

GROWTH OF REGULAR PARTITIONS 2: WEAK REGULARITY

C. TERRY

ABSTRACT. This is Part 2 in a series of papers about the growth of regular partitions in hereditary properties 3-uniform hypergraphs. The focus of this paper is the notion of weak hypergraph regularity, first developed by Chung, Chung-Graham, and Haviland-Thomason. Given a hereditary property of 3-uniform hypergraphs \mathcal{H} , we define a function $M_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by letting $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ be the smallest integer M such that all sufficiently large elements of \mathcal{H} admit weak regular partitions of size at most M . We show the asymptotic growth rate of such a function falls into one of four categories: constant, polynomial, between single and double exponentials, or tower. These results are a crucial component in Part 3 of the series, which considers vertex partitions associated to a stronger notion of hypergraph regularity.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is Part 2 in a series of papers about the growth of regular partitions in hereditary properties of graphs and hypergraphs. A *hereditary graph property* \mathcal{H} is a class of finite graphs closed under induced subgraphs and isomorphisms. There is a rich literature studying structural dichotomies among hereditary graph properties and their generalizations. Examples include dichotomies related to speeds [2, 3, 7–14, 16, 24, 36, 47], bounds for the removal lemma [30], sizes of cliques and independent sets [20, 25, 26, 28, 39, 51], and regular partitions [6, 28, 38, 49, 50]. Many of these results have substantive connections to model theory (see for example, [15, 17, 37, 39, 42]).

Szemerédi’s regularity lemma provides structural decompositions for finite graphs. Informally speaking, the regularity lemma says any large finite graph can be partitioned into a bounded number of pieces, so that most pairs of pieces behave quasi-randomly. We state here a version of the regularity lemma, and refer the reader Section 3 for precise definitions.

Theorem 1.1 (Szemerédi [46]). *For all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $M = M(\epsilon)$ so that the following holds. For all finite graphs $G = (V, E)$ there exists $1 \leq m \leq M$ and an partition \mathcal{P} of V , so that at least most $(1 - \epsilon)|V|^2$ many pairs of vertices in V^2 lie in an ϵ -regular pair from \mathcal{P}^2 .*

The regularity lemma comes equipped with several parameters which generate dichotomies in hereditary properties. These include results related to the existence irregular pairs [39], densities of the regular pairs [5, 28, 38, 39], and the behavior of the bound $M(\epsilon)$ [5, 6, 27, 38]. Extensions of these types of results to the hypergraph setting have appeared

The author was partially supported by NSF CAREER Award DMS-2115518 and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

in [1, 18, 19, 48, 50]. This series of papers focus on open problems related to hypergraph analogues of the function $\epsilon \mapsto M(\epsilon)$.

We begin by discussing the case of graphs in more detail. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 yield a tower-type dependence between ϵ and $M(\epsilon)$, where the *tower function*, $Tw : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, is defined by setting $Tw(1) = 1$, and for $i > 1$ setting $Tw(i) = 2^{Tw(i-1)}$. A tower type dependence was shown to be necessary by Gowers, who proved $M(\epsilon) \geq Tw(\epsilon^{-1/16})$ [31]. This was later improved by Fox and Lovász, who showed $M(\epsilon) \geq Tw(\Omega(\epsilon^{-2}))$ [27]. This matches the best known upper bound of $Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$, also due to Fox and Lovász [27].

On the other hand, under certain hypotheses, the dependence of $M(\epsilon)$ on ϵ is much better. In particular, work of Alon-Fischer-Newman and Lovász-Szegedy showed a polynomial type dependence suffices for graphs of uniformly bounded VC-dimension [4, 38] (with best current bounds due to Fox, Pach, and Suk [28]). The partitions constructed in these papers are not only regular, but also *homogeneous*, meaning most pairs of parts have edge density near 0 or 1.

It was observed in a paper of Alon, Fox, and Zhao [6] that these results yield a dichotomy for hereditary graph properties. To state this precisely, we associate a growth function to a hereditary property \mathcal{H} based on the sizes of regular partitions for elements of \mathcal{H} .

Definition 1.2. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Define $M_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by letting $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ be smallest integer so that any sufficiently large graph in \mathcal{H} has an ϵ -regular partition with at most $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ parts.

In other words, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is the best bound one can use in Theorem 1.1, if one cares only about graphs in \mathcal{H} . In analogy to the question posed in [45] about speeds of hereditary graph properties, one can ask the following question about $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$.

Question 1.3. *What is the possible asymptotic behavior a function of the form $M_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for \mathcal{H} a hereditary graph property?*

By “asymptotic,” we mean as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. It was observed in [6] that one cannot have arbitrary behavior for such a function. In particular, Theorem 4.11, in conjunction with the work of Fox and Lovász [27] shows there is a dichotomy, or “jump,” in the possible behavior of $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$, based on whether the VC-dimension of \mathcal{H} is finite or infinite (for definitions see Section 3.2).

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then one of the following hold.*

- (1) $VC(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$. In this case $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$.
- (2) $VC(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$. In this case, there is some constant $C > 0$ so that $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-C}$.

We will show there is one additional jump, yielding the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then one of the following hold.*

- (1) (Tower) $Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$.
- (2) (Polynomial) For some $C > 0$, $\epsilon^{-1+o(1)} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-C}$.
- (3) (Constant) There is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = C$.

Theorem 1.5 is closely related to an analogous question about the growth of homogeneous partitions in graphs. In particular, the work of [4, 38], on graphs of small VC-dimension naturally gives rise to the following analogue of Definition 1.2 (see Section 3.2 for more details).

Definition 1.6. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property with finite VC-dimension. Define $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by letting $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon)$ be smallest integer so that any sufficiently large graph in \mathcal{H} has an ϵ -homogeneous partition with at most $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ parts.

Using this, we now give a more detailed version of Theorem 1.5, which shows that when $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}$ is defined, it grows at roughly the same rate as $M_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then one of the following hold.*

(1) (Tower) \mathcal{H} has infinite VC-dimension and

$$Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16).$$

(2) (Polynomial) \mathcal{H} has VC-dimension $k < \infty$ and

$$\epsilon^{-1+o(1)} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon^3) \leq \epsilon^{-6k-3}.$$

(3) (Constant) There is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon) = C$.

The main result of this paper is an analogue of Theorem 1.5 for 3-uniform hypergraphs. There are many kinds of hypergraph regularity, and we refer the reader to [40] for a survey on this. The focus of this paper is on *weak regularity* for 3-uniform hypergraphs, as first developed by Chung [23], Chung-Graham [22], and Haviland-Thomason [34]. In Parts 3 and 4 of this series, we consider the stronger notion of regularity developed in [29, 32, 33, 40, 41, 43, 44]. While understanding the growth of weak regular partitions is interesting in its own right, we will show in Part 3 that it is also crucial for understanding the growth of regular partitions in the stronger sense. However, in this paper we will only be discussing one type of regularity (the “weak” kind). For this reason we will usually omit the work “weak” from our definitions, and refer simply to regularity for 3-graphs.

Weak regularity for 3-graphs is defined in close analogy to graph regularity (see Section 4.1 for precise definitions). Informally speaking, given a 3-uniform hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, a triple of subsets (X, Y, Z) is called ϵ -regular if for all large subsets $X' \subseteq X$, $Y' \subseteq Y$, and $Z' \subseteq Z$, the density of edges between X, Y, Z is within ϵ of the density of edges between X', Y', Z' . An ϵ -regular partition for H is then a partition \mathcal{P} of V so that at least $(1-\epsilon)|V|^3$ many triples from V^3 are in an ϵ -regular triple from \mathcal{P}^3 .

All 3-uniform hypergraphs admit ϵ -regular partitions of this kind. We state the version of this result from [23]. To give a precise statement of the bound involved, we will use the following notation. Given $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, define $Tw_f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by setting $Tw_f(1) = f(1)$, and for all $x > 1$, $Tw_f(x) = 2^{f(x-1)}$.

Theorem 1.8 (Chung [23]). *Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function defined by $f(1) = f(2) = f(3) = 3$ and for $x > 3$, $f(x) = 2^{\binom{f(x-1)}{3}}$.*

For all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $T \leq Tw_f(2\epsilon^{-4})$ such that the following holds. If $H = (V, E)$ is a sufficiently large 3-uniform hypergraph, then there is some $1 \leq t \leq T$ and an ϵ -regular partition for H with t parts.

In light of Theorem 4.3, we give the following analogue of Definition 1.2.

Definition 1.9. Given a hereditary property \mathcal{H} of 3-uniform hypergraphs, define $M_{\mathcal{H}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by letting $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ be the smallest integer so that every sufficiently large $H \in \mathcal{H}$ has an ϵ -regular partition with at most $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ parts.

Theorem 4.3 implies that for any hereditary property \mathcal{H} of 3-uniform hypergraphs, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is bounded above by a tower of height polynomial in ϵ^{-1} . The only other known result about this function is due to Fox, Pach, and Suk, who showed that when the property \mathcal{H} has finite VC-dimension, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is bounded above by a polynomial in ϵ^{-1} [27]. The same paper [27] includes an example showing there is a property \mathcal{H} with finite VC-dimension for which $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is bounded below by a polynomial.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem, which shows that any function of the form $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ must fall into four distinct growth classes: constant, polynomial, between one or two exponentials (which we will call “almost exponential”), or tower.

Theorem 1.10. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary property of 3-uniform hypergraphs. Then one of the following hold.*

- (1) (Tower) For some $C, C' > 0$, $Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(\epsilon^{-C'})$,
- (2) (Almost Exponential) For some $C, C' > 0$, $2^{\epsilon^{-C}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C'}}$,
- (3) (Polynomial) For some $C, C' > 0$, $\epsilon^{-C} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-C'}$,
- (4) (Constant) There is some $C > 0$ so that $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = C$.

In analogy to the graphs case, Theorem 1.10 is closely related to homogeneous partitions. In particular, an analogue of Definition 1.6 makes sense for certain hereditary properties of 3-uniform hypergraphs (a characterization of when this makes sense was given in [50]). Using the analogous notation (defined precisely in Section 4), we can state the following more detailed version of Theorem 1.10.

Theorem 1.11. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. Then one of the following hold.*

- (1) (Tower) For some $C, C' > 0$, $Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(\epsilon^{-C'})$,
- (2) (Almost Exponential) For some $C, C' > 0$ and $K \geq 1$,

$$2^{\epsilon^{-C}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^K) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C'}}},$$

- (3) (Polynomial) For some $C, C' > 0$ and $K \geq 1$, $\epsilon^{-C} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^K) \leq \epsilon^{-C'}$,
- (4) (Constant) There is some $C > 0$, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon) = C$.

The ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.11 include tools developed in this paper to prove the (2)-(3) gap in Theorem 1.5, a lower bound construction for graphs due to Fox and Lovász [27], results of the author and Wolf [50] about homogeneous decompositions and

slicewise VC-dimension, the main theorem of Part 1 of this series (which bounds the size of regular partitions of 3-uniform hypergraphs graphs with small slicewise VC-dimension), and the efficient regularity lemma for hypergraphs of small VC-dimension due to Fox, Pach, and Suk [28]. Our proofs provide explicit characterizations of the properties in each growth class according to forbidden substructures. An overview of these characterizations are provided at the end of this introduction.

We now discuss some open problems. Regarding Theorem 1.10, the most glaring open questions are about range (2). In this paper we will exhibit a property \mathcal{H} where $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is bounded above and below by functions of the form $2^{\epsilon^{-C}}$. This shows the form of the lower bound in range (2) cannot be improved. The current upper bound comes from Part 1 of the series. One possibility is that the bound there can be improved. However, the author conjectures the form of this upper bound is tight, and that instead range (2) contains two distinct classes, a single exponential class and a double exponential class.

With regards to Theorem 1.5, there are also problems left open. For instance, can the upper or lower bounds in (2) can be improved? More specifically, can the lower bound in (2) be improved to $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$? It is also open to understand the optimal exponent in the upper bound of range (2). The graph properties in this range all have finite VC-dimension, and the exponent on the polynomial in the upper bound, due to Fox, Pach, and Suk [28], depends linearly on the VC-dimension. In [28], an example is given showing this type of dependence is necessary, however, it remains open to determine the correct coefficient.

1.1. Statements of Characterizations. To aid the reader as they read the paper, we include here the combinatorial characterizations of the properties in each growth class. We list references for the required definitions. We intend this section as a reference for the reader, who may choose to skip this section for now. We begin with the graphs case.

Theorem 1.12 (Constant). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = C$ for some constant C .
- (2) For all irreducible graphs G on $C + 1$ vertices, there exists some $n \geq 1$ so that \mathcal{H} contains no n -blow up of G (see Definitions 3.7, 3.23).
- (3) $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many non-isomorphic graphs (see Definition 3.24).

Theorem 1.13 (Polynomial). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\epsilon^{-C} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-C'}$ for some constants C, C' .
- (2) There exist $k \geq 1$ so that $U(k) \notin \text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$, but for all $m \geq 1$, there is some $G_m \in \{M(m), H(m), \overline{M}(m)\}$ so that $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains an n -blowup of G_m (see Definitions 2.3, 3.12, 3.25, 3.7).
- (3) \mathcal{H} has finite VC-dimension and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs (see Definitions 3.11, 3.24).

Theorem 1.14 (Tower). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(\epsilon^{-C'})$ for some constants C, C' .
- (2) For all $k \geq 1$, $U(k) \in \text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ (see Definitions 2.3, 3.12).
- (3) \mathcal{H} has infinite VC-dimension (see Definition 3.11).

We now state the characterizations in the 3-graphs case.

Theorem 1.15 (Constant). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = C$ for some constant C .
- (2) For all irreducible 3-graphs G on $C + 1$ vertices, there exists some $n \geq 1$ so that \mathcal{H} contains no n -blow up of G (see Definitions 4.5, 7.2).
- (3) $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs (see Definition 7.3).

Theorem 1.16 (Polynomial). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\epsilon^{-C} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-C'}$ for some constants C, C' .
- (2) There exist $k, n \geq 1$ so that \mathcal{H} contains no n -blowup of $\widehat{U(k)}$ but for all $m \geq 1$, there is $G_m \in \{M(m), H(m), \overline{M}(m)\}$ so that $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains an n -blowup of \widehat{G}_m (see Definitions 3.12, 6.2, 3.25, 4.5).
- (3) \mathcal{H} is close to finite VC-dimension and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs (see Definitions 7.3, 6.1).

Theorem 1.17 (Almost Exponential). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $2^{\epsilon^{-C}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq 2^{2^{-C'}}$ for some constants C, C' .
- (2) For all $k, n \geq 1$, $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains an n -blowup of $\widehat{U(k)}$, but for some $m \geq 1$, $m \otimes U(m) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ (see Definitions 6.2, 4.5, 4.17).
- (3) \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension and close to finite slice-wise VC-dimension (Definitions 6.1, 4.19).

Theorem 1.18 (Tower). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw_f(4\epsilon^{-4})$ for some constant C .
- (2) For all $k \geq 1$, $k \otimes U(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ (see Definition 4.17).
- (3) \mathcal{H} is far from finite Slice-wise VC-dimension (Definition 6.1).

1.2. Outline. We now give an outline of the rest of the paper. In Section 2 we cover basic notation and definitions, and include a guide to some of the constructions used in the paper. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.5. In Section 4 we introduce background related to weak regularity for 3-uniform hypergraphs, homogeneous partitions, and various generalizations of VC-dimension. In Section 5, we prove the existence of a jump between the double exponential and tower speeds. In Section 6 we prove the existence of a jump between polynomial and exponential speeds. Finally, in Section 7 we prove the existence of a jump between constant and polynomial speeds.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section contains preliminaries for the rest of the paper.

2.1. Basic notation. Given an integer n , let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For a set V and an integer $k \geq 1$, define $\binom{V}{k} = \{X \subseteq V : |X| = k\}$. We will use the notation xy for a two element set $\{x, y\}$, and xyz for a three element set $\{x, y, z\}$. Given $\ell \geq 2$ and sets X_1, \dots, X_ℓ , we let $K_\ell[X_1, \dots, X_\ell]$ be the set of ℓ -element sets $\{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}$ where $x_i \in X_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. We will primarily use this notation for $\ell = 2, 3$. In these cases we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_2[X_1, X_2] &= \{xy : x \in X_1, y \in X_2, x \neq y\} \text{ and} \\ K_3[X_1, X_2, X_3] &= \{xyz : x \in X_1, y \in X_2, z \in X_3, x \neq y, y \neq z, x \neq z\}. \end{aligned}$$

An *equipartition* of a set V is a partition $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t$ satisfying $||V_i| - |V_j|| \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq t$.

Given $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we use the notation $r_1 = r_2 \pm \epsilon$ or $r_1 \approx_\epsilon r_2$ to mean that $r_1 \in (r_2 - \epsilon, r_2 + \epsilon)$. We will use the notation $x \ll y$ to mean “ x is sufficiently small compared to y .”

Given an integer $k \geq 1$, a *k-uniform hypergraph* is a pair (V, E) where $E \subseteq \binom{V}{k}$. To ease notation, we will refer to k -uniform hypergraphs as simply *k-graphs*, and 2-graphs as simply *graphs*. Given a k -graph G , $V(G)$ will denote its vertex set of V and $E(G)$ will denote its edge set of G . An induced sub- k -graph of G is a k -graph of the form (V', E') where $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' = E \cap \binom{V'}{k}$. We let $G[V']$ denote the induced sub- k -graph of G with vertex set V' .

Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph. We let \overline{E} denote the *ordered edge set of G* , i.e.

$$\overline{E} := \{(x, y) \in V^2 : xy \in E\}.$$

Given sets $X, Y \subseteq V$, we define

$$d_G(X, Y) := |\overline{E} \cap (X \times Y)| / |X||Y|.$$

For any $v \in V$, the *neighborhood in G of v* is $N_G(v) = \{x \in V : vx \in E\}$. We will also use the following more general notation. Given an arbitrary set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ and $v \in V$, let $N_E(v) = \{x \in V : vx \in E\}$. Similarly, given two sets A, B , any subset $E \subseteq A \times B$, $a \in A$, we write $N_E(a) = \{b \in B : (a, b) \in E\}$.

Suppose now $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-uniform hypergraph. We let \overline{E} denote the *ordered edge set of H* , i.e.

$$\overline{E} := \{(x, y, z) \in V^3 : xyz \in E\}.$$

Given sets $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$, we define

$$d_G(X, Y, Z) := |\overline{E} \cap (X \times Y \times Z)| / |X||Y||Z|.$$

For any $x, y \in V$, we let

$$N_G(x) = \{uv \in \binom{V}{2} : xuv \in E\} \text{ and } N_G(xy) = \{z \in V : xyz \in E\}.$$

More generally, for an arbitrary set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{3}$ and $x, y \in V$, let

$$N_E(x) = \{uv \in \binom{V}{2} : xuv \in E\} \text{ and } N_E(xy) = \{v \in V : yxv \in E\}.$$

Similarly, given three sets A, B, C , any set $E \subseteq A \times B \times C$, and $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, write $N_E(a) = \{(b, c) \in B \times C : (a, b, c) \in E\}$ and $N_E(a, b) = \{c \in C : (a, b, c) \in E\}$.

Given $\ell \leq k$, we say G is ℓ -partite if there exists a partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_\ell$ so that for every $e \in E(G)$, $|e \cap V_i| \leq 1$, for each $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. In this case, we will write $G = (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_\ell, E)$ to denote G is ℓ -partite with partition given by $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_\ell$.

