

Extremal theory of locally sparse multigraphs

Dhruv Mubayi *

Caroline Terry †

September 28, 2018

Abstract

An (n, s, q) -graph is an n -vertex multigraph where every set of s vertices spans at most q edges. In this paper, we determine the maximum product of the edge multiplicities in (n, s, q) -graphs if the congruence class of q modulo $\binom{s}{2}$ is in a certain interval of length about $3s/2$. The smallest case that falls outside this range is $(s, q) = (4, 15)$, and here the answer is $a^{n^2+o(n^2)}$ where a is transcendental assuming Schanuel's conjecture. This could indicate the difficulty of solving the problem in full generality. Many of our results can be seen as extending work by Bondy-Tuza [2] and Füredi-Kündgen [8] about sums of edge multiplicities to the product setting.

We also prove a variety of other extremal results for (n, s, q) -graphs, including product-stability theorems. These results are of additional interest because they can be used to enumerate and to prove logical 0-1 laws for (n, s, q) -graphs. Our work therefore extends many classical enumerative results in extremal graph theory beginning with the Erdős-Kleitman-Rothschild theorem [6] to multigraphs.

1 Introduction

Given a set X and a positive integer t , let $\binom{X}{t} = \{Y \subseteq X : |Y| = t\}$. A *multigraph* is a pair (V, w) , where V is a set of vertices and $w : \binom{V}{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

Definition 1. Given integers $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$, a multigraph (V, w) is an (s, q) -*graph* if for every $X \in \binom{V}{s}$ we have $\sum_{xy \in \binom{X}{2}} w(xy) \leq q$. An (n, s, q) -graph is an (s, q) -graph with n vertices, and $F(n, s, q)$ is the set of (n, s, q) -graphs with vertex set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$.

The goal of this paper is to investigate extremal, structural, and enumeration problems for (n, s, q) -graphs for a large class of pairs (s, q) .

Definition 2. Given a multigraph $G = (V, w)$, define

$$S(G) = \sum_{xy \in \binom{V}{2}} w(xy) \quad \text{and} \quad P(G) = \prod_{xy \in \binom{V}{2}} w(xy),$$

$$\text{ex}_\Sigma(n, s, q) = \max\{S(G) : G \in F(n, s, q)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q) = \max\{P(G) : G \in F(n, s, q)\}.$$

An (n, s, q) -graph G is *sum-extremal* (*product-extremal*) if $S(G) = \text{ex}_\Sigma(n, s, q)$ ($P(G) = \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q)$). Let $\mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$ ($\mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$) be the set of all sum-extremal (product-extremal) (n, s, q) -graphs with vertex set $[n]$.

*Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, University of Illinois at Chicago. Research supported in part by NSF Grant DMS 1300138; mubayi@uic.edu

†Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park; cterry@umd.edu

In [2], Bondy and Tuza determine the structure of multigraphs in $\mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$ when n is large compared to s and $q \equiv 0, -1 \pmod{\binom{s}{2}}$ and when $s = 3$. In [9], Füredi and Kündgen (among other things) determine the asymptotic value of $\text{ex}_\Sigma(n, s, q)$ for all s, q with a $O(n)$ error term, and the exact value is determined for many cases. Other special cases of these questions have appeared in [13]. A natural next step from the investigation of extremal problems for (n, s, q) -graphs is to consider questions of structure and enumeration. The question of enumeration for (n, s, q) -graphs was first addressed in [14], where it was shown the problem is closely related extremal results for the product of the edge multiplicities.

Definition 3. Given integers $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$, define the *asymptotic product density* and the *asymptotic sum density*, respectively, as the following limits (which both exist):

$$\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q) \right)^{\frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ex}_\Sigma(s, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{ex}_\Sigma(n, s, q)}{\binom{n}{2}}.$$

In [14], the current authors showed $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q)$ exists for all $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$ and proved the following enumeration theorem for (n, s, q) -graphs in terms of $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2})$.

Theorem 1. ([14]) *Suppose $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$ are integers. If $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$, then*

$$\text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{\binom{n}{2}} \leq |F(n, s, q)| \leq \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{(1+o(1))\binom{n}{2}},$$

and if $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) \leq 1$, then $|F(n, s, q)| \leq 2^{o(n^2)}$.

This result was used in [14] along with a computation of $\text{ex}_\Pi(4, 15)$ to give an enumeration of $F(n, 4, 9)$. This case was of particular interest because it turned out that $|F(n, 4, 9)| = a^{n^2 + o(n^2)}$, where a is transcendental under the assumption of Schanuel's conjecture. In this paper, we continue this line of investigations by proving enumeration results for further cases of s and q , and in some cases proving approximate structure theorems (the particular special case $(s, q) = (3, 4)$ was recently studied in [7]). This generalizes many classical theorems about enumeration in extremal graph theory (beginning with the Erdős-Kleitman-Rothschild theorem [6]) to the multigraph setting. All of these results rely on computing $\text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q)$, characterizing the elements in $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$, and proving corresponding product-stability theorems, and this is the main content of this paper. Questions about $\text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q)$ and $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ may also be of independent interest, as they are natural "product versions" of the questions about extremal sums for (n, s, q) -graphs investigated in [2, 9].

2 Main Results

Given a multigraph $G = (V, w)$ and $xy \in \binom{V}{2}$, we will refer to $w(xy)$ as the *multiplicity* of xy . The *multiplicity* of G is $\mu(G) = \max\{w(xy) : xy \in \binom{V}{2}\}$. Our first main result, Theorem 2 below, gives us information about the asymptotic properties of elements in $F(n, s, q)$, in the case when $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$. Suppose $G = (V, w)$ and $G' = (V, w')$ are multigraphs. We say that G is a *submultigraph* of G' if $V = V'$ and for each $xy \in \binom{V}{2}$, $w(xy) \leq w'(xy)$. Define $G^+ = (V, w^+)$ where for each $xy \in \binom{V}{2}$, $w^+(xy) = w(xy) + 1$. Observe that if $G \in F(n, s, q)$, then $G^+ \in F(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})$.

Definition 4. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ and n, s, q are integers satisfying $n \geq 1$, $s \geq 2$, and $q \geq 0$. Set

$$\mathbb{E}(n, s, q, \epsilon) = \left\{ G \in F(n, s, q) : P(G^+) > \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{(1-\epsilon)\binom{n}{2}} \right\}.$$

Then set $E(n, s, q, \epsilon) = \{G \in F(n, s, q) : G \text{ is a submultigraph of some } G' \in \mathbb{E}(n, s, q, \epsilon)\}$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$ are integers satisfying $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\beta > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n , the following holds.*

$$\frac{|F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)|}{|F(n, s, q)|} \leq 2^{-\beta n^2}. \quad (1)$$

Theorem 2 will be proved in Section 4 using a consequence of a version of the hypergraph containers theorem for multigraphs from [14]. Our next results investigate $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$ and $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ for various values of (s, q) . Observe that if $q < \binom{s}{2}$, then for any $n \geq s$, every (n, s, q) -graph G must contain an edge of multiplicity 0, and therefore $P(G) = 0$. Consequently, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = 0$ and $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) = F(n, s, q)$, for all $n \geq s$. For this reason we restrict our attention to the cases where $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$. Suppose $G = (V, w)$ and $G' = (V', w')$. Then $G = (V, w)$ and $G' = (V', w')$ are *isomorphic*, denoted $G \cong G'$, if there is a bijection $f : V \rightarrow V'$ such that for all $xy \in \binom{V}{2}$, $w(xy) = w'(f(x)f(y))$. If $V = V'$, set $\Delta(G, G') = \{xy \in \binom{V}{2} : w(xy) \neq w'(xy)\}$. Given $\delta > 0$, G and G' are δ -close if $|\Delta(G, G')| \leq \delta n^2$, otherwise they are δ -far. If $X \subseteq V$, $G[X]$ denotes the multigraph $(X, w \upharpoonright_{\binom{X}{2}})$. Suppose that $q \equiv b \pmod{\binom{s}{2}}$. Our results fall into three cases depending on the value of b .

2.1 The case $0 \leq b \leq s - 2$

Definition 5. Given $n \geq s \geq 1$ and $a \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{U}_{s,a}(n)$ be the set of multigraphs $G = ([n], w)$ such that there is a partition $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{\lfloor n/s \rfloor}$ of $[n]$ for which the following holds.

- For each $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor n/s \rfloor$, $|A_i| = s$, and $|A_0| = n - s \lfloor n/s \rfloor$.
- For each $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor n/s \rfloor$, and $G[A_i]$ is a star with $|A_i| - 1$ edges of multiplicity $a + 1$ and all other edges of multiplicity a .
- For all $xy \notin \bigcup \binom{A_i}{2}$, $w(xy) = a$.

Let $\mathbb{U}_a(n)$ be the unique element of $\mathbb{U}_{1,a}(n)$, i.e. $\mathbb{U}_a(n) = ([n], w)$ where $w(xy) = a$ for all $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose n, s, q, a are integers satisfying $n \geq s \geq 2$, $a \geq 1$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} + b$ for some $0 \leq b \leq s - 2$.*

- (Extremal) *Then $a \binom{n}{2} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq a \binom{n}{2} ((a+1)/a)^{\lfloor \frac{b}{s+1} n \rfloor}$ and thus $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) = a$. Further,*
 - If $b = 0$, then $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) = \{\mathbb{U}_a(n)\}$ and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = a \binom{n}{2}$.*
 - If $b = s - 2$, then $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = a \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{a+1}{a}\right)^{\lfloor \frac{(s-2)n}{s-1} \rfloor}$. Also, $\mathcal{P}(n, 3, q) = \mathbb{U}_{2,a}(n)$.*
- (Stability) *For all $\delta > 0$, there is $\epsilon > 0$ and M such that for all $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$, if $P(G) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$, then G is δ -close to $\mathbb{U}_a(n)$.*

One interesting phenomenon discovered in [2] is that $\mathcal{S}(n, 3, 3a + 1)$ has many non-isomorphic multigraphs when $a \geq 1$ and n is large. In contrast to this, Theorem 3 shows that all the multigraphs in $\mathcal{P}(n, 3, 3a + 1) = \mathbb{U}_{2,a}(n)$ are isomorphic.

2.2 The case $b = \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$

Call a partition U_1, \dots, U_k of a finite set X an *equipartition* if $||U_i| - |U_j|| \leq 1$ for all $i \neq j$. Recall the Turán graph, $T_s(n)$, is the complete s -partite graph with n vertices, whose parts form an equipartition of its vertex set.

Definition 6. Given integers $a \geq 2$ and $n \geq s \geq 1$, define $\mathbb{T}_{s,a}(n)$ to be the set of multigraphs $G = ([n], w)$ with the following property. There is an equipartition U_1, \dots, U_s of $[n]$ such that

$$w(xy) = \begin{cases} a - 1 & \text{if } xy \in \binom{U_i}{2} \text{ for some } i \in [s]. \\ a & \text{if } (x, y) \in U_i \times U_j \text{ for some } i \neq j \in [s]. \end{cases}$$

We think of elements of $\mathbb{T}_{s,a}(n)$ as multigraph analogues of Turán graphs. Let $t_s(n)$ be the number of edges in $T_s(n)$.

