

# On a hypergraph Mantel theorem

Xizhi Liu\*

Mathematics Institute and DIMAP, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

February 3, 2025

## Abstract

An  $r$ -graph is a triangle if there exists a positive integer  $i \leq \lceil r/2 \rceil$  such that it is isomorphic to the following  $r$ -graph with three edges:

$$\{\{1, \dots, r\}, \{1, \dots, i, r+1, \dots, 2r-i\}, \{i+1, \dots, r, r+1, 2r-i+1, \dots, 2r-1\}\}.$$

We prove an Andrásfai–Erdős–Sós-type stability theorem for triangle-free  $r$ -graphs. In particular, it implies that for large  $n$ , the unique extremal triangle-free construction on  $n$  vertices is the balanced complete  $r$ -partite  $r$ -graph. The latter result answers a question by Mubayi and Pikhurko [MPS11, Problem 20] on weakly triangle-free  $r$ -graphs for large  $n$  in a stronger form. The proof combines the recently introduced entropic technique of Chao–Yu [CY24] with the framework developed in [LMR23, HLZ24].

## 1 Introduction

Given an integer  $r \geq 2$ , an  $r$ -**uniform hypergraph** (henceforth  $r$ -**graph**)  $\mathcal{H}$  is a collection of  $r$ -subsets of some finite set  $V$ . We identify a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with its edge set and use  $V(\mathcal{H})$  to denote its vertex set. The size of  $V(\mathcal{H})$  is denoted by  $v(\mathcal{H})$ . For every vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$ , the **degree**  $d_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$  of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  is the number of edges containing  $v$ . We use  $\delta(\mathcal{H})$ ,  $\Delta(\mathcal{H})$ , and  $d(\mathcal{H})$  to denote the **minimum degree**, the **maximum degree**, and the **average degree** of  $\mathcal{H}$ , respectively.

Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $r$ -graphs, we say  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -**free** if it does not contain any member of  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subgraph. The **Turán number**  $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the maximum number of edges in an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices. The **Turán density** of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined as  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F}) / \binom{n}{r}$ . A straightforward averaging argument (see e.g. [KNS64]) shows that  $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F}) / \binom{n}{r}$  is non-increasing in  $n$ , and hence, the limit  $\pi(\mathcal{F})$  is well-defined. We say  $\mathcal{F}$  is **nondegenerate** if  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) > 0$ .

For  $r = 2$ , the value  $\pi(\mathcal{F})$  is well understood thanks to the classical work of Erdős–Stone [ES46] (see also [ES66]), which extends Turán’s seminal theorem from [Tur41]. For  $r \geq 3$ , determining  $\pi(\mathcal{F})$  is notoriously difficult in general, despite significant effort devoted to this area. For results up to 2011, we refer the reader to the excellent survey by Keevash [Kee11].

---

\*Research supported by ERC Advanced Grant 101020255. Email: [xizhi.liu.ac@gmail.com](mailto:xizhi.liu.ac@gmail.com)

Given integers  $r > i \geq 1$ , let  $\mathbb{T}_{r,i}$  denote the  $r$ -graph whose vertex set is  $[2r+1]$  and whose edge set is

$$\{\{1, \dots, r\}, \{1, \dots, i, r+1, \dots, 2r-i\}, \{i+1, \dots, r, r+1, 2r-i+1, \dots, 2r-1\}\}.$$

Observe that  $\mathbb{T}_{r,i}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{T}_{r,r-i}$  for every  $i \in [r-1]$ . Let

$$\Delta_r := \{\mathbb{T}_{r,i} : 1 \leq i \leq \lceil r/2 \rceil\}.$$

For convenience, let  $T^r(n)$  denote the balanced complete  $r$ -partite  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$ . Prior to Turán's theorem, Mantel [Man07] proved that the maximum size of a  $\Delta_2$ -free graph on  $n$  vertices is uniquely achieved by  $T^2(n)$ . To extend Mantel's theorem to hypergraphs, Katona proposed in the 1960s the problem of determining the value of  $\text{ex}(n, \{\mathbb{T}_{3,1}, K_4^{3-}\})$ , where  $K_4^{3-}$  denotes the 3-graph obtained by removing one edge from the complete 4-vertex 3-graph  $K_4^3$ . This problem was answered later by Bollobás [Bol74], who proved that the unique extremal construction for  $\{\mathbb{T}_{3,1}, K_4^{3-}\}$  is  $T^3(n)$ . Later, Frankl–Füredi [FF83] strengthened Bollobás's theorem by showing that the same conclusion holds for  $\mathbb{T}_{3,1}$  when  $n \geq 3000$ , thereby establishing the first tight bound for the Turán number of a single hypergraph. Their results were further refined in subsequent works, such as [KM04, Gol, BBH<sup>+</sup>16, LM21, Liu21, LMR23, Liu24, LRW24a, LRW24b].

Let  $\mathbb{C}_r$  denote the collection of  $r$ -graphs consisting of three edges  $A, B, C$  such that the symmetric difference  $A \Delta B$  of  $A$  and  $B$  is contained in  $C$ . Note that  $\mathbb{C}_2 = \Delta_2 = \{K_3\}$  and  $\Delta_3 \subseteq \mathbb{C}_3 = \{\mathbb{T}_{3,1}, K_4^{3-}\}$ . Motivated by the Mantel Theorem and Bollobás's theorem on  $\text{ex}(n, \mathbb{C}_3)$ , Bollobás [Bol74] conjectured that  $T^r(n)$  is the unique extremal construction for  $\mathbb{C}_r$  for all  $r \geq 4$ . His conjecture was proved for  $r = 4$  in a stronger form when  $n$  is large by Pikhurko [Pik08] (see [Sid94] for an asymptotic version). However, constructions by Shearer [She96] show that this conjecture is false for  $r \geq 10$ . Amending Bollobás's conjecture, Mubayi and Pikhurko (see [MPS11, Problem 20]) introduced the weakly triangle-free  $r$ -graphs and posed the following question:

An  $r$ -graph is **weakly triangle-free** if it does not contain three edges  $A, B, C$  such that  $C$  contains strictly more than half of vertices from the symmetric difference  $A \Delta B$ .