If $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph and $U' \subseteq U$ and $V' \subseteq V$, we write $G[U', V']$ for the bipartite graph $(U' \cup V', E \cap K_2[U', V'])$. Similarly, if $H = (U \cup V \cup W, E)$ is a tripartite 3-graph and $U' \subseteq U$, $V' \subseteq V$, and $W' \subseteq W$, we write $H[U', V', W']$ for the tripartite 3-graph $(U' \cup V' \cup W', E \cap K_3[U', V', W'])$.

2.2. Constructions of graphs and hypergraphs. This subsection contains an overview of the constructions which appear throughout the paper. We include this mainly as a point of reference for the reader, and several of these definitions will be reintroduced at the appropriate times later.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, $\text{Bip}(G)$ denotes the bipartite graph obtained by doubling the vertices of G , and connecting pairs from different parts which come from edges in G . More specifically,

$$(1) \quad \text{Bip}(G) = (\{u_v : v \in V\} \cup \{w_v : v \in V\}, \{u_v w_{v'} : vv' \in E\}).$$

Similarly, for a 3-graph $H = (V, E)$, we obtain a tripartite 3-graph, $\text{Trip}(G)$ by tripling the vertices of H , and connecting triples from different parts which come from edges in H . In particular,

$$(2) \quad \text{Trip}(H) = (\{x_v : v \in V\} \cup \{y_v : v \in V\} \cup \{z_v : v \in V\}, \{x_v y_{v'} w_{v''} : vv'v'' \in E\}).$$

We will also need two methods for turning a graph into a 3-graph. The first, defined below, adjoins n new vertices.

Definition 2.1. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph. Given $n \geq 1$, define

$$n \otimes G := (U \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}, \{c_i u w : u w \in E\}),$$

where c_1, \dots, c_n are n new vertices.

We now define a way of turning a bipartite graph into a 3-graph, by “doubling” some vertices.

Definition 2.2. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph. Define

$$\widehat{G}_{UV} = (\{a_u : u \in U\} \cup \{b_v : v \in V\} \cup \{c_v : v \in V\} : \{a_u b_v c_v : uv \in E\}).$$

2.3. Hereditary Properties. This section contains preliminaries related to hereditary properties. First, a *hereditary k -graph property* is a class of finite k -graphs closed under induced sub- k -graphs and isomorphisms.

Given a hereditary graph property \mathcal{H} , its bipartite analogue (defined below) will contain much of the important combinatorial information about \mathcal{H} .

Definition 2.3. If \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property, then $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined to be the closure of $\{\text{Bip}(G) : G \in \mathcal{H}\}$ under induced subgraphs (see (1) for the definition of $\text{Bip}(G)$).

We note that for any finite graph G , the condition $G \notin \text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ is equivalent to saying \mathcal{H} omits some finite collection of graphs. We now define analogues for 3-graphs.

Definition 2.4. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property, $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ is the closure of $\{\text{Trip}(H) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ under induced sub-3-graphs (see (2) for the definition of $\text{Trip}(H)$).

Similar to above, for any finite 3-graph H , the condition $H \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ is equivalent to saying \mathcal{H} omits some finite collection of 3-graphs. We now define a notion of “closeness” for k -graphs, and then for hereditary properties.

Definition 2.5. Suppose $H = (V, E)$ and $H' = (V, E')$ are two k -graphs on the same vertex set. We say H and H' are δ -close if $|\overline{E\Delta E'}| \leq \delta|V|^k$.

Definition 2.6. Suppose \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' are hereditary k -graph properties. We say \mathcal{H} is *close to \mathcal{H}'* if for all $\delta > 0$ there is N so that for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ on at least N vertices, H is δ -close to some $H' \in \mathcal{H}'$ on the same vertex set.

When \mathcal{H} is close to \mathcal{H}' and \mathcal{H}' is close to \mathcal{H} , we write $\mathcal{H} \sim \mathcal{H}'$.

3. WARM UP: THE GRAPHS CASE

This section contains the proof of Theorem 1.5, which considers the growth of regular partitions for hereditary graph properties. Several of the ideas and lemmas will appear in later sections.

3.1. Background. This subsection contains background on graph regularity.

Definition 3.1. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph. Given sets $U, W \subseteq V$, we say (U, W) is an ϵ -regular pair if for all $U' \subseteq U$ and $W' \subseteq W$ with $|U'| \geq \epsilon|U|$ and $|W'| \geq \epsilon|W|$,

$$\left| d_G(U, W) - d_G(U', W') \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

We now state the definition of an ϵ -regular partition.

Definition 3.2. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph. A partition \mathcal{P} of V is an ϵ -regular partition if for at least $(1 - \epsilon)|V|^2$ many pairs $(x, y) \in V^2$, there is an ϵ -regular pair $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $(x, y) \in X \times Y$.

We note this is slightly different from the typical definition, in that it considers pairs of the form (V_i, V_i) and also does not require \mathcal{P} to be an equipartition. Definition 3.2 is the correct formulation for the purposes of this paper. In particular, we will want to allow sets

to be “regular” with themselves in order to allow regular partitions of constant size. For instance, if \mathcal{H} is the hereditary property consisting graphs containing no edges, we want our definition of regular partition to output $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = 1$. This is exactly what Definition 3.2 allows. This is also consistent with the definition used in [27]. We now state Szemerédi’s regularity lemma, with the upper bound from [27].

Theorem 3.3 (Fox-Lovász [27]). *For all $m \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the following holds. Every finite graph G has there is an ϵ -regular partition of size at most $Tm(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$.*

We will use the following lemma which says sub-pairs of regular pairs are still somewhat regular (see Lemma 3.1 in [4]).

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose $G = (A \cup B, E)$ is a bipartite graph and $|E| = d|A||B|$. Suppose $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$ satisfy $|A'| \geq \gamma|A|$ and $|B'| \geq \gamma|B|$ for some $\gamma \geq \epsilon$, and G is ϵ -regular. Then $G' := (A' \cup B', G[A', B'])$ is ϵ' -regular with density d' , where $\epsilon' = 2\gamma^{-1}\epsilon$ and $d' \in (d - \epsilon, d + \epsilon)$.*

We now state a few results about hereditary properties that are close in the sense of Definition 2.6. First, we show that when $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are hereditary properties satisfying $\mathcal{H} \sim \mathcal{H}'$, their regular partitions grow at roughly the same rate. To prove this we will use the following averaging Lemma. The proof is an exercise which appears in Part 1. This lemma will also be used throughout the paper.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $a, b, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $ab = \epsilon$. Suppose $A \subseteq X$ and $|A| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|X|$. For any partition \mathcal{P} of X , if we let $\Sigma = \{Y \in \mathcal{P} : |A \cap Y| \geq (1 - a)|Y|\}$, then $|\bigcup_{Y \in \Sigma} Y| \geq (1 - b)|X|$.*

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' are hereditary graph properties and \mathcal{H} is close to \mathcal{H}' . Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(2\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}'}(\epsilon)$.*

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $\delta \ll \min\{M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)^{-1}, M_{\mathcal{H}'}(\epsilon)^{-1}\}$. Let N be sufficiently large so that any element in \mathcal{H} of size at least N is δ -close to some element in \mathcal{H}' , and vice versa.

Suppose $G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{H}$ has at least N vertices and \mathcal{P} is an ϵ -regular partition of G . Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$ be the set of ϵ -regular pairs in \mathcal{P} , and let

$$\Sigma' = \{(X, Y) \in \Sigma : \min\{|X|, |Y|\} > \delta^{1/4}|V|\}.$$

Standard arguments, and the fact that \mathcal{P} is ϵ -regular, imply

$$|\bigcup_{(X, Y) \in \Sigma'} X \times Y| \geq (1 - 2\delta^{1/4} - \epsilon)|V|^2.$$

By assumption, there is $G' = (V, E') \in \mathcal{H}'$ which is δ -close to G . By Lemma 3.5, since $|\overline{E} \Delta \overline{E}'| \leq \delta|V|^2$, there is a set $\Sigma'' \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$ so that for all $(X, Y) \in \Sigma''$, $|(\overline{E} \Delta \overline{E}') \cap (X \times Y)| \leq \sqrt{\delta}|X||Y|$, and so that

$$|\bigcup_{(X, Y) \in \Sigma''} X \times Y| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta})|V|^2.$$

Clearly $|\bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma \cap \Sigma' \cap \Sigma''} X \times Y| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta} - 2\delta^{1/4} - \epsilon)|V|^2 \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)|V|^2$, so it suffices to show that each pair (X, Y) from $\Sigma \cap \Sigma' \cap \Sigma''$ is 2ϵ -regular with respect to G . To this end, fix $(X, Y) \in \Sigma \cap \Sigma' \cap \Sigma''$ and suppose $X' \subseteq X$ and $Y' \subseteq Y$ satisfy $|X'| \geq 2\epsilon|X|$ and $|Y'| \geq 2\epsilon|Y|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |d_{G'}(X', Y') - d_{G'}(X, Y)| &\leq |d_{G'}(X', Y') - d_G(X', Y')| + |d_G(X', Y') - d_G(X, Y)| \\ &\quad + |d_G(X, Y) - d_{G'}(X, Y)| \\ &\leq \delta \frac{|V|^2}{|X'||Y'|} + \epsilon + \delta \frac{|V|^2}{|X||Y|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\delta} + \epsilon + \sqrt{\delta} \\ &\leq 2\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $(X, Y) \in \Sigma \cap \Sigma''$, and the third inequality is because $(X, Y) \in \Sigma'$. This shows $M_{\mathcal{H}}(2\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}'}(\epsilon)$. \square

Our next goal is to state a well known characterization of when a graph property is close or far from omitting a certain induced subgraph. To state this result, we require the following notion of a blow-up of a graph.

Definition 3.7. Suppose $n \geq 1$, $G = (U, E)$ is a graph. An n -blow up of G is any graph H with vertex set of the form $V(H) = \bigcup_{u \in U} V_u$, where each V_u has size n , and where

$$\bigcup_{uu' \in E} K_2[V_u, V_{u'}] \subseteq E(H) \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{uu' \in \binom{U}{2} \setminus E} K_2[V_u, V_{u'}] \right) \cap E(H) = \emptyset.$$

We say that H is a *simple n -blowup of G* if moreover, $E(H) = \bigcup_{uu' \in E} K_2[V_u, V_{u'}]$.

We will use the following characterization of when a hereditary graph property is close to omitting a finite collection of induced subgraphs.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property and \mathcal{F} is a finite collection of finite graphs. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathcal{H} is close to some \mathcal{H}' such that $\mathcal{H}' \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$.
- (2) There is some n so that for all $H \in \mathcal{F}$, \mathcal{H} contains no n -blowup of H .

Theorem 3.8 is well known consequence of the regularity lemma and the induced removal lemma [4]. For more discussion on this, see the remarks following Theorem 4.6.

3.2. Homogeneity and VC-dimension. This section contains background on VC-dimension and homogeneous partitions of graphs. We begin with the definition of homogeneous pairs and homogeneous partitions of graphs.

Definition 3.9. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph.

- (1) Given sets $X_1, X_2 \subseteq V$, we say the pair (X_1, X_2) is ϵ -homogeneous with respect to G if $d_G(X_1, X_2) \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1]$.

- (2) We say a partition \mathcal{P} of V is ϵ -homogeneous with respect to G if at least $(1 - \epsilon)|V|^2$ of the tuples $(x, y) \in V^2$ are in $X_1 \times X_2$ for some ϵ -homogeneous pair $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathcal{P}^2$.

Homogeneous pairs are well known to be regular, as the next proposition shows. The proof is an exercise we include for completeness.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$. If $G = (V, E)$ is a bipartite graph, $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V$, and $d_G(V_1, V_2) \leq \epsilon$, then (V_1, V_2) is an $\epsilon^{1/3}$ -regular pair in G .*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction (V_1, V_2) is not an $\epsilon^{1/3}$ -regular pair in G . Then there are $V'_1 \subseteq V_1, V'_2 \subseteq V_2$ satisfying $|V'_1| \geq \epsilon^{1/3}|V_1|, |V'_2| \geq \epsilon^{1/3}|V_2|$, with

$$|d_G(V'_1, V'_2) - d_G(V_1, V_2)| > \epsilon^{1/3} - \epsilon.$$

Since $d_G(V_1, V_2) \leq \epsilon$ by assumption, this implies $d_G(V'_1, V'_2) > \epsilon^{1/3} - \epsilon$. But we now have

$$|\overline{E} \cap (V_1 \times V_2)| \geq |\overline{E} \cap (V'_1 \times V'_2)| > (\epsilon^{1/3} - \epsilon)|V'_1||V'_2| \geq \epsilon|V_1||V_2|,$$

contradicting $d_G(V_1, V_2) \leq \epsilon$. \square

Proposition 3.10 implies that an ϵ -homogeneous partition of a graph G is automatically $\epsilon^{1/3}$ -regular. Homogeneous partitions are closely related to VC-dimension. We recall the definition of the VC-dimension of a graph here.

Definition 3.11. The VC-dimension of a graph $G = (V, E)$, denoted $\text{VC}(G)$, is the largest k so that there exist vertices $\{a_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\} \subseteq V$, such that for all $i \in [k]$ and $S \subseteq [k]$, $a_i b_S \in E$ if and only if $i \in S$.

We will also use a restatement of Definition 3.11 in terms of forbidden bipartite graphs. For this we require notation for the so-called ‘‘power set’’ or ‘‘universal’’ graph.

Definition 3.12. Given $k \geq 1$, the k -th power set graph is the bipartite graph $U(k)$ with vertex set $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \cup \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\}$ and edge set $\{a_i b_S : i \in S\}$.

Note that the VC-dimension of a graph G is the largest k so that $U(k)$ is an induced subgraph of $\text{Bip}(G)$. We extend this notion to hereditary graph properties as follows.

Definition 3.13. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Define $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ to be $\sup\{\text{VC}(G) : G \in \mathcal{H}\}$.

The following is a well known exercise.

Fact 3.14. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. If $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$, then $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains every bipartite graph.*

A standard application of the counting lemma shows regular pairs in graphs of small VC-dimension are homogeneous.

Lemma 3.15. *For all $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, there are δ and n_0 so that the following hold. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph with VC-dimension less than k , and $U, W \subseteq G$ are such that $\min\{|U|, |W|\} \geq n_0$, and (U, W) is a δ -regular pair in G . Then*

$$d_G(U, W) \in [0, \epsilon] \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1].$$

Lemma 3.15 implies that any sufficiently regular partition of a large graph G with $\text{VC}(G) < k$ will automatically be ϵ -homogeneous. The theorems of Alon-Fischer-Newman, Lovász-Szegedy, and Fox-Pach-Suk mentioned in the introduction [5, 28, 38] show much more, namely that such homogeneous partitions exist with efficient bounds. We give a more detailed statement here, including the bounds from [28].

Theorem 3.16. *For all $\epsilon > 0$, there is $c = c(k)$ so that the following hold. Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a graph with VC-dimension at most k . Then it has an ϵ -homogeneous equipartition of size K , for some $8\epsilon^{-1} \leq K \leq c\epsilon^{-2k-1}$.*

In light of Theorem 3.16, the following analogue of Definition 1.2 makes sense.

Definition 3.17. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property with $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, define $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by letting $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon)$ to be the smallest integer M so that all sufficiently large elements in \mathcal{H} admit ϵ -homogeneous partitions with at most M parts.

The following is an immediate corollary of Proposition 3.10.

Fact 3.18. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property with $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$. Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^3)$.*

This shows that for \mathcal{H} of finite VC-dimension, the function $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is roughly bounded above by $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}$. By the end of this section, we will have shown that these two functions grow at about the same rate (when \mathcal{H} has finite VC-dimension).

3.3. Polynomial to Tower Jump. In this section, we provide an exposition on the jump between polynomial and tower. This dichotomy was first observed by Fox, and is stated explicitly in a paper by Alon, Fox, and Zhao [6]. As the reader will see, it is an immediate corollary of Theorem 4.11 and a construction of Fox and Lovász [27]. We include the details in part to guide analogous arguments later in the paper. We begin by stating the relevant theorem from [27].

Theorem 3.19 (Fox-Lovász [27]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ so that for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there are arbitrarily large bipartite graphs G so that any ϵ -regular partition of G has at least $\text{Tw}(c\epsilon^{-2})$ many parts.*

We remark that in [27], they do not state explicitly the G they construct for Theorem 3.19 is bipartite. However, it is made clear that this is the case during the proof (see Section 3 of [27]). We will use the following fact in combination with Theorem 3.19 to prove the tower-type lower bound for properties of infinite VC-dimension.

Fact 3.20. *For any hereditary graph property \mathcal{H} , $M_{\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})}(2\epsilon) \leq 2M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon^9) + 1$.*

Proof. Fix $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, and let $M = M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon^9)$. Suppose $H = (A \cup B, E)$ is a sufficiently large element of $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$. By definition of $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$, there is some $G = (V, F) \in \mathcal{H}$ and subsets $Z_1, Z_2 \subseteq V$ so that $A = \{a_v : v \in Z_1\}$, $B = \{b_v : v \in Z_2\}$, and $E = \{a_v b'_v : vv' \in K_2[Z_1, Z_2] \cap F\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $Z_1 = V$ and $Z_1 \subseteq Z_2$. We show H has a 2ϵ -regular partition of size at most $2M + 1$.

Assume first $|B| \leq \epsilon^3|A \cup B|$. Then the partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{A \cup B\}$ is ϵ^3 -homogeneous for H , since

$$|\overline{E}| \leq |A||B| \leq \epsilon^3(|A \cup B|)|A| \leq \epsilon^3|A \cup B|^2.$$

By Proposition 3.10, \mathcal{Q} is ϵ -regular, so in this case we are done.

Assume now $|B| \geq \epsilon^3|A \cup B|$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ be an ϵ^9 -regular partition of G . For each $i \in [t]$, let $A_i = \{a_v : v \in V_i\}$ and $B_i = \{b_v : v \in V_i \cap Z_2\}$, and set

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \{B_i : |B_i| < \epsilon^5|V_i|\}.$$

Setting $B_0 = \bigcup_{B_i \in \mathcal{B}_0} B_i$, we have $|B_0| \leq \epsilon^5|V| \leq \epsilon^2|B|$. Finally, define $\mathcal{B} = \{B_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{B}_0$. We consider the partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{A_1, \dots, A_t\} \cup \{B_0\} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Note $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 2t + 1 \leq 2M + 1$.

