

# Packing edge disjoint cliques in graphs

József Balogh\*

Michael C. Wigal†

February 25, 2025

## Abstract

Let  $r \geq 3$  be fixed and  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph. A long-standing conjecture of Győri states that if  $e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + k$ , where  $t_{r-1}(n)$  denotes the number of edges of the Turán graph on  $n$  vertices and  $r - 1$  parts, then  $G$  has at least  $(2 - o(1))k/r$  edge disjoint  $r$ -cliques. We prove this conjecture.

## 1 Introduction

We follow the notation of [4] unless otherwise stated. A classical theorem of Erdős, Goodman and Pósa [7] states that the edge set of a graph  $G$  can be covered by at most  $t_2(n)$  edges and triangles. Bollobás [3] later generalized this result to  $r$ -cliques.

**Theorem 1.1** ( $r = 3$  [7],  $r \geq 4$  [3]). *Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $r \geq 3$ . Then there exists a covering of the edge set of  $G$ , consisting of  $r$ -cliques and edges, of size at most  $t_{r-1}(n)$ .*

Many generalizations of Theorem 1.1 have been considered. Erdős, Goodman, and Pósa [7] also illustrated for  $r = 3$ , the edges of an  $n$ -vertex graph can be decomposed into at most  $t_2(n)$  edges and triangles. Another possible strengthening is to assign non-uniform ‘costs’ to cliques contained in the decomposition. Denote  $\pi(G)$  the smallest cost for a decomposition of the edge set of a graph  $G$  into cliques, where the cost of an  $r$ -clique is  $r$  for every  $r$ . The following was conjectured by Katona and Tarján [15], and proved independently by Győri and Kostochka [12], Chung [5], and Kahn [16].

**Theorem 1.2** (Győri and Kostochka [12], Chung [5], Kahn [16]). *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, then*

$$\pi(G) \leq 2 \cdot t_2(G).$$

A closely related question of Erdős (see [18, Problem 43] or [10]) is as follows: if every  $r$ -clique has cost  $r - 1$ , then can the edge set of an  $n$ -vertex graph be decomposed into at most  $t_2(n)$  cliques? This was recently shown to hold asymptotically by He, Krueger, and Nguyen in a joint work with the authors of this paper [1]. Another possible strengthening of Theorem 1.2 is to have restrictions on the possible supports of a decomposition. For  $r \geq 3$  denote  $\pi_r(G)$  the smallest cost of a decomposition of the edge set of a graph  $G$  into 2-cliques and  $r$ -cliques, where the cost of a clique is its number of vertices. Clearly,  $\pi_r(G) \geq \pi(G)$ . Győri and Tuza [13] proved the following.

**Theorem 1.3** (Győri and Tuza [13]). *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph and  $r \geq 4$ . Then*

$$\pi_r(G) \leq 2 \cdot t_{r-1}(G). \tag{1}$$

We let  $\nu_r(G)$  denote the maximum number of edge disjoint  $r$ -cliques in  $G$ . It is straightforward to verify that (1) is equivalent to the following. Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, let  $r \geq 4$ , and  $k \geq 0$  such that  $e(G) = t_{r-1}(G) + k$ . Then (1) holds if and only if

$$\nu_r(G) \geq \frac{2k}{r(r-2)}.$$

---

\*Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA. Research supported in part by NSF grants RTG DMS-1937241, FRG DMS-2152488, the Arnold O. Beckman Research Award (UIUC Campus Research Board RB 24012), and the Simons Fellowship. Email: jobal@illinois.edu.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA. Research supported in part by NSF RTG DMS-1937241 and an AMS-Simons Travel Grant. Email: wigal@illinois.edu.

Motivated by this, Győri [9], see also [10, 18], conjectured that Theorem 1.3 holds asymptotically for  $r = 3$ , and further, Theorem 1.3 can be strengthened for  $r \geq 4$ .

**Conjecture 1.4** (Győri [9, 10], Tuza [18]). *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, let  $r \geq 3$  be fixed, and let  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + k$ . Then*

$$\nu_r(G) \geq (2 - o(1))k/r.$$

Kráľ, Lidický, Martins, and Pehova [17] proved Conjecture 1.4 in the special case of  $r = 3$ .

