

Lower bounds for Ramsey numbers of bounded degree hypergraphs

Domagoj Bradač*

Benny Sudakov*

Abstract

We prove that, for all $k \geq 3$, and any integers Δ, n with $n \geq \Delta$, there exists a k -uniform hypergraph on n vertices with maximum degree at most Δ whose 4-color Ramsey number is at least $\text{tw}_k(c_k \sqrt{\Delta}) \cdot n$, for some constant $c_k > 0$, where tw_k denotes the tower function. This is tight up to the power of Δ on top of the tower and extends a result of Graham, Rödl and Ruciński for graphs.

1 Introduction

Given a positive integer q and a k -uniform hypergraph (or k -graph for short) H , the q -color Ramsey number of H , denoted by $r(H; q)$ is the minimum integer N such that in any q -coloring of the complete k -uniform hypergraph on N vertices, there is a monochromatic copy of H . The existence of these numbers is a cornerstone result of Ramsey [19] and since then a great deal of work has been done on establishing good quantitative bounds for these numbers.

The most classical problem is when H is a graph clique. Famous results of Erdős [11] and Erdős and Szekeres [13] show that $\sqrt{2}^n < r(K_n; 2) < 4^n$. The upper bound was improved in a recent breakthrough of Campos, Griffiths, Morris and Sahasrabudhe [3] and the best current bound is $(3.8)^{k+o(k)}$ from [17]. For hypergraph cliques, the picture is somewhat less clear. Erdős and Rado [12] showed that $r(K_n^{(k)}; q) \leq \text{tw}_k(O_q(n))$, where tw_k denotes the tower function defined as $\text{tw}_1(x) = x$ and $\text{tw}_k(x) = 2^{\text{tw}_{k-1}(x)}$ for $k \geq 2$. On the other hand, an ingenious construction of Erdős and Hajnal, known as the stepping-up lemma (see e.g. [16]), shows that for $k \geq 3$, $r(K_n^{(k)}; 2) \geq \text{tw}_{k-1}(\Omega_k(n^2))$ and $r(K_n^{(k)}; 4) \geq \text{tw}_k(\Omega_k(n))$. Notably, for at least 4 colors, the lower bound matches the upper bound up to the constant on top of the tower, and it is a major open problem to close the gap for two colors.

One prominent direction has been to understand the growth rate of Ramsey numbers of sparse graphs and hypergraphs. As an early application of the regularity method, Chvátal, Rödl, Szemerédi and Trotter [4] proved that Ramsey numbers of bounded degree graphs are linear in their number of vertices. In other words, for any Δ and q there is a constant $C = C(\Delta, q)$ such that for any graph G with n vertices and maximum degree at most Δ , it holds that $r(G; q) \leq C \cdot n$. Because their proof relies on the regularity lemma, it gives a tower-type dependence of C on Δ . Since this breakthrough result, the problem of determining the correct dependence of C on Δ has received a lot of attention.

Eaton [10] used the so-called weak regularity lemma of Duke, Lefmann and Rödl [9] to improve the bound to $C(\Delta, q) \leq 2^{2^{c' \Delta}}$. For two colors, Graham, Rödl and Ruciński [15] pioneered the so-called greedy embedding approach which avoids the use of the regularity lemma and gave the bound $C(\Delta, 2) \leq 2^{c' \Delta \log^2 \Delta}$. Furthermore, they showed that for any Δ, n there exists a graph G on n vertices with maximum degree at most Δ satisfying $r(G; 2) \geq 2^{c'' \Delta} \cdot n$ for some absolute constant c'' . Finally, Conlon, Fox and Sudakov [6] built on the approach of Graham, Rödl and Ruciński to prove the current best bound $C(\Delta, 2) \leq 2^{c' \Delta \log \Delta}$.

*Department of Mathematics, ETH, Zürich, Switzerland. Research supported in part by SNSF grant 200021-228014. Email: {domagoj.bradac, benjamin.sudakov}@math.ethz.ch.

For more than two colors, the best known bound from [14] is weaker $C(\Delta, q) \leq 2^{O_q(\Delta^2)}$ and it is achieved using dependent random choice.

Next we turn our attention to Ramsey numbers of bounded degree hypergraphs. The result that bounded degree hypergraphs have linear Ramsey numbers was proved by Cooley, Fountoulakis, Kühn and Osthus [7, 8] and for 3-uniform hypergraphs independently by Nagle, Olsen, Rödl and Schacht [18]. Formally, they show that for any k, Δ, q , there exists a constant $C = C^{(k)}(\Delta, q)$ such that $r(H; q) \leq Cn$ for any n -vertex k -graph with maximum degree Δ . These results relied on the hypergraph regularity method and thus gave Ackermann type bounds on C with respect to Δ . Conlon, Fox and Sudakov [5] used dependent random choice to show that $C^{(k)}(\Delta, q) \leq \text{tw}_k(c\Delta)$ for some $c = c(k)$.

This bound was shown to be tight in some cases. Specifically, Conlon, Fox and Sudakov [5] constructed a 3-uniform hypergraph with maximum degree Δ whose 4-color Ramsey number is at least $\text{tw}_3(c\Delta)$ for some constant c and this was generalized to higher uniformities by Fox and the authors [1]. Notably, however, in both of these constructions, the number of vertices of the hypergraph is comparable to its maximum degree. Hence, it was an open problem (mentioned in [1, 5]) to obtain constructions with large but fixed Δ and growing n .

