

# A note on extremal constructions for the Erdős–Rademacher problem

Xizhi Liu\* and Oleg Pikhurko†

Mathematics Institute and DIMAP,  
University of Warwick,  
Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

December 1, 2023

## Abstract

For given positive integers  $r \geq 3$ ,  $n$  and  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , the famous Erdős–Rademacher problem asks for the minimum number of  $r$ -cliques in a graph with  $n$  vertices and  $e$  edges. A conjecture of Lovász and Simonovits from the 1970s states that, for every  $r \geq 3$ , if  $n$  is sufficiently large then, for every  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , at least one extremal graph can be obtained from a complete partite graph by adding a triangle-free graph into one part.

In this note, we explicitly write the minimum number of  $r$ -cliques predicted by the above conjecture. Also, we describe what we believe to be the set of extremal graphs for any  $r \geq 4$  and all large  $n$ , amending the previous conjecture of Pikhurko and Razborov.

**Keywords:** Erdős–Rademacher problem, Lovász–Simonovits conjecture, Clique density theorem.

## 1 Introduction

Given integers  $n \geq r \geq 2$ , let  $T_r(n)$  denote the balanced complete  $r$ -partite graph on  $n$  vertices, and let  $t_r(n)$  denote the number of edges in  $T_r(n)$ . The celebrated Turán Theorem [24] (with the case  $r = 3$  proved earlier by Mantel [13]) states that, for  $n \geq r \geq 3$ , every  $n$ -vertex graph with at least  $t_{r-1}(n) + 1$  edges contains a copy of an  $r$ -clique  $K_r$ , that is, a complete graph on  $r$  vertices. An unpublished result of Rademacher from 1941 (see [3]) states that, in fact, every  $n$ -vertex graph with  $t_2(n) + 1$  edges contains at least  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  copies of  $K_3$ . The graph obtained from  $T_2(n)$  by adding one edge to the larger part shows that the bound  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  is tight. Rademacher’s theorem motivated Erdős [3] to consider the following more general question, now referred to as the *Erdős–Rademacher problem*: determine

$$g_r(n, e) := \min \left\{ N(K_r, G) : G \text{ is an } (n, e)\text{-graph} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

---

\*Research was supported by ERC Advanced Grant 101020255 and Leverhulme Research Project Grant RPG-2018-424. Email: [xizhi.liu.ac@gmail.com](mailto:xizhi.liu.ac@gmail.com)

†Research was supported by ERC Advanced Grant 101020255 and Leverhulme Research Project Grant RPG-2018-424. Email: [o.pikhurko@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:o.pikhurko@warwick.ac.uk)

where an  $(n, e)$ -graph means a graph with  $n$  vertices and  $e$  edges and  $N(K_r, G)$  denotes the number of  $r$ -cliques in  $G$ .

This problem has attracted a lot of attention and has been actively studied since it first appeared. Various results covering special ranges of  $(n, e)$  were obtained (see e.g. [7, 4, 14, 20, 2, 11, 18, 19, 5, 6]) until Razborov [22] determined the asymptotic value of  $g_3(n, e)$  using flag algebras. Later, using different methods, Nikiforov [17] determined the asymptotic value of  $g_r(n, e)$  for  $r = 4$  and Reiher [23] did this for all  $r \geq 5$ . For some further related results, we refer the reader to [15, 16, 21, 8, 25, 10, 1].

Determining the exact value of  $g_r(n, e)$  seems very challenging due to multiple (conjectured) extremal constructions. Given  $n$  and  $e$  in  $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$  with  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , let

$$k = k(n, e) := \min \{s \in \mathbb{N} : t_s(n) \geq e\}, \quad (2)$$

that is,  $k$  is the smallest chromatic number that an  $(n, e)$ -graph can have. Let  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$ ) denote the family of  $(n, e)$ -graphs that can be obtained from a complete  $(k - 1)$ -partite (resp. complete multipartite) graph by adding a triangle-free graph into one part. Note that the only difference between these two definitions is that we restrict the number of parts to  $k - 1$  when defining  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$ ; thus  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(n, e)$ . Lovász and Simonovits [11] conjectured that for every integer  $r \geq 3$  there exists  $n_0$  such that, for all positive integers  $n \geq n_0$  and  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , it holds that

$$g_r(n, e) = \min \left\{ N(K_r, H) : H \in \mathcal{K}(n, e) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

that is, at least one  $g_r(n, e)$ -extremal graph is in  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$ . Note that (3) trivially holds for  $e \leq t_{r-1}(n)$  when  $g_r(n, e) = 0$ .

Erdős in [3] (resp. [4]) showed that (3) is true for  $r = 3$  when  $e \leq t_2(n) + 3$  (resp.  $e \leq t_2(n) + cn$  for some constant  $c > 0$ ). Lovász and Simonovits [11] (see also Nikiforov and Khadzhivanov [19]) extended the result of Erdős to all  $e$  satisfying  $e \leq t_2(n) + \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ . Later, Lovász and Simonovits [12] proved (3) for  $r \geq 3$  when  $e/\binom{n}{2}$  lies in a small upper neighborhood of  $1 - 1/m$  for some integer  $m \geq r - 1$ . More recently, Liu, Pikhurko and Staden [9] determined  $g_3(n, e)$  for all positive integers  $n$  when  $e \leq (1 - o(1))\binom{n}{2}$ . Determining the exact value of  $g_r(n, e)$  for  $r \geq 4$  is still wide open in general.

Given  $n, e \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , let  $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a}^*(n, e) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  be the unique vector such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_k^* &:= \min \{a \in \mathbb{N} : a(n - a) + t_{k-1}(n - a) \geq e\}, \\ a_1^* + \dots + a_{k-1}^* &= n - a_k^*, \quad \text{and} \quad a_1^* \geq \dots \geq a_{k-1}^* \geq a_1^* - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k = k(n, e)$  is as defined in (2). Thus  $a_k^*$  is the smallest possible part size that a  $k$ -partite  $(n, e)$ -graph can have. Also, let

$$\begin{aligned} m^* = m^*(n, e) &:= \sum_{\{i, j\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}} a_i^* a_j^* - e, \quad \text{and} \\ h_r^*(n, e) &:= \sum_{I \in \binom{[k]}{r}} \prod_{i \in I} a_i^* - m^* \cdot \sum_{I' \in \binom{[k-2]}{r-2}} \prod_{j \in I'} a_j^*, \end{aligned}$$

where  $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $T := K[A_1^*, \dots, A_k^*]$  be the complete  $k$ -partite graph with parts  $A_1^*, \dots, A_k^*$  where  $|A_i^*| = a_i^*$  for  $i \in [k]$ . Let  $H^* = H^*(n, e)$  be the graph obtained from  $T$  by removing an  $m^*$ -edge star whose centre lies in  $A_k^*$  and whose leaves lie in  $A_{k-1}^*$ . It is not hard to see (see e.g. the calculation in (10)) that  $0 \leq m^* \leq a_{k-1}^* - a_k^*$ , so the graph