Theorem 4. Let s, q, a, t be integers satisfying $a \geq 2$, $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ and either

(a) $s \geq 2$ and $t = 1$ or

(b) $s \geq 4$ and $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$.

- (Extremal) Then for all $n \geq s$, $\mathbb{T}_{s-t,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = (a - 1) \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{t_{s-t}(n)}$, and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) = (a - 1) \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{\frac{s-t-1}{s-t}}$. If (a) holds and $n \geq s$ or (b) holds and n is sufficiently large, then $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) = \mathbb{T}_{s-t,a}(n)$.
- (Stability) For all $\delta > 0$, there is M and ϵ such that for all $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$, if $P(G) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$ then G is δ -close to an element of $\mathbb{T}_{s-t,a}(n)$.

2.3 The case $(s, q) = (4, 9)$

The case $(s, q) = (4, 9)$ is the first pair where $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$ which is not covered by Theorems 3 and 4, and is closely related to an old question in extremal combinatorics. Let $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})$ denote the maximum number of edges in a graph on n vertices which contains no C_3 or C_4 as a non-induced subgraph.

Theorem 5. $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9) = 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$ for all $n \geq 4$.

It is known that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} + o(1)\right) n^{3/2} < \text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\}) < \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) n^{3/2}$$

and an old conjecture of Erdős and Simonovits [4] states that the lower bound is correct.

The next case not covered here is $(s, q) = (4, 15)$ and it was shown in [14] that $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 15) = 2^{\gamma n^2 + o(n^2)}$ where γ is transcendental and 2^γ is also transcendental if we assume Schanuel's conjecture from number theory. Many other cases were conjectured in [14] to have transcendental behaviour like the case $(4, 15)$. This suggests that determining $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q)$ for all pairs (s, q) will be a hard problem.

2.4 Enumeration and structure of most (n, s, q) -graphs

Combining the extremal results of Theorems 3, 4, and 5 with Theorem 1 we obtain Theorem 6 below, which enumerates $F(n, s, q)$ for many cases of (s, q) .

Theorem 6. *Let s, q, a, b be integers satisfying $s \geq 2$, $a \geq 0$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} + b$.*

(i) *If $0 \leq b \leq s - 2$, then $|F(n, s, q)| = (a + 1) \binom{n}{2} 2^{o(n^2)}$.*

(ii) *If $b = \binom{s}{2} - t$ where $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$, then $|F(n, s, q)| = (a + 1) \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{a+2}{a+1}\right)^{t_{s-t}(n)+o(n^2)}$.*

(iii) $|F(n, 4, 3)| = 2^{\Theta(n^{3/2})}$.

In our last main result, Theorem 7 below, we combine the stability results of Theorems 3 and 4 with Theorem 2 to prove approximate structure theorems for many (s, q) . Given $\delta > 0$ and a set $E(n) \subseteq F(n, s, q)$, let $E^\delta(n)$ be the set of $G \in F(n, s, q)$ such that G is δ -close to some $G' \in E(n)$.

Definition 7. Suppose n, a, s are integers such that $n, s \geq 1$.

(i) If $a \geq 1$, set $U_a(n) = \{G = ([n], w) : G \text{ is a submultigraph of some } G' \in \mathbb{U}_a(n)\}$.

(ii) If $a \geq 2$, set $T_{s,a}(n) = \{G = ([n], w) : G \text{ is a submultigraph of some } G' \in \mathbb{T}_{s,a}(n)\}$.

Observe that in each case, $\mathbb{U}_a(n) \subseteq U_a(n)$ and $\mathbb{T}_{s,a}(n) \subseteq T_{s,a}(n)$.

Theorem 7. *Suppose s, q, a, t, b are integers such that $n \geq s \geq 2$, and $E(n)$ is a set of multigraphs such that one of the following holds.*

(i) $a \geq 0$, $q = a \binom{s}{2} + b$ for some $0 \leq b \leq s - 2$, and $E(n) = U_a(n)$.

(ii) $a \geq 1$, $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $1 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$, and $E(n) = T_{s-t,a}(n)$.

Then for all $\delta > 0$ there exists $\beta > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\frac{|F(n, s, q) \setminus E^\delta(n)|}{|F(n, s, q)|} \leq 2^{-\beta \binom{n}{2}}. \quad (2)$$

3 Proof of Theorems 6 and 7

In this section we prove Theorems 6 and 7 assuming Theorems 2, 3, and 4.

Proof of Theorem 6. Suppose first that case (i) holds. By Theorem 3 (Extremal),

$$\text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right) = \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, (a + 1) \binom{s}{2} + b\right) = a + 1.$$

If $a = 0$, then $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) = 1$, so Theorem 1 implies $|F(n, s, q)| = 2^{o(n^2)} = (a + 1) \binom{n}{2} 2^{o(n^2)}$. If $a \geq 1$, then $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) = a + 1 > 1$, so Theorem 1 implies

$$|F(n, s, q)| = (a + 1) \binom{n}{2}^{+o(n^2)} = (a + 1) \binom{n}{2} 2^{o(n^2)}.$$

Suppose now that case (ii) holds. So $q = a \binom{s}{2} + \binom{s}{2} - t = (a + 1) \binom{s}{2} - t$. By Theorem 4 (Extremal),

$$\text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right) = \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, (a + 2) \binom{s}{2} - t\right) = (a + 1) \left(\frac{a + 2}{a + 1}\right)^{\frac{s-t-1}{s-t}}.$$

Since $a \geq 0$, this shows $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$, so Theorem 1 implies

$$|F(n, s, q)| = \left((a+1) \left(\frac{a+2}{a+1} \right)^{\frac{s-t-1}{s-t}} \right)^{\binom{n}{2} + o(n^2)} = (a+1)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a+2}{a+1} \right)^{t_{s-t}(n) + o(n^2)}.$$

For (iii) first observe that any subgraph of a graph of girth at least 5 is a (4, 3)-graph, and since $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\}) \geq c_1 n^{3/2}$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$ (see [4]) we obtain the lower bound. For the upper bound, observe that in a (4, 3)-graph, there is at most one pair with multiplicity at least two and the set of pairs with multiplicity one forms a graph with no C_4 . By the Kleitman-Winston theorem [12], the number of ways to choose the pairs of multiplicity one is at most $2^{c_2 n^{3/2}}$ for some constant $c_2 > 0$ and this gives the upper bound. \square

Proof of Theorem 7. Fix $\delta > 0$. Observe that if case (i) holds (respectively, case (ii)), then $(s, q + \binom{s}{2})$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3 (respectively, Theorem 4). Let

$$\mathbb{E}(n) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{U}_{a+1}(n) & \text{in case (i)} \\ \mathbb{T}_{s-t, a+1}(n) & \text{in case (ii)} \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 3 (Stability) in case (i) and Theorem 4 (Stability) in case(ii), there is $\epsilon > 0$ so that for sufficiently large n , if $G^+ \in F(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})$ satisfies $P(G^+) > \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon}$, then G^+ is δ -close to some $G' \in \mathbb{E}(n)$. Note that $G' \in \mathbb{E}(n)$ implies there is $H \in E(n)$ such that $H^+ = G'$. Combining this our choice of ϵ , we obtain the following. For all sufficiently large n and $G \in F(n, s, q)$,

$$\text{if } P(G^+) > \text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{1-\epsilon}, \text{ then } G^+ \text{ is } \delta\text{-close to } H^+, \text{ for some } H \in E(n). \quad (3)$$

By Theorem 3 (Extremal) in case (i) and Theorem 4 (Extremal) in case(ii), we must have that $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$. So Theorem 2 implies there is $\beta > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n the following holds.

$$\frac{|F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)|}{|F(n, s, q)|} \leq 2^{-\beta n^2}.$$

So to show (2), it suffices to show that for sufficiently large n , $E(n, s, q, \epsilon) \subseteq E^\delta(n)$. Fix n sufficiently large and suppose $G = ([n], w^G) \in E(n, s, q, \epsilon)$. By definition, this means there is $G' \in F(n, s, q)$ such that $P(G'^+) > \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon}$ and G is a submultigraph of G' . By (3), G'^+ is δ -close to H^+ , for some $H \in E(n)$. Define $H' = ([n], w^{H'})$ such that $w^{H'}(xy) = w^G(xy)$ if $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus \Delta(G', H)$, and $w^{H'}(xy) = 0$ if $xy \in \Delta(G', H)$. We claim H' is a submultigraph of H . Fix $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}$. We want to show $w^{H'}(xy) \leq w^H(xy)$. If $xy \in \Delta(G', H)$, then $w^{H'}(xy) = 0 \leq w^H(xy)$ is immediate. If $xy \notin \Delta(G', H)$, then $w^{H'}(xy) = w^G(xy) \leq w^{G'}(xy) = w^H(xy)$, where the inequality is because G is a submultigraph of G' and the last equality is because $xy \notin \Delta(G', H)$. Thus H' is a submultigraph of $H \in E(n)$, which implies H' is also in $E(n)$. By definition of H' , $\Delta(G, H') \subseteq \Delta(G', H) = \Delta(G'^+, H^+)$. Since G'^+ and H^+ are δ -close, this implies $|\Delta(G, H')| \leq \delta n^2$, and $G \in E^\delta(n)$. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section we prove Theorem 2. We will use Theorem 8 below, which is a version of the hypergraph containers theorem of [1, 15] for multigraphs. Theorem 8 was proved in [14].

Definition 8. Suppose $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$ are integers. Set

$$\mathcal{H}(s, q) = \{G = ([s], w) : \mu(G) \leq q \text{ and } S(G) > q\}, \quad \text{and} \quad g(s, q) = |\mathcal{H}(s, q)|.$$

If $G = (V, w)$ is a multigraph, let $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q) = \{X \in \binom{V}{s} : G[X] \cong G' \text{ for some } G' \in \mathcal{H}(s, q)\}$.

Theorem 8. For every $0 < \delta < 1$ and integers $s \geq 2$, $q \geq 0$, there is a constant $c = c(s, q, \delta) > 0$ such that the following holds. For all sufficiently large n , there is \mathcal{G} a collection of multigraphs of multiplicity at most q and with vertex set $[n]$ such that

(i) for every $J \in F(n, s, q)$, there is $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that J is a submultigraph of G ,

(ii) for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq \delta \binom{n}{s}$, and

(iii) $\log |\mathcal{G}| \leq cn^{2-\frac{1}{4s}} \log n$.

We will also use the following two results appearing in [14].

Lemma 1 (Lemma 1 of [14]). Fix integers $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$. For all $0 < \nu < 1$, there is $0 < \delta < 1$ such that for all sufficiently large n , the following holds. If $G = ([n], w)$ satisfies $\mu(G) \leq q$ and $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq \delta \binom{n}{s}$, then G is ν -close to some G' in $F(n, s, q)$.

Proposition 1 (Proposition 2 in [14]). For all $n \geq s \geq 2$ and $q \geq 0$, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q)$ exists and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) \binom{n}{2}$. If $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$, then $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) \geq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and set $\nu = (\epsilon \log(\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q + \binom{s}{2}))) / (8 \log(q + 1))$. Choose $\delta > 0$ according to Lemma 1 so that the following holds for all sufficiently large n .