Our main result achieves this. It can be viewed as a generalization of these results and the aforementioned lower bound of Graham, Rödl and Rucinski for Ramsey numbers of bounded degree graphs.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $k \geq 2$, there is a constant $c_k > 0$ such that for any integers Δ, n with $n \geq \Delta$, there exists a k -uniform hypergraph H with maximum degree at most Δ whose 4-color Ramsey number is at least $\text{tw}_k(c_k \sqrt{\Delta}) \cdot n$.*

The tower height of our result is optimal, but unfortunately we could not get a linear dependence of Δ on top of the tower and it would be interesting to obtain it. As it relies on the stepping-up lemma, our construction requires four colours.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

2.1 Setup

To begin, we recall an important function used in this construction. For a nonnegative integer x , let $x = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i 2^i$ be its unique binary representation (where $a_i = 0$ for all but finitely many i). We denote $\text{bit}(x, i) = a_i$. Then $\delta(x, y) := \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \text{bit}(x, i) \neq \text{bit}(y, i)\}$. Additionally, for convenience we define $\delta(x, x) = -1$, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For nonnegative integers $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_t$, we denote $\delta(\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{t-1})$ where for $i \in [t-1]$, $\delta_i = \delta(x_i, x_{i+1})$. The following properties of this function are well known and easy to verify.

P1) For distinct x, y we have $x < y \iff \text{bit}(x, \delta(x, y)) < \text{bit}(y, \delta(x, y))$.

P2) For any $x < y < z$, $\delta(x, y) \neq \delta(y, z)$.

P3) For any $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_k$, $\delta(x_1, x_k) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \delta(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

To help illustrate the function δ , we borrowed Figure 1 from [2].

Let us now define the coloring which will be used to prove Theorem 1.1. For a positive integer m , we start with a red-blue coloring $\phi_m^{(2)}$ of the complete graph with vertex set $[0, \dots, M_2]$, where $M_2 = M_2(m) = 2^{10^{-8}m}$, with properties given by Lemma 2.1. For $k \geq 3$, the coloring $\phi_m^{(k)}$ is on the vertex set $\{0, \dots, M_k - 1\}$, where $M_k = M_k(m) = 2^{M_{k-1}(m)} = \text{tw}_k(10^{-8}m)$ and is defined as follows. For a set




Figure 1: It is convenient to think about the function δ in the following way. The value of $\delta(x, y)$ is given by the highest line between x and y on the picture. So, for example, $\delta(0, 1) = \delta(6, 7) = 0$, $\delta(0, 3) = \delta(5, 6) = 1$, $\delta(3, 4) = \delta(2, 7) = 2$.

$\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ with $0 \leq x_1 < \dots < x_k < M_k$, we consider the vector $\delta(\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1})$. Note that $0 \leq \delta_i < M_{k-1}$ for all $i \in [k-1]$. Hence if δ_i are all distinct the set $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1}\}$ forms an edge of the complete $(k-1)$ -uniform hypegraph on $\{0, \dots, M_{k-1} - 1\}$. For $k = 3$, the 4-coloring is given as:

$$\phi_m^{(3)}(\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}) = \begin{cases} C_1, & \text{if } \delta_1 < \delta_2 \text{ and } \phi_m^{(2)}(\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}) \text{ is red;} \\ C_2, & \text{if } \delta_1 < \delta_2 \text{ and } \phi_m^{(2)}(\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}) \text{ is blue;} \\ C_3, & \text{if } \delta_1 > \delta_2 \text{ and } \phi_m^{(2)}(\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}) \text{ is red;} \\ C_4, & \text{if } \delta_1 > \delta_2 \text{ and } \phi_m^{(2)}(\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}) \text{ is blue.} \end{cases}$$

We denote by $\arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta_i$ the unique index $j \in [k-1]$ such that $\delta_j = \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta_i$, where the uniqueness follows from Properties P2) and P3). For $k \geq 4$, the coloring is given as:

$$\phi_m^{(k)}(\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}) = \begin{cases} \phi_m^{(k-1)}(\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1}\}), & \text{if } \delta \text{ is a monotone sequence;} \\ C_1, & \text{if } \delta \text{ is not monotone and } \arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta_i \in \{1, k-1\}; \\ C_2, & \text{if } \arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta_i \notin \{1, k-1\}. \end{cases}$$

Finally, for a positive integer b , we denote by $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ the b -blow-up of $\phi_m^{(k)}$, namely a coloring of $\{0, \dots, M_k - 1\} \times [b]$, where k -tuples of different vertices with different first coordinate inherit the coloring from $\phi_m^{(k)}$ and the rest of the k -tuples are left uncolored.

Given a k -graph H , we say that there is a monochromatic copy of H in $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ in color C_q if there is a function $\Psi: V(H) \rightarrow [M_k]$ such that $|\Psi^{-1}(x)| \leq b, \forall x \in [0, M_k - 1]$ and for any edge $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \in E(H)$, either there are $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ such that $\Psi(v_i) = \Psi(v_j)$ or $\phi_m^{(k)}(\{\Psi(v_1), \dots, \Psi(v_k)\}) = C_q$.

When defining $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$, we have left the k -tuples containing vertices with the same first coordinate uncolored as this will be more convenient for using induction in our proof. Crucially, note that if there is no monochromatic copy of H in $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$, then $R(H; 4) \geq M_k \cdot b$ as we can arbitrarily color the uncolored edges and there will be no monochromatic copy of H in the usual sense.