**Theorem 1.5** (Kráľ, Lidický, Martins, Pehova [17]). *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, then*

$$\pi_3(G) \leq (1/2 + o(1))n^2.$$

Computer assisted flag algebra calculations were essential in the proof of Theorem 1.5. Building on Theorem 1.5 and using stability arguments, Blumenthal, Lidický, Pehova, Pfender, Pikhurko, and Volec [2] showed  $\pi_3(G) \leq n^2/2 + 1$  for sufficiently large  $n$  and characterized the extremal graphs. Their work still depended essentially on flag-algebra calculations. Also using stability arguments, Győri [9] showed that Conjecture 1.4 is true for small  $k$ .

**Theorem 1.6** (Győri [9]). *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, let  $r \geq 3$  be fixed, and let  $k(n) = k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + k$  and  $k = o(n^2)$ . Then*

$$\nu_r(G) \geq k - O\left(\frac{k^2}{n^2}\right) = (1 - o(1))k.$$

Before stating our result, we need to introduce some notation. For a graph  $G$ , write  $\mathcal{K}(G)$  for the set of cliques of  $G$ , and  $\mathcal{K}_r(G)$  for the set of  $r$ -cliques, where  $r \geq 2$ . A fractional  $r$ -clique packing is a mapping  $f : \mathcal{K}_r(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ e \in E(K)}} f(K) \leq 1 \quad \text{for every } e \in E(G).$$

For a fractional  $r$ -clique packing  $f$  we define

$$\|f\| = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}(G)} f(K).$$

We let  $\nu_r^*(G) = \max \|f\|$ , where the maximum is taken over all fractional  $r$ -clique packings. Standard linear programming arguments shows that  $\nu_r^*(G)$  is well-defined. Clearly,  $\nu_r^*(G) \geq \nu_r(G)$ . A well-known result of Haxell and Rödl [14] states that the  $r$ -clique packing number and its fractional analog are close in dense graphs, see also [20].

**Theorem 1.7** (Haxell, Rödl [14]). *For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n$  sufficiently large, for all  $n$ -vertex graphs  $G$ ,*

$$\nu_r^*(G) - \nu_r(G) \leq \varepsilon n^2.$$

Our main result is a continuous analog of Conjecture 1.4.

**Theorem 1.8.** *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph, let  $r \geq 3$  and  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $e(G) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \frac{n^2}{2} + k$ . Then*

$$\nu_r^*(G) \geq 2k/r.$$

Let us derive Conjecture 1.4 from Theorem 1.8. As a byproduct of our proof of Conjecture 1.4, we also obtain flag-algebra free proof of Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Conjecture 1.4 assuming Theorem 1.8.* By Theorem 1.7, there exist a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\nu_r^*(G) - \nu_r(G) \leq f(n),$$

where  $G$  is an  $n$ -vertex graph and  $f(n) = o(n^2)$ . Let  $g(n) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) n^2/2 - t_{r-1}(n) = g(n) = o(n^2).$$

Finally, let  $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function such that  $f(n) = o(h(n))$ ,  $g(n) = o(h(n))$ , and  $h(n) = o(n^2)$ . Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph such that

$$e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + k.$$

If  $k \leq h(n)$ , then by Theorem 1.6, we have that  $\nu_r(G) \geq (2 - o(1))k/r$ . Otherwise, let  $k' \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $e(G) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) n^2/2 + k'$ . Note  $k = k' + g(n)$ . By Theorem 1.8,

$$\nu_r(G) \geq \nu_r^*(G) - f(n) \geq 2k'/r - f(n) = 2(k - g(n))/r - f(n) = (2 - o(1))k/r.$$

□

The proof of Theorem 1.8 follows the general framework set up in [1]. However, there are several differences, we have not found a simple way of ‘uniting’ the two proofs. In Section 2, we prove a specialized fractional analog of ‘Zykov Symmetrization’, effectively reducing the problem to complete multipartite graphs. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.8 by optimizing over complete multipartite graphs. In Section 4, we discuss possible improvements to Theorem 1.8.

## 2 Symmetrization

Let  $G$  be a graph. Two vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$  are *clones* if  $uv \notin E(G)$  and  $N(u) = N(v)$ . Let  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  be two sets of clones of  $G$  such that there is no edge between  $V_0$  and  $V_1$ . We let  $G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]$  denote the graph where  $V(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]) = V(G)$  and

$$E(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]) = \{xy \in E(G) : x, y \notin V_0 \cup V_1\} \cup \{xy : x \in V_0 \cup V_1, y \notin V_0 \cup V_1, zy \in E(G)\},$$

where  $z$  is some arbitrary vertex belonging to  $V_1$ . For a fixed  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and an integer  $r \geq 3$ ,

$$h_{r,c}(G) := \nu_r^*(G) + c \cdot e(G). \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $G$  be a graph, let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $r \geq 3$  be fixed, and let  $h_{r,c}$  be defined as in (2). Let  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  be sets of pairwise clones of  $G$  such that  $V_0 \cup V_1$  forms an independent set in  $G$ . Then,*

$$h_{r,c}(G) \geq \min\{h_{r,c}(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]), h_{r,c}(G[V_1 \rightarrow V_0])\}.$$

