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#### Abstract

We provide several constructions for problems in Ramsey theory. First, we prove a superexponential lower bound for the classical 4 -uniform Ramsey number $r_{4}(5, n)$, and the same for the iterated $(k-4)$-fold logarithm of the $k$-uniform version $r_{k}(k+1, n)$. This is the first improvement of the original exponential lower bound for $r_{4}(5, n)$ implicit in work of Erdős and Hajnal from 1972 and also improves the current best known bounds for larger $k$ due to the authors. Second, we prove an upper bound for the hypergraph Erdős-Rogers function $f_{k+1, k+2}^{k}(N)$ that is an iterated $(k-13)$-fold logarithm in $N$. This improves the previous upper bounds that were only logarithmic and addresses a question of Dudek and the first author that was reiterated by Conlon, Fox and Sudakov. Third, we generalize the results of Erdős and Hajnal about the 3 -uniform Ramsey number of $K_{4}$ minus an edge versus a clique to $k$-uniform hypergraphs.


## 1 Introduction

A $k$-uniform hypergraph $H$ ( $k$-graph for short) with vertex set $V$ is a collection of $k$-element subsets of $V$. We write $K_{n}^{k}$ for the complete $k$-uniform hypergraph on an $n$-element vertex set. Given $k$ graphs $F, G$, the Ramsey number $r(F, G)$ is the minimum $N$ such that every red/blue coloring of the edges of $K_{N}^{k}$ results in a monochromatic red copy of $F$ or a monochromatic blue copy of $G$.

In this paper, we study several problems in hypergraph Ramsey theory. We describe each problem in detail in its relevant section. Here we provide a brief summary. In Section 2, we give new lower bounds on the classical Ramsey number $r\left(K_{k+1}^{k}, K_{n}^{k}\right)$, improving the previous best known bounds obtained by the authors [18]. In particular, we give the first superexponential lower bound for $r\left(K_{5}^{4}, K_{n}^{4}\right)$ since the problem was first explicitly stated by Erdős and Hajnal [12] in 1972. In Section 3, we establish a new upper bound for the hypergraph Erdős-Rogers function $f_{k+1, k+2}^{k}(N)$ that is an iterated logarithm function in $N$. More precisely, we construct $k$-graphs on $N$ vertices, with no copy of $K_{k+2}^{k}$, yet every set of $n$ vertices contains a copy of $K_{k+1}^{k}$ where $n$ is the ( $k-13$ )-fold iterated logarithm of $N$. This addresses questions posed by Dudek and the first author [8 as well as by Conlon, Fox, and Sudakov [7] and significantly improves the previous best known bound in [8] of $n=O\left((\log N)^{1 /(k-1)}\right)$. In Section 4 we study the Ramsey numbers for $k$-half-graphs versus

[^0]cliques, generalizing the results of Erdős and Hajnal [12] about the 3-uniform Ramsey number of $K_{4}$ minus an edge versus a clique. The upper bound is a straightforward extension of the method in [12], while the constructions are new.

All logarithms are base 2 unless otherwise stated. For the sake of clarity of presentation, we systematically omit floor and ceiling signs whenever they are not crucial.

## 2 A new lower bound for $r_{k}(k+1, n)$

In order to avoid the excessive use of superscripts, we use the simpler notation $r\left(K_{s}^{k}, K_{n}^{k}\right)=r_{k}(s, n)$. Estimating the Ramsey number $r_{k}(s, n)$ is a classical problem in extremal combinatorics and has been extensively studied [13, 14, 16]. Here we study the off-diagonal Ramsey number, that is, $r_{k}(s, n)$ with $k$, $s$ fixed and $n$ tending to infinity. It is known that for fixed $s \geq k+1, r_{2}(s, n)$ grows polynomially in $n$ [1, 2, 3] and $r_{3}(s, n)$ grows exponentially in a power of $n$ [6]. In 1972, Erdős and Hajnal [12] raised the question of determining the correct tower growth rate for $r_{k}(s, n)$. We define the tower function $\operatorname{twr}_{k}(x)$ by

$$
\operatorname{twr}_{1}(x)=x \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname{twr}_{i+1}=2^{\operatorname{twr}_{i}(x)}
$$

By applying the Erdős-Hajnal stepping up lemma in the off-diagonal setting (see [17), it follows that $r_{k}(s, n) \geq \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(\Omega(n))$, for $k \geq 4$ and for all $s \geq 2^{k-1}-k+3$. However they conjectured the following.
Conjecture 2.1. (Erdős-Hajnal [12]) For $s \geq k+1 \geq 5$ fixed, $r_{k}(s, n) \geq \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(\Omega(n))$.
In [5], Conlon, Fox, and Sudakov modified the Erdős-Hajnal stepping-up lemma to show that Conjecture 2.1 holds for all $s \geq\lceil 5 k / 2\rceil-3$. Recently the authors nearly proved the conjecture by establishing the following.
Theorem 2.2 (18]). There is a positive constant $c>0$ such that the following holds. For $k \geq 4$ and $n>3 k$, we have

1. $r_{k}(k+3, n) \geq \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(c n)$,
2. $r_{k}(k+2, n) \geq \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}\left(c \log ^{2} n\right)$,
3. $r_{k}(k+1, n) \geq \operatorname{twr}_{k-2}\left(c n^{2}\right)$.

Implicit in work of Erdős and Hajnal [12] is the bound $r_{4}(5, n)>2^{c n}$ for some absolute positive constant $c$. While the authors [18] recently improved this to $2^{c n^{2}}$ above, there has been no superexponential lower bound given for this basic problem. Here we provide such a lower bound.