2.2 Proof outline

Our proof borrows some ideas from the work of Graham, Rödl and Ruciński [15] who proved the lower bound for graphs as well as from [1] where Fox and the authors constructed k -graphs with m edges whose 4-color Ramsey number is $\text{tw}_k(\Theta(\sqrt{m}))$.

The k -graph H in Theorem 1.1 is essentially a random hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(n, \Delta/n^{k-1})$. In fact, we shall only be using simple pseudorandom properties that hold for H with high probability. The first of these properties

is that for any two sets A, B of size $\Omega(n/\sqrt{\Delta})$ and sets W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} of sizes $\Omega(n)$, H contains an edge in $A \times B \times W_1 \times \dots \times W_{k-2}$. We take $m = c_k \sqrt{\Delta}$ and $b = c_k n/m$ for some small constant c_k . Now, assuming there is a monochromatic copy of H in the coloring $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$, using the properties of the stepping up coloring, we show that in $\phi_m^{(k-1)}[b']$, there is a monochromatic copy of H' , where $b' = O(b)$ and H' is a $(k-1)$ -uniform hypergraph with the same pseudorandom properties (with slightly worse parameters) and $\Omega(n)$ vertices. Applying this argument $k-2$ times, we reach a graph which G , which should be present monochromatically in the coloring $\phi_m^{(2)}$. On the other hand, the pseudorandom properties of G imply that $G \in \mathcal{G}_m$ (see Definition 2.2 below). This leads to a contradiction as we will show, using Lemma 2.1, that there is no monochromatic copy of such a graph in $\phi_m^{(2)}$.

2.3 Technical lemmas

We shall use the following lemma of Graham, Rödl and Ruciński.

Lemma 2.1 ([15]). *Let $m \geq 10^9$ and set $s = 2^{10^{-8}m}$. There is a coloring of K_s , represented by $E_R \cup E_B = E(K_s)$, such that for all functions $w: [s] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i=1}^s w(i) = x \geq m$ and any $c \in \{R, B\}$, we have*

$$W = \sum_{ij \in E_c} w(i)w(j) < 0.51 \binom{x}{2}.$$

Definition 2.2. Let m be a positive integer and let $s = 2^{10^{-8}m}$. Let \mathcal{G}_m be the set of all graphs G satisfying the following. For every partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ with $|V_i| \leq n/m, \forall i \in [s]$, it holds that

$$\sum_{i < j: e_G(V_i, V_j) > 0} |V_i||V_j| > 0.55 \binom{|V(G)|}{2}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let n, m, d be positive integers satisfying $m \geq 10^9, d \geq m, n \geq 2^m$. Then, for the random graph $G \sim G(n, d/n)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[G \notin \mathcal{G}_m] \leq e^{-dn/10}.$$

Proof. Let $s = 2^{10^{-8}m}$. Fix a partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ with $|V_i| \leq n/m$ for all $i \in [s]$. Note that the number of pairs of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ in the same set among V_1, \dots, V_s is at most n^2/m , hence if $\sum_{i < j: e_G(V_i, V_j) > 0} |V_i||V_j| \leq 0.55 \binom{n}{2}$, then $\sum_{i < j: e_G(V_i, V_j) = 0} |V_i||V_j| \geq \binom{n}{2} - 0.55 \binom{n}{2} - n^2/m \geq 0.3 \binom{n}{2}$, where we used $m \geq 10^9$.

Taking a union bound over all partitions $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_s$ and all choices of pairs (i, j) such that $e_G(V_i, V_j) = 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[G \notin \mathcal{G}_m] \leq s^n 2^{\binom{s}{2}} (1 - d/n)^{0.3 \binom{n}{2}} \leq s^n 2^{s^2} e^{-0.12dn} < e^{-dn/10},$$

where we used that $d \geq m, n \geq 2^m$ and $s = 2^{10^{-8}m}$. □

Definition 2.4. Let H be a k -uniform hypergraph and let U, W_1, \dots, W_r be pairwise disjoint subsets of $V(H)$, where $1 \leq r \leq k-2$. We define a $(k-r)$ -uniform hypergraph $H(U; W_1, \dots, W_r)$ on the vertex set U where a subset S of size $k-r$ of U forms an edge if and only if there are $(w_1, \dots, w_r) \in W_1 \times \dots \times W_r$ such that $S \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_r\} \in E(H)$.

The following definition lists the pseudorandom properties that will be relevant for our inductive proof.

Definition 2.5. For positive integers $k, m \geq 2$ and real $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we say that a k -uniform hypergraph H is (α, m) -good if the following conditions hold:

- a) For any disjoint sets $A, B, W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} \subseteq V(H)$ with $|A|, |B| \geq \frac{\alpha|V(H)|}{m}$ and $|W_1|, \dots, |W_{k-2}| \geq \alpha|V(H)|$, H contains an edge in $A \times B \times W_1 \times \dots \times W_{k-2}$.
- b) For any disjoint sets $U, W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} \subseteq V(H)$ with $|U|, |W_1|, \dots, |W_{k-2}| \geq \alpha|V(H)|$, the graph $H(U; W_1, \dots, W_{k-2})$ is in \mathcal{G}_m .

