

The clique chromatic number of sparse random graphs

Manuel Fernandez V* and Lutz Warnke†

March 3, 2024

Abstract

The clique chromatic number of a graph is the smallest number of colors in a vertex coloring so that no maximal clique is monochromatic. In this paper, we determine the order of magnitude of the clique chromatic number of the random graph $G_{n,p}$ for most edge-probabilities p in the range $n^{-2/5} \ll p \ll 1$. This resolves open problems and questions of Lichev, Mitsche and Warnke as well as Alon and Krievelevich.

One major proof difficulty stems from high-degree vertices, which prevent maximal cliques in their neighborhoods: we deal with these vertices by an intricate union bound argument, that combines the probabilistic method with new degree counting arguments in order to enable Janson's inequality. This way we determine the asymptotics of the clique chromatic number of $G_{n,p}$ in some ranges, and discover a surprising new phenomenon that contradicts earlier predictions for edge-probabilities p close to $n^{-2/5}$.

1 Introduction

What can we say about the typical behavior of the chromatic number $\chi(G_{n,p})$ of a random graph? This question has tremendously impacted the development of probabilistic combinatorics [26, 7, 2, 1, 13]. We revisit this fundamental question for a widely-studied variant of the chromatic number that is more difficult to analyze, due to non-standard properties such as lack of monotonicity. In particular, despite considerable attention [23, 3, 9, 20], even the typical order of magnitude of the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ remained an open problem for edge-probabilities p in the range $n^{-2/5} \ll p \ll 1$. In this paper we essentially close this knowledge gap regarding $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$, and discover a surprising new phenomenon that contradicts earlier predictions for $p = n^{-2/5+o(1)}$.

The *clique chromatic number* $\chi_c(G)$ of a graph G is the smallest number of colors required to color the vertices of G so that no inclusion-maximal clique is monochromatic (ignoring isolated vertices). There is no simple connection between $\chi_c(G)$ and the normal chromatic number $\chi(G)$, which by definition satisfies $\chi_c(G) \leq \chi(G)$. For example, we have equality $\chi_c(G) = \chi(G)$ for triangle-free graphs G , and the large gap $2 = \chi_c(K_n) \ll \chi(K_n) = n$ for complete graphs. Two further differences are that $\chi_c(G)$ is not monotone with respect to taking subgraphs, and that the algorithmic problem of deciding whether $\chi_c(G) \leq 2$ is already NP-complete [19, 4, 21]; for more structural results on $\chi_c(G)$ see [10, 24, 27, 8, 22, 11, 17]. Overall, these non-standard properties suggest that the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G)$ is harder to determine than the usual chromatic number $\chi(G)$.

McDiarmid, Mitsche and Prałat [23] initiated the study of the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ with edge-probability $p = p(n)$ and vertex-set $V = V(G_{n,p}) := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Perhaps surprisingly, they discovered three different behaviors of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$: for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, they showed that typically

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \begin{cases} \Theta\left(\frac{np}{\log(np)}\right) & \text{if } n^{-1} \ll p \leq n^{-1/2-\varepsilon}, \\ \Theta\left(\frac{p^{3/2}n}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right) & \text{if } n^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-2/5-\varepsilon}, \\ \tilde{\Theta}\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) & \text{if } n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-1/3-\varepsilon} \text{ or } n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-\varepsilon}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where the $\tilde{\Theta}$ -notation suppresses extra logarithmic factors, as usual. In concrete words, (1) determines the typical value of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ up to constants factors for most p in the range $n^{-1} \ll p \leq n^{-2/5-\varepsilon}$, and up to logarithmic

*School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA 30332, USA. E-mail: mfernandez39@gatech.edu.

†Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla CA 92093, USA. E-mail: lwarnke@ucsd.edu. Supported by NSF CAREER grant DMS-2225631, and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

factors for most p in the range $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-\varepsilon}$. The fact that the form of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ changes in different edge-probability ranges adds to the increased level of difficulty, which intuitively explains why in (1) we only know the ‘correct’ order of magnitude of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ in two out of three cases. The behavior of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ in the intermediate range $n^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$ was clarified by Lichev, Mitsche and Warnke [20], but their approach did not fully extend to $p \gg n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$, which they left as an open problem. The typical order of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for constant $p \in (0, 1)$ was resolved by Alon and Krivelevich [3], who pointed out that their argument does not give the ‘correct’ order for $p \ll 1$, i.e., they raised the question what happens in the sparse case; see also [9]. To sum up: the logarithmic gaps in (1) for $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-1/3-\varepsilon}$ and $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \leq p \leq n^{-\varepsilon}$ remained the main open problem for $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$.

1.1 Main results

The main result of this paper determines the typical order of magnitude of the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for most edge-probabilities p in the range $n^{2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \ll 1$, closing the logarithmic gaps that were present until now. This resolves the aforementioned open problems and questions of Lichev, Mitsche and Warnke [20] and Alon and Krivelevich [3], respectively.

Theorem 1.1 (Main result: order of magnitude). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. If the edge-probability $p = p(n)$ satisfies $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \ll p \ll n^{-1/3}$ or $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \ll p \ll 1$, then with high probability (i.e., with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$) the clique chromatic number of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ satisfies*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Theta(\log(n)/p). \quad (2)$$

The main contribution of Theorem 1.1 is the lower bound in (2). To go beyond the bound $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Omega(1/p)$ from previous work [23, 20], we needed to deal with one major difficulty: the impact of high-degree vertices, which prevent inclusion-maximal cliques in their neighborhoods. Our proof strategy is to show that, in any vertex coloring of $G_{n,p}$ with ‘too few’ colors, there is a monochromatic inclusion-maximal clique. To prove the existence of these cliques we shall use an intricate union bound argument, that relies on the probabilistic method and new degree counting arguments, in order to work around the impact of high-degree vertices and eventually apply Janson’s inequality (a large-deviation inequality for non-existence); see Section 1.2 for more details.

To improve our understanding of the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ of $G_{n,p}$, in view of Theorem 1.1 it is desirable to understand (i) if we can determine asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for some p in the range $n^{2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \ll 1$, and (ii) if the extra n^ε factors in the assumptions $p \gg n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ and $p \gg n^{-1/3+\varepsilon}$ of Theorem 1.1 are necessary. Our proof techniques are powerful enough to provide some insights into these natural questions. In particular, Theorem 1.2 determines the typical asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ in the sparse range $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$.

Theorem 1.2 (Sparse asymptotics). *If the edge-probability $p = p(n)$ satisfies $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$, then with high probability the clique chromatic number of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ satisfies*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) \log(n)/p. \quad (3)$$

The typical asymptotics (3) of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ are consistent with a result of Demidovich and Zhukovskii [9] for constant $p \in [0.5, 1)$, and thus it is natural to wonder whether Theorem 1.2 can be extended to smaller edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$. It turns out that this is not the case: the leading constant in (3) must be smaller than $1/2$ for $n^{-2/5} \leq p \leq n^{-\Omega(1)}$ due to the upper bound of Lemma 5.1 in Section 5. This difference is further highlighted by Theorem 1.3, which determines the typical asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for very small edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$.

Theorem 1.3 (Very sparse asymptotics). *Suppose that $\omega = \omega(n) \gg 1$. If the edge-probability $p = p(n)$ satisfies $(\log n)^\omega n^{-2/5} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$, then with high probability the clique chromatic number of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ satisfies*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \left(\frac{5}{2} + o(1)\right) \log(n^{2/5}p)/p. \quad (4)$$

Writing $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$, note that Theorem 1.3 implies that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = (1 + o(1))5\varepsilon/2 \cdot \log(n)/p$, which in concrete word says that the leading constant in front of $\log(n)/p$ changes ‘adaptively’ with p . This is a new and surprising phenomenon, which in particular (using Lemma 5.3 in Section 5) implies that whp

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = o(\log(n)/p) \quad \text{if } n^{-2/5} \ll p \leq n^{-2/5+o(1)}. \quad (5)$$

This ‘smallness’ conclusion is interesting for several reasons. Namely, (5) shows that in Theorem 1.1 the assumption $p \gg n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ with fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ is necessary to conclude (2). Furthermore, (5) contradicts the earlier prediction of Lichev, Mitsche and Warnke [20] that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Theta(\log(n)/p)$ for $n^{-2/5}(\log n)^{3/5} \ll p \ll 1$. It may be possible that the typical behavior of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ undergoes additional surprises when p is around $n^{-1/3}$, which is one of several interesting open problems that we discuss in the concluding Section 6 of this paper.

1.2 Proof difficulties and strategy

In the following we informally discuss some difficulties that our proof of Theorem 1.1 needs to overcome, in order to establish the lower bound $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Omega(\log(n)/p)$ on the clique chromatic number of the random graph $G_{n,p}$.

The natural proof approach would be a union bound argument over all color classes, which unfortunately does not give the desired lower bound. Indeed, if we try to prove $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) > n/r$ by showing that every set of r vertices contains a clique that is inclusion-maximal in $G_{n,p}$, then we get the wrong logarithmic factor. To see this, consider a set U in the neighborhood of a vertex: by construction U contains no inclusion-maximal cliques, which together with the typical neighborhood size implies that the aforementioned argument requires $r = \Omega(np)$. It follows that this kind of union bound argument can at best give $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Omega(1/p)$, which in fact was established for many edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$ by McDiarmid, Mitsche and Pralat [23]; see also [20].

The basic idea for bypassing the discussed union bound bottleneck is to look at all color classes simultaneously. More concretely, for suitable $s = \Theta(\log(n)/p)$ the plan is to argue that for any vertex partition into s color classes, there is at least one color class which contains a clique that is inclusion-maximal in $G_{n,p}$, which in turn implies that $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) > s = \Theta(\log(n)/p)$. To implement this plan, we would like to use the following three-step approach:

- (i) first we show that any such s vertex coloring contains at least one ‘useful’ color class W , i.e., where every vertex outside of W has a reasonable number of non-neighbors in W ,
- (ii) then we show that any such useful W contains many maximal clique candidates, i.e., subsets $K \subseteq W$ which have no common neighbor outside of W , and
- (iii) finally we show that at least one of these maximal clique candidates K is a clique in $G_{n,p}$, by combining Janson’s inequality (a large-deviation inequality for non-existence) with a union bound argument over all W .

For constant edge-probabilities $p \in (0, 1)$ this plan was implemented by Alon and Krivelevich [3], who pointed out that their argument gives $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Omega(\log(n)/\log(1/p))$ in the sparse case $p \rightarrow 0$, which is weaker than our desired lower bound. In the sparse case, akin to the analysis of large independent sets in random constructions of clique-free graphs [18, 5, 6, 29, 12], the main bottleneck for the three-step proof approach are vertices outside of W with many neighbors in W : these can severely limit the number of maximal clique candidates inside W in step (ii), which in turn prevents Janson’s inequality from yielding good enough failure probabilities in step (iii).

The core idea for limiting the impact of the high-degree vertices outside of W is to use the probabilistic method to randomly partition W into $m + 1$ parts A, B_1, \dots, B_m , in a way that ensures that all vertices outside of W with many neighbors in A (say at least $0.8|A|$ many) have zero neighbors in one of the parts B_1, \dots, B_m ; see Lemma 2.3. For carefully chosen parameters m, k (see Lemma 2.1 and Section 2.3), we then focus on the ‘structured’ collection \mathcal{C} of k -element subsets $K \subseteq W$ whose vertices satisfy $|K \cap A| = k - m$ and $|K \cap B_i| = 1$, the point being that these $K \in \mathcal{C}$ are by construction not contained in the neighborhood of any vertex outside of W with many neighbors in A . To implement step (ii), the plan is to then show that \mathcal{C} contains a large subcollection $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ of maximal clique candidates, say at least $|\mathcal{C}'| \geq |\mathcal{C}|/10$ many. To show this we would like to use degree-counting arguments to estimate the number of ‘bad’ $K \in \mathcal{C}$, i.e., where K is contained in the neighborhood of some vertex outside of W . This works for reasonably sparse edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$ by adapting the (level-set based) degree counting arguments of Lichev, Mitsche and Warnke [20], but in order to go down to very sparse edge-probabilities $p \gg n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ we needed to develop a new degree counting argument (whose proof exploits codegree information) to deal with vertices outside of W that have a reasonable number of neighbors in A ; see Lemma 2.4 and property (iii) in Lemma 2.2. After these preparations, we are then in position to implement step (iii): we show that at least one of the $|\mathcal{C}'| \geq |\mathcal{C}|/10$ many maximal clique candidates $K \in \mathcal{C}'$ is a clique in $G_{n,p}$, by combining Janson’s inequality with a union bound argument; see Lemma 2.5.

Finally, in addition to the above-discussed difficulties, many of the technicalities in Section 2 stem from the fact that there is very little elbow room in the arguments for very sparse p , including the ‘correct’ choice of k and m (which are both fairly small constants in that range of p , see Section 2.3.1). Furthermore, in order to obtain the correct asymptotics in Theorem 1.3, we needed to develop a new upper bound on the clique chromatic number that bootstraps existing upper bounds (to color certain remaining ‘leftover’ vertices); see Lemma 5.3.

1.3 Organization of the paper

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In the next subsection we state our main technical result, and show how it implies our main results Theorem 1.1–1.3. The proof of this technical result in Sections 2–3 uses some additional auxiliary results, whose standard proofs are given in Section 4. New upper bounds on $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ are given in Section 5. The final Section 6 contains some concluding remarks and open problems.