$H^*$  is well-defined. Also, let  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  be the family defined as follows: If  $m^* = 0$ , take all graphs obtained from  $T$  by replacing, for some  $i \in [k-1]$ , the bipartite graph  $T[A_i^* \cup A_k^*]$  with an arbitrary triangle-free graph with  $a_i^* a_k^*$  edges. If  $m^* > 0$ , take all graphs obtained from  $T$  by replacing  $T[A_{k-1}^* \cup A_k^*]$  with an arbitrary triangle-free graph with  $a_{k-1}^* a_k^* - m^*$  edges. Observe that  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$  and every graph in  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  has the same number of  $r$ -cliques (see Fact 2.2); also, the graph  $H^* = H^*(n, e)$  is contained in  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ .

Sharpening the Lovász–Simonovits Conjecture, Pikhurko and Razborov [21, Conjecture 1.4] conjectured that, for  $r \geq 4$  and sufficiently large  $n$ , every  $n$ -vertex graph with  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  edges and that contains the minimum number of  $K_r$  is in  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$ . However, we show here that this conjecture is false and present an amended version as follows.

First, we write explicitly the value of  $g_r(n, e)$  predicted by the Lovász–Simonovits Conjecture. (We also refer the reader to [9, Proposition 1.5] where similar results are proved for  $r = 3$ .)

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that  $r, n, e \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $n \geq r \geq 3$  and  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ . Then*

$$\min \left\{ N(K_r, G) : G \in \mathcal{K}(n, e) \right\} = h_r^*(n, e). \quad (4)$$

Moreover, if  $r \geq 4$  and  $e > t_{r-1}(n)$ , then

$$\left\{ G \in \mathcal{K}(n, e) : N(K_r, G) = h_r^*(n, e) \right\} = \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e). \quad (5)$$

Note that, since  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$ , Theorem 1.1 remains true if we replace  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$  by  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$ . In fact, the later version of the Lovász–Simonovits Conjecture from [12] states that, for all sufficiently large  $n \geq n_0(r)$ , at least one  $g_r(n, e)$ -extremal graph is in  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e)$ . By (4), these two conjectures are equivalent. One should be able to show with some extra work that (5) also holds for  $r = 3$ . Since our main focus is the case  $r \geq 4$ , we do not pursue this strengthening here.

Given integers  $n, e \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , we define the family  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$  as follows (with  $k, \mathbf{a}^*, m^*$  being as before). Take those graphs in  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  that are  $k$ -partite, along with the following family. Take disjoint sets  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  of sizes  $a_1^*, \dots, a_k^*$ , respectively, and let  $m := m^*$ . If  $m^* = 0$  and  $a_1^* \geq a_k^* + 2$ , then we also allow  $(|A_1|, \dots, |A_k|) = (a_2^*, \dots, a_{k-1}^*, a_1^* - 1, a_k^* + 1)$  and let  $m := a_1^* - a_k^* - 1$ . Take all graphs obtained from  $K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$  by removing  $m$  edges, each connecting  $B_i$  to  $A_i$  for some  $i \in I$ , where  $I := \{i \in [k-1] : |A_i| = |A_{k-1}|\}$  and  $\{B_i : i \in I\}$  are some pairwise disjoint subsets of  $A_k$ . Clearly, every graph in  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$  is an  $(n, e)$ -graph.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Suppose that  $n \geq r \geq 4$  and  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  are integers. Then*

$$N(K_r, G) = h_r^*(n, e), \quad \text{for every } G \in \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e).$$

Also, there are infinitely many pairs  $(n, e) \in \mathbb{N}^2$  with  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  such that  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e) \setminus \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \neq \emptyset$ .

We propose the following amended conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.3.** *Let  $r \geq 4$ . For every sufficiently large integer  $n$  and every integer  $e$  with  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , it holds that*

$$\left\{ G : G \text{ is an } (n, e)\text{-graph with } N(K_r, G) = g_r(n, e) \right\} = \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \cup \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e).$$

For comparison with the case  $r = 3$ , the exact result of Liu, Pikhurko and Staden [9] valid for  $e \leq (1 - o(1))\binom{n}{2}$  states that the set of  $g_3(n, e)$ -extremal graphs is exactly  $\mathcal{H}_0^*(n, e) \cup \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$  for a certain explicit family  $\mathcal{H}_0^*(n, e) \supseteq \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ , where the inclusion is strict for infinitely many pairs  $(n, e)$ . However, for  $r \geq 4$  and  $e > t_{r-1}(n)$ , every graph in  $\mathcal{H}_0^*(n, e) \setminus \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  can be shown to have more  $K_r$ 's than  $H^*(n, e)$ . (Basically, each such graph is obtained from a complete  $(k-1)$ -partite graph by adding edges into more than one parts and cannot minimise the number of  $K_r$ 's for  $r \geq 4$  by Lemma 2.5.)

For the purposes of this paper (namely for Proposition 1.2), only the difference  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e) \setminus \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  matters; we use the current definitions merely so that the families  $\mathcal{H}_i^*(n, e)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_i(n, e)$  are the same as in [9].

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we present some definitions and preliminary results. As a step towards proving Theorem 1.1, we first find extremal graphs in a certain family  $\mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$  in Section 3 (see Proposition 3.1 for the exact statement). We derive Theorem 1.1 in Section 4. The proof of Proposition 1.2 is presented in Section 5.

## 2 Preliminaries

Given  $\ell$  pairwise disjoint sets  $A_1, \dots, A_\ell$ , we use  $K[A_1, \dots, A_\ell]$  to denote the complete  $\ell$ -partite graph with parts  $A_1, \dots, A_\ell$ ; if we care only about the isomorphism type of this graph (i.e. only the sizes of the parts matter), we may instead write  $K_{a_1, \dots, a_\ell}$ , where  $a_i := |A_i|$  for  $i \in [\ell]$ .