Theorem 2.3. There is an absolute constant $c>0$ such that

$$
r_{4}(5, n)>2^{n^{c \log \log n}}
$$

and more generally for $k>4$,

$$
r_{k}(k+1, n)>\operatorname{twr}_{k-2}\left(n^{c \log \log n}\right) .
$$

One of the building blocks we will use in our construction is the following lower bound of Conlon, Fox, and Sudakov [6]: there is an absolute positive constant $c>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{3}(4, t)>2^{c t \log t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our lower bound for $r_{4}(5, n)$ is proved via the following theorem.
Theorem 2.4. For $n$ sufficiently large, we have

$$
r_{4}(5, n)>2^{r_{3}(4,\lfloor(\log n) / 2\rfloor)-1} .
$$

Proof. The idea is to apply a variant of the Erdős-Hajnal stepping up lemma (see [17). Set $t=\left\lfloor\frac{\log n}{2}\right\rfloor$. Let $\phi$ be a red/blue coloring of the edges of the complete 3 -uniform hypergraph on the vertex set $\left\{0,1, \ldots, r_{3}(4, t)-2\right\}$ without a red $K_{4}^{3}$ and without a blue $K_{t}^{3}$. We use $\phi$ to define a red/blue coloring $\chi$ of the edges of the complete 4 -uniform hypergraph $K_{N}^{4}$ on the vertex set $V=\{0,1, \ldots, N-1\}$ with $N=2^{r_{3}(4, t)-1}$, as follows.

For any $a \in V$, write $a=\sum_{i=0}^{r_{3}(4, t)-2} a(i) 2^{i}$ with $a(i) \in\{0,1\}$ for each $i$. For $a \neq b$, let $\delta(a, b)$ denote the largest $i$ for which $a(i) \neq b(i)$. Notice that we have the following stepping-up properties (again see [17])

Property A: For every triple $a<b<c, \delta(a, b) \neq \delta(b, c)$.
Property B: For $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{r}, \delta\left(a_{1}, a_{r}\right)=\max _{1 \leq j \leq r-1} \delta\left(a_{j}, a_{j+1}\right)$.

Given any 4-tuple $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{4}$ of $V$, consider the integers $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right), 1 \leq i \leq 3$. Say that $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{3}$ forms a monotone sequence if $\delta_{1}<\delta_{2}<\delta_{3}$ or $\delta_{1}>\delta_{2}>\delta_{3}$. Now, define $\chi$ as follows:

$$
\chi\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}\right)= \begin{cases}\phi\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{3}\right) & \text { if } \delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{3} \text { is monotone } \\ b l u e & \text { if } \delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \delta_{3} \text { is not monotone }\end{cases}
$$

Hence we have the following property which can be easily verified using Properties A and B (see [17]).

Property C: For $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{r}$, set $\delta_{j}=\delta\left(a_{j}, a_{j+1}\right)$ and suppose that $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ form a monotone sequence. If $\chi$ colors every 4 -tuple in $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}\right\}$ red (blue), then $\phi$ colors every triple in $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\right\}$ red (blue).

For sake of contradiction, suppose that the coloring $\chi$ produces a red $K_{5}^{4}$ on vertices $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{5}$, and let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right), 1 \leq i \leq 4$. Then $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{4}$ form a monotone sequence and, by Property C , $\phi$ colors every triple in $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{4}\right\}$ red which is a contradiction. Therefore, there is no red $K_{5}^{4}$ in coloring $\chi$.

Next we show that there is no blue $K_{n}^{4}$ in coloring $\chi$. Our argument is reminiscent of the standard argument for the bound $r_{2}(n, n)<4^{n}$, though it must be adapted to this setting. For sake of
contradiction, suppose we have vertices $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in V$ such that $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{n}$ and $\chi$ colors every 4 -tuple in the set $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$ blue. Let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We greedily construct a set $D_{h}=\left\{\delta_{i_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{h}}\right\} \subset\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}\right\}$ and a set $S_{h} \subset\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$ such that the following holds.

1. We have $\delta_{i_{1}}>\cdots>\delta_{i_{h}}$.
2. For each $\delta_{i_{j}}=\delta\left(a_{i_{j}}, a_{i_{j}+1}\right) \in D_{h}=\left\{\delta_{i_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{h}}\right\}$, consider the set of vertices

$$
A=\left\{a_{i_{j+1}}, a_{i_{j+1}+1}, \ldots, a_{i_{h}}, a_{i_{h}+1}\right\} \cup S_{h} .
$$

Then either every element in $A$ is greater than $a_{i_{j}}$ or every element in $A$ is less than $a_{i_{j}+1}$. In the former case we will label $\delta_{i_{j}}$ white, in the latter case we label it black.
3. The indices of the vertices in $S_{h}$ are consecutive, that is, $S_{h}=\left\{a_{r}, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_{s-1}, a_{s}\right\}$ for $1 \leq r<s \leq n$.