Let $\Sigma_{reg} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$ be the set of ϵ^9 -regular pairs in G , and define $\Sigma'_{reg} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^2$ as follows.

$$\Sigma'_{reg} = \mathcal{Q}^2 \setminus \{(A_i, B_j) : B_j = \text{ or } (V_i, V_j) \notin \Sigma_{reg}\}.$$

We show every $(X, Y) \in \Sigma'_{reg}$ is 2ϵ -regular in $\text{Bip}(G)$. To this end, fix $(X, Y) \in \Sigma'_{reg}$. If (X, Y) has the form (A_i, A_j) or (B_i, B_j) , then $\overline{E} \cap (X \times Y) = \emptyset$, so (X, Y) is ϵ -regular by Proposition 3.10. This leaves the case where (X, Y) has the form (A_i, B_j) for some $(V_i, V_j) \in \Sigma_{reg}$. Suppose $A'_i \subseteq A_i$ and $B'_j \subseteq B_j$ satisfy $|A'_i| \geq 2\epsilon|A_i|$ and $|B'_j| \geq 2\epsilon|B_j|$. Let $V'_i = \{v \in V_i : a_v \in A'_i\}$ and $V'_j = \{v \in V_j : b_v \in B'_j\}$. Note $|V'_i| = |A'_i| \geq 2\epsilon|A_i| = 2\epsilon|V_i|$ and $|V'_j| \geq 2\epsilon|B_j| \geq \epsilon^6|V_j|$, where the second inequality is because $B_j \notin \mathcal{B}_0$. We then have the following, by definition of $\text{Bip}(G)$, because $(V_i, V_j) \in \Sigma_{reg}$, and since $|V_j \cap Z_2| = |B_j| \geq \epsilon^5|V_j|$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{Bip}(G)}(A'_i, B'_j) &= d_G(V'_i, V'_j) = d_G(V_i, V_j) \pm \epsilon^9 = d_G(V_i, V_j \cap Z_2) \pm 2\epsilon^9 \\ &= d_G(A_i, B_j) \pm 2\epsilon^9. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (X, Y) is 2ϵ -regular, as desired. We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{(A_i, B_j) \notin \Sigma'_{reg}} A_i \times B_j \right| &\leq \sum_{(V_i, V_j) \in \Sigma'_{reg}} |A_i||B_j| + |B_0||A| \leq \epsilon^9|V|^2 + \epsilon^2|A||B| \leq \epsilon^6|A||B| + \epsilon^2|A||B| \\ &\leq 2\epsilon|A||B|. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof that \mathcal{Q} is 2ϵ -regular with respect to $\text{Bip}(G)$. \square

We now deduce the jump between polynomial and tower growth.

Corollary 3.21. *For any hereditary graph property \mathcal{H} , one of the following hold.*

(1) $VC(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$. In this case, there exists a constant $C > 0$ so that

$$Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16).$$

(2) There is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $VC(\mathcal{H}) = k$. In this case $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq O(\epsilon^{-6k-3})$.

Proof. Fix a hereditary graph property \mathcal{H} . If there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $VC(\mathcal{H}) = k$, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq O(\epsilon^{-6k-3})$ holds by Theorem 4.11 and Fact 3.18.

Suppose now $VC(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$. Let c be as in Theorem 3.19. By Fact 3.20, $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains every bipartite graph. In particular, $\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains all the examples from Theorem 3.19, so $Tw(c\epsilon^{-2}) \leq M_{\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon)$. Combining this with Fact 3.20, we have that

$$M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq \frac{M_{\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})}((2\epsilon)^{1/9}) - 1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}M_{\text{Bip}(\mathcal{H})}((2\epsilon)^{1/9}) \geq \frac{1}{4}Tw(c(2\epsilon)^{-2/9}).$$

Clearly there is some choice of positive constant C' so that the above is at least $Tw(\epsilon^{-C'})$. The fact that $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$ is from Theorem 3.3. \square

3.4. Constant to Polynomial Jump. This section contains the jump from constant to polynomial growth rates for graphs. We will require several preliminaries. First, we define an equivalence relation on the vertices of any graph. Roughly speaking, two vertices are equivalent if they are connected to the same vertices (other than themselves).

Definition 3.22. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph. Define $x \sim_G y$ if for all $z \in V \setminus \{x, y\}$, $xz \in E$ if and only if $yz \in E$.

Note that for any graph G , \sim_G is an equivalence relation, and further, each \sim_G -equivalence class is either a clique or independent set.

Definition 3.23. Suppose $G = (U, E)$ is an graph. We say G is *irreducible* if every \sim_G -class has size 1.

It is trivial to see that in any irreducible graph G , the number of vertices is also the number of \sim_G -classes. Further, for any graph G (not necessarily irreducible), if ℓ is the number of \sim_G -classes, then G contains an irreducible induced subgraph of size ℓ (just take a single vertex from each \sim_G -class). The jump between constant and polynomial growth is closely related to the blow-ups which appear in a property \mathcal{H} (recall Definition 3.7). In particular, we associate the following auxiliary class to a hereditary graph property.

Definition 3.24. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the class of irreducible graphs G with the property that for all n , there is some n -blow up of G in \mathcal{H} . In other words,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}} = \{G : G \text{ is irreducible and for all } n \geq 1, \text{ some } n\text{-blow up of } G \text{ is in } \mathcal{H}\}.$$

We will show that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains finitely many graphs up to isomorphism, $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is constant, and when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many graphs up to isomorphism, $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded below by a polynomial.

We will first prove the lower bound. For this we need a bit more information about large irreducible graphs. In particular, we need Theorem 3.29 below, which says that any large irreducible graph contains one of a short list of special induced subgraphs. Roughly speaking, the special subgraphs look like half-graphs, matchings, or compliments of matchings. This theorem is related to a much stronger result about prime graphs due to Chudnovsky, Kim, Oum, and Seymour [21].

Definition 3.25. Given $k \geq 1$, define

$$\begin{aligned} H(k) &= (\{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}, \{a_i b_j : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k\}), \\ M(k) &= (\{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}, \{a_i b_i : i \in [k]\}), \text{ and} \\ \overline{M}(k) &= (\{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}, \{a_i b_j : 1 \leq i \neq j \leq k\}). \end{aligned}$$

Finding induced copies of the graphs appearing in Definition 3.25 is important in this section, as well as later in the paper. For the later applications, it will be particularly important to keep track of the vertex partition $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ associated to the graphs $H(k)$, $M(k)$, or $\overline{M}(k)$. For this reason, we now give a more detailed definition of “induced copy” which will help us retain this additional information.

Definition 3.26. Let $G = (U \cup V, E)$ and $G' = (U' \cup V', E')$ be bipartite graphs. A $(UV, U'V')$ -copy of G' in G consists of a set of vertices $\{x_u : u \in U'\} \cup \{x_v : v \in V'\} \subseteq V(G)$ so that $\{x_u : u \in U'\} \subseteq U$, $\{x_v : v \in V'\} \subseteq V$, and $x_u x_v \in E$ if and only if $uv \in E'$.

If the graph G' in Definition 3.26 is one of $H(k)$, $M(k)$, or $\overline{M}(k)$, we will say simply a UV -copy of G' to mean a (UV, AB) -copy of G' , where $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$. Definition 3.26 will be particularly important for applications later on in the paper. For now, we use it in the statement of Lemma 3.27, which gives a sufficient condition for finding large induced copies of the graphs from Definition 3.25. In particular, this lemma says that if a graph G contains large subset U, V so that U which “looks irreducible” with respect to V , then G must contain a large induced copy of a graph from Definition 3.26, with one side inside U and one side inside V .

Lemma 3.27. *For all $k \geq 1$ there is N so that the following holds. Suppose G is a graph, $U, V \subseteq V(G)$, $|U| \geq N$, and assume the following holds. For all $u \neq u'$ in U , there is some $v \in V$ with $uv \in E(G)$ and $u'v \notin E(G)$, or vice versa. Then G contains a UV -copy of $H(k)$, $M(k)$, or $\overline{M}(k)$.*

The proof of Lemma 3.27 consists of Ramsey type arguments common in model theory, and similar to those appearing in [21]. We include the proof in the appendix. Before proving Theorem 3.29, we define a more general class of graphs based on those in Definition 3.25.

Definition 3.28. Suppose $k \geq 1$. Let $Irr(k)$ be the set of all graphs with vertex set $\{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ so that one of the following hold.

- (1) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $a_i b_j \in E$ if and only if $i \leq j$,
- (2) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $a_i b_j \in E$ if and only if $i = j$,
- (3) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $a_i b_j \in E$ if and only if $i \neq j$.

Note $Irr(k)$ contains many more graphs than just those appearing in Definition 3.25. In particular, Definition 3.28 does not require the elements in $Irr(k)$ to be bipartite. We now state and prove Theorem 3.29.

Theorem 3.29. *For all $k \geq 1$ there is N so that the following holds. Every irreducible graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| \geq N$ contains an element of $Irr(k)$ as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let N be from Lemma 3.27 for $2k$. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is irreducible and $|V| \geq N$. Let $G' = \text{Bip}(G) = (U \cup W, E')$ where $U = \{u_v : v \in V\}$, $W = \{w_v : v \in V\}$ and $E' = \{u_v w_{v'} : vv' \in E\}$. Note $|U| \geq N$, and, because G is irreducible, U and W satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 3.27 in G' . Consequently, G' contains a UW -copy of one of $H(2k)$, $M(2k)$, or $\overline{M}(2k)$. By definition of $G' = \text{Bip}(G)$, this implies there are vertices $c_1, \dots, c_{2k}, d_1, \dots, d_{2k} \in V$ (not necessarily pairwise distinct) so that one of the following hold.

- (1) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2k$, $c_i d_j \in E$ if and only if $i \leq j$,
- (2) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2k$, $c_i d_j \in E$ if and only if $i = j$,
- (3) For all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2k$, $c_i d_j \in E$ if and only if $i \neq j$.

This clearly implies the c_1, \dots, c_{2k} are pairwise distinct and the d_1, \dots, d_{2k} are pairwise distinct, but one could possibly have some $c_i = d_j$. By deleting pairs (c_i, d_i) we can extract a subsequence $c_{i_1}, d_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_k}, d_{i_k}$ which are all pairwise distinct. Then $G[\{c_{i_1}, d_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_k}, d_{i_k}\}] \in \text{Irr}(k)$. \square

We now use Theorem 3.29 to give a corollary of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ containing infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs.

Corollary 3.30. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. If $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs, then for all $n, m \geq 1$, \mathcal{H} contains an n -blow up of some element of $\text{Irr}(m)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs. Then in particular, it contains arbitrarily large irreducible graphs. By Theorem 3.29, for all $k \geq 1$, $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains some element $G_k \in \text{Irr}(k)$. By definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, \mathcal{H} contains an n -blowup of G_k for all $n \geq 1$. \square

We now move on to proving that if $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded below by a polynomial. Our first lemma in this direction, Lemma 3.31 below, shows that certain large blowups of the graphs from Definition 3.28 require polynomial sized regular partitions.

Lemma 3.31. *Suppose $0 < s_1 < 1 - s_1 < s_2 < 1$, and $\epsilon = \epsilon(s_1, s_2) > 0$ is sufficiently small. Set $m = \epsilon^{-1}/4$ and let n be sufficiently large compared to ϵ^{-1} . Suppose $H \in \text{Irr}(m)$ and G is an n -blowup of H . Then any ϵ -regular partition of G has at least ϵ^{-s_2} parts.*

Proof. Fix s_1, s_2, ϵ, m as in the hypotheses, and assume n is sufficiently large. Fix $H \in \text{Irr}(m)$ and assume $G = (W, E)$ is an n -blowup of H . By definition, this means H has vertex set of the form

$$W = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_m \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m,$$

where $|U_i| = |V_i| = n$ for each $i \in [m]$, and edge set of E satisfying one of the following.

- (a) $K_2[U_i, V_j] \subseteq E$ if $i = j$ and $K_2[U_i, V_j] \cap E = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$,
- (b) $K_2[U_i, V_j] \subseteq E$ if $i \neq j$ and $K_2[U_i, V_j] \cap E = \emptyset$ if $i = j$, or
- (c) $K_2[U_i, V_j] \subseteq E$ if $i \leq j$ and $K_2[U_i, V_j] \cap E = \emptyset$ if $i > j$.

To ease notation, let $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^m U_i$ and $V = \bigcup_{i=1}^m V_i$. Suppose towards a contradiction there exists $\mathcal{P} = \{A_1, \dots, A_t\}$, an ϵ -regular partition of G with $t < \epsilon^{-s_2}$. Let Σ_{reg} be the set of ϵ -regular pairs from \mathcal{P}^2 , and let $\Sigma_{err} = \mathcal{P}^2 \setminus \Sigma_{reg}$. We begin with an observation about this partition.

Claim 3.32. *Suppose $(X, Y) \in \Sigma_{reg}$, $q > 2$, and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_q \leq m$ are such that $|X \cap U_{i_j}| \geq \epsilon|X|$ for each $1 \leq j \leq q$. Then $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $2 \leq j \leq q - 1$.*

Proof. Since $(X, Y) \in \Sigma_{reg}$, our assumptions imply the following hold in each of the respective cases (a)-(c) above.

- (a) $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $1 \leq j \leq q$,
- (b) $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $1 \leq j \leq q$,
- (c) Either $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $1 \leq j \leq q - 1$ or $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $2 \leq j \leq q$.

In all three cases, we have that $|Y \cap V_{i_j}| < \epsilon|Y|$ for each $2 \leq j \leq q - 1$. This finishes the proof of Claim 3.32. \square

Let

$$E_{err} = \bigcup_{(A_i, A_j) \in \Sigma_{err}} A_i \times A_j.$$

Since \mathcal{P} is ϵ -regular, $|E_{err}| \leq \epsilon|U \cup V|^2$. Let

$$X = \{x \in U \cup V : |N_{E_{err}}(x)| < \epsilon^{1-s_1}|U \cup V|\}.$$

Since $|E_{err}| \leq \epsilon|U \cup V|^2$, $|X| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{s_1})|U \cup V|$. Note that by definition, X is a union of parts from \mathcal{P} , and consequently, there is some $P_{i_*} \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $P_{i_*} \subseteq X$ and

$$|P_{i_*}| \geq |X|/t \geq (1 - \epsilon^{s_1})|U \cup V|/t.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{R} = \{Z \in \{U_1, \dots, U_m, V_1, \dots, V_m\} : |P_{i_*} \cap Z| \geq \epsilon|P_{i_*}|\} \text{ and } r = |\mathcal{R}|.$$

Our next goal is to obtain a lower bound for $r = |\mathcal{R}|$. First, observe that by definition of \mathcal{R} ,

$$|P_{i_*}| < rn + (2m - r)\epsilon|P_{i_*}|.$$

Rearranging and solving for $|P_{i_*}|$ yields the inequality $|P_{i_*}| < rn/(1 - (2m - r)\epsilon)$. On the other hand, by choice of P_{i_*} and assumption on t , we have

$$|P_{i_*}| \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})|U \cup V|}{t} = \frac{(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})2mn}{t} > \epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})2mn.$$

Combining these inequalities yields the following.

$$\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})2nm < |P_{i_*}| < \frac{rn}{1 - (2m - r)\epsilon}.$$

Rearranging, this implies

$$r \geq 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})m(1 - (2m - r)\epsilon) = 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})m(1 - 2m\epsilon) + 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})mr\epsilon.$$

Rearranging and solving for r , and using $m = \epsilon^{-1}/4$, we obtain the following.

$$r \geq \frac{2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})m(1 - m\epsilon)}{1 - 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})m\epsilon} = 2m\epsilon^{s_2} \frac{(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})(1 - 1/2)}{1 - 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1}} = \epsilon^{s_2-1}4^{-1} \frac{1 - \epsilon^{s_1}}{1 - 2\epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1}}.$$

Note that since ϵ is sufficiently small, and $1 - s_1 < s_2 < 1$, the above quantity is large (e.g. at least 4). Without loss of generality, assume $|\mathcal{R} \cap \{U_1, \dots, U_m\}| \geq |\mathcal{R} \cap \{V_1, \dots, V_m\}|$ (the other case is similar). Letting $r' = |\mathcal{R} \cap \{U_1, \dots, U_m\}|$, we then have

$$(3) \quad r' - 2 \geq \frac{r}{2} - 2 \geq \epsilon^{s_2-1}8^{-1} \frac{1 - \epsilon^{s_1}}{1 - \epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1}} - 2 \geq \left(\frac{\epsilon^{s_2-1}}{16}\right) \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon^{s_1}}{1 - \epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1}}\right),$$

where the last inequality is since ϵ is sufficiently small, and since $s_1 < 1 - s_1 < s_2 < 1$.

Let $1 \leq a_1 < \dots < a_{r'} \leq m$ be such that $\mathcal{R} \cap \{U_1, \dots, U_m\} = \{U_{a_1}, \dots, U_{a_{r'}}\}$. By Claim 3.32, for all $1 \leq j \leq t$ such that $(P_{i_*}, P_j) \in \Sigma_{reg}$, we have that for all $2 \leq v \leq r' - 1$, $|P_j \cap V_{a_v}| < \epsilon|P_j|$. This implies

$$(4) \quad \left| (V_{a_2} \cup \dots \cup V_{a_{r'-2}}) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} P_j \right) \right| = \sum_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} |P_j \cap (V_{a_2} \cup \dots \cup V_{a_{r'-2}})| < \epsilon \left(\sum_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} |P_j| \right).$$

On the other hand, by our choice of P_{i_*} ,

$$(5) \quad \sum_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} |P_j| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1-s_1})|U \cup V|.$$

Combining (4) and (5), we have

$$(6) \quad \left| \left(\bigcup_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} P_j \right) \setminus (V_{a_2} \cup \dots \cup V_{a_{r'-2}}) \right| \geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} |P_j| \geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon^{1-s_1})|U \cup V|.$$

On the other hand, using (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left(\bigcup_{\{P_j \in \mathcal{P}: (P_j, P_{i_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}\}} P_j \right) \setminus (V_{a_2} \cup \dots \cup V_{a_{r'-2}}) \right| &\leq |U \cup V| - |V_{a_2} \cup \dots \cup V_{a_{r'-2}}| \\ &= |U \cup V| - (r' - 2)n \\ &= 2nm - (r' - 2)n \\ &= |U \cup V|(1 - (r' - 2)m^{-1}2^{-1}) \\ &\leq |U \cup V| \left(1 - \epsilon^{s_2} \frac{1 - \epsilon^{s_1}}{32(1 - \epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6), we have

$$(1 - \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon^{1-s_1}) \leq \left(1 - \epsilon^{s_2} \frac{1 - \epsilon^{s_1}}{32(1 - \epsilon^{s_2}(1 - \epsilon^{s_1})4^{-1})} \right).$$

However, this is false since ϵ sufficiently small and $s_1 < 1 - s_1 < s_2 < 1$. Thus we have a contradiction. \square

We are now ready to prove that if $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is infinite, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded below by a polynomial. The idea of the proof is that if $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is infinite, we will find large blow ups of graphs appearing in Theorem 3.29. We will conclude using Lemma 3.31 that these require at least polynomially many parts in their regular partitions, which yields the desired lower bound for $M_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Corollary 3.33. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs. Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^{-1+o(1)}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.29, for arbitrarily large m , $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}} \cap \text{Irr}(m) \neq \emptyset$. Fix $0 < s_1 < 1 - s_1 < s_2 < 1$, and assume ϵ is sufficiently small as in Lemma 3.31. Let $m = \epsilon^{-1}/4$, and let n be sufficiently large, and fix $H \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}} \cap \text{Irr}(m)$. Since $H \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, there is some $G \in \mathcal{H}$ so that G is an n -blowup of H . By Lemma 3.31, any ϵ -regular partition of G requires at least ϵ^{-s_2} parts. Thus, for all $0 < s_2 < 1$, we have $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^{-s_2}$. \square

An interesting open problem is to understand whether the form of the bound in Corollary 3.33 is tight. In particular, can the lower bound there be improved to $\Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$?

We now shift gears to considering hereditary graph properties \mathcal{H} where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many graphs up to isomorphism. We begin by briefly discussing an example of such a property. Suppose $1 \leq t \leq s$, and consider $\text{Forb}(K_{s,t})$, the class of all finite graphs omitting $K_{s,t}$ as a non-induced subgraph. By K3v3ari-S3s-Tur3n, any $G \in \text{Forb}(K_{s,t})$ with n vertices contains at most $O(n^{2-1/t})$ edges. If n is sufficiently large compared to ϵ , the trivial partition $\{V(G)\}$ will be ϵ^3 -homogeneous for G , and thus ϵ -regular (by Proposition 3.10). This shows $M_{\text{Forb}(K_{s,t})}(\epsilon) = 1$. On the other hand, it's easy to see the only graph in $\mathcal{B}_{\text{Forb}(K_{s,t})}$ is the graph with one vertex. This turns out to be a fairly representative example.