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. By  $|G|$  we denote the number of edges in  $G$ . Let  $\overline{G} := \left(V, \binom{V}{2} \setminus E\right)$  denote the *complement* of  $G$ . The subgraph of  $G$  *induced* by a set  $A \subseteq V$  is  $G[A] := \left(A, \binom{A}{2} \cap E\right)$ . For disjoint  $A, B \subseteq V$ , we use  $G[A, B]$  to denote the induced bipartite graph with parts  $A$  and  $B$  (which consists of edges connecting  $A$  to  $B$ ).

In the remainder of this note, we assume unless it is stated otherwise that  $r, n, e \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $r \geq 3$  and  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  (and we minimise the number of  $r$ -cliques over  $(n, e)$ -graphs). Also,  $k = k(n, e)$  is defined in (2).

Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $(n, e)$ -graphs, we use  $\mathcal{F}^{\min}$  to denote the collection of graphs  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with the minimum number of  $K_r$ 's (over all graphs in  $\mathcal{F}$ ). For convenience, we set  $N(K_0, G) := 1$  and  $N(K_{-1}, G) := 0$  for all graphs  $G$ .

Let the family  $\mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$  be the collection of all  $(n, e)$ -graphs that can be obtained from an  $n$ -vertex complete  $(k-1)$ -partite graph by adding a (possibly empty) triangle-free graph into each part. It is clear from the definition that  $\mathcal{H}_1(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ .

The following fact follows from some simple calculations (with the argument for Part (i) being the same as in (10)).

**Fact 2.1.** *Let  $k, \mathbf{a}^*, m^*, H^*$ , and  $h_r^*(n, e)$  be as defined in Section 1. Then it holds for all  $r \geq 3$  that*

- (i)  $0 \leq m^* \leq a_{k-1}^* - a_k^*$ ,
- (ii)  $|K_{a_1^*, \dots, a_k^*}| - |K_{a_1^*, \dots, a_{k-2}^*, a_{k-1}^*+1, a_k^*-1}| = a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* + 1$ ,
- (iii)  $N(K_r, H^*) = h_r^*(n, e) \geq g_r(n, e)$ .

We also need the following simple facts for counting  $r$ -cliques in some special classes of graphs.

**Fact 2.2.** *Let  $G$  be a graph,  $S \subseteq V(G)$  be a vertex set, and  $\overline{S} := V(G) \setminus S$ . Suppose that the induced subgraph  $G[S]$  is triangle-free, and the induced bipartite graph  $G[S, \overline{S}]$  is complete. Then*

$$N(K_r, G) = |G[S]| \cdot N(K_{r-2}, G[\overline{S}]) + |S| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, G[\overline{S}]) + N(K_r, G[\overline{S}]).$$

**Fact 2.3.** *Suppose that  $G$  is a graph obtained from  $K[V_1, \dots, V_\ell]$  by adding a triangle-free graph. Let  $S := V_1 \cup V_2$  and  $\overline{S} := V(G) \setminus S$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} N(K_r, G) &= |G[V_1]| \cdot |G[V_2]| \cdot N(K_{r-4}, G[\overline{S}]) \\ &\quad + (|G[V_1]| \cdot |V_2| + |G[V_2]| \cdot |V_1|) \cdot N(K_{r-3}, G[\overline{S}]) \\ &\quad + |G[S]| \cdot N(K_{r-2}, G[\overline{S}]) + |S| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, G[\overline{S}]) + N(K_r, G[\overline{S}]). \end{aligned}$$

**Fact 2.4.** *Let  $G$  be a graph,  $S \subseteq V(G)$ , and  $\overline{S} := V(G) \setminus S$ . Suppose that the induced subgraph  $G[S]$  is 3-partite, and the induced bipartite subgraph  $G[S, \overline{S}]$  is complete. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} N(K_r, G) &= N(K_3, G[S]) \cdot N(K_{r-3}, G[\overline{S}]) + |G[S]| \cdot N(K_{r-2}, G[\overline{S}]) \\ &\quad + |S| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, G[\overline{S}]) + N(K_r, G[\overline{S}]). \end{aligned}$$

We will also use the following results.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $r \geq 4$  and let  $n, e \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ . Suppose that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$  is a graph with a vertex partition  $V(G) = B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_{k-1}$  such that  $G$  is the union of  $K[B_1, \dots, B_{k-1}]$  with a triangle-free graph. Then  $G$  contains at most one part  $B_i$  which is partially full, meaning that  $0 < |G[B_i]| < t_2(|B_i|)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $G$  contains two partially full parts  $B_i$  and  $B_j$  for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq k-1$ . Let  $x := |G[B_i]|$ ,  $\sigma := |G[B_i]| + |G[B_j]|$  and  $H := G[V(G) \setminus (B_i \cup B_j)]$ . Observe from Fact 2.3 that there exist constants  $C_2, C_3, C_4$  depending on  $|B_i|$ ,  $|B_j|$  and  $H$  (but not on  $x$ ) such that

$$N(K_r, G) = N(K_{r-4}, H) \cdot x(\sigma - x) + C_2x + C_3(\sigma - x) + C_4 =: P(x).$$

Let  $G_i$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by moving one edge from  $G[B_j]$  to  $G[B_i]$  and rearranging the latter graph to be still  $K_3$ -free, which is possible by Mantel's theorem. Similarly, let  $G_j$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by moving one edge from  $G[B_i]$  to  $G[B_j]$ . Note that  $N(K_r, G_i) = P(x+1)$  and  $N(K_r, G_j) = P(x-1)$ . Since  $k \geq r$ , we have

$$P(x+1) + P(x-1) - 2P(x) = -2N(K_{r-4}, H) < 0. \quad (6)$$

Thus  $\min\{N(K_r, G_i), N(K_r, G_j)\} < N(K_r, G)$ , contradicting the minimality of  $G$ .  $\blacksquare$

The following simple inequality from [9] will be useful. For completeness, we include its short proof here.