*Proof.* For  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , let  $f_i$  denote an optimal fractional  $r$ -clique packing of  $G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]$ . Note that

$$f'_i = \frac{1}{|Aut(G)|} \sum_{\pi \in Aut(G)} f_i \circ \pi,$$

is also an optimal fractional  $r$ -clique packing of  $G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]$  such that  $\|f'_i\| = \|f_i\|$ , where  $Aut(G)$  denotes the automorphism group of  $G$ . Without loss of generality, we may suppose  $f_i(Q \cup \{v\})$  is the same for every  $v \in V_0 \cup V_1$ , where  $Q$  is an arbitrary clique in the neighborhood of  $V_i$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $f : \mathcal{K}(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be defined as follows,

$$f(K) = \begin{cases} \frac{|V_0|}{|V_0|+|V_1|} \cdot f_0(K) + \frac{|V_1|}{|V_0|+|V_1|} \cdot f_1(K), & \text{when } |K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1)| = 0, \\ f_i(K), & \text{when } |K \cap V_i| = 1 \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

We first show that  $f$  is an  $r$ -clique packing. First observe that for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , if  $e$  is an edge with an endpoint in  $V_i$ , as  $V_0 \cup V_1$  is an independent set in both  $G$  and  $G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]$ , it follows,

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ e \in K}} f(K) = \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) = \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) \leq 1.$$

Now suppose  $e$  has no endpoint in  $V_0 \cup V_1$ . First observe that for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap V_i \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f(K) = \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap V_i \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) = \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K).$$

It follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ e \in K}} f(K) &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left( \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) = \emptyset \\ e \in K}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} f_i(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap V_i \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left( \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) = \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap V_i \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left( \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) = \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) + \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) \neq \emptyset \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \left( \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ e \in K}} f_i(K) \right) \leq \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $f$  is indeed an  $r$ -clique packing. We now perform a similar calculation for  $\|f\|$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\| &= \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}(G)} f(K) = \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left( \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) = \emptyset}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} f_i(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ K \cap V_i \neq \emptyset}} f_i(K) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left( \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) = \emptyset}} f_i(K) + \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i]) \\ K \cap (V_0 \cup V_1) \neq \emptyset}} f_i(K) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \left( \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}(G[V_{1-i} \rightarrow V_i])} f_i(K) \right) = \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}} \frac{|V_i|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \|f_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

We now claim that

$$e(G) = \frac{|V_0|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} e(G[V_1 \rightarrow V_0]) + \frac{|V_1|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} e(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]). \quad (3)$$

Let  $u \in V_0$  and  $v \in V_1$  be arbitrary, and let  $d_G(u) = d_0$  and  $d_G(v) = d_1$ . Then  $e(G[V_1 \rightarrow V_0]) = e(G) + |V_1|(d_0 - d_1)$  and  $e(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]) = e(G) + |V_0|(d_1 - d_0)$ , implying (3). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{r,c}(G) &= \frac{|V_0|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \cdot h_{r,c}(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]) + \frac{|V_1|}{|V_0| + |V_1|} \cdot h_{r,c}(G[V_1 \rightarrow V_0]) \\ &\geq \min\{h_{r,c}(G[V_0 \rightarrow V_1]), h_{r,c}(G[V_1 \rightarrow V_0])\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We remark that Lemma 2.1 holds for a larger class of functions of  $h_{r,c}$  which may be of general interest. The proof remains valid if we replace  $h_{r,c}$  with

$$\nu_r^*(G) + g(|\mathcal{K}_2(G)|, \dots, |\mathcal{K}_b(G)|),$$

where  $g$  is a concave function and  $b \geq 2$  is an arbitrary integer. In [1], an analog of Lemma 2.1 was proved for weighted covers/decompositions and  $g := 0$ . A similar statement for a broader family of functions of  $g$  can be proved in these settings as well. As this is not pertinent to our proof of Theorem 1.8, we omit these details. Iterating Lemma 2.1 yields the following.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $r \geq 3$ . For every graph  $G$  there exists a complete multipartite graph  $H$  such that*