**Problem 1.1** (Mubayi–Pikhurko [MPS11, Problem 20]). *Is it true that the maximum size of a weakly triangle-free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices is attained by  $T^r(n)$ ?*

Observe that weakly triangle-free  $r$ -graphs are  $\Delta_r$ -free (but not vice versa in general). A very recent result by Chao–Yu [CY24, Theorem 1.4] shows that for  $r \geq 2$ ,  $\pi(\Delta_r) = r!/r^r$ , the same edge density given by the construction  $T^r(n)$ . Their ingenious approach employs the concept of the entropic density of hypergraphs that they introduced, which is equivalent to the well-studied Lagrangian of hypergraphs. As a result, similar to proofs using the Lagrangian Method, it does not directly provide much information about the structure of extremal  $\Delta_r$ -free constructions. To address this, we combine their approach with the framework (for proving a strong stability of Turán-type problems) established by Mubayi, Reiher, and the author in [LMR23], along with [HLZ24, Theorem 1.1], to show that for large  $n$ ,  $T^r(n)$  is the unique extremal construction for  $\Delta_r$ . In particular, this answers the question of Mubayi–Pikhurko for large  $n$  in a stronger form.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. There exist  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(r) > 0$  and  $N_0 = N_0(r)$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq N_0$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $\Delta_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq n^{r-1}/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon n^{r-1}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $r$ -partite. In particular, for large  $n$ ,  $T^r(n)$  is the unique extremal  $\Delta_r$ -free construction on  $n$  vertices.*

## Remarks.

- The constant  $\varepsilon(r)$  can be made explicit through a more careful analysis of the proofs, but we did not attempt this, as it is unlikely to yield a tight bound. In fact, determining the optimal value of  $\varepsilon(r)$  is an interesting and nontrivial problem. The case  $r = 2$  was solved by the celebrated Andrásfai–Erdős–Sós Theorem [AES74], while the case  $r = 3$  was solved only very recently in [LRW24a].
- In Theorem 1.2, the family  $\Delta_r$  can be replaced by the single  $r$ -graph (which is not contained in  $\Delta_r$ ) described in [CY24, Theorem 1.5]. The necessary modifications to the proofs in this paper are relatively straightforward, so we omit the details.
- Theorem 1.2, along with the results of Keevash–Lenz–Mubayi [KLM14, Theorem 1.4] and Kang–Nikiforov–Yuan [KNY15, Theorem 2], solves the  $\alpha$ -spectral Turán problem for  $\Delta_r$  (as well as for the  $r$ -graphs mentioned in the previous remark) for all  $\alpha \geq 1$  when  $n$  is sufficiently large. For further details, we refer the reader to [KLM14] and [HLZ24].

In the next section, we introduce some necessary definitions and preliminary results. In Section 3, we establish the uniqueness of optimal solution to the Lagrangian of  $r$ -graphs that contain no homomorphic copy of  $\Delta_r$  (Proposition 3.1). In Section 4, we prove the vertex-extendability of  $\Delta_r$  with respects to the family of  $r$ -partite  $r$ -graphs (Proposition 4.1). In Section 5, we present the proof of Theorem 1.2. Section 6 contains additional remarks and open problems.

## 2 Preliminaries

Given integers  $\ell \geq r \geq 2$ , we use  $K_\ell^r$  to denote the complete  $r$ -graph on  $\ell$  vertices. The superscript  $r$  will be omitted when  $r = 2$ .

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $r$ -graph. For every vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$ , the **link**  $L_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$  of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as

$$L_{\mathcal{H}}(v) := \left\{ e \in \binom{V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{v\}}{r-1} : e \cup \{v\} \in \mathcal{H} \right\}.$$

For every  $i \in [r-1]$ , the  **$i$ -th shadow**  $\partial_i \mathcal{H}$  (or simply the shadow  $\partial \mathcal{H}$  if  $i = 1$ ) is given by

$$\partial_i \mathcal{H} := \left\{ e \in \binom{V(\mathcal{H})}{r-i} : \text{there exists } E \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } e \subseteq E \right\}.$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{H} - v$  the  $r$ -graph obtained from  $\mathcal{H}$  by removing the vertex  $v$  and all edges containing  $v$ .

Suppose that the vertex set of  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $[n]$ . Given a collection of disjoint sets  $V_1, \dots, V_n$ , the **blowup**  $\mathcal{H}[V_1, \dots, V_n]$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{H}$  by replacing each vertex  $i$  with the set  $V_i$  and each edge with the corresponding complete  $r$ -partite  $r$ -graph. By **duplicating a vertex**  $v \in \mathcal{H}$ , we mean adding a new vertex  $\hat{v}$  to  $\mathcal{H}$  with the same link as  $v$ .

We say  $\mathcal{H}$  is **2-covered** if every pair of vertices is contained in at least one edge in  $\mathcal{H}$ . We say  $\mathcal{H}$  is **symmetrized** if it is a blowup of some 2-covered  $r$ -graph.

A family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $r$ -graphs is **blowup-invariant** if, for every  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$ , every blowup of  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free. Since a blowup of  $\mathcal{H}$  can be obtained by duplicating vertices one by one,

$\mathcal{F}$  is blowup-invariant iff duplicating any vertex in an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  preserves the  $\mathcal{F}$ -freeness.

Given two  $r$ -graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$ , a map  $\psi: V(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a **homomorphism** if  $\psi(e) \in \mathcal{H}$  for every  $e \in \mathcal{G}$ . We say  $\mathcal{G}$  is  **$\mathcal{H}$ -colorable** if there exists a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ .

## 2.1 Basic properties of triangle-free hypergraphs

Denote by  $\mathcal{T}_r$  the collection of  $r$ -graphs consisting of three edges  $A, B, C$  such that

$$A \subseteq B \cup C \quad \text{and} \quad (B \cap C) \setminus A \neq \emptyset.$$

Note that  $\Delta_r \subseteq \mathcal{T}_r$  for  $r \geq 2$ . Moreover, an  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free iff there is no homomorphism from any member of  $\Delta_r$  to  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The following facts are straightforward to verify.

**Fact 2.1.** *For every  $r \geq 2$ , the family  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is blowup-invariant.*

An  $(n, r, r-1)$ -**system** is an  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices such that every set of  $r-1$  vertices is contained in at most one edge.

**Fact 2.2.** *Let  $r \geq 3$  be an integer. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *For every  $v \in V(\mathcal{H})$ , the link  $L_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$  is  $\mathcal{T}_{r-1}$ -free.*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{H}$  is 2-covered, then  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $(v(\mathcal{H}), r, r-1)$ -system.*

## 2.2 Vertex-extendability

Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a nondegenerate family of  $r$ -graphs. Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be a family of  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graphs. We say

- $\mathcal{F}$  is **edge-stable** with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$  if for every  $\delta > 0$  there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n_0$  such that every  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $n \geq n_0$  vertices with  $|\mathcal{H}| \geq (\pi(\mathcal{F})/r! - \varepsilon)n^r$  becomes a member in  $\mathfrak{H}$  after removing at most  $\delta n^r$  edges,
- $\mathcal{F}$  is **degree-stable** with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$  if there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n_0$  such that every  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $n \geq n_0$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq (\pi(\mathcal{F})/(r-1)! - \varepsilon)n^{r-1}$  is a member in  $\mathfrak{H}$ ,
- $\mathcal{F}$  is **vertex-extendable** with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$  if there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n_0$  such that for every  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $n \geq n_0$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq (\pi(\mathcal{F})/(r-1)! - \varepsilon)n^{r-1}$  the following holds: if  $\mathcal{H} - v$  is a member in  $\mathfrak{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{H}$  is a member in  $\mathfrak{H}$  as well.
- $\mathcal{F}$  is **symmetrized-stable** with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$  if every symmetrized  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph is contained in  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

Vertex-extendability was introduced in [LMR23] to provide a unified framework for proving the degree stability of certain classes of nondegenerate hypergraph families. It was later refined in [HLZ24].

