times in later proofs, we restate and reprove it in order to be self-contained. The undirected underlying graph of a directed graph $\overrightarrow{G} = (V, \overrightarrow{E})$ is G = (V, E), where $E = \{(uv) : \overrightarrow{uv} \in \overrightarrow{E} \text{ or } \overrightarrow{vu} \in \overrightarrow{E}\}.$

Lemma 8. Let $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ be a directed graph on n vertices with maximum out-degree at most d and let Γ be the undirected underlying graph of $\overline{\Gamma}$

- (1) Then we have $\chi(\Gamma) \leq 2d+1$, and thus $\alpha(\Gamma) \geq \frac{n}{2d+1}$. (2) If d=1, and m vertices have out-degree 0, then $\alpha(\Gamma) \geq m + \lceil \frac{n-2m}{3} \rceil$. Furthermore, if m=0 and 3|n, then equality holds if and only if $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ consists of vertex-disjoint cyclically directed triangles.

Proof. We start with the proof of (2). Note that as the out-degree of each vertex of $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ is at most 1, the components of Γ are trees or unicyclic¹ graphs. Also, note that the components containing a vertex with 0 out-degree (in $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$) are trees. Trees are bipartite, unicyclic graphs are 3-colorable. This implies inequality.

If m=0, then we need all components of Γ to be unicyclic. As all such graphs can be three-colored with one color class having size one, we need $\left\lceil \frac{|C|-1}{2} \right\rceil = \frac{|C|}{3}$ for all components C. This implies |C|=3 and the out-degree condition yields that the triangles are cyclically directed.

To see (1), observe that if the out-degree of $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ is d, then the average degree, and thus the degeneracy² of Γ is at most 2d, so its chromatic number is at most 2d + 1.

We will apply Lemma 8 in the following situation: given are a graph G, a mapping $f \in F_{G,1}$, and a partition $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m\}$ of E(G). We define $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_{f,\mathcal{E}}$ to have vertex set \mathcal{E} and there is a directed edge from E_i to E_j if and only if there exists $e \in E_i$ with $f(e_i) \in E_j$. If all E_i s consist of a single edge, then we will drop \mathcal{E} from the subscript and write $\overline{\Gamma}_f$. An edge subset $E' \subset E(G)$ is f-free if and only if the corresponding vertices form an independent set in Γ_f .

3. Results about h(n,G)

In this section, we obtain results on h(n,G). Let us mention that prior to our paper the only graph class for which the exact h-value was known is that of stars due to Alon and Caro [2]. They showed $h(n, K_{1,r}) = \min\{\binom{n}{2}, n(r-1)\}$ for all $r \geq 1$. We start our investigations with general observations strengthening the lower bound of Proposition 6.

Proposition 9.

(1) Let G be a graph with no isolated edges. Then

$$h(n,G) \ge \exp(n,G) + |\alpha(H)/2|$$

for any G-free graph H on n vertices with ex(n, G) edges.

¹A unicyclic graph is a connected graph containing exactly one cycle.

 $^{^{2}}$ A k-degenerate graph is an undirected graph in which every subgraph has a vertex of degree at most k. The degeneracy of a graph is the smallest value of k for which it is k-degenerate.

(2) Let T be a non-star tree and H be a T-free graph on k vertices. Then

$$h(n,T) \ge \left| \frac{n-1}{k} \right| (e(H) + \alpha(H)).$$

(3) For any tree T on k vertices, we have

$$h(n,T) \ge \left(\frac{k-2}{2} + \frac{1}{k-1}\right)n - c_k$$

for some constant c_k that depends only on k and not on T.

Proof. To prove (1) let H be an n-vertex G-free graph with ex(n,G) edges, and let I be an independent set in H of size $\alpha(H)$. Then pick any matching M that covers $2\lfloor \alpha(H)/2\rfloor$ vertices of I. Clearly, $M \cap E(H) = \emptyset$. Define H' by V(H') = V(H), $E(H') = E(H) \cup M$ and set $f \in F_{n,H',1}$ as follows: if $e \in E(H)$ is incident to some edge $e^* \in M$, then let $f(e^*) = e$, for other edges e of E(H) or for edges of M define f arbitrarily but satisfying $f(e) \neq e$. Then any copy of G in H' must contain at least one edge $e^* \in M$ and, as e^* is not an isolated edge of G, an edge e incident to e^* . As $f(e) = e^*$, the copy of G cannot be f-free.

To prove (2) let I be an independent set of H of size $\alpha(H)$. Define H' to be a graph that contains a special vertex u, and $H' \setminus \{u\}$ having $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{k} \rfloor$ copies of H possibly with some isolated vertices. The special vertex u is joined to the vertices in all copies of I. For any edge e = xy with x in I in some component and $y \neq u$, we set f(xy) = xu and for all other edges e of H', we define f such that $f(e) \neq e$ holds. As H is T-free, any copy of T must contain an edge xu. Also, as T is not a star, it must contain an edge that is incident to an edge not containing u. So we may assume that the copy of T must contain xy for some $y \neq u$, and thus the copy of T cannot be f-free.

Part (3) follows from (2) with
$$H = K_{k-1}$$
.

For a tree T with bipartition (A, B), we set $\Delta(A) = \max\{d_T(u) : u \in A\}$, $\Delta(B) = \max\{d_T(u) : u \in B\}$, and $\Delta^*(T) = \min\{\Delta(A), \Delta(B)\}$. With these definitions, we obtain the following constructive lower bounds.

Proposition 10.

- (1) For any tree T and $n > 2(\Delta(T) 1)$, we have $h(n, T) \ge n(\Delta(T) 1)$.
- (2) For any tree T, we have $h(n,T) \ge (3\Delta^*(T) 3)(n 3\Delta^*(T) + 3)$.

Proof. To prove (1) it is known that there exists a $2(\Delta(T)-1)$ -regular graph H on n vertices. Consider a closed Eulerian trail $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{n(\Delta(T)-1)}$ of H and define $f(e_i) = e_{i+1}$ implying $f \in F_{n,H,1}$. If u is a maximum-degree vertex of T, then consider the vertex corresponding to u in any copy of T in H. As there are exactly $\Delta(T)-1$ incoming and outgoing edges in the trail at u, there must exist a pair e_j, e_{j+1} that belongs to the copy of T. Therefore this copy cannot be f-free.

To prove (2) consider $K = K_{3(\Delta^*(T)-1),n-3(\Delta^*(T)-1)}$ and name the vertices in the part of size $3(\Delta^*(T)-1)$ as a_i,b_i,c_i for $i=1,2,\ldots,3(\Delta^*(T)-1)$. Define the mapping f by $f(a_ix)=b_ix$,

 $f(b_i x) = c_i x$, and $f(c_i x) = a_i x$ for all $i = 1, 2, ..., 3(\Delta^*(T) - 1)$ and all vertices x being in the other part of K. Any copy of T must contain a vertex x in the big part of K of degree $\Delta^*(T)$. Therefore, there must exist an index i such that at least two of $a_i x, b_i x, c_i x$ belong to the copy of T, so this copy cannot be f-free.

Corollary 11. For the balanced double star $D_{k,k}$, we have $3kn - 9k^2 \le h(n, D_{k,k}) \le 3kn$.

Proof. To obtain the lower bound, apply Proposition 10 (2) with $\Delta^*(D_{k,k}) = k + 1$. The upper bound follows from Theorem A, as for double-stars the Erdős–Sós conjecture is known to hold.

Proposition 12. We have

- (1) $h(n, P_4) \ge 3(n-3)$,
- (2) $h(n, P_7) \ge h(n, P_6) \ge h(n, P_5) \ge 3n 6$,
- (3) $h(n, P_{2m+1}) \ge h(n, P_{2m}) \ge m(n-m)$ for all $m \ge 4$.

Proof. $P_4 = D_{1,1}$, so Corollary 11 yields (1).