Note that if H is an (α, m) -good k -graph and U, W are disjoint sets vertices of size at least $\alpha|V(H)|$, then $H(U; W)$ is an (α', m) -good $(k-1)$ -graph, where $\alpha' = \alpha|V(H)|/|U|$.

The next lemma shows that, even after deleting high degree vertices, a random k -graph satisfies the desired pseudorandom properties.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $k \geq 2$ be a given integer and let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then, for any $m \geq 10^9$, $n \geq \left(\frac{16}{\alpha}\right)^k m^2$ and $\alpha n/2 \geq 2^m$, there exists an n -vertex (m, α) -good k -graph with maximum degree at most Cm^2 , where $C = 8 \cdot \left(\frac{16}{\alpha}\right)^k$.*

Proof. Set $d = \left(\frac{16}{\alpha}\right)^k m^2$, $N = 2n$, $p = d/N^{k-1}$, and let $H \sim \mathcal{H}^{(k)}(N, p)$ be the N -vertex binomial random k -uniform hypergraph with edge probability p . Let $\beta = \alpha/2$ and let us show that H is (β, m) -good with probability at least $1/2$. Indeed, consider disjoint sets $A, B, W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} \subseteq V(H)$ with $|A|, |B| \geq \beta N/m$ and $|W_1|, \dots, |W_{k-2}| \geq \beta N$. The probability that there is no edge in $A \times B \times \dots \times W_1 \times \dots \times W_{k-2}$ equals

$$(1-p)^{|A||B||W_1|\dots|W_{k-2}|} \leq e^{-p\beta^k N^k/m^2} = e^{-8^k N}.$$

Hence, H satisfies a) with probability at least

$$1 - k^N \cdot e^{-8^k N} > 3/4.$$

Now consider fixed disjoint sets $U, W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} \subseteq V(H)$ with $|U|, |W_1|, \dots, |W_{k-2}| \geq \beta N$ and let $H' = H(U; W_1, \dots, W_{k-2})$. Denote $T = \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} |W_i|$ and note that $|T|p \leq N^{k-2}p \leq 1/2$. For fixed vertices $u, v \in U$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[uv \in E(H')] = \mathbb{P}[\text{Bin}(T, p) \geq 1] \geq |T|p - |T|^2 p^2 \geq |T|p/2 \geq (\beta N)^{k-2} p/2 \geq \frac{8^k m^2}{\alpha^2 N/2}.$$

Note that the events $\{uv \in E(H')\}, \{u, v\} \in \binom{U}{2}$ are mutually independent. Hence, H' is distributed as $\mathcal{G}(|U|, p')$ for some $p' \geq \frac{8^k m^2}{\alpha^2 N/2} \geq \frac{8^k m^2}{\alpha|U|}$. By Lemma 2.3 it follows that for fixed U, W_1, \dots, W_{k-2} , we have

$$\mathbb{P}[H' \notin \mathcal{G}_m] \leq e^{-p'|U|^2/10} \leq e^{-8^k m^2 |U|/(10\alpha)} \leq e^{-8^k m^2 N/20}.$$

Using that $m \geq 10^9$ and taking a union bound over at most k^N choices for U, W_1, \dots, W_k , we obtain that H satisfies b) with probability at least $3/4$.

Finally, note that the expected number of edges in H is $\binom{N}{k}p \leq dN/k$, so with probability at least $3/4$, $e(H) \leq 4dN/k$. Putting it all together, with positive probability H' is (β, m) -good and has at most $4dN/k$ edges. Let H' be the induced subgraph of H on $N/2 = n$ vertices obtained by removing the $N/2$ vertices of largest degree. Recalling that $\beta = \alpha/2$, since H is (β, m) -good, it follows that H' is (α, m) -good. Finally, observe that $\Delta(H') \cdot N/2 \leq k \cdot e(H)$, which implies $\Delta(H') \leq 8d$. Putting it all together, with positive probability, we obtain a k -graph H' satisfying the statement. \square

2.4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We prove the following main lemma, which together with Lemma 2.6, easily implies Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $k \geq 2$, and set $\alpha_k = (10^5)^{-k+2}$. Suppose that H is an n -vertex (α_k, m) -good k -graph. Then, for $b = \alpha_k n/m$, the coloring $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ does not contain a monochromatic copy of H .*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on k . Consider first the base case $k = 2$ and note that $\alpha_2 = 1$. Suppose there is a monochromatic copy of H in $\phi = \phi_m^{(2)}[b]$ with color $q \in \{\text{red}, \text{blue}\}$. Recall that $\phi_m^{(2)}[b]$ is an edge-coloring on the vertex set $\{0, \dots, M_2 - 1\} \times [b]$ with $M_2 = 2^{10^{-8}m}$. Let $V_i \subseteq V(H)$ denote the set of vertices embedded into the set $\{i\} \times [b]$ in the given monochromatic copy of H and let $w_i = |V_i|/b$. Note that $w_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, M_2 - 1\}$ and that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{M_2-1} w_i = n/b = m.$$

Thus, by the properties of ϕ inherited from Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\sum_{0 \leq i < j < M_2, \phi(ij)=q} w(i)w(j) < 0.51 \binom{m}{2}.$$

Since we have a monochromatic copy of H in color q , this implies that

$$\sum_{0 \leq i < j < M_2: e_H(V_i, V_j) > 0} |V_i||V_j| < 0.51 \binom{m}{2} \cdot b^2 \leq 0.51 \binom{n}{2}.$$

On the other hand, by assumption H is $(1, m)$ -good so $H \in \mathcal{G}_m$, implying that

$$\sum_{0 \leq i < j < M_2, : e_H(V_i, V_j) > 0} |V_i||V_j| > 0.55 \binom{n}{2},$$

a contradiction. This finishes the proof of the base case.