$$\nu_r^*(G) - \frac{2}{r}e(G) \geq \nu^*(H) - \frac{2}{r}e(H).$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph and  $r \geq 3$ . Define an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $V(G)$  where  $u \sim v$  if and only if  $u$  and  $v$  are clones. Let  $V_1, \dots, V_s$  be the equivalence classes under this relation. If for all distinct  $i, j \in [s]$ ,  $V_i \cup V_j$  is not an independent set, then  $G$  is a complete multipartite graph. Otherwise, there exists distinct  $i, j \in [s]$  such that  $V_i \cup V_j$  is an independent set. Applying Lemma 2.1 to  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  with  $c = -2/r$  yields a graph  $G'$  such that

$$\nu_r^*(G) - \frac{2}{r}e(G) \geq \nu^*(G') - \frac{2}{r}e(G'),$$

and the number of equivalence classes of  $G'$  induced by  $\sim$  is strictly smaller than  $s$ . A straightforward induction on  $s$  yields the claim.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.8

Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph and  $r \geq 3$ . It suffices to prove that

$$\nu_r^*(G) - \frac{2}{r}e(G) \geq -\frac{2}{r} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \frac{n^2}{2} = -\frac{r-2}{r(r-1)}n^2. \quad (4)$$

As a base case, for our induction on  $r$ , we note that for  $r = 2$ , both sides of (4) are 0. By Lemma 2.2, we may suppose that  $G$  is a complete multipartite graph with  $s$  parts, for some  $s$ .

**Claim 3.1.** *Relation (4) holds when*

$$e(G) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \frac{n^2}{2} = \frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}n^2.$$

*In particular, (4) holds when  $s \leq r-1$ .*

*Proof.* As  $\nu_r^*(G) \geq 0$ , Relation (4) holds when  $e(G) \leq \frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}n^2$ . Standard optimization techniques yields for a complete  $s$ -partite graph  $G$ , where  $s \leq r-1$ , that

$$e(G) \leq \binom{s}{2} \binom{n}{s}^2 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right) \frac{n^2}{2} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \frac{n^2}{2}.$$

$\square$

As  $G$  is complete multipartite, denote by  $V_1, \dots, V_s$  the parts of  $G$ , and for all  $i \in [s]$ , let  $x_i := |V_i|/n$ . Note  $\sum_i x_i = 1$ , and we may further suppose  $x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_s \geq 0$ .

**Claim 3.2.** *Relation (4) holds when  $s = r \geq 3$ , i.e., when  $G$  is complete  $r$ -partite.*

*Proof.* Assigning a uniform weighting to  $r$ -cliques, it is straightforward to verify  $\nu_r^*(G) = x_{r-1}x_r$ . Note,

$$\frac{e(G)}{n^2} \leq x_{r-1}x_r + (x_{r-1} + x_r)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r) + \frac{r-3}{2(r-2)}(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)^2.$$

By (4) is suffices to show the following:

$$x_{r-1}x_r - \frac{2}{r} \left( x_{r-1}x_r + (x_{r-1} + x_r)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r) + \frac{r-3}{2(r-2)}(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)^2 \right) \geq -\frac{r-2}{r(r-1)}.$$

Multiplying by  $r$  and rearranging,

$$(r-2)x_{r-1}x_r \geq 2 \left( (x_{r-1} + x_r)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r) + \frac{r-3}{2(r-2)}(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)^2 \right) - \frac{r-2}{r-1}.$$

Multiplying with  $r - 2$  and further algebraic rearranging yields the following.

$$(r - 2)^2 x_{r-1} x_r \geq (2r - 4)(x_{r-1} + x_r)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r) + (r - 3)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)^2 - \frac{(r - 2)^2}{r - 1}.$$

Further rearranging results in the following,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r^2 - 4r + 4}{r - 1} + (r^2 - 4r + 4)x_{r-1}x_r &\geq (1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)[(2r - 4)(x_{r-1} + x_r) + (r - 3)(1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)] \\ &= (1 - x_{r-1} - x_r)[r - 3 + (r - 1)x_{r-1} + (r - 1)x_r] \\ &= r - 3 + 2x_{r-1} + 2x_r - 2(r - 1)x_{r-1}x_r - (r - 1)x_{r-1}^2 - (r - 1)x_r^2. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging more, we have that the above inequality is equivalent to the following.