1.4 Main technical result: proofs of Theorem 1.1–1.3

The main technical result of this paper is Theorem 1.5 below. As we shall demonstrate in this subsection, it is key for establishing the lower bounds on the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ in our main results Theorem 1.1–1.3 (the corresponding upper bounds are conceptually much simpler). More concretely, our goal is to show that we typically have $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) > s$, where we defer our choice of the real-valued parameter $\delta = \delta(n, p) \in (0, 1)$ in

$$s = s(n, p, \delta) := \left\lfloor \delta \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n) \right\rfloor. \quad (6)$$

For this our starting point is the following auxiliary result, which formalizes some pseudorandom properties of $G_{n,p}$. The proof of Lemma 1.4 is based on standard Chernoff bounds, and thus deferred to Section 4.1. For brevity, we henceforth use whp as an abbreviation for with high probability, as usual (see Theorem 1.1).

Lemma 1.4. *If $\delta = \delta(n, p) \in (0, 1)$ satisfies $n^{1-\delta} p \gg \log^2(n)$, then there is $\tau = \tau(n, p, \delta) = o(1)$ such that whp the following holds in $G_{n,p}$. Every set $S \subseteq V$ of size $|S| \leq s$ has at least $(1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}$ mutual non-neighbors, where $s = s(n, p, \delta)$ is defined as in (6). Furthermore, every vertex $v \in V$ has at most $2np$ neighbors.*

With foresight, we then say that a set $W \subseteq V$ is *useful* if every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least

$$\ell_1(W) = \ell_1(n, p, \delta, W) := \max\left\{(1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}/s, |W| - 2np\right\} \quad (7)$$

many non-neighbors in W , where $s = s(n, p, \delta)$ is defined as in (6) and $\tau = \tau(n, p, \delta) = o(1)$ is defined as in Lemma 1.4. After these preparations we are now ready to state our main technical result Theorem 1.5 below, whose proof is spread across the core Sections 2 and 4 of this paper.

Theorem 1.5 (Main technical result). *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there is a choice of the real-valued parameter $\delta = \delta(n, p, \varepsilon)$ with $\min\{\varepsilon, 1/200\} \leq \delta \leq 1/2$ such that (i) the assumptions of Lemma 1.4 hold, and (ii) whp every useful set $W \subseteq V$ in $G_{n,p}$ contains a clique K so that every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K . Furthermore, we have $\delta = 1/2 + o(1)$ when $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$.*

Remark 1.6. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold for $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) > 0$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 remains valid, with $\min\{\varepsilon, 1/200\} \leq \delta \leq 1/2$ replaced by $\delta = (1 + o(1))5\varepsilon/2$.*

Ignoring a number of details, in the below proofs of our main results we shall use Theorem 1.5 and Lemma 1.4 to essentially argue as follows. If we partition the vertex set of $G_{n,p}$ into any s disjoint classes W_1, \dots, W_s , then (i) at least one of the classes W_j is useful and (ii) this useful class W_j must contain an inclusion-maximal clique. This in turn establishes that $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \geq s + 1 \geq \delta \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n)$, which by the properties of δ asserted by Theorem 1.5 then establishes the lower bounds in Theorem 1.1 and 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2. The upper bounds in (2) and (3) follow from Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 in [23]; see also the proof of Remark 5.2 in Section 5 for a self-contained proof.

We now turn to the more interesting lower bounds in (2) and (3), for which we pick $\delta = \delta(n, p, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ as in Theorem 1.5. Since these hold whp, we henceforth assume that the random graph $G_{n,p}$ satisfies all the properties and assertions of both Lemma 1.4 and Theorem 1.5.

Aiming at a contradiction, suppose that $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq s$, where $s = s(n, p, \delta)$ is as defined in (6). Hence there exists a valid clique coloring of the vertices of $G_{n,p}$ with color classes W_1, \dots, W_s . For each color class W_i , we denote by $v_i \in V \setminus W_i$ some vertex with the fewest number of non-neighbors in W_i among all vertices in $V \setminus W_i$. Let N denote the set of mutual non-neighbors of $S := \{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$. By the first assertion of Lemma 1.4, we know that $|N| \geq (1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}$. By averaging, there exists a color class W_j with $|W_j \cap N| \geq |N|/s$. By construction, all vertices in $W_j \cap N$ are non-neighbors of $v_j \in S \cap (V \setminus W_j)$. By the extremal choice of v_j , it thus follows that every

vertex $v \in V \setminus W_j$ has at least $|W_j \cap N| \geq |N|/s \geq (1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}/s$ non-neighbors in W_j . By the degree assertion of Lemma 1.4, it also follows that every $v \in V \setminus W_j$ has at least $|W_j| - 2np$ non-neighbors in W_j . Combining these two lower bounds, in view of (7) we infer that W_j is useful. By the second assertion of Theorem 1.5 it then follows that W_j contains a clique K so that every $v \in V \setminus W_j$ has at least one non-neighbor in K . This clique is contained in some inclusion-maximal clique, say K^+ . Note that K^+ is contained in W_j , since every vertex $v \in V \setminus W_j$ has at least one non-neighbor in $K \subseteq K^+$. Hence W_j contains an inclusion-maximal clique, which contradicts that W_j is the color class of a valid clique coloring of $G_{n,p}$.

To sum up, we so far obtained that whp

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \geq s + 1 \geq \delta \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n) = (1 - o(1)) \frac{\delta \log(n)}{p}, \quad (8)$$

where the last estimate exploits that $p \ll 1$ implies $\log(\frac{1}{1-p}) = -\log(1-p) = p(1+o(1))$. Note that (8) establishes the lower bounds in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, since Theorem 1.5 guarantees that $\delta \geq \min\{\varepsilon, 1/200\} = \Omega(1)$ always holds, in addition to the more precise estimate $\delta = 1/2 + o(1)$ when $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$. \square

For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the above proof gives the lower bound $\delta \geq \varepsilon$ in (8). This is not a proof artifact, since for $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ a linear dependence of δ on ε is in fact needed, as shown by Lemma 5.3 in Section 5. In the following proof of Theorem 1.3 we take this observation one step further, and use Remark 1.6 to determine the typical asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$, where we even allow for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n) \rightarrow 0$ at some rate.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We start with the lower bound in (4), for which we pick $\delta = \delta(n, p, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ as in Remark 1.6. By proceeding word-by-word as in the above proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2, for this choice of δ we then establish that whp the lower bound (8) holds. Since Remark 1.6 guarantees that $\delta = (1 + o(1))5\varepsilon/2$, this completes the proof of the lower bound in (4), by noting that for $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ we have $\varepsilon \log(n) = \log(n^{2/5}p)$.

Finally, the upper bound in (4) follows from Lemma 5.3 in Section 6, since $\varepsilon \log(n) = \log(n^{2/5}p)$. \square

2 Proof of main technical result: Theorem 1.5

In this section we prove our main technical result Theorem 1.5, by proceeding in three steps. First, in Section 2.1 we use combinatorial arguments to show that any useful set W contains a large collection \mathcal{C} of *inclusion-maximal clique candidates (with respect to W)*, i.e., sets $K \subseteq W$ for which every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K . Second, in Section 2.2 we use probabilistic arguments to show that at least one of these clique candidates $K \in \mathcal{C}$ in fact is a clique in $G_{n,p}$. Third, in Section 2.3 we establish the desired form of δ asserted by Theorem 1.5, and verify several other technical inequalities needed for our arguments.

We now turn to the technical details of our three-step approach, which requires us to introduce a number of different auxiliary variables. In particular, with foresight we define $\phi(x) := (1+x)\log(1+x) - x$ as well as

$$x_i := \frac{\log(n)}{\phi(r_i - 1)p}, \quad r_i := e^{\zeta^i}, \quad \zeta := \frac{1}{\log^4(n)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_0 := \ell_1(\emptyset). \quad (9)$$

These variables must satisfy a number of technical inequalities for our arguments to work, which requires different parameter choices for different ranges of edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$. Lemma 2.1 below records that we can always choose the parameters in a suitable way. We defer the technical proof of Lemma 2.1 to Section 2.3, which in the upcoming Sections 2.1 and 2.2 then allows us to focus on our main combinatorial and probabilistic line of reasoning. On a first reading, the details of the technical inequalities (10)–(19) below can safely be ignored.

Lemma 2.1 (Choice of parameters). *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then there is a choice of the integer-valued parameters $k, m \geq 1$ and the real-valued parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$ that satisfies, for all sufficiently*

large n , the following inequalities:

$$m + 2 \leq k \leq \log(n), \quad (10)$$

$$\delta \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \rho, \frac{k-1}{k}\left(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1)\right)\right\} - \frac{9 \log(\log(n))}{\log(n)}, \quad (11)$$

$$\min\{\ell_0, n^{1-\delta}p\} \geq \max\{16m(1 + \log(nm)), 8(k-m)^2, \log^4(n)\}, \quad (12)$$

$$\min_{i \geq 1} [x_i](\phi(r_i - 1)p - \log^3(n)/\ell_0) \geq \log(n \log^2(n) e^2 / \ell_0), \quad (13)$$

$$1 - \Lambda \geq \nu, \quad (14)$$

where $\nu := 1/10$, $\rho := \log_n(1/p)$, and $\Lambda = \Lambda(n, p, k, m, \alpha) \geq 0$ is defined as in equation (33) of the proof of Lemma 2.4. Furthermore, for $\sigma := 1/100$ and $\alpha := 4/5$ the following is also true: if $m \geq 2$, then

$$p \geq n^{-\sigma}, \quad (15)$$

$$\delta = 1/2 - 3\rho - \frac{9 \log(\log(n))}{\log(n)}, \quad (16)$$

$$(m+1)(\phi(\alpha/p)p - \log^3(n)/\ell_0) \geq \log(n \log^2(n) e^2 / \ell_0), \quad (17)$$

and if $m = 1$, then

$$p < n^{-\sigma}, \quad (18)$$

$$\delta = \min\{\varepsilon, \sigma/2\}. \quad (19)$$

As discussed, we now fix the parameters $k, m \geq 1$ and $\delta, \nu, \sigma, \alpha \in (0, 1)$ as given by Lemma 2.1, and in the remainder of this section we can thus tacitly assume all the properties and assertions of Lemma 2.1. Note that by (12) we have $n^{1-\delta}p \gg \log^4(n)$, so the assumptions of Lemma 1.4 hold. Furthermore, inspecting the definitions (16) and (19) for the different ranges (15) and (18) of $p = p(n)$, in view of $\sigma = 1/100$ it is easy to check that $\min\{\varepsilon, 1/200\} \leq \delta \leq 1/2$ for all sufficiently large n . Note that for $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$ we also have $\rho = \log_n(1/p) = o(1)$, and thus $\delta = 1/2 + o(1)$ by (16). Hence all properties of δ asserted by Theorem 1.5 hold.

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.5, it therefore remains to establish its assertion (ii), i.e., that whp every useful set $W \subseteq V$ in $G_{n,p}$ contains a clique K so that every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K . The proof of assertion (ii) is spread across the remainder of this section, and naturally splits into three parts: a combinatorial part in Section 2.1, a probabilistic part in Section 2.2, and a technical part in Section 2.3.

2.1 Combinatorial part: existence of many maximal clique candidates

The goal of this section is to prove that any useful set W contains a large collection \mathcal{C} of inclusion-maximal clique candidates. Our combinatorial arguments will exploit some additional pseudorandom properties of $G_{n,p}$, which are formalized in the following auxiliary result, where $\Gamma(v) = \Gamma_{G_{n,p}}(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors of vertex v in $G_{n,p}$. The proof of Lemma 2.2 is based on standard Chernoff bounds, and thus deferred to Section 4.2 (as we shall see, the proof of property (iii) is somewhat roundabout, but key for very small edge-probabilities).

Lemma 2.2. *A vertex set $W \subseteq V$ is called nice if all vertex subsets $U \subseteq W$ of size at least $|U| \geq \ell_0 / \log^2(n)$ satisfy the following graph property $\mathcal{D}_{U,W}$:*

- (i) *For each integer $i \geq 1$, there are at most x_i many vertices $v \in V \setminus W$ with $|\Gamma(v) \cap U| \geq r_i p |U|$.*
- (ii) *If $m \geq 2$, then there are at most m many vertices $v \in V \setminus W$ with $|\Gamma(v) \cap U| \geq \alpha |U|$.*
- (iii) *If $m = 1$, then, for each integer $1 \leq j \leq 9 \log(n)$, there are at most j many vertices $v \in V \setminus W$ with $|\Gamma(v) \cap U| \geq [1/(j+1) + 1/\log^3(n)] \cdot |U|$.*

Then whp all vertex subsets $W \subseteq V$ of $G_{n,p}$ are nice.

Turning to the details, in the next two subsections we fix one useful and nice set $W \subseteq V$, and deterministically show that W contains a large collection \mathcal{C} of inclusion-maximal clique candidates (with respect to W) of size k , i.e., sets $K \subseteq W$ of size $|K| = k$ for which every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K .

2.1.1 Constructing a pseudo-partition of W (probabilistic method)

Intuitively, our first step is to construct a pseudo-partition of W , see Lemma 2.3 below. Let us motivate why this helps us to find many inclusion-maximal clique candidates. Namely, one could perhaps hope to argue that a typical k -subset $K \subseteq W$ is a inclusion-maximal clique candidate, but this turns out to be too optimistic: the problem is that the ‘high-degree’ vertices of $V \setminus W$ are adjacent to most of W , in which case a typical k -subset $K \subseteq W$ is likely to be completely contained in the neighborhood of such vertices (and thus not an inclusion-maximal clique candidate). To get around this major obstacle the idea is that, for each such ‘high-degree’ vertex u_i , we should try to have at least one vertex in our clique-candidate K that is a non-neighbor of u_i . It turns out that by randomly partitioning most of W into several disjoint parts, with certain parts corresponding to non-neighbors of a fixed ‘high-degree’ vertex u_i , we are eventually able to make this idea work and construct many inclusion-maximal clique candidates. The following lemma is the first step towards making this plan precise, where we slightly abuse notation in (20)–(21) below, since the parameters a and b both depend on $|W|$.