In general, we will prove that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many graphs up to isomorphism, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is a constant function equal to the maximal size of a graph in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The idea for the upper bound is that, by Theorem 3.8 and the definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, any large graph G in \mathcal{H} is close to a graph G' with a constant number of $\sim_{G'}$ -classes. The $\sim_{G'}$ -classes of G will then yield a constant sized regular partition for the original graph G .

Lemma 3.34. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains finitely many graphs up to isomorphism. Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = \max\{|V(G)| : G \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}\}$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains finitely many graphs up to isomorphism. Let

$$C = \max\{|V(G)| : G \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}\}.$$

Let \mathcal{F} be the set of irreducible graphs on $C + 1$ -vertices. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. By definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and Theorem 3.8, there is some N so that every element in \mathcal{H} on at least N vertices is ϵ^8 -close to a graph containing no induced copy of any element in \mathcal{F} .

Suppose $H = (V, E) \in \mathcal{H}$ has at least N vertices. Then H is ϵ^8 -close to some $H' = (V, E')$ containing no induced copy of any element in \mathcal{F} . This implies H' has at most C -many

$\sim_{H'}$ -classes. Say U_1, \dots, U_t is an enumeration of the $\sim_{H'}$ -classes, for some $t \leq C$. We claim U_1, \dots, U_t is an ϵ -regular partition of H . By our choice of H' , $|\overline{E\Delta\overline{E'}}| \leq \epsilon^8 |V(H)|^2$. By Lemma 3.5, if we let

$$\Sigma = \{(U_i, U_j) : |(\overline{E\Delta\overline{E'}}) \cap (U_i \times U_j)| \leq \epsilon^4 |U_i| |U_j|\},$$

then $|\bigcup_{(U_i, U_j) \in \Sigma} U_i \times U_j| \geq (1 - \epsilon^4) |V(H)|^2$. It now suffices to show every $(U_i, U_j) \in \Sigma$ is ϵ -regular with respect to H . Fix $(U_i, U_j) \in \Sigma$. By construction, $d_{H'}(U_i, U_j) \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $(U_i, U_j) \in \Sigma$, this implies $d_H(U_i, U_j) \leq [0, \epsilon^4] \cup (1 - \epsilon^4, 1]$. This shows every pair in Σ is ϵ^4 -homogeneous with respect to H , and thus ϵ -regular with respect to H by Proposition 3.10. Thus $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq C$.

We now show $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq C$. Fix any $0 < \epsilon \ll C^{-1}$ and let $n \gg \epsilon^{-1}$. By definition of C and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, there is some $G \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $|V(G)| = C$ so that some n -blowup H of G satisfies $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

By definition of a blow up, H has vertex set $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} U_v$ where each $|U_v| = n$, and edge set $E(H)$ satisfying

$$\bigcup_{vv' \in E(G)} K_2[U_v, U_{v'}] \subseteq E(H) \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{vv' \notin E(G)} K_2[U_v, U_{v'}] \right) \cap E(H) = \emptyset.$$

Note $|V(H)| = Cn$. Suppose $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ is an ϵ -regular partition of H . Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}^2$ be the set of ϵ -regular pairs from \mathcal{P} . By assumption, $\sum_{(X, Y) \in \Sigma} |X| |Y| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |V(H)|^2$.

Since $t < C$, there is some $S \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|S| \geq |V(H)| / (C - 1)$. By pigeon hole and the definition of H , there is some $v_0 \in V$ so that

$$|S|/C \leq |S \cap U_{v_0}| \leq |U_{v_0}| = |V(H)|/C.$$

By pigeon hole again, there is some $v_1 \neq v_0 \in V$ so that

$$|S \cap U_{v_1}| \geq \frac{|S \setminus U_{v_0}|}{C - 1} \geq \frac{|S| - |V(H)|/C}{C - 1} \geq \frac{|V(H)|/(C - 1) - |V(H)|/C}{C - 1} > \epsilon |S|,$$

where the last inequality is because $|S| \leq |V(H)|$ and our assumption that $\epsilon \ll C^{-1}$. Since $\sum_{(X, Y) \in \Sigma} |X| |Y| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |V(H)|^2$, we have

$$|S| \left| \bigcup_{\{S' \in \mathcal{P}: (S, S') \notin \Sigma\}} S' \right| \leq \epsilon |V(H)|^2 \leq \epsilon (C - 1) |V(H)| |S|,$$

and consequently,

$$(7) \quad \left| \bigcup_{\{S' \in \mathcal{P}: (S, S') \notin \Sigma\}} S' \right| \leq \epsilon (C - 1) |V(H)|.$$

Since G is irreducible, there is some $v_3 \in V(G)$ with $v_1 v_3 \in E(G)$ and $v_0 v_3 \notin E(G)$ or vice versa. Using $\epsilon (C - 1) \ll 1/C$ and (7), we have that

$$\left| \left(\bigcup_{\{S' \in \mathcal{P}: (S, S') \in \Sigma\}} S' \right) \cap U_{v_3} \right| \geq |U_{v_3}| - \epsilon (C - 1) |V(H)| = |U_{v_3}| (1 - \epsilon (C - 1) C) \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon}) |U_{v_3}|.$$

Thus, there must be some $S' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $(S, S') \in \Sigma$ and with

$$|S' \cap U_{v_3}| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|U_{v_3}|/C = (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|V(H)|/C^2 \geq \epsilon|V(H)| \geq \epsilon|S'|,$$

where the second inequality is because $\epsilon \ll 1/C$. But now $d_H(S \cap U_{v_1}, S' \cap U_{v_3}) = 1$ and $d_H(S \cap U_{v_2}, S' \cap U_{v_3}) = 0$, or vice versa. In either case, this implies $(S, S') \notin \Sigma$, a contradiction. \square

We now put things together to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix \mathcal{H} a hereditary graph property. Suppose first $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains finitely many non-isomorphic graphs. Then by Lemma 3.34, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ is constant.

Suppose now $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic graphs, and \mathcal{H} has finite VC-dimension. Say $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) = k$. By Corollaries 3.33 and 3.21, $\epsilon^{-1+o(1)} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq O(\epsilon^{-6k-3})$.

If \mathcal{H} has infinite VC-dimension, then by Corollary 3.21, there exists a constant $C > 0$ so that $Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(2 + \epsilon^{-2}/16)$. \square

4. WEAK HYPERGRAPH REGULARITY

In this section we introduce preliminaries about weak regularity for 3-graphs. The ideas are closely related to those needed to prove Theorem 1.5 in the graphs case. For this reason, this section will therefore follow a similar outline to Section 3.

4.1. Background. Weak hypergraph regularity, developed by Chung in [23], Chung-Graham [22], and Haviland-Thomason [34] extends the notion of graph regularity in a natural way.

Definition 4.1. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ and H is a 3-graph, and $U, V, W \subseteq V(H)$. We say the triple (X, Y, Z) is ϵ -regular in H if for all $U' \subseteq U$, $V' \subseteq V$, and $W' \subseteq W$, satisfying $|U'| \geq \epsilon|U|$, $|V'| \geq \epsilon|V|$, and $|W'| \geq \epsilon|W|$,

$$|d_H(U, V, W) - d_H(U', V', W')| \leq \epsilon.$$

Definition 4.2. Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-graph and $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ is a partition of V . We say \mathcal{P} is an ϵ -regular partition for H if for all but at most $\epsilon|V|^3$ many $(x, y, z) \in V^3$, there is some ϵ -regular $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{P}^3$ so that $(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z$.

We now state Chung's regularity lemma. Recall that, given $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we define $Tw_f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by setting $Tw_f(1) = f(1)$ and for $x > 1$, $Tw_f(x) = 2^{f(x-1)}$.

Theorem 4.3. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function defined by $f(1) = f(2) = f(3) = 3$ and for $x > 3$, $f(x) = 2^{\binom{f(x-1)}{3}}$. For all integers $t_0 \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $T \leq Tw_f(2\epsilon^{-4})$ and $N = N(\epsilon)$ such that the following holds. If $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-uniform hypergraph with $|V| \geq N$, there is some $t_0 \leq t \leq T$ and an ϵ -regular equipartition for H with t parts.

Note that for $x > 3$, and f as in Theorem 4.3, $f(x) \leq 2^{f(x-1)^3} \leq 2^{2^{2^{f(x-1)}}$, and consequently, $Tw_f(x) \leq Tw(3x)$. Thus, the bound in Theorem 4.3 can be take as a tower of 2's whose height is polynomial in ϵ^{-1} (e.g. we could take the bound $Tw(6\epsilon^{-4})$).

Theorem 4.3 tells us Definition 1.2 in the introduction makes sense for every hereditary property of 3-graphs. In analogy to Proposition 3.6, it is true that if two hereditary properties of 3-graphs $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are close in the sense of Definition 2.6, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $M_{\mathcal{H}'}$ are roughly the same.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are hereditary 3-graph properties and \mathcal{H} is close to \mathcal{H}' . Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(2\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$.*

We omit the proof as it is basically the same as the proof of Proposition 3.6. In analogy of Definition 3.7, we will use a notion of blow-ups for 3-graphs.

Definition 4.5. Suppose $n \geq 1$ and $G = (U, E)$ is an 3-graph. An n -blowup of G is any 3-graph H with vertex set of the form $V(H) = \bigcup_{u \in U} V_u$, where each V_u has size n , and where

$$\bigcup_{u_1 u_2 u_3 \in E} K_3[V_{u_1}, V_{u_2}, V_{u_3}] \subseteq E(H) \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{u_1 u_2 u_3 \in \binom{U}{3} \setminus E} K_3[V_{u_1}, V_{u_2}, V_{u_3}] \right) \cap E(H) = \emptyset$$

We say such an H is a *simple n -blowup of G* if moreover, $E(H) = \bigcup_{u_1 u_2 u_3 \in E} K_3[V_{u_1}, V_{u_2}, V_{u_3}]$.

We will also use the following analogue of Theorem 3.8.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and \mathcal{F} is a finite collection of finite graphs. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathcal{H} is close to some \mathcal{H}' such that for all $H \in \mathcal{F}$, $H \notin \mathcal{H}'$.
- (2) There is some n so that for all $H \in \mathcal{F}$, \mathcal{H} contains no n -blowup of H .

Theorem 4.6 is likely well known, but the author could not find an explicit proof in the literature. It can be proved using stronger regularity for 3-graphs developed by Frankl-Rödl and Gowers [29,32] as well as an induced removal lemma for 3-graphs [35]. For this reason, we will provide a proof of Theorem 4.6 in Part 3 of this series, which deals with this form of regularity (see the Appendix in Part 3). A sketch of the proof of the graphs version, Theorem 3.8 will also appear there.

4.2. Homogeneity and VC-dimension in Hypergraphs. In this section we discuss homogeneous partitions and versions of VC-dimension for 3-graphs. First, we define homogeneous partitions for 3-graphs.

Definition 4.7. Suppose G is an 3-graph.

- (1) Given $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$, the tuple (X, Y, Z) is ϵ -homogeneous for G if

$$d_G(X, Y, Z) \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1].$$

- (2) A partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ is ϵ -homogeneous for G if for at least $(1 - \epsilon)|V|^3$ many $(x, y, z) \in V^3$, there is an ϵ -homogeneous triple $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{P}^3$ so that $(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z$.

Homogeneous triples are also regular in the sense of Definition 4.1, as the next proposition shows. We omit the proof as it is almost identical to the proof of Proposition 3.10.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and assume H is a 3-graph. Assume $V_1, V_2, V_3 \subseteq H$ and $d_H(V_1, V_2, V_3) \leq \epsilon$. Then (V_1, V_2, V_3) is $\epsilon^{1/4}$ -regular for H .*

Homogeneous partitions are closely related to two analogues of VC-dimension for 3-graphs. As mentioned in Section 3, work of Alon-Fischer-Newman and Lovász-Szegedy showed that graphs of bounded VC-dimension have homogeneous partitions with extremely efficient bounds. We will need an extension of this theorem to hypergraphs due to Fox-Pach-Suk [27]. We first define the notion of VC-dimension for 3-graphs used there.

Definition 4.9. Given a 3-graph H , the *VC-dimension of H* is the maximal $k \geq 1$ for which there exist vertices $\{a_1b_1, \dots, a_kb_k\} \cup \{c_S : S \subseteq [k]\}$ so that $a_ib_ic_S \in E(H)$ if and only if $i \in S$.

This extends to hereditary 3-graph properties in the natural way.

Definition 4.10. For a hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} , we then define $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ as follows.

$$\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) = \sup\{\text{VC}(H) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

We will now state the relevant version of the theorem of Fox, Pach, and Suk.

Theorem 4.11 (Fox-Pach-Suk [27]). *For all $k \geq 1$ there is $C = C(k) > 0$ so that the following holds. Suppose H is a 3-graph with VC-dimension at most k . Then H has an ϵ -homogeneous equipartition of size K for some $\epsilon^{-1} \leq K \leq \epsilon^{-C}$.*

We note that the theorem proved in [27] is stronger and more detailed than what we have stated above. In particular, their result applies to r -graphs for any $r \geq 3$, and also gives an explicit expression for C in terms of the dual VC-dimension of the hypergraph. We have stated above only what we need for this paper.

Theorem 4.11 shows that 3-graphs of finite VC-dimension admit homogeneous partitions. It turns out the existence of homogeneous partitions can be extended to a wider class of 3-graphs, namely those satisfying a different generalization of VC-dimension called “slice VC-dimension.”¹ To define this, we require the following notion of “slice graphs.”

Definition 4.12. Suppose $H = (V, F)$ is a 3-graph. For each $x \in V$, define the *slice graph of H at x* , denoted H_x , to be the graph with vertex set V and edge set $\{yz \in \binom{V}{2} : xyz \in F\}$.

We now give a second analogue of VC-dimension for 3-graphs, which is defined in terms of the slice graphs.

Definition 4.13. Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-graph. The *slice VC-dimension of H* is

$$\text{SVC}(H) := \max\{\text{VC}(H_x) : x \in V\},$$

We then extend this definition to hereditary properties.

¹In [50], this notion is called *weak VC-dimension*.

Definition 4.14. For a hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} , the *slicewise VC-dimension* of \mathcal{H} is

$$\text{SVC}(\mathcal{H}) = \sup\{\text{SVC}(H) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

It is an exercise to see that for any 3-graph H , $\text{VC}(H) \leq \text{SVC}(H)$. Work of Wolf and the author [50] and, independently, Chernikov and Towsner [19] showed the existence of homogeneous partitions can be extended to 3-graphs with bounded slicewise VC-dimension.

Theorem 4.15. *For all $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is an integer $M(\epsilon) \geq 1$ so that any 3-graph H with $\text{SVC}(H) < k$ admits an ϵ -homogeneous partition with at most $M(\epsilon)$ parts.*

The proof of this by Chernikov and Towsner is non-quantitative. The proof by the author and Wolf is quantitative, but relies on a strong version of the hypergraph regularity lemma. For this reason, it produced a Wowzer style bound for $M(\epsilon)$. A crucial ingredient for this paper is the following quantitative improvement which is the main result of Part 1 of this series.

Theorem 4.16 (Theorem 1.4 of Part 1). *For all $k \geq 1$ there is $C > 0$ so that for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, the following holds. Suppose $H = (U, F)$ is a sufficiently large 3-graph with $\text{SVC}(H) < k$. Then there exists an ϵ -homogeneous partition for H of size at most $2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C}}}$.*

We will also require a characterization of which hereditary 3-graph properties admit homogeneous partitions from [50] (similar results were obtained independently in [19]). Before stating the full theorem, we remind the reader of the following notation for a 3-graph built from a graph by adjoining n new vertices.

Definition 4.17. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph. Given $n \geq 1$, define

$$n \otimes G := (U \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}, \{c_i u w : u w \in E\}),$$

where c_1, \dots, c_n are n new vertices.

Recalling the definition of $U(k)$ from Definition 3.12, we note that for any hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} ,

$$\text{SVC}(\mathcal{H}) = \max\{k : 1 \otimes U(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})\}.$$

It is an exercise to verify the following analogue of Fact 3.20.

Observation 4.18. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $k \otimes U(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then for all bipartite graphs G and all $n \geq 1$, $n \otimes G \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$.*

It turns out that whether or not a property \mathcal{H} satisfies $k \otimes U(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $k \geq 1$ is related to whether or not it is “close” to some other property which has finite slicewise VC-dimension (in the sense of Definition 2.6). We will use the following definition to make this precise.

Definition 4.19. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. We say \mathcal{H} is *close to finite slice-wise VC-dimension* if \mathcal{H} is close to some \mathcal{H}' with $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}') < \infty$.

We say \mathcal{H} is *far from finite slice-wise VC-dimension* if it is not close to finite slice-wise VC-dimension.

We now state the result from [50] which characterizes which hereditary 3-graph properties admit homogeneous partitions.²

Theorem 4.20. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *For some $k \geq 1$, $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$,*
- (2) *\mathcal{H} is close to finite slice-wise VC-dimension*
- (3) *\mathcal{H} admits homogeneous partitions in the following sense: for all $\epsilon > 0$ there is $M(\epsilon)$ so that all sufficiently large elements in \mathcal{H} have ϵ -homogeneous partitions with at most $M(\epsilon)$ parts.*

Theorem 4.20 tells us that we are guaranteed the existence of homogeneous partitions if and only if $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ for some $k \geq 1$. For this reason the following analogue of Definition 3.17 makes sense.

Definition 4.21. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ for some $k \geq 1$. Define $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by setting $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon)$ to be the smallest integer M so that all sufficiently large elements in \mathcal{H} have ϵ -homogeneous partitions with at most M parts.

If two properties $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are close in the sense of Definition 2.6, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}$ and $M_{\mathcal{H}'}^{\text{hom}}$ are roughly the same (when both are defined).

Proposition 4.22. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'$ are hereditary 3-graph properties so that for some $k, k' \geq 1$, $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ and $k' \otimes U(k') \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H}')$. If \mathcal{H} is close to \mathcal{H}' , then $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(2\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}'}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon)$.*

We leave the proof as an exercise to the reader, as it is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.6. An immediate corollary of Proposition 4.8 is the following.

Lemma 4.23. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^4)$.*

Lemma 4.23 implies that, when its defined, $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}$ gives a rough upper bound for $M_{\mathcal{H}}$. By the end of the paper, we will see that something much stronger is true, namely that $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}$ grow at roughly the same rate (when both are defined).

5. JUMP FROM ALMOST EXPONENTIAL TO TOWER

In this section we prove there exists a jump from almost exponential to tower growth. The proof is closely related to Section 3. We begin with an analogue of Fact 3.20.

²In [50] the term of $\text{vdisc}_3(\epsilon)$ -quasirandomness is used in place of ϵ -regularity. These notions are easily seen to be equivalent.

Fact 5.1. $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon) \leq 3M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon^{12})$.

The proof is very similar to the proof of Fact 3.20, and is thus relegated to the appendix. We next prove a technical lemma about regular triples in 3-partite 3-graphs. In particular, Lemma 5.2 tells us that any regular triple in a 3-partite 3-graph H is either sparse, or approximately respects the 3-partite partition of H .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/3$. Suppose $H = (X^1 \cup X^2 \cup X^3, E)$ is a 3-partite 3-graph, $D_1, D_2, D_3 \subseteq V(H)$, and (D_1, D_2, D_3) is an ϵ -regular triple in H . Then one of the following hold.*

- (1) $d_H(D_1 \times D_2 \times D_3) \leq \epsilon$ or
- (2) There are pairwise distinct $f(1), f(2), f(3) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, so that for each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)|D_i|$.