We start with the $D_{0}=\emptyset$ and $S_{0}=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$. Having obtained $D_{h}=\left\{\delta_{i_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{h}}\right\}$ and $S_{h}=\left\{a_{r}, \ldots, a_{s}\right\}, 1 \leq r<s \leq n$, we construct $D_{h+1}$ and $S_{h+1}$ as follows. Let $\delta_{i_{h+1}}=\delta\left(a_{\ell}, a_{\ell+1}\right)$ be the unique largest element in $\left\{\delta_{r}, \delta_{r+1}, \ldots, \delta_{s-1}\right\}$, and set $D_{h+1}=D_{h} \cup \delta_{i_{h+1}}$. The uniqueness of $\delta_{i_{h+1}}$ follows from Properties A and B. If $\left|\left\{a_{r}, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_{\ell}\right\}\right| \geq\left|S_{h}\right| / 2$, then we set $S_{h+1}=$ $\left\{a_{r}, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_{\ell}\right\}$. Otherwise by the pigeonhole principle, we have $\left|\left\{a_{\ell+1}, a_{\ell+2}, \ldots, a_{s}\right\}\right| \geq\left|S_{h}\right| / 2$ and we set $S_{h+1}=\left\{a_{\ell+1}, a_{\ell+2}, \ldots, a_{s}\right\}$.
Since $\left|S_{0}\right|=n, t=\left\lfloor\frac{\log n}{2}\right\rfloor$ and $\left|S_{h+1}\right| \geq\left|S_{h}\right| / 2$ for $h \geq 0$, we can construct $D_{2 t}=\left\{\delta_{i_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{2 t}}\right\}$ with the desired properties. By the pigeonhole principle, at least $t$ elements in $D_{2 t}$ have the same label, say white. The other case will follow by a symmetric argument. We remove all black labeled elements in $D_{2 t}$, and let $\left\{\delta_{j_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{j_{t}}\right\}$ be the resulting set. Now consider the vertices $a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}, \ldots, a_{j_{t}} \in V$. By construction and by Property B, we have $a_{j_{1}}<a_{j_{2}}<\cdots<a_{j_{t}}$ and $\delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}\right)=\delta_{i_{j_{1}}}, \delta\left(a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{3}}\right)=\delta_{j_{j_{2}}}, \ldots, \delta\left(a_{j_{t}}, a_{j_{t+1}}\right)=\delta_{i_{j_{t}}}$. Therefore we have a monotone sequence

$$
\delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}\right)>\delta\left(a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{3}}\right)>\cdots>\delta\left(a_{j_{t}}, a_{j_{t+1}}\right) .
$$

By Property C, $\phi$ colors every triple from this set blue which is a contradiction. Therefore there is no red $K_{5}^{4}$ and no blue $K_{n}^{4}$ in coloring $\chi$.

Applying the lower bound in (1), we obtain that

$$
r_{4}(5, n) \geq 2^{r_{3}(4,\lfloor\log n / 2\rfloor)-1}>2^{2^{c \log n \log \log n}}=2^{n^{c \log \log n}}
$$

for some absolute positive constant $c$ and this establishes the first part of Theorem 2.3.
We next prove Theorem 2.3 for $k \geq 5$. Independently, Conlon, Fox and Sudakov [4] gave a different proof of Theorem [2.2 part 1. Their approach was to begin with a known 4-uniform construction that yields $r_{4}(7, n)>2^{2 c n}$ and then use a variant of the stepping up lemma to give tower-type lower bounds for larger $k$. Unfortunately, this variant of the stepping up lemma does not work if one begins instead with a lower bound for $r_{4}(5, n)$ which is our case. However, a further variant of the approach does work, and this is what we do below.

Lemma 2.5. For $k \geq 5$ and $n$ sufficiently large, we have

$$
r_{k}(k+1, n) \geq 2^{r_{k-1}(k,\lfloor n / 6\rfloor)-1} .
$$

Proof. Again we apply a variant of the stepping-up lemma. Let $\phi$ be a red/blue coloring of the edges of the complete $(k-1)$-uniform hypergraph on the vertex set $\left\{0,1, \ldots, r_{k-1}(k,\lfloor n / 6\rfloor)-2\right\}$ without a red $K_{k}^{k-1}$ and without a blue $K_{\lfloor n / 6\rfloor}^{k-1}$. We use $\phi$ to define a red/blue coloring $\chi$ of the edges of the complete $k$-uniform hypergraph $K_{N}^{k}$ on the vertex set $V=\{0,1, \ldots, N-1\}$ with $N=2^{r_{k-1}(k,\lfloor n / 6\rfloor)-1}$, as follows.

Just as above, for any $a \in V$, write $a=\sum_{i=0}^{r_{k-1}(k,\lfloor n / 6\rfloor)-2} a(i) 2^{i}$ with $a(i) \in\{0,1\}$ for each $i$. For $a \neq b$, let $\delta(a, b)$ denote the largest $i$ for which $a(i) \neq b(i)$. Hence Properties A and B hold.

Given any $k$-tuple $a_{1}<a_{2}<\ldots<a_{k}$ of $V$, consider the integers $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right), 1 \leq i \leq k-1$. We say that $\delta_{i}$ is a local minimum if $\delta_{i-1}>\delta_{i}<\delta_{i+1}$, a local maximum if $\delta_{i-1}<\delta_{i}>\delta_{i+1}$, and a local extremum if it is either a local minimum or a local maximum. We say that $\delta_{i}$ is locally monotone if $\delta_{i-1}<\delta_{i}<\delta_{i+1}$ or $\delta_{i-1}>\delta_{i}>\delta_{i+1}$. Since $\delta_{i-1} \neq \delta_{i}$ for every $i$, every nonmonotone sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ has a local extremum. If $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ form a monotone sequence, then let $\chi\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)=\phi\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}\right)$. Otherwise if $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ is not monotone, then let $\chi\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k}\right)$ be red if and only if $\delta_{2}$ is a local maximum and $\delta_{3}$ is a local minimum. Hence the following generalization of Property C holds.

Property D: For $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{r}$, set $\delta_{j}=\delta\left(a_{j}, a_{j+1}\right)$ and suppose that $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ form a monotone sequence. If $\chi$ colors every $k$-tuple in $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}\right\}$ red (blue), then $\phi$ colors every ( $k-1$ )tuple in $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\right\}$ red (blue).

For sake of contradiction, suppose that the coloring $\chi$ produces a red $K_{k+1}^{k}$ on vertices $a_{1}<\cdots<$ $a_{k+1}$, and let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right), 1 \leq i \leq k$. We have two cases.