Lemma 2.3. *There exists disjoint subsets A, B_1, \dots, B_m of W with*

$$|A| = \lceil |W|/4 \rceil =: a, \quad (20)$$

$$|B_i| = \lceil \ell_1(W)/(4m) \rceil =: b \quad \text{for all } i \in [m] \quad (21)$$

such that $|\Gamma(u_i) \cap B_i| = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$, where u_1, u_2, \dots is an enumeration of all vertices in $V \setminus W$ in decreasing order according to their number of neighbors $|\Gamma(u_j) \cap A|$ in A (ties broken in lexicographic order, say).

Proof. We first randomly partition W into $A^+ \cup B_1^+ \cup \dots \cup B_m^+$, by independently placing each vertex $v \in W$ into A^+ with probability $1/2$, and into B_i^+ with probability $1/(2m)$ for all $i \in [m]$. Note that the marginal distribution of $|A^+|$ equals the Binomial distribution $\text{Bin}(|W|, 1/2)$. Similarly, for each pair of $i \in [m]$ and $v \in V \setminus W$, the marginal distribution of $|B_i^+ \setminus \Gamma(v)|$ equals $\text{Bin}(|W \setminus \Gamma(v)|, 1/(2m))$. Recall that $|W| \geq \ell_0$ and, since W is useful, for every $v \in V \setminus W$ we have $|W \setminus \Gamma(v)| \geq \ell_1(W) \geq \ell_0$. Using a standard union bound argument and Chernoff bounds (see [15, Theorem 2.1]), the probability that one of the random variables in the collection

$$\{|A^+|\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [m]} \bigcup_{v \in V \setminus W} \{|B_i^+ \setminus \Gamma(v)|\} \right)$$

is less than half of its expected value is at most

$$e^{-|W|/16} + \sum_{i \in [m]} \sum_{v \in V \setminus W} e^{-|W \setminus \Gamma(v)|/(16m)} \leq e^{-\ell_0/16} + m \cdot n \cdot e^{-\ell_0/(16m)} \leq 2 \cdot e^{-1} < 1, \quad (22)$$

where the second last inequality holds by assumption (12). Since the failure probability (22) is strictly less than one, by the probabilistic method there must exist a partition $A^+ \cup B_1^+ \cup \dots \cup B_m^+$ of W with

$$|A^+| \geq |W|/4, \quad (23)$$

$$|B_i^+ \setminus \Gamma(v)| \geq |W \setminus \Gamma(v)|/(4m) \geq \ell_1(W)/(4m) \quad \text{for all } i \in [m] \text{ and } v \in V \setminus W. \quad (24)$$

To obtain the desired disjoint subsets A, B_1, \dots, B_m of W , we now further refine the above-constructed partition A^+, B_1^+, \dots, B_m^+ of W as follows. First, using (23) we pick an arbitrary subset $A \subseteq A^+$ of size $|A| = a$, which determines the enumeration u_1, u_2, \dots of the vertices in $V \setminus W$ appearing in the statement of Lemma 2.3. Afterwards, using (24) we then pick an arbitrary subset $B_i \subseteq B_i^+ \setminus \Gamma(u_i)$ of size $|B_i| = b$ for each $i \in [m]$. \square

2.1.2 Counting maximal clique candidates in pseudo-partition of W (degree counting)

Using the pseudo-partition A, B_1, \dots, B_m of W given by Lemma 2.3, our second step is to then show that there are many inclusion maximal clique candidates in

$$\mathcal{C}^+ := \{K \subseteq W : |K| = k, |K \cap A| = k - m \text{ and } |K \cap B_i| = 1 \text{ for all } i \in [m]\}, \quad (25)$$

as formalized by Lemma 2.4 below (where we again slightly abuse notation, since \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}^+ both depend on W). Here our strategy is to count the number of $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ that are not inclusion-maximal clique candidates, i.e., for

which K is contained in the neighborhood of some vertex in $V \setminus W$. The point is that we can estimate the number of such ‘bad’ $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ via degree counting arguments, though the details are significantly more involved than in earlier work [3, 20]. Here one difficulty is that $|W|$ can be much smaller than the typical degree np , which means that a single vertex could potentially make all $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ bad. We overcome this obstacle by combining combinatorial properties of A, B_1, \dots, B_m with pseudorandom properties from Lemma 2.2, which allows us to deduce that all vertices in $V \setminus (W \cup L)$ have at most $\alpha|A|$ neighbors in A , say. However, the major technical difficulty is that natural degree counting arguments based on property (i) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{U,W}$ (see Lemma 2.2 as well as (29)–(30) and (62)–(68) below) yield ‘too large’ upper bounds on the number of bad $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ for very small $p = p(n)$. We overcome this major obstacle by developing a new degree counting argument in the sparse case $m = 1$, based on property (iii) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{A,W}$ (see (31)–(32) below). Note that $|\mathcal{C}^+| = \binom{a}{k-m} b^m$.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^+$ containing at least $|\mathcal{C}| \geq \nu|\mathcal{C}^+|$ many inclusion-maximal clique candidates with respect to W .*

Proof. Writing $\deg_S(v) := |\Gamma(v) \cap S|$ for the number of neighbors of v in the set S , we partition $V \setminus W$ into

$$V \setminus W = L \cup X \cup Y \cup Z,$$

where $L := \{u_1, \dots, u_m\} \subseteq V \setminus W$ contains the m highest-degree vertices from Lemma 2.3, and

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \{v \in V \setminus (W \cup L) : \deg_A(v) \geq r_1 p |A|\}, \\ Y &:= \{v \in V \setminus (W \cup L) : \deg_A(v) < r_1 p |A| \text{ and } \deg_{B_i}(v) \geq r_1 p |B_i| \text{ for some } i \in [m]\}, \\ Z &:= \{v \in V \setminus (W \cup L) : \deg_A(v) < r_1 p |A| \text{ and } \deg_{B_i}(v) < r_1 p |B_i| \text{ for all } i \in [m]\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define $\mathcal{C}_X^+, \mathcal{C}_Y^+$, and \mathcal{C}_Z^+ as the sets $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ that are contained in the neighborhood of some vertex in X, Y , and Z , respectively. Observe that, by Lemma 2.3 and the definition (25) of \mathcal{C}^+ , every set $K \in \mathcal{C}^+$ contains at least one non-neighbor of every vertex $u_j \in L$. Hence all sets in

$$\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}^+ \setminus (\mathcal{C}_X^+ \cup \mathcal{C}_Y^+ \cup \mathcal{C}_Z^+) \tag{26}$$

are inclusion-maximal clique candidates with respect to W . To obtain the desired lower bound on $|\mathcal{C}|$, it thus suffices to derive suitable upper bounds on $|\mathcal{C}_X^+|, |\mathcal{C}_Y^+|$ and $|\mathcal{C}_Z^+|$.

We start with an upper bound on $|\mathcal{C}_Y^+|$. Recall that $|B_i| = \lceil \ell_1(W)/(4m) \rceil \geq \ell_0(\emptyset)/(4m) \gg \ell_0/\log^2(n)$ for every $i \in [m]$. We now exploit that every vertex $v \in Y$ satisfies $\deg_{B_i}(v) \geq r_1 p |B_i|$ for some $i \in [m]$. Indeed, since W is nice, by property (ii) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{B_i,W}$ (see Lemma 2.2) we infer that $|Y| \leq m \cdot x_1$. For every vertex $v \in Y$, observe that there are $\binom{\deg_A(v)}{k-m}$ many subsets of A of size $k-m$ in the neighborhood of v . By exploiting that every vertex $v \in Y$ satisfies $\deg_A(v) \leq r_1 p |A|$, it follows that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{C}_Y^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} \leq \sum_{v \in Y} \underbrace{\frac{\binom{r_1 p |A|}{k-m}}{\binom{|A|}{k-m}}}_{\leq (r_1 p)^{k-m}} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i \in [m]} \frac{|B_i|}{|B_i|}}_{=1} \leq |Y| \cdot (r_1 p)^{k-m} \leq m x_1 \cdot (r_1 p)^{k-m}. \tag{27}$$

Next we estimate $|\mathcal{C}_Z^+|$ from above. By definition every vertex in Z is adjacent to at most an $r_1 p$ fraction of each of A, B_1, \dots, B_m . By proceeding similarly to the estimate (27) for $|\mathcal{C}_Y^+|$, using $|Z| \leq n$ it follows that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{C}_Z^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} \leq \sum_{v \in Z} \underbrace{\frac{\binom{r_1 p |A|}{k-m}}{\binom{|A|}{k-m}}}_{\leq (r_1 p)^{k-m}} \underbrace{\prod_{i \in [m]} \frac{r_1 p |B_i|}{|B_i|}}_{=(r_1 p)^m} \leq |Z| \cdot (r_1 p)^k \leq n \cdot (r_1 p)^k. \tag{28}$$

Finally we estimate $|\mathcal{C}_X^+|$, which is the crux of the matter. For any real parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$X_\beta := \{v \in X : \deg_A(v) \leq \beta |A|\}.$$

Recall that $|A| = \lceil |W|/4 \rceil \geq \ell_1(\emptyset)/4 \gg \ell_0/\log^2(n)$. We now exploit that $L := \{u_1, \dots, u_m\} \subseteq V \setminus W$ contains the m highest-degree vertices from the enumeration in the statement of Lemma 2.3, using a case distinction.

Case $m \geq 2$: Since W is nice, by property (ii) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{A,W}$ (see Lemma 2.2) we infer that all vertices $v \in X \subseteq V \setminus (W \cup L)$ must satisfy $\deg_A(v) \leq \alpha|A|$. This degree bound establishes that $X = X_\alpha$, so by proceeding similarly to (27) and (28) it follows that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{C}_X^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} \leq \sum_{v \in X_\alpha} \frac{\binom{\deg_A(v)}{k-m}}{\binom{A}{k-m}}. \quad (29)$$

Let z_i denote the number of vertices $v \in X_\alpha$ with $\deg_A(v) \geq r_i p |A|$. Since W is useful, by property (i) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{A,W}$ we know that $z_i \leq x_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. Exploiting that all vertices $v \in X_\alpha$ satisfy $r_1 p |A| \leq \deg_A(v) \leq \alpha|A|$, by splitting the degrees into level-sets (also called dyadic decomposition) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{C}_X^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} &\leq \sum_{i \geq 2: r_{i-1} \leq \alpha} (z_{i-1} - z_i) \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\binom{\min\{r_i p, \alpha\} |A|}{k-m}}{\binom{|A|}{k-m}}}_{\leq (r_i p)^{k-m}} \\ &\leq z_1 (r_2 p)^{k-m} + \sum_{i \geq 3: r_{i-1} p \leq \alpha} z_{i-1} \cdot \left[(r_i p)^{k-m} - (r_{i-1} p)^{k-m} \right] \\ &\leq x_1 (r_2 p)^{k-m} + \underbrace{\sum_{i \geq 2: r_i p \leq \alpha} x_i \left[(r_{i+1} p)^{k-m} - (r_i p)^{k-m} \right]}_{=: \Pi_\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

(Although not directly relevant here, we remark that Π_α is further analyzed and simplified in (62)–(68) of Section 2.3.6, as part of the deferred proof of inequality (14) from Lemma 2.1.)