**Theorem 2.3** ([LMR23, Theorem 1.7] and [HLZ24, Theorem 1.1]). *Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a blowup-invariant nondegenerate family of  $r$ -graphs and  $\mathfrak{H}$  is a hereditary<sup>1</sup> family of  $\mathcal{F}$ -free*

<sup>1</sup> Here, hereditary means that if  $H \in \mathfrak{H}$ , then every subgraph of  $H$  is also contained in  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

$r$ -graphs. Then the following statements hold.

- (i) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is both symmetrized-stable and vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  is degree-stable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ .
- (ii) If  $\mathcal{F}$  is both edge-stable and vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  is degree-stable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

## 2.3 Lagrangian and entropy

First, we introduce the definition of the Lagrangian and some basic properties related to it. This notion was first introduced by Motzkin–Straus [MS65] for graphs to provide a different proof for the celebrated Turán Theorem, and used later by Frankl–Rödl [FR84] for hypergraph Turán problems.

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$ . Define the **Lagrangian polynomial** of  $\mathcal{H}$  as

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{H}} \prod_{i \in e} X_i.$$

For every  $i \in [n]$ , denote by  $\partial_i P_{\mathcal{H}}$  the partial derivative of  $P_{\mathcal{H}}$  with respect to the  $i$ -th variable. The **Lagrangian** of  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as

$$\lambda(\mathcal{H}) := \max \{ P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \},$$

where  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is the standard  $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplex, i.e.

$$\mathbb{S}^{n-1} := \max \{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 + \dots + x_n = 1 \text{ and } x_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i \in [n] \}.$$

For convenience, let

$$\text{Opt}(\mathcal{H}) := \{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{S}^n : P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda(\mathcal{H}) \}.$$

Vectors in  $\text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$  are called **optimal solutions** of  $P_{\mathcal{H}}$ .

The following fact follows directly from the definition.

**Fact 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $r$ -graph on  $[m]$  and  $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{G}[V_1, \dots, V_m]$  be a blowup of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $n := |V_1| + \dots + |V_m|$  and  $x_i := |V_i|/n$  for  $i \in [m]$ . The following statements hold.*

- (i)  $|\mathcal{H}|/n^r = P_{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ , and
- (ii) for every  $j \in [m]$  and every  $v \in V_j$ ,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(v)/n^{r-1} = \sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(j)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i = \partial_j P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_m).$$

Given a vector  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , its **support** is defined as

$$\text{Supp}(\vec{x}) := \{ i \in [n] : x_i \neq 0 \}.$$

The following lemma follows from a standard application of the Lagrangian Multiplier Method (see e.g. [FR84, Theorem 2.1]).

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$ . Suppose that  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$ . Then for every  $j \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})$ , it holds that*

$$\partial_j P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = r \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}).$$

The following result concerning the Lagrangian of  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graphs was established in [CY24].

**Theorem 2.6** ([CY24, Theorem 7.1]). *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph. Then  $\lambda(\mathcal{H}) = 1/r^r$ .*

Below, we present definitions and results related to entropy as introduced in [CY24].

Let  $X$  be a discrete random variable taking values in the set  $\Omega$ . For simplicity, let  $p_X(x) := \mathbb{P}[X = x]$  for every  $x \in \Omega$ . The **support** of  $X$  is defined as

$$\text{Supp}(X) := \{x \in \Omega : p_X(x) > 0\}.$$

Recall that the well-known **Shannon entropy** [Sha48] of  $X$  is given by

$$\mathbb{H}(X) := - \sum_{x \in \text{Supp}(X)} p_X(x) \cdot \log p_X(x).$$

Following the definition from [CY24], an  $r$ -tuple of random variables  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  is a **random edge with uniform ordering** on  $\mathcal{H}$  if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i)  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  is symmetric, that is,  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  is the same as  $(X_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, X_{\sigma(r)})$  for every permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[r]$ ,
- (ii)  $\{X_1, \dots, X_r\}$  is always an edge of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The **entropy density**  $\lambda_{\text{entropy}}(\mathcal{H})$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as

$$\lambda_{\text{entropy}}(\mathcal{H}) := \max_{(X_1, \dots, X_r)} 2^{\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - r \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1)},$$

where the maximum is taken over all random edges with uniform ordering on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

It was shown in [CY24, Proposition 5.4] that, for every  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\lambda_{\text{entropy}}(\mathcal{H}) = r! \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}).$$

Given an  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on vertex set  $V$ , denote by  $\vec{\mathcal{H}}$  the collection of all ordered  $r$ -tuples  $(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in V^r$  such that  $\{i_1, \dots, i_r\} \in \mathcal{H}$ . Let

$$P_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \vec{\mathcal{H}}} X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_r} = r! \cdot P_{\mathcal{H}}(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

For every  $j \in [r-1]$ , the  **$j$ -th ordered shadow**  $\partial_j \vec{\mathcal{H}}$  is defined as

$$\partial_j \vec{\mathcal{H}} := \{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-j}) \in V^{r-j} : \{i_1, \dots, i_{r-j}\} \in \partial_j \mathcal{H}\}.$$

For every ordered  $j$ -tuple  $(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \partial_{r-j} \vec{\mathcal{H}}$ , the **ordered link** of  $(i_1, \dots, i_j)$  in  $\vec{\mathcal{H}}$  is defined as

$$L_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(i_1, \dots, i_j) := \{(i_{j+1}, \dots, i_r) \in \partial_j \vec{\mathcal{H}} : (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \vec{\mathcal{H}}\}.$$

The following result follows from a modification of the proof for [CY24, Proposition 5.4].