Case 1. Suppose $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ is monotone. Then if $\delta_{2}, \ldots, \delta_{k}$ is also a monotone sequence, $\phi$ colors every $(k-1)$-tuple in $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k}\right\}$ red by Property D, which is a contradiction. Otherwise, $\delta_{k-1}$ is the only local extremum and $\chi\left(a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k+1}\right)$ is blue, which is again a contradiction.

Case 2. Suppose $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ is not monotone. Then we know that $\delta_{2}$ is a local maximum and $\delta_{3}$ is a local minimum. However this implies that $\chi\left(a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k+1}\right)$ is blue, which is a contradiction. Hence there is no red $K_{k+1}^{k}$ in coloring $\chi$.

Next we show that there is no blue $K_{n}^{k}$ in coloring $\chi$. For sake of contradiction, suppose we have vertices $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in V$ such that $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{n}$ and $\chi$ colors every $k$-tuple blue, and let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. By Property D, there is no integer $r$ such that $\delta_{r}, \delta_{r+1}, \ldots, \delta_{r+\lfloor n / 6\rfloor}$ is monotone, since this implies that $\phi$ colors every ( $k-1$ )-tuple in the set $\left\{\delta_{r}, \delta_{r+1}, \ldots, \delta_{r+\lfloor n / 6\rfloor}\right\}$ blue which is a contradiction. Therefore the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$ contains at least four local extrema. Let $\delta_{j_{1}}$ be the first local maximum, and let $\delta_{j_{2}}$ be the next local extremum, which must be a local minimum. Recall that $\delta_{j_{1}}=\delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{1}+1}\right)$ and $\delta_{j_{2}}=\delta\left(a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{2}+1}\right)$. Consider the $k$ vertices

$$
a_{j_{1}-1}, a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{2}+1}, a_{j_{2}+2}, \ldots, a_{j_{2}+k-3}
$$

and the sequence

$$
\delta\left(a_{j_{1}-1}, a_{j_{1}}\right), \delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}\right), \delta\left(a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{2}+1}\right), \ldots, \delta\left(a_{j_{2}+k-4}, a_{j_{2}+k-3}\right) .
$$

By Property B we have $\delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}\right)=\delta_{j_{1}}$, and therefore $\delta\left(a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}\right)$ is a local maximum and $\delta\left(a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{2}+1}\right)$ is a local minimum. Therefore $\chi\left(a_{j_{1}-1}, a_{j_{1}}, a_{j_{2}}, a_{j_{2}+1}, \ldots, a_{j_{2}+k-3}\right)$ is red and we have our contradiction. Hence there is no blue $K_{n}^{k}$ in coloring $\chi$.

By combining Theorem 2.4 with Lemma 2.5, we establish Theorem 2.3.

## 3 The Erdős-Rogers function for hypergraphs

An $s$-independent set in a $k$-graph $H$ is a vertex subset that contains no copy of $K_{s}^{k}$. So if $s=k$, then it is just an independent set. Let $\alpha_{s}(H)$ denote the size of the largest $s$-independent set in $H$.

Definition 3.1. For $k \leq s<t<N$, the Erdős-Rogers function $f_{s, t}^{k}(N)$ is the minimum of $\alpha_{s}(H)$ taken over all $K_{t}^{k}$-free $k$-graphs $H$ of order $N$.

To prove the lower bound $f_{s, t}^{k}(N) \geq n$ one must show that every $K_{t}^{k}$-free $k$-graph of order $N$ contains an $s$-independent set with $n$ vertices. On the other hand, to prove the upper bound $f_{s, t}^{k}(N)<n$, one must construct a $K_{t}^{k}$-free $k$-graph $H$ of order $N$ with $\alpha_{s}(H)<n$.

The problem of determining $f_{s, t}^{k}(n)$ extends that of finding Ramsey numbers. Formally,

$$
r_{k}(s, n)=\min \left\{N: f_{k, s}^{k}(N) \geq n\right\}
$$

For $k=2$ the above function was first considered by Erdős and Rogers [15] only for $t=s+1$, which might be viewed as the most restrictive case. Since then the function has been studied by several researchers culminating in the work of Wolfowitz [20] and Dudek, Retter and Rödl 9 who proved the upper bound that follows (the lower bound is due to Dudek and the first author [8]): for every $s \geq 3$ there are positive constants $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}(s)$ such that

$$
c_{1}\left(\frac{N \log N}{\log \log N}\right)^{1 / 2}<f_{s, s+1}^{2}(N)<c_{2}(\log N)^{4 s^{2}} N^{1 / 2}
$$

The problem of estimating the Erdős-Rogers function for $k>2$ appears to be much harder. Let us denote

$$
g(k, N)=f_{k+1, k+2}^{k}(N)
$$

so that the above result (for $s=3$ ) becomes $g(2, N)=N^{1 / 2+o(1)}$. Dudek and the first author [8] proved that $(\log N)^{1 / 4+o(1)}<g(3, N)<O(\log N)$ and more generally that there are positive constants $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1}\left(\log _{(k-2)} N\right)^{1 / 4}<g(k, N)<c_{2}(\log N)^{1 /(k-2)} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\log _{(i)}$ is the $\log$ function iterated $i$ times. The exponent $1 / 4$ was improved to $1 / 3$ by Conlon, Fox, Sudakov [7]. Both sets of authors asked whether the upper bound could be improved (presumably to an iterated $\log$ function). Here we prove this where the number of iterations is $k-O(1)$. It remains an open problem to determine the correct number of iterations (which may well be $k-2$ ).