Now consider $k \geq 3$. Let H be an n -vertex (α_k, m) -good k -graph and denote $\phi = \phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ with $b = \alpha_k n/m$ and $M = M_k(m)$. For convenience, we identify the vertices of H with the set $[n]$. Suppose there is a monochromatic copy of H with color C_q and let vertex i be embedded into (x_i, y_i) . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$. Then, for any $e = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \in E(H)$ such that $x_{i_1} < x_{i_2} < \dots < x_{i_k}$, we have $\phi(e) = C_q$. For a set $S \subseteq [n]$, we denote $x_S = \{x_i \mid i \in S\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, M - 1\}$. For two sets of integers A and A' we write $A < A'$ if $a < a'$ for all $a \in A, a' \in A'$.

We shall repeatedly use the following simple fact.

Claim 2.8. *Let $I = [\ell, r] \subseteq [n]$ be an interval of size $r - \ell \geq K(L + b)$ for some integers $K, L \geq 1$. Then there are subintervals $I_1, \dots, I_K \subseteq I$ of size $|I_1| = |I_2| = \dots = |I_K| = L$ satisfying $I_1 < I_2 < \dots < I_K$ and moreover the sets $x_{I_1}, x_{I_2}, \dots, x_{I_K}$ are all pairwise disjoint.*

Proof. Let $a_1 = \ell, b_1 = \ell + L - 1$ and set $I_1 = [a_1, b_1]$. Then, for $2 \leq i \leq K$, let a_i be the minimum index such that $x_{a_i} > x_{b_{i-1}}$. Since for any y , there are at most b indices i such that $x_i = y$, it follows that $a_i \leq b_{i-1} + b$. Set $b_i = a_i + L - 1$ and $I_i = [a_i, b_i]$. Inductively, we have $b_K \leq \ell + KL + (K - 1)b < r$, so the intervals I_1, \dots, I_K are well defined and it is easy to see they satisfy all the requirements. \square

For $i \in [n - 1]$, let $\delta_i = \delta(x_i, x_{i+1})$. We shall repeatedly use the following simple facts. Given an interval $[\ell, r] \subseteq [n - 1]$ with $r - \ell > b$, let us denote $\delta^* = \max_{i \in [\ell, r]} \delta_i$. Then, there is a unique index i^* such that $\delta_{i^*} = \delta^*$. Indeed, since $x_\ell < x_{r+1}$, we have $\max_{i \in I} \delta(x_\ell, x_{r+1}) \geq 0$. If there are two indices $i_1, i_2 \in [\ell, r], i_1 < i_2$ with $\delta_{i_1} = \delta_{i_2} = \delta^*$, then using Property P3), we have $\delta^* = \delta(x_\ell, x_{i_1+1}) = \delta(x_{i_1+1}, x_{r+1}) = \delta(x_\ell, x_{r+1})$, which contradicts Property P2). Furthermore, given an interval $J \subseteq [\ell, r]$ with $i^* \notin J$, we clearly have $\max_{j \in J} \delta_j < \delta^*$.

We run the following procedure in steps $j = 1, \dots$. At each step, we have two parameters ℓ_j, r_j with $1 \leq \ell_j < r_j \leq n$. If $r_j - \ell_j < n/100$, we stop the process. Otherwise, we shall consider the interval $x_{\ell_j}, \dots, x_{r_j}$. We start with $\ell_1 = 1, r_1 = n$.

At step j , let p_j denote the unique index such that $\delta_{p_j} = \max\{\delta_i \mid i \in [\ell_j, r_j - 1]\}$. Since for $k \geq 3$, $\alpha_k \leq 10^{-5} < 1/100$, we have $r_j > \ell_j + b$, so p_j really is unique by the discussion above. If $p_j - \ell_j \geq r_j - p_j$,

we set $\ell_{j+1} = \ell_j, r_{j+1} = p_j$ and otherwise we set $\ell_{j+1} = p_j + 1, r_{j+1} = r_j$. We proceed to step $j + 1$. Note that at every step the length of the new interval $[\ell_{j+1}, r_{j+1}]$ is at least half of the length of the previous interval $[\ell_j, r_j]$.

Let τ be the minimum value of j such that $\ell_j \geq n/100$ or $r_j \leq n - n/100$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $r_\tau \leq n - n/100$, the other case being analogous. Note that, by definition of τ we have $r_\tau = p_{\tau-1}$. Also, by the above discussion, we have that $r_\tau - \ell_\tau \geq 0.49n$ as at the previous step the interval still had length at least $n - 2 \cdot n/100 = 0.98n$.

Claim 2.9. *For any step $j \geq \tau$, we have $p_j \notin [\ell_j + 4b, r_j - 4b]$.*

Proof. Let us first give some intuition behind the short, but rather technical proof. If $p_j \in [\ell_j + 4b, r_j - 4b]$, then we consider the following three large intervals: $[\ell_j, p_j - 1]$, $[p_j, r_j]$ and $[p_\tau + 1, n]$. By the way they are defined, we have some information about $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2})$ depending on which of the intervals i_1, i_2 lie in. Using the pseudorandom properties of H , we can find edges with different numbers of vertices in the three aforementioned intervals, which by the definition of the step-up coloring, will imply that they have different colors under ϕ , contradicting our assumption. We proceed with the formal argument.