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r - 1} + (r^2 - 2r + 2)x_{r-1}x_r + (r - 1)x_{r-1}^2 + (r - 1)x_r^2 - 2x_{r-1} - 2x_r \\ &= (r - 1) \left( x_{r-1} + x_r - \frac{1}{r - 1} \right)^2 + (r - 2)^2 x_{r-1}x_r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

We proceed with induction on  $r + s$ . As a base case, we already settled the case when  $r = 2$ , and by Claims 3.1 and 3.2, we already handled the cases when  $s \leq r$ . Hence, we will assume that  $s > r \geq 3$ , and we know that the induction hypothesis holds for the pairs  $(r - 1, s - 1)$  and  $(r, s - 1)$ .

Let  $k_G \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$e(G) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) \frac{n^2}{2} + k_G = \frac{r - 2}{2(r - 1)} n^2 + k_G. \quad (5)$$

By Claim 3.1, we may suppose  $e(G) > \frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}n^2$ , i.e.,  $k_G > 0$ . It suffices to show that  $\nu_r^*(G) \geq 2k_G/r$ . Define  $H := G - V_1$ . We shall need to compute  $e(G)$  in two additional ways. Let  $t_H \in \mathbb{R}$  such that,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= e(H) + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 2}\right) (1 - x_1)^2 n^2 + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 + t_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 2}\right) n^2 - x_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 2}\right) n^2 + \frac{x_1^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 2}\right) n^2 + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 + t_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 2}\right) n^2 + \frac{x_1}{r - 2} n^2 - \frac{x_1^2(r - 1)}{2(r - 2)} n^2 + t_H. \end{aligned}$$

By (5),

$$t_H = k_G + \frac{n^2}{2(r - 1)(r - 2)} - \frac{x_1}{r - 2} n^2 + \frac{x_1^2(r - 1)}{2(r - 2)} n^2. \quad (6)$$

Now let  $k_H \in \mathbb{R}$  such that,

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= e(H) + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) (1 - x_1)^2 n^2 + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 + k_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) n^2 - x_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) n^2 + \frac{x_1^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) n^2 + x_1(1 - x_1)n^2 + k_H \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r - 1}\right) n^2 + \frac{x_1}{r - 1} n^2 - \frac{rx_1^2}{2(r - 1)} n^2 + k_H. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by (5),

$$k_H = k_G - \frac{x_1}{r - 1} n^2 + \frac{rx_1^2}{2(r - 1)} n^2. \quad (7)$$

**Claim 3.3.** *We have that  $k_G \leq t_H$ . In particular,  $t_H \leq 0$  implies  $k_G \leq 0$ .*

*Proof.* By (6), it suffices to prove the following inequality.

$$\frac{n^2}{2(r-1)(r-2)} + \frac{x_1^2(r-1)}{2(r-2)}n^2 \geq \frac{x_1}{r-2}n^2.$$

Multiplying by  $2(r-2)/n^2$ , it can be rewritten as

$$(r-1) \left( x_1 - \frac{1}{r-1} \right)^2 \geq 0.$$

□

Define

$$\alpha := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{nx_1}, \frac{r-2}{n(1-x_1)} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

**Claim 3.4.** *There exists an  $r$ -clique packing  $f'$  of  $G$  such that for every  $uv \in E(H)$  we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(H) \\ uv \in E(K)}} f'(K) \leq nx_1\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \|f'\| \geq nx_1\alpha \frac{2t_H}{r-1}.$$

*Proof.* If  $s > r > 3$ , then by induction on  $s$  and  $r$ , there is an optimal  $(r-1)$ -clique packing  $h$  of  $H$  such that  $\|h\| \geq \frac{2}{r-1}t_H$ . Otherwise, if  $r = 3$ , then we let  $h$  denote the identity map of  $E(G)$  (which is essentially the same as reducing to the  $r-1 = 2$  case), and trivially  $\|h\| = e(H) \geq \frac{2}{r-1}t_H$ . We will extend  $h$  to a fractional  $r$ -clique packing in  $G$ , by adding vertices from  $V_1$  to each  $(r-1)$ -clique in the support of  $h$ . Define the map  $f' : \mathcal{K}_r(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  where

$$f'(K) = \begin{cases} \alpha \cdot h(Q) & \text{if } K \cap V_1 \neq \emptyset \text{ and } Q \subset K; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We first show that  $f'$  satisfies the packing constraints. We break the proof into two cases. Let  $uv \in E(G)$  where  $v \in V_1$  and  $u \notin V_1$ . As  $u$  has degree at most  $(1-x_1)n$  in  $H$  and an  $(r-1)$ -clique is an  $(r-2)$ -regular graph, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{K}_{r-1}(H) \\ u \in Q}} h(Q) \leq \frac{(1-x_1)n}{r-2}.$$