Case $m = 1$: It turns out that the previous bound (30) on $|\mathcal{C}_X^+|/|\mathcal{C}^+|$ degenerates for very small $p = p(n)$, i.e., is no longer less than one (see estimates (68)–(69) in Section 2.3.6, where $\Pi_\alpha < 1$ only holds when $\rho = \log_n(1/p)$ is sufficiently small). To overcome this technical bottleneck, we thus had to develop another bound on $|\mathcal{C}_X^+|/|\mathcal{C}^+|$, which exploits property (iii) of $\mathcal{D}_{A,W}$ as well as $X \subseteq V \setminus (W \cup L)$ and $L = \{u_1\}$. Turning to the details, by first decomposing X into $X_{1/\log(n)}$ and $X \setminus X_{1/\log(n)}$ and then proceeding similarly to (29)–(30), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{C}_X^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} &\leq \sum_{v \in X_{1/\log(n)}} \frac{\binom{\deg_A(v)}{k-m}}{\binom{A}{k-m}} + \sum_{v \in X \setminus X_{1/\log(n)}} \underbrace{\frac{\binom{\deg_A(v)}{k-m}}{\binom{|A|}{k-m}}}_{\leq (\deg_A(v)/|A|)^{k-m}} \\ &\leq x_1 (r_2 p)^{k-m} + \Pi_{1/\log(n)} + \sum_{v \in X \setminus X_{1/\log(n)}} \left(\frac{\deg_A(v)}{|A|} \right)^{k-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the parameter $\Pi_{1/\log(n)}$ is defined analogously to Π_α in (30), but with $r_i p \leq \alpha$ replaced by $r_i p \leq 1/\log(n)$. Let u_1, u_2, \dots be the enumeration of all vertices in $V \setminus W$ as in Lemma 2.3, i.e., in decreasing order according to $\deg_A(u_j)$. By property (iii) of the event $\mathcal{D}_{A,W}$, for any $1 \leq j \leq 9 \log n$ we know that at most j many vertices $v \in V \setminus W$ satisfy $\deg_A(v)/|A| \geq 1/(j+1) + 1/\log^3(n)$. The crux is that this implies

$$\frac{\deg_A(u_j)}{|A|} \leq \frac{1}{j} + \frac{1}{\log^3(n)} \quad \text{for all } 2 \leq j \leq 9 \log n.$$

Since $L = \{u_1\}$ and $X \subseteq V \setminus (W \cup L)$, we also infer that $X \setminus X_{1/\log(n)} \subseteq \{u_2, u_3, \dots, u_{\lfloor 9 \log n \rfloor}\}$, say. As assumption (10) implies $k \leq \log(n)$ and $k - m \geq 2$, it therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in X \setminus X_{1/\log(n)}} \left(\frac{\deg_A(v)}{|A|} \right)^{k-m} &\leq \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \lfloor 9 \log n \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{j} + \frac{1}{\log^3(n)} \right)^{k-m} \\ &= \sum_{2 \leq j \leq 9 \log n} \left(\frac{1}{j} \right)^{k-m} \left(1 + \frac{j}{\log^3(n)} \right)^{k-m} \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{1}{j^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1 + o(1) < 0.7. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

To sum up: by combining the above estimates (27), (28) for $|\mathcal{C}_Y^+|$ and $|\mathcal{C}_Z^+|$ with the two different estimates (30) and (31)–(32) for $|\mathcal{C}_X^+|$, using $r_1 \leq r_2$ it follows that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{C}_X^+| + |\mathcal{C}_Y^+| + |\mathcal{C}_Z^+|}{|\mathcal{C}^+|} \leq (m+1)x_1(r_2p)^{k-m} + n(r_1p)^k + \mathbb{1}_{\{m \geq 2\}}\Pi_\alpha + \mathbb{1}_{\{m=1\}} \left[\Pi_{1/\log(n)} + 0.7 \right] =: \Lambda, \quad (33)$$

which by definition (26) of \mathcal{C} and assumption (14) establishes the desired lower bound $|\mathcal{C}|/|\mathcal{C}^+| \geq 1 - \Lambda \geq \nu$. \square

2.2 Probabilistic part: existence of a maximal clique (Janson's inequality)

In this section we use probabilistic arguments to prove assertion (ii) of Theorem 1.5, i.e., that whp every useful set $W \subseteq V$ in $G_{n,p}$ contains a clique K so that every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K (as discussed in Section 1.4, the crux is that each such K is contained in some inclusion maximal clique $K^+ \subseteq W$). The starting point here is Lemma 2.2, which guarantees that every useful set is also nice. This allows us to bring Lemma 2.4 into play, which guarantees that any useful and nice set W contains a large collection \mathcal{C} of inclusion-maximal clique candidates K of size k , i.e., sets $K \subseteq W$ of size $|K| = k$ for which every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K . To establish assertion (ii), we then use Janson's inequality [14, 25, 16] to prove that typically at least one of these clique candidates $K \in \mathcal{C}$ is in fact a clique in $G_{n,p}$, as formalized by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Whp every useful set $W \subseteq V$ in $G_{n,p}$ satisfies $Y_W \geq 1$, where the random variable Y_W denotes the number of cliques K in W so that every vertex $v \in V \setminus W$ has at least one non-neighbor in K .*

Proof. With an eye on the upcoming union bound argument, recall that any useful set $W \subseteq V$ must contain at least $|W| \geq \ell_1(W)$ many vertices, where $\ell_1(W)$ is defined as in (7). For later reference, we now derive two lower bounds on $\ell_1(W)$ that holds for all sufficiently large n . Since $s \leq \log(n)/p$ as in the proof of Lemma 1.4, in view of the definition (7) of $\ell_1(W)$ and $1 - \tau = 1 - o(1)$ it follows that

$$\ell_1(W) \geq \ell_1(\emptyset) \geq (1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}/s \geq \frac{1}{2}n^{1-\delta}p \log^{-1}(n), \quad (34)$$

and, using a basic case distinction, it also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell_1(W)}{|W|} &\geq \mathbb{1}_{\{|W| \leq 4np\}} \frac{(1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}/s}{|W|} + \mathbb{1}_{\{|W| \geq 4np\}} \frac{|W| - 2np}{|W|} \\ &\geq \mathbb{1}_{\{|W| \leq 4np\}} \frac{(1 - \tau)n^{-\delta}}{4ps} + \mathbb{1}_{\{|W| \geq 4np\}} (1 - 1/2) \geq \frac{1}{8}n^{-\delta} \log^{-1}(n). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Turning to the technical details, we henceforth fix a vertex set $W \subseteq V$ satisfying $|W| \geq \ell_1(W)$. For technical reasons, in the following we will often (sometimes tacitly) condition on the random variable

$$\Xi_W := \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{uv \in E(G_{n,p})\}} \right)_{uv \in \binom{V}{2} \setminus \binom{W}{2}},$$

which encodes the edge-status of all vertex pairs of $G_{n,p}$ except for those inside W . Note that Ξ_W contains enough information to determine whether W is useful and also whether W is nice. Furthermore, when W is useful and nice, then Ξ_W also contains enough information to determine the collection $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(W)$ of at least

$$|\mathcal{C}| \geq \nu |\mathcal{C}^+| = \nu \binom{a}{k-m} b^m$$

many inclusion-maximal clique candidates with respect to W , that is guaranteed by Lemma 2.4. Denoting by X_W the number of $K \in \mathcal{C}$ that are cliques in $G_{n,p}$, using $0 \leq X_W \leq Y_W$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_W = 0, \text{ and } W \text{ useful and nice}) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(Y_W = 0 \mid \Xi_W) \mathbb{1}_{\{W \text{ useful and nice}\}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(X_W = 0 \mid \Xi_W) \mathbb{1}_{\{W \text{ useful and nice}\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

After conditioning on Ξ_W , note that all potential edges inside W are still included independently with probability p . By applying Janson's inequality (see, e.g., [15, Theorem 2.14]) to X_W it thus follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_W = 0 \mid \Xi_W) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu + \Delta)}\right), \quad (37)$$

where, for useful and nice W , the associated parameters μ and Δ appearing in (37) satisfy

$$\mu := \mathbb{E}(X_W \mid \Xi_W) = |\mathcal{C}| p^{\binom{k}{2}} \geq \nu \frac{(a-k+m)^{k-m}}{(k-m)!} b^m p^{\binom{k}{2}}$$

as well as

$$\mu + \Delta \leq \sum_{2 \leq r \leq k} \sum_{\substack{x+y=r: \\ 0 \leq x \leq k-m \\ 0 \leq y \leq m}} |\mathcal{C}| \underbrace{\binom{k-m}{x} \binom{a-k-m}{k-m-x} \binom{m}{y}}_{=: \Delta_{x,y}} b^{m-y} p^{2\binom{k}{2} - \binom{r}{2}}. \quad (38)$$

Fix $x+y=r$. Note that $\binom{k-m}{x} \binom{m}{y} \leq \binom{k}{x+y} \leq k^{x+y} = k^r$ and $\binom{a-k-m}{k-m-x} \leq a^{k-m-x}/(k-m-x)!$. Recalling that $a \geq |W|/4 \geq \ell_0/4$, from (12) we know that $a \geq 2(k-m)^2$, so using $a \geq b$ and $x \leq x+y=r$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu^2}{\Delta_{x,y}} &\geq \nu \cdot (1 - (k-m)/a)^{k-m-x} \cdot \frac{(k-m-x)!}{(k-m)! k^r} \cdot a^x b^y p^{\binom{r}{2}} \\ &\geq \nu \cdot (1 - (k-m)^2/a) \cdot k^{-(x+r)} \cdot b^{x+y} p^{\binom{r}{2}} \\ &\geq \nu/2 \cdot (b/k^2)^r p^{\binom{r}{2}} =: \lambda_r. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Note that the ratio $\lambda_{r+1}/\lambda_r = b/k^2 \cdot p^r$ is decreasing in r , which implies that the minimum of $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$ is either λ_2 or λ_k , i.e., that $\min_{2 \leq r \leq k} \lambda_r = \min\{\lambda_2, \lambda_k\}$. Using $\Delta_{x,y} \leq \mu^2/\lambda_r$ and the definition of λ_r , for useful and nice W it follows that the exponent in inequality (37) satisfies

$$\frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu + \Delta)} \geq \frac{\mu^2}{2 \sum_{2 \leq r \leq k} k \mu^2 / \lambda_r} \geq \frac{\min_{2 \leq r \leq k} \lambda_r}{2k^2} = \frac{\nu}{4} \min \left\{ \frac{(b/k^2)^2 p}{k^2}, \frac{(b/k^2)^k p^{\binom{k}{2}}}{k^2} \right\}. \quad (40)$$

Recall that $p = n^{-\rho}$ and $b = \lceil \ell_1(W)/(4m) \rceil$. Using first the assumption (10) and estimates (34)–(35) for $m < k \leq \log(n)$ and $\ell_1(W)$, and finally the estimate $\delta \leq 1/2 - \rho - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ from (11), it follows that

$$\frac{(b/k^2)^2 p}{k^2 |W| \log n} \geq \frac{\ell_1(W) p}{16k^4 m^2 \log n} \cdot \frac{\ell_1(W)}{|W|} \gg \frac{n^{1-2\delta} p^2}{\log^{10}(n)} = \frac{n^{1-2\delta-2\rho}}{\log^{10}(n)} \gg 1. \quad (41)$$

By analogous reasoning, using the estimate $\delta \leq \frac{k-1}{k} (1 - \rho(k/2 + 1)) - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ from (11), and that $4 + 7/(k-1) \leq 7.5$ follows from (10), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(b/k^2)^k p^{\binom{k}{2}}}{k^2 |W| \log n} &\geq \frac{1}{4k^4 m \log n} \cdot \frac{\ell_1(W)}{|W|} \cdot \left(\frac{\ell_1(W) p^{k/2}}{4mk^2} \right)^{k-1} \\ &\geq \frac{n^{-\delta}}{32 \log^7(n)} \cdot \left(\frac{n^{1-\delta} p^{k/2+1}}{32 \log^4(n)} \right)^{k-1} \\ &\gg \left(\frac{n^{1-\frac{k}{k-1}\delta - \rho(k/2+1)}}{\log^8(n)} \right)^{k-1} \gg 1. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Since Ξ_W determines whether W is useful and nice, by inserting (40)–(42) into (37) it follows that, say,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_W = 0 \mid \Xi_W) \mathbb{1}_{\{W \text{ useful and nice}\}} \ll \exp(-2|W| \log n) = n^{-2|W|}. \quad (43)$$

Finally, by inserting the estimate (43) into (36), the probability that $Y_W = 0$ holds for some useful and nice vertex set $W \subseteq V$ is thus routinely seen (by a standard union bound argument) to be at most

$$\sum_{W \subseteq V: |W| \geq \ell_1(W)} \mathbb{P}(Y_W = 0, \text{ and } W \text{ useful and nice}) \leq \sum_{W \subseteq V: |W| \geq 1} n^{-2|W|} \leq \sum_{w \geq 1} n^w \cdot n^{-2w} = o(1).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.5, since by Lemma 2.2 whp every useful set W is also nice. \square

Remark 2.6 (Improved estimate for $m = 1$). For later reference (see Section 3) we record that, in the special case $m = 1$, in the above application of Janson's inequality (37) we can improve the exponent estimate (40) to

$$\frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu + \Delta)} \geq \frac{\nu}{4} \min \left\{ \frac{(a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)p}{k^2}, \frac{(a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)^{k-1} p^{\binom{k}{2}}}{k^2} \right\}. \quad (44)$$

Indeed, the key observation is that in (38) we have $0 \leq y \leq m = 1$ and $r \geq 2$, so that in the subsequent estimates with fixed $x + y = r$ we have $x = r - y \geq 1$. This implies that estimate (39) now holds with $\lambda_r := \nu/2 \cdot (a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)^{r-1} p^{\binom{r}{2}}$, and by mimicking the argument leading to (40) we then readily infer (44).

2.3 Technical part: deferred choice of parameters

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 (modulo the routine proofs of Lemma 1.4 and 2.2 in Section 4) by giving the deferred proof of Lemma 2.1, i.e., we show that we can always choose suitable parameters δ , m and k satisfying the technical inequalities (10)–(19). Our concrete choices in Section 2.3.1 are in some sense already a significant part of the proof, as checking that they indeed satisfy the desired inequalities is tedious, but conceptually routine. Here one difficulty is that for $p \geq n^{-o(1)}$ and $p \leq n^{-o(1)}$ we need to establish rather different guarantees on δ , which are required for the different conclusions of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2. However, the major technical difficulty is that for very small edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$ there is hardly any elbow room in the arguments, and so for $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$ and $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \leq p < n^{-1/4-\varepsilon}$ we effectively need to do some calculations for $k = 3$ and $k = 4$ on an ad-hoc basis (rather than relying on general formulas and estimates).

Recall that Theorem 1.1 assumes that $p = p(n)$ satisfies $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \ll p \ll n^{-1/3}$ or $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \ll p \ll 1$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed. Furthermore, we have $\sigma = 1/100$, $\alpha = 4/5$, $\nu = 1/10$ and $\rho = \log_n(1/p)$.

2.3.1 Concrete choices of δ , m and k

In this subsection we define the parameters m , k and δ by a case distinction.