Proof. Fix an ϵ -regular triple (D_1, D_2, D_3) and assume (2) fails. For each $i \in [3]$, let $f(i) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be such that $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| = \max\{|D_i \cap X^1|, |D_i \cap X^2|, |D_i \cap X^3|\}$. Note that for each $i \in [3]$, $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| \geq |D_i|/3$. Since (2) fails, either $f(1), f(2), f(3)$ are not pairwise distinct, or they are pairwise distinct, but for some $i \in [3]$, $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| < (1 - 2\epsilon)|D_i|$.

Suppose first $f(1), f(2), f(3)$ are not pairwise distinct, say $f(1) = f(2) = 1$ (the other cases are similar). In this case, since H is 3-partite, we have

$$d_H(D_1 \cap X^1, D_2 \cap X^1, D_3) = 0.$$

Since $|D_1 \cap X^1| \geq |D_1|/3$ and $|D_2 \cap X^1| \geq |D_2|/3$ and (D_1, D_2, D_3) is ϵ -regular, this implies $d_H(D_1, D_2, D_3) \leq \epsilon_1$, so (1) holds.

Suppose now $f(1), f(2), f(3)$ are pairwise distinct but for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we have $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| < (1 - 2\epsilon)|D_i|$. Without loss of generality (the other cases are similar), let us assume $|D_1 \cap X^{f(1)}| < (1 - 2\epsilon)|D_1|$. By definition of $f(1)$, we now have that $|D_1|/3 \leq |D_1 \cap X^{f(1)}| < (1 - 2\epsilon)|D_1|$. This implies that either $|D_1 \cap X^{f(2)}| \geq \epsilon|D_1|$ or $|D_1 \cap X^{f(3)}| \geq \epsilon|D_1|$. Without loss of generality, say $|D_1 \cap X^{f(2)}| \geq \epsilon|D_1|$ (the other case is similar). We now have $|D_1 \cap X^{f(2)}| \geq \epsilon|D_1|$ and $|D_2 \cap X^{f(2)}| \geq \epsilon|D_2|$ and, since H is tripartite,

$$d_H((D_1 \cap X^{f(2)}, D_2 \cap X^{f(2)}, D_3) = 0.$$

Since (D_1, D_2, D_3) is ϵ -regular, this implies $d_H(D_1 \times D_2 \times D_3) \leq \epsilon$, so (1) holds. This finishes the proof. \square

We next prove a lemma which shows that for any bipartite graph G , we can construct a regular partition for G , given a regular partition for the 3-graph $n \otimes G$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/3$. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph and $H = n \otimes G$ where $n = \max\{|U|, |V|\}$. If H has an ϵ -regular partition of size t , then G has an $36\epsilon^{1/18}$ -regular partition of size at most $2t + 2$.*

Proof. Let $G = (U \cup V, E)$, and let $H = n \otimes G$ where $n = \max\{|U|, |V|\}$. Assume H has an ϵ -regular partition of size t . We show G has an $36\epsilon^{1/18}$ -regular partition of size at most $2t + 2$. If $\min\{|U|, |V|\} \leq \epsilon^{1/3}|U \cup V|$, then

$$|E| \leq |U||V| \leq \min\{|U|, |V|\} \max\{|U|, |V|\} \leq \epsilon^{1/3}|U \cup V|^2.$$

This implies the trivial partition $\{U \cup V\}$ is $\epsilon^{1/3}$ -homogeneous for G , and thus $\epsilon^{1/9}$ -regular by Proposition 3.10, so in this case, we are done.

Assume now $\min\{|U|, |V|\} \geq \epsilon^{1/3}|U \cup V|$. By Definition 4.17, we may assume H has vertex set $U \cup V \cup C$, where C is a new set of n vertices, and edge set

$$E(H) = \{uvc : uv \in E, c \in C\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{X_1, \dots, X_t\}$ be an ϵ -regular partition of H , and let $\Sigma_{reg} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^3$ be the set of ϵ -regular triples from \mathcal{P} with respect to H . Define $S_{reg} = \bigcup_{(X_i, X_j, X_s) \in \Sigma_{reg}} X_i \times X_j \times X_s$. By assumption, $|S_{reg}| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|V(H)|^3$.

We now work towards defining the desired partition of G . First, for each $i \in [t]$, let $U_i = X_i \cap U$, $V_i = X_i \cap V$, and $C_i = C \cap X_i$. We now set aside the resulting parts which are too small. In particular, let

$$\mathcal{U}_0 = \{U_i : |U_i| \leq \epsilon^{2/3}|X_i|\}, \quad \mathcal{V}_0 = \{V_i : |V_i| \leq \epsilon^{2/3}|X_i|\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_0 = \{C_i : |C_i| \leq \epsilon^{2/3}|X_i|\}$$

Then let $U_0 = \bigcup_{U_i \in \mathcal{U}_0} U_i$, $V_0 = \bigcup_{V_i \in \mathcal{V}_0} V_i$, and $C_0 = \bigcup_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_0} C_i$. Observe that by definition of \mathcal{U}_0 and since $|U| \geq \epsilon^{1/3}|U \cup V|$, we have

$$|U_0| \leq \epsilon^{2/3}|V(H)| \leq \epsilon^{1/3}|U|.$$

A similar argument shows $|V_0| \leq \epsilon^{1/3}|V|$, and $|C_0| \leq \epsilon^{1/3}|C|$. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{U_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{U}_0, \quad \mathcal{V} = \{V_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{V}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C} = \{C_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0.$$

We now define \mathcal{Q} to be the partition of $V(G)$ given by $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \{V_0, U_0\}$. Clearly $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 2t + 2$. We show \mathcal{Q} is $36\epsilon^{1/18}$ -regular for G .

To ease notation, set $U' = \bigcup_{U_i \in \mathcal{U}} U_i$, $V' = \bigcup_{V_i \in \mathcal{V}} V_i$, and $C' = \bigcup_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{reg} \cap (U' \times V' \times C')| &\geq |U'| |V'| |C'| - \epsilon |V(H)|^3 \geq |U'| |V'| |C'| - 9\epsilon^{2/3} |U| |V| |C| \\ (8) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\geq (1 - 12\epsilon^{1/3}) |U'| |V'| |C'|. \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathcal{C}_{good} be the set of $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ so that

$$|S_{reg} \cap (U' \times V' \times C_i)| \geq (1 - 12\epsilon^{1/9}) |U'| |V'| |C_i|.$$

By (8) and Lemma 3.5, we have $|\bigcup_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_{good}} C_i| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/9}) |C'|$. Thus by pigeon hole, there is some $C_{s_*} \in \mathcal{C}_{good}$ with $|C_{s_*}| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/9}) |C'| / t$. Let

$$\Omega = \{(U_i, V_j) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} : |S_{reg} \cap (U_i \times V_j \times C_{s_*})| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/18}) |U_i| |V_j| |C_{s_*}|\}.$$

By Lemma 3.5 and our choice of C_{s_*} ,

$$\left| \bigcup_{(U_i, V_j) \in \Omega} U_i \times V_j \right| \geq (1 - 12\epsilon^{1/18}) |U'| |V'| \geq (1 - 36\epsilon^{1/18}) |U| |V|.$$

Thus, it suffices to show every $(U_i, V_j) \in \Omega$ is $\epsilon^{1/18}$ -regular in G . To this end, fix $(U_i, V_j) \in \Omega$ and let $U'_i \subseteq U_i$ and $V'_j \subseteq V_j$ be such that $|U'_i| \geq \epsilon^{1/18} |U_i|$ and $|V'_j| \geq \epsilon^{1/18} |V_j|$. Since $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$,

$V_j \in \mathcal{V}$, and $C_{s_*} \in \mathcal{C}$, we have that $|U'_i| \geq \epsilon|X_i|$, $|V'_j| \geq \epsilon|V_j|$, and $|C_{s_*}| \geq \epsilon|X_{s_*}|$. Then, since $(X_i, X_j, X_{s_*}) \in \Sigma_{reg}$ and by definition of H , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{E} \cap (U'_i \times V'_j)| &= \frac{1}{|C_{s_*}|} |\overline{E(H)} \cap (U'_i \times V'_j \times C_{s_*})| = \frac{(d_H(X_{s_*}, X_i, X_j) \pm \epsilon)|C_{s_*}| |U'_i| |V'_j|}{|C_{s_*}|} \\ &= (d_H(X_{s_*}, X_i, X_j) \pm \epsilon) |U'_i| |V'_j|. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $d_G(U'_i, V'_j) = d_H(X_{s_*}, X_i, X_j) \pm \epsilon$. The same computation with U_i, V_j in place of U'_i, V'_j shows $d_G(U_i, V_j) = d_H(X_{s_*}, X_i, X_j) \pm \epsilon$. Consequently, $d_G(U'_i, V'_j) = d_G(U_i, V_j) \pm 2\epsilon$. This finishes the proof. \square

We can now prove a sufficient condition for $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ bounded above and below by a tower.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains $k \otimes U(k)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then for some $K, K' > 0$, $Tw(\epsilon^{-K}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(\epsilon^{-K'})$.*

Proof. Let C be as in Theorem 3.19. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains $k \otimes U(k)$ for all $k \geq 1$. The upper bound for $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$ holds by Theorem 4.3 (see also the remark following the statement of Theorem 4.3).

For the lower bound, suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and n is sufficiently large. Let G be as in Theorem 3.19 with $|V(G)| \geq n$. Let t_G be the size of the smallest $\epsilon^{18}/36$ -regular partition of G , and let t_H be the size of the smallest ϵ -regular partition of $H := n \otimes G$. By Theorem 3.19, $t_G \geq Tw((\epsilon^{18}/36)^{-C})$. By Lemma 5.3, $t_G \leq 2t_H + 2$. By Observation 4.18, $H \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus, we have shown $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon) \geq Tw(\epsilon^{-C'})$ for some $C' > 0$ depending only on C . By Lemma 5.1, we then have $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon^{12})/3 \geq Tw(\epsilon^{-12C'})/3$. Clearly this implies that for some $K > 0$, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq Tw(\epsilon^{-K})$. \square

We can now characterize the jump to tower.

Theorem 5.5. *For any hereditary 3-graph property, \mathcal{H} , one of the following hold.*

(1) *For all $k \geq 1$, $k \otimes U(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. Then for some $C, C' > 0$,*

$$Tw(\epsilon^{-C}) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq Tw(\epsilon^{-C'}).$$

(2) *For some $k \geq 1$, $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. Then for some $K > 0$,*

$$M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon^4) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-K}}}.$$

Proof. Part (1) follows immediately from Theorem 5.4. We now prove (2). Suppose there is some $k \geq 1$ so that $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $C > 0$ be as in Theorem 4.16 for k . By Theorem 4.20, \mathcal{H} is close to some \mathcal{H}' with $\text{SVC}(\mathcal{H}') < k$. By Theorem 4.16, $M_{\mathcal{H}'}^{hom}(\epsilon) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C}}}$. By Proposition 4.22, $M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}'}^{hom}(\epsilon/2)$. Combining with Lemma 4.23 we have

$$M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon^4) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}'}^{hom}(\epsilon^4/2) \leq 2^{2^{(\epsilon^4/2)^{-C}}}.$$

This implies that for some $K > 0$, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{hom}(\epsilon^4) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-K}}}$. \square

6. JUMP FROM POLYNOMIAL TO ALMOST EXPONENTIAL

In this section we prove the existence of a jump from polynomial growth to exponential. While the jump in the previous section (almost exponential to tower) was characterized by being close to finite slicewise VC-dimension (see Definition 4.19), the jump from polynomial to exponential is characterized by being “close” to having finite VC-dimension (defined below). We already know from Theorem 4.11 that if a hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} has finite VC-dimension, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded above by a polynomial. By Proposition 4.4, this implies that for any \mathcal{H} which is close (in the sense of Definition 2.6) to some \mathcal{H}' of finite VC-dimension, $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is also bounded above by a polynomial. It turns out that this will characterize the jump between polynomial and exponential. This is the motivation for the following definition.

Definition 6.1. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property. We say \mathcal{H} is *close to finite VC-dimension* if there is some \mathcal{H}' so that \mathcal{H} is close to \mathcal{H}' , and $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}') < \infty$.

We say \mathcal{H} is *far from finite VC-dimension* if it is not close to finite VC-dimension.

We show that if a hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} is close to finite VC-dimension, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded above by a polynomial, and if \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded below by an exponential.

We begin with a combinatorial characterization of what properties are close to finite VC-dimension using Theorem 4.6. We recall our notation for 3-graphs built by “doubling” some vertices of a bipartite graph.

Definition 6.2. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph. Define

$$\widehat{G}_{UV} = (\{a_u : u \in U\} \cup \{b_v : v \in V\} \cup \{c_v : v \in V\} : \{a_u b_v c_v : uv \in E\}).$$

An important example of Definition 6.2 is the case where the starting graph G is $U(k)$. We recall from Definition 3.12 that $U(k) = (A_k \cup B_k, E_k)$, where $A_k = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, $B_k = \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\}$, and $E_k = \{a_i b_S : i \in S\}$. To ease notation, we will write $\widehat{U}(k)$ to denote the 3-graph $\widehat{U}(k)_{A_k B_k}$. In other words,

$$\widehat{U}(k) = (\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_k\} \cup \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\}, \{a_i c_i b_S : i \in S\}).$$

Note that for any hereditary 3-graph property, $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) = \max\{k : \widehat{U}(k) \in \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})\}$ (see Definition 3.11).

The following characterization of which hereditary 3-graph properties are close to finite VC-dimension follows immediately from Theorem 4.6.

Proposition 6.3. *For any hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} , the following are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension.
- (2) For all $n, k \geq 1$, \mathcal{H} contains an n -blowup of $\widehat{U}(k)$.

We now give an overview of the strategy we will use for the rest of this section. First, we will show an exponential lower bound for *graph theoretic* regular partitions of *graph*

theoretic blow ups of $U(k)$. We will then prove two lemmas which will allow us to transfer this lower bound to 3-graph blowups of $\widehat{U(k)}$.

We begin by proving the following lower bound on the size of a graph theoretic regular partition for a certain graph theoretic blow up of the power set graph.

Proposition 6.4. *For all $c \in (0, 1)$, the following holds. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, $K = \epsilon^{-1}$, n is sufficiently large, and $N = \epsilon 2^{\epsilon^{-1}} n$. Let Γ be a simple N -blowup of $U(K)$ (in the sense of Definition 3.7). Then there is an induced subgraph G of Γ , so that any ϵ^{100} -regular partition of G has at least $2^{\epsilon^{-1+c}}$ parts.*

Proof. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small compared to c , $K = \epsilon^{-1}$, $n \gg \epsilon^{-1}$, and $N = \epsilon 2^{\epsilon^{-1}} n$. Suppose Γ is a simple N -blowup of $U(K)$ (in the sense of Definition 3.7). By definition, this means Γ has vertex set of the form

$$V(\Gamma) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_K \cup \bigcup_{S \subseteq [K]} W_S,$$

where for each $i \in [K]$ and $S \subseteq [K]$, $|V_i| = |W_S| = N$, and edge set

$$E(\Gamma) = \bigcup_{i \in S} K_2[V_i, W_S].$$

For each $S \subseteq [K]$, let $U_S \subseteq W_S$ be any subset of size n . We then set

$$V = \bigcup_{i=1}^K V_i \text{ and } U = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [K]} U_S,$$

and define $G = \Gamma[V, U]$. Note $|V| = |U| = KN = 2^K n$ (the reason we pass from Γ to G is to ensure $|V| = |U|$). Suppose $\mathcal{P} = \{X_1, \dots, X_t\}$ is an ϵ^{100} -regular partition of G . Let Σ_{reg} denote the set of regular pairs from \mathcal{P} with respect to G , and set

$$S_{reg} = \bigcup_{(X, Y) \in \Sigma_{reg}} X \times Y.$$

For each $i \in [t]$, let $X_i^V = X_i \cap V$ and $X_i^U = X_i \cap U$, and define

$$\mathcal{P}^U = \{X_i^U : i \in [t]\} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}^V = \{X_i^V : i \in [t]\}.$$

Now define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_0 := & \{X_i^V : i \in [t], |X_i^V| < \epsilon^{50} |X_i|\} \cup \{X_i^U : i \in [t], |X_i^U| < \epsilon^{50} |X_i|\} \\ & \cup \{X_i : i \in [t], |X_i| < \epsilon^{50} |U \cup V|/t\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $P_0 := \bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}_0} Z$. One can easily check that $|P_0| < 3\epsilon^{50} |U \cup V|$. Let

$$\Sigma'_{reg} = \{(X_i^V, X_j^U) : (X_i, X_j) \in \Sigma_{reg}, X_i^V \in \mathcal{P}^V \setminus \mathcal{P}_0, \text{ and } X_j^U \in \mathcal{P}^U \setminus \mathcal{P}_0\}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, every $(X_i^V, X_j^U) \in \Sigma'_{reg}$ is $2\epsilon^{50}$ -regular. Setting $S'_{reg} = \bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma'_{reg}} (X \times Y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(U \times V) \setminus \mathcal{S}'_{reg}| &\leq |(U \times V) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{err}| + |P_0||U \cup V| \leq \epsilon^{100}|U \cup V|^2 + 3\epsilon^{50}|U \cup V|^2 \\ &\leq 4\epsilon^{50}|U \cup V|^2 \\ (9) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= 16\epsilon^{50}|U||V|. \end{aligned}$$

We now define an auxiliary graph \mathcal{G} . In particular, let \mathcal{G} be the bipartite graph with vertex set $U \cup V$ and edge set \mathcal{S}'_{reg} . Now let

$$V_{good} = \{x \in V : |N_{\mathcal{G}}(x)| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon^{25})|U|\} \text{ and } U_{good} = \{x \in U : |N_{\mathcal{G}}(x)| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon^{25})|U|\}.$$

Inequality (9) implies $|V_{good}| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon^{25})|V|$ and $|U_{good}| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon^{25})|U|$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{good}^V &= \{X_i^V \in \mathcal{P}^V \setminus \mathcal{P}_0 : |X_i^V \cap V_{good}| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{20})|X_i^V|\} \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{P}_{good}^U &= \{X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}^U \setminus \mathcal{P}_0 : |X_i^U \cap U_{good}| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{20})|X_i^U|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{V} = \{V_j : j \in [K], |V_j \cap V_{good}| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon^{10})|V_j|\},$$

and then define

$$V'_{good} = \bigcup_{V_j \in \mathcal{V}} V_j \cap V_{good}.$$

By Lemma 3.5 and the lower bound above for $|V_{good}|$, we have $|V'_{good}| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon^{10})|V|$. Since all V_j have the same size, this implies $|\mathcal{V}| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon^{10})K$.