Theorem 3.2. Fix $k \geq 14$. Then $g(k, N)<O\left(\log _{(k-13)} N\right)$.
Proof. We will proceed by induction on $k$. The base case of $k=14$ follows from the upper bound in (2). For the inductive step, let $k>14$ and assume that the result holds for $k-1$. We will show that

$$
g\left(k, 2^{N}\right)<k \cdot g(k-1, N),
$$

and this recurrence clearly implies the theorem. Indeed, it easily implies the upper bound

$$
g(k, N)<2^{k} k!\log _{(k-13)} N
$$

by induction on $k$, as $g(k+1, N)$ is at most

$$
\begin{aligned}
g\left(k+1,2^{\lceil\log N\rceil}\right) & <(k+1) g(k,\lceil\log N\rceil) \\
& <2^{k}(k+1)!\log _{(k-13)}\lceil\log N\rceil \\
& \leq 2^{k+1}(k+1)!\log _{(k-12)} N .
\end{aligned}
$$

Our strategy is to apply a variant of the stepping-up lemma. Let us begin with a $K_{k+1}^{k-1}$-free $(k-1)$ graph $H^{\prime}$ on $N$ vertices for which $\alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)=g(k-1, N)$. Note that this exists by definition of $g(k-1, N)$. We will use $H^{\prime}$ to produce a $K_{k+2}^{k}$-free $k$-graph $H$ on $2^{N}$ vertices with $\alpha_{k+1}(H)<$ $k \alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)=k g(k-1, N)$.

Let $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)=\{0,1, \ldots, N-1\}$ and $V(H)=\left\{0,1, \ldots, 2^{N}-1\right\}$. For any $a \in V(H)$, write $a=$ $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a(i) 2^{i}$ with $a(i) \in\{0,1\}$ for each $i$. For $a \neq b$, let $\delta(a, b)$ denote the largest $i$ for which $a(i) \neq b(i)$. Therefore Properties A and B in the previous section hold.

Given any set of $s$ vertices $a_{1}<a_{2}<\ldots<a_{s}$ of $V(H)$, consider the integers $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right), 1 \leq$ $i \leq s-1$. For $e=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{s}\right)$, let $m(e)$ denote the number of local extrema in the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{s-1}$. In the case $s=k$, we define the edges of $H$ as follows. If $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ form a monotone sequence, then let $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) \in E(H)$ if and only if $\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}\right) \in E\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. Otherwise if $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ is not monotone, then $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) \in E(H)$ if and only if $m(e) \in\{k-4, k-3\}$. In other words, given that $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ is not monotone, $\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{k}\right) \in E(H)$ if and only if $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$ has at most one locally monotone element. Note that we have the following variant of Property D.

Property E: For $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{r}$, set $\delta_{j}=\delta\left(a_{j}, a_{j+1}\right)$ and suppose that $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$ form a monotone sequence. If every $k$-tuple in $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{r}\right\}$ is in $E(H)$ (in $\bar{E}(H)$ ), then every $(k-1)$-tuple in $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\right\}$ is in $E\left(H^{\prime}\right)\left(\right.$ in $\left.\bar{E}\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right)$.

We are to show that $H$ contains no $(k+2)$-clique and $\alpha_{k+1}(H)<k \alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. First let us establish the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. Given $e=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{7}\right)$ with $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{7}$, let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 6$. If $m(e)=4$, then there is an $a_{i}$ such that $2 \leq i \leq 6$ and $m\left(e-a_{i}\right)=2$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\delta_{2}$ is a local minimum, so $\delta_{1}>\delta_{2}<\delta_{3}>\cdots$. Then we have $m\left(e-a_{4}\right)=2$. Indeed, since $\delta_{4}$ is a local minimum, Property B implies $\delta\left(a_{3}, a_{5}\right)=\delta_{3}$. If $\delta_{5}>\delta_{3}$, then we have $\delta_{2}<\delta\left(a_{3}, a_{5}\right)<\delta_{5}$ and therefore $m\left(e-a_{4}\right)=2$. If $\delta_{5}<\delta_{3}$, then we have $\delta\left(a_{3}, a_{5}\right)>\delta_{5}>\delta_{6}$ which again implies that $m\left(e-a_{4}\right)=2$.

Now suppose that $\delta_{2}$ is a local maximum, so $\delta_{1}<\delta_{2}>\delta_{3}<\cdots$. Then we have $m\left(e-a_{3}\right)=2$. Indeed, by Property B we have $\delta\left(a_{2}, a_{4}\right)=\delta_{2}$. If $\delta_{4}<\delta_{2}$, then we have $\delta\left(a_{2}, a_{4}\right)>\delta_{4}>\delta_{5}$ which implies $m\left(e-a_{3}\right)=2$. If $\delta_{4}>\delta_{2}$, then we have $\delta_{1}<\delta\left(a_{2}, a_{4}\right)<\delta_{4}$ which again implies $m\left(e-a_{3}\right)=2$.
For sake of contradiction, suppose there are $k+2$ vertices $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{k+2}$ that induce a $K_{k+2}^{k}$ in $H$. Define $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k+1$. Given the sequence $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}, \ldots, \delta_{k+1}$, let us consider the number of locally monotone elements in $D=\left\{\delta_{2}, \ldots, \delta_{k}\right\}$.

Case 1. Suppose every element in $D$ is locally monotone. Then $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k+1}$ form a monotone sequence. By Property E, every $(k-1)$-tuple in the set $\left\{\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{k+1}\right\}$ is an edge in $H^{\prime}$ which is a contradiction since $H^{\prime}$ is $K_{k+1}^{k-1}$-free.