Case $n^{-\sigma} \leq p \ll 1$: Here we define $\delta = \delta(\rho, n)$ as in (16), and set

$$m := \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3\rho} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad k := \left\lceil \frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rceil, \quad (45)$$

for which it is routine (using $0 \leq \rho \leq \sigma = 1/100$) to check that $m \geq 2/(3\rho) - 1 \geq 2$ and, say,

$$(k - m - 1)\rho \geq 1/4. \quad (46)$$

Case $n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$ or $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \leq p < n^{-\sigma}$: Here we define $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, \sigma)$ as in (19), and set

$$m := 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k := \left\lceil \frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\rho \leq 4/15\}}}{2} \right\rceil, \quad (47)$$

for which a basic case distinction (depending on whether $\sigma \leq \rho \leq 1/3$ or $1/3 \leq \rho \leq 2/5$, in which case either $k \geq 1/\rho$ or $k = 3$) shows that, say,

$$(k - m - 1)\rho \geq 1/4. \quad (48)$$

2.3.2 Inequality (10): bounds on m and k

In this subsection we verify inequality (10) of Lemma 2.1, using that $\rho = \log_n(1/p) \leq 2/5$ and $p \ll 1$.

We start by noting that $k \leq 1/\rho + 3/2 \leq 2/\rho = 2 \log_{1/p}(n) \ll \log(n)$. Furthermore, since m and k are both integers, estimates (46) and (48) each imply $k - m = \lceil k - m \rceil \geq \lceil 1 + 1/(4\rho) \rceil \geq 2$, establishing inequality (10).

2.3.3 Inequality (11): bounds on δ

In this subsection we verify inequality (11) of Lemma 2.1 by several case distinctions, using that $\sigma = 1/100$.

We start with the case when $\rho \leq \sigma$. Then $1/\rho + 1/2 \leq k \leq 1/\rho + 3/2$ and thus

$$\min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \rho, \frac{k-1}{k} \left(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1) \right) \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \rho, 1 - (\rho k/2 + \rho) - 1/k \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} - 3\rho. \quad (49)$$

We next consider the case when $\sigma < \rho < 4/15$. Then $1/\rho + 1/2 \leq k \leq 1/\rho + 3/2$ and thus

$$\min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \rho, \frac{k-1}{k}\left(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1)\right)\right\} \geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \rho, (1 - \rho)(1/2 - 7\rho/4)\right\} \geq \sigma. \quad (50)$$

Thereafter we consider the case when $4/15 \leq \rho \leq 1/3 - \varepsilon$. Then $k = \lceil 1/\rho \rceil = 4$ and thus

$$\min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \rho, \frac{k-1}{k}\left(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1)\right)\right\} \geq \min\left\{\sigma, \frac{3}{4}(1 - 3\rho)\right\} \geq \min\{\sigma, 9\varepsilon/4\}. \quad (51)$$

Finally we consider the remaining case when $1/3 \leq \rho \leq 2/5 - \varepsilon$. Then $k = \lceil 1/\rho \rceil = 3$ and thus

$$\min\left\{\frac{1}{2} - \rho, \frac{k-1}{k}\left(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1)\right)\right\} \geq \min\left\{\sigma, \frac{2}{3}(1 - 5\rho/2)\right\} \geq \min\{\sigma, 5\varepsilon/3\}. \quad (52)$$

To sum up: inspecting our choices (16) and (19) of δ for $p \geq n^{-\sigma}$ and $p < n^{-\sigma}$, a moment's thought reveals that the estimates (49)–(52) together establish inequality (11) for all sufficiently large n (depending on ε).

2.3.4 Inequality (12): bound on ℓ_0 and $n^{1-\delta}p$

In this subsection we verify inequality (12) of Lemma 2.1. Recall that $\ell_0 = \ell_1(\emptyset)$. By proceeding as in (34), using $p = n^{-\rho}$ and the estimate $\delta \leq 1/2 - \rho - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ from (11) it follows that

$$\min\{\ell_0, n^{1-\delta}p\} \gg n^{1-\delta}p \log^{-2}(n) = \frac{n^{1-\delta-\rho}}{\log^2(n)} \gg n^{1/2}. \quad (53)$$

This readily establishes (12), since (10) implies $m < k \leq \log(n)$.

2.3.5 Inequalities (13) and (17): bounds involving x_i and m

In this subsection we verify inequalities (13) and (17) of Lemma 2.1.

With an eye on inequality (13), using the definition (9) of $r_i = e^{\zeta^i}$ and $\zeta = \log^{-4}(n)$ we see that

$$r_i - 1 \geq r_1 - 1 = e^\zeta - 1 = (1 + o(1)) \log^{-4}(n) \quad \text{for } i \geq 1. \quad (54)$$

It is well-known (see e.g., the proof of Corollary 8 in [28]) that $\phi(x) = (1+x)\log(1+x) - x$ satisfies

$$\phi(x) \geq \min\{x, x^2\}/2 \quad \text{for } x \geq 0. \quad (55)$$

Using these estimates together with (53) and $p \geq n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ it follows that $\phi(r_i - 1) \gg \log^{-9}(n)$ and

$$\frac{\log^3(n)}{\phi(r_i - 1)p\ell_0} \ll \frac{\log^{12}(n)}{pn^{1/2}} \ll 1. \quad (56)$$

Combining these estimates with (53) and the definition (9) of $x_i = \log(n)/[\phi(r_i - 1)p]$, it follows that

$$\frac{\lceil x_i \rceil (\phi(r_i - 1)p - \log^3(n)/\ell_0)}{\log(n \log^2(n) e^2/\ell_0)} \geq \frac{(1 - o(1))x_i \phi(r_i - 1)p}{\log(n^{1/2 - o(1)})} \geq 2 - o(1) > 1, \quad (57)$$

which establishes inequality (13).

We now turn to inequality (17), for which it suffices to consider the case $m \geq 2$, where we actually have $m = \lfloor 2/(3\rho) \rfloor$ by (45). Here we use the basic inequality

$$\phi(x) \geq \phi(x) - 1 = (1+x)\log((1+x)/e) \quad (58)$$

together with (53) as well as $\alpha = \Theta(1)$ and $p \ll 1$ to deduce that $\phi(\alpha/p)p \geq (1 - o(1))\alpha \log(1/p)$ and

$$\frac{\log^3(n)}{(\phi(\alpha/p)p\ell_0)} \ll \frac{\log^3(n)}{\log(1/p)n^{1/2}} \ll 1.$$

Combining these estimates with (53) and $\log(1/p) = \rho \log n$, using $\alpha = 4/5$ and $p \ll 1$ together with $\phi(\alpha/p)p \geq (1 - o(1))\alpha \log(1/p)$ and $m + 1 \geq 2/(3\rho)$ it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(m+1)(\phi(\alpha/p)p - \log^3(n)/\ell_0)}{\log(n \log^2(n) e^2/\ell_0)} &\geq \frac{(1 - o(1))(m+1)\phi(\alpha/p)p}{\log(n^{1/2 - o(1)})} \geq \frac{(2 - o(1))(m+1)\alpha \log(1/p)}{\log(n)} \\ &\geq (8/5 - o(1))(m+1)\rho \geq 16/15 - o(1) > 1, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes inequality (17).

2.3.6 Inequality (14): bound on Λ from Lemma 2.4

In this subsection we verify the remaining inequality (14) of Lemma 2.1. Recalling (33), our goal is to show that

$$\Lambda = \underbrace{(m+1)x_1(r_2p)^{k-m} + n(r_1p)^k}_{=: \Lambda_0} + \mathbb{1}_{\{m \geq 2\}} \Pi_\alpha + \mathbb{1}_{\{m=1\}} \left[\Pi_{1/\log(n)} + 0.7 \right] \quad (59)$$

is at most $1 - \nu = 0.9$, where Π_α and $\Pi_{1/\log(n)}$ are defined as in (30).

We start with Λ_0 as defined in (59). Recall that (10) implies $m < k \leq \log(n)$. Using (54)–(55) and $r_i = e^{i\zeta}$ together with $p = n^{-\rho}$ and $\zeta = \log^{-4}(n)$, in view of the auxiliary estimates (46) and (48) as well as the definitions (45) and (47) of k it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_0 &\leq \log(n) \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\phi(r_1 - 1)} \cdot e^{2\zeta(k-m)} p^{k-m-1} + e^{\zeta k} n p^k \\ &\leq (2 + o(1)) \cdot \log^{10}(n) \cdot n^{-(k-m-1)\rho} + 2n^{1-\rho k} \\ &\leq \underbrace{3 \cdot \log^{10}(n) \cdot n^{-1/4} + 2p^{1/2} \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho \leq 4/15\}}}_{=o(1)} + 2n^{-(\rho \lceil 1/\rho \rceil - 1)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho > 4/15\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Recall that $\rho = \log_n(1/p)$. By distinguishing whether $n^{-2/5} \ll p \ll n^{-1/3}$ and $n^{-1/3} \ll p \leq n^{-4/15}$ (in which case either $\lceil 1/\rho \rceil = 3$ and $\lceil 1/\rho \rceil = 4$), it is not difficult (by writing $p \leq n^{-1/3}/\omega$ and $p \leq n^{-4/15}$, say) to verify that $\rho \lceil 1/\rho \rceil - 1 \gg 1/\log(n)$ when $\rho > 4/15$. Inserting this estimate into (60) then yields

$$\Lambda_0 = o(1). \quad (61)$$

We now turn to Π_α and $\Pi_{1/\log(n)}$ appearing in (59). By the definitions in (9) and (30) we have

$$\Pi_\alpha = \log(n) \sum_{i \geq 2: pr_i \leq \alpha} \frac{(pr_i)^{k-m}}{\phi(r_i - 1)p} \left(e^{\zeta(k-m)} - 1 \right). \quad (62)$$

The sum in (62) is intuitively dominated (up to constant factors) by the last term, and to make this rigorous we shall now separately analyze the behavior of the term $\phi(r_i - 1)p$ and also the behavior of the sum without the term $\phi(r_i - 1)p$. Turning to the details, using the definition (9) of $r_i = e^{\zeta i}$ and $\zeta = \log^{-4}(n)$ together with $k \leq \log n$, for any $\beta > 0$ and $1 \leq s \leq k$ it follows that $\zeta s = o(1)$ as well as $e^{-\zeta s} = 1 - \zeta s(1 + o(1))$ and

$$\sum_{i \geq 0: pr_i \leq \beta} (pr_i)^s \leq \beta^s \sum_{j \geq 0} e^{-\zeta s j} \leq \frac{\beta^s}{1 - e^{-\zeta s}} = \frac{(1 + o(1))\beta^s}{\zeta s}. \quad (63)$$

Next we carefully estimate the term $\phi(r_i - 1)$ in (62). Using estimates (54)–(55), for all $i \geq 1$ we have

$$\phi(r_i - 1) \geq \phi(r_1 - 1) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) \log^{-8}(n) \gg \log^{-9}(n). \quad (64)$$

Using estimate (58), for $i \geq 1$ we also have

$$\phi(r_i - 1) \geq r_i \log(r_i/e) \geq \begin{cases} r_i & \text{if } r_i \geq e^2, \\ r_i \log(p^{\sigma-1}) & \text{if } r_i \geq ep^{\sigma-1}. \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

We are now ready to estimate Π_α from (62): by distinguishing whether $r_i \leq e^2$ or $r_i \geq e^2$ or $r_i \geq ep^{\sigma-1}$, using estimates (63)–(65) together with $k - m - 1 \geq 1$ and $e^{\zeta(k-m)} - 1 = \zeta(k-m)(1 + o(1))$ it follows that, say,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\alpha &\leq \log(n) \cdot \left[\sum_{i \geq 2: pr_i \leq e^2 p} \frac{(pr_i)^{k-m}}{\log^{-9}(n)} + \sum_{i \geq 2: pr_i \leq ep^\sigma} (pr_i)^{k-m-1} + \sum_{i \geq 2: pr_i \leq \alpha} \frac{(pr_i)^{k-m-1}}{\log(p^{\sigma-1})} \right] \cdot (e^{\zeta(k-m)} - 1) \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot \left[\log^{10}(n) \cdot (e^2 p)^{k-m} + \log(n) \cdot (ep^\sigma)^{k-m-1} + \frac{\log(n)}{\log(p^{\sigma-1})} \alpha^{k-m-1} \right] \cdot \frac{k-m}{k-m-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Using $e^2 p \ll p^{1/2}$ and $ep^\sigma \ll p^{\sigma/2}$ as well as $p = n^{-\rho}$ together with estimates (46) and (48), we see that

$$(e^2 p)^{k-m} + (ep^\sigma)^{k-m-1} \ll n^{-(k-m)\rho/2} + n^{-\sigma(k-m-1)\rho/2} \leq n^{-1/8} + n^{-\sigma/8} \ll \log^{-10}(n). \quad (67)$$

To sum up, by combining (66)–(67) with $k - m - 1 \geq 1$ it follows that $\frac{k-m}{k-m-1} \leq 2$ and

$$\Pi_\alpha \leq o(1) + (2 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{\alpha^{k-m-1} \log(n)}{(1-\sigma) \log(1/p)}. \quad (68)$$