Also, (3) follows from Proposition 9 (2) with $H = K_{m-1,n-m}$, k = n-1, and $\alpha(K_{m-1,n-m}) = n-m$. (Actually, the graph verifying the lower bound is $H = K_{m,n-m}$.)

Finally to see (2), consider $K_3 + E_{n-3}$ with the vertices of the K_3 being a, b, c. Define the mapping f by f(ab) = bc, f(bc) = ca, f(ca) = ab and for any x in $V(E_{n-3})$ we let f(ax) = bx, f(bx) = cx, f(cx) = ax. Then if a copy of P_5 uses two edges of K_3 , then it is not f-free. If such a copy uses at most one such edge, then there exists an $x \in V(E_{n-3})$ such that x is incident to two edges of the P_5 , and thus this copy of P_5 cannot be f-free either.

Observe that if n is not divisible by 3, then $ex(n, P_4) = n - 1$ and so by Theorem A, we have $h(n, P_4) \leq 3n - 3$.

In the remainder of this section, we prove Theorem 1. We repeat the statements of both of its parts, separately.

Theorem 13. We have

$$h(n, 2K_2) = n$$

for $n \geq 7$. Furthermore, $h(4, 2K_2) = 6$, and $h(5, 2K_2) = h(6, K_2) = 7$.

Proof. The lower bound $h(4, 2K_2) \geq 6$ is shown by the mapping $f: E(K_4) \to E(K_4)$ with $f(e) = V(K_4) \setminus e$. To see $h(6, 2K_2) \geq h(5, 2K_2) \geq 7$, consider the graph H that we obtain from K_4 by adding a pendant edge e and the mapping $f \in F_{H,1}$ with $f(e^*) = e$ for all $e^* \in E(H)$ disjoint with e, and $f(e^{**}) = V(K_4) \setminus e^{**}$ for all other $e^{**} \in E(K_4)$ (and f(e) defined arbitrarily). Finally, the general lower bound $h(n, 2K_2) \geq n$ is given by the graph H obtained from $K_{1,n-1}$ by adding an edge between two leaves and the mapping that maps all the edges of $K_{1,n-1}$ to the additional edge.

The upper bound $h(4, 2K_2) \leq 6$ is trivial as there are at most 6 edges on 4 vertices. For larger n we apply the following assertion whose validity is seen by observing that each pair (e, f(e)) can make only one copy of $2K_2$ non-f-free.

Claim 14. For a graph H let m denote the number of copies of $2K_2$ and m' the number of edges that are contained in at least one copy of $2K_2$. If m > m', then H is unavoidable for $2K_2$.

Based on this claim we first derive $h(5, 2K_2) \leq 7$. Observe that K_5 contains 15 copies of $2K_2$ because each of its edges occurs in precisely three copies. Hence a graph with 5 vertices and 8 edges contains at least 9 copies, more than the number of edges.

For $n \ge 6$ we prove the upper bounds by induction. Let us prove first $h(6, 2K_2) \le 7$. Should it be 8, then a graph verifying it would have no isolated vertices, due to $h(5, 2K_2) = 7$.

The 8 edges determine 28 edge pairs, and a degree sequence $d_1 \ge \cdots \ge d_6$ yields $s := \sum {d_i \choose 2}$ pairs that are not $2K_2$. To have a chance without f-free copies of $2K_2$ we would need $s \ge 20$ because of Claim 14. However, the largest degree is at most 5 and the smallest one is at least 1. The sequence cannot begin with 5, 5 because it would already require 9 edges. Therefore the degree sequence with maximum s is 5, 4, 2, 2, 2, 1 whose s-value is 19 only (the sequence 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 1 is not graphical).

We prove $h(7, 2K_2) \leq 7$ in a similar way. The degree sequence cannot begin with 6, 4 as it would require 9 edges. The sequence 6, 3, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1 is not graphical. So the sequence is 6, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1 with s = 20, or 6, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1 (s = 19) or 5, 4, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1 (s = 18) or something with an even smaller s. Only the first sequence has a chance, but the edge e joining the first two vertices is not contained in a $2K_2$, hence the pair (e, f(e)) is useless and an f-free $2K_2$ occurs.

The induction step for n > 7 is really simple because the formula would become false only if a graph with minimum degree of 2 would be found. However, with n+1 edges, the degree sum is only 2n+2, hence s would be maximized with the degree sequence $4, 2, 2, \ldots, 2$. The corresponding s is only n+5 while we have just n+1 edges, however $n+1 < \binom{n+1}{2} - (n+5)$ holds for every $n \ge 6$. This completes the proof.

Finally, we restate and prove the second part of Theorem 1.

Theorem 15. For any $t \geq 3$ there exists n_t such that if $n \geq n_t$, then

$$h(n, tK_2) = \exp(n, tK_2) + t - 1 = (t - 1)(n - t + 1) + {t - 1 \choose 2} + (t - 1).$$

Proof. We start with the general lower bound: consider the split graph $K_{t-1} + E_{n-t+1}$. Let the vertices of K_{t-1} be $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{t-1}$. Embed a star on t-1 edges in E_{n-t+1} with center v and t-1 leaves $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{t-1}$. Call this graph H. We define the mapping f as follows: for any $1 \le i \le t-1$ and $x \ne u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{t-1}$, we set $f(u_i x) = v v_i$ and define f on all other edges e with $f(e) \ne e$ arbitrarily. Any $t K_2$ in H contains exactly one edge incident with $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{t-1}, v$ each and these edges must be distinct. So if the edge incident with v is $v v_i$, then for the edge e_i incident with v we have $f(e_i) = v v_i$ and thus this copy is not f-free.

To see the general upper bound, we first prove a claim.

Claim 16. For any $t \geq 2$ there exists a constant α_t such that for any n-vertex graph H with $\operatorname{ex}(n, tK_2)$ edges, $f \in F_{H,1}$ and $e \in E(H)$ there are at most $\alpha_t n^{t-2}$ copies of tK_2 that contain both e and f(e).

Proof of Claim. The t-matching should contain t-2 other edges of H, and $\operatorname{ex}(n, tK_2)$ is a linear function of n for every fixed t.

Now we are ready to prove the general upper bound of the theorem. Let H be a graph on n vertices with $\operatorname{ex}(n, tK_2) + t$ edges. Then for any $T \subset V(H)$ with |T| = t - 1, there exist at least t edges not incident with any vertex of T.

Let $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_n$ be the degree sequence of H and let u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n be the corresponding vertices. Fix $f \in F_{H,1}$ and consider the following cases.

Case 1. $\frac{2}{7}n \leq d_{t-1} \leq n - D_t$ for some appropriately chosen constant D_t .

Any edge e that is not incident with any u_i is contained in $\prod_{j=1}^{t-1} (d_j - 2t)$ copies of tK_2 such that e is the only such edge in the t-matching. We have at least D_t such edges, so H contains at least $D_t n^{t-1}/4^{t-1}$ copies of tK_2 . By Claim 16, every edge can ruin the f-free property of at most $\alpha_t n^{t-2}$ copies of tK_2 , so the number of non-f-free copies of tK_2 is at most $t\alpha_t n^{t-1}$ which is smaller than the total number of copies if $D_t \geq t \cdot 4^{t-1} \cdot \alpha_t$.

Case 2.
$$d_{t-1} \ge n - D_t$$
.

Let us fix edges e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_t none of which is incident with any of $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{t-1}$. Let $E_i^0 = \{u_i x : x \neq u_j \ j \neq i, \ x \notin e_h\}$, so $|E_i^0| \geq n - D_t - 3t$. Observe that for any i there is at most one $j = j_i$ such that for at least n/2 edges $e \in E_i^0$ we have $f(e) = e_j$. Therefore there exists a j^* that is not a j_i for any $1 \leq i \leq t - 1$. Then we set e_{j^*} to be the first edge of our future f-free tK_2 and obtain E_i^1 from E_i^0 by removing $f(e_{j^*})$ and all edges e with $f(e) = e_{j^*}$. By definition, $|E_i^1| \geq n/2 - D_t - 4t$. Next, for any $1 \leq i \leq t - 2$ there exists at most one edge $e_i^1 \in E_{t-1}^1$ such that $f(e) = e_i^1$ for more than n/4 edges $e \in E_i^1$. Pick an edge $e^{t-1} \in E_{t-1}^1$ that is not e_i^1 for any $1 \leq i \leq t - 2$, and e^{t-2} is our next edge of the future tK_2 . We obtain E_i^2 from E_i^1 by removing $f(e^{t-2})$ and all edges e for which we have $f(e) = e^{t-2}$. By definition, we have $|E_i^2| \geq n/4 - D_t - 5t$. We keep repeating this process to obtain an f-free copy of tK_2 .