For the sake of contradiction assume that $p_j \in [\ell_j + 4b, r_j - 4b]$. We shall find two edges of H which receive different colors under ϕ which would be a contradiction. Since, $r_j - \ell_j \geq n/100$, we have $r_j - p_j \geq n/200$ or $p_j - \ell_j \geq n/200$. Observe that for any $k \geq 3$ we have $\alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{1000k}$ and therefore $n/200 \geq k \cdot (\alpha_k n + b)$.

First consider the case $k = 3$. Assume that $r_j - p_j \geq n/200$, the other case being analogous. Since $p_j - \ell_j \geq 4b$, by Claim 2.8 (with $a = 2$ and $L = b$), there are intervals $S_1, S_2 \subseteq [\ell_j, p_j]$ with $|S_1|, |S_2| = b$, $S_1 < S_2$ such that x_{S_1}, x_{S_2} are pairwise disjoint. Also by the same claim applied to interval $[p_j + 1, r_j]$ (with $a = 2$ and $L = \alpha_k n$) there are intervals $I_1, I_2 \subseteq [p_j + 1, r_j]$ with $|I_1|, |I_2| = \alpha_k n$ such that $I_1 < I_2$ and the sets x_{I_1}, x_{I_2} are pairwise disjoint. By definition, $S_2 < I_1$ and since $\delta_{p_j} \geq 0$, we have that all of the sets $x_{S_1}, x_{S_2}, x_{I_1}, x_{I_2}$ are pairwise disjoint. Since H is (α_k, m) -good, there is an edge $e = (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in S_1 \times S_2 \times I_1$ as well as an edge $f = (z_1, z_2, z_3) \in S_1 \times I_1 \times I_2$. By construction and using Property P3), for two indices $i_1 \in [\ell_j, p_j], i_2 \in [p_j + 1, r_j]$, we have $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) = \max_{i \in [i_1, i_2]} \delta_i = \delta_{p_j}$. On the other hand, if $i_1, i_2 \in [\ell_j, p_j]$ or $i_1, i_2 \in [p_j + 1, r_j]$, then $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) = \max_{i \in [i_1, i_2]} \delta_i < \delta_{p_j}$. Therefore, $\delta(x_{w_1}, x_{w_2}) < \delta(x_{w_2}, x_{w_3})$, so $\phi(x_e) \in \{C_1, C_2\}$, whereas $\delta(x_{z_1}, x_{z_2}) > \delta(x_{z_2}, x_{z_3})$, so $\phi(x_f) \in \{C_3, C_4\}$. Thus $\phi(x_e) \neq \phi(x_f)$, a contradiction.

Now consider the case $k \geq 4$. Assume first that $r_j - p_j \geq n/200$. Similarly as in case $k = 3$, by Claim 2.8, there are intervals $S_1, S_2 \subseteq [\ell_j, p_j]$ with $|S_1|, |S_2| = b$ and $I_1, \dots, I_{k-2} \subseteq [p_j + 1, r_j]$ with $|I_1|, \dots, |I_{k-2}| = \alpha_k n$ such that $S_1 < S_2 < I_1 < \dots < I_{k-2}$ and the sets $x_{S_1}, x_{S_2}, x_{I_1}, \dots, x_{I_{k-2}}$ are pairwise disjoint. Denote $I_R = [r_\tau + 1, n] = [p_{\tau-1} + 1, n]$ and recall that $|I_R| \geq n/100 > \alpha_k n$. Since H is (α_k, m) -good, H contains an edge $e = (z_1, \dots, z_k) \in S_1 \times S_2 \times I_1 \times I_2 \times \dots \times I_{k-2}$ as well as an edge $f = (w_1, \dots, w_k) \in S_1 \times I_1 \times I_2 \times \dots \times I_{k-2} \times I_R$. We will show that $\phi(x_e) \neq \phi(x_f)$ which would be a contradiction. Observe that by construction, for $i_1 \in [\ell_j, p_j], i_2 \in [p_j + 1, r_j]$, we have $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) = \max_{i_1 \leq i < i_2} \delta_i = \delta_{p_j}$. On the other hand if $i_1, i_2 \in [\ell_j, p_j]$ or $i_1, i_2 \in [p_j + 1, r_j]$, then $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) < \delta_{p_j}$. Finally, for $i_1 \in [\ell_j, p_{\tau-1}]$ and $i_2 \in [p_{\tau-1} + 1, n]$, we have $\delta(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}) = \max_{i \in [i_1, i_2]} \delta_i \geq \delta_{p_{\tau-1}} > \delta_{p_j}$. The last inequality follows from the fact that the interval $[\ell_j, p_j]$, which is used to define δ_{p_j} is a subset of the interval $[\ell_{\tau-1}, r_{\tau-1}]$ which is used to define $\delta_{p_{\tau-1}}$. Putting these facts together implies that $\arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta(x_{z_i}, x_{z_{i+1}}) = 2$, so $\phi(x_e) = C_2$. On the other hand, $\arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta(x_{w_i}, x_{w_{i+1}}) = k - 1$ and $\delta(x_{w_1}, x_{w_2}) > \delta(x_{w_2}, x_{w_3})$, implying that $\phi(x_f) = C_1$, a contradiction.