After these preparations, we are now ready to bound Λ from (59) via a case distinction. First we consider the case $m \geq 2$, where $n^{-\sigma} \leq p \ll 1$. Using $\alpha = 4/5$ and $\rho = \log_n(1/p)$ together with the auxiliary estimates (46) and (48), in view of $\rho \leq \sigma = 1/100$ it follows via basic calculus that

$$\frac{\alpha^{k-m-1} \log(n)}{(1-\sigma) \log(1/p)} \leq \frac{(4/5)^{1/(4\rho)}}{0.99\rho} \leq \frac{(4/5)^{1/(4\sigma)}}{0.99\sigma} < 0.4, \quad (69)$$

which combined with (59), (61) and (68) then yields

$$\Lambda \leq \Lambda_0 + \Pi_\alpha \leq o(1) + (2 + o(1)) \cdot 0.4 < 0.9 = 1 - \nu. \quad (70)$$

Finally we consider the remaining case $m = 1$, where $p \leq n^{-\sigma}$. Note that the arguments leading to (68) only used $\alpha > 0$, i.e., remain valid (for all sufficiently large n) when we replace α with $1/\log(n)$. Using $1/p \geq n^\sigma$ and $\sigma = 1/100$ together with $k - m - 1 \geq 1$, in view of (68) it therefore follows that

$$\Pi_{1/\log(n)} \leq o(1) + O(1) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\log(n)} \right)^{k-m-1} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\log(1/p)} \leq o(1) + \frac{O(1)}{\log(n)} = o(1),$$

which combined with (59) and (61) then yields

$$\Lambda \leq \Lambda_0 + \Pi_{1/\log(n)} + 0.7 \leq o(1) + o(1) + 0.7 < 0.9 = 1 - \nu. \quad (71)$$

Note that estimates (70) and (71) together establish inequality (14), completing the proof of Lemma 2.1. \square

Remark 2.7 (Relaxing the assumption $p \ll n^{-1/3}$). *In the above proof of Theorem 1.5 (and the upcoming proof of Remark 1.6) the assumed bound $p \ll n^{-1/3}$ can easily be relaxed to $p \leq \frac{1}{3}n^{-1/3}$, say. Indeed, $p \ll n^{-1/3}$ is only used in the proof of Lemma 2.1 to conclude that $e^{\zeta k} np^k = o(1)$ in the arguments (60)–(61) leading to the estimate $\Lambda_0 = o(1)$. The crux is that for $p \leq \frac{1}{3}n^{-1/3}$ we have $e^{\zeta k} np^k \leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot 3^{-3} < 0.04$ and thus $\Lambda_0 \leq 0.05$, say, which in turn readily ensures that the arguments in (70) and (71) still give the key conclusion $\Lambda < 1 - \nu$. It follows that we can relax the assumption $p \ll n^{-1/3}$ in Theorem 1.1 and 1.3 to $p \leq \frac{1}{3}n^{-1/3}$.*

3 Refinement of Section 2: proof of Remark 1.6

In this section we prove Remark 1.6, which is a refinement of our main technical result Theorem 1.5. Our approach is to modify the proof from Section 2 when the edge-probability $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ satisfies $(\log n)^\omega n^{-2/5} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$. Following the definition (47) from Section 2.3.1, in this case we have $m = 1$ and $k = 3$.

Ignoring technicalities, the main proof idea is that we can use Remark 2.6 to improve the constraint (11) on $\delta = \delta(n, p, \varepsilon)$, which is mainly used to lower bound the exponents (41)–(42) of Janson’s inequality. As we

shall see in Section 3.2 below, this intuitively will allow us to improve the constraint $\frac{k-1}{k}(1 - \rho(k/2 + 1))$ in (11) to $1 - \rho(k/2 + 1) = 1 - 5\rho/2 = 5\varepsilon/2$, which matches (up to second order error terms) the desired form of δ .

The details of the proof of Remark 1.6 are spread across the remainder of this section. Recall that we are in the case $m = 1$, and so in (19) of Section 2 we previously set $\delta = \min\{\varepsilon, \sigma/2\}$. In view of $\varepsilon \gg \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$, for the proof of Remark 1.6 it thus suffices to verify that the proof of Theorem 1.5 from Section 2 can indeed be made to work (in the case $m = 1$, by suitable minor modifications) with the new parameter choice

$$\delta := \min \left\{ \underbrace{1 - 5\rho/2}_{=1-5\rho/2=5\varepsilon/2}, \rho \right\} - \frac{9 \log(\log(n))}{\log(n)}, \quad (72)$$

where for evaluating the minimum we used that $\rho = \log_n(1/p) = 2/5 - \varepsilon$ satisfies $1/3 \leq \rho \leq 2/5$.

3.1 Application of old choice (19) of δ

Recall that in Section 2 we previously used $\delta = \min\{\varepsilon, \sigma/2\}$, see (19). In the proof of Theorem 1.5, the bound $\delta \leq \sigma/2$ is only used in the deferred proof of Lemma 2.2 in Section 4.2, more precisely in (82) to establish that

$$n^\delta p \ll \log^{-7}(n). \quad (73)$$

We now show that that (73) remains valid for our new choice (72) of δ , which is routine: using $p = n^{-\rho}$ and $\delta \leq \rho - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ we here readily infer that

$$n^\delta p = n^{\delta-\rho} \leq \log^{-9}(n) \ll \log^{-7}(n).$$

In the proof of Theorem 1.5, the other bound $\delta \leq \varepsilon$ from (19) is only used in two places. First, in Section 2 below Lemma 2.1 it is used in the arguments leading to $\min\{\varepsilon, 1/200\} \leq \delta \leq 1/2$: in the conclusion of Remark 1.6 this estimate is replaced by $\delta = (1 + o(1))5\varepsilon/2$, which in turn readily follows from $\varepsilon \gg \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ and the new definition (72) of δ . Second, in Section 2.3.3 the bound $\delta \leq \varepsilon$ is also used establish the upper bound (11) on δ , whose applications are the subject of the next subsection (as we shall see, they will again remain valid).

3.2 Application of old inequality (11) for δ

In the proof of Theorem 1.5 from Section 2, inequality (11) for δ is only used in two places. Firstly, inequality (11) is used in the proof of Lemma 2.5 in Section 2.2, more precisely in (41)–(42) to show that the exponent (37) of Janson's inequality satisfies

$$\frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu + \Delta)} \gg |W| \log n. \quad (74)$$

Secondly, inequality (11) is used in the proof of (53) in Section 2.3.4, to establish the technical estimate

$$\min\{\ell_0, n^{1-\delta}p\} \gg n^{1/2}. \quad (75)$$

We thus need to show that the two estimates (74)–(75) remain valid for our new choice (72) of δ , and we start with the routine proof of (75): by proceeding as in (34) and (53), using $\delta \leq 1 - 5\rho/2 - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$ and $\rho = \log_n(1/p) \geq 1/3$ it here readily follows that

$$\min\{\ell_0, n^{1-\delta}p\} \gg n^{1-\delta}p \log^{-2}(n) = \frac{n^{1-\delta-\rho}}{\log^2(n)} \geq n^{3\rho/2} \log^7(n) \gg n^{1/2}. \quad (76)$$

We now turn to the key estimate (74), which is the crux of the matter. Recalling that $m = 1$, Remark 2.6 implies that the exponent (37) of Janson's inequality can here be written as

$$\frac{\mu^2}{2(\mu + \Delta)} \geq \frac{\nu}{4} \min \left\{ \frac{(a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)p}{k^2}, \frac{(a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)^{k-1} p^{\binom{k}{2}}}{k^2} \right\}. \quad (77)$$

Recall that $b \geq \ell_1(W)/(4m)$. Using $a \geq |W|/4$ as well as $m \leq k = 3$ and $\delta \leq 1 - 2\rho - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$, note that the arguments leading to estimate (41) here imply (with room to spare) that

$$\frac{(a/k^2) \cdot (b/k^2)p}{k^2|W| \log n} \geq \frac{\ell_1(W)p}{4k^6 m \log n} \cdot \frac{a}{|W|} \gg \frac{n^{1-\delta} p^2}{\log^3(n)} = \frac{n^{1-\delta-2\rho}}{\log^3(n)} \gg 1. \quad (78)$$

Similarly, using $a \geq |W|/4$ as well as $m \leq k = 3$ and $\delta \leq 1 - \rho(k/2 + 1) - 9 \log(\log(n))/\log(n)$, note that the arguments leading to estimate (42) here imply (with room to spare) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(a/k)^2 \cdot (b/k^2)^{k-1} p^{\binom{k}{2}}}{k^2|W| \log n} &\geq \frac{1}{k^6 \log n} \cdot \frac{a}{|W|} \cdot \left(\frac{\ell_1(W)p^{k/2}}{4mk^2} \right)^{k-1} \\ &\gg \frac{1}{\log^2(n)} \cdot \left(\frac{n^{1-\delta} p^{k/2+1}}{\log^2(n)} \right)^{k-1} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{n^{1-\delta-\rho(k/2+1)}}{\log^4(n)} \right)^{k-1} \gg 1. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Combining (78)–(79) with (77) and $\nu = \Omega(1)$ then establishes the desired estimate (74), as claimed.

3.3 Completing the proof of Remark 1.6

With the discussed minor modifications from Section 3.1 and 3.1 in hand, now all remaining arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.5 carry over unchanged (in the relevant case $m = 1$). This completes the proof of Remark 1.6. \square

4 Deferred standard proofs: edge-density arguments

In this section we give the deferred routine proofs of Lemma 1.4 and 2.2 from Sections 1.4 and 2. Both proofs are based on edge-density arguments, i.e., use Chernoff bounds as well as union bound and counting arguments.

4.1 Non-neighbors and neighbors: proof of Lemma 1.4

Proof of Lemma 1.4. We start with the first assertion about the number of mutual non-neighbors. Given a set $S \subseteq V$ of size $|S| \leq s$, we denote by X_S the number of its mutual non-neighbors in $G_{n,p}$. Note that X_S has distribution $\text{Bin}(n - |S|, (1-p)^{|S|})$. Since $|S| \leq s \leq \delta \log_{1/(1-p)}(n)$ by definition (6) of s , it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}X_S = (n - |S|)(1-p)^{|S|} \geq (n - s)n^{-\delta} = n^{1-\delta}(1 - s/n),$$

In view of $s \leq \delta \log(n)/[-\log(1-p)] \leq \log(n)/p$, with foresight we define

$$\tau := \max \left\{ \frac{2 \log n}{np}, \sqrt{\frac{32 \log^2(n)}{n^{1-\delta} p [1 - \log(n)/(np)]}} \right\} \geq \max \left\{ \frac{2s}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{32s \log n}{n^{1-\delta}(1 - s/n)}} \right\}.$$

Using the assumption $n^{1-\delta} p \gg \log^2(n)$, it is routine to see that $np \geq n^{1-\delta} p \gg \log n$ and $\tau = o(1)$. Using a union bound argument and standard Chernoff bounds (such as [15, Theorem 2.1]), the probability that we have $X_S \leq (1 - \tau/2)\mathbb{E}X_S$ for some set $S \subseteq V$ of size $|S| \leq s$ is at most

$$\sum_{S \subseteq V: |S| \leq s} \exp \left(-\frac{(\tau/2)^2 \mathbb{E}X_S}{2} \right) \leq n^{s+1} \cdot e^{-\tau^2 n^{1-\delta} u/8} \leq n^{-2s} \ll 1.$$

Noting that $(1 - \tau/2)\mathbb{E}X_S \geq (1 - \tau)n^{1-\delta}$ then establishes the first assertion of Lemma 1.4.

We now turn to the second assertion about the number of neighbors. Given a vertex $v \in V$, we denote by X_v the number of its neighbors in $G_{n,p}$. Note that X_S has distribution $\text{Bin}(n - 1, p)$, with $\mathbb{E}X \leq np$. Using a union

bound argument and standard Chernoff bounds (such as [15, Theorem 2.1]), in view of $np \geq n^{1-\delta}p \gg \log^2(n)$ we see that the probability that we have $X_v \geq 2np$ for some vertex $v \in V$ is at most, say,

$$\sum_{v \in V} \exp\left(-\frac{np}{4}\right) \leq n \cdot o(n^{-2}) \ll 1.$$

This establishes the second assertion of Lemma 1.4, completing the proof of Lemma 1.4. \square

4.2 Pseudorandom properties: proof of Lemma 2.2

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Let \mathcal{U} denote the set of all $U \subseteq V$ of size $|U| \geq \ell_0/\log^2(n)$. We decompose

$$\mathcal{D}_{U,W} = \mathcal{D}_{U,W,(i)} \cap \mathcal{D}_{U,W,(ii)} \cap \mathcal{D}_{U,W,(iii)},$$

corresponding to the three properties of $\mathcal{D}_{U,W}$. The crux is that if $\mathcal{D}_{U,W}$ fails for some set $W \subseteq V$ and $U \subseteq W$, then by edge-monotonicity also the event

$$\mathcal{D}_U := \mathcal{D}_{U,(i)} \cap \mathcal{D}_{U,(ii)} \cap \mathcal{D}_{U,(iii)}$$

fails, where the definition of each $\mathcal{D}_{U,x}$ is the same as $\mathcal{D}_{U,W,x}$ except that the restriction ‘vertices in $V \setminus W$ ’ is replaced by ‘vertices in $V \setminus U$ ’. It thus suffices to show that the probability that \mathcal{D}_U fails for some $U \in \mathcal{U}$ has probability $o(1)$, and in the following we shall deal with each property $\mathcal{D}_{U,x}$ separately.