**Lemma 2.6** ([9, Lemma 4.5]). *For all integers  $a \geq 1$ ,  $k \geq 2$ , and  $n \geq ak$ , we have*

$$a(n-a) + t_{k-1}(n-a) > (a-1)(n-a+1) + t_{k-1}(n-a+1). \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* Let  $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_{k-1}$  denote the part sizes of  $T_{k-1}(n-a)$ . If we increase its number of vertices by one, then the part sizes of the new Turán graph, up to reordering, can be obtained by increasing  $a_{k-1}$  by one. Thus the difference between the expressions in (7) is

$$|K_{a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, a}| - |K_{a_1, \dots, a_{k-2}, a_{k-1}+1, a-1}| = a_{k-1}a - (a_{k-1}+1)(a-1) = a_{k-1} - a + 1, \quad (8)$$

which is positive since  $a_{k-1} \geq \lfloor (n-a)/(k-1) \rfloor \geq \lfloor (ak-a)/(k-1) \rfloor = a$ .  $\blacksquare$

### 3 Extremal graphs in $\mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$

As an intermediate step towards Theorem 1.1, we will first prove the following result, which determines the extremal graphs in  $\mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *For all integers  $n \geq r \geq 4$  and  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e) = \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ .*

We will use this result later to prove Theorem 1.1 by induction on the number of parts in a graph in  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$ . Note that, in general, none of  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$  and  $\mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$  is a subfamily of the other. However, when we work on the structure of extremal graphs in  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$  in the proof of Theorem 1.1, some intermediate graphs may be in  $\mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ .

We need some further preliminaries before we can prove Proposition 3.1.

Given a graph  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$  with partition  $B_1, \dots, B_{k-1}$ , we apply the following modification to  $G$  to obtain a new graph  $H' = H'(G) \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$ . Note that, in fact, these steps do not depend on  $r$ .

**Step 1:** If there is a part  $B_i$  that is partially full in  $G$ , then let  $B := B_i$  (by Lemma 2.5, such  $B_i$  is unique if it exists). Otherwise, take an arbitrary  $i \in [k-1]$  with  $|G[B_i]| = t_2(|B_i|)$  and let  $B := B_i$ . Since  $|G| > t_{k-1}(n)$ , the set  $B$  is well-defined.

**Step 2:** Note that  $G - B$  is a complete multipartite graph. Let  $A_1, \dots, A_{t-2}$  denote its parts. Let  $a_i := |A_i|$  for  $i \in [t-2]$  and assume that  $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_{t-2}$ . Note that each original part  $B_\ell$  is either  $B$ , some  $A_i$ , or the union of two parts  $A_i$  and  $A_j$ .

**Step 3:** Choose integers  $a_{t-1} \geq a_t \geq 1$  such that

$$a_{t-1} + a_t = |B| \quad \text{and} \quad (a_{t-1} + 1)(a_t - 1) < |G[B]| \leq a_{t-1}a_t.$$

Note that this is possible by Mantel's theorem since  $G[B]$  is triangle-free. Let  $A_{t-1} \sqcup A_t = B$  be a partition with  $|A_{t-1}| = a_{t-1}$  and  $|A_t| = a_t$ . If  $|G[B]| = t_2(|B|)$ , then  $a_{t-1} = \lceil |B|/2 \rceil$  and  $a_t = \lfloor |B|/2 \rfloor$  and we assume that  $A_{t-1} \sqcup A_t = B$  is the original partition of  $G[B]$  with the two parts labelled so that  $|A_{t-1}| \geq |A_t|$ .

**Step 4:** Let  $H'$  be obtained from  $K[A_1, \dots, A_t]$  by removing a star whose centre lies in  $A_t$  and  $m'$  leaves lie in  $A_{t-1}$ , where

$$m' := \sum_{ij \in \binom{[t]}{2}} a_i a_j - e = a_{t-1}a_t - |G[B]|. \quad (9)$$

This is possible because, by Step 3,

$$0 \leq m' = a_{t-1}a_t - |G[B]| \leq a_{t-1}a_t - ((a_{t-1} + 1)(a_t - 1) + 1) = a_{t-1} - a_t. \quad (10)$$

Notice that to obtain  $H'$  we only change the structure of  $G$  on  $B$  while keeping  $|G[B]| = |H'[B]|$ . Thus  $H' \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$  and, since  $G[B, V(G) \setminus B]$  is a complete bipartite and  $G[B]$  is triangle-free, it follows from Fact 2.2 that  $N(K_r, H') = N(K_r, G)$ , and hence,  $H' \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *For all  $r \geq 3$ , integers  $n$  and  $e$  with  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  and  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$ , the graph  $H'$  produced by Steps 1–4 above is isomorphic to  $H^*(n, e)$ .*

*Proof.* To prove that  $H' \cong H^*(n, e)$ , it suffices to show that  $t = k$  and  $(|A_1|, \dots, |A_t|) = \mathbf{a}^*$ , where  $k$  and  $\mathbf{a}^*$  are as defined in Section 1.

**Claim 3.3.** *If  $m' = 0$ , then  $|H'[A_h \cup A_i \cup A_j]| > t_2(a_h + a_i + a_j)$  for all  $\{h, i, j\} \in \binom{[t]}{3}$ . If  $m' > 0$ , then  $|H'[A_h \cup A_{t-1} \cup A_t]| > t_2(a_h + a_{t-1} + a_t)$  for all  $h \in [t-2]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S := A_h \cup A_i \cup A_j$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $|H'[W]| \leq t_2(|W|)$ . Then let  $G_1$  be a new graph obtained from  $H'$  by replacing  $H'[W]$  with a bipartite graph of the same size. Note that the induced bipartite graph  $H'[W, \overline{W}]$  is complete. (Indeed, this is trivially true if  $m' = 0$  as then  $H' = K[A_1, \dots, A_t]$ ; if  $m' > 0$ , then the only non-complete pair is  $[A_{t-1}, A_t]$ , but both sets lie in  $W$ .) Since  $H'$  is  $t$ -partite, the graph  $G_1$  is  $(t-1)$ -partite (and with at most one non-complete pair of parts). By Steps 2–3, we have  $t \leq 2(k-1)$ . So we can represent  $G_1$  as the union of a complete  $(k-1)$ -partite graph and a triangle-free graph, which implies that  $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ . It is easy to see from Fact 2.4 that  $N(K_r, G_1) \leq N(K_r, H')$ , since  $0 = N(K_3, G_1[W]) \leq N(K_3, H'[W])$ . So it follows from the minimality of  $H'$  that  $N(K_3, H'[W]) = 0$ . If  $\{t-1, t\}$  is not a subset of  $\{h, i, j\}$ , then  $H'[W]$  is a complete 3-partite graph and contains at least one triangle, contradicting  $N(K_3, H'[W]) = 0$ . Therefore,  $\{t-1, t\} \subseteq \{h, i, j\}$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $\{t-1, t\} = \{i, j\}$ . Note that  $|H[A_{t-1}, A_t]| \geq 1$ , since otherwise, we would have  $m' \geq a_{t-1}a_t > a_{t-1} - a_t$ , contradicting (10). Note that each edge in  $H[A_{t-1}, A_t]$  is in  $|A_h|$  triangles in  $H[W]$ , contradicting  $N(K_3, H'[W]) = 0$ . ■