**Proposition 2.7.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$  and  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  be a vector such that  $\beta := P_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0$ . Consider the random edge  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  with uniform ordering on  $\mathcal{H}$ , given by the following probability distribution:

$$\mathbb{P}[(X_1, \dots, X_r) = (i_1, \dots, i_r)] := y_{i_1, \dots, i_r} := \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}{\beta} \quad \text{for every } (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \vec{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (1)$$

Then for every  $j \in [r]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_j) = \log \beta - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}}{y_{i_1, \dots, i_j}}, \quad (2)$$

where the summation is taken over  $\text{Supp}(X_1, \dots, X_j)$ , and for each  $(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \partial_{r-j} \vec{\mathcal{H}}$ ,

$$y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} := \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{(i_{j+1}, \dots, i_r) \in L_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(i_1, \dots, i_j)} x_{i_{j+1}} \cdots x_{i_r}. \quad (3)$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_j) \geq \log \beta - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \log P_{\partial_{r-j} \vec{\mathcal{H}}}(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Moreover, if  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$ , then

$$\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - r \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1) = \log \beta. \quad (4)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.7.* Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  be the random edge with uniform ordering on  $\mathcal{H}$  given by the proposition. Observe that the proposition holds trivially for  $j = r$ , so we may assume that  $j \in [r-1]$ . Given the probability distribution in (1), it is easy to see that for every  $(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \partial_{r-j} \vec{\mathcal{H}}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[(X_1, \dots, X_j) = (i_1, \dots, i_j)] = y_{i_1, \dots, i_j}.$$

For  $j \in [r]$ , let  $\text{Supp}_j = \text{Supp}(X_1, \dots, X_j)$ . Straightforward calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \text{Supp}_r} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}{\beta} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\binom{r-1}{j-1}} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \text{Supp}_r} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{\{k_1, \dots, k_j\} \subseteq \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}} \log(x_{k_1} \cdots x_{k_j}) \\ &= \frac{\binom{r}{j}}{\binom{r-1}{j-1}} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}}{\beta} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}) \cdot \sum_{(i_{j+1}, \dots, i_r) \in L_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(i_1, \dots, i_j)} x_{i_{j+1}} \cdots x_{i_r} \\ &= \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) &= - \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \text{Supp}_r} y_{i_1, \dots, i_r} \cdot \log \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}{\beta} \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \text{Supp}_r} y_{i_1, \dots, i_r} \cdot \log \beta - \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \text{Supp}_r} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}{\beta} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}) \\ &= \log \beta - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_j) \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}) + \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{j} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \text{Supp}_j} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}}{y_{i_1, \dots, i_j}},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (2).

The "In particular" part follows easily from the following inequality (which follows from Jensen's inequality)

$$\sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} y_{i_1, \dots, i_j} \cdot \log \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}}{y_{i_1, \dots, i_j}} \leq \log \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j} = \log P_{\partial_{r-j} \vec{\mathcal{H}}}(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Finally, suppose that  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$ . Then for every  $j \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})$ , it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
y_j &= \frac{x_j}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}) \in L_{\vec{\mathcal{H}}}(j)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}} = \frac{x_j}{r! \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H})} \cdot (r-1)! \cdot \partial_j P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\
&= \frac{x_j}{r! \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H})} \cdot (r-1)! \cdot r \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}) = x_j,
\end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (2), implies (4). This completes the proof of Proposition 2.7.  $\blacksquare$

### 3 Uniqueness of the optimal solution

The goal of this section is to establish the following result, which is crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $n \geq r \geq 2$  be integers. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a 2-covered  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$ . Then  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$  iff*

- (i)  $\text{Supp}(\vec{x})$  has size  $r$  and is an edge in  $\mathcal{H}$ ,
- (ii)  $x_i = 1/r$  for every  $i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})$ .

Before proving Proposition 3.1, let us present several useful lemmas.

The following result can be derived directly from the proofs Lemma 7.3 and Theorem 7.1 in [CY24].

**Lemma 3.2** ([CY24]). *Suppose that  $0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_r = 1$  are real numbers satisfying  $x_i + x_j \leq x_{i+j}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq r$ . Then  $x_1 \cdots x_r \leq r!/r^r$ , with equality holding iff  $x_i = i/r$  for  $i \in [r]$ .*

**Lemma 3.3.** *Suppose that  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  satisfies*

$$\max_{i \in [n]} x_i \leq \frac{1}{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})} x_i \log x_i = -\log r. \tag{5}$$

*Then, up to a permutation of the indices, we have*

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (1/r, \dots, 1/r, 0, \dots, 0).$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Suppose to the contrary that this lemma fails. Then there exists  $i \in [n]$  such that  $0 < x_i < 1/r$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $i = 1$ . Since  $\max_{i \in [n]} x_i \leq 1/r$  (by (5)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})} x_i \log x_i &= x_1 \log x_1 + \sum_{i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x}) \setminus \{1\}} x_i \log x_i \\ &\leq x_1 (\log x_1 - \log 1/r) + x_1 \log 1/r + \sum_{i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x}) \setminus \{1\}} x_i \log 1/r \\ &= x_1 (\log x_1 - \log 1/r) + \log 1/r < \log 1/r, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the assumption that  $\sum_{i \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})} x_i \log x_i = -\log r$ .  $\blacksquare$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a 2-covered  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $[n]$ . Fix  $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Opt}(\mathcal{H})$ . It follows from Theorem 2.6 that

$$\beta := r! \cdot P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = r! \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}) = r!/r^r.$$

Additionally, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that for every  $j \in \text{Supp}(\vec{x})$ ,

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(j)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i = \partial_j P_{\mathcal{H}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = r \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}) = 1/r^{r-1}. \quad (6)$$

Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  be the random edge with uniform ordering on  $\mathcal{H}$  whose probability distribution is given by (1). Then for every  $j \in [r]$  and for every  $(i_1, \dots, i_j) \in \partial \vec{\mathcal{H}}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}[(X_1, \dots, X_j) = (i_1, \dots, i_j)] = y_{i_1, \dots, i_j},$$

where  $y_{i_1, \dots, i_j}$  is given by (3).