Any $G = ([n], w)$ with $\mu(G) \leq q$ and $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq \delta \binom{n}{s}$ is ν -close to some G' in $F(n, s, q)$. (4)

Fix n sufficiently large. Apply Theorem 8 to obtain a constant c and a collection \mathcal{G} of multigraphs of multiplicity at most q and with vertex set $[n]$ satisfying (i)-(iii) of Theorem 8. Suppose that $H = ([n], w^H) \in F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)$. By (i), there is $G = ([n], w^G) \in \mathcal{G}$ such that H is a submultigraph of G and $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq \delta \binom{n}{s}$. We claim that $P(G^+) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon/2}$. Suppose towards a contradiction this is not the case, so $P(G^+) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon/2}$. By (4), $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq \delta \binom{n}{s}$ implies there is $G' = ([n], w^{G'}) \in F(n, s, q)$ which is ν -close to G . Define $H' = ([n], w^{H'})$ by setting $w^{H'}(xy) = w^H(xy)$ for all $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus \Delta(G, G')$ and $w^{H'}(xy) = 0$ for all $xy \in \Delta(G, G')$. By construction and because H' is a submultigraph of G' , we have that H is also a submultigraph of G' . Observe

$$P(G'^+) = P(G^+) \left(\prod_{xy \in \Delta(H, H')} \frac{w^{G'}(xy) + 1}{w^G(xy) + 1} \right) \geq P(G^+) (q + 1)^{-|\Delta(G, G')|},$$

where the inequality is because $1 \leq w^{G'}(xy) + 1, w^G(xy) + 1 \leq q + 1$ implies $\frac{w^{G'}(xy) + 1}{w^G(xy) + 1} \geq \frac{1}{q + 1}$. Combining this with the fact that G and G' are ν -close, the definition of ν , and our assumption that $P(G^+) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon/2}$, we have that $P(G'^+)$ is at least the following.

$$P(G^+) (q + 1)^{-\nu n^2} = P(G^+) \text{ex}_{\Pi} \left(s, q + \binom{s}{2} \right)^{-\epsilon n^2 / 8} \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi} \left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2} \right)^{1-\epsilon/2} \text{ex}_{\Pi} \left(s, q + \binom{s}{2} \right)^{-\epsilon n^2 / 8}.$$

Since $\text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1/\binom{n}{2}} \geq \text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2})$ (see Proposition 1), we obtain that the right hand side is at least

$$\text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{1-\epsilon/2} \text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{-\epsilon n^2/(8\binom{n}{2})} \geq \text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{1-\epsilon},$$

where the inequality is because n large implies $\epsilon n^2/(8\binom{n}{2}) \leq \epsilon/2$. But now H is a submultigraph of G' and $P(G'^+) \geq \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon}$, contradicting that $H \in F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)$. Therefore, every element of $F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)$ can be constructed as follows.

- Choose some $G \in \mathcal{G}$ with $P(G^+) \leq \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon/2}$. There are at most $cn^{2-\frac{1}{4s}} \log n$ choices. Since n is large and $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$, we may assume $cn^{2-\frac{1}{4s}} \log n \leq \text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{\epsilon\binom{n}{2}/4}$.
- Choose a submultigraph of G . There are at most $P(G^+) \leq \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{1-\epsilon/2}$ choices.

This shows

$$\begin{aligned} |F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)| &\leq \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{\epsilon\binom{n}{2}/4} \text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{1-\epsilon/2} \\ &\leq \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{-\epsilon\binom{n}{2}/4} \text{ex}_\Pi\left(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $\text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q + \binom{s}{2}) \geq \text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2})^{\binom{n}{2}}$. By Theorem 1, $|F(n, s, q)| \geq \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q)$, so this implies

$$\frac{|F(n, s, q) \setminus E(n, s, q, \epsilon)|}{|F(n, s, q)|} \leq \text{ex}_\Pi\left(s, q + \binom{s}{2}\right)^{-\epsilon\binom{n}{2}/4}.$$

Setting $\beta = \frac{\epsilon}{4} \log_2(\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}))$ finishes the proof (note $\beta > 0$ since $\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q + \binom{s}{2}) > 1$). \square

5 Extremal Results

In this section we prove the extremal statements in Theorems 3 and 4. We begin with some preliminaries. Suppose $s \geq 2$ and $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$. It was shown in [9] that $\text{ex}_\Sigma(s, q)$ exists, and the AM-GM inequality implies that

$$\text{ex}_\Pi(s, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ex}_\Pi(n, s, q)^{1/\binom{n}{2}} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{ex}_\Sigma(n, s, q)}{\binom{n}{2}} = \text{ex}_\Sigma(s, q). \quad (5)$$

The following lemma is an integer version of the AM-GM inequality.

Lemma 2. *If $\ell \geq 2$, $k \in [\ell]$ and a, x_1, \dots, x_ℓ are positive integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^\ell x_i \leq a\ell - k$, then $\prod_{i=1}^\ell x_i \leq a^{\ell-k}(a-1)^k$. Moreover, equality holds if and only if exactly k of the x_i are equal to $a-1$ and the rest are equal to a .*

Proof. If there are x_i and x_j with $x_i < x_j - 1$, then replacing x_i with $x_i + 1$ and replacing x_j with $x_j - 1$ increases the product and keeps the sum unchanged. So no two of the x_i 's differ by more than one when the product is maximized. \square

Corollary 1. *Let $n \geq s \geq 2$, $a \geq 2$, and $(a-1)\binom{s}{2} \leq q < a\binom{s}{2}$. Suppose $G \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$ has all edge multiplicities in $\{a, a-1\}$ and contains exactly k edges of multiplicity $a-1$. Then for all other $G' \in F(n, s, q)$, $G' \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ if and only if G' has k edges of multiplicity $a-1$ and all other edges of multiplicity a . Consequently, $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$.*

Proof. Fix G so that the hypotheses hold. Then $S(G) = a\binom{n}{2} - k$ and $P(G) = a\binom{n}{2} - k(a-1)^k$. Let $G' = ([n], w)$ be another element of $F(n, s, q)$. Since $G \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$, we have

$$S(G') \leq S(G) = a\binom{n}{2} - k.$$

By Lemma 2 with $\ell = \binom{n}{2}$, $P(G') \leq a\binom{n}{2} - k(a-1)^k$ with equality if and only if $\{w(xy) : xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}\}$ consists of k elements equal to $a-1$ and the rest equal to a . This shows $G' \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ if and only if G' has k edges of multiplicity $a-1$ and the rest of multiplicity a . Consequently, $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. To show $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$, let $G' \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. Then by what we have shown, $S(G') = a\binom{n}{2} - k = S(G)$, so $G' \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$ implies $G' \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$. \square

The following is a consequence of Theorem 5.2 in [2] (case $b = 0$) and Theorems 8 and 9 in [9] (cases $0 < b \leq s-2$).

Theorem 9 (Bondy-Tuza [2], Füredi-Kündgen [9]). *Let $n \geq s \geq 2$, $a \geq 1$, $0 \leq b \leq s-2$, and $q = a\binom{s}{2} + b$. Then*

$$\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, q) \leq a\binom{n}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{b}{b+1}n \right\rfloor.$$

with equality holding when $b = s-2$ and when $b = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3 (Extremal). Since $\mathbb{U}_a(n) \in F(n, s, q)$, $a\binom{n}{2} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$. On the other hand, let $G \in F(n, s, q)$. Theorem 9 implies that $S(G) \leq a\binom{n}{2} + \lfloor \frac{b}{b+1}n \rfloor$. This along with Lemma 2 implies that $P(G) \leq a\binom{n}{2}((a+1)/a)^{\lfloor \frac{b}{b+1}n \rfloor}$. Thus $a\binom{n}{2} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq a\binom{n}{2}((a+1)/a)^{\lfloor \frac{b}{b+1}n \rfloor}$, which implies $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = a$.

Case (a): If $b = 0$, then Theorem 9 implies $\mathbb{U}_a(n) \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$. Because $\mathbb{U}_a(n)$ has all edge multiplicities in $\{a\}$, Corollary 1 implies $\mathbb{U}_a(n) \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and moreover, every other element of $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ has all edges of multiplicity a . In other words, $\{\mathbb{U}_a(n)\} = \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$, so $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = a\binom{n}{2}$.

Case (b): If $b = s-2$, then it is straightforward to check $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq F(n, s, q)$. Since $S(G) = a\binom{n}{2} + \lfloor \frac{s-2}{s-1}n \rfloor$ for all $G \in \mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n)$, Theorem 9 implies $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$. Because every element in $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n)$ has all edge multiplicities in $\{a+1, a\}$, Corollary 1 implies $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and every $G' \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ contains exactly $\lfloor \frac{s-2}{s-1}n \rfloor$ edges of multiplicity $a+1$, and all others of multiplicity a . Thus $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = a\binom{n}{2}(\frac{a+1}{a})^{\lfloor \frac{s-2}{s-1}n \rfloor}$. Suppose $s = 3$, $b = 1$, and $G' = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. If there are $x, y \neq z \in [n]$ such that $w(xy) = w(xz) = a+1$, then because G' contains only edges of multiplicity $a+1$ and a , $S(\{x, y, z\}) \geq 2(a+1) + a = 3a+2 > q$, a contradiction. Thus the edges of multiplicity $a+1$ form a matching of size $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ in G' , so $G' \in \mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n)$. This shows $\mathbb{U}_{s-1,a}(n) = \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. \square

The following is a consequence of Theorem 5.2 of [2].

Theorem 10 (Bondy-Tuza [2]). *Suppose $n \geq s \geq 2$, $a \geq 1$, and $q = a\binom{s}{2} - 1$. Then*

$$\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, q) = (a-1)\binom{n}{2} + t_{s-1}(n).$$

Proof of Theorem 4(a) (Extremal). Since $\mathbb{T}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq F(n, s, q)$ and for all $G \in \mathbb{T}_{s-1,a}(n)$, $S(G) = (a-1)\binom{n}{2} + t_{s-1}(n)$, Theorem 10 implies that $\mathbb{T}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$. Therefore Corollary 1 implies $\mathbb{T}_{s-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and each $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ has $t_{s-1}(n)$ edges of multiplicity a and the

rest of multiplicity $a - 1$. Fix $G = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and let G' be the graph with vertex set $[n]$ and edge set $E = \{xy \in \binom{[n]}{2} : w(xy) = a\}$. Then G' is K_s -free and has $t_{s-1}(n)$ edges, so by Turán's theorem, $G' = T_{s-1}(n)$ and thus $G \in \mathbb{T}_{s-1, a}(n)$. So we have shown, $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) = \mathbb{T}_{s-1, a}(n)$. Consequently, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = (a - 1) \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n)}$ and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) = (a - 1) \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{\frac{s-2}{s-1}}$. \square

To prove Theorem 4(b) (Extremal), we will need the following theorem, as well as a few lemmas.