**Claim 3.4.** *If  $m' > 0$ , then  $a_{t-2} \geq a_{t-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $a_{t-2} \leq a_{t-1} - 1$ . Then let  $G_2$  be a new graph obtained from  $H'$  by moving edges from  $[A_{t-2}, A_t]$  to  $[A_{t-1}, A_t]$  until this is no longer possible. Let  $S := A_{t-2} \cup A_{t-1} \cup A_t$ . If  $A_{t-2} \cup A_t$  is an independent set in  $G_2$  (i.e. if  $m' \geq a_{t-2}a_t$ ), then  $|H'[W]| = |G_2[W]| \leq t_2(|W|)$ , contradicting Claim 3.3. Thus  $G_2[W]$  can be viewed as a graph obtained from  $K[A_{t-2}, A_{t-1}, A_t]$  by removing  $m'$  edges from  $K[A_{t-2}, A_t]$ . So  $G_2 \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ . Note that

$$N(K_3, G_2[W]) - N(K_3, H'[W]) = m'(a_{t-2} - a_{t-1}) < 0,$$

which combined with Fact 2.4 implies that  $N(K_r, G_2) - N(K_r, H') < 0$ , contradicting the minimality of  $H'$ . ■

If  $m' > 0$ , let  $C_i := A_i$  for  $i \in [t]$ . If  $m' = 0$ , let  $C_1, \dots, C_t$  be a relabelling of  $A_1, \dots, A_t$  so that the sizes of the sets is non-increasing. Regardless of the value of  $m'$ , the following statements clearly hold:

- (i)  $c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_t$ , where  $c_i := |C_i|$  for  $i \in [t]$ ,
- (ii)  $0 \leq m' \leq c_{t-1} - c_t$ ,
- (iii) Claim 3.3 applies to all triples  $\{C_i, C_{t-1}, C_t\}$  for  $i \in [t-2]$ .

The rest of the proof is written so that it works for both  $m' = 0$  and  $m' > 0$ .

**Claim 3.5.** *We have  $c_1 \leq c_{t-1} + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S := C_1 \cup C_{t-1} \cup C_t$ . Note that

$$|K_{c_1-1, c_{t-1}+1, c_t}| - |H'[S]| = m' - c_{t-1} + c_1 - 1 =: m''.$$

Suppose to the contrary that  $c_1 \geq c_{t-1} + 2$ . Then  $m'' \geq m' + 1$ . Take a partition  $C'_1 \cup C'_{t-1} \cup C'_t = W$  of sizes  $c_1 - 1, c_{t-1} + 1, c_t$ , respectively. Let  $H_S$  be the graph obtained from  $K[C'_1, C'_{t-1}, C'_t]$  by removing  $m''$  edges between  $C'_{t-1}$  and  $C'_t$ . This is possible since  $m'' \leq (c_{t-1} + 1)c_t$ . (Indeed, otherwise  $|H'[S]| \leq (c_1 - 1)(c_{t-1} + c_t + 1) \leq t_2(|S|)$ , contradicting Claim 3.3.) We have  $|H_S| = |H'[S]|$ . Let  $H''$  be the graph obtained from  $H'$  by replacing  $H'[W]$  with  $H_S$ . Note that  $H'' \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ . It follows from  $m' \leq c_{t-1} - c_t$  that

$$\begin{aligned} N(K_3, H'[W]) - N(K_3, H''[W]) &= (c_1 c_{t-1} c_t - m' c_1) \\ &\quad - ((c_1 - 1)(c_{t-1} + 1)c_t - (m' - c_{t-1} + c_1 - 1)(c_1 - 1)) \\ &\geq (c_1 - c_t)(c_1 - c_{t-1} - 2) + 1 \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which combined with Fact 2.4 implies that  $N(K_r, H') - N(K_r, H'') > 0$ , contradicting the minimality of  $H'$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Claim 3.6.** *We have  $t = k$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $t_{t-1}(n) < e \leq t_t(n)$ . The upper bound  $e \leq t_t(n)$  is trivial, since  $H'$  is  $t$ -partite. So it remains to show that  $e > t_{t-1}(n)$ . Let  $T := H'[C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_{t-1}]$ . It follows from Claim 3.5 that  $T \cong T_{t-1}(n - c_t)$ . Therefore,

$$|H'| - t_{t-1}(n - c_t) = |H' \setminus T| = c_t(n - c_t) - m'. \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, by viewing  $T_{t-1}(n)$  as a graph obtained from  $T_{t-1}(n - c_t)$  by adding  $c_t$  new vertices into some parts, we obtain

$$t_{t-1}(n) - t_{t-1}(n - c_t) \leq c_t(n - c_{t-1} - 1).$$

By combining these two inequalities, we obtain

$$|H'| - t_{t-1}(n) \geq c_t(c_{t-1} + 1 - c_t) - m' \geq (c_t - 1)(c_{t-1} - c_t) + c_t > 0,$$

proving that  $e > t_{t-1}(n)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Claim 3.7.** *The sequence  $(|C_1|, \dots, |C_k|)$  of part sizes is equal to  $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a}^*(n, e)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $t = k$  and, by (11), we have that

$$|H'| - t_{k-1}(n - c_k) = c_k(n - c_k) - m' \leq c_k(n - c_k). \quad (12)$$

Let us show that  $c_k$  is the smallest nonnegative integer  $a$  satisfying

$$f(a) := a(n - a) + t_{k-1}(n - a) \geq e.$$

This inequality holds for  $a = c_k$  by (12). Note that  $c_k \leq n/k$  as it is the smallest among  $c_1 + \dots + c_k = n$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.6, it is enough to check that  $a = c_k - 1$  violates this condition. Notice that

$$f(c_k - 1) - f(c_k) \leq 2c_k - n - 1 + (n - c_k - c_{k-1}) = c_k - c_{k-1} - 1.$$

Therefore, it follows from  $m' \leq c_{k-1} - c_k$  that

$$f(c_k - 1) \leq f(c_k) - (m' + 1) \leq |H'| + m' - (m' + 1) < |H'|,$$

as desired.