Case 3.
$$d_{t-1} \le \frac{n-t}{3}$$

We will need the following claim.

Claim 17. For any $t \geq 2$ there exists a constant C_t such that any n-vertex graph H with $ex(n, tK_2) + 1$ edges and maximum degree at most n/3 contains at least $C_t \cdot n^t$ copies of tK_2 .

Proof of Claim. We proceed by induction on t. If t=2 then any edge can be extended to a $2K_2$ with at least $|E(H)| - 2 \cdot n/3$ other edges, so the number of copies of $2K_2$ is quadratic.

For the inductive step, we argue similarly. For any edge uv the graph $H \setminus \{u, v\}$ has more than $\operatorname{ex}(n-2, (t-1)K_2)$ edges, and thus by induction more than $C_{t-1}(n-2)^{t-1}$ copies of $(t-1)K_2$ each of which can be extended to a tK_2 with the edge uv. So any edge is extendable

to at least $C_{t-1}(n-2)^{t-1}$ copies of tK_2 , therefore H contains at least $C_{t-1}(n-2)^{t-1}|E(H)|/t \ge C_t n^t$ copies of tK_2 .

Let j be the smallest index such that $d_j \leq \frac{n-t}{3}$, so $j \leq t-1$. Then $H' := H - \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{j-1}\}$ has more than $\exp(n-(j-1), (t-(j-1))K_2)$ edges. So by Claim 17, H' contains at least $C_{t-(j-1)} \cdot (n-j+1)^{t-(j-1)}$ copies of $(t-(j-1))K_2$. Each such copy can be extended to at least $(n/3-3t)^{j-1}$ copies of tK_2 greedily with edges incident with $u_{j-1}, u_{j-2}, \ldots, u_1$. Therefore H contains at least $C'_t n^t$ copies of tK_2 , so by Claim 16, there must exist an f-free copy of tK_2 if n is large enough.

4. Results about s(n, G).

Our first result asymptotically determines s(n, G) for non-bipartite graphs, along the lines of how the asymptotic behavior of h(n, G) is determined in [2].

Theorem 18. For any graph G with $\chi(G) \geq 3$, we have $s(n,G) = (1+o(1)) \exp(n,G)$. If G is bipartite, then $s(n,G) = o(n^2)$.

Proof. The inequality $\operatorname{ex}(n,G) \leq s(n,G)$ holds by definition. To see the upper bound, assume H is an n-vertex graph with $(1+\varepsilon)\operatorname{ex}(n,G)$ edges, and $f\in F_{H,0}$. By the celebrated result of Erdős and Stone [14], for any positive integer q, there exists $n_0=n_0(q)$ such that if $n\geq n_0$, then H contains a copy of the complete $\chi(G)$ -partite graph $K=K_{q,q,\dots,q}$ with q vertices in each part. Observe that K contains $\Theta(q^{|V(G)|})$ copies of G. On the other hand, for every edge $e\in E(K)$ there exist $O(q^{|V(G)|-3})$ copies of G in K that contain e and that meet f(e). Therefore there are $O(q^{|V(G)|-1})$ copies of G in K that are not f-exclusive, so there must exist at least one f-exclusive copy of G.

The statement about bipartite G follows along the same lines as $ex(n, K_{q,q}) = o(n^2)$ for any fixed q.

Proposition 19. Let G be a graph in which no edge is incident to all other edges. If $\Delta(G) \ge 5r - 4$, then any $f \in F_{G,0}$ admits an f-exclusive copy of $K_{1,r}$.

Proof. Let v be a vertex of G with $d(v) \geq 5r - 4$ and let e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_t be the edges incident to v. We will apply Lemma 8 to the directed graph $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ with $V(\overrightarrow{\Gamma}) = \{e_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots, t\}$ with $e_i e_j$ being an arc if and only if $f(e_i) \cap e_j \neq \emptyset$. As $f \in F_{G,0}$, $v \notin f(e_i)$ for all i, so the maximum out-degree of $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ is at most 2. Lemma 8 implies the existence of an independent set in Γ of size $\lceil \frac{t}{5} \rceil \geq r$ that corresponds to an f-exclusive star of size r with center v.

If a graph G on n vertices contains an edge adjacent to all other edges, then $e(G) \leq 2n-3$, so the following is an immediate corollary of Proposition 19.

Corollary 20.

$$s(n, K_{1,r}) \le \min\{\binom{n}{2}, 5(r-1)n/2\}.$$

Proposition 21. $s(n, K_{1,2}) = \frac{5n}{2}$ for every n divisible by 6. Moreover, for any $j = 1, \ldots, 5$ there exists a constant c_j such that $s(6n + j, K_{1,2}) = 15n + c_j$ if n is large enough.

Proof. The upper bound follows from Corollary 20. The lower bound is given by n/6 copies of K_6 with an f defined as follows: $E(K_6)$ decomposes into five copies of $3K_2$. Within each $3K_2$, we map the edges cyclically. Each $3K_2$ destroys 12 distinct copies of $K_{1,2}$, so the five copies destroy all 60 copies of $K_{1,2}$ in K_6 .

The general lower bound follows from $s(6n + j, K_{1,2}) \ge s(6(n - 1), K_{1,2}) + s(6, K_{1,2}) = s(6(n - 1), K_{1,2}) + 15$. As Corollary 20 implies $s(6n + j, K_{1,2}) \le 15n + 15$ there exist only a finite number of values of n for which $s(6n+j, K_{1,2}) - 15n > s(6(n-1)+j, K_{1,2}) - 15(n-1)$. \square

Proposition 22. For $r, t \ge 1$ we have $s(n, tK_{1,r}) \le ex(n, ((4r+1)(t-1)+1)K_{1,5r-4})$. In particular, $s(n, tK_2) \le ex(n, (5t-4)K_2)$.

Proof. Suppose G is a graph on n vertices with at least $\exp(n, ((4r+1)(t-1)+1)K_{1,5r-4})+1$ edges, and let $f \in F_{G,0}$. Then G contains (4r+1)(t-1)+1 vertex-disjoint copies of $K_{1,5r-4}$. The proof of Proposition 19 shows that each copy of $K_{1,5r-4}$ contains an f-exclusive copy of $K_{1,r}$.

Define a directed graph $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ where a vertex corresponds to a copy of $K_{1,r}$ and there is an ij arc if there is an edge e in the i-th copy of $K_{1,r}$ such that f(e) contains at least one vertex from the jth copy of $K_{1,r}$. The outdegree of every vertex in $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ is at most 2r. Hence, by Lemma 8, we obtain a set of at least t independent vertices corresponding to an f-exclusive copy of $tK_{1,r}$.

Before our last result concerning the parameter s, let us recall that we use the notation $\Delta(r,t) = \{K_{1,r}, tK_2\}.$

Proposition 23. $s(n, \Delta(r, r)) = \Theta(r^2)$.

Proof. Abbott, Hanson, and Sauer [1] proved that $\exp(n, \Delta(r, r)) = \Theta(r^2)$ (they determined the exact value of the extremal function). So if G has more edges than $\exp(n, \Delta(5r-4, 5r-4))$, then G contains either a $K_{1,5r-4}$ or a $(5r-4)K_2$. In the former case Proposition 19, in the latter case the proof of Proposition 22 yields an f-exclusive $K_{1,r}$ or rK_2 for any $f \in F_{G,0}$.