We first focus on $\mathcal{D}_{U,(i)}$. Note that if $\mathcal{D}_{U,(i)}$ fails, then for some integer $i \geq 1$ with $r_i p \leq 1$ there is a set of vertices $X \subseteq V \setminus U$ of size $|X| = \lceil x_i \rceil$ such that there are at least $\lceil x_i \rceil \cdot \lceil r_i p |U| \rceil \geq r_i \lceil x_i \rceil |U| p$ edges between X and U . Since the number of these edges has distribution $\text{Bin}(\lceil x_i \rceil |U|, p)$, using Chernoff bounds for the upper tail (see [15, Theorem 2.1]) and a standard union bound argument it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\neg \mathcal{D}_{U,(i)}) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1: r_i p \leq 1} \binom{n}{\lceil x_i \rceil} \cdot e^{-\phi(r_i-1)\lceil x_i \rceil |U| p}. \quad (80)$$

Taking all $U \in \mathcal{U}$ into account, using assumptions (13) and (12) it follows via a standard union bound argument that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\neg \mathcal{D}_{U,(i)} \text{ for some } U \in \mathcal{U}) &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \binom{n}{u} \cdot \sum_{i \geq 1: r_i p \leq 1} n^{\lceil x_i \rceil} e^{-\phi(r_i-1)\lceil x_i \rceil u p} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \sum_{i \geq 1: r_i p \leq 1} \left[\frac{ne}{u} \cdot n^{\lceil x_i \rceil / u} \cdot e^{-\phi(r_i-1)\lceil x_i \rceil p} \right]^u \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \sum_{i \geq 1: r_i p \leq 1} \left[\frac{n \log^2(n) e}{\ell_0} \cdot e^{\lceil x_i \rceil \log^3(n) / \ell_0 - \phi(r_i-1)\lceil x_i \rceil p} \right]^u \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \sum_{i \geq 1: r_i p \leq 1} e^{-u} \leq n \cdot (\log n)^{O(1)} \cdot e^{-\log^2(n)} \ll 1. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Next, the argument for $\mathcal{D}_{U,(ii)}$ is similar (but simpler) than for $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$. Indeed, replacing $\lceil x_i \rceil$ and $r_i p$ with $m+1$ and α in the Chernoff part, using assumptions (17) and (12) it follows similarly to (80)–(81) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\neg \mathcal{D}_{U,(ii)} \text{ for some } U \in \mathcal{U}) &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \binom{n}{u} \binom{n}{m+1} \cdot e^{-\phi(\alpha/p)(m+1)u p} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} \left[\frac{n \log^2(n) e}{\ell_0} \cdot e^{(m+1) \log^3(n) / \ell_0 - \phi(\alpha/p)(m+1)p} \right]^u \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell_0/\log^2(n) \leq u \leq n} e^{-u} \leq n \cdot e^{-\log^2(n)} \ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we turn to $\mathcal{D}_{U,(\text{iii})}$, for which we shall use a completely different approach (using counting arguments and contradiction). Given a vertex $v \in V$, we denote by $\Gamma(v)$ the neighborhood of v in $G_{n,p}$. Let \mathcal{N} denote the event that $X_{v,w} := |\Gamma(v) \cap \Gamma(w)| \leq 2np^2$ for all distinct vertices $v, w \in V$. Note that $X_{v,w}$ has distribution $\text{Bin}(n-2, p^2)$, with $\mathbb{E}X_{v,w} \leq np^2$. Using a union bound argument and standard Chernoff bounds (such as [15, Theorem 2.1]), in view of the lower bound $np^2 \gg n^{1-4/5} \gg \log(n)$ it routinely follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\neg \mathcal{N}) \leq n^2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{np^2}{4}\right) \ll 1.$$

Since \mathcal{N} holds whp, it remains to deterministically argue that \mathcal{N} implies the event $\mathcal{D}_{U,(\text{iii})}$ for any $1 \leq j \leq 9 \log(n)$ and set $U \subseteq V$ of size $|U| \geq \ell_0 / \log^2(n)$. Aiming at a contradiction, suppose that there are $j+1$ distinct vertices $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{j+1} \in V \setminus U$ that are each adjacent to at least $\lceil 1/(j+1) + 1/\log^3(n) \rceil \cdot |U|$ vertices of U . With foresight, note that assumptions (18)–(19) imply (with room to spare) the upper bound

$$n^\delta p \leq n^{\delta-\sigma} \leq n^{-\sigma/2} \ll \log^{-7}(n). \quad (82)$$

Since $s \leq \log(n)/p$ as in the proof of Lemma 1.4, in view of the definition (7) of $\ell_0 = \ell_0(\emptyset)$ we see that $\ell_0 \geq (1-\tau)n^{1-\delta}p/\log(n)$. Using the codegree-property \mathcal{N} and the lower bound $|U| \geq \ell_0/\log^2(n)$ together with $\tau = o(1)$ and the upper bound $n^\delta p \ll \log^{-7}(n)$ from (82), for any $1 \leq i \leq j+1$ it follows that

$$\frac{\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq j+1: i \neq \ell} |\Gamma(v_i) \cap \Gamma(v_\ell)|}{|U|} \leq \frac{j \cdot 2np^2}{\Omega(n^{1-\delta}p/\log^3(n))} \leq O(n^\delta p \log^4(n)) \ll 1/\log^3(n).$$

Since $|U \cap \Gamma(v_i)| \geq |U|/(j+1) + |U|/\log^3(n)$, we thus obtain a contradiction by noting that

$$|U| \geq \left| \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq j+1} (U \cap \Gamma(v_i)) \right| \geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j+1} (|U \cap \Gamma(v_i)| - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq j+1: i \neq \ell} |\Gamma(v_i) \cap \Gamma(v_\ell)|) > |U|,$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 2.2, as discussed. \square

5 Upper bounds on clique chromatic number

In this section we prove new upper bounds on the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ of $G_{n,p}$ for $n^{-2/5} \ll p \ll 1$, which are used in the proofs of our main results Theorem 1.1–1.3. Our first upper bound demonstrates that the typical asymptotics $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = (\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log(n)/p$ for $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$ (see Theorem 1.1 and Remark 5.2) do not extend to smaller edge-probabilities $p = p(n)$. Indeed, Lemma 5.1 below shows that the leading constant must be smaller than $1/2$ for $n^{-2/5} \leq p \leq n^{-\Omega(1)}$, since then $\rho = \log_n(1/p) = \Omega(1)$ in (83) below.

Lemma 5.1. *If the edge-probability $p = p(n)$ satisfies $n^{-1/2} \ll p \ll \log^{-1}(n)$, then whp*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho \left(\frac{1}{2} - \rho \right) + o(\rho) \right) \log(n)/p. \quad (83)$$

Remark 5.2. *The proof implies that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq (\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log(n)/p$ when $n^{-1/2} \ll p \ll 1$.*

Our second upper bound demonstrates that $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = o(\log(n)/p)$ for $p = n^{-2/5+o(1)}$, which is surprising in view of previous bounds and speculations [3, 23, 20, 9] for $p \gg n^{-2/5}(\log n)^{3/5}$. In fact, the upper bound (84) of Lemma 5.3 is best possible for $(\log n)^\omega n^{-2/5} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3}$, see the proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 1.4.

Lemma 5.3. *If the edge-probability $p = p(n)$ satisfies $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ with $2n^{-2/5} \leq p \leq n^{-1/9}$, then whp*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq \left(\frac{5\varepsilon}{2} + o(1) \right) \log(n)/p. \quad (84)$$

The proofs of Lemma 5.1 and 5.3 are given in the next two subsections, and they both follow similar two-step approaches to construct a valid vertex coloring of $G_{n,p}$ without monochromatic inclusion-maximal cliques. Aiming at roughly $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq \delta \log(n)/p$ in (83) and (84) for suitable $\delta > 0$, in the first step we use a simple greedy approach to color the vertices of $G_{n,p}$ using $\delta \log(n)/p$ colors, until a set N of $|N| = \Theta(n^{1-\delta})$ uncolored vertices is left. In the second step we then use a lemma-specific argument to color the remaining vertices in N using a negligible number of additional new colors (compared to the number of colors used in the first step).

5.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

In the below proof of Lemma 5.1, in the second coloring step we partition the set $N = N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_z$ into $z = \Theta(1/p)$ parts, and then show that whp there are no cliques in the induced subgraphs $G_{n,p}[N_i]$ that are inclusion maximal with respect to $G_{n,p}$. By giving all vertices in each N_i one new color, it turns out that we obtain a valid coloring of the remaining vertices in N using $z = o(\rho \log(n)/p)$ many additional new colors.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Recalling that $\rho = \log_n(1/p)$, with foresight we define

$$s := \left\lceil \delta \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n) \right\rceil, \quad \delta := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\rho}{2} + \frac{\rho^2}{1-\lambda} + \lambda, \quad \lambda := \frac{6 \log \log(n)}{\log(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad z := \left\lceil \frac{4}{p} \right\rceil.$$

Since $p \ll \log^{-1}(n)$ ensures $\log_{1/(1-p)}(n) = (1 + O(p)) \log(n)/p$ and $\max\{p, \lambda\} \ll \log(1/p)/\log(n) = \rho$ as well as $z \ll \log(1/p)/p = \rho \log(n)/p$, to complete the proof of (83) and Remark 5.2 it suffices to show that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq s + z + 1$ under the assumption $n^{-1/2} \ll p \ll 1$. (To clarify: this also establishes the bound of Remark 5.2, since $p \ll 1$ implies $\rho, \lambda = o(1)$ and $\log_{1/(1-p)}(n) = (1 + o(1)) \log(n)/p$.)

Our approach is to color the vertices of $G_{n,p}$ with the colors $\{1, \dots, s + z + 1\}$ using the following procedure, where we fix an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of all vertices (say using lexicographic ordering). First we sequentially consider the vertices v_1, \dots, v_s , and each time color all so far uncolored vertices in $N(v_i)$ with color i . Then we color all so far uncolored vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ with color $s + 1$, so that the set of all so far uncolored vertices equals

$$N := V \setminus \left(S \cup \bigcup_{v_i \in S} N(v_i) \right) \quad \text{with} \quad S := \{v_1, \dots, v_s\}.$$

Using the ordering of the vertices fixed above, we then sequentially partition N into disjoint sets

$$N = N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_z \quad \text{with} \quad |N_i| \leq 2|N|/z,$$

and, for each $1 \leq i \leq z$, then color all vertices in N_i with color $s + 1 + i$.

Let us collect some basic properties of the resulting coloring. First we record that, by an analogous argument to the proof in Section 4.1 of the non-neighbors result Lemma 1.4 (exploiting that $n^{1-\delta}p \gg (\log n)^2$ holds), we obtain that whp $|N| \leq 2n^{1-\delta}$. Next, note that every vertex colored $i \leq s$ is adjacent to vertex v_i , which itself has a different color than i (either color $s + 1$ or a color that is less than i). Furthermore, the set of vertices colored $s + 1$ form an independent set. From this we deduce the following: if $G_{n,p}$ contains an inclusion-maximal monochromatic clique K , then its color must be in $\{s + 2, \dots, s + z + 1\}$, which means that K must be contained in some set N_i . To complete the proof, it thus suffices to show that whp no N_i contains an inclusion-maximal clique.

To this end we expose the status of potential edges of $G_{n,p}$ in two rounds: in the first round we expose the edge-status of all vertex pairs containing at least one vertex from S (which contains enough information to determine N), and in the second round we expose the edge-status of all remaining vertex pairs. We henceforth condition on the outcome of the first exposure round, and assume that $|N| \leq 2n^{1-\delta}$ (since this holds whp). As usual, to avoid clutter, we shall omit this conditioning from our notation. Fix N_i with $1 \leq i \leq z$. We infer that

$$|N_i| \leq 2|N|/z \leq n^{1-\delta}p.$$

Note that if $K \subseteq N_i$ is an inclusion-maximal clique in $G_{n,p}$, then K is also an inclusion-maximal clique in $G_{n,p}[V \setminus S]$. Denoting by $X_{i,k}$ the number of inclusion-maximal cliques $K \subseteq N_i$ of size $|K| = k$ in $G_{n,p}[V \setminus S]$, writing $X_i := \sum_{2 \leq k \leq |N_i|} X_{i,k}$ it therefore routinely follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(N_i \text{ contains an inclusion-maximal clique}) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_i \geq 1) \leq \sum_{2 \leq k \leq |N_i|} \mathbb{E}X_{i,k}. \quad (85)$$

Note that after conditioning on the outcome of the first exposure round, all potential edges inside $V \setminus S$ are still included independently with probability p . Hence standard random graph estimates give, in view of $|S| = z = O(n^{1/2})$ and $|N_i| \leq n^{1-\delta}p = n^{1-\delta+\rho/2}p^{1/2} = O(n^{1/2})$ that, say,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{i,k} = \binom{|N_i|}{k} p^{\binom{k}{2}} (1-p^k)^{n-|S|-|N_i|} \leq \left(en^{1-\delta}p/k \cdot p^{(k-1)/2} \cdot e^{-(1-o(1))p^k n/k} \right)^k.$$

We now proceed by via several case distinctions. If $p^k n \geq 4k \log(n)$, then it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}X_{i,k} \leq \left(en e^{-(1-o(1))p^k n/k} \right)^k \leq n^{-k}. \quad (86)$$

If otherwise $p^k n \leq 4k \log(n)$, then in view of $p = n^{-\rho}$ we see that

$$\mathbb{E}X_{i,k} \leq \left(en^{1-\delta} \cdot p^{1/2+k/2}/k \right)^k \leq \left(en^{1-\delta} p^{1/2} \sqrt{4 \log(n)/(nk)} \right)^k \leq \left(e^2 n^{1/2-\delta-\rho/2} \sqrt{\log(n)/k} \right)^k.$$