Claim 6.5. *For all $X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^U$, $|X_i^U| \leq \frac{|U|}{(1 - \epsilon^{49})2^{(1 - \epsilon^2)\epsilon^{-1}}}$.*

Proof. Fix $X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^U$. Define

$$J(X_i^U) = \bigcup_{\{X_{i'}^V \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^V : (X_i^U, X_{i'}^V) \in \Sigma'_{reg}\}} (X_{i'}^V \cap V'_{good}).$$

Since $X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^U$, $|J(X_i^U)| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon^{25} - 2\epsilon^{10})|V'_{good}|$. Since all the V_j have the same size, the lower bound for $|J(X_i^U)|$ implies there exists a set

$$\mathcal{J}(X_i^U) \subseteq \{V_j : j \in [K]\},$$

such that $|\mathcal{J}(X_i^U)| \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)K$ and such that for all $V_j \in \mathcal{J}(X_i^U)$, $|J(X_i^U) \cap V_j| \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)|V_j|$. Now for each $V_j \in \mathcal{J}(X_i^U)$, by pigeon hole principle, there is some $X_{f(i,j)}^V \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^V$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{f(i,j)}^V \cap V_j \cap J(X_i^U)| &\geq |V_j \cap J(X_i^U)|/t \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)|V_j|/t = (1 - \epsilon^2)|U \cup V|/tK \\ &= \epsilon(1 - \epsilon^2)|U \cup V|/t \\ &\geq \epsilon^{48}|X_{f(i,j)}^V|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two lines are by definition of K and because $X_{f(i,j)}^V \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^V$. For each $V_j \in \mathcal{J}(X_i^U)$, let

$$U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 1) = \bigcup_{j \in S} U_S \text{ and } U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 0) = \bigcup_{j \notin S} U_S.$$

Note

$$(10) \quad (X_{f(i,j)}^V \cap V_j) \times (U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 1)) \subseteq \overline{E} \text{ and } (X_{f(i,j)}^V \cap V_j) \times (U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 0)) \cap \overline{E} = \emptyset.$$

By construction, $(X_{f(i,j)}^V, X_i^U) \in \Sigma'_{reg}$ and $|X_{f(i,j)}^V \cap V_j| > \epsilon^{100}|X_{f(i,j)}^V|$, so by (10), must have either

$$|X_i^U \cap U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 1)| < \epsilon^{100}|X_i^U| \leq \epsilon^{50}|X_i^U| \text{ or } |X_i^U \cap U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, 0)| < \epsilon^{100}|X_i^U| \leq \epsilon^{50}|X_i^U|.$$

Consequently, there is some function $\sigma : \mathcal{J}(X_i^U) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ so that if we let

$$R(X_i^U) = \bigcap_{V_j \in \mathcal{J}(X_i^U)} U(X_{f(i,j)}^V, \sigma(j)),$$

then

$$|X_i^U \setminus R(X_i^U)| \leq K\epsilon^{50}|X_i^U| = \epsilon^{49}|X_i^U|.$$

This shows that $|X_i^U| \leq |R(X_i^U)| + \epsilon^{49}|X_i^U|$, so $|X_i^U| \leq \frac{|R(X_i^U)|}{(1-\epsilon^{49})}$. We now observe that

$$|R(X_i^U)| \leq \frac{|U|}{2^{|\mathcal{J}(X_i^U)|}} \leq 2^{-(1-\epsilon^2)\epsilon^{-1}}|U|.$$

Combining these inequalities finishes the proof of Claim 6.5. \square

Using Claim 6.5, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^U} X_i^U \right| \leq \frac{t|U|}{(1-\epsilon^{49})2^{(1-\epsilon^2)\epsilon^{-1}}}.$$

On the other hand, by definition of \mathcal{P}_{good}^U , Lemma 3.5, and since $|U_{good}| \geq (1-4\epsilon^{25})|U|$, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{X_i^U \in \mathcal{P}_{good}^U} X_i^U \right| \geq (1-\epsilon^5)|U|.$$

Combining these inequalities yields that

$$(1-\epsilon^5)|U| \leq \frac{t|U|}{(1-\epsilon^{49})2^{(1-\epsilon^2)\epsilon^{-1}}}.$$

Rearranging, this yields that $t \geq (1-\epsilon^5)(1-\epsilon^{49})2^{(1-\epsilon^2)\epsilon^{-1}} \geq 2^{\epsilon^{-1+c}}$, where the last inequality is because we have assumed ϵ is sufficiently small. \square

We now turn to proving two lemmas which will allow us to bootstrap Proposition 6.4 into a lower bound about 3-graphs. The first, Lemma 6.6 below, will imply that homogeneous partitions of 3-graphs which are blowups of $\widehat{U(k)}$ will yield homogeneous partitions of graph theoretic blowups of $U(k)$.

Lemma 6.6. *There exists $D > 0$ so that the following holds. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph, $0 < \epsilon \ll |U|^{-1}, |V|^{-1}$, and $n \gg |U| + |V|$. Assume $H = \widehat{G}_{UV}$ and \mathbf{H} is a simple n -blowup of H (as in Definition 4.5), and assume there is an ϵ -homogeneous partition of \mathbf{H} with at most t parts. Then there is a simple n -blow up \mathbf{G} of G (as in Definition 3.7) so that \mathbf{G} has an $\epsilon^{1/D}$ -homogeneous partition with at most t parts.*

Proof. By definition, we may assume \mathbf{H} has vertex set $V(\mathbf{H}) = \bigcup_{u \in U} A_u \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} B_v \cup C_v$ where for each $u \in U$ and $v \in V$, $|A_u| = |B_v| = |C_v| = n$, and

$$E(\mathbf{H}) = \bigcup_{uv \in E} K_3[A_u, B_v, C_v].$$

Note $|V(\mathbf{H})| = (|U| + 2|V|)n$. To ease notation, let $A = \bigcup_{u \in U} A_u$, $B = \bigcup_{v \in V} B_v$ and $C = \bigcup_{v \in V} C_v$. Let \mathbf{G} be the graph with vertex set $A \cup B$ and edge set

$$E(\mathbf{G}) = \bigcup_{uv \in E} K_2[A_u, B_v].$$

Note \mathbf{G} is a simple n -blow-up of G (in the sense of Definition 3.7) and $|V(\mathbf{G})| = (|U| + |V|)n$.

Suppose $\mathcal{P} = \{D_1, \dots, D_t\}$ is an ϵ -homogeneous partition of \mathbf{H} . We show \mathbf{G} has an ϵ -homogeneous partition with size at most t . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 &= \{(X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{P}^3 : \epsilon < d_{\mathbf{H}}(X, Y, Z) < 1 - \epsilon\}, \\ \Omega_0 &= \{(X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{P}^3 \setminus \Omega_2 : d_{\mathbf{H}}(X, Y, Z) \leq \epsilon\}, \\ \Omega_1 &= \{(X, Y, Z) \in \mathcal{P}^3 \setminus \Omega_2 : d_{\mathbf{H}}(X, Y, Z) \geq 1 - \epsilon\}, \text{ and} \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{P} is ϵ -homogeneous, $|\bigcup_{(X, Y, Z) \in \Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1} X \times Y \times Z| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|V(\mathbf{H})|^3$.

Note \mathcal{P} induces a partition on $V(\mathbf{G})$, namely $\mathcal{Q} = \{D'_1, \dots, D'_t\}$, where for each $i \in [t]$, $D'_i = D_i \cap (A \cup B)$. We show \mathcal{Q} is $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -homogeneous with respect to \mathbf{G} . We first define a set of parts from \mathcal{Q} which we wish to ignore (as they are small).

$$\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{D'_i \in \mathcal{Q} : |D'_i| < \epsilon^{1/4}|D_i|\}.$$

We next define three subsets of pairs from \mathcal{Q} .

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0 &= \{(D'_i, D'_j) \in (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_0)^2 : \text{for some } k \in [t], (D_i, D_j, D_k) \in \Omega_0\}, \\ \Sigma_1 &= \{(D'_i, D'_j) \in (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{Q}_0)^2 : \text{for some } k \in [t], (D_i, D_j, D_k) \in \Omega_1\}, \text{ and} \\ \Sigma_2 &= \mathcal{Q}^2 \setminus (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that every $(D'_i, D'_j) \in \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0$ is $\epsilon^{1/8}$ -homogeneous with respect to \mathbf{G} . Suppose first $(D'_i, D'_j) \in \Sigma_0$. Then there is some $k \in [t]$ so that $(D_i, D_j, D_k) \in \Omega_0$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{E}(\mathbf{G}) \cap (D'_i \times D'_j) \parallel D_k| &\leq \sum_{uv \in E} |(D'_i \cap A_u) \times (D'_j \cap B_v) \parallel D_k| + |(D'_i \cap B_v) \times (D'_j \cap A_u) \parallel D_k| \\ &\leq |\overline{E}(\mathbf{H}) \cap (D_i \times D_j \times D_k)| \\ &\leq \epsilon |D_i| |D_j| |D_k|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $|\overline{E}(\mathbf{G}) \cap (D'_i \times D'_j)| \leq \epsilon |D_i| |D_j| \leq \epsilon^{1/2} |D'_i| |D'_j|$, where the last inequality is because $D'_i, D'_j \notin \mathcal{Q}_0$ by definition of Σ_0 .

Assume now $(D'_i, D'_j) \in \Sigma_1$. Then there is some $k \in [t]$ so that $(D_i, D_j, D_k) \in \Omega_1$. Since \mathbf{H} is tripartite (because it is a simple blowup), this implies (possibly after relabeling), that the following hold.

$$(11) \quad |D_i \cap A| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |D_i|, \quad |D_j \cap B| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |D_j|, \quad \text{and} \quad |D_k \cap C| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |D_k|.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{E}(\mathbf{G}) \cap (D'_i \times D'_j)| &= \sum_{uv \in E} |(D'_i \cap A_u) \times (D'_j \cap B_v)| + |(D'_i \cap B_v) \times (D'_j \cap A_u)| \\ &= \sum_{uv \in E} |(D_i \cap A_u) \times (D_j \cap B_v)| \pm 2\epsilon |D'_i| |D'_j|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon) |D_i| |D_j| |D_k| &\leq |\overline{E}(\mathbf{H}) \cap (D_i \times D_j \times D_k)| \\ &= \sum_{uv \in E} |(D_i \cap A_u) \times (D_j \cap B_v) \times (D_k \cap C_v)| \pm 6\epsilon |D_i| |D_j| |D_k| \\ &\leq \sum_{uv \in E} |(D_i \cap A_u) \times (D_j \cap B_v)| |D_k| \pm 6\epsilon |D_i| |D_j| |D_k| \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities, we have

$$(1 - \epsilon) |D_i| |D_j| \leq \sum_{uv \in E} |(D_i \cap A_u) \times (D_j \cap B_v)| \pm 6\epsilon |D_i| |D_j| = |\overline{E}(\mathbf{G}) \cap (D'_i \times D'_j)| \pm 6\epsilon |D'_i| |D'_j|.$$

Thus every $(D'_i, D'_j) \in \Sigma_1$ is $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -homogeneous (since ϵ is sufficiently small). This finishes our verification that each pair in $\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1$ is $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -homogeneous. Thus, it suffices to show $|\bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma_2} X \times Y| \leq \epsilon^{1/8} |V(\mathbf{G})|^2$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} 2\epsilon^{1/4} |V(\mathbf{H})|^3 &\geq \left| \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{Q}_0} V \times V \times X \right| + \left| \bigcup_{(X,Y,Z) \in \Omega_2} X \times Y \times Z \right| \geq \left| \bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}} \bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma_2} X \times Y \times Z \right| \\ &= |V(\mathbf{G})| \left| \bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma_2} X \times Y \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Sigma_2} X \times Y \right| &\leq \epsilon^{1/4} \frac{|V(\mathbf{H})|^3}{|V(\mathbf{G})|} = \frac{\epsilon^{1/4} ((K_1 + 2K_2)n)^3}{(|U| + |V|)n} \leq \frac{\epsilon^{1/4} ((2|U| + 2|V|)n)^3}{(|U| + |V|)n} \\ &= 8\epsilon^{1/4} (|U| + |V|) |V(\mathbf{G})|^2 \\ &< \epsilon^{1/8} |V(\mathbf{G})|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because, by assumption, $\epsilon \ll |U|^{-1}, |V|^{-1}$. \square

Our next lemma shows all regular partitions of certain blow-ups are homogeneous.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $t \geq 1$, $1 \leq K_1 \leq K_2$, $0 < \mu < 1/2K_1$ and assume n is sufficiently large. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph with $|V| = K_1$, $|U| = K_2$, and \mathbf{H} is a simple n -blowup of the 3-graph $H = \widehat{G}_{UV}$. Suppose \mathcal{P} is a μ -regular partition of \mathbf{H} with at most t parts. Then \mathcal{P} is 4μ -homogeneous with respect to \mathbf{H} .*

Proof. Let t, K_1, K_2, μ be as in the hypotheses, and assume n is sufficiently large. Suppose $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph with $|V| = K_1$, $|U| = K_2$, and \mathbf{H} is a simple n -blowup of the 3-graph $H = \widehat{G}_{UV}$.

By definition, we may assume \mathbf{H} has vertex set $\bigcup_{u \in U} X_u^1 \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} X_v^2 \cup X_v^3$ and edge set $E(\mathbf{H}) = \bigcup_{uv \in E} K_3[X_u^1, X_v^2, X_v^3]$. To ease notation, let $X^1 = \bigcup_{u \in U} X_u^1$, $X^2 = \bigcup_{v \in V} X_v^2$, and $X^3 = \bigcup_{v \in V} X_v^3$. Note that \mathbf{H} has slicewise VC-dimension less than $K_1 + K_2$.

Suppose $\mathcal{P} = \{D_1, \dots, D_t\}$ is an μ -regular partition of \mathbf{H} . For each $i \in [t]$, let

$$D_i^1 = D_i \cap X^1, \quad D_i^2 = D_i \cap X^2, \quad \text{and} \quad D_i^3 = D_i \cap X^3.$$

For each $i \in [t]$, let $f(i) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be such that $|D_i^{f(i)}| = \max\{|D_i^1|, |D_i^2|, |D_i^3|\}$.

Given a triple $(D_i, D_j, D_k) \in \mathcal{P}^3$, we say (D_i, D_j, D_k) is *crossing* if $f(i), f(j), f(k)$ are pairwise distinct, and moreover, $|D_i \cap X^{f(i)}| \geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_i|$, $|D_j \cap X^{f(j)}| \geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_j|$, and $|D_k \cap X^{f(k)}| \geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_k|$. By Lemma 5.2, every μ -regular, non-crossing triple is μ -homogeneous.

Suppose now (D_i, D_j, D_k) is crossing and μ -regular. Say $f(i) = 1$, $f(j) = 2$, and $f(k) = 3$. By pigeon hole principle, since $|V| \leq K_1$ and $\mu < 1/2K_1$, there are $v, v' \in V$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_j \cap X_v^2| &\geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_j|/K_1 \geq \mu|D_j|, \quad \text{and} \\ |D_k \cap X_{v'}^3| &\geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_k|/K_1 \geq \mu|D_k|. \end{aligned}$$

Since (D_i, D_j, D_k) is μ -regular,

$$(12) \quad |d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i \cap X^1, D_j \cap X_v^2, D_k \cap X_{v'}^3) - d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i, D_j, D_k)| \leq \mu.$$

If $v \neq v'$, then by definition of \mathbf{H} , $d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i \cap X^1, D_j \cap X_v^2, D_k \cap X_{v'}^3) = 0$, so (12) implies $d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i, D_j, D_k) \leq \mu$. If $v = v'$, then

$$(13) \quad d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in N_G(v)} X_u^1), D_j \cap X_v^2, D_k \cap X_{v'}^3) = 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(14) \quad d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in U \setminus N_G(v)} X_u^1), D_j \cap X_v^2, D_k \cap X_{v'}^3) = 0.$$

Since (D_i, D_j, D_k) is μ -regular this implies

$$\min\{|D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in N_G(v)} X_u^1)|, |D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in U \setminus N_G(v)} X_u^1)|\} < \mu|D_i|.$$

Combining this with the fact that $|D_i \cap X^1| \geq (1 - 2\mu)|D_i|$, we have that either

$$|D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in N_G(v)} X_u^1)| \geq (1 - 3\mu)|D_i| \quad \text{or} \quad |D_i \cap (\bigcup_{u \in U \setminus N_G(v)} X_u^1)| \geq (1 - 3\mu)|D_i|.$$

Combining this with (13) and (14), we have that

$$d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i \cap X^1, D_j \cap X_v^2, D_k \cap X_{v'}^3) \in [0, 3\mu] \cup (1 - 3\mu, 1].$$

Combining with (12), this implies $d_{\mathbf{H}}(D_i, D_j, D_k) \in [0, 4\mu] \cup (1 - 4\mu, 1]$. We have now shown all regular triples of \mathcal{P} are 4μ -homogeneous. \square

We are now ready to prove the jump from polynomial to exponential.

Theorem 6.8. *For all $k \geq 1$ there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ so that the following hold. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property such that $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$, and such that \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension. Then $2^{\epsilon^{-C_1}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^4/2) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C_2}}}$.*

Proof. Fix \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property such that $k \otimes U(k) \notin \text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$, and such that \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension. The inequalities $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^4/2) \leq 2^{2^{\epsilon^{-C_2}}}$ are from Theorem 5.5.

For the lower bound, let D be as in Lemma 6.6. Fix a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, let $K = \epsilon^{-1}$, $0 < c < 1$, and let n be sufficiently large. Since \mathcal{H} is far from every property of finite VC-dimension, Proposition 6.3 implies \mathcal{H} contains an n -blowup of $H := \widehat{U(K)}$. This implies that there is a *simple* n -blowup \mathbf{H} of H in $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ be an $\epsilon^{4D}/4$ -regular partition of \mathbf{H} whose size is as small as possible. By Lemma 6.6, \mathcal{P} is ϵ^D -homogeneous with respect to \mathbf{H} . By Lemma 6.6, there is a simple n -blowup \mathbf{G} of $U(K)$ which has an ϵ^4 -homogeneous partition \mathcal{Q} of size t (note \mathbf{G} is a graph). By Proposition 3.10, \mathcal{Q} is ϵ -regular. By Proposition 6.4, $t \geq 2^{\epsilon^{(-1+c)/100}}$.

The argument above shows $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon^{4D}/4) \geq 2^{\epsilon^{-C}}$ for some $C > 0$. Consequently, $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon) \geq 2^{(4\epsilon)^{-C/4D}}$. This shows that for some $C_0 > 0$, $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon) \geq 2^{\epsilon^{-C_0}}$. Fact 5.1 then implies that for some $C_1 > 0$, $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) > 2^{\epsilon^{-C_1}}$. \square

We now show the general form of lower bound cannot be improved beyond a single exponential.

Theorem 6.9. *There is a hereditary 3-graph property \mathcal{H} with $\text{SVC}(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$, so that \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension, and so that for some $C, C' > 0$,*

$$2^{\epsilon^{-C}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq 2^{\epsilon^{-C'}}.$$

Proof. For all $k, n \geq 1$, let $H(k, n)$ be the 3-partite 3-graph with vertex set $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_k \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_k \cup \bigcup_{S \subseteq [k]} W_S$ where for each $i \in [k]$ and $S \subseteq [k]$, $|U_i| = |V_i| = |W_S| = n$, and with edge set

$$E(H) = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [k]} \bigcup_{i \in S} K_3[U_i, V_i, W_S].$$

In other words, $H(k, n)$ is a simple n -blowup of $\widehat{U(k)}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the hereditary 3-graph property obtained by taking the closure of $\bigcup_{k, n \geq 1} H(k, n)$ under isomorphism and induced sub-3-graphs. Since \mathcal{H} contains n -blowups of $\widehat{U(k)}$ for every k and n , Theorem 4.20 implies \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension. We leave it as an exercise to the reader to see that on

the other hand, \mathcal{H} has finite slicewise VC-dimension. By Theorem 6.8, there is some C so that $2^{\epsilon^{-C}} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$.