Case 2. Suppose there is at least one local extremum $\delta_{\ell} \in D$ and at least two elements $\delta_{i}, \delta_{j} \in D$ that are locally monotone. Then any $k$-tuple $e \subset\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+2}\right\}$ that includes the vertices

$$
a_{i-1}, a_{i}, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, a_{j-1}, a_{j}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+2}, a_{\ell-1}, a_{\ell}, a_{\ell+1}, a_{\ell+2}
$$

satisfies $1 \leq m(e)<k-4$. Therefore $e$ is not an edge in $H$ and we have a contradiction.
Case 3. Suppose there is exactly one element $\delta_{i} \in D$ that is locally monotone (and therefore at least one local extremum). Since $k \geq 15$, either $\left|\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{i-1}\right\}\right| \geq 7$ or $\left|\left\{a_{i+2}, \ldots, a_{k+2}\right\}\right| \geq 7$. Let us only consider the former case, the latter being symmetric. By Lemma 3.3, there is an element $a_{j} \in\left\{a_{2}, \ldots, a_{6}\right\} \subset\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{i-1}\right\}$ such that for $e^{\prime}=\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{7}\right), m\left(e^{\prime}-a_{j}\right)=2$. Then any $k$-tuple $e \subset\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+2}\right\} \backslash\left\{a_{j}\right\}$ that includes vertices

$$
\left\{a_{t}: 1 \leq t \leq 7, t \neq j\right\} \cup\left\{a_{i-1}, a_{i}, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}\right\}
$$

satisfies $1 \leq m(e)<k-4$. Hence $e$ is not an edge in $H$ and we have a contradiction.
Case 4. Suppose every element in $D$ is a local extremum. We then apply Lemma 3.3 to the set $A=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{7}\right\}$ and $B=\left\{a_{8}, \ldots, a_{14}\right\}$ to obtain vertices $a_{i} \in A$ and $a_{j} \in B$ such that $m\left(\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{7}\right\} \backslash\left\{a_{i}\right\}\right)=2$ and $m\left(\left\{a_{8}, \ldots, a_{14}\right\} \backslash\left\{a_{j}\right\}\right)=2$. In particular, this implies that for $e=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+2}\right\} \backslash\left\{a_{i}, a_{j}\right\}$, the corresponding sequence of $\delta$ 's has at least two locally monotone elements. Since clearly $e$ has at least one local extremum, we obtain $1 \leq m(e)<k-4$. Hence $e \notin E(H)$ and we have a contradiction.

Therefore we have shown that $H$ is $K_{k+2}^{k}$-free.
Our final task is to show that $\alpha_{k+1}(H)<k \alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. Set $n=k t$ where $t=\alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. Let us assume for contradiction that there are vertices $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{n}$ that induce a $(k+1)$-independent set in $H$. Let $\delta_{i}=\delta\left(a_{i}, a_{i+1}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. If the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$ contains fewer than $k$
local extrema, then there is a $j$ such that $\delta_{j}, \ldots, \delta_{j+t}$ is monotone. Since $t=\alpha_{k}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$, the $t+1$ vertices $\left\{\delta_{j}, \ldots, \delta_{j+t}\right\}$ contain a copy of $K_{k}^{k-1}$ in $H^{\prime}$. Say this copy is given by $\delta_{j_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{j_{k}}$. Then by Property E, the vertices $a_{j_{1}}<\cdots<a_{j_{k}}<a_{j_{k}+1}$ induce a copy of $K_{k+1}^{k}$ which contradicts our assumption that $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$ is a $(k+1)$-independent set in $H$.

We may therefore assume that the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$ contains at least $k$ local extrema. Now we make the following claim.

Claim 3.4. There is a set of $k+1$ vertices $a_{1}^{*}, \ldots, a_{k+1}^{*} \in\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$ such that for $\delta_{i}^{*}=\delta\left(a_{i}^{*}, a_{i+1}^{*}\right)$, the sequence $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ has $k-2$ local extrema.

Proof. Let $\delta_{i_{1}}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{k}}$ be the first $k$ extrema in the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$.
Case 1. Suppose $\delta_{i_{1}}$ is a local minimum. If $k$ is odd, then consider the $k+1$ distinct vertices

$$
e=a_{i_{1}}, a_{i_{1}+1}, a_{i_{3}}, a_{i_{3}+1}, a_{i_{5}}, a_{i_{5}+1}, \ldots, a_{i_{k}}, a_{i_{k}+1}
$$

Note that the pairs $\left(a_{i_{1}}, a_{i_{1}+1}\right),\left(a_{i_{3}}, a_{i_{3}+1}\right),\left(a_{i_{5}}, a_{i_{5}+1}\right), \ldots$ correspond to local minima. By Property $\mathrm{B}, \delta\left(a_{i_{1}+1}, a_{i_{3}}\right)=\delta_{i_{2}}, \delta\left(a_{i_{3}+1}, a_{i_{5}}\right)=\delta_{i_{4}}, \ldots$. Since $\delta_{i_{2}}, \delta_{i_{4}}, \delta_{i_{6}}, \ldots$ were local maxima in the sequence $\delta_{1}, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$, we have

$$
\delta\left(a_{i_{1}}, a_{i_{1}+1}\right)<\delta\left(a_{i_{1}+1}, a_{i_{3}}\right)>\delta\left(a_{i_{3}}, a_{i_{3}+1}\right)<\delta\left(a_{i_{3}+1}, a_{i_{5}}\right)>\cdots .
$$