Theorem 11. [Dirac [3], Bondy-Tuza [2]] *Let $n \geq s \geq 4$, $a \geq 1$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$. Then $\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, q) = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s', q')$ where $s' = s - t + 1$ and $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$.*

Proof. Let $n \geq s \geq 4$ and $2 \leq t \leq s/2$. In [3], Dirac proved that $\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, \binom{s}{2} - t) = t_{s-t}(n)$. This along with Lemma 5.1 in [2] implies that for all $a \geq 1$,

$$\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, a \binom{s}{2} - t) = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, \binom{s}{2} - t) + (a-1) \binom{n}{2} = t_{s-t}(n) + (a-1) \binom{n}{2} = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s', a \binom{s'}{2} - 1),$$

where the last equality is by Theorem 10 applied to s' and $a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$. \square

Lemma 3. *If s, q, a, t are integers satisfying case (b) of Theorem 4, and $s' = s - t + 1$, $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$, then for all $n \geq s$, $\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')$.*

Proof. Set $s' = s - t + 1$ and $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$, and fix $n \geq s$. Fix $G \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n)$. It is straightforward to check that $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. By Theorem 11, $\text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s', q') = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, q)$. Since $S(G) = (a - 1) \binom{n}{2} + t_{s'-1}(n)$, by Theorem 10 applied to s' and q' , we have that $S(G) = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s', q') = \text{ex}_{\Sigma}(n, s, q)$. This shows $G \in \mathcal{S}(n, s, q)$. By Corollary 1, since G has all edge multiplicities in $\{a, a - 1\}$, $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$, so $P(G) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$. Since $G \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n)$ and $\mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s', q')$ by Theorem 4(a) (Extremal), $P(G) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')$. Thus $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = P(G) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')$. \square

We now fix some notation. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $z \in [n]$, $Y \subseteq [n]$, and $G = ([n], w)$, set

$$S(Y) = \sum_{xy \in \binom{Y}{2}} w(xy), \quad S_z(Y) = \sum_{y \in Y} w(yz), \quad P(Y) = \prod_{xy \in \binom{Y}{2}} w(xy), \quad \text{and} \quad P_z(Y) = \prod_{y \in Y} w(yz)$$

If $X \subseteq [n]$ is disjoint from Y , set $P(X, Y) = \prod_{x \in X, y \in Y} w(xy)$.

Claim 1. *Suppose s, q, a, t are integers satisfying the hypotheses of case (b) of Theorem 4. Then for all $n \geq 2s$ and $s - t + 1 \leq y \leq s - 1$,*

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n - y, s, q) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) (a - 1)^{-\binom{y}{2}} \left(a^{y-2} (a - 1)^2 \right)^{-(n-y)} \left(\frac{a - 1}{a} \right)^{\frac{n-y}{s-t}}.$$

Proof. Set $s' = s - t + 1$ and $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$. Fix $n \geq s$ and $s' \leq y \leq s - 1$. Choose some $H = ([n - y], w) \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n - y)$ and let $U_1, \dots, U_{s'-1}$ be the partition of $[n - y]$ corresponding to H . Observe that there is some i such that $|U_i| \geq \frac{n-y}{s'-1}$. Without loss of generality, assume $|U_1| \geq \frac{n-y}{s'-1}$. Assign the elements of $Y' := [n] \setminus [n - y]$ to the U_i in as even a way as possible, to obtain an equipartition $U'_1, \dots, U'_{s'-1}$ of $[n]$ extending $U_1, \dots, U_{s'-1}$. Observe that because $s' \leq |Y'| \leq s - 1$ and $s' - 1 = s - t \geq s/2$, for each i , $|U'_i \setminus U_i| \in \{1, 2\}$, and there is at least one i such that $|U'_i \setminus U_i| = 1$. Since $|U_1| \geq \frac{n-y}{s-t}$, by redistributing Y' if necessary, we may assume that $|U'_1 \setminus U_1| = 1$. Define a new multigraph $H' = ([n], w')$ so that $w'(xy) = a - 1$ if $xy \in \binom{U'_i}{2}$ for some $i \in [s' - 1]$ and $w'(xy) = a$ if $(x, y) \in U'_i \times U'_j$ for some $i \neq j$. Note that by construction $H' \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n)$ and

$H'[[n-y]] = H$. By Lemma 3, since $n-y \geq s$, $H \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1,a}(n-y)$ and $H' \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1,a}(n)$ imply $H \in \mathcal{P}(n-y, s, q)$ and $H' \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. These facts imply the following.

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = P(H') = P(H)P(Y')P(Y', [n-y]) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q)P(Y')P(Y', [n-y]). \quad (6)$$

By definition of H' , if $|U'_i \setminus U_i| = 2$, then for all $z \in U_i$, $P_z(Y') = a^{y-2}(a-1)^2$ and if $|U'_i \setminus U_i| = 1$, then for all $z \in U_i$, $P_z(Y') = a^{y-1}(a-1)$. Since $|U'_1 \setminus U_1| = 1$, this implies

$$P(Y', [n-y]) \geq \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y-|U_1|} \left(a^{y-1}(a-1)\right)^{|U_1|} = \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y} \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{|U_1|}. \quad (7)$$

By construction, $P(Y') \geq (a-1)^{\binom{y}{2}}$. Combining this with (6), (7), and the fact that $|U_1| \geq \frac{n-y}{s-t}$, we obtain

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q)(a-1)^{\binom{y}{2}} \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y} \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{\frac{n-y}{s-t}}.$$

Rearranging this yields $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)(a-1)^{-\binom{y}{2}} \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{-(n-y)} \left(\frac{a-1}{a}\right)^{\frac{n-y}{s-t}}$. \square

Lemma 4. *Let $n \geq s \geq 4$, $a \geq 2$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$. Suppose $G \in F(n, s, q)$ and $Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-t+1}$ satisfies $S(Y) \geq a \binom{s-t+1}{2}$. Then there is $Y \subseteq Y' \subseteq [n]$ such that $s-t+1 \leq |Y'| \leq s-1$ and for all $z \in [n] \setminus Y'$, $S_z(Y') \leq a|Y'| - 2$, and consequently, $P_z(Y') \leq a^{|Y'|-2}(a-1)^2$.*

Proof. Suppose towards a contradiction that $Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-t+1}$ satisfies $S(Y) \geq a \binom{s-t+1}{2}$ but for all $Y \subseteq Y' \subseteq [n]$ such that $s-t+1 \leq |Y'| \leq s-1$, there is $z \in [n] \setminus Y'$ with $S_z(Y') > a|Y'| - 2$. Apply this fact with $Y' = Y$ to choose $z_1 \in [n] \setminus Y$ such that $S_{z_1}(Y) > a|Y| - 2$. Then inductively define a sequence z_2, \dots, z_{t-1} so that for each $1 \leq i \leq t-2$, $S_{z_{i+1}}(Y \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_i\}) \geq a(s-t+1+i) - 1$ (to define z_{i+1} , apply the fact with $Y' = Y \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_i\}$). Then $|Y \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_{t-1}\}| = s$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S(Y \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_{t-1}\}) &\geq S(Y) + S_{z_1}(Y) + S_{z_2}(Y \cup \{z_1\}) + \dots + S_{z_{t-1}}(Y \cup \{z_1, \dots, z_{t-2}\}) \\ &\geq a \binom{s-t+1}{2} + a(s-t+1) - 1 + \dots + a(s-1) - 1 \\ &= a \binom{s}{2} - (t-1) > a \binom{s}{2} - t, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting that $G \in F(n, s, q)$. Therefore there is $Y \subseteq Y' \subseteq [n]$ such that $s-t+1 \leq |Y'| \leq s-1$ and for all $z \in [n] \setminus Y'$, $S_z(Y') \leq a|Y'| - 2$. By Lemma 2, this implies $P_z(Y') \leq a^{|Y'|-2}(a-1)^2$. \square

Lemma 5. *Suppose s, q, a, t are integers satisfying the hypotheses of case (b) of Theorem 4. Then there are constants $C > 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ the following holds. Suppose $G \in F(n, s, q)$ and $k(G)$ is the maximal number of pairwise disjoint elements of $\{Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-t+1} : S(G[Y]) \geq a \binom{s-t+1}{2}\}$. Then*

$$P(G) \leq C^{k(G)} \alpha^{k(G)n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q). \quad (8)$$

Proof. Set $\alpha = \left(\frac{a-1}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2t(s-t)}}$. Choose $C \geq q \binom{s-1}{2}$ sufficiently large so that $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq C \alpha^{n^2}$ holds for all $1 \leq n \leq s^3$. We proceed by induction on n . If $1 \leq n \leq s^3$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$, then (8) is clearly true of $k(G) = 0$. If $k(G) \geq 1$, then by choice of C and since $k(G) \leq n$ and $\alpha < 1$,

$$P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq C \alpha^{n^2} \leq C \alpha^{k(G)n} \leq C^{k(G)} \alpha^{k(G)n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q).$$

Now let $n > s^3$ and suppose by induction (8) holds for all $G' \in F(n', s, q)$ where $1 \leq n' < n$. If $G \in F(n, s, q)$, then (8) is clearly true if $k(G) = 0$. If $k(G) > 0$, let Y_1, \dots, Y_k be a maximal set of pairwise disjoint elements in $\{Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-t+1} : S(G[Y]) \geq a^{\binom{s-t+1}{2}}\}$. Apply Lemma 4 to find Y' such that $Y_1 \subseteq Y' \subseteq [n]$, $s-t+1 \leq |Y'| \leq s-1$, and for all $z \in [n] \setminus Y'$, $P_z(Y') \leq a^{|Y'|-2}(a-1)^2$. Let $|Y'| = y$. Then note

$$P(Y', [n] \setminus Y') = \prod_{z \in [n] \setminus Y'} P_z(Y') \leq \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y}. \quad (9)$$

Observe that $G[[n] \setminus Y']$ is isomorphic to some $H \in F(n-y, s, q)$. Since Y' can intersect at most $t-2$ other Y_i , and since Y_1, \dots, Y_k was maximal, we must have $k(H) + 1 \leq k(G) \leq k(H) + t - 1$. By our induction hypothesis,

$$P([n] \setminus Y') = P(H) \leq C^{k(H)} \alpha^{k(H)(n-y)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q). \quad (10)$$

Since $\mu(G) \leq q$ and $y \leq s-1$, and by our choice of C , $P(Y') \leq q^{\binom{y}{2}} \leq C$. Combining this with (9), (10) and the fact that $\mu(H) \leq \mu(G)$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} P(G) &= P([n] \setminus Y') P(Y', [n] \setminus Y') P(Y') \leq C^{k(H)} \alpha^{k(H)(n-y)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q) \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y} C \\ &= C^{k(H)+1} \alpha^{k(H)(n-y)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q) \left(a^{y-2}(a-1)^2\right)^{n-y}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the upper bound for $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n-y, s, q)$ from Claim 1 yields that $P(G)$ is at most

$$C^{k(H)+1} \alpha^{k(H)(n-y)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) (a-1)^{-\binom{y}{2}} \left(\frac{a-1}{a}\right)^{\frac{n-y}{s-t}} \leq C^{k(H)+1} \alpha^{k(H)(n-y)+2t(n-y)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q), \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality is because $(a-1)^{-\binom{y}{2}} < 1$ and by definition of α , $\left(\frac{a-1}{a}\right)^{1/(s-t)} = \alpha^{2t}$. We claim that the following holds.