Moreover, by Proposition 2.7 (4),

$$\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - r \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1) = \log \beta. \quad (7)$$

For every  $i \in [r]$ , define

$$\alpha_i := 2^{\mathbb{H}(X_i | X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) - \mathbb{H}(X_i)}.$$

By the chain rule (see e.g. [CY24, Proposition 3.3]) and the symmetry of  $(X_1, \dots, X_r)$  that, for every  $j \in [r]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\alpha_r \cdots \alpha_j) &= \sum_{i \in [j, r]} (\mathbb{H}(X_i | X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) - \mathbb{H}(X_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i \in [j, r]} (\mathbb{H}(X_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) - \mathbb{H}(X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r) - \mathbb{H}(X_i)) \\ &= \mathbb{H}(X_j, \dots, X_r) - (r - j + 1) \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1). \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, this can be rewritten as, for every  $j \in [r]$ ,

$$\log(\alpha_r \cdots \alpha_{r-j+1}) = \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_j) - j \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1). \quad (8)$$

**Claim 3.4.** *We have  $\alpha_i = i/r$  for  $i \in [r]$ .*

*Proof of Claim 3.4.* By definition, we have  $\alpha_r = 1$ . Moreover, by [CY24, Lemma 7.2], for all  $i, j \in [r]$  satisfying  $i + j \leq r$ , we have

$$\alpha_i + \alpha_j \leq \alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_r = 1. \quad (9)$$

Additionally, combining (7) and (8), we obtain

$$\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_r = \beta = r!/r^r,$$

which, combined with (9) and Lemma 3.2, implies that  $\alpha_i = i/r$  for  $i \in [r]$ .  $\blacksquare$

By Claim 3.4 and (8), for every  $j \in [r]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_j) - j \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1) = \log \frac{r(r-1) \cdots (r-j+1)}{r^j}. \quad (10)$$

**Claim 3.5.** We have  $x_i \leq 1/r$  for every  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof of Claim 3.5.* Suppose to the contrary that  $\max_{i \in [n]} x_i > 1/r$ . By relabeling the vertices if necessary, we may assume that  $x_n > 1/r$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  denote the link of  $n$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . It follows from Fact 2.2 (i) that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $\mathcal{T}_{r-1}$ -free  $(r-1)$ -graph on  $[n-1]$ . For  $i \in [n-1]$ , let

$$y_i := \frac{x_i}{x_1 + \cdots + x_{n-1}} = \frac{x_i}{1 - x_n}.$$

Note that  $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-2}$ . It follows from Theorem 2.6 that

$$\frac{1}{(1-x_n)^{r-1}} \cdot \sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(n)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i = P_{\mathcal{G}}(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{(r-1)^{r-1}},$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(n)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i \leq \frac{(1-x_n)^{r-1}}{(r-1)^{r-1}} < \frac{(1-1/r)^{r-1}}{(r-1)^{r-1}} = \frac{1}{r^{r-1}}. \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, since  $x_n > 0$ , it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(n)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i = r \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H}) = \frac{1}{r^{r-1}},$$

which contradicts (11). This completes the proof of Claim 3.5.  $\blacksquare$

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is 2-covered and  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free, it follows from Fact 2.2 (ii) that  $\mathcal{H}$  is an  $(n, r, r-1)$ -system. This means that for every  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}\} \in \partial\mathcal{H}$ , there exists a unique vertex, denoted by  $\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})$ , such that  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}, \psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})\} \in \mathcal{H}$ . So, by definition (3), for every  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}\} \in \text{Supp}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1})$ ,

$$y_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} = \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{j \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} x_j = \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} \cdot x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})}. \quad (12)$$

Additionally, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}) \in \text{Supp}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1})} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} \cdot x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \cdot \log x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{j \in \text{Supp}(X_1)} x_j \cdot \log x_j \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}) \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(j)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}} \\ &= \frac{(r-1)! \cdot r \cdot \lambda(\mathcal{H})}{\beta} \cdot \sum_{j \in \text{Supp}(X_1)} x_j \cdot \log x_j = \sum_{j \in \text{Supp}(X_1)} x_j \cdot \log x_j, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the second-to-last equality follows from Lemma 2.5.

Combining (12) and (13) with Proposition 2.7 (2) (taking  $j = r - 1$ ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}) \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} \cdot x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \cdot \log \frac{\beta}{x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})}} \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} \cdot x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \cdot (\log \beta - \log x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})}) \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \frac{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}}}{\beta} x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \cdot \log x_{\psi(i_1, \dots, i_{r-1})} \\
&= -\frac{\log \beta}{r-1} + \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \sum_j x_j \log x_j.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (8) and Claim 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}) \\
&= (\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_r) - r \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1)) - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot (\mathbb{H}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}) - (r-1) \cdot \mathbb{H}(X_1)) \\
&= \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \log \frac{r(r-1) \cdots 2}{r^{r-1}} = \log \beta - \frac{r}{r-1} \cdot \log(r\beta) = -\frac{\log \beta}{r-1} - \frac{r}{r-1} \log r.
\end{aligned}$$

By combining these two inequalities, we obtain

$$\sum_j x_j \log x_j = -\log r,$$

which, together with Claim 3.5 and Lemma 3.3, implies the assertion in Proposition 3.1. ■

## 4 Vertex-extendability of $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$

In this section, we establish the following result, which is another key ingredient in the proof Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. Let  $\mathfrak{K}_r^r$  denote the collection of all  $r$ -partite  $r$ -graphs. The  $r$ -graph  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^r$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Fix  $r \geq 2$ . Let  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$  be sufficiently small constants such that  $0 \leq \varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_1 \ll \varepsilon_2$ . Let  $n$  be a sufficiently large integer. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $n$ -vertex  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$ -free  $r$ -graph and  $v_* \in V(\mathcal{H})$  be a vertex such that

- (i)  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - \varepsilon n^{r-1}$ , and
- (ii)  $\mathcal{H} - v_* \in \mathfrak{K}_r^r$ , this is,  $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{H} - v_*$  is  $r$ -partite.

We aim to show that  $\mathcal{H} \in \mathfrak{K}_r^r$ , this is,  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $r$ -partite as well.

Let  $V := V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{v_*\}$  and let  $V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_r = V$  be a partition such that every edge in  $\mathcal{H}$  intersects each  $V_i$  in exactly one vertex. Since

$$\delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq \delta(\mathcal{H}) - \binom{n-2}{r-2} \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1},$$

straightforward calculations (see e.g. [LMR23, Corollary 2.3(a)]) show that

$$\max_{i \in [r]} |V_i - n/r| \leq \varepsilon_1 n. \quad (14)$$

**Claim 4.2.** *We have  $|e \cap V_i| \leq 1$  for every  $e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*)$  and for every  $i \in [r]$ .*

*Proof of Claim 4.2.* Suppose to the contrary that there exist  $e \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*)$  and  $i \in [r]$  such that  $|e \cap V_i| \geq 2$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $i = 1$ . Fix two vertices  $u, w \in e \cap V_1$  and let  $E_1 := e \cup \{v_*\}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  denote  $K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_2, \dots, V_r]$ , the complete  $(r-1)$ -partite  $(r-1)$ -graph with parts  $V_2, \dots, V_r$ . Note that

- both links  $L_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$  and  $L_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$  are subgraphs of  $\mathcal{K}$ ,
- $\min\{|L_{\mathcal{G}}(u)|, |L_{\mathcal{G}}(w)|\} \geq \delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1}$ , and
- $|\mathcal{K}| \leq \left(\frac{n}{r} + \varepsilon_1 n\right)^{r-1}$  (which follow from (14)).