Thus  $c_k = a_k^*$  and (since  $t = k$  by Claim 3.6) we have  $(c_1, \dots, c_k) = \mathbf{a}^*$  by Claim 3.5, as desired.  $\blacksquare$

Also, it follows from the definitions that  $m' = m^*$  and thus  $H'$  is isomorphic to  $H^*(n, e)$ . This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2.  $\blacksquare$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Let  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e)$  be arbitrary. Let  $B_1, \dots, B_{k-1}$  be a vertex partition such that  $G$  is the union of  $K[B_1, \dots, B_{k-1}]$  with a triangle-free graph  $J$ . Let  $b_i := |B_i|$  for  $i \in [k-1]$ . Apply Steps 1–4 to  $G$  to obtain a  $k$ -partite graph  $H'$  with parts  $A_1, \dots, A_k$ . By Lemma 3.2, we have  $H' \cong H^* := H^*(n, e)$ . Assume that  $|A_i| = a_i^*$  for  $i \in [k]$  and that all missing edges of  $H'$  (if any exist) go between  $A_{k-1}$  and  $A_k$ .

The following claim follows from the definitions of Steps 1–4.

**Claim 3.8.** *If  $i \in [k-1]$  satisfies  $|G[B_i]| \in \{0, t_2(b_i)\}$ , then  $H'[B_i] = G[B_i]$ .*

Since  $H'$  is  $k$ -partite, it follows from the definitions of Steps 1–4 that exactly one part  $B_p$  of  $G$  is divided into  $A_q \cup A_s$  in Steps 2–3, where, say,  $1 \leq q < s \leq k$ , while the remaining parts of  $G$  correspond to the remaining parts of  $H'$ . In particular,  $b_p = a_q^* + a_s^*$ .

**Claim 3.9.** *We have  $|G[B_p]| > 0$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from  $m^* \leq a_{k-1}^* - a_k^*$  that

$$|H'[B_p]| = a_q^* a_s^* - m^* \geq a_q^* a_s^* - (a_{k-1}^* - a_k^*) > 0.$$

Combined with Claim 3.8, we see that  $|G[B_p]| > 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

Suppose first that  $m^* = 0$ . Then  $H' = K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$ , and  $G$  can be obtained from  $H'$  by replacing  $H'[A_q \cup A_s]$  with  $G[B_p]$ . Moreover,  $G[B_p]$  is a triangle-free graph with  $a_q^* + a_s^*$  vertices and  $a_q^* a_s^*$  edges. If  $a_s^* = a_k^*$ , then it follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ . Otherwise,  $|a_q^* - a_s^*| \leq 1$  (by the definition of  $\mathbf{a}^*$ ), and hence,  $G \cong T_2(a_q^* + a_s^*)$ . This implies that  $G$  does not contain any partially full part, and hence,  $G = H' \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ .

Suppose that  $m^* > 0$ . Since  $G[A_i, A_j]$  is complete for all  $\{i, j\} \neq \{q, s\}$  and  $H'[A_i, A_j]$  is complete iff  $\{i, j\} \neq \{k-1, k\}$ , we have  $\{q, s\} = \{k-1, k\}$ . Thus  $G$  can be obtained from  $K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$  by replacing  $K[A_{k-1} \cup A_k]$  with a triangle-free graph with  $a_{k-1}^* a_k^* - m^*$  edges. This gives  $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ . We conclude that  $\mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$  and every graph in  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  contains the same number of  $K_r$ 's, we have  $\mathcal{H}_0^{\min}(n, e) = \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

With Proposition 3.1 in hand, we are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Fix integers  $n \geq r \geq 3$  and  $e \leq \binom{n}{2}$ . Notice that (4) can be reduced to  $\min \{N(K_r, G) : G \in \mathcal{K}(n, e)\} \geq h_r^*(n, e)$ , since the other direction is trivially true. Suppose that  $G \in \mathcal{K}^{\min}(n, e)$  is a graph obtained from a complete  $\ell$ -partite graph by adding a triangle-free graph to one part. We aim to show that  $N(K_r, G) \geq h_r^*(n, e)$  when  $r \geq 3$  and, in addition,  $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$  when  $r \geq 4$  and  $e > t_{r-1}(n)$ . We prove this statement by induction on  $\ell + r$ . Notice that if  $\ell = k-1$  (where  $k = k(n, e)$ ) and  $r \geq 4$ , then  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ , and it follows from Proposition 3.1 that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ , as desired. If

$\ell = k - 1$  and  $r = 3$ , then  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ , and it follows from [9, Proposition 1.5] that  $N(K_3, G) \geq h_3^*(n, e)$ . So the statement is true for all pairs  $(\ell, r)$  with  $\ell = k - 1$  and  $r \geq 3$ , and this serves as our base case.

Assume that  $\ell \geq k$  and  $r \geq 3$ . Let  $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_\ell = V(G)$  be a partition such that  $G$  is obtained from the complete  $\ell$ -partite graph  $K[U_1, \dots, U_\ell]$  by adding a triangle-free graph into  $U_\ell$ . We can assume that  $U_\ell$  is not an independent set (otherwise consider instead the  $(\ell - 1)$ -partition of  $V(G)$  where  $U_{\ell-1}$  and  $U_\ell$  are merged together).

First, we prove (4). Assume that  $\ell \geq r - 1$ , as otherwise  $h_r^*(n, e) = 0$  and there is nothing to do. Note that  $U_\ell$  is as large as any other part: if some part  $U_i$  has strictly larger size then by moving all edges from  $U_\ell$  to  $U_i$  (by  $|U_i| > |U_\ell|$  there is enough space for this) we strictly decrease the number of  $r$ -cliques (since  $\ell \geq r - 1$ ), a contradiction. By relabelling parts  $U_1, \dots, U_{\ell-1}$ , we may assume that  $U_1$  is of smallest size among  $U_1, \dots, U_{\ell-1}$ . Let  $\hat{G}$  denote the induced subgraph of  $G$  on  $U_2 \cup \dots \cup U_\ell$ . Let  $\hat{n} := n - |U_1|$  and  $\hat{e} := |\hat{G}|$ . Let  $\hat{k} := k(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$  be as defined in (2) (while we reserve  $k$  for  $k(n, e)$ ).