$$k(H)(n-y) + 2t(n-y) \geq (k(H) + t - 1)n. \quad (12)$$

Rearranging this, we see (12) is equivalent to $yk(H) \leq tn + n - 2ty$. Since $2 \leq t \leq s/2$ and $y \leq s-1$, $tn + n - 2ty \geq 3n - s(s-1)$, so it suffices to show $yk(H) \leq 3n - s(s-1)$. By definition, $k(H) \leq \frac{n-y}{s-t+1}$ so $yk(H) \leq \frac{y(n-y)}{s-t+1}$. Combining this with the facts that $s-t+1 \leq y \leq s-1$ and $s/2 < s-t+1$ yields

$$yk(H) \leq \frac{(s-1)(n-(s-t+1))}{s-t+1} = n \left(\frac{s-1}{s-t+1}\right) - s + 1 < 2n \left(\frac{s-1}{s}\right) - s + 1.$$

Thus it suffices to check $2n \left(\frac{s-1}{s}\right) - s + 1 \leq 3n - s(s-1)$. This is equivalent to $(s-1)^2 \leq n \left(\frac{s+2}{s}\right)$, which holds because $n \geq s^3$. This finishes the verification of (12). Combining (11), (12), and the fact that $k(H) + 1 \leq k(G) \leq k(H) + t - 1$ yields

$$P(G) \leq C^{k(H)+1} \alpha^{(k(H)+t-1)n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq C^{k(G)} \alpha^{k(G)n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4(b) (Extremal). Set $s' = s - t + 1$ and $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$. Fix $n \geq s$. By Lemma 3 and definition of s' , $\mathbb{T}_{s-t,a}(n) = \mathbb{T}_{s'-1,a}(n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$ and

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q') = (a-1) \binom{n}{2} \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{t_{s'-1}(n)},$$

where the last equality is by Theorem 4(a) (Extremal) applied to s' and q' . By definition, we have $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) = (a-1) \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{s'-1}}$. We have left to show that $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{s'-1,a}(n)$ holds for large n . Assume n is sufficiently large and C and α are as in Lemma 5. Note $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')$ implies $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \cap F(n, s', q') \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n, s', q') = \mathbb{T}_{s'-1,a}(n)$, where the equality is by Theorem 4 (a) (Extremal). So it suffices to show $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \subseteq F(n, s', q')$. Suppose towards a contradiction that there exists $G = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q) \setminus F(n, s', q')$. Then in the notation of Lemma 5, $k(G) \geq 1$. Combining this with Lemma 5, we have

$$P(G) \leq C^{k(G)} \alpha^{k(G)n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \left(C\alpha^n\right)^{k(G)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) < \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q),$$

where the last inequality is because n is large, $\alpha < 1$, and $k(G) \geq 1$. But now $P(G) < \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$ contradicts that $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, s, q)$. \square

6 Stability

In this section we prove the product-stability results for Theorems 3 and 4(a). We will use the fact that for any (s, q) -graph G , $\mu(G) \leq q$. If $G = (V, w)$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$, let $E_a(G) = \{xy \in \binom{V}{2} : w(xy) = a\}$ and $e_a(G) = |E_a(G)|$. In the following notation, p stands for “plus” and m stands for “minus.”

$$p_a(G) = |\{xy \in \binom{V}{2} : w(xy) > a\}| \quad \text{and} \quad m_a(G) = |\{xy \in \binom{V}{2} : w(xy) < a\}|.$$

Lemma 6. *Let $s \geq 2$, $q \geq \binom{s}{2}$ and $a > 0$. Suppose there exist $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $n \geq s$, every $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies*

$$P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)}.$$

Then for all $\delta > 0$ there are $\epsilon, M > 0$ such that for all $n > M$ the following holds. If $G \in F(n, s, q)$ and $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$ then $p_a(G) \leq \delta n^2$.

Proof. Fix $\delta > 0$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\frac{2\epsilon \log q}{\log(1/\alpha)} = \delta$. Choose $M \geq s$ sufficiently large so that $n \geq M$ implies $(\epsilon n^2 + Cn) \log q \leq 2\epsilon \log q n^2$. Let $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ be such that $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. Our assumptions imply

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \leq P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)}.$$

Rearranging $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)}$ yields $\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{p_a(G)} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{\epsilon} q^{Cn} \leq q^{\epsilon n^2 + Cn}$, where the second inequality is because $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq q^{n^2}$. Taking logs of both sides, we obtain

$$p_a(G) \log(1/\alpha) \leq (\epsilon n^2 + Cn) \log q \leq 2\epsilon n^2 \log q,$$

where the second inequality is by assumption on n . Dividing both sides by $\log(1/\alpha)$ and applying the definition of ϵ yields $p_a(G) \leq \frac{2\epsilon n^2 \log q}{\log(1/\alpha)} = \delta n^2$. \square

We now prove the key lemma for this section.

Lemma 7. *Let s, q, b, a be integers satisfying $s \geq 2$ and either*

$$(i) \ a \geq 1, \ 0 \leq b \leq s - 2, \ \text{and } q = a \binom{s}{2} + b \text{ or}$$

$$(ii) \ a \geq 2, \ b = 0, \ \text{and } q = a \binom{s}{2} - 1.$$

Then there exist $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $n \geq s$ and all $G \in F(n, s, q)$,

$$P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on $s \geq 2$, and for each fixed s , by induction on n . Let $s \geq 2$ and q, b, a be as in (i) or (ii) above. Set

$$\xi = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if case (i) holds.} \\ 1 & \text{if case (ii) holds.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose first $s = 2$. Set $\alpha = 1/2$ and $C = 2$. Since G is an $(n, 2, a - \xi)$ -graph, $p_a(G) = 0$. Therefore for all $n \geq 2$,

$$P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)}.$$

Assume now $s > 2$. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of $(s', q', b') \in \mathbb{N}^3$ such that $2 \leq s' < s$ and s', q', b', a satisfy (i) or (ii). Observe that \mathcal{I} is finite. Suppose by induction on s that $(s', q', b') \in \mathcal{I}$ implies there are $0 < \alpha(s', q', b') < 1$ and $C(s', q', b') > 1$ such that for all $n' \geq s'$ and $G' \in F(n', s', q')$, $P(G') \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n', s', q') q^{C(s', q', b')n'} \alpha(s', q', b')^{p_a(G')}$. Set

$$\alpha = \max \left(\left\{ q^{-1}, \left(\frac{a^{s-2}(a-\xi) - 1}{a^{s-2}(a-\xi)} \right)^{\frac{1}{s-2}}, \left(\frac{a-1}{a} \right)^{\frac{1}{s-2}} \right\} \cup \left\{ \alpha(s', q', b') : (s', q', b') \in \mathcal{I} \right\} \right).$$

Observe $0 < \alpha < 1$. Choose $C \geq \binom{s-1}{2}$ sufficiently large so that for all $n \leq s$

$$q^{\binom{n}{2}} \leq q^{Cn} (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \alpha^{\binom{n}{2}}, \quad (14)$$

and so that for all $(s', q', b') \in \mathcal{I}$, $C(s', q', b') \leq C/2$ and $\left(\frac{a+1}{a} \right)^{(s-3)/(s-2)} \leq q^{C/2}$. Given $G \in F(n, s, q)$, set

$$\Theta(G) = \left\{ Y \subseteq \binom{[n]}{s-1} : S(Y) \geq a \binom{s-1}{2} + (1 - \xi)b \right\},$$

and let $A(n, s, q) = \{G \in F(n, s, q) : \Theta(G) \neq \emptyset\}$. We show the following holds for all $n \geq 1$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ by induction on n .

$$P(G) \leq q^{Cn} (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \alpha^{p_a(G)}. \quad (15)$$

This will finish the proof since $(a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$ (by Theorem 3 (Extremal) for case (i) and Theorem 4(a) (Extremal) for case (ii)). If $n \leq s$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$, then (15) holds because of (14) and the fact that $P(G) \leq q^{\binom{n}{2}}$. So assume $n > s$, and suppose by induction that

(15) holds for all $s \leq n' < n$ and $G' \in F(n', s, q)$. Let $G = ([n], w) \in F(n, s, q)$. Suppose first that $G \in A(n, s, q)$. Choose $Y \in \Theta(G)$ and set $R = [n] \setminus Y$. Given $z \in R$, note that

$$a \binom{s-1}{2} + (1-\xi)b + S_z(Y) \leq S(Y) + S_z(Y) = S(Y \cup \{z\}) \leq a \binom{s}{2} + (1-\xi)b - \xi,$$

and therefore $S_z(Y) \leq a(s-1) - \xi$. Then for all $z \in R$, Lemma 2 implies $P_z(Y) \leq a^{s-2}(a-\xi)$, with equality only if $\{w(yz) : y \in Y\}$ consists of $s-1-\xi$ elements equal to a and ξ elements equal to $a-1$. Let $R_1 = \{z \in R : \exists y \in Y, w(zy) > a\}$ and $R_2 = R \setminus R_1$. Then $z \in R_1$ implies $P_z(Y) < a^{s-2}(a-\xi)$, so $P_z(Y) \leq a^{s-2}(a-\xi) - 1$. Let $k = |R_1|$. Observe that $G[R]$ is isomorphic to an element of $F(n', s, q)$, where $n' = n - |R| \geq 1$. By induction (on n) and these observations we have that the following holds, where $p_a(R) = p_a(G[R])$.

$$\begin{aligned} P(G) &= P(R)P(Y) \prod_{z \in R_1} P_z(Y) \prod_{z \in R_2} P_z(Y) \\ &\leq q^{C(n-s+1)}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n-s+1}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n-s+1)} \alpha^{p_a(R)} q^{\binom{s-1}{2}} \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi) - 1\right)^k \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi)\right)^{n-s+1-k} \\ &\leq q^{C(n-s+2)}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n-s+1}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n-s+1)} \alpha^{p_a(R)} \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi) - 1\right)^k \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi)\right)^{n-s+1-k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $\binom{s-1}{2} \leq C$. Since $\alpha \geq \left(\frac{a^{s-2}(a-\xi)-1}{a^{s-2}(a-\xi)}\right)^{1/(s-2)}$, this is at most

$$q^{C(n-s+2)}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n-s+1}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n-s+1)} \alpha^{p_a(R)+k(s-1)} \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi)\right)^{n-s+1}. \quad (16)$$

Because $C(n-s+2) \leq Cn - \binom{s-1}{2}$ and $q^{-1} \leq \alpha$, we have $q^{C(n-s+2)} \leq q^{Cn} \alpha^{\binom{s-1}{2}}$. Combining this with the fact that $p_a(G) \leq p_a(R) + k(s-1) + \binom{s-1}{2}$ implies that (16) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &q^{Cn}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n-s+1}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n-s+1)} \alpha^{p_a(R)+k(s-1)+\binom{s-1}{2}} \left(a^{s-2}(a-\xi)\right)^{n-s+1} \\ &= q^{Cn}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n-s+1}{2}+(s-1)(n-s+1)} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n-s+1)+(s-2)(n-s+1)} \alpha^{p_a(R)+k(s-1)+\binom{s-1}{2}} \\ &\leq q^{Cn}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \alpha^{p_a(G)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now have that $P(G) \leq q^{Cn}(a-\xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a-\xi}\right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \alpha^{p_a(G)}$, as desired. Assume now $G \notin A(n, s, q)$. Then for all $Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-1}$, $S(Y) \leq a \binom{s-1}{2} + (1-\xi)b - 1$. Thus G is an (n, s', q') -graph where $s' = s-1$ and $q' = a \binom{s-1}{2} + (1-\xi)b - 1$. Suppose $a = 1$, $\xi = 0$, and $b = 0$. Then $q' = \binom{s'}{2} - 1$ and any (n, s', q') -graph must contain an edge of multiplicity 0. This implies $P(G) = 0$ and (15) holds. We have the following three cases remaining, where $b' = \max\{b-1, 0\}$.