In particular, if in addition $k \geq e^6 \log n$, then using $\delta \geq 1/2 - \rho/2$ we see that

$$\mathbb{E}X_{i,k} \leq \left(e^{-1} n^{1/2-\delta-\rho/2} \right)^k \leq e^{-k}. \quad (87)$$

If otherwise $k \leq e^6 \log n$, then we have $p^k n \ll \log^3(n)$ and thus $k \geq \log_{1/p}(n/\log^3(n)) = (1-\lambda)/\rho$. Using the form of δ and $n^{-\lambda} = \log^{-3}(n)$ together with $k \geq (1-\lambda)/\rho$ and $n^{-\rho} = p$, we then infer that

$$\mathbb{E}X_{i,k} \leq \left(e^2 n^{1/2-\delta-\rho/2} \sqrt{\log(n)} \right)^k \leq \left(n^{-\rho^2/(1-\lambda)-\lambda/2} \right)^k \leq n^{-\rho} n^{-\lambda k/2} \leq p/\log^k(n). \quad (88)$$

To sum up, using estimates (86), (87) and (88) it follows that

$$\sum_{2 \leq k \leq |N_i|} \mathbb{E}X_{i,k} \leq \sum_{k \geq 2} \left[n^{-k} + e^{-k} \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq e^6 \log n\}} + p/\log^k(n) \right] \leq o(n^{-1}) + o(p).$$

Combining this estimate with (85) and $z = O(1/p) \ll n$ then shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{some } N_i \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq z \text{ contains an inclusion-maximal clique}) \leq z \cdot \left[o(n^{-1}) + o(p) \right] = o(1),$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 5.1, as discussed. \square

5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.3

The below proof of Lemma 5.3 uses a similar first coloring step as Lemma 5.1, but in the second step we focus on the induced subgraph $G_{n,p}[N]$ and argue as follows: since $G_{n,p}[N]$ has the same distribution as $G_{|N|,p}$, by exploiting the non-monotone behavior of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ around $p = n^{-2/5}$ (see [23]) it turns out that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}[N]) = o(\varepsilon \log(n)/p)$. Since inclusion-maximal cliques in $G_{n,p}$ are also inclusion-maximal in $G_{n,p}[N]$, we thus obtain a valid coloring of the remaining vertices in N using at most $o(\varepsilon \log(n)/p)$ many additional new colors.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. With foresight we define

$$s := \left\lceil \delta \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n) \right\rceil, \quad \delta := \frac{5\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad z := \left\lceil \frac{8}{p\sqrt{\log n}} \right\rceil.$$

Note that $\varepsilon \geq \log(2)/\log(n)$. Since $p \leq n^{-1/9}$ ensures $\log_{1/(1-p)}(n) = (1 + O(p)) \log(n)/p$ and $p \ll \varepsilon$ as well as $z \ll \log(2)/p \leq \varepsilon \log(n)/p$, to complete the proof of (84) it suffices to show that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \leq s + z + 1$.

Similar to Lemma 5.1, our approach is to color the vertices of $G_{n,p}$ with the colors $\{1, \dots, s + z + 1\}$ using the following procedure, where we fix an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of all vertices (say using lexicographic ordering). First we sequentially consider the vertices v_1, \dots, v_s , and each time color all so far uncolored vertices in $N(v_i)$ with color i . Then we color all so far uncolored vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ with color $s + 1$, so that the set of all so far uncolored vertices equals

$$N := V \setminus \left(S \cup \bigcup_{v_i \in S} N(v_i) \right) \quad \text{with} \quad S := \{v_1, \dots, v_s\}.$$

Subsequently, our plan is to color the vertices in N with colors from the set $\{s + 2, \dots, s + z + 1\}$, so that $G_{n,p}[N]$ contains no monochromatic inclusion-maximal clique. By an argument analogous to the one used in the proof

of Lemma 5.1, we deduce the following: if $G_{n,p}$ contains a monochromatic inclusion-maximal clique K , then K must be contained in the set N . To complete the proof, it thus suffices to show that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}[N]) \leq z$.

To this end we expose the status of potential edges of $G_{n,p}$ in two rounds: in the first round we expose the edge-status of all vertex pairs containing at least one vertex from S (which contains enough information to determine N), and in the second round we expose the edge-status of all remaining vertex pairs. We henceforth condition on the outcome of the first exposure round, and assume that $\frac{1}{2}n^{1-\delta} \leq |N| \leq 2n^{1-\delta}$ (since this holds whp, by an argument analogous to the proof Lemma 1.4, as discussed in Section 5.1). Note that after conditioning on the outcome of the first exposure round, all potential edges inside N are still included independently with probability p , which implies that $G_{n,p}[N]$ has the same distribution as $G_{|N|,p}$. Since $\delta = 5\varepsilon/2$, $p \leq n^{-1/9}$ and $\frac{1}{2}n^{1-\delta} \leq |N| \leq 2n^{1-\delta}$ imply $p = n^{-2/5+\varepsilon} = \Theta(|N|^{-2/5})$ and $|N| = \Theta(1/p^{5/2}) \gg n^{1/4}$, by invoking Theorem 3.1 in [23] it then follows that, whp,

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}[N]) \leq \frac{2 \cdot |N| \cdot p^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\log |N|}} \leq \frac{2 \cdot 2n^{1-5\varepsilon/2} \cdot n^{-3/5+3\varepsilon/2}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \log n}} = \frac{8n^{2/5-\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{\log n}} = \frac{8}{p\sqrt{\log n}} \leq z,$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 5.3, as discussed. \square

6 Concluding remarks and open problems

We close this paper with some remarks and open problems concerning the clique chromatic number $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ of the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ with edge-probability $p = p(n)$.

- **Order of magnitude.** The main remaining open problem for the clique chromatic number is to determine the typical order of magnitude of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ when $p = p(n)$ is close to $n^{-2/5}$ and $n^{-1/3}$ (cf. Remark 2.7).

Problem 6.1. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Determine the whp order of magnitude of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ when $n^{-2/5-\varepsilon} \ll p \ll n^{-2/5+\varepsilon}$ and $\frac{1}{3}n^{-1/3} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3+\varepsilon}$.

These two ranges of $p = p(n)$ are of particular interest, because around $p = n^{-2/5}$ and $p = n^{-1/3}$ there seems to be a phase transition in the structure of the valid colorings: indeed, around these points the optimal lower bound strategies appear to change (in terms of which clique size matters), which makes the proof approaches from [23, 20] run into technical difficulties. To further illustrate our limited understanding, we remark that a conjecture from [20, Section 5] predicts that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Theta(\log(n)/p)$ for $n^{-2/5}(\log n)^{3/5} \ll p \ll 1$, whereas Lemma 5.3 demonstrates that this conjecture is not always correct: indeed, (84) implies that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = o(\log(n)/p)$ for $n^{-2/5} \ll p \leq n^{-2/5+o(1)}$. It may be possible that the aforementioned conjecture from [20] is also incorrect around $p = n^{-1/3}$. To stimulate more research into this intriguing possibility, we record that a simple modification of the proof of Remark 1.6 from Section 3 yields the following lower bound.

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose that $\omega = \omega(n) \gg 1$. If $p = p(n)$ satisfies $(\log n)^\omega n^{-1/3} \leq p \ll n^{-1/3.75}$, then whp*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) \geq (3 + o(1)) \log(n^{1/3}p)/p. \quad (89)$$

It would be desirable to know if there is an upper bound on $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ which matches (89), since this could potentially lead to a variant of Theorem 1.3 for a range of suitable of edge-probabilities $p \geq (\log n)^\omega n^{-1/3}$.

- **Asymptotics.** Another major open problem for the clique chromatic number is to determine the typical asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ when $p = p(n)$ is between $n^{-1/3}$ and $n^{-o(1)}$.

Problem 6.3. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Determine the whp asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ when $n^{-1/3+\varepsilon} \ll p \ll n^{-\varepsilon}$.

In this range of $p = p(n)$ we know that whp $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \Theta(\log(n)/p)$ by Theorem 1.1, so the main difficulty is to determine the behavior of the leading constant. This is of particular interest, since (i) by Lemma 5.1 the leading constant must be smaller than $1/2$, which contrasts the typical asymptotics $\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = (\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log(n)/p$ of Theorem 1.2 for $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \ll 1$, and (ii) it may be possible that ‘adaptive’ behavior akin to (4) and (89) plays a role in some range of $p = p(n)$. The whp asymptotics of $\chi_c(G_{n,p})$ for constant $p \in (0, 1)$ is a related problem of interest. A close inspection of its proof reveals that Theorem 1.2 carries over to $p \leq p_0$ for some small constant $p_0 > 0$ (via simple routine modifications), provided one uses $\log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n)$ instead of $\log(n)/p$ in the resulting estimate (3); we now record this observation for future reference.

Corollary 6.4. *There exists $p_0 > 0$ such that the following holds: if $n^{-o(1)} \leq p \leq p_0$, then whp*

$$\chi_c(G_{n,p}) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}}(n). \quad (90)$$

By the results of Demidovich and Zhukovskii [9] we know that (90) also holds whp for constant $p \in [0.5, 1)$. We believe that it should be possible to close the gap for constant $p \in (p_0, 0.5)$ by adding more bells and whistles to our proof approach, which we intend to elaborate on in future work.

Acknowledgements. Lutz Warnke would like to thank Lyuben Lichev and Dieter Mitsche for helpful discussions on the clique chromatic number of random graphs.

References

- [1] D. Achlioptas and A. Naor. The two possible values of the chromatic number of a random graph. *Annals of Mathematics* **162** (2005), 1335–1351.
- [2] N. Alon and M. Krivelevich. The concentration of the chromatic number of random graphs. *Combinatorica* **17** (1997), 303–313.
- [3] N. Alon and M. Krivelevich. Clique coloring of dense random graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* **88** (2018), 428–433.
- [4] G. Bacsó, S. Gravier, A. Gyárfás, M. Preissmann, and A. Sebő. Coloring the maximal cliques of graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **17** (2004), 361–376.
- [5] T. Bohman. The triangle-free process. *Advances in Mathematics* **221** (2009), 1653–1677.
- [6] T. Bohman and P. Keevash. The early evolution of the H -free process. *Inventiones Mathematicae* **181** (2010), 291–336.
- [7] B. Bollobás. The chromatic number of random graphs. *Combinatorica* **8** (1988), 49–55.
- [8] P. Charbit, I. Penev, S. Thomassé, and N. Trotignon. Perfect graphs of arbitrarily large clique-chromatic number. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **116** (2016), 456–464.
- [9] Y. Demidovich and M. Zhukovskii. Tight asymptotics of clique-chromatic numbers of dense random graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* **103** (2023), 451–461.
- [10] D. Duffus, B. Sands, N. Sauer, and R. Woodrow. Two-colouring all two-element maximal antichains. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **57** (1991), 109–116.
- [11] J. Fox, J. Pach, and A. Suk. A note on the clique chromatic number of geometric graphs. *Geombinatorics* **28** (2018), 83–86.
- [12] H. Guo and L. Warnke. Packing Nearly Optimal Ramsey $R(3, t)$ Graphs. *Combinatorica* **40** (2020), 63–103.
- [13] A. Heckel. Non-concentration of the chromatic number of a random graph. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **34** (2021), 245–260.
- [14] S. Janson. Poisson approximation for large deviations. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **1** (1990), 221–229.
- [15] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random Graphs*. Wiley-Interscience, New York (2000).
- [16] S. Janson and L. Warnke. The lower tail: Poisson approximation revisited. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **48** (2016), 219–246.
- [17] G. Joret, P. Micek, B. Reed, and M. Smid. Tight bounds on the clique chromatic number. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **28** (2021), Paper No. 3.51, 8pp.
- [18] J.H. Kim. The Ramsey number $R(3, t)$ has order of magnitude $t^2/\log t$. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **7** (1995), 173–207.
- [19] J. Kratochvíl and Z. Tuza. On the complexity of bicoloring clique hypergraphs of graphs. *Journal of Algorithms* **45** (2002), 40–54.
- [20] L. Lichev, D. Mitsche, and L. Warnke. The jump of the clique chromatic number of random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **62** (2023), 1016–1034.
- [21] D. Marx. Complexity of clique coloring and related problems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **412** (2011), 3487–3500.
- [22] C. McDiarmid, D. Mitsche, and P. Prałat. Clique colourings of geometric graphs. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **25** (2018), Paper 4.56, 20pp.

- [23] C. McDiarmid, D. Mitsche, and P. Prałat. Clique coloring of binomial random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **54** (2019), 589–614.
- [24] B. Mohar and R. Škrekovski. The Grötzsch theorem for the hypergraph of maximal cliques. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **6** (2020), Paper 26, 13pp.
- [25] O. Riordan and L. Warnke. The Janson inequalities for general up-sets. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **46** (2015), 391–395.
- [26] E. Shamir and J. Spencer. Sharp concentration of the chromatic number on random graphs $G_{n,p}$. *Combinatorica* **7** (1987), 121–129.
- [27] E. Shan, Z. Liang, and L. Kang. Clique-transversal sets and clique-coloring in planar graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics* **36** (2014), 367–376.
- [28] M. Šileikis and L. Warnke. Upper tail bounds for stars. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **27** (2020), Paper No. 1.67, 23pp.
- [29] L. Warnke. When does the K_4 -free process stop? *Random Structures & Algorithms* **44** (2014), 355–397.