The rest of the proof is devoted to the stated upper bound for $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon)$. Fix a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, and suppose $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is sufficiently large. By definition of \mathcal{H} , we may assume there are n, k so that $V(H) = U \cup V \cup W$, where $U = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_k$, $V = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [k]} V_S$, and $W = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [k]} W_S$, and for each $i \in [k]$ and $S \subseteq [k]$, each $|U_i|, |V_i|, |W_S| \leq n$, and where

$$E(H) = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [k]} \bigcup_{i \in S} K_3[U_i, V_i, W_S].$$

We show H has an $\epsilon^{1/4}$ -regular partition of size at most $2^{3+\epsilon^{-4}}$. If

$$\min\{|U|, |V|, |W|\} \leq \epsilon|V(H)|,$$

then the partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{V(H)\}$ is ϵ -homogeneous, and thus $\epsilon^{1/4}$ -regular, so we are done. Assume now $\min\{|U|, |V|, |W|\} \geq \epsilon|V(H)|$. Let $\mathcal{P}_U = \{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$, $\mathcal{P}_V = \{V_S : S \subseteq [k]\}$, and $\mathcal{P}_W = \{W_S : S \subseteq [k]\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_U = \{X \in \mathcal{P}_U : |X| \geq \epsilon^{10}|U|\} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_V = \{X \in \mathcal{P}_V : |X| \geq \epsilon^{10}|V|\}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{F}_W = \{X \in \mathcal{P}_W : |X| \geq \epsilon^4|W|\}.$$

Note each of \mathcal{F}_U , \mathcal{F}_V , and \mathcal{F}_W have size at most ϵ^{-4} . Now define

$$U_0 := \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{P}_U \setminus \mathcal{F}_U} X, \quad V_0 := \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{P}_V \setminus \mathcal{F}_V} X, \quad \text{and } W_0 := \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{P}_W \setminus \mathcal{F}_W} X.$$

Observe that we have no information about the sizes of U_0, V_0, W_0 . Let

$$\mathcal{J} = \{S \subseteq [k] : W_S \subseteq W \setminus W_0\}.$$

By definition of W_0 , $|\mathcal{J}| \leq \epsilon^{-4}$. Let S_1, \dots, S_t enumerate all Boolean combinations of elements in \mathcal{J} . Clearly $t \leq 2^{|\mathcal{J}|}$. For all $1 \leq i \leq t$, define

$$I_{S_i}^U = \bigcup_{\{U_i \in \mathcal{F}_U : i \in S\}} U_i \text{ and } I_{S_i}^V = \bigcup_{\{V_i \in \mathcal{F}_V : i \in S\}} V_i.$$

Now let $\mathcal{U} = \{I_{S_i}^U : i \in [t]\}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{I_{S_i}^V : i \in [t]\}$, and define

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{W_S : S \in \mathcal{J}\} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \{V_0, W_0, U_0\}.$$

Observe that \mathcal{Q} is a partition of $V(H)$ and

$$|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 1 + |\mathcal{J}| + 2 \cdot 2^{2^{|\mathcal{J}|}} + 3 \leq 8 \cdot 2^{|\mathcal{J}|} \leq 8 \cdot 2^{\epsilon^{-4}}$$

We show \mathcal{Q} is 5ϵ -homogeneous, which will finish the proof. Let Σ be the set of 5ϵ -homogeneous triples from \mathcal{Q} and let $\mathcal{S}^{hom} = \bigcup_{(X,Y,Z) \in \Sigma} X \times Y \times Z$. Let us call a triple $(X_1, X_2, X_3) \in \mathcal{Q}^3$ *crossing* if there is some permutation $\sigma : [3] \rightarrow [3]$ so that $X_{\sigma(1)} \subseteq U$, $X_{\sigma(2)} \subseteq V$, and $X_{\sigma(3)} \subseteq W$. Note that because H is tripartite, any non-crossing triple from \mathcal{Q}^3 has density 0, and is thus in Σ . Therefore, it suffices to show

$$(15) \quad |\mathcal{S}^{hom} \cap (U \times V \times W)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|V(H)|^3.$$

We first show that if $|W_0| \geq \epsilon^2|V(H)|$, then

$$(16) \quad |\mathcal{S}^{hom} \cap (U \times V \times W_0)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|U||V||W_0|.$$

Indeed, observe that if $|W_0| \geq \epsilon^2|V(H)|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |(W_0 \times V \times V) \cap \overline{E(H)}| &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{\{S \subseteq [k]: W_S \in \mathcal{P}_W \setminus \mathcal{F}_W, i \in S\}} |U_i||V_i||W_S| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{S \subseteq [k]} |U_i||V_i|\epsilon^4|W| \\ &\leq \epsilon^4|U||V||W| \\ &\leq \epsilon^2|U||V||W_0|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.5, at least $(1 - \epsilon)|U||V||W_0|$ triples from $U \times V \times W_0$ are in an element of Σ , so (16) holds. We next show that if $|U_0| \geq \epsilon^2|V(H)|$, then

$$(17) \quad |\mathcal{S}^{hom} \cap (U_0 \times V \times W)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|U||V||W_0|.$$

Indeed, observe that if $|U_0| \geq \epsilon^2|V(H)|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |(U_0 \times V \times W) \cap \overline{E(H)}| &= \sum_{\{i \in [k]: U_i \in \mathcal{P}_U \setminus \mathcal{F}_U\}} \sum_{\{S \subseteq [k]: i \in S\}} |U_i||V_i||W_S| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{S \subseteq [k]} \epsilon^4|U_i||V_i||W_S| \\ &\leq \epsilon^4|U||V||W| \\ &= \epsilon^2|U_0||V||W|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Lemma 3.5, at least $(1 - \epsilon)|U_0||V||W|$ triples from $U_0 \times V \times W$ are in an element of Σ , so (17) holds. A similar argument shows that if $|V_0| \geq \epsilon^2|V(H)|$, then

$$|\mathcal{S}^{hom} \cap (U \times V_0 \times W)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|U||V||W_0|.$$

Consider now a triple of the form $(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S)$ for some $1 \leq i, j \leq t$, and $W_S \in \mathcal{F}_W$. If $S_i \neq S_j$, then $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$, so by construction, $d_{\mathbf{H}}(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) = 0$, and consequently, $(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) \in \Sigma$. If $S_i = S_j$, then either $S_i = S_j$ and both are contained in S , or $S_i = S_j$ and both are disjoint from S . If $S_i = S_j \subseteq S$, then $d_{\mathbf{H}}(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) = 1$, so $(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) \in \Sigma$. If $S_i = S_j$ and both are disjoint from S , then $d_{\mathbf{H}}(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) = 0$, so $(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) \in \Sigma$. In all cases, $(I_{S_i}^U, I_{S_j}^V, W_S) \in \Sigma$.

Now let $\mathcal{Q}_{small} = \{Y \in \{V_0, W_0, U_0\} : |Y| < \epsilon^2|V(H)|\}$. Then we have shown

$$|(U \times V \times W) \setminus \mathcal{S}^{hom}| \leq |\mathcal{Q}_{small}|\epsilon^2|V(H)|^3 + \epsilon|U||V||W| \leq 5\epsilon|V(H)|^3.$$

□

7. JUMP FROM CONSTANT TO POLYNOMIAL

This section contains the jump from constant to polynomial growth. Ideas for this proof are very close to those for the corresponding jump for graphs. In particular, we will use blowups the following analogues of Definitions 3.22 and 3.23.

Definition 7.1. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is an 3-graph. Define $x \sim y$ if for all $z_2, z_3 \in V \setminus \{x, y\}$, $xz_1z_2 \in E$ if and only if $yz_1z_2 \in E$.

Definition 7.2. Suppose $G = (U, E)$ is an 3-graph. We say G is *irreducible* if every \sim -class has size 1 or 2.

Irreducible 3-graphs will play a similar role here as irreducible graphs did in Section 3. Note that any irreducible 3-graph with ℓ -many distinct \sim -classes contains at least ℓ and at most 2ℓ vertices. Further, for any (not necessarily irreducible) 3-graph with ℓ -many \sim -classes contains an induced irreducible sub-3-graph of size at most 2ℓ (just take two vertices from each \sim -class of size at least 2 and one vertex from each \sim_G -class of size 1). We now state the 3-graph analogue of Definition 3.24.

Definition 7.3. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the class of irreducible 3-graphs G so that for all n , there is some n -blow up of G in \mathcal{H} .

In analogy to Section 3, we will show that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many 3-graphs, up to isomorphism, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is constant, and when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs, then $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is at least polynomial.

We begin with the lower bound. We will use the following, which shows that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs, we can find blow-ups of certain special 3-graphs in $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. The reader may wish to revisit Definition 3.26 at this point.

Proposition 7.4. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs. Then for all $k, n \geq 1$, $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains a simple n -blow up of \widehat{G} for some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs. Fix $k, n \geq 1$. We want to show $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains an n -blow up of \widehat{G} for some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$. Let $N \gg k$ and choose some $H = (V, E) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with at least N vertices (this exists by our assumption on $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$). We first show that $\text{Trip}(H)$ contains an induced sub-3-graph isomorphic to \widehat{G} for some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$. Let U_1, \dots, U_K enumerate the \sim_H -classes of H .

Suppose first at least half of the \sim_H -classes have size 1. Say U_1, \dots, U_t have size 1, and for each $i \in [t]$, $U_i = \{u_i\}$. In this case, we define a bipartite graph Γ with vertex set $X \cup Y$ where $X = V \times V$ and $Y = \{u_1, \dots, u_t\}$, and with edge set

$$E(\Gamma) = \{u_i(b, c) : i \in [t], u_i b c \in E\}.$$

Because H is irreducible, the graph Γ , with distinguished sets X and Y , satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.27. Consequently, there exists an XY -copy in Γ of some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$. This precisely implies $\text{Trip}(H)$ contains \widehat{G} as an induced sub-3-graph.

Suppose now at least half the \sim_H -classes in H have size 2, say U_1, \dots, U_t have size 2, and for each $i \in [t]$, $U_i = \{x_i, y_i\}$. In this case, we define a bipartite graph Γ with vertex set $X \cup Y$, where $X = V$ and $Y = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_t, y_t)\}$, and with edge set

$$E(\Gamma) = \{v(x_i, y_i) : i \in [t], vx_i y_i \in E\}.$$

Because H is irreducible, the graph Γ , with distinguished sets X and Y , satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.27. This implies there exists an XY -copy in Γ of some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$, and therefore, $\text{Trip}(H)$ contains \widehat{G} as an induced sub-3-graph.

We have now shown that $\text{Trip}(H)$ contains an induced sub-3-graph isomorphic to \widehat{G} for some $G \in \{H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)\}$. Since $H \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, we know that \mathcal{H} contains an n -blowup of H . It is an exercise to see this implies $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains a simple n -blowup of $\text{Trip}(H)$, and consequently, $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains a simple n -blowup of \widehat{G} . \square

We can quickly show that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains arbitrarily large 3-graphs, $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is at least exponential. The idea of this proof is to use Lemmas 6.7, 6.6 in conjunction with the graph theoretic lower bound construction from Lemma 3.31.

Theorem 7.5. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs. Then for some $C > 0$, $\epsilon^{-C} \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \leq M_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{hom}}(\epsilon^4)$.*

Proof. Note that the upper bound is just from Proposition 4.8. Fix \mathcal{H} a hereditary 3-graph property so that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains infinitely many non-isomorphic 3-graphs. If \mathcal{H} is far from finite VC-dimension, we are done by Theorem 6.8.

Assume now \mathcal{H} is close to finite VC-dimension. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small, set $K = \epsilon^{-1}/4$, and let n be sufficiently large. By Proposition 7.4, there is some $G \in \{H(K), M(K), \overline{M}(K)\}$ so that $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$ contains a simple n -blowup \mathbf{H} of \widehat{G} . Let \mathcal{P} be an ϵ -regular partition of \mathbf{H} of size t . By Lemma 6.7, \mathcal{P} is 4ϵ -homogeneous. By Lemma 6.6, there is an $\epsilon^{1/D}$ -regular partition of size t for the graph \mathbf{G} obtained by taking the simple n -blowup of G . By Lemma 3.31, $t \geq (\epsilon^{1/100D})^{-1+c}$ for some $0 < c < 1$. This shows that $M_{\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})}(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^{-C}$ for some $C > 0$. By Fact 5.1, the conclusion follows. \square

Our next goal is to show that when $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many graphs, up to isomorphism, $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ is constant. The proof is similar to Lemma 3.34 in Section 3.

Theorem 7.6. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains finitely many graphs, up to isomorphism. Let*

$$C = \max\{\ell : \text{there is } G \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ with } \ell\text{-many } \sim_G\text{-classes}\}.$$

Then $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) = C$.

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{H} is a hereditary 3-graph property and assume $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ contains only finitely many graphs, up to isomorphism and

$$C = \max\{\ell : \text{there is } G \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ with } \ell\text{-many } \sim_G\text{-classes}\}.$$

Let \mathcal{F} be the class of irreducible 3-graphs G with the property that G has $C + 1$ many distinct \sim_G -classes. Note every element in \mathcal{F} has at most $2C$ vertices. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. By Theorem 4.6 and definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, there is N so that for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ on at least N vertices, H is ϵ^9 -close to some H' omitting all elements of \mathcal{F} .

Let $G = (U, E)$ be a sufficiently large element of \mathcal{H} . By above, G is ϵ^9 -close to some G' on the same vertex set, such that G' contains no element of \mathcal{F} as an induced sub-3-graph. Since G' omits all elements of \mathcal{F} , G' has at most C -many $\sim_{G'}$ -classes. Say these are

U_1, \dots, U_t for some $t \leq C$. One can now show $\{U_1, \dots, U_t\}$ is ϵ -regular for G via a similar argument to that at the end of the proof of Lemma 3.34. The arguments are sufficiently close that we omit the details here.

We now need to show $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq C$. Let $n \gg N$. By definition of C , there is an irreducible 3-graph Γ with C -many \sim -classes, so that \mathcal{H} contains an n -blowup of Γ . Let us enumerate the \sim_{Γ} -classes in Γ as $\{x_1\}, \dots, \{x_{C_1}\}, \{u_1, v_1\}, \dots, \{u_{C_2}, v_{C_2}\}$, where $C_1 + C_2 = C$. By definition, $V(\Gamma) = \{x_1, \dots, x_{C_1}, u_1, v_1, \dots, u_{C_2}, v_{C_2}\}$.

By assumption, there exists an n -blowup H of Γ with $H \in \mathcal{H}$. We may assume H has vertex set $\bigcup_{a \in V(\Gamma)} Z_a$ where each $|Z_a| = n$ and edge set $E(H)$ satisfying

$$\bigcup_{abc \in E(\Gamma)} K_3[Z_a, Z_b, Z_c] \subseteq E(H) \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{abc \notin E(\Gamma)} K_3[Z_a, Z_b, Z_c] \right) \cap E(H) = \emptyset.$$

We now pass to subsets to ensure some equitability properties hold. For each $1 \leq j \leq C_2$, let $Z'_{u_j} \subseteq Z_{u_j}$ and $Z'_{v_j} \subseteq Z_{v_j}$ have size $n/2$ and let $W'_j = Z'_{u_j} \cup Z'_{v_j}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq C_1$, let $Z'_{x_i} = Z_{x_i}$.

Define $H' = H[\bigcup_{a \in V(\Gamma)} Z'_a]$. By construction, we have that for each $1 \leq i \leq C_1$ and $1 \leq j \leq C_2$, $|Z'_{x_i}| = |W'_j| = n$, and consequently $|V(H')| = C_1 n + C_2 n$ (obtaining these facts is why we shrink the vertex sets). Since \mathcal{H} is hereditary $H' \in \mathcal{H}$. We show any ϵ -regular partition of H' has at least C parts, which implies $M_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon) \geq C$, finishing the proof.

Suppose towards a contradiction there exists $1 \leq t < C$ and an ϵ -regular partition $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ of H' . Suppose towards a contradiction $t < C$. Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}^3$ be the set of ϵ -regular triples of \mathcal{P} with respect to H' , and set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= \bigcup_{(X,Y,Z) \in \Sigma} X \times Y \times Z \text{ and} \\ \Omega &= \{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{P}^2 : \text{for all } (x, y) \in X \times Y, |N_{\mathcal{S}}(x, y)| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|V'(H')|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{S}' = \bigcup_{(X,Y) \in \Omega} X \times Y$$

By Lemma 3.5, $|\mathcal{S}'| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|V(H')|^2$. Set

$$\mathcal{R} = \{X \in \mathcal{P} : \text{for all } x \in X, |N_{\mathcal{S}'}(x)| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/2})|V(H')|^2\} \text{ and } \mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{X \in \mathcal{R}} X.$$

By Lemma 3.5, $|\mathcal{R}| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/4})|V(H')|$. Consequently, by pigeon hole principle, there is some $T \in \mathcal{R}$ with

$$|T| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/4})|V(H')|/t \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/4})|V(H')|/(C - 1) = (1 - \epsilon^{1/4})n(C_1 + C_2)/(C_1 + C_2 - 1),$$

where the second inequality is because $t < C$. Since each Z'_i and W'_j have size n , this implies that for some $A \neq B \in \{Z'_{x_1}, \dots, Z'_{x_{C_1}}, W'_1, \dots, W'_{C_2}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{|T \cap A|, |T \cap B|\} &\geq (|T| - n)/C \geq (C_1 + C_2)^{-1} \left(\frac{(1 - \epsilon^{1/4})n(C_1 + C_2)}{(C_1 + C_2 - 1)} - n \right) \\ &= \frac{n(2 - \epsilon^{1/4}(C_1 + C_2))}{C_1 + C_2} \\ &> 2\epsilon|T|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by the lower bound on T and assumption on ϵ . Observe that one of the three cases following hold.

- (1) $A = Z'_{x_i}$ and $B = Z'_{x_{i'}}$ some $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq C_1$.
- (2) $A = Z'_{x_i}$ and $B = W'_j$ some $1 \leq i \leq C_1$, $1 \leq j \leq C_2$. In this case, there is $b \in \{u_j, v_j\}$ so that if $B' = Z'_b$, then $|T \cap B'| > \epsilon|T|$.
- (3) $A = W'_j$ and $B = W'_{j'}$ some $1 \leq j \neq j' \leq C_2$. In this case, there are $a \in \{u_j, v_j\}$ and $b \in \{u_{j'}, v_{j'}\}$ so that if $A' = Z'_a$ and $B' = Z'_b$, then $|T \cap A'|, |T \cap B'| > \epsilon|T|$.