Now assume that $p_j - \ell_j \geq n/200$. A very similar argument leads to a contradiction in this case as well. Using Claim 2.8, we obtain intervals $S_1, S_2 \subseteq [p_j + 1, r_j]$ with $|S_1|, |S_2| = b$ and intervals $I_1, \dots, I_{k-2} \subseteq [\ell_j, p_j]$ with $|I_1|, \dots, |I_{k-2}| = \alpha_k n$ such that $I_1 < I_2 < \dots < I_{k-2} < S_1 < S_2$. Again, denote $I_R = [p_{\tau-1} + 1, n]$. Since H is (α_k, m) -good, it contains an edge $e = (w_1, \dots, w_k) \in I_1 \times I_2 \times \dots \times I_{k-2} \times S_1 \times S_2$

and an edge $f = (z_1, \dots, z_k) \in I_1 \times I_2 \times \dots \times I_{k-3} \times S_1 \times S_2 \times I_R$. Then, we have $\arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta(w_i, w_{i+1}) = k - 2$, implying that $\phi(x_e) = C_2$. On the other hand, we have $\arg \max_{i \in [k-1]} \delta(x_{z_i}, x_{z_{i+1}}) = k - 1$ and $\delta(x_{z_{k-3}}, x_{z_{k-2}}) > \delta(x_{z_{k-2}}, x_{z_{k-1}})$, which implies that $\phi(x_f) = C_1$, a contradiction. This finishes the proof of the claim. \square

Therefore, for any $j \geq \tau$, we have $p_j - \ell_j < 4b$ or $r_j - p_j < 4b$. Finally, we shall identify two large intervals U and W such that our given monochromatic copy of H implies a monochromatic copy of $H[U; W]$ in the coloring $\phi_m^{(k-1)}[4b]$, which would be a contradiction by the induction hypothesis.

To this end, let T be the step at which the process stops, so we have $r_T - \ell_T < n/100$. Since we had $r_\tau - \ell_\tau \geq 0.49n$, this implies that either $\ell_T - \ell_\tau \geq n/5$ or $r_\tau - r_T \leq n/5$. Without loss of generality we assume $\ell_T - \ell_\tau \geq n/5$, the other case being analogous. Recall that in each step of the process, we either increase ℓ_j or decrease r_j . Let, $\{p'_1, \dots, p'_h\} = \{p_a \mid a \in [\tau, T-1], \ell_{a+1} = p_a\}$, with $p'_1 < p'_2 < \dots < p'_h$. By construction we have $\delta_{p'_j} > \delta_{p'_{j+1}}$ and by the Claim 2.9, $p'_{j+1} - p'_j < 4b$, for all $j \in [h-1]$. Indeed, note that by our process p'_j was the left endpoint of the interval at the step when we defined p'_{j+1} . Since $b < n/100$, there is an index j^* such that $p_{j^*} \in [\ell_\tau + n/20, \ell_\tau + n/10]$. For ease of notation, denote $p^* = p_{j^*}$.

Let $U = [\ell_\tau, \ell_\tau + n/20]$, $W = [p^* + 1, \ell_T - 1]$ and define $H' = H[U; W]$. Denote $n' = |U| = n/20$. Observe that, by definition, H' is a $(k-1)$ -uniform hypergraph and that it is $(20\alpha_k, m)$ -good since $|U| = n/20 \geq \alpha_k n$ and $|W| = \ell_T - p^* - 1 \geq n/20 \geq \alpha_k n$. We claim that there is a monochromatic copy of H' in $\phi_m^{(k-1)}[4b]$ in color C_q which would contradict the induction hypothesis, since $4b \leq \frac{80\alpha_k n'}{m} < \frac{\alpha_{k-1} n'}{m}$.

Denote $M' = M_{k-1} = \text{tw}_{k-1}(10^{-8}m)$. Let $x^* = x_{p^*+1}$ and consider the mapping $\Psi: U \rightarrow [M_{k-1}]$ defined as $\Psi(i) = \delta(x_i, x^*)$. Observe that by Property P3), we have $\Psi(i) \geq \Psi(i+1)$ for all $i \in [\ell_\tau, \ell_\tau + n/20 - 1]$. Let $I_1 = [\ell_\tau, p'_1]$ and for $2 \leq j \leq h-1$, let $I_j = [p'_{j-1} + 1, p'_j]$. Note that for $j \in [h-1]$ and any $i \in I_j$, by Property P3), $\Psi(i) \geq \delta_{p'_j}$ and if $j \geq 2$, $\Psi(i) < \delta_{p'_{j-1}}$. Since $|I_j| < 4b$, for all $j \in [h-1]$, this implies that $|\Psi^{-1}(x)| \leq 4b$ for all $x \in [0, M_{k-1} - 1]$.