Hence the vertices in $e$ satisfy the claim. If $k$ is even, then by the same argument as above, the $k+1$ vertices

$$
a_{1}, a_{i_{1}}, a_{i_{1}+1}, a_{i_{3}}, a_{i_{3}+1}, a_{i_{5}}, a_{i_{5}+1}, \ldots, a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_{k-1}+1}
$$

satisfy the claim.
Case 2. Suppose $\delta_{i_{1}}$ is a local maximum. If $k$ is odd, then the arguments above imply that the set of $k+1$ vertices

$$
a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{i_{2}}, a_{i_{2}+1}, a_{i_{4}}, a_{i_{4}+1}, \ldots, a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_{k-1}+1}
$$

satisfies the claim. Likewise, if $k$ is even, the set of $k+1$ vertices

$$
a_{1}, a_{i_{2}}, a_{i_{2}+1}, a_{i_{4}}, a_{i_{4}+1}, \ldots, a_{i_{k}}, a_{i_{k}+1}
$$

satisfies the claim.
By Claim 3.4, we obtain $k+1$ vertices $h=\left(a_{1}^{*}, \ldots, a_{k+1}^{*}\right)$ along with $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ with the desired properties. Consider the $k$-tuple $e=h-a_{i}^{*}$. If $i=1$ or $k+1$, then it is easy to see that $m(e)=k-3$, which implies $e \in E(H)$. For $i=2, \delta_{3}^{*}$ is the only possible locally monotone element in the sequence $\delta\left(a_{1}^{*}, a_{3}^{*}\right), \delta_{3}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$. Therefore $m\left(e-a_{i}\right) \geq k-4$ and $e \in E(H)$. A symmetric argument for the
case $i=k$ implies that $e \in E(H)$. Therefore we can assume $3 \leq i \leq k-1$. By Property B, we have $\delta\left(a_{i-1}^{*}, a_{i+1}^{*}\right)=\max \left\{\delta_{i-1}^{*}, \delta_{i}^{*}\right\}$. Let us consider the two cases.

Case 1. Suppose $\delta\left(a_{i-1}^{*}, a_{i+1}^{*}\right)=\delta_{i-1}^{*}$. If $\delta_{i+1}^{*}>\delta_{i-1}^{*}$, then $\delta_{i-1}^{*}$ is the only element in the sequence $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{i-1}^{*}, \delta_{i+1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ that is locally monotone. Hence $m(e)=k-4$ and $e \in E(H)$. If $\delta_{i+1}^{*}<$ $\delta_{i-1}^{*}$, then $\delta_{i+1}^{*}$ is the only possible element in the sequence $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{i-1}^{*}, \delta_{i+1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ that is locally monotone. More precisely, if $i=k-1$ then $m(e)=k-3$, and if $3 \leq i<k-1$ then $m(e)=k-4$. Hence $m(e) \geq k-4$ and therefore $e \in E(H)$.

Case 2. Suppose $\delta\left(a_{i-1}^{*}, a_{i+1}^{*}\right)=\delta_{i}^{*}$. If $\delta_{i-2}^{*}>\delta_{i}^{*}$, then $\delta_{i}^{*}$ is the only element in the sequence $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{i-2}^{*}, \delta_{i}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ that is locally monotone. Hence $m(e)=k-4$ and $e \in E(H)$. If $\delta_{i-2}^{*}<\delta_{i}^{*}$, then $\delta_{i-2}^{*}$ is the only possible element in the sequence $\delta_{1}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{i-2}^{*}, \delta_{i}^{*}, \ldots, \delta_{k}^{*}$ that is locally monotone. More precisely, if $i=3$ then $m(e)=k-3$, and if $3<i \leq k-1$ then $m(e)=k-4$. Hence $m(e) \geq k-4$ and $e \in E(H)$.

Therefore every $k$-tuple $e=h-a_{i}$ is an edge in $H$, and the $k+1$ vertices $h$ induces a $K_{k+1}^{k}$ in $H$. This is a contradiction and we have completed the proof.

## 4 Ramsey numbers for $k$-half-graphs versus cliques

Let $K_{4}^{3} \backslash e$ denote the 3-uniform hypergraph on four vertices, obtained by removing one edge from $K_{4}^{3}$. A simple argument of Erdős and Hajnal [12] implies $r\left(K_{4}^{3} \backslash e, K_{n}^{3}\right)<(n!)^{2}$. On the other hand, they also gave a construction that shows $r\left(K_{4}^{3} \backslash e, K_{n}^{3}\right)>2^{c n}$ for some constant $c>0$. Improving either of these bounds is a very interesting open problem, as $K_{4}^{3} \backslash e$ is, in some sense, the smallest 3 -uniform hypergraph whose Ramsey number with a clique is at least exponential.

A $k$-half-graph, denote by $B^{k}$, is a $k$-uniform hypergraph on $2 k-2$ vertices, whose vertex set is of the form $S \cup T$, where $|S|=|T|=k-1$, and whose edges are all $k$-subsets that contain $S$, and one $k$-subset that contains $T$. The hypergraph $B^{k}$ can be viewed as a generalization of $K_{4}^{3} \backslash e$ as $B^{3}=K_{4}^{3} \backslash e$.
The goal of this section is to obtain upper and lower bounds for $r\left(B^{k}, K_{n}^{k}\right)$ that parallel the known state of affairs for $K_{4}^{3} \backslash e$. We begin by presenting a straightforward generalization of the argument of Erdős and Hajnal to establish an upper bound for Ramsey numbers for $k$-half-graphs versus cliques. Again for simplicity we write $r\left(B^{k}, K_{n}^{k}\right)=r_{k}(B, n)$.
Theorem 4.1. For $k \geq 4$, we have $r_{k}(B, n) \leq(n!)^{k-1}$.
First, let us recall an old lemma due to Spencer.
Lemma 4.2 ([19]). Let $H=(V, E)$ be a $k$-uniform hypergraph on $N$ vertices. If $|E(H)|>N / k$, then there exists a subset $S \subset V(H)$ such that $S$ is an independent set and

$$
|S| \geq\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right) N\left(\frac{N}{k|E(H)|}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}
$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We proceed by induction on $n$. The base case $n=k$ is trivial. Let $n>k$ and assume the statement holds for $n^{\prime}<n$. Let $k \geq 4$ and let $\chi$ be a red/blue coloring on the edges of $K_{N}^{k}$, where $N=(n!)^{k-1}$. Let $E_{R}$ denote the set of red edges in $K_{N}^{k}$.