By the definition of  $\alpha$ , see (8), we conclude

$$\alpha \cdot \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}_r(G) \\ uv \in E(K)}} f'(K) \leq 1.$$

Now assume  $uv \in E(H)$ . In this case we have

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}_r(G) \\ uv \in E(K)}} f'(K) = nx_1\alpha \cdot \sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{K}_{r-1}(H) \\ uv \in E(Q)}} h(Q) \leq nx_1\alpha \leq 1,$$

where the last inequality follows from (8). We conclude  $f'$  is indeed a packing. Finally, we have,

$$\|f'\| = nx_1\alpha \cdot \|h\| \geq nx_1\alpha \frac{2t_H}{r-1}.$$

□

If  $\|f'\| \geq \frac{2k_G}{r}$  then we are done. For the rest of the proof we assume that it does not hold. As an immediate consequence of Claim 3.4, we can determine  $\alpha$ .

**Claim 3.5.** If  $\|f'\| < \frac{2k_G}{r}$  then

$$\alpha = \frac{r-2}{n(1-x_1)}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise, then by (8) we have that  $\alpha = 1/(nx_1)$ . Let  $f'$  be the  $r$ -clique packing of  $G$  as guaranteed by Claim 3.4. By Claims 3.3 and 3.4, we have the following contradiction:

$$\|f'\| \geq nx_1\alpha \frac{2t_H}{r-1} \geq \frac{2k_G}{r}.$$

□

**Claim 3.6.** The following holds:

$$k_G < \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)} - x_1 \frac{n^2}{2}.$$

*Proof.* First suppose  $k_H > 0$ . Let  $g$  be an optimal  $r$ -clique packing in  $H$ . By induction on  $s$ ,  $\|g\| \geq 2k_H/r$ . Let  $f'$  be an  $r$ -clique packing of  $G$  as guaranteed by Claim 3.4. By Claim 3.5,  $\alpha = \frac{r-2}{n(1-x_1)}$  and by Claim 3.4, for all  $uv \in E(H)$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{K}(G) \\ uv \in E(K)}} f'(K) \leq nx_1\alpha = \frac{x_1(r-2)}{1-x_1},$$

and

$$\|f'\| \geq nx_1\alpha \frac{2t_H}{r-1} = \frac{2x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)(r-1)}t_H.$$

Then,

$$f := f' + \left(1 - \frac{x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)}\right)g,$$

is also an  $r$ -clique packing of  $G$ . Furthermore,

$$\|f\| \geq \frac{2x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)(r-1)}t_H + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)}\right)k_H. \quad (9)$$

Observe, that (9) holds when  $k_H \leq 0$ , as in the above proof we could just define  $g$  to be the zero map, i.e.  $f = f'$ . To show that  $f$  is our desired  $r$ -clique packing of  $G$ , it is enough to show

$$\frac{2x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)(r-1)}t_H + \frac{2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{x_1(r-2)}{(1-x_1)}\right)k_H \geq \frac{2}{r}k_G. \quad (10)$$

To conclude the proof of the claim, we show (10) when  $k_G \geq n^2/(2(r-1)) - x_1/2$ . Multiplying (10) by  $r(1-x_1)(r-1)/2n^2$  yields

$$x_1r(r-2)\frac{t_H}{n^2} + (r-1)(1-x_1(r-1))\frac{k_H}{n^2} \geq (1-x_1)(r-1)\frac{k_G}{n^2}. \quad (11)$$

Using (6) and (7), the left-hand side of the inequality (11) is equal to the following.

$$x_1r(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} + \frac{rx_1}{2(r-1)} - rx_1^2 + \frac{x_1^3r(r-1)}{2} + (r-1)(1-x_1(r-1))\frac{k_G}{n^2} - (1-x_1(r-1))x_1 + \frac{rx_1^2(1-x_1(r-1))}{2}.$$

We can subtract a  $(1-x_1)(r-1)k_G/n^2$  term from both sides of the inequality, thus inequality (11) is equivalent to showing the following is nonnegative,

$$x_1r(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} + \frac{rx_1}{2(r-1)} - rx_1^2 + \frac{x_1^3r(r-1)}{2} - (r-1)(r-2)x_1\frac{k_G}{n^2} - (1-x_1(r-1))x_1 + \frac{rx_1^2(1-x_1(r-1))}{2}.$$



Multiplying by  $2/x_1$  yields,

$$2r(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} + \frac{r}{r-1} - 2rx_1 + x_1^2r(r-1) - 2(r-1)(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} - 2(1-x_1(r-1)) + rx_1(1-x_1(r-1)) \geq 0.$$