1. $\xi = 0$, $b = 0$, and $a \geq 2$. In this case $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$ and $b' = 0$.
2. $\xi = 1$, $b = 0$, and $a \geq 2$. In this case $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$ and $b' = 0$.
3. $\xi = 0$, $1 \leq b \leq s-2$, and $a \geq 1$. In this case $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} + b'$ and $0 \leq b' \leq s' - 2$.

It is clear that in all three of these cases, $(s', q', b') \in \mathcal{I}$, so by our induction hypothesis (on s), there are $\alpha' = \alpha(s', q', b') \leq \alpha$ and $C' = C(s', q', b')$ such that

$$P(G) \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')(q')^{C'n}(\alpha')^{p_a(G)} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')q^{C'n}\alpha^{p_a(G)}, \quad (17)$$

where the inequality is because $q' \leq q$ and $\alpha' \leq \alpha$. By Theorem 4(a) (Extremal) if cases 1 or 2 hold, and by Theorem 3 (Extremal) if case 3 holds, we have the following.

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q') \leq (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s'-1}(n)} \left(\frac{a+1}{a} \right)^{\lfloor \frac{b'}{b'+1}n \rfloor} \leq (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} \left(\frac{a+1}{a} \right)^{\frac{s-3}{s-2}n},$$

where the last inequality is because $t_{s'-1}(n) \leq t_{s-1}(n)$ and $\lfloor \frac{b'}{b'+1}n \rfloor \leq \frac{b'}{b'+1}n \leq \frac{s-3}{s-2}n$. By choice of C , $(\frac{a+1}{a})^{\frac{s-3}{s-2}n} \leq q^{Cn/2}$. Thus $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q') \leq (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} (\frac{a}{a-\xi})^{t_{s-1}(n)} q^{Cn/2}$. Combining this with (17) implies

$$P(G) \leq (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} q^{Cn/2} q^{C'n} \alpha^{p_a(G)} \leq (a - \xi)^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{a - \xi} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n)} q^{Cn} \alpha^{p_a(G)},$$

where the last inequality is because $C' \leq C/2$. Thus (15) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3 (Stability). Let $s \geq 2$, $a \geq 1$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} + b$ for some $0 \leq b \leq s - 2$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Given $G \in F(n, s, q)$, let $p_G = p_a(G)$ and $m_G = m_a(G)$. Note that if $G \in F(n, s, q)$, then $|\Delta(G, \mathbb{U}_a(n))| = m_G + p_G$. Suppose first $a = 1$, so $m_G = 0$. Combining Lemma 7 with Lemma 6 implies there are ϵ_1 and M_1 such that if $n > M_1$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon_1}$, then $|\Delta(G, \mathbb{U}_a(n))| = p_G \leq \delta n^2$. Assume now $a > 1$. Combining Lemma 7 with Lemma 6 implies there are ϵ_1 and M_1 such that if $n > M_1$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon_1}$, then $p_G \leq \delta' n^2$, where

$$\delta' = \min \left\{ \frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta \log(a/(a-1))}{4 \log q} \right\}.$$

Set $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_1, \frac{\delta \log(a/(a-1))}{4 \log q}\}$. Suppose $n > M_1$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. Our assumptions imply $p_G \leq \delta' n^2 \leq \delta n^2/2$. Observe that by definition of p_G and m_G ,

$$P(G) \leq a^{\binom{n}{2}-m_G} (a-1)^{m_G} q^{p_G} = a^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a-1}{a} \right)^{m_G} q^{p_G}. \quad (18)$$

By Theorem 3(a)(Extremal), $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \geq a^{\binom{n}{2}}$. Therefore $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \geq a^{\binom{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)}$. Combining this with (18) yields

$$a^{\binom{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)} \leq a^{\binom{n}{2}} \left(\frac{a-1}{a} \right)^{m_G} q^{p_G}.$$

Rearranging this, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{a}{a-1} \right)^{m_G} \leq a^{\epsilon \binom{n}{2}} q^{p_G} \leq q^{\epsilon \binom{n}{2} + p_G} \leq q^{\epsilon n^2 + p_G}.$$

Taking logs, dividing by $\log(a/(a-1))$, and applying our assumptions on p_G and ϵ yields

$$m_G \leq \frac{\epsilon n^2 \log q}{\log(a/(a-1))} + \frac{p_G \log q}{\log(a/(a-1))} \leq \frac{\delta n^2}{4} + \frac{\delta n^2}{4} = \frac{\delta n^2}{2}.$$

Combining this with the fact that $p_G \leq \frac{\delta n^2}{2}$ we have that $|\Delta(G, \mathbb{U}_a(n))| \leq \delta n^2$. \square

The following classical result gives structural information about n -vertex K_s -free graphs with close to $t_{s-1}(n)$ edges.

Theorem 12 (Erdős-Simonovits [5, 16]). For all $\delta > 0$ and $s \geq 2$, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that every K_s -free graph with n vertices and $t_{s-1}(n) - \epsilon n^2$ edges can be transformed into $T_{s-1}(n)$ by adding and removing at most δn^2 edges.

Proof of Theorem 4(a) (Stability). Let $s \geq 2$, $a \geq 2$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} - 1$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Given $G \in F(n, s, q)$, let $p_G = p_a(G)$, $m_G = m_{a-1}(G)$. Choose M_0 and μ such that $\mu < \delta/2$ and so that Theorem 12 implies that any K_s -free graph with $n \geq M_0$ vertices and at least $(1 - \mu)t_{s-1}(n)$ edges can be made into $T_{s-1}(n)$ by adding or removing at most $\frac{\delta n^2}{3}$ edges. Set

$$A = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } a = 2 \\ \frac{a-1}{a-2} & \text{if } a > 2 \end{cases}$$

Combining Lemma 7 with Lemma 6 implies there are ϵ_1, M_1 so that if $n > M_1$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon_1}$, then $p_G \leq \delta' n^2$, where

$$\delta' = \min \left\{ \frac{\delta}{3}, \frac{\mu \log(a/(a-1))}{2 \log q}, \frac{\delta \log A}{6 \log q} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

Let

$$\epsilon = \min \left\{ \epsilon_1, \frac{\delta \log A}{6 \log q}, \frac{\mu \log(a/(a-1))}{2 \log q} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \max\{M_0, M_1\}.$$

Suppose now that $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. By assumption, $p_G \leq \delta' n^2 \leq \frac{\delta n^2}{3}$. We now bound m_G . Note that if $a = 2$ and $P(G) \neq 0$, then $m_G = 0$. If $a > 2$, observe that by definition of p_G and m_G ,

$$P(G) \leq q^{p_G} (a-2)^{m_G} a^{e_a(G)} (a-1)^{e_{a-1}(G)} \leq q^{p_G} \left(\frac{a-2}{a-1} \right)^{m_G} a^{e_a(G)} (a-1)^{\binom{n}{2} - e_a(G)}, \quad (20)$$

where the last inequality is because $e_{a-1}(G) + m_G \leq \binom{n}{2} - e_a(G)$. Note that Turán's theorem and the fact that G is an (n, s, q) -graph implies that $e_a(G) \leq t_{s-1}(n)$, so

$$a^{e_a(G)} (a-1)^{\binom{n}{2} - e_a(G)} \leq a^{t_{s-1}(n)} (a-1)^{\binom{n}{2} - t_{s-1}(n)} = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q),$$

where the last equality is from Theorem 4(a) (Extremal). Combining this with (20) yields

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \leq P(G) \leq q^{p_G} \left(\frac{a-2}{a-1} \right)^{m_G} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q).$$

Rearranging $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \leq q^{p_G} \left(\frac{a-2}{a-1} \right)^{m_G} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$ and using that $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq q^{n^2}$, we obtain

$$A^{m_G} = \left(\frac{a-1}{a-2} \right)^{m_G} \leq q^{p_G} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{\epsilon} \leq q^{p_G + \epsilon n^2}.$$

Taking logs, dividing by $\log A$, and applying our assumptions on p_G and ϵ we obtain $m_G < \delta n^2/3$. Using (20) and $a^{t_{s-1}(n)} (a-1)^{\binom{n}{2} - t_{s-1}(n)} = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$, we have

$$\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \leq P(G) \leq q^{p_G} a^{e_a(G)} (a-1)^{\binom{n}{2} - e_a(G)} = q^{p_G} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \left(\frac{a}{a-1} \right)^{e_a(G) - t_{s-1}(n)}.$$

Rearranging this we obtain

$$\left(\frac{a}{a-1} \right)^{t_{s-1}(n) - e_a(G)} \leq q^{p_G} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{\epsilon} \leq q^{p_G + \epsilon n^2}.$$

Taking logs, dividing by $\log(a/(a-1))$, and using the assumptions on p_G and ϵ we obtain that

$$t_{s-1}(n) - e_a(G) \leq \frac{p_G \log q}{\log(a/(a-1))} + \frac{\epsilon n^2 \log q}{\log(a/(a-1))} \leq \frac{\mu n^2}{2} + \frac{\mu n^2}{2} = \mu n^2.$$

Let H be the graph with vertex set $[n]$ and edge set $E = E_a(G)$. Then H is K_s -free, and has $e_a(G)$ many edges. Since $t_{s-1}(n) - e_a(G) \leq \mu n^2$, Theorem 12 implies that H is $\frac{\delta}{3}$ -close to some $H' = T_{s-1}(n)$. Define $G' \in F(n, s, q)$ so that $E_a(G') = E(H')$ and $E_{a-1}(G') = \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus E_a(G')$. Then $G' \in \mathbb{T}_{s-1, a}(n)$ and

$$\Delta(G, G') \subseteq (E_a(G) \Delta E_a(G')) \cup \bigcup_{i \notin \{a, a-1\}} E_i(G) = \Delta(H, H') \cup \bigcup_{i \notin \{a, a-1\}} E_i(G).$$

This implies $|\Delta(G, G')| \leq |\Delta(H, H')| + p_G + m_G \leq \frac{\delta}{3}n^2 + \frac{\delta}{3}n^2 + \frac{\delta}{3}n^2 = \delta n^2$. \square

6.1 Proof of Theorem 4(b) (Stability)

In this subsection we prove Theorem 4(b) (Stability). We first prove two lemmas.