Clearly, $ex(n, \Delta(r, r))$ is a lower bound on $s(n, \Delta(r, r))$.

5. Results about $\mathcal{M}(G)$

The notion of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is introduced and discussed in this research for the first time. Our main motivation in this section is to prove Theorem 3. However, we start with two results that completely determine $\mathcal{M}(G)$ for the two simplest graphs P_3 and $2K_2$.

Proposition 24. $\mathcal{M}(P_3) = \{K_{1,4}\} \cup \{C_k^+ : k \geq 3\} \cup \{B_k : k \geq 1\}$, where C_k^+ is the cycle of length k with a pendant edge and B_k is the subdivision of the double-star $D_{2,2}$ with the degree-3 vertices being distance k apart.

Proof. Clearly, any $G \in \mathcal{M}(P_3)$ is connected. Also, if a graph G contains a vertex v with degree of at least 4, then v will be the middle vertex of an f-free copy of P_3 for any $f \in F_{G,1}$. As one can define an edge mapping of K_3 without f-free copies of P_3 by $e_1 \to e_2 \to e_3 \to e_1$, we have that $K_{1,4}$ is the only member of $\mathcal{M}(P_3)$ containing a vertex of degree 4.

Next, we show that subgraphs of C_k^+ and B_k are avoidable for P_3 . Indeed, a cycle C_k or a path P_k is avoidable as one takes a Hamiltonian orientation of C_k/P_k and let f(e) be the next edge of that orientation. For a tree T with $\Delta(T)=3$ and exactly one vertex u of degree 3, if the neighbors of u are v_1, v_2, v_3 , then we can let f be defined as $uv_1 \to uv_2 \to uv_3 \to uv_1$ and the edges of the "hanging paths" are sent to the edge "one closer" to u. So all we are left to show is that all graphs $G \in \mathcal{M}(P_3)$ with $\Delta(G)=3$ are C_k^+ and B_k . As some C_k^+ is a subgraph of any connected cyclic graph with maximum degree 3, and some B_k is a subgraph of any tree containing at least two vertices of degree 3, it is enough to show that B_k and C_k^+ are unavoidable for P_3 .

To avoid an f-free P_3 in C_k^+ , the edges of the cycle must be mapped cyclically by f. So we may assume that v_2 is the vertex of degree 3, $f(v_1v_2) = v_2v_3$, $f(v_2v_3) = v_3v_4$ and u is the leaf of C_k^+ . But then if $f(uv_2) = v_2c_3$, then v_1v_2u is f-free, while if $f(uv_2) = v_1v_2$, then uv_2v_3 is f-free. (If $f(uv_2)$ is any other edge, then both of these P_3 s are f-free.)

Let u, v be the degree-3 vertices of B_k and let $u = w_0, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{k-1}, v = w_k$ be the vertices of the path from u to v. To avoid an f-free P_3 , for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$ at least one of the two edges incident to w_i must be sent by f to the other such edge. Also, to avoid an f-free P_3 , the edges incident to u must be mapped by f cyclically, and the same is true for v. This shows that G is unavoidable for P_3 if $\ell = 0$, i.e. u and v are adjacent. Note that if u and v are adjacent and have common neighbors, then G contains C_3^+ as a proper subgraph, so $G \notin \mathcal{M}(P_3)$. If u and v are not adjacent, then because of the cyclical mapping of the edges adjacent to u and to v, to avoid f-free P_3 , we must have $f(w_1, w_2) = vw_1 = w_0w_1$. And this implies $f(w_3w_2) = w_2w_1$ and so on. But the same reasoning at the other end of the path shows $f(w_iw_{i+1}) = w_{i+1}w_{i+2}$, so for some i we must have $f(w_{i-1}w_i) = w_{i-2}w_{i-1}$, $f(w_iw_{i+1}) = w_{i+1}w_{i+2}$ and so w_{i-1}, w_i, w_{i+1} form an f-free copy of P_3 .

For the characterization of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$ the following observation will be useful.

Lemma 25. A graph G admits a $2K_2$ -free edge mapping $f \in F_{G,1}$ if and only if each component in the complement $\overline{L(G)}$ of its line graph is either a tree or a unicyclic graph.

Proof. As noted after Lemma 8, every mapping $f: E(G) \to E(G)$ with the property $f(e) \neq e$ for all $e \in E(G)$ can be represented with a digraph $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_f$ of constant out-degree 1 on the vertex set $V(\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_f) = E(G)$, by drawing an arc from e to e' if f(e) = e'. A pair $e, e' \in E(G)$ of disjoint edges is an f-free copy of $2K_2$ if and only if neither f(e) = e' nor f(e') = e holds. Hence if no f-free f(e) = e' nor f(e') = e holds. Hence if no f-free f(e) = e' nor f(e') = e holds. Hence if no f-free allowed). Here out-degree 1 implies that every component is a tree or a unicyclic graph.

Conversely, if each component of $H = \overline{L(G)}$ is a tree or a unicyclic graph, then H admits an orientation, say $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}$ (with exactly one 2-cycle in each tree component by doubling an edge of the component in question) to which an edge mapping f is naturally associated. Then G contains no f-free copy of $2K_2$ under this f, because the copies of $2K_2$ in G are in one-to-one correspondence with the non-edges of the line graph L(G).

Proposition 26.

$$\mathcal{M}(2K_2) = \{4K_2, P_3 + 2K_2, P_3 + K_3, P_3 + K_{1,3}, C_4 + K_2, P_6, W_4^-, C_4^{++}\}\$$

where W_4^- is the graph on vertices a, b, c, d, e with $W_4^-[a, b, c, d] = C_4$ and d(e) = 3, while C_4^{++} has vertex set a, a', b, c, c', d with $C_4^{++}[a, b, c, d] = C_4$, d(a') = d(c') = 1 and $(aa'), (cc') \in E(C_4^{++}), (ac) \notin C_4^{++}$.

Proof. We first show that the eight listed graphs are members of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. We apply Lemma 25 to each graph.

- $\overline{L(4K_2)} = K_4$ has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(4K_2 e)} = K_3$ is unicyclic.
- $\overline{L(P_3+2K_2)})=K_4-e$ has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(P_3+2K_2-e)}$ is either K_3 or P_3 .
- $\overline{L(P_3 + K_3)} = K_{2,3}$ has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(P_3 + K_3 e)}$ is either C_4 or $K_{1,3}$.
- $\overline{L(P_3 + K_{1,3})}$ is the same as the preceding case $\overline{L(P_3 + K_3)}$, and also we have the same options when an edge is removed.
- $\overline{L(C_4 + K_2)} = K_1 \vee 2K_2$ has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(C_4 + K_2 e)}$ is either $2K_2$ or the paw graph (a triangle with a pendant edge).
- $\overline{L(P_6)} = \overline{P_5}$ has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(P_6 e)}$ is either P_4 or C_4 or the paw.
- $\overline{L(W_4^-)}$ is the 6-cycle plus one vertex adjacent to two antipodal vertices of C_6 , also called the theta-graph $\theta_{3,3,2}$. It has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(W_4^- e)}$ is either C_6 or C_5 with a pendant edge or P_5 with a pendant vertex adjacent to the middle vertex.
- $\overline{L(C_4^{++})}$ is C_6 with a long diagonal. It has more than one cycle, and $\overline{L(C_4^{++}-e)}$ is either P_5 or C_4 with a pendant edge.

In proving that $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$ contains no other graphs, we shall use the fact that all those eight graphs above do belong to $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. Several case distinctions will be needed. In the sequel G denotes any supposed member of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$, and the cases will end up either with the contradiction $G \notin \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$ or with the conclusion that G is an already known member of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

First, assume that G is disconnected.

Case 1.1: G has at least three components.

In case of four components or more, we can take one edge from each and obtain $4K_2 \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$, hence $G = 4K_2$. If G has three components, then at least one of them contains P_3 because $G \neq 3K_2$. Taking a P_3 from the largest component and one edge from each of the other two components we obtain $P_3 + 2K_2 \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$, hence G cannot have further edges.