Finally, consider an edge $\{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}\} \in E(H')$, with $\Psi(v_1) > \Psi(v_2) > \dots > \Psi(v_{k-1})$. Note that $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_{k-1}$ since Ψ is non-decreasing. By definition of H' , there is a vertex $v_k \in W$ such that $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \in E(H)$ and note that $x_{v_1} < x_{v_2} < \dots < x_{v_k}$. Let $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1}) = \delta(x_{v_1}, \dots, x_{v_k})$. For all $a \in [k-1]$, by Property P3), we have

$$\delta_a = \delta(x_{v_a}, x_{v_{a+1}}) = \max_{i \in [v_a, v_{a+1}-1]} \delta_i = \max_{i \in [v_a, p^*]} \delta_i = \delta(x_{v_a}, x^*) = \Psi(v_a).$$

In particular, it follows that $\delta_1 > \delta_2 > \dots > \delta_{k-1}$. Therefore, if $k \geq 4$, then

$$C_q = \phi_m^{(k)}(\{x_{v_1}, \dots, x_{v_k}\}) = \phi_m^{(k-1)}(\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1}\}) = \phi_m^{(k-1)}(\{\Psi(v_1), \dots, \Psi(v_{k-1})\}).$$

Similarly, if $k = 3$, we get

$$\phi_m^{(k-1)}(\{\Psi(v_1), \dots, \Psi(v_{k-1})\}) = \begin{cases} \text{red,} & \text{if } C_q = C_3; \\ \text{blue,} & \text{if } C_q = C_4. \end{cases}$$

In either case, we conclude that Ψ is a monochromatic embedding of H' into $\phi_m^{(k-1)}[4b]$, contradicting our assumption and finishing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Clearly we may assume that Δ is sufficiently large in terms of k . Now, let C_k be a sufficiently large constant. Furthermore, we may assume that $n \geq C_k \cdot \Delta$, for some large constant C_k as otherwise we may apply the argument with $\Delta' = \Delta/C_k$ at the cost of decreasing the constant c_k in the result. If $n \leq 2^{C_k \sqrt{\Delta}}$, then by a result of Fox and the authors [1], there is a k -graph with at most $C_k \Delta$ vertices, maximum degree at most Δ , and 4-color Ramsey number at least $\text{tw}_k c'_k \Delta > n \cdot \text{tw}_k(\sqrt{\Delta})$, where c'_k is a positive constant depending only on k .

So assume that $n \geq 2^{C_k \sqrt{\Delta}}$ and let $\alpha = (10^5)^{-k+2}$, $C = 8 \cdot \left(\frac{16}{\alpha}\right)^k$ and $m = \sqrt{\Delta/C}$. By Lemma 2.6, there is an n -vertex (m, α) -good k -graph H with $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$. Setting $b = \alpha n/m$, by Lemma 2.7, the coloring $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ does not contain a monochromatic copy of H . Recalling that $\phi_m^{(k)}[b]$ is a coloring on $\text{tw}_k(10^{-8}m) \cdot b \geq n \cdot \text{tw}_k(10^{-9}m)$ vertices, the statement follows. \square

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank David Conlon for stimulating discussions.

References

- [1] D. Bradač, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov. Ramsey numbers of hypergraphs of a given size. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, to appear.
- [2] D. Bradač, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov. The growth rate of multicolor Ramsey numbers of 3-graphs. *Res. Math. Sci.*, 11(3):Paper No. 52, 16, 2024.
- [3] M. Campos, S. Griffiths, R. Morris, and J. Sahasrabudhe. An exponential improvement for diagonal Ramsey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09521*, 2023.
- [4] C. Chvatál, V. Rödl, E. Szemerédi, and W. T. Trotter, Jr. The Ramsey number of a graph with bounded maximum degree. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 34(3):239–243, 1983.
- [5] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov. Ramsey numbers of sparse hypergraphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 35(1):1–14, 2009.
- [6] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov. On two problems in graph Ramsey theory. *Combinatorica*, 32(5):513–535, 2012.
- [7] O. Cooley, N. Fountoulakis, D. Kühn, and D. Osthus. 3-uniform hypergraphs of bounded degree have linear Ramsey numbers. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 98(3):484–505, 2008.
- [8] O. Cooley, N. Fountoulakis, D. Kühn, and D. Osthus. Embeddings and Ramsey numbers of sparse k -uniform hypergraphs. *Combinatorica*, 29(3):263–297, 2009.
- [9] R. A. Duke, H. Lefmann, and V. Rödl. A fast approximation algorithm for computing the frequencies of subgraphs in a given graph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(3):598–620, 1995.
- [10] N. Eaton. Ramsey numbers for sparse graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 185(1-3):63–75, 1998.
- [11] P. Erdős. Some remarks on the theory of graphs. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 53:292–294, 1947.
- [12] P. Erdős and R. Rado. Combinatorial theorems on classifications of subsets of a given set. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 2:417–439, 1952.
- [13] P. Erdős and G. Szekeres. A combinatorial problem in geometry. *Compositio Math.*, 2:463–470, 1935.
- [14] J. Fox and B. Sudakov. Density theorems for bipartite graphs and related Ramsey-type results. *Combinatorica*, 29:153–196, 2009.
- [15] R. L. Graham, V. Rödl, and A. Ruciński. On graphs with linear Ramsey numbers. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 35(3):176–192, 2000.
- [16] R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, and J. H. Spencer. *Ramsey theory*, volume 20. John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [17] P. Gupta, N. Ndiaye, S. Norin and L. Wei, Optimizing the CGMS upper bound on Ramsey numbers *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19026*, 2024.
- [18] B. Nagle, S. Olsen, V. Rödl, and M. Schacht. On the Ramsey number of sparse 3-graphs. *Graphs Combin.*, 24(3):205–228, 2008.
- [19] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-30(1):264–286, 1930.