In each of these cases, we have that for some distinct pair $a, b \in V(\Gamma)$ with $a \asymp_\Gamma b$, we have $|T \cap A'|, |T \cap B'| > \epsilon|T|$, where $A' = Z'_a$ and $B' = Z'_b$,

Since Γ is irreducible, there are some $c, d \in V(\Gamma) \setminus \{a, b\}$ so that $cda \in E(\Gamma)$ and $cbd \notin E(\Gamma)$, or vice versa. Assume $cda \in E(\Gamma)$ but $cbd \notin E(\Gamma)$ (the other case is similar). By choice of T ,

$$|Z'_c \cap \left(\bigcup_{\{X \in \mathcal{P}: (T, X) \in \mathcal{R}\}} X \right)| \geq |Z'_c| - \epsilon^{1/4}|V(H')| \geq |Z'_c|(1 - \epsilon^{1/4}(C_1 + C_2)).$$

By pigeon hole principle, there exists $T' \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $(T, T') \in \mathcal{R}$, and such that

$$|Z'_c \cap T'| \geq |Z'_c|(1 - \epsilon^{1/4}(C_1 + C_2))/t > \epsilon|T'|,$$

where the last inequality is because $\epsilon \ll C^{-1}$ and $t < C$. Since $(T, T') \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$|Z'_d \cap \left(\bigcup_{\{X \in \mathcal{P}: (T, T', X) \in \Sigma\}} X \right)| \geq |Z'_d| - \sqrt{\epsilon}|V(H')| \geq |Z'_d|(1 - (C_1 + C_2)\epsilon^{1/2}).$$

Thus, there is some $T'' \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $(T, T', T'') \in \Sigma$, and

$$|Z'_d \cap T''| \geq (1 - (C_1 + C_2)\epsilon^{1/2})/t > \epsilon|T''|,$$

where the last inequality is because $\epsilon \ll C^{-1}$ and $t < C$. But we also have that $d_{H'}(Z'_a \cap T, Z'_c \cap T', Z'_d \cap T'') = 1$ while $d_{H'}(Z'_b \cap T, Z'_c \cap T', Z'_d \cap T'') = 0$, contradicting $(T, T', T'') \in \Sigma$. \square

8. APPENDIX

We begin with the proof of Lemma 3.27, which shows we can always find one of $H(k), M(k), \overline{M}(k)$ is certain bipartite graphs.

Proof of Lemma 3.27. Fix $k \geq 1$ and let $N \gg m \gg M \gg k$. Assume G is a graph and $U, V \subseteq V(G)$ satisfy $|U| \geq N$. Assume that for all $u \neq u' \in U$, $V \cap (N_G(u) \Delta N_G(u')) \neq \emptyset$. We construct a sequence of sets and vertices inductively. To ease notation, we set $E = E(G)$, and let $E^1 = E$ and $E^0 = \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E$.

Step 0: Fix any $z_0 \neq z_1 \in U$ and $x_1 \in V$ such that $x_1 z_1 \in E$ and $x_1 z_0 \notin E$. Let $\alpha(1) \in \{0, 1\}$ be that $|N_{E^{\alpha(1)}}(x) \cap U| \geq |U|/2$, and let $\beta(1)$ be such that $\{0, 1\} = \{\alpha(1), \beta(1)\}$. Let $y_1 = z_{\beta(1)}$ and $Y_1 = N_{E^{\alpha(1)}}(x_1) \cap U$.

Step $k+1$: Suppose we have constructed tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in V^k$, $(y_1, \dots, y_k) \in U^k$, and

$$(\alpha(1), \beta(1), \dots, \alpha(k), \beta(k)) \in \{0, 1\}^{2k},$$

and a sequence of subsets $U \supseteq Y_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq Y_k$ where $|Y_k| \geq 2$. Choose $z_0, z_1 \in Y_k$ and $x_{k+1} \in V \setminus \{z_1, z_0\}$ so that $x_{k+1} z_1 \in E$ and $x_{k+1} z_0 \notin E$. Let $\alpha(k+1)$ be such that $|N_{E^{\alpha(k+1)}}(x_{k+1}) \cap Y_k| \geq |Y_k|/2$. Now let $y_{k+1} = z_{\beta(k+1)}$ and set

$$Y_{k+1} = N_{E^{\alpha(k+1)}}(x_{k+1}) \cap Y_k.$$

Since $N \gg m$, this will proceed at least m steps. After m steps we will have chosen vertices $x_1, \dots, x_m \in V$, $y_1, \dots, y_m \in U$, $\alpha(1), \beta(1), \dots, \alpha(m), \beta(m)$ so that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, $x_i y_i \in E^{\alpha(i)}$ and $x_i y_j \in E^{\beta(i)}$. By pigeon hole principle, there are $\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{0, 1\}$ so that at least half the pairs are of the form $(\alpha(i), \beta(i))$ are equal to (α, β) . Define the sequence $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_t \leq m$ so that for each $u \in [t]$, we have $(\alpha(i_u), \beta(i_u)) = (\alpha, \beta)$.

We now construct a sequence of integers t_i , sets B_i , and tuples $(a_1^i, \dots, a_{t_i}^i)$, $(b_1^i, \dots, b_{t_i}^i)$.

Step 0: Let $t_0 = t$, $(a_1^0, \dots, a_{t_0}^0) = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t})$, $(b_1^0, \dots, b_{t_0}^0) = (y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_t})$, and set $B_0 = \{b_1^0, \dots, b_{t_0}^0\}$.

Step 1: Let $\tau(1)$ be such that $|N_{E^{\tau(1)}}(a_{t_1}^0) \cap B_0| \geq |B_0|/2$ and set $B_1 = N_{E^{\tau(1)}}(a_{t_1}^0) \cap B_0$. Say $B_1 = \{b_{j_1}^0, \dots, b_{j_{t_1}}^0\}$ where $j_1 < \dots < j_{t_1}$. Then define $(a_1^1, \dots, a_{t_1}^1) = (a_{j_1}^0, \dots, a_{j_{t_1}}^0)$ and $(b_1^1, \dots, b_{t_1}^1) = (b_{j_1}^0, \dots, b_{j_{t_1}}^0)$.

Step $k+1$: Let $\tau(k+1)$ be such that $|N_{E^{\tau(k+1)}}(a_{t_k}^k) \cap B_j| \geq |B_k|/2$ and define $B_{k+1} = N_{E^{\tau(k+1)}}(a_{t_k}^k) \cap B_k$. Say $B_{k+1} = \{b_{s_1}^k, \dots, b_{s_{t_{k+1}}}^k\}$ where $s_1 < \dots < s_{t_{k+1}}$. Then define $(a_1^{k+1}, \dots, a_{t_{k+1}}^{k+1}) = (a_{s_1}^k, \dots, a_{s_{t_{k+1}}}^k)$ and $(b_1^{k+1}, \dots, b_{t_{k+1}}^{k+1}) = (b_{s_1}^k, \dots, b_{s_{t_{k+1}}}^k)$.

Since $m \gg M$, this will proceed at least M steps. After M steps, we will have tuples $(a_1^M, \dots, a_{t_M}^M)$ and $(b_1^M, \dots, b_{t_M}^M)$ so that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq M$, $a_i^M b_i^M, a_j^M b_j^M \in E^\alpha$, $a_i^M b_j^M \in E^\beta$, and $a_j^M b_i^M \in E^{\tau(j)}$.

After deleting at most $M/2$ pairs (a_i^M, b_i^M) , we will be left with some $\tau \in \{0, 1\}$ and subsequences $(a_{u_1}^M, \dots, a_{u_s}^M)$ and $(b_{u_1}^M, \dots, b_{u_s}^M)$ so that $\tau(u_i) = \tau$ for each $i \in [s]$. Note we may assume $s \gg k$ since $s \geq M/2$.

To ease notation, let $(c_1, \dots, c_s) = (a_{u_1}^M, \dots, a_{u_s}^M)$ and $(d_1, \dots, d_s) = (b_{u_1}^M, \dots, b_{u_s}^M)$. By construction, we now have that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq s$, $c_i d_i, c_j d_j \in E^\alpha$, $c_i d_j \in E^\beta$, and $c_j d_i \in E^\tau$. We now have that $G[\{c_1, \dots, c_s\} \cup \{d_1, \dots, d_s\}]$ is an induced copy of one of $H(s), M(s), \overline{M}(s)$.

□

We now provide a proof of Fact 5.1.

Proof of Fact 5.1. Let $H = (A \cup B \cup C, E)$ be a sufficiently large element of $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$. By definition of $\text{Trip}(\mathcal{H})$, there is some $G = (V, F) \in \mathcal{H}$ and subsets $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \subseteq V$ so that $A = \{a_v : v \in Z_1\}$, $B = \{b_v : v \in Z_2\}$, $C = \{c_v : v \in Z_3\}$ and $E = \{a_v b'_v c_{v''} : vv'v'' \in K_3[Z_1, Z_2, Z_3] \cap F\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $Z_1 = V$ and thus $Z_2, Z_3 \subseteq Z_1$.

If $|B| \leq \epsilon^4 |A \cup B \cup C|$ or $|C| \leq \epsilon^4 |A \cup B \cup C|$, then observe that partition $\mathcal{P} = \{A \cup B \cup C\}$ is ϵ^4 -homogeneous for H , as $|E| \leq |A||B||C| \leq \epsilon |A \cup B \cup C|^3$. We then have that \mathcal{P} is ϵ -regular by Proposition 4.8.

Assume now $|B|, |C| \geq \epsilon^4 |A \cup B \cup C|$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, \dots, V_t\}$ be an ϵ^{12} -regular partition of G . For each $i \in [t]$, let $A_i = \{a_v : v \in V_i\}$, $B_i = \{b_v : v \in V_i \cap Z_2\}$, $C_i = \{c_v : v \in V_i \cap Z_3\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \{B_i : |B_i| < \epsilon^8 |V_i|\} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}_0 = \{C_i : |C_i| < \epsilon^8 |V_i|\}$$

Let $B_0 = \bigcup_{B_i \in \mathcal{B}_0} B_i$ and $C_0 = \bigcup_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}_0} C_i$. Note $|B_0| \leq \epsilon^8 |V| \leq \epsilon |B|$ and $|C_0| \leq \epsilon^8 |V| \leq \epsilon |C|$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{C_i : i \in [t]\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_0$.

Let $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{P}^3$ the set of ϵ^{12} -regular triples in G , and let

$$\Sigma' = \{(A_i, B_j, C_k) : (V_i, V_j, V_k) \in \Sigma \text{ and } B_i \in \mathcal{B}, C_k \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We show every $(A_i, B_j, C_k) \in \Sigma'$ is ϵ -regular in $\text{Trip}(G)$. To this end, fix $(A_i, B_j, C_k) \in \Sigma$ and $A'_i \subseteq A_i$, $B'_j \subseteq B_j$, $C'_k \subseteq C_k$ with $|A'_i| \geq \epsilon |A_i|$, $|B'_j| \geq \epsilon |B_j|$, and $|C'_k| \geq \epsilon |C_k|$. Let $V'_i = \{v \in V_i : a_v \in A'_i\}$, $V'_j = \{v \in V_j : b_v \in B'_j\}$, $V'_k = \{v \in V_k : c_v \in C'_k\}$. Note $|V'_i| \geq \epsilon |A_i| = \epsilon |V_i|$, $|V'_j| \geq \epsilon |B_j| \geq \epsilon^9 |V_j|$, and $|V'_k| \geq \epsilon |C_k| \geq \epsilon^9 |V_k|$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{Trip}(G)}(A'_i, B'_j, C'_k) &= d_G(V'_i, V'_j, V'_k) = d_G(V_i, V_j, V_k) \pm \epsilon^{12} \\ &= d_G(V_i, V_j \cap Z_2, V_k \cap Z_3) \pm 2\epsilon^{12} \\ &= d_G(A_i, B_j, C_k) \pm \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] Nathanael Ackerman, Cameron Freer, and Rehana Patel, *Stable regularity for relational structures*, arXiv:1712.09305 (2017).
- [2] V. E. Alekseev, *Hereditary classes and coding of graphs*, Problemy Kibernet. (1982), no. 39, 151–164. MR 694829
- [3] ———, *Range of values of entropy of hereditary classes of graphs*, Diskret. Mat. **4** (1992), no. 2, 148–157. MR 1181539
- [4] Noga Alon, Eldar Fischer, Michael Krivelevich, and Mario Szegedy, *Efficient Testing of Large Graphs*, Combinatorica **20** (2000), no. 4, 451–476.
- [5] Noga Alon, Eldar Fischer, and Ilan Newman, *Efficient testing of bipartite graphs for forbidden induced subgraphs*, SIAM Journal on Computing **37** (2007), no. 3, 959–976.
- [6] Noga Alon, Jacob Fox, and Yufei Zhao, *Efficient arithmetic regularity and removal lemmas for induced bipartite patterns*, Discrete Analysis **2019** (2019), no. 3, 14pp.
- [7] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and Robert Morris, *Hereditary properties of ordered graphs*, pp. 179–213, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.
- [8] ———, *Hereditary properties of combinatorial structures: posets and oriented graphs*, J. Graph Theory **56** (2007), no. 4, 311–332. MR 2360508

- [9] ———, *Hereditary properties of tournaments*, Electron. J. Combin. **14** (2007), no. 1, Research Paper 60, 25 pp. (electronic). MR 2336337
- [10] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, Michael Saks, and Vera T. Sós, *The unlabelled speed of a hereditary graph property*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **99** (2009), no. 1, 9–19. MR 2467814
- [11] József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and David Weinreich, *The speed of hereditary properties of graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **79** (2000), no. 2, 131–156. MR 1769217
- [12] ———, *The penultimate rate of growth for graph properties*, European J. Combin. **22** (2001), no. 3, 277–289. MR 1822715
- [13] Béla Bollobás and Andrew Thomason, *Projections of bodies and hereditary properties of hypergraphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **27** (1995), no. 5, 417–424. MR 1338683
- [14] ———, *Hereditary and monotone properties of graphs*, The mathematics of Paul Erdős, II, Algorithms Combin., vol. 14, Springer, Berlin, 1997, pp. 70–78. MR 1425205
- [15] Samuel Braufeld, *Monadic stability and growth rates of ω -categorical structures*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **124** (2022), no. 3, 373–386. MR 4407488
- [16] Samuel Braufeld, Anuj Dawar, Ioannis Eleftheriadis, and Aris Papadopoulos, *Monadic NIP in monotone classes of relational structures*, 50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 261, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2023, pp. Art. No. 119, 18. MR 4612989
- [17] Samuel Braufeld and Michael C. Laskowski, *Characterizations of monadic NIP*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **8** (2021), 948–970. MR 4334194
- [18] Artem Chernikov and Sergei Starchenko, *Definable regularity lemmas for NIP hypergraphs*, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics (2021).
- [19] Artem Chernikov and Henry Towsner, *Hypergraph regularity and higher arity VC-dimension*, arXiv:2010.00726 (2020).
- [20] Maria Chudnovsky, *The Erdős-Hajnal conjecture—a survey*, J. Graph Theory **75** (2014), no. 2, 178–190. MR 3150572
- [21] Maria Chudnovsky, Ringi Kim, Sang-il Oum, and Paul Seymour, *Unavoidable induced subgraphs in large graphs with no homogeneous sets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **118** (2016), 1–12. MR 3471842
- [22] F. R. K. Chung and R. L. Graham, *Quasi-random hypergraphs*, Random Structures Algorithms **1** (1990), no. 1, 105–124. MR 1068494
- [23] Fan Chung, *Regularity lemmas for hypergraphs and quasi-randomness*, Random Structures and Algorithms **2** (1991), no. 2, 241–252.
- [24] Ryan Dotson and Brendan Nagle, *Hereditary properties of hypergraphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **99** (2009), no. 2, 460–473. MR 2482964
- [25] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal, *Ramsey-type theorems*, vol. 25, 1989, Combinatorics and complexity (Chicago, IL, 1987), pp. 37–52. MR 1031262
- [26] Paul Erdős, András Hajnal, and János Pach, *A Ramsey-type theorem for bipartite graphs*, Geombinatorics **10** (2000), no. 2, 64–68. MR 1784373
- [27] Jacob Fox and László Miklós Lovász, *A tight bound for Szemerédi’s regularity lemma*, Combinatorica **37** (2017), no. 5, 911–951.
- [28] Jacob Fox, Janos Pach, and Andrew Suk, *Erdős-Hajnal Conjecture for Graphs with Bounded VC-Dimension*, Discrete and Computational Geometry **61** (2019), no. 4, 809–829.
- [29] Peter Frankl and Vojtěch Rödl, *Extremal problems on set systems*, Random Structures and Algorithms **20** (2002), no. 2, 131–164.
- [30] Lior Gishboliner and Asaf Shapira, *Removal lemmas with polynomial bounds*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2021), no. 19, 14409–14444. MR 4324721
- [31] Timothy Gowers, *Lower bounds of tower type for Szemerédi’s uniformity lemma*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **7** (1997), no. 2, 322–337.
- [32] ———, *Quasirandomness, counting and regularity for 3-uniform hypergraphs*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **15** (2006), no. 1-2, 143–184.

- [33] ———, *Hypergraph regularity and the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem*, *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series* **166** (2007), no. 3, 897–946.
- [34] Julie Haviland and Andrew Thomason, *Pseudo-random hypergraphs*, *Discrete Mathematics* **75** (1989), no. 1-3, 255 – 278, *Graph theory and combinatorics* (Cambridge, 1988).
- [35] Yoshiharu Kohayakawa, Vojtěch Rödl, and Jozef Skokan, *Hypergraphs, quasi-randomness, and conditions for regularity*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **97** (2002), no. 2, 307–352. MR 1883869
- [36] M. C. Laskowski and C. A. Terry, *Jumps in speeds of hereditary properties in finite relational languages*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **154** (2022), 93–135. MR 4362853
- [37] Michael C. Laskowski and Caroline A. Terry, *Uniformly bounded arrays and mutually algebraic structures*, *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.* **61** (2020), no. 2, 265–282. MR 4092535
- [38] László Lovász and Balázs Szegedy, *Regularity partitions and the topology of graphons*, *An Irregular Mind* (2010).
- [39] M. Malliaris and S. Shelah, *Regularity lemmas for stable graphs*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **366** (2014), no. 3, 1551–1585.
- [40] Brendan Nagle, Annika Poerschke, Vojtěch Rödl, and Matthias Schacht, *Hypergraph regularity and quasi-randomness*, *SIAM J Discrete Mathematics* (2013), 227–235.
- [41] Brendan Nagle, Vojtěch Rödl, and Mathias Schacht, *The counting lemma for regular k -uniform hypergraphs*, *Random Structures and Algorithms* **28** (2006), no. 2, 113–179.
- [42] Anand Pillay, *Domination and regularity*, *Bull. Symb. Log.* **26** (2020), no. 2, 103–117. MR 4222408
- [43] V. Rödl, B. Nagle, J. Skokan, M. Schacht, and Y. Kohayakawa, *The hypergraph regularity method and its applications*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **102** (2005), no. 23, 8109–8113. MR 2167756
- [44] Vojtěch Rödl and Jozef Skokan, *Counting subgraphs in quasi-random 4-uniform hypergraphs*, *Random Structures Algorithms* **26** (2005), no. 1-2, 160–203. MR 2116581
- [45] Edward R. Scheinerman and Jennifer Zito, *On the size of hereditary classes of graphs*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **61** (1994), no. 1, 16–39. MR 1275261
- [46] Endre Szemerédi, *Regular partitions of graphs*, *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes* (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976), *Colloq. Internat. CNRS*, vol. 260, CNRS, Paris, 1978, pp. 399–401. MR 540024
- [47] C. Terry, *VC_ℓ -dimension and the jump to the fastest speed of a hereditary L -property*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **146** (2018), 3111–3126.
- [48] ———, *An improved bound for regular decompositions of 3-uniform hypergraphs of bounded VC_2 -dimension*, *Model Theory* **2** (2023).
- [49] C. Terry and J. Wolf, *Higher-order generalisations of stability and arithmetic regularity*, arXiv:2111.01739 (2021).
- [50] ———, *Irregular triads in 3-uniform hypergraphs*, arXiv:2111.01737 (2021).
- [51] Paul Seymour Tung Nguyen, Alex Scott, *Induced subgraph density. VI. Bounded VC -dimension*, arXiv:2312.15572 (2023).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH 43210, USA
Email address: terry.376@osu.edu