So it follows from the Inclusion-Exclusion Principle that

$$|L_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \cap L_{\mathcal{G}}(w)| \geq 2 \left( \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1} \right) - \left( \frac{n}{r} + \varepsilon_1 n \right)^{r-1} \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - \varepsilon_2 n^{r-1} > (r-1)n^{r-2}.$$

So there exists a set  $e' \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \cap L_{\mathcal{G}}(w)$  that is disjoint from  $e$ . Let  $E_2 := e' \cup \{u\}$  and  $E_3 := e' \cup \{w\}$ . Note that  $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  and  $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$  is a copy of  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$ , which contradicts the  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$ -freeness of  $\mathcal{H}$ .  $\blacksquare$

By Claim 4.2 and the Pigeonhole Principle, there exists an  $(r-1)$ -set  $\{k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}\} \subseteq [r]$  such that

$$|L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \cap K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_{k_1}, \dots, V_{k_{r-1}}]| \geq \frac{|L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*)|}{r} \geq \frac{\delta(\mathcal{H})}{r} \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^r} - \varepsilon n^{r-1}. \quad (15)$$

**Claim 4.3.** *We have  $L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \subseteq K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_{k_1}, \dots, V_{k_{r-1}}]$ .*

*Proof of Claim 4.3.* By symmetry, we may assume that  $\{k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}\} = \{1, \dots, r-1\}$ . Suppose to the contrary that there exists another  $(r-1)$ -set  $\{k'_1, \dots, k'_{r-1}\} \subseteq [r]$  that is different from  $\{1, \dots, r-1\}$  such that  $L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \cap K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_{k'_1}, \dots, V_{k'_{r-1}}] \neq \emptyset$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $\{k'_1, \dots, k'_{r-1}\} = \{2, \dots, r\}$ .

Fix a set  $e_1 \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \cap K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_2, \dots, V_r]$  and let  $u$  denote the vertex in  $e_1 \cap V_r$ . Note that

- $L_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \subseteq K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_1, \dots, V_{r-1}]$ ,
- $|L_{\mathcal{G}}(u)| \geq \delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1}$ , and
- $|K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_1, \dots, V_{r-1}]| \leq \left(\frac{n}{r} + \varepsilon_1 n\right)^{r-1}$  (which follows from (14)).

So, it follows from (15) and the Inclusion-Exclusion Principle that

$$\begin{aligned} & |L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \cap L_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \cap K_{r-1}^{r-1}[V_1, \dots, V_{r-1}]| \\ & \geq \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^r} - \varepsilon n^{r-1} + \frac{n^{r-1}}{r^{r-1}} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1} - \left(\frac{n}{r} + \varepsilon_1 n\right)^{r-1} > \frac{n^{r-1}}{2r^r} > (r-1)n^{r-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a set  $e_2 \in L_{\mathcal{H}}(v_*) \cap L_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \cap K^{r-1}[V_1, \dots, V_{r-1}]$  that is disjoint from  $e_1$ . Let  $E_1 := e_1 \cup \{v_*\}$ ,  $E_2 := e_2 \cup \{v_*\}$ , and  $E_3 := e_2 \cup \{u\}$ . Note that  $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  and  $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$  is a copy of  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$ , which contradicts the  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$ -freeness of  $\mathcal{H}$ .  $\blacksquare$

It follows from Claim 4.3 that  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $r$ -partite, this proves that  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^r$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. Before that, let us prove the following result.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. There exist  $\varepsilon_{5.1} = \varepsilon_{5.1}(r) > 0$  and  $N_{5.1} = N_{5.1}(r)$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq N_{5.1}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a symmetrized  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq n^{r-1}/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon_{5.1}n^{r-1}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $r$ -partite.*

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be sufficiently small and  $n$  be sufficiently large. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a symmetrized  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq n^{r-1}/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon n^{r-1}$ . By the definition of symmetrized, there exists a 2-covered  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $m := v(\mathcal{G})$  vertices and a partition  $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m = V(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}[V_1, \dots, V_m]$ . For convenience, let us assume that the vertex set of  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $[m]$ . Let  $x_i := |V_i|/n$  for  $i \in [m]$ . Note from Fact 2.4 that

$$P_{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = |\mathcal{H}|/n^r \geq \frac{n}{r} \cdot \delta(\mathcal{H})/n^r \geq 1/r^r - \varepsilon/r. \quad (16)$$

Also, for every  $j \in [m]$  and every  $v \in V_j$ , we have

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(j)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i = \partial_j P_{\mathcal{G}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = d_{\mathcal{H}}(v)/n^{r-1} \geq \delta(\mathcal{H})/n^{r-1} \geq 1/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon. \quad (17)$$

**Claim 5.2.** *We have  $m \leq \frac{2r^{r-1}}{(r-1)!}$ .*

*Proof of Claim 5.2.* It follows from Fact 2.2 (ii) that  $\mathcal{G}$  is an  $(m, r, r-1)$ -system. This implies that  $L_{\mathcal{G}}(i) \cap L_{\mathcal{G}}(j) = \emptyset$  for all distinct  $i, j \in [m]$ . Combining this with (17), we obtain

$$m(1/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{i \in [m]} \sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(i)} \prod_{j \in e} x_j \leq P_{K_m^{r-1}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) \leq \binom{m}{r-1} / m^{r-1}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Maclaurin Inequality.

It follows that

$$m \leq \frac{1}{1/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon} \cdot \binom{m}{r-1} / m^{r-1} \leq \frac{2r^{r-1}}{(r-1)!},$$

which proves Claim 5.2.  $\blacksquare$

By Proposition 3.1, for every  $(y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ , we have

$$P_{\mathcal{G}}(y_1, \dots, y_m) \leq r!/r^r,$$

with equality holding iff there exists some  $r$ -set  $J \subseteq [m]$  with  $J \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $y_i = 1/r$  for every  $i \in J$ . So, by compactness (see e.g. the proof of [HLZ24, Theorem 1.11]), there exists  $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, m) > 0$  such that

$$\max_{i \in [m]} |x_i - \hat{x}_i| \leq \delta, \quad (18)$$

where  $\hat{x}_i = 1/r$  iff  $i \in J$ . Note that we can choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  to be sufficiently small at the beginning so that  $\delta > 0$  is also sufficiently small.