**Claim 4.1.** *We have  $\hat{k} \leq k$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H^* = H^*(n, e)$  be the  $k$ -partite graph as defined in Section 1. Assume that  $A_1^*, \dots, A_k^*$  are the corresponding parts of  $H^*$  of sizes  $a_1^* \geq \dots \geq a_k^*$ , respectively. It is clear that  $|A_1^*| \geq \frac{n}{k}$ . It follows from the minimality of  $U_1$  that  $|U_1| \leq \frac{n - |U_\ell|}{\ell - 1} < \frac{n}{k} \leq |A_1^*|$ . Let  $W_1 \subseteq A_1^*$  be a set of size  $|U_1|$  and let  $H'$  be the induced subgraph of  $H^*$  on  $V(H) \setminus W_1$ . Observe that  $H'$  is still a  $k$ -partite graph and  $|H'| \geq |\hat{G}|$ . So it follows from the definition that  $\hat{k} \leq k$ .  $\blacksquare$

Note that  $\hat{G}$  can be viewed as a graph obtained from a complete  $(\ell - 1)$ -partite graph by adding a triangle-free graph into one part; in particular,  $\hat{G} \in \mathcal{K}(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$ . Let  $\hat{H}$  be  $H^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$  and let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from  $G$  by replacing  $\hat{G}$  with  $\hat{H}$ . It follows from the inductive hypothesis that

$$N(K_r, \hat{H}) = h_r^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e}) \leq N(K_r, \hat{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad N(K_{r-1}, \hat{H}) \leq N(K_{r-1}, \hat{G}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} h_r^*(n, e) &\leq N(K_r, G') = N(K_r, \hat{H}) + |U_1| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, \hat{H}) \\ &\leq N(K_r, \hat{G}) + |U_1| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, \hat{G}) = N(K_r, G), \end{aligned}$$

finishing the inductive step for proving (4).

Now suppose that that  $r \geq 4$  and  $e > t_{r-1}(n)$ , and suppose for contradiction that  $G \notin \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ . Reusing the notation introduced above, let us first derive a contradiction from assuming that  $\hat{G} \notin \mathcal{H}_1^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$ .

If  $\hat{e} > t_{r-1}(\hat{n})$ , then it follows from the inductive hypothesis that

$$N(K_r, \hat{H}) < N(K_r, \hat{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad N(K_{r-1}, \hat{H}) \leq N(K_{r-1}, \hat{G}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} N(K_r, G') &= N(K_r, \hat{H}) + |U_1| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, \hat{H}) \\ &< N(K_r, \hat{G}) + |U_1| \cdot N(K_{r-1}, \hat{G}) = N(K_r, G), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

contradicting the minimality of  $G$ .

So suppose that  $\hat{e} \leq t_{r-1}(\hat{n})$ . We have that  $\ell \geq k \geq r$ . Recall that  $\hat{G}$  is a graph obtained from an  $(\ell - 1)$ -partite graph by adding a non-empty triangle-free graph. Thus, we have  $N(K_r, \hat{H}) = 0 < N(K_r, \hat{G})$ . In addition, by (4), we have  $N(K_{r-1}, \hat{H}) = h_{r-1}^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e}) \leq N(K_{r-1}, \hat{G})$ . But then the same calculation as in (13) gives a contradiction to the minimality of  $G$ .

Thus we have that  $\hat{G} \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$ . Let  $\hat{A}_1^* \cup \dots \cup \hat{A}_{\hat{k}}^* = V(\hat{G})$  be the partition of  $\hat{G}$  as in the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_1^*(\hat{n}, \hat{e})$ . Let  $B_1 := U_1 \cup \hat{A}_1^*$ ,  $B_i := \hat{A}_i^*$  for  $2 \leq i \leq \hat{k} - 2$ , and  $B_{\hat{k}-1} := \hat{A}_{\hat{k}-1}^* \cup \hat{A}_{\hat{k}}^*$ . We can view  $G$  as a graph obtained from  $K[B_1, \dots, B_{\hat{k}-1}]$  by adding triangle-free graphs into two parts, namely  $G[B_1]$  and  $G[B_{\hat{k}-1}]$ . Since  $\hat{k} \leq k$  by Claim 4.1, it holds that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_0(n, e)$ . Therefore, it follows from Proposition 3.1 that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ , finishing the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\blacksquare$

Let us remark that if we replace the family  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$  in Theorem 1.1 by the larger family  $\mathcal{K}'(n, e)$  that consists of all graphs obtained from a complete partite graph by adding a triangle-free graph (that is, we allow to add edges into more than one part) then the theorem will remain true. Indeed, for  $r \geq 4$ , the proof of Lemma 2.5 (which in fact works for any number of parts) shows that every extremal graph  $\mathcal{K}'(n, e)$  has at most one partially full part and thus belongs to  $\mathcal{K}(n, e)$ . For  $r = 3$ , the equality in (4), will also remain true (again by the proof of Lemma 2.5 except the inequality in (6) becomes equality).

## 5 Proof of Proposition 1.2

*Proof of Proposition 1.2.* First, we prove that  $N(K_r, H) = h_r^*(n, e)$  for all  $H \in \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$ . Fix  $H \in \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$ .

First consider the case when  $(|A_1|, \dots, |A_k|) = \mathbf{a}^*$ , where the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  are as in the definition of  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e)$ . Let  $K := K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$ , and  $m_i^* := |\overline{H}[B_i, A_i]|$  for  $i \in I := \{j \in [k-1] : |A_j| = |A_{k-1}|\}$ . Note from the definition of  $I$  that for all  $i \in I$ , we have that

$$N(K_{r-2}, K[A_1, \dots, A_{i-1}, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{k-1}]) = N(K_{r-2}, K[A_1, \dots, A_{k-2}]),$$

because we count  $r$ -cliques in two isomorphic graphs. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} N(K_r, K) - N(K_r, H) &= \sum_{i \in I} m_i^* \cdot N(K_{r-2}, K[A_1, \dots, A_{i-1}, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{k-1}]) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} m_i^* \cdot N(K_{r-2}, K[A_1, \dots, A_{k-2}]) \\ &= m^* \cdot N(K_{r-2}, K[A_1, \dots, A_{k-2}]) = N(K_r, K) - N(K_r, H^*). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

It follows that  $N(K_r, H) = N(K_r, H^*) = h^*(n, e)$ , as desired.

Now suppose that  $(|A_1|, \dots, |A_k|) \neq \mathbf{a}^*$ . Recall that then  $m^* = 0$ ,  $(|A_1|, \dots, |A_k|) = (a_2^*, \dots, a_{k-1}^*, a_1^* - 1, a_k^* + 1)$ ,  $m = a_1^* - a_k^* + 1$ , and  $H$  is a graph obtained from  $K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$  by removing some  $m$  edges. We may assume that these  $m$  edges were removed from parts  $[A_{k-1}, A_k]$ , since this does not affect the value of  $N(K_r, H)$  by the calculation in (14). Now, by viewing  $H$  as a graph obtained from  $K[A_1, \dots, A_k]$  by replacing  $K[A_{k-1}, A_k]$  with a triangle-free graph, we see that  $H \in \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ , and hence,  $N(K_r, H) = h^*(n, e)$ .