Lemma 8. *Let $s \geq 4$, $a \geq 2$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$. For all $\lambda > 0$ there are M and $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. Then $k(G) < \lambda n$, where $k(G)$ is as defined in Lemma 5.*

Proof. Fix $\lambda > 0$. Set $\eta = a^{\frac{s-t-1}{s-t}}(a-1)^{\frac{1}{s-t}}$ and choose C and α as in Lemma 5. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\alpha^{\lambda/2} = \eta^{-\epsilon}$. By Theorem 4(b) (Extremal), $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \eta^{\binom{n}{2} + o(n^2)}$. Assume M sufficiently large so that for all $n \geq M$, (4) holds for all $G \in F(n, s, q)$, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) < \eta^{n^2}$, $C^{\lambda n} \leq \eta^{\epsilon n^2}$, and $C\alpha^n < 1$. Fix $n \geq M$ and suppose towards a contradiction that $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$ and $k(G) \geq \lambda n$. By Lemma 5 and the facts that $C\alpha^n < 1$ and $k(G) \geq 1$, we obtain that

$$P(G) \leq C^{k(G)} \alpha^{nk(G)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = (C\alpha^n)^{k(G)} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \leq (C\alpha^n)^{\lambda n} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q).$$

By assumption on n and definition of ϵ , $(C\alpha^n)^{\epsilon n} = C^{\lambda n} \alpha^{\lambda n^2} = C^{\lambda n} \eta^{-2\epsilon n^2} \leq \eta^{-\epsilon n^2}$. Thus

$$P(G) \leq \eta^{-\epsilon n^2} \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) < \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon},$$

where the last inequality is because by assumption, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) < \eta^{n^2}$. But this contradicts our assumption that $P(G) > \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. \square

Given a multigraph $G = (V, w)$, let $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q) = \{Y \in \binom{V}{s} : S(Y) > q\}$. Observe that G is an (s, q) -graph if and only if $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q) = \emptyset$.

Lemma 9. *Let $s, q, m \geq 2$ be integers. For all $0 < \delta < 1$, there is $0 < \lambda < 1$ and N such that $n > N$ implies the following. If $G = ([n], w)$ has $\mu(G) \leq m$ and $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)$ contains strictly less than $\lceil \lambda n \rceil$ pairwise disjoint elements, then G is δ -close to an element in $F(n, s, q)$.*

Proof. Fix $0 < \delta < 1$. Observe we can view any multigraph G with $\mu(G) \leq m$ as an edge-colored graph with colors in $\{0, \dots, m\}$. By Theorem 1, there is ϵ and M such that if $n > M$ and $G = ([n], w)$ has $\mu(G) \leq m$ and $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q) \leq \epsilon \binom{[n]}{s}$, then G is δ -close to an element of $F(n, s, q)$. Let $\lambda := \epsilon/s$ and $N = \max\{M, \frac{s}{1-\lambda s}\}$. We claim this λ and N satisfy the desired conclusions. Suppose towards a contradiction that $n > M$ and $G = ([n], w)$ has $\mu(G) \leq m$, $\mathcal{H}(n, s, q)$ contains

strictly less than $\lceil \lambda n \rceil$ pairwise disjoint elements, but G is δ -far from every element in $F(n, s, q)$. Then $\mathcal{H}(G, s, q) > \epsilon \binom{n}{s}$ by choice of M and λ . By our choice of N , $\lceil \lambda n \rceil s \leq (\lambda n + 1)s \leq n$. Then Proposition 11.6 in [11] and our assumptions imply $|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq (\lceil \lambda n \rceil - 1) \binom{n-1}{s-1}$. But now

$$|\mathcal{H}(G, s, q)| \leq (\lceil \lambda n \rceil - 1) \binom{n-1}{s-1} < \lambda n \binom{n-1}{s-1} = \left(\frac{\epsilon n}{s}\right) \binom{s}{n} \binom{n}{s} = \epsilon \binom{n}{s},$$

a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 4(b) (Stability). Let $s \geq 4$, $a \geq 2$, and $q = a \binom{s}{2} - t$ for some $2 \leq t \leq \frac{s}{2}$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Let $s' = s - t + 1$ and $q' = a \binom{s'}{2} - 1$. Note Theorem 4 (Extremal) implies that for sufficiently large n , $\mathcal{P}(n, s, q) = \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n)$, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q') = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)$, and $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(s', q') = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(s, q) = \eta$, where $\eta = (a-1) \left(\frac{a}{a-1}\right)^{(s'-2)/(s'-1)}$.

Apply Theorem 4 (a) (Stability) for (s', q') to $\delta/2$ to obtain ϵ_0 . By replacing ϵ_0 if necessary, assume $\epsilon_0 < 4\delta/\log \eta$. Set $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_0 \log \eta / (8 \log q)$ and note $\epsilon_1 < \delta/2$. Apply Lemma 9 to ϵ_1 and $m = q$ to obtain λ such that for large n the following holds. If $G = ([n], w)$ has $\mu(G) \leq q$ and $\mathcal{H}(G, s', q')$ contains strictly less than $\lceil \lambda n \rceil$ pairwise disjoint elements, then G is ϵ_1 -close to an element in $F(n, s', q')$. Finally, apply Lemma 8 for s, q, t to λ to obtain $\epsilon_2 > 0$.

Choose M sufficiently large for the desired applications of Theorems 4(a) (Stability) and 4(b) (Extremal) and Lemmas 8 and 9. Set $\epsilon = \min\{\epsilon_2, \epsilon_0/2\}$. Suppose $n > M$ and $G \in F(n, s, q)$ satisfies $P(G) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon}$. Then Lemma 8 and our choice of ϵ implies $k(G) < \lambda n$. Observe that by the definitions of s', q' ,

$$\left\{ Y \in \binom{[n]}{s-t+1} : S(Y) \geq a \binom{s-t+1}{2} \right\} = \left\{ Y \in \binom{[n]}{s'} : S(Y) \geq q' + 1 \right\} = \mathcal{H}(G, s', q').$$

Thus $k(G) < \lambda n$ means $\mathcal{H}(G, s', q')$ contains strictly less than $\lceil \lambda n \rceil$ pairwise disjoint elements. Lemma 9 then implies G is ϵ_1 -close to some $G' \in F(n, s', q')$. Combining this with the definition of ϵ_1 yields

$$P(G') \geq P(G) q^{-|\Delta(G, G')|} \geq P(G) q^{-\epsilon_1 n^2} = P(G) \eta^{-\epsilon_0 n^2/8} \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \eta^{-(\epsilon_0/2) \binom{n}{2}}. \quad (21)$$

By Proposition 1, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) \binom{n}{2} = \eta \binom{n}{2}$. Combining this with (21) and the definition of ϵ yields

$$P(G') \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon} \eta^{-(\epsilon_0/2) \binom{n}{2}} \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon-\epsilon_0/2} \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q)^{1-\epsilon_0}. \quad (22)$$

Since $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s, q) = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')$, (22) implies $P(G') \geq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, s', q')^{1-\epsilon_0}$, so Theorem 4(a) (Stability) implies G' is $\delta/2$ -close to some $G'' \in \mathbb{T}_{s'-1, a}(n) = \mathbb{T}_{s-t, a}(n)$. Now we are done, since

$$|\Delta(G, G'')| \leq |\Delta(G, G')| + |\Delta(G', G'')| \leq \epsilon_1 n^2 + \delta n^2/2 \leq \delta n^2.$$

\square

7 Extremal Result for $(n, 4, 9)$ -graphs

In this section we prove Theorems 5. We first prove one of the inequalities needed for Theorem 5.

Lemma 10. *For all $n \geq 4$, $2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9)$.*

Proof. Fix $G = ([n], E)$ an extremal $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graph, and let $G' = ([n], w)$ where $w(xy) = 2$ for all $xy \in E$ and $w(xy) = 1$ for all $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus E$. Suppose $X \in \binom{[n]}{4}$. Since G is $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free, $|E \cap \binom{X}{2}| \leq 3$. Thus $\{w(xy) : xy \in \binom{X}{2}\}$ contains at most 3 elements equal to 2 and the rest equal to 1, so $S(X) \leq 9$. This shows $G' \in F(n, 4, 9)$. Thus $2^{|E|} = 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} = P(G') \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9)$. \square

To prove the reverse inequality, our strategy will be to show that if $G \in F(n, 4, 9)$ has no edges of multiplicity larger than 2, then $P(G) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$ (Theorem 13). We will then show that all product extremal $(4, 9)$ -graphs have no edges of multiplicity larger than 2 (Theorem 14). Theorem 5 will then follow. We begin with a few definitions and lemmas.

Definition 9. Suppose $n \geq 1$. Set $F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9) = \{G \in F(n, 4, 9) : \mu(G) \leq 2\}$ and

$$D(n) = F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9) \cap F(n, 3, 5).$$

Lemma 11. For all $n \geq 4$, if $G = ([n], w) \in D(n)$, then $P(G) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$.

Proof. If $P(G) = 0$ we are done, so assume $P(G) > 0$. Let $H = ([n], E)$ be the graph where $E = \{xy \in \binom{[n]}{2} : w(xy) = 2\}$. Since $P(G) > 0$ and $\mu(G) \leq 2$, G contains all edges of multiplicity 1 or 2. Consequently, $P(G) = 2^{|E|}$. Since $G \in F(n, 3, 5)$, H is C_3 -free and since $G \in F(n, 4, 9)$, H is C_4 -free, so $|E| \leq \text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})$. This shows $P(G) = 2^{|E|} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. \square

The following lemma gives us useful information about elements of $F(n, 4, 9) \setminus F(n, 3, 5)$.

Lemma 12. Suppose $n \geq 4$ and $G = ([n], w) \in F(n, 4, 9)$ satisfies $P(G) > 0$. If there is $X \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ such that $S(X) \geq 6$, then $P(X) \leq 2^3$ and $w(xy) = 1$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in [n] \setminus X$. Consequently

$$P(G) = P(X)P([n] \setminus X) \leq 2^3 P([n] \setminus X).$$

Proof. Let $y \in [n] \setminus X$. Since $P(G) > 0$, every edge in G has multiplicity at least 1, so $S_y(X) \geq 3$. Thus

$$3 + S(X) \leq S_y(X) + S(X) = S(X \cup \{y\}) \leq 9,$$

which implies $S(X) \leq 6$. By Lemma 2, this implies $P(X) \leq 2^3$. By assumption, $S(X) \geq 6$, so we have $6 + S_y(X) \leq S(X) + S_y(X) = S(X \cup \{y\}) \leq 9$, which implies $S_y(X) \leq 3$. Since every edge in G has multiplicity at least 1 and $|X| = 3$, we must have $w(yx) = 1$ for all $x \in X$. Therefore $P(G) = P([n] \setminus X)P(X) \leq P([n] \setminus X)2^3$. \square

Fact 1. For all $n \geq 4$ and $1 \leq i < n$, $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\}) \geq \text{ex}(n - i, \{C_3, C_4\}) + i$.

Proof. Suppose $n \geq 4$ and $1 \leq i < n$. Fix $G = ([n - i], E)$ an extremal $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graph. Let $G' = ([n], E')$ where $E' = E \cup \{n1, (n - 1)1, \dots, (n - i + 1)1\}$. Then G' is $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free graph because $G = G'[n - i]$ is $\{C_3, C_4\}$ -free and because the elements of $[n] \setminus [n - i]$ all have degree 1 in G' . Therefore $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\}) \geq \text{ex}(n - i, \{C_3, C_4\}) + |E' \setminus E| = \text{ex}(n - i, \{C_3, C_4\}) + i$. \square

We now prove Theorem 13. We will use that $\text{ex}(4, \{C_3, C_4\}) = 3$, $\text{ex}(5, \{C_3, C_4\}) = 5$, and $\text{ex}(6, \{C_3, C_4\}) = 6$ (see [10]).