**Claim 5.3.** *We have  $m = r$ .*

*Proof of Claim 5.3.* Suppose to the contrary that  $m \geq r + 1$ . Applying (17) to the vertex  $m$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(m)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i \geq 1/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2r^{r-1}}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is an  $(m, r, r-1)$ -system and  $J \in \mathcal{G}$ , for each term in  $\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(m)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i$ , the index of at least one  $x_i$  comes from the set  $[m] \setminus J$ . Therefore, by Claim 5.2 and (18),

$$\sum_{e \in L_{\mathcal{G}}(m)} \prod_{i \in e} x_i \leq \binom{m-1}{r-1} \cdot \delta \leq \binom{2r^{r-1}/(r-1)!}{r-1} \cdot \delta < \frac{1}{2r^{r-1}},$$

contradicting the previous inequality. ■

It follows from Claim 5.3 that  $\mathcal{G} \cong K_r^r$ , and hence,  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $r$ -partite. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. ■

Next, we present the proof of Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Fix  $r \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathfrak{S}$  denote the collection of all 2-covered  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graphs. Let

$$\mathfrak{H} := \{\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{H} \text{ is } \mathcal{G}\text{-colorable for some } \mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{S}\}.$$

Let us first prove that  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is degree-stable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

It is clear from the definition that  $\mathfrak{H}$  is hereditary and contains all symmetrized  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graphs. By Fact 2.1,  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is blowup-invariant. So, by Theorem 2.3 (i), it remains to show that  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be a sufficiently small constant and  $n$  be a sufficiently large integer. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $n$ -vertex  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices with  $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq n^{r-1}/r^{r-1} - \varepsilon n^{r-1}$ . Suppose that  $v_* \in V(\mathcal{H})$  is a vertex such that  $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{H} - v_*$  is contained in  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{H}$  and

$$\delta(\mathcal{G}) \geq \delta(\mathcal{H}) - \binom{n-2}{r-2} \geq n^{r-1}/r^{r-1} - 2\varepsilon n^{r-1}.$$

So it follows from Proposition 5.1 that  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $r$ -partite, that is,  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathfrak{K}_r^r$ . By Proposition 4.1, the  $r$ -graph  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1} \in \mathcal{T}_r$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^r$ . Therefore, by the definition of vertex-extendable,  $\mathcal{H}$  is contained in  $\mathfrak{K}_r^r \subseteq \mathfrak{H}$  as well. This proves that  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{H}$ .

Notice that the argument above actually shows that  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is degree-stable with respect to the family  $\mathfrak{K}_r^x$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{T}_r$  is edge-stable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^x$ . Since for every member  $F \in \mathcal{T}_r$ , there exists a member  $\tilde{F} \in \Delta_r$  such that there exists a homomorphism from  $\tilde{F}$  to  $F$ , a standard application of the Hypergraph Removal Lemma (see e.g. [RS04, NRS06, Gow07]) shows that every  $\Delta_r$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices can be made  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free by removing  $o(n^r)$  edges. This implies that  $\Delta_r$  is edge-stable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^x$  as well. Since, by Proposition 4.1 again, the  $r$ -graph  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1} \in \Delta_r$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^x$ , it follows from Theorem 2.3 (ii) that  $\mathbb{T}_{r,1}$  is vertex-extendable with respect to  $\mathfrak{K}_r^x$ . This completes the proof of Proposition 1.2.  $\blacksquare$

## 6 Concluding remarks

A standard blowup argument (see e.g. the proof of [LRW24a, Theorem 1.2]), combined with Theorem 1.2, implies that every  $\mathcal{T}_r$ -free  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $n \geq r$  vertices satisfies  $|\mathcal{H}| \leq n^r/r^r$ , with equality holding iff  $r \mid n$  and  $\mathcal{H} \cong T^r(n)$ .

It seems to be an interesting problem to determine all minimal subfamilies  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\Delta_r$  such that the extremal  $\mathcal{F}$ -free construction for large  $n$  is still given by  $T^r(n)$ . Results by Frankl–Füredi [FF89] (see also [NY17]) show that  $\mathcal{F}$  cannot be  $\{\mathbb{T}_{r,1}\}$  if  $r \geq 5$ .

Below is a somewhat interesting application of Theorem 1.2 in generalized Turán problems (see e.g. [Erd62, AS16] for related background).

A 3-graph  $\mathbb{S}$  is a **Steiner triple system** (STS for short) if every pair of vertices in  $\mathbb{S}$  is contained in exactly one edge of  $\mathbb{S}$ . It follows from the definition that a  $k$ -vertex STS (if exists) contains exactly  $\binom{k}{2}/3$  edges. A well-known result (see e.g. [Wil03]) states that a  $k$ -vertex STS exists iff  $k \in 6\mathbb{N} + \{1, 3\}$ .

Denote by  $\text{ex}(n, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{C}_3)$  the maximum number of copies of  $\mathbb{S}$  in an  $n$ -vertex  $\mathbb{C}_3$ -free 3-graphs.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{S}$  is a Steiner triple system on  $k \geq 3$  vertices. Then there exists  $n_0 = n_0(\mathbb{S})$  such that, for  $n \geq n_0$ ,*

$$\text{ex}(n, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{C}_3) = |T^k(n)|.$$

*Proof sketch of Theorem 6.1.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $\mathbb{C}_3$ -free 3-graph on  $n$  vertices that contains the maximum number of copies of  $\mathbb{S}$ . Since  $\mathbb{S}$  is 2-covered and  $\mathbb{C}_3$  is blowup-invariant, by [CL24, Proposition 7.1], we may assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a blowup of some 2-covered 3-graph  $\mathcal{S}$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{S}$  must be an STS (see Fact 2.2 (ii)).

Define an auxiliary  $k$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  on the same vertex set as  $\mathcal{H}$ , in which a  $k$ -set  $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{G}$  iff it spans a copy of  $\mathbb{S}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a blowup of another  $k$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}'$ , which arises in the same way from  $\mathcal{S}$ .

It can be derived from a result on Steiner triple systems by Doyen–Wilson [DW73, Section 1] that every pair of edges in  $\mathcal{G}'$  share at most  $(k-1)/2$  vertices (by showing that the intersection of two copies of  $\mathbb{S}$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is also an STS). In particular,  $\mathcal{G}'$  is  $\mathcal{T}_k$ -free, and hence,  $\mathcal{G}$  is also  $\mathcal{T}_k$  (by Fact 2.1). Then the assertion in Theorem 6.1 follows easily from Theorem 1.2.  $\blacksquare$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 motivates the following problem on  $L$ -intersecting families (see [FT16, Section 9] for a survey).

Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer and  $L \subseteq [r]$  be a subset. An  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is called  **$L$ -intersecting** if  $|e \cap e'| \in L$  for all distinct edges  $e, e' \in \mathcal{H}$ .