Case 1.2: G has two components.

Assume that $G = G_1 + G_2$, where $|E(G_1)| \le |E(G_2)|$. If G_i has m_i edges for i = 1, 2 then G contains at least m_1m_2 copies of $2K_2$, while the number of edges is $m_1 + m_2$. We cannot have $m_1 > 2$ (what would imply $m_2 \ge 3$) for otherwise keeping only two edges of G_1 the

remaining graph would still contain at least $2m_2$ copies of $2K_2$ while there would be only $m_2 + 2$ edges, i.e. fewer edges than $2K_2$ subgraphs, contradicting the assumption that G is a (minimal) member of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. Consequently $G_1 = P_3$ or $G = K_2$ holds.

In the same way, we see that if $G = P_3$, then $m_2 \leq 3$, because for a larger m_2 , we may omit an edge from G_2 . Note that $2P_3 \notin \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$, we have already seen this fact during the verification of $P_3 + K_3 \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. Hence if $G_1 = P_3$, then $m_2 = 3$ and G_2 is either K_3 or $K_{1,3}$ or $K_$

It remains to consider $G_1 = K_2$. In this case we have $L(G) = K_1 \vee L(G_2)$, always connected. This $\overline{L(G)}$ is a star if G_2 contains no $2K_2$, unicyclic if G_2 has precisely one $2K_2$ subgraph, and has more than one cycle if G_2 contains more than one copy of $2K_2$. Hence the latter should hold for G_2 . Also, $P_3 + K_2 \not\subset G_2$, for otherwise we would have $P_3 + 2K_2 \subset G$. Moreover, G_2 contains a non-star spanning tree. It follows that $|V(G_2)| = 4$, and two copies of $2K_2$ yield $C_4 \subset G_2$; in fact $G_2 = C_4$, due to the minimality condition on the members of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Second, assume that G is a tree.

Case 2.1: $\operatorname{diam}(G) < 3$.

In the case of $\operatorname{diam}(G) \leq 2$, G would be a star, not containing any $2K_2$ subgraph. On the other hand $\operatorname{diam}(G) = 3$ would mean that G is a double star and its middle edge would not be contained in any $2K_2$, contradicting the minimality condition concerning the members of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Case 2.2: $\operatorname{diam}(G) \geq 4$.

We can immediately settle the case diam $(G) \geq 5$, because then G contains P_6 , hence it must be P_6 if $G \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Assume diam(G) = 4 and let $P = v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ be a longest path in G. Any further vertices must be leaves adjacent to P, otherwise a path of length 2 attached to P would yield $P_3 + 2K_2$ as a proper subgraph (and also a path longer than P, if attached to v_2 or v_4). The same would occur if v_3 had two further neighbors, or if both v_2 and v_3 (or both v_3 and v_4) had a further neighbor. But if just one new leaf is attached to v_3 , then $\overline{L(G)}$ is the unicyclic "bull" graph, and if it is attached to v_2 or v_4 then $\overline{L(G)}$ is the 4-cycle with a pendant edge. On the other hand, if more than one new leaf is attached to v_2 or v_4 , then a proper subgraph $P_3 + K_{1,3} \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$ occurs. The same happens if both v_2 and v_4 get a new leaf neighbor.

Third, assume that G is connected and contains a cycle.

Case 3.1: The longest cycle has a length of at least 5.

Cycle lengths of at least 6 are excluded by the fact $P_6 \in \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$. Hence assume that C is a 5-cycle in G. Any neighbor of C would yield a P_6 subgraph, consequently |V(G)| = 5. If there are two disjoint chords in C, then we obtain $W_4^- \subset G$, and hence $G = W_4^-$ follows. On the other hand, if C does not have disjoint chords, then $\overline{L(G)}$ is a 5-cycle supplemented with at most two pendant edges, hence unicyclic and therefore, by Lemma 25, G cannot be a member of $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Case 3.2: The longest cycle has length 4.

Let $C = v_1v_2v_3v_4 \subset G$. Then the set $Z := V(G) \setminus V(C)$ is independent, otherwise $G = C_4 + K_2$ would follow. Suppose first that there are two disjoint edges from C to Z. Their ends cannot be consecutive along C, because then P_6 would be a proper subgraph of G. Hence their ends in C are antipodal, thus $C_4^{++} \subset G$ holds and $G = C_4^{++}$ follows.

The other possibility is that all edges between C and Z share a vertex, which can be in C or in Z.

If it is $v_i \in V(C)$, say v_1 , then it has |Z| pendant neighbors. For $|Z| \geq 3$ a subgraph $P_3 + K_{1,3} \subset G$ would occur, that cannot be the case. For |Z| = 2 the presence of the edge v_2v_4 would also lead to the contradiction $P_3 + K_3 \subset G$, moreover the edge v_1v_3 would not be included in any copy of $2K_2$, hence it cannot be present. So in that case the only possibility for G remains to be the 4-cycle with two pendant edges at v_1 . But then $\overline{L(G)}$ is the unicyclic graph formed by a C_4 with two pendant edges at antipodal vertices, hence, by Lemma 25, such a G cannot belong to $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Finally if |Z| = 1, then either there is just one connecting edge say v_1z , or two edges v_1z and v_3z , because G does not contain a 5-cycle. In the first case V(C) may induce K_4 , but even in that densest situation $\overline{L(G)}$ is a tree (three paths of length 2 at a vertex of degree 3 as their common end). In the second case G would be $K_{2,3}$ and hence $\overline{L(G)} = C_6$ would hold, consequently $G \notin \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

Case 3.3: Every cycle in G is a triangle.

Let $T = v_1v_2v_3 \subset G$ be a triangle. Since $P_3 + K_3$ and $P_3 + 2K_2$ are in $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$, the set $V(G) \setminus V(T)$ either is independent or induces just one edge.

In the first case, every vertex outside T is a pendant vertex with exactly one neighbor in T, because G is connected and does not contain a 4-cycle. Let X_i denote the set of neighbors of v_i outside T, for i=1,2,3. None of the X_i is empty, because e.g. if $X_3=\varnothing$, then the edge v_1v_2 does not occur in any $2K_2$. On the other hand, if some X_i has more than one vertex, then we get the contradiction $P_3 + 2K_2 \subset G$. Hence $|X_1| = |X_2| = |X_3| = 1$ should hold. But then $\overline{L(G)} \cong G$ would be a unicyclic graph.

In the other case, let $e = v_4v_5$ be the unique edge outside T, and let v_3v_4 be an edge connecting e with T. Then v_3v_5 may be an edge or a non-edge.

If v_3v_5 is an edge, then a pendant edge at a $v_i \neq v_3$ would yield $P_3 + K_3 \subset G$; and in case of more than one pendant edge at v_3 we would have $P_3 + 2K_2 \subset G$. On the other hand, if there is only one pendant edge at v_3 , then $\overline{L(G)}$ is a unicyclic graph, namely a triangle with two vertices having two pendant neighbors each, hence $G \notin \mathcal{M}(2K_2)$.

In the last case, if v_3v_5 is not an edge, there can be a pendant edge at v_3 or at v_1 (or v_2) but not both, otherwise, we would have $P_3 + 2K_2 \subset G$. For the same reason a second pendant neighbor at the same vertex is not possible. It follows that $\overline{L(G)}$ is the unicyclic graph formed by a triangle with two pendant neighbors at one vertex and two pendant neighbors at another vertex.

The above analysis shows that $\mathcal{M}(2K_2)$ contains no graphs beyond the eight listed ones. \square

Now we start working toward Theorem 3.

Lemma 27. For any $t \geq 2$, we have $(3t-2)K_2 \in \mathcal{M}(tK_2)$.