Next, we show that there are infinitely many pairs  $(n, e) \in \mathbb{N}^2$  with  $t_{r-1}(n) < e \leq \binom{n}{2}$  such that  $\mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e) \setminus \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e) \neq \emptyset$ . It is enough to choose  $(n, e)$  so that  $a_{k-2}^* = a_{k-1}^*$  and  $m^*, a_k^* \geq 2$ ; the choice that we use (in (15) below) is rather arbitrary.

Take any integers  $p \geq r - 1$ ,  $q \geq 100$ , and  $2 \leq m \leq q$ . Let  $n := 2pq + q$  and  $e := \binom{p}{2}(2q)^2 + 2pq^2 - m$ . Note that  $e + m$  is the number of edges in the complete  $(p + 1)$ -partite graph  $K_{2q, \dots, 2q, q}$  with  $p$  parts of size  $2q$  and one part of size  $q$ . The choice of  $(p, q, m)$  ensures that

$$e = \binom{p}{2}(2q)^2 + 2pq^2 - m > \binom{p}{2} \left( \frac{2pq + q}{p} \right)^2 \geq t_p(n).$$

By  $e \leq e + m \leq t_p(n)$ , we have that  $k(n, e) = p$ .

Let us show that  $a_p^* = q$ . By Lemma 2.6, it is enough to show that  $(q - 1)(n - q - 1) + t_{k-1}(n - q - 1) < e$ . The left-hand side here is the size of the graph obtained from the complete partite graph  $K_{2q, \dots, 2q, q}$  by moving a vertex from the part of size  $q$  into one of size  $2q$ . This results in losing  $q + 1 > m$  edges, giving the required. Thus

$$a_1^* = \dots = a_{p-1}^* = 2q, \quad a_p^* = q, \quad \text{and} \quad m^* = m. \quad (15)$$

Let  $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{p+1} = [n]$  be a partition such that  $|V_1| = \dots = |V_p| = 2q$  and  $|V_{p+1}| = q$ . Fix  $m$  distinct vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_m \in V_{p+1}$ , and choose a vertex  $u_i \in V_i$  for every  $i \in [m]$ . Let  $G$  be the graph obtained from  $K[V_1, \dots, V_{p-1}]$  by removing pairs in  $\{\{v_i, u_i\} : i \in [m]\}$ . It is easy to see that  $G \in \mathcal{H}_2^*(n, e) \setminus \mathcal{H}_1^*(n, e)$ , proving Proposition 1.2.  $\blacksquare$

## References

- [1] J. Balogh and F. C. Clemen. On stability of the Erdős-Rademacher problem. *Illinois J. Math.*, 67(1):1–11, 2023. 2
- [2] B. Bollobás. On complete subgraphs of different orders. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 79(1):19–24, 1976. 2
- [3] P. Erdős. Some theorems on graphs. *Riveon Lematematika*, 9:13–17, 1955. 1, 2
- [4] P. Erdős. On a theorem of Rademacher-Turán. *Illinois J. Math.*, 6:122–127, 1962. 2
- [5] D. C. Fisher. Lower bounds on the number of triangles in a graph. *J. Graph Theory*, 13(4):505–512, 1989. 2
- [6] M. Goldwurm and M. Santini. Clique polynomials have a unique root of smallest modulus. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 75(3):127–132, 2000. 2
- [7] A. W. Goodman. On sets of acquaintances and strangers at any party. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 66:778–783, 1959. 2
- [8] J. Kim, H. Liu, O. Pikhurko, and M. Sharifzadeh. Asymptotic structure for the clique density theorem. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 19, 26, 2020. 2
- [9] H. Liu, O. Pikhurko, and K. Staden. The exact minimum number of triangles in graphs with given order and size. *Forum Math. Pi*, 8:e8, 144, 2020. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10
- [10] X. Liu and D. Mubayi. On a generalized Erdős-Rademacher problem. *J. Graph Theory*, 100(1):101–126, 2022. 2

- [11] L. Lovász and M. Simonovits. On the number of complete subgraphs of a graph. In *Proceedings of the Fifth British Combinatorial Conference (Univ. Aberdeen, Aberdeen, 1975)*, volume No. XV of *Congress. Numer.*, pages 431–441. Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, MB, 1976. 2
- [12] L. Lovász and M. Simonovits. On the number of complete subgraphs of a graph. II. In *Studies in pure mathematics*, pages 459–495. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983. 2, 3
- [13] W. Mantel. Problem 28. *Wiskundige Opgaven*, 10(60-61):320, 1907. 1
- [14] J. W. Moon and L. Moser. On a problem of Turán. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 7:283–286, 1962. 2
- [15] D. Mubayi. Counting substructures I: color critical graphs. *Adv. Math.*, 225(5):2731–2740, 2010. 2
- [16] D. Mubayi. Counting substructures II: Hypergraphs. *Combinatorica*, 33(5):591–612, 2013. 2
- [17] V. Nikiforov. The number of cliques in graphs of given order and size. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(3):1599–1618, 2011. 2
- [18] V. S. Nikiforov. On a problem of P. Erdős. *Annuaire Univ. Sofia Fac. Math. Méc.*, 71(2):157–160, 1976/77. 2
- [19] V. S. Nikiforov and N. G. Khadzhiiivanov. Solution of the problem of P. Erdős on the number of triangles in graphs with  $n$  vertices and  $\lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor + l$  edges. *C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci.*, 34(7):969–970, 1981. 2
- [20] E. A. Nordhaus and B. M. Stewart. Triangles in an ordinary graph. *Canadian J. Math.*, 15:33–41, 1963. 2
- [21] O. Pikhurko and A. Razborov. Asymptotic structure of graphs with the minimum number of triangles. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 26(1):138–160, 2017. 2, 3
- [22] A. A. Razborov. On the minimal density of triangles in graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 17(4):603–618, 2008. 2
- [23] C. Reiher. The clique density theorem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 184(3):683–707, 2016. 2
- [24] P. Turán. On an external problem in graph theory. *Mat. Fiz. Lapok*, 48:436–452, 1941. 1
- [25] C. Xiao and G. O. H. Katona. The number of triangles is more when they have no common vertex. *Discrete Math.*, 344(5):Paper No. 112330, 6, 2021. 2