**Problem 6.2.** *Determine the maximum value of the Lagrangian of an  $L$ -intersecting  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices. Also, determine the collection of sets  $L \subseteq [r]$  such that the maximum value is  $1/r^r$ .*

**Remark.** Theorem 2.6 implies that if  $L = [i]$  for some  $i < \lceil r/2 \rceil$ , then the answer is  $1/r^r$ .

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Ting-Wei Chao, Jinghua Deng, Oleg Pikhurko, and Hung-Hsun Hans Yu for related discussions, and Yixiao Zhang for bringing [CY24] to his attention.

## References

- [AES74] B. Andrásfai, P. Erdős, and V. T. Sós. On the connection between chromatic number, maximal clique and minimal degree of a graph. *Discrete Math.*, 8:205–218, 1974. 3
- [AS16] Noga Alon and Clara Shikhelman. Many  $T$  copies in  $H$ -free graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 121:146–172, 2016. 15
- [BBH<sup>+</sup>16] József Balogh, Jane Butterfield, Ping Hu, John Lenz, and Dhruv Mubayi. On the chromatic thresholds of hypergraphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 25(2):172–212, 2016. 2
- [Bol74] Béla Bollobás. Three-graphs without two triples whose symmetric difference is contained in a third. *Discrete Math.*, 8:21–24, 1974. 2
- [CL24] Wanfang Chen and Xizhi Liu. Strong stability from vertex-extendability and applications in generalized Turán problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05748*, 2024. 15
- [CY24] Ting-Wei Chao and Hung-Hsun Hans Yu. When entropy meets Turán: new proofs and hypergraph Turán results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08075*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 16
- [DW73] Jean Doyen and Richard M. Wilson. Embeddings of Steiner triple systems. *Discrete Math.*, 5:229–239, 1973. 15
- [Erd62] P. Erdős. Über ein Extremalproblem in der Graphentheorie. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 13:222–227, 1962. 15
- [ES46] P. Erdős and A. H. Stone. On the structure of linear graphs. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 52:1087–1091, 1946. 1
- [ES66] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits. A limit theorem in graph theory. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 1:51–57, 1966. 1
- [FF83] Peter Frankl and Zoltán Füredi. A new generalization of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem. *Combinatorica*, 3(3-4):341–349, 1983. 2

- [FF89] P. Frankl and Z. Füredi. Extremal problems whose solutions are the blowups of the small Witt-designs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 52(1):129–147, 1989. 15
- [FR84] P. Frankl and V. Rödl. Hypergraphs do not jump. *Combinatorica*, 4(2-3):149–159, 1984. 5
- [FT16] Peter Frankl and Norihide Tokushige. Invitation to intersection problems for finite sets. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 144:157–211, 2016. 15
- [Gol] John Goldwasser. On the Turán number of  $\{123, 124, 345\}$ . Manuscript. 2
- [Gow07] W. T. Gowers. Hypergraph regularity and the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(3):897–946, 2007. 15
- [HLZ24] Jianfeng Hou, Xizhi Liu, and Hongbin Zhao. A criterion for Andrásfai–Erdős–Sós type theorems and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17219*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 14
- [Kee11] Peter Keevash. Hypergraph Turán problems. In *Surveys in combinatorics 2011*, volume 392 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 83–139. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2011. 1
- [KLM14] Peter Keevash, John Lenz, and Dhruv Mubayi. Spectral extremal problems for hypergraphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(4):1838–1854, 2014. 3
- [KM04] Peter Keevash and Dhruv Mubayi. Stability theorems for cancellative hypergraphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 92(1):163–175, 2004. 2
- [KNS64] Gyula Katona, Tibor Nemetz, and Miklós Simonovits. On a problem of Turán in the theory of graphs. *Mat. Lapok*, 15:228–238, 1964. 1
- [KNY15] L. Kang, V. Nikiforov, and X. Yuan. The  $p$ -spectral radius of  $k$ -partite and  $k$ -chromatic uniform hypergraphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 478:81–107, 2015. 3
- [Liu21] Xizhi Liu. New short proofs to some stability theorems. *European J. Combin.*, 96:Paper No. 103350, 8, 2021. 2
- [Liu24] Xizhi Liu. Cancellative hypergraphs and Steiner triple systems. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 167:303–337, 2024. 2
- [LM21] Xizhi Liu and Dhruv Mubayi. The feasible region of hypergraphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 148:23–59, 2021. 2
- [LMR23] Xizhi Liu, Dhruv Mubayi, and Christian Reiher. A unified approach to hypergraph stability. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 158:36–62, 2023. 1, 2, 4, 12
- [LRW24a] Xizhi Liu, Sijie Ren, and Jian Wang. Andrásfai–Erdős–Sós theorem for the generalized triangle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20832*, 2024. 2, 3, 15
- [LRW24b] Xizhi Liu, Sijie Ren, and Jian Wang. Positive codegree Andrásfai–Erdős–Sós theorem for the generalized triangle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07090*, 2024. 2
- [Man07] Willem Mantel. Vraagstuk XXVIII. *Wiskundige Opgaven*, 10(2):60–61, 1907. 2
- [MPS11] Dhruv Mubayi, Oleg Pikhurko, and Benny Sudakov. Hypergraph Turán problem: some open questions. In *AIM workshop problem lists, manuscript*, page 166, 2011. 1, 2

- [MS65] T. S. Motzkin and E. G. Straus. Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of Turán. *Canadian J. Math.*, 17:533–540, 1965. 5
- [NRS06] Brendan Nagle, Vojtěch Rödl, and Mathias Schacht. The counting lemma for regular  $k$ -uniform hypergraphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 28(2):113–179, 2006. 15
- [NY17] S. Norin and L. Yepremyan. Turán number of generalized triangles. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 146:312–343, 2017. 15
- [Pik08] Oleg Pikhurko. An exact Turán result for the generalized triangle. *Combinatorica*, 28(2):187–208, 2008. 2
- [RS04] Vojtěch Rödl and Jozef Skokan. Regularity lemma for  $k$ -uniform hypergraphs. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 25(1):1–42, 2004. 15
- [Sha48] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 27:379–423, 623–656, 1948. 6
- [She96] James B. Shearer. A new construction for cancellative families of sets. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 3(1):Research Paper 15, approx. 3, 1996. 2
- [Sid94] A. Sidorenko. An analytic approach to extremal problems for graphs and hypergraphs. In *Extremal problems for finite sets (Visegrád, 1991)*, volume 3 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 423–455. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 1994. 2
- [Tur41] Paul Turán. On an external problem in graph theory. *Mat. Fiz. Lapok*, 48:436–452, 1941. 1
- [Wil03] Robin Wilson. The early history of block designs. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Messina Ser. II*, 9(25):267–276, 2003. 15