The left hand side after simplification is

$$\begin{aligned} &= 2(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} - \frac{r-2}{r-1} - 2rx_1 + x_1^2r(r-1) + 2x_1(r-1) + rx_1(1-x_1(r-1)) \\ &= 2(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} - \frac{r-2}{r-1} + (r-2)x_1 + x_1^2r(r-1) - x_1^2r(r-1) = 2(r-2)\frac{k_G}{n^2} - \frac{r-2}{r-1} + (r-2)x_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $f$  is the desired packing if the final function is non-negative, i.e.,

$$k_G \geq \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)} - x_1 \frac{n^2}{2}.$$

□

**Claim 3.7.** *We have that  $e(G) \geq (1-x_1)n^2/2$ .*

*Proof.* First observe for arbitrary  $1 \leq i < j \leq s$ , if  $G'$  is a complete multipartite graph with parts  $V'_1, \dots, V'_s$  such that for every  $k \in [s]$ ,

$$|V'_k| = \begin{cases} |V_i| + 1 & \text{if } k = i, \\ |V_j| - 1 & \text{if } k = j, \\ |V_k| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then  $e(G') \leq e(G)$ . Applying this operation, we shall arrive to a  $G'$ , where  $x'_i = x_1$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor\}$  and for  $i = \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor + 1$ ,  $x'_i = (1 - \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor x_1)$  (possibly equal to zero). Let  $z = 1/x_1 - \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor$  and note  $z \in [0, 1)$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e(G)}{n^2} &\geq \frac{e(G')}{n^2} = \binom{\lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor}{2} x_1^2 + (1 - \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor x_1) x_1 \lfloor 1/x_1 \rfloor \\ &= \frac{(1/x_1 - z)(1/x_1 - z - 1)}{2} x_1^2 + (1 - (1/x_1 - z)x_1) x_1 (1/x_1 - z) \\ &= \frac{(1 - zx_1)(1 - (z+1)x_1)}{2} + (1 - (1 - x_1z))(1 - x_1z) \\ &= \frac{1 - (2z+1)x_1 + (z^2+z)x_1^2}{2} + x_1z(1 - x_1z) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x_1}{2} + \frac{(z-z^2)x_1^2}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x_1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

By Claim 3.7,  $k_G \geq (1-x_1)n^2/2 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right)n^2/2$ . By Claim 3.6,

$$\frac{n^2}{2(r-1)} - x_1 \frac{n^2}{2} = (1-x_1)\frac{n^2}{2} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{r-1}\right)\frac{n^2}{2} \leq k_G < \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)} - x_1 \frac{n^2}{2},$$

which is a contradiction, completing the proof of our main result.

## 4 Concluding remarks

Define the following function,

$$\phi_r(n, k) = \min_G \nu_r(G),$$

where the minimum is taken over all  $n$ -vertex graphs  $G$  such that  $e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + k$ . By Turán's Theorem,  $\phi_r(n, 0) = 0$ . By Wilson's Theorem [19], for the complete graph  $K_n$ , we have that  $\phi_r(n, e(K_n) - t_{r-1}(n)) = (1 - o(1))\binom{n}{2}/\binom{r}{2} = (2 - o(1))(n^2/(2r-2))/r$ . By our proof of Conjecture 1.4 we have

$$\phi_r(n, k) \geq (2 - o(1))k/r.$$

While, our bound is asymptotically sharp at the Turán graph  $T_{r-1}(n)$  and the complete graph, for the other values we do not have a conjecture. A direct consequence of Theorem 1.6 is  $\phi_r(n, k) = (1 - o(1))k$  when  $k = o(n^2)$ . Győri [9] showed for fixed  $r \geq 4$  and for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\phi_r(n, k) = k$  when  $k \leq 3 \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{r-1} \right\rfloor - 5$ .

For  $r = 3$ , the problem of determining the behavior of  $\phi_3(n, k)$  dates back to Erdős [6]. Győri [8] proved, see [10] for minor correction,  $\phi_3(n, k) = k$  if  $k \leq 2n - 10$  when  $n$  is odd or if  $k \leq 1.5n - 5$  when  $n$  is even. A very precise result of Győri and Keszegh [11] claims that a  $K_4$ -free graph on  $n^2/4 + k$  edges contains  $k$  pairwise edge-disjoint triangles. Here  $k \leq n^2/12$ .