Proof. First we show that every $f \in F_{(3t-2)K_2,1}$ admits an f-free tK_2 . Let $e_1, ..., e_m$ be the edges of $(3t-2)K_2$. For any given f, construct the auxiliary digraph F with vertex set $u_1, ..., u_m$ where there is an arc from u_i to u_j if and only if $f(e_i) = e_j$. Every vertex has out-degree 1, therefore each component in the undirected underlying graph F' of F is a tree or a unicyclic graph. Hence F' is 3-colorable and therefore it contains an independent set of size t. This set corresponds to an f-free tK_2 in $(3t-2)K_2$.

To show that $G = mK_2$ with m = 3t - 3 admits an f without f-free tK_2 subgraphs, take the mapping $e_{3i-2} \to e_{3i-1} \to e_{3i} \to e_{3i-2}$ for i = 1, 2, ..., t-1.

Proposition 28. The family $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$ is finite for every $t \geq 2$.

Proof. Let G = (V, E) be any graph from $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$, and let $M = \{e_1, ..., e_m\}$ be the edge set of a largest matching in G. We certainly have $m \geq t$, otherwise G would not be unavoidable; and by the minimality of graphs in $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$, we also know from Lemma 27 that $m \leq 3t - 2$. (In fact if m = 3t - 2, then $G = mK_2$, but this is unimportant.) We need to prove that |V| is bounded above by a function of t. We have seen that V' := V(M) is bounded by |V'| = 2m < 6t.

Since the matching M is non-extendable, $V'' := V \setminus V'$ is an independent set. We label each $x \in V''$ with its neighborhood N(x), which is a subset of V'. This classifies the vertices of V'' into $2^{2m} - 1$ types $T_1, T_2, ..., T_k$. The distribution of types is represented by the k-tuple $(n_1, ..., n_k)$, whose meaning is that exactly n_i vertices of V'' have type T_i . In this way each $G \in \mathcal{M}(tK_2)$ is represented by

- (1) the subgraph induced by V',
- (2) the associated k-tuple $(n_1, ..., n_k)$.

Since all graphs in $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$ are minimal under inclusion, it follows that if two graphs have the same subgraph under (1), then their associated k-tuples are incomparable, i.e., each of them has a component n_i larger than the same component in the representation of the other graph.

Assume now for a contradiction that $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$ is infinite. We are going to select a sequence from its members as follows. Since m < 6t, an infinite subfamily $\mathcal{M}_1(tK_2)$ has the same subgraph under (1). Restricting attention to $\mathcal{M}_1(tK_2)$, select an arbitrary member $G_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1(tK_2)$. Let i_1 be its component where n_{i_1} exceeds the corresponding component of infinitely many members of $\mathcal{M}_1(tK_2)$. All those members have this component smaller than n_{i_1} , hence infinitely many of them have the same value in the i_1 -component. Let $\mathcal{M}_2(tK_2) \subset \mathcal{M}_1(tK_2)$ be the family of the latter graphs. Analogously, we select an arbitrary G_2 from $\mathcal{M}_2(tK_2)$. It has a component indexed with i_2 where n_{i_2} exceeds the corresponding component of infinitely many members of $\mathcal{M}_2(tK_2)$, among which infinitely many have the same value in the i_2 -component. Note that $i_1 = i_2$ is impossible, by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_2(tK_2)$. After k steps of this kind we obtain an infinite subfamily $\mathcal{M}_k(tK_2)$ of $\mathcal{M}(tK_2)$ in which all graphs have the same associated k-tuple $(n_1, ..., n_k)$. However, with a fixed k-tuple and with a fixed subgraph induced by V' we specify just one graph. This contradiction proves the proposition.

The other direction of the proof of Theorem 3 will be shown in two cases. The next proposition considers star-forests.

Proposition 29. $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is infinite for all star-forests that are not matchings, i.e. whenever $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} a_i K_{1,r_i}$ for some $r_1 \geq r_2 \geq \cdots \geq r_j \geq 1$ with $r_1 \geq 2$ and the a_i are positive integers.

Proof. We define the graph class $D_{\ell,k,\ell'}$ as follows: we start with the double-star $D_{\ell,\ell}$ with center $\{u,v\}$. Then we subdivide the edge uv with k-1 intermediate vertices $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{k-1}$ and add ℓ' pendant edges to all w_i . First, we claim that $D=D_{3r-4,k,3r-6}\in \mathcal{M}(K_{1,r})$ holds for all $r\geq 2, k\geq 1$. Let us fix $f\in F_{D,1}$. We need to show that there exists an f-free copy of $K_{1,r}$. Observe that u and v have degree 3r-3 in D. Applying Lemma 8 (2), we obtain that the only way there is no f-free copy of $K_{1,r}$ with center u or v is that edges incident to u are partitioned into triples (e,e',e'') such that f(e)=e',f(e')=e'',f(e'')=e. In particular, the edge uw_1 is mapped to an edge not incident to w_1 . Therefore if $f(w_1w_2)$ is not incident to w_1 , then applying Lemma 8 (2) with m=2 and n-m=3r-6 to the edges incident to w_1 , we would have an f-free copy of $K_{1,2+\lceil \frac{3r-8}{3} \rceil}=K_{1,r}$. So $f(w_1w_2)$ must be incident to w_1 and thus non-incident to w_2 . Repeating this argument shows that every $f(w_iw_{i+1})$ should be incident to w_i and obtain the same way that $f(w_{k-1}v)$ is incident to v and thus not to v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then all v and then exist an v are copy of v and not to v and thus not to v and then exist an v and obtain the same way that v and not to v and thus not to v and then exist an v are copy of v and v are copy of v and v are copy of v and not to v and then exist an v are copy of v and not to v an

We also need to show that D is minimal unavoidable for $K_{1,r}$; that is, $D \setminus e$ is not unavoidable for $K_{1,r}$ for any $e \in E(D)$. We distinguish three types of edges of D: e is a path-edge if e lies on the path from u to v, e is an end-leaf edge if e is incident to u or v and not a path-edge, and e is a path-leaf edge if e is incident to some w_i and not a path-edge. In all three cases, we need to define an $f \in F_{D \setminus e,1}$ that admits no f-free copy of K_r .

- If e is an end-leaf edge, then by symmetry we may assume e is incident to u. There are 3r-5 other end-leaf edges incident to u which we partition into r-2 triples which f maps cyclically and the last end-leaf edge incident to u is mapped to uw_1 . Therefore the largest f-free star centered at u is of size r-1. The 3r-6 path-leaf edges incident to w_i are partitioned in 3r-2 triples that are mapped cyclically by f and we let $f(uw_1) = w_1w_2$, $f(w_iw_{i+1}) = w_{i+1}w_{i+2}$ for all $i=1,2,\ldots,j-1$. This ensures that the largest f-free star centered at any w_i is of size r-1. Finally, w_jv and the end-leaf edges incident to v are partitioned into triples that are mapped cyclically, so the largest f-free star centered at v is also of size r-1.
- If e is a path-leaf edge adjacent to w_i , then let $f(w_h w_{h+1}) = w_{h-1} w_h$ if $h+1 \le i$, and let $f(w_h w_{h+1}) = w_{h+1} w_{h+2}$ if $h \ge i$. The 3r-3 edges incident to u are mapped cyclically by f in r-1 triples, similarly to those that incident to v, and those path-leaf edges that are incident to w_h for some $h \ne i$. Finally, let 3r-9 out of the remaining path-leaf edges adjacent to w_i be partitioned into r-3 triples and let f map them cyclically,

and for the two remaining such edges e', e'' let $f(e') = w_{i-1}w_i$ and $f(e'') = w_iw_{i+1}$. It is easy to check that f does not admit any f-free copies of $K_{1,r}$.

• Finally, if e is a path-edge, then the removal of e yields two tree components, each being a proper subgraph of some graph already discussed under end-leaf deletion.

Now we consider the general case $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} a_i K_{1,r_i}$ with $r_1 \ge r_2 \ge \cdots \ge r_j \ge 1$ and $r_1 \ge 2$. Let $a = \sum_{i=1}^{j} a_i$ and let $G_{a,k}$ consist of $(2r_1 + 1)a$ copies of $D_{3r_1 - 4,k,3r_1 - 6}$.