Theorem 13. For all $n \geq 4$ and $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$, $P(G) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . Assume first $4 \leq n \leq 6$ and $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$. If $P(G) = 0$ then we are done. If $G \in D(n)$, then we are done by Lemma 11. So assume $P(G) > 0$ and $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9) \setminus D(n)$. By definition of $D(n)$ this means $G \notin F(n, 3, 5)$, so there is $X \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ such that $S(X) \geq 6$. By Lemma 12, this implies $P(G) \leq P([n] \setminus X)2^3 \leq 2^{\binom{n-3}{2}+3}$, where the second inequality is because $\mu(G) \leq 2$. The explicit values for $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})$ show that for $n \in \{4, 5, 6\}$, $2^{\binom{n-3}{2}+3} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. Consequently, $P(G) \leq 2^{\binom{n-3}{2}+3} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$.

Suppose now $n \geq 7$ and assume by induction that for all $4 \leq n' < n$ and $G' \in F_{\leq 2}(n', 4, 9)$, $P(G') \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n', 4, 9)}$. Fix $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$. If $P(G) = 0$ then we are done. If $G \in D(n)$, then we are done by Lemma 11. So assume $P(G) > 0$ and $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9) \setminus D(n)$. By definition of $D(n)$ this means $G \notin F(n, 3, 5)$, so there is $X \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ such that $S(X) \geq 6$. By Lemma 12, this implies $P(G) \leq P([n] \setminus X)2^3$. Clearly there is $H \in F_{\leq 2}(n-3, 4, 9)$ such that $G[[n] \setminus X] \cong H$. By our induction hypothesis applied to H , $P([n] \setminus X) = P(H) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n-3, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. Therefore

$$P(G) \leq P([n] \setminus X)2^3 \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n-3, \{C_3, C_4\})+3} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})},$$

where the last inequality is by Fact 1 with $i = 3$. □

We will use the following lemma to prove Theorem 14. Observe for all $n \geq 2$, $\text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9) > 0$ implies that for all $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9)$, every edge in G has multiplicity at least 1. We will write xyz to denote the three element set $\{x, y, z\}$.

Lemma 13. *Suppose $n \geq 4$ and $G = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9)$ satisfies $\mu(G) \geq 3$. Then one of the following hold.*

- (i) *There is $xyz \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ such that $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xyz]) \leq 2$ and $P(G) \leq 6 \cdot P([n] \setminus xyz)$.*
- (ii) *There is $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ such that $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xy]) \leq 2$ and $P(G) \leq 3 \cdot P([n] \setminus xy)$.*

Proof. Suppose $n \geq 4$ and $G = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9)$ is such that $\mu(G) \geq 3$. Fix $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ such that $w(xy) = \mu(G)$. We begin by proving some preliminaries about G and xy . We first show $w(xy) = 3$. By assumption, $w(xy) \geq 3$. Suppose towards a contradiction $w(xy) \geq 4$. Choose some $u \neq v \in [n] \setminus xy$. Since every edge in G has multiplicity at least 1, $5 + w(xy) \leq S(\{x, y, u, v\}) \leq 9$. This implies $w(xy) \leq 9 - 5 = 4$, and consequently $w(xy) = 4$. Combining this with the fact that every edge has multiplicity at least 1, we have

$$9 \leq 4 + w(uv) + w(ux) + w(vx) + w(yu) + w(yv) = S(\{x, y, u, v\}) \leq 9.$$

Consequently, $w(uv) = w(ux) = w(vx) = w(yu) = w(yv) = 1$. Since this holds for all pairs $uv \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus xy$, we have shown $P(G) = w(xy) = 4$. Because $n \geq 4$, Fact 1 implies

$$2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} \geq 2^{\text{ex}(4, \{C_3, C_4\})} = 2^3 > 4 = P(G).$$

Combining this with Lemma 10 shows $P(G) < 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 5)$, a contradiction. Thus $\mu(G) = w(xy) = 3$. We now show that for all $uv \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus xy$, $w(uv) \leq 2$. Fix $uv \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus xy$ and suppose towards a contradiction $w(uv) \geq 3$. Choose some $X \in \binom{[n]}{4}$ containing $\{x, y, u, v\}$. Because every edge in G has multiplicity at least 1, we have that $S(X) \geq w(uv) + w(xy) + 4 \geq 10$, a contradiction. Thus $w(uv) \leq 2$ for all $uv \in \binom{[n]}{2} \setminus xy$. We now show that for all $z \in [n] \setminus xy$, at most one of $w(xz)$ or $w(yz)$ is equal to 2. Suppose towards a contradiction there is $z \in [n] \setminus xy$ such that $w(xz) = w(yz) = 2$. Note $S(xyz) \geq 7$. So for each $z' \in [n] \setminus xyz$, $S_{z'}(xyz) \leq 9 - S(xyz) = 9 - 7 = 2$.

But since every edge has multiplicity at least 1 this is impossible. Thus for all $z \in [n] \setminus xy$, at most one of $w(xz)$ or $w(yz)$ is equal to 2.

We now prove either (i) or (ii) holds. Suppose there is $z \in [n] \setminus xy$ such that one of $w(xz)$ or $w(yz)$ is equal to 2. Then by what we have shown, $\{w(xy), w(xz), w(yz)\} = \{3, 1, 2\}$, and consequently $P(xyz) = 6$. By Lemma 12, since $S(xyz) \geq 6$, we have that

$$P(G) = P(xyz)P([n] \setminus xyz) = 6 \cdot P([n] \setminus xyz).$$

By the preceding arguments, $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xyz]) \leq 2$. Thus (i) holds. Suppose now that for all $z \in [n] \setminus xy$, $w(xz) = w(yz) = 1$. Then $P(G) = w(xy)P([n] \setminus xy) = 3 \cdot P([n] \setminus xy)$. By the preceding arguments, $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xy]) \leq 2$. Thus (ii) holds. \square

Theorem 14. *For all $n \geq 4$, $\mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9) \subseteq F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$.*

Proof. Fix $n \geq 4$ and $G = ([n], w) \in \mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9)$. Suppose towards a contradiction $G \notin F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$. We show $P(G) < 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$, contradicting that G is product-extremal (since by Lemma 10, $2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} \leq \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9)$).

Since $G \notin F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$, either (i) or (ii) of Lemma 13 holds. If (i) holds, choose $xyz \in \binom{[n]}{3}$ with $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xyz]) \leq 2$ and $P(G) \leq 6 \cdot P([n] \setminus xyz)$. Let $H \in F_{\leq 2}(n-2, 4, 9)$ be such that $G[[n] \setminus xyz] \cong H$. If $n \in \{4, 5, 6\}$, then $P(G) \leq 6 \cdot P(H) \leq 6 \cdot 2^{\binom{n-3}{2}} < 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$, where the second inequality is because $\mu(H) \leq 2$, and the strict inequality is from the exact values for $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})$ for $n \in \{4, 5, 6\}$. If $n \geq 7$, then by Lemma 13 and because $n-3 \geq 4$, $P(H) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n-3, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. Therefore,

$$P(G) \leq 6 \cdot P(H) \leq 6 \cdot 2^{\text{ex}(n-3, \{C_3, C_4\})} < 2^{\text{ex}(n-3, \{C_3, C_4\})+3} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})},$$

where the last inequality is by Fact 1. If (ii) holds, choose $xy \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ with $\mu(G[[n] \setminus xy]) \leq 2$ and $P(G) \leq 3 \cdot P([n] \setminus xy)$. Let $H \in F_{\leq 2}(n-2, 4, 9)$ be such that $G[[n] \setminus xy] \cong H$. If $n \in \{4, 5\}$, then $P(G) \leq 3 \cdot P(H) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{\binom{n-2}{2}} < 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$, where the second inequality is because $\mu(H) \leq 2$, and the strict inequality is from the exact values for $\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})$ for $n \in \{4, 5\}$. If $n \geq 6$, then $n-2 \geq 4$ and Lemma 13 imply $P(H) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n-2, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. Therefore,

$$P(G) \leq 3 \cdot P([n] \setminus xy) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{\text{ex}(n-2, \{C_3, C_4\})} < 2^{\text{ex}(n-2, \{C_3, C_4\})+2} \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})},$$

where the last inequality is by Fact 1. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. Fix $n \geq 4$ and $G \in \mathcal{P}(n, 4, 9)$. By Theorem 14, $G \in F_{\leq 2}(n, 4, 9)$. By Theorem 13, this implies $P(G) \leq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. By Lemma 10, $P(G) \geq 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})}$. Consequently, $P(G) = 2^{\text{ex}(n, \{C_3, C_4\})} = \text{ex}_{\Pi}(n, 4, 9)$. \square

References

- [1] József Balogh, Robert Morris, and Wojciech Samotij, *Independent sets in hypergraphs*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 3, 669–709. MR 3327533
- [2] J. A. Bondy and Zs. Tuza, *A weighted generalization of Turán's theorem*, J. Graph Theory **25** (1997), no. 4, 267–275. MR 1459892 (99c:05097)
- [3] G. Dirac, *Extensions of turán's theorem on graphs*, Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica **14** (1963), no. 3, 417–422.

- [4] P. Erdős, *Some recent results on extremal problems in graph theory. Results*, Theory of Graphs (Internat. Sympos., Rome, 1966), Gordon and Breach, New York; Dunod, Paris, 1967, pp. 117–123 (English); pp. 124–130 (French). MR 0227049
- [5] ———, *On some new inequalities concerning extremal properties of graphs*, Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 77–81. MR 0232703
- [6] Paul Erdős, Daniel J. Kleitman, and Bruce L. Rothschild, *Asymptotic enumeration of K_n -free graphs*, Colloquio Internazionale sulle Teorie Combinatorie (Rome, 1973), Tomo II, Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rome, 1976, pp. 19–27. Atti dei Convegni Lincei, No. 17. MR 0463020 (57 #2984)
- [7] V. Falgas-Ravry, O’Connell K., Strmberg J., and Uzzell A., *Multicolour containers and the entropy of decorated graph limits*, arXiv:1607.08152 [math.CO], 2016.
- [8] Zoltán Füredi and André Kündgen, *Turán problems for integer-weighted graphs*, J. Graph Theory **40** (2002), no. 4, 195–225. MR 1913847 (2003g:05075)
- [9] ———, *Turán problems for integer-weighted graphs*, J. Graph Theory **40** (2002), no. 4, 195–225. MR 1913847 (2003g:05075)
- [10] David K. Garnick, Y. H. Harris Kwong, and Felix Lazebnik, *Extremal graphs without three-cycles or four-cycles*, Journal of Graph Theory **17** (1993), no. 5, 633–645.
- [11] R. L. Graham, M. Grötschel, and L. Lovász (eds.), *Handbook of combinatorics. Vol. 1, 2*, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam; MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995. MR 1373655
- [12] Daniel J. Kleitman and Kenneth J. Winston, *On the number of graphs without 4-cycles*, Discrete Math. **41** (1982), no. 2, 167–172. MR 676877
- [13] J.A. Kuchenbrod, *Extremal problems on weighted graphs*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Kentucky, 1999.
- [14] D. Mubayi and C. Terry, *An extremal graph problem with a transcendental solution*, arXiv:1607.07742, 2016.
- [15] David Saxton and Andrew Thomason, *Hypergraph containers*, Inventiones mathematicae **201** (2015), no. 3, 925–992 (English).
- [16] M. Simonovits, *A method for solving extremal problems in graph theory, stability problems*, Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 279–319. MR 0233735