However, the  $K_4$ -freeness is important, as the following example shows: Partition the vertex set of  $G$  into three classes  $A, B, C$ , where  $G[A]$  is a complete graph, and  $G[A \cup C, B]$  spans a complete bipartite graph, where  $|A| = t, |B| = n/2 - t/6, |C| = n/2 - 5t/6$ . Then  $e(G) = t(t-1)/2 + n^2/4 - t^2/36$ , i.e.,  $k = 17t^2/36 - t/2$ . The number of triangles is at most

$$|\mathcal{K}_3(G)| \leq f(t) := (t^2/2 + tn/2 - t^2/6)/3,$$

as the edges between  $B$  and  $C$  are not part of any triangle. Set  $t_\varepsilon := (1 + \varepsilon)6n/13$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is an arbitrary small constant. For sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $f(t_\varepsilon) < (1 - \varepsilon/100)k$ , i.e., the number of triangles drops under  $(1 - o(1))k$ , when  $k > 17n^2/169 > n^2/12$ .

One could easily extend this example for larger  $r$ . We have not done it as we do not see any reasons why they would be best possible. It seems interesting to determine the range of  $k$  when  $\phi_r(n, k) = (1 - o(1))k$ .

## References

- [1] J. Balogh, J. He, R. A. Krueger, T. Nguyen, and M. C. Wigal, Clique covers and decompositions of cliques of graphs, arXiv:2412.05522, 2024.
- [2] A. Blumenthal, B. Lidický, Y. Pehova, F. Pfender, O. Pikhurko, and J. Volec, Sharp bounds for decomposing graphs into edges and triangles, *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, **30**(2) (2021), 271–287.
- [3] B. Bollobás, On complete subgraphs of different order, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **79** (1976), 19–24.
- [4] B. Bollobás, *Extremal graph theory*, Reprint of the 1978 original, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004.
- [5] F. R. K. Chung, On the decomposition of graphs, *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods*, **2**(1) (1981), 1–12.
- [6] P. Erdős, Some unsolved problems in graph theory and combinatorial analysis, in: *Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications (Proc. Conf., Oxford, 1969)*, Academic Press, London-New York, 1971, 97–109.
- [7] P. Erdős, A. Goodman, and L. Pósa, The representation of graphs by set intersections, *Canadian J. Math.*, **18** (1966), 106–112.
- [8] E. Győri, On the number of edge disjoint triangles in graphs of given size, in: *Combinatorics (Eger, 1987)*, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, **52**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988, 267–276.
- [9] E. Győri, On the number of edge disjoint cliques in graphs of a given size, *Combinatorica*, **11**(3) (1991), 231–243.
- [10] E. Győri, Edge disjoint cliques in graphs, in: *Sets, graphs, and numbers (Budapest 1991)*, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, **60**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992, 357–363.
- [11] E. Győri and B. Keszegh, On the number of edge-disjoint triangles in  $K_4$ -free graphs, *Combinatorica*, **37**(6) (2017), 1113–1124.
- [12] E. Győri and A. V. Kostochka, On a problem of G. O. H. Katona and T. Tarján, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, **34** (1979), 321–327.

- [13] E. Gyóri and Zs. Tuza, Decomposition of graphs into complete subgraphs of given order, *Sudia Sci. Math. Hung.*, **22** (1987), 315–320.
- [14] P. E. Haxell and V. Rödl, Integer and fractional packings in dense graphs, *Combinatorica*, **21**(1) (2001), 13–38.
- [15] G.O.H. Katona and T. Tarján, 5th Hungarian Combinatorial Colloquium, Open Problem. Combinatorics (Coll. Math. Soc. Bolyai, 18, Keszthely, 1976), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978, 1207.
- [16] J. Kahn, Proof of a conjecture of Katona and Tarján, *Period. Math. Hungar.*, **12**(1) (1981), 81–82.
- [17] D. Král', B. Lidický, T. L. Martins, and Y. Pehova, Decomposing graphs into edges and triangles, *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, **28**(3) (2019), 465–472.
- [18] Zs. Tuza, Unsolved combinatorial problems, Part I. BRICS Lecture Series LS-01-1, 2001.
- [19] R. M. Wilson, Decomposition of complete graphs into subgraphs isomorphic to a given graph, in: *Proceedings of the Fifth British Combinatorial Conference (Univ. Aberdeen, Aberdeen, 1975)*, Congr. Numer., No. XV, Utilitas Math, Winnipeg, MB, 1975, 647–659.
- [20] R. Yuster, Integer and fractional packing of families of graphs, *Random Structures and Algorithms*, **26** (2005), 110–118.