Claim 30. $G_{a,k}$ is unavoidable for G.

Proof of Claim. For $f \in F_{G,1}$ and $1 \le h \le (2r_1 + 1)a$, let f_h defined on the hth copy of $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6}$ by $f_h(e) = f(e)$, whenever f(e) is in the same copy of $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6}$, and otherwise $f_h(e)$ is picked arbitrarily with $f_h(e) \ne e$. By the first part of the proof, D_{r_1-4,k,r_1-6} is unavoidable for K_{1,r_1} , and so for all h there exists an f_h -free copy K^h of K_{1,r_1} in the hth copy of D_{r_1-4,k,r_1-6} . These are clearly, f-free as well, but it is not guaranteed that their union (or the union of some of them) is still f-free as for some $e \in K^h$, $e' \in K^{h'}$ we might have f(e) = e'.

With the notation after Lemma 8 us, let introduce the directed graph $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_{f,\mathcal{E}}$ such that \mathcal{E} is the partition with parts being the edge sets of distinct K^h s. As K^h has r_1 edges, the maximum out-degree of $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_{f,\mathcal{E}}$ is at most r_1 , so by Lemma 8 (1), the underlying undirected graph contains an independent set I of size $\frac{(2r_1+1)a}{2r_1+1}=a$. Clearly, $\bigcup_{h\in I}K^h$ is an f-free copy of $aK_{1,r}$ that contains G.

 $G_{a,k}$ is unlikely to be minimal unavoidable for G, but if we remove edges of $G_{a,k}$ greedily according to whether the remaining graph is unavoidable or not, then we obtain $G'_{a,k} \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. Observe that independently of the greedy order of the edges, $G'_{a,k}$ must contain at least one (actually many more) complete copy of $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6}$. If not, then by the fact that $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6} \in \mathcal{M}(K_{1,r})$, there would exist a mapping f_h for the remaining part of the hth copy of $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6}$ that does not admit a free K_{1,r_1} . Considering the union f of these f_h s, f would not admit a free copy of K_{1,r_1} let alone that of G.

Finally, observe that for $k \neq k'$ none of the graphs $D_{3r_1-4,k,3r_1-6}$ and $D_{3r_1-4,k',3r_1-6}$ contains the other, so neither does $G'_{a,k}$ and $G'_{a,k'}$. So $\{G'_{a,k}:k\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}(G)$. \square

The next proposition is a general statement that resolves the case of all non-star forests in Theorem 3.

Proposition 31. Let \mathcal{H} be a family of graphs with $ex(n, \mathcal{H}) \leq c_{\mathcal{H}}n$ for some constant $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that every $H \in \mathcal{H}$ contains a P_4 . Then $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{H})$ is infinite.

Proof. We need several auxiliary results.

Claim 32. Every tree is avoidable for P_4 and thus for any graph that contains a P_4 .

Proof. Let T be an arbitrary tree and r an arbitrarily chosen root in T. Let us define $f \in F_{T,1}$ by letting f(e) = e' for any e not incident with r with e' being the edge one closer to r and adjacent to e. We define f on edges e incident with r arbitrarily but with $f(e) \neq e$. Observe

that for any P_4 in T if v is the vertex closest to r, then an edge e of P_4 that is not incident to v is f-mapped to another edge of this P_4 . Therefore there is no f-free copy of P_4 in T.

Theorem B (Erdős, Sachs [13]). For any d and k, there exists a d-regular graph with girth k

Claim 33. Any d-regular graph G with $d \geq 6c_{\mathcal{H}}$ is unavoidable for \mathcal{H} .

Proof. Consider any $f \in F_{G,1}$. Applying Lemma 8 (1), we obtain a subgraph G' of G such that the average degree of G' is at least d/3 and for any $e \in E(G')$ we have $f(e) \in E(G) \setminus E(G')$. Clearly, any subgraph of G' is f-free, and since the average degree of G' is at least $2c_{\mathcal{H}}$, G' contains some $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

With all the above statements in hand, we are ready to prove the theorem. Applying Theorem B, we take an infinite sequence of $6c_{\mathcal{H}}$ -regular graphs, one graph G_k for each possible girth k. This G_k is unavoidable for \mathcal{H} , by Claim 33. So there exists $G'_k \subseteq G_k$ with $G'_k \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{H})$. This G'_k is not a tree, by Claim 32, i.e. G'_k contains a cycle C_k . We can begin with $k_1 = 5$. Then choose $k_2 > |V(G'_{k_1})|$. Clearly, G'_{k_1} is not a subgraph of G'_{k_2} because the latter has higher girth, and G'_{k_1} does not contain G'_{k_2} as a subgraph because the latter has more vertices. So an infinite sequence of mutually incomparable members of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{H})$ can be selected. \square

Choosing \mathcal{H} to be $\{F\}$ for some non-star forest, \mathcal{C}_k the cycles of length at least k, $\mathcal{M}K_p$ the family of K_p -minor-free graphs, or $\mathcal{S}K_p$ the family of topological K_p -minor-free graphs, one obtains that the corresponding set of minimal unavoidable graphs is infinite.

Now we have all the ingredients for the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. If F is a matching, then $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is finite by Proposition 28. If F is a star-forest that is not a matching, then $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is infinite by Proposition 29. If F is a non-star forest, then F contains a P_4 , and therefore $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is infinite by Proposition 31 applied with $\mathcal{H} = \{F\}$.

In the remainder of this section, we show that $\mathcal{M}(G)$ is infinite for some other graphs G.

Proposition 34. $\mathcal{M}(K_3)$ is infinite.

Proof. Observe that for any graph G, edge $e \in E(G)$ and $f \in F_{G,1}$ there is at most one triangle T such that T is not f-free because T contains both e, f(e). Therefore, any graph G is unavoidable that has more triangles than edges. In particular, K_6 minus an edge is unavoidable. Let us introduce two of its subgraphs: $H_1 := K_6 \setminus E(P_3)$, with 13 edges and 13 triangles, and $H_2 := K_6 \setminus E(2K_2)$, with 13 edges and 12 triangles. We call the edges of $K_6 \setminus H_i$ the missing edges of H_i . We construct G_k as a "chain" of k-2 copies of H_2 , any two consecutive copies sharing an edge, and a copy of H_1 is taken at each end of the chain again sharing an edge with the first and last copy of H_2 in the chain. So, G_k has 4k+2 vertices and 12k+1 edges. The overall number of triangles is 12k+2, and thus G_k is unavoidable for all k. Note that G_k is not uniquely determined at this moment, since we have not specified

which edges of neighboring parts are shared. To prove that with appropriately chosen shared edges G_k belongs to $\mathcal{M}(K_3)$, we will need the following claims.

Claim 35. Let e_1 be the edge of H_2 that extends the missing edges of H_2 to a perfect matching, and let e_2 be an edge of H_2 that connects the two missing edges of H_2 . Then for any $e \in E(H_2)$ (including the possibility of $e = e_1$ or $e = e_2$), there exists an injection ι from the triangles of $H_2 \setminus e$ to $E(H_2) \setminus \{e, e_1, e_2\}$ with $\iota(T) \subseteq T$.

Proof. First observe that for any $e \in E(H_2)$, the number of triangles in $H_2 \setminus e$ is at most 10. We will use the shadow function KK(m) that tells us the minimum number of pairs that are contained in any set of m triples. By the famous Kruskal-Katona theorem, its value is attained at the initial segment of the colex order of triples. So for m = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, the value of KK(m) is 3, 5, 6, 6, 8, 9, 9, 10, 10, 10, respectively.

We need to verify that Hall's condition holds in the auxiliary bipartite graph with one part $E(H_2) \setminus \{e, e_1, e_2\}$ and other parts of the triangles of $E(H_2) \setminus e$, and e^* joined to T if and only if $e^* \subset T$. As only e_1, e_2 can make a problem, a set of vertices corresponding to m triangles are joined to at least KK(m) - 2 vertices corresponding to edges. So if $m \leq 8$, then $KK(m) - 2 \geq m$ ensures Hall's condition. The case m = 10 is trivial as all edges are contained in at least one triangle. Finally, the case m = 9 follows from the fact that every edge is contained in at least 2 triangles, so the neighborhood of vertices corresponding to 9 triangles is already the whole "edge part" of the auxiliary graph.

Claim 36. Let e'_1 be an edge of H_1 that is not adjacent to any of the missing edges of H_1 . Then for any $e \in E(H_1)$ (including the possibility of $e = e'_1$), there exists an injection ι from the triangles of $H_1 \setminus e$ to $E(H_1) \setminus \{e, e'_1\}$ with $\iota(T) \subseteq T$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Claim 35. Here $H_1 \setminus e$ has at most 11 triangles. But since this time only e'_1 can cause problems, m triangles have a neighborhood of size at least KK(m) - 1, so this covers the case $m \le 9$. The case m = 11 is trivial, and case m = 10 is analogous to the case m = 9 of Claim 35.

Observe that the claims above show the existence of mappings f with no f-free K_3 in $H_j \setminus e$: if $e' = \iota(T)$ for some triangle T, then define f(e') to be one of the other edges of T. Because of this, we define G_k in such a way that a copy of H_2 shares e_2 with its right neighbor piece in the chain, and e_1 with its left neighbor piece in the chain. The copies of H_1 share e'_1 with their neighbor piece in the chain.

Let e^* be an arbitrary edge of G_k and consider $G_k \setminus e^*$. If e^* belongs to the hth (and (h+1)st) piece(s) of the chain, then we use Claims 35 and 36 to define f on this (these) piece(s). After that, an edge shared by two neighbor pieces is used in the piece that is farther from the piece from which e^* has been removed. In this way, an f-free mapping is obtained for every proper subgraph of G_k .

Proposition 37. Let G_0 be a graph with an infinite $\mathcal{M}(G_0)$ and let G_1, \ldots, G_k be distinct subgraphs of G_0 . Then for $G = \bigcup_{j=0}^k a_j G_j$, $j = 0, \ldots, k$ with $a_0 \geq 1$ the family $\mathcal{M}(F)$ is infinite.

Proof. Set $z := \sum_{j=0}^k a_j$. Similarly to the case of star-forests, we claim that for any member H of $\mathcal{M}(G_0)$ the graph $z(2e(G_0)+1)H$ is unavoidable for F. To see this consider an $f \in F_{G,1}$. Each copy of H must contain an f-free copy of G_0 . Then we apply Lemma 8 to the graph $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_{f,\mathcal{E}}$, where $\mathcal{E} = E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_{z'}$ with $z' := z(2e(G_0)+1)$ and E_i is the edge set of the f-free copy of G_0 in the ith copy of H. We obtain that the chromatic number is at most $2e(G_0)+1$, hence there exists an independent set of size at least z in $\Gamma_{f,\mathcal{E}}$. The corresponding copy of zG_0 is f-free, hence it contains a G that is f-free.

Now $z(2e(G_0)+1)H$ contains a member H' of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ for every $H \in \mathcal{M}(G_0)$. This H' must contain at least one copy of H as otherwise, by the minimality of H for G_0 , we could obtain an f without a free copy of G_0 and thus without a free copy of G_0 . As any $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{M}(G_0)$ are incomparable, so are H'_1, H'_2 .

By Proposition 34, $\mathcal{M}(K_3)$ is infinite, and so we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 38. $\mathcal{M}(aK_3 \cup bP_3 \cup cK_2)$ is infinite for a > 0.

6. Concluding remarks and open problems

Here we list those open problems, apart from Conjecture 4, that we find the most natural to consider, and we add some comments regarding the parameters that we addressed in the paper.

First, let us mention that a relatively standard argument using greedy deletion of f-free or f-exclusive copies of G and then applying Lemma 8 yields the following statement of which the Turán number analog is well-known. We leave the details to the Reader.

Proposition 39. For any graph G and integer $t \geq 2$ there exist constants $c_1(t, G)$ and $c_2(t, G)$ such that

```
(1) h(n,tG) \le h(n,G) + c_1(t,G)n,
```

(2) $s(n, tG) \le s(n, G) + c_2(t, G)n$.

Unavoidability for s(n, G). The observation that made possible the introduction of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ was that if H is unavoidable for G, then so is any supergraph of H. Then Proposition 2 proved that $h(n, G) = \exp(n, \mathcal{M}(G))$ holds. We would like to obtain a similar equality for s(n, G) via minimal f-exclusive unavoidable graphs G, but the situation is not that simple.

Consider C_4 with vertices a, b, c, d and to each vertex attach leaf 1 to a, 2 to b, 3 to c, and 4 to d, to obtain graph H. The edge mapping f that maps (1, a) to (b, c), (2, b) to (c, d), (3, c) to (d, a), and (4, d) to (a, b) and vice versa belongs to $F_{H,0}$ with no exclusive copy of $2K_2$, However if we consider $H' = 4K_2 \subseteq H$ alone, it is unavoidable for exclusive copies of $2K_2$.

Problem 40. Determine h(n,T) at least for small trees. In particular, is 3n-9 the true value of $h(n, P_4)$?

Problem 41. Determine or get good bounds for s(n,G) in case G is $K_{1,r}$, tK_2 , a tree in general, or a bipartite graph.

Problem 42. We introduced q(n, G) as an analog of h(n, G), and Proposition 7 states that these quantities coincide. Similarly, one can define

 $p(n,G) := \max\{m : \exists f \in F_{n,m,0}, \text{ with no } f\text{-exclusive copy of } G \text{ in } K_n\}.$

Prove or disprove p(n, G) = s(n, G).

References

- [1] H. L. Abbott, D. Hanson, and N. Sauer, Intersection theorems for systems of sets, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, *Series A*, **12** (3) (1972), 381–389.
- [2] N. Alon and Y. Caro, Extremal problems concerning transformations of the set of edges of the complete graph, European J. Combinatorics, 7 (1986), 93–104.
- [3] N. Alon, Y. Caro, and Zs. Tuza, Sub-Ramsey numbers for arithmetic progressions, *Graphs and Combinatorics*, **5**(1) (1989), 307–314.
- [4] M. Axenovich and R. Martin, Sub-Ramsey numbers for arithmetic progressions, Graphs and Combinatorics, 22(3) (2006), 297–309.
- [5] Y. Caro, Extremal problems concerning transformations of the edges of the complete hypergraphs, *Journal* of Graph Theory, **11**(1) (1987), 25–37.
- [6] Caro, Y., Patkós, B., Tuza, Zs., Vizer, M., Edge mappings of graphs: Ramsey type parameters, manuscript
- [7] Y. Caro and J. Schonheim, On edge-mappings with fixed edges avoiding free triangles, *Ars Combinatoria*, 25-A (1988), 159–164.
- [8] V. Chvátal and D. Hanson, Degrees and matchings, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, **20**(2) (1976), 128–138.
- [9] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, Short proofs of some extremal results II, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, **121** (2016), 173–196.
- [10] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, Short proofs of some extremal results III, Random Structures and Algorithms, 57(4) (2020), 958–982.
- [11] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, Independent arithmetic progressions, arXiv:1901.05084.
- [12] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal, On the structure of set-mappings, Acta Mathematica Academia Scientia Hungarica, 9 (1958), 111–131.
- [13] Erdős, P., Sachs, H., Reguläre graphen gegebener Taillenweite mit minimaler Knotenzahl. Wiss. Z. Martin-Luther-Univ. Halle-Wittenberg Math.-Natur. Reihe, 12 (1963) 251-257.
- [14] Erdős, P., Stone, A.H., On the structure of linear graphs, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1946), 1087–1091

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA-ORANIM, ISRAEL

Email address: yacaro@kvgeva.org.il

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Email address: patkos@renyi.hu

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics and University of Pannonia

Email address: tuza.zsolt@mik.uni-pannon.hu

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND INFORMATION THEORY, BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

Email address: vizermate@gmail.com