Case 1: Suppose $\left|E_{R}\right| \leq N / k$. Then one can delete $N / k$ vertices from $H$ and obtain a blue clique of size $(1-1 / k) N \geq n$.

Case 2: Suppose $N / k<\left|E_{R}\right|<\frac{\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-1} N^{k}}{k n^{k-1}}$. Then by Lemma 4.2, $K_{N}^{k}$ contains a blue clique of size $n$.

Case 3: Suppose $\left|E_{R}\right| \geq \frac{\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-1} N^{k}}{k n^{k-1}}$. Then by averaging, there is a $(k-1)$-element subset $S \subset V$ such that $N(S)=\left\{v \in V: S \cup\{v\} \in E_{R}\right\}$ satisfies

$$
|N(S)| \geq \frac{\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)^{k-1} N^{k}}{n^{k-1}\binom{N}{k-1}} \geq((n-1)!)^{k-1}
$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $k \geq 4$. Fix a vertex $u \in S$. If $\{u\} \cup T \in E_{R}$ for some $T \subset N(S)$ such that $|T|=k-1$, then $S \cup T$ forms a red $B^{k}$ and we are done. Therefore we can assume otherwise. By the induction hypothesis, $N(S)$ contains a red copy of $B^{k}$, or a blue copy of $K_{n-1}^{k}$. We are done in the former case, and in the latter case, we can form a blue $K_{n}^{k}$ by adding the vertex $u$.

We now move to our main new contribution, which are constructions which show that $r_{k}(B, n)$ is at least exponential in $n$.
Theorem 4.3. For fixed $k \geq 3$, we have $r_{k}(B, n)>2^{\Omega(n)}$.

Proof. Surprisingly, we require different arguments for $k$ even and $k$ odd.
The case when $k$ is odd. Assume $k$ is odd, and set $N=2^{c n}$ where $c=c(k)$ will be determined later. Then let $T$ be a random tournament on the vertex set [ $N$ ], that is, for $i, j \in[N]$, independently, either $(i, j) \in E$ or $(j, i) \in E$, where each of the two choices is equally likely. Then let $\chi:\binom{[N]}{k} \rightarrow$ \{red, blue\} be a red/blue coloring on the $k$-subsets of $[N]$, where $\chi\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right)=$ red if $v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}$ induces a regular tournament, that is, the indegree of every vertex is $(k-1) / 2$ (and hence the outdegree of every vertex is $(k-1) / 2)$. Otherwise we color it blue. We note that since $k$ is odd, a regular tournament on $k$ vertices is possible by the fact that $K_{k}$ has an Eulerian circuit, and then by directing the edges according to the circuit we obtain a regular tournament.

Notice that the coloring $\chi$ does not contain a red $B^{k}$. Indeed, let $S, T \subset[N]$ such that $|S|=|T|=$ $k-1, S \cap T=\emptyset$, and every $k$-tuple of the form $S \cup\{v\}$ is red, for all $v \in T$. Then for any $u \in S$, all edges in the set $u \times T$ must have the same direction, either all emanating out of $u$ or all directed towards $u$. Therefore it is impossible for $u \cup T$ to have color red, for any choice $u \in S$.

Next we estimate the expected number of monochromatic blue copies of $K_{n}^{k}$ in $\chi$. For a given $k$-tuple $v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k} \in[N]$, the probability that $\chi\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right)=$ blue is clearly at most $1-1 / 2^{\binom{k}{2}}$.

Let $T=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ be a set of $t$ vertices in $[n]$, where $v_{1}<\cdots<v_{n}$. Let $S$ be a partial Steiner ( $n, k, 2$ )-system with vertex set $T$, that is, $S$ is a $k$-uniform hypergraph such that each 2-element set of vertices is contained in at most one edge in $S$. Moreover, $S$ satisfies $|S|=c^{\prime} n^{2}$ where $c^{\prime}=c^{\prime}(k)$. It is known that such a system exists. Then the probability that every $k$-tuple in $T$ has color blue is at most the probability that every $k$-tuple in $S$ is blue. Since the edges in $S$ are independent, that is no two edges have more than one vertex in common, the probability that $T$ is a monochromatic blue clique is at most $\left(1-1 / 2^{\binom{k}{2}}\right)^{|S|} \leq\left(1-1 / 2^{\binom{k}{2}}\right)^{c^{\prime} n^{2}}$. Therefore the expected number of monochromatic blue copies of $K_{n}^{k}$ in $\chi$ is at most

$$
\binom{N}{n}\left(1-1 / 2^{\binom{k}{2}}\right)^{c^{\prime} n^{2}}<1,
$$

for an appropriate choice for $c=c(k)$. Hence, there is a coloring $\chi$ with no red $B^{k}$ and no blue $K_{n}^{k}$. Therefore

$$
r_{k}(B, n)>2^{c n}
$$

The case when $k$ is even. Assume $k$ is even and set $N=2^{c n}$ where $c=c(k)$ will be determined later. Consider the coloring $\phi:\binom{[N]}{2} \rightarrow\{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, where each edge has probability $1 /(k-1)$ of being a particular color independent of all other edges (pairs). Using $\phi$, we define the coloring $\chi:\binom{[N]}{k} \rightarrow\{$ red, blue $\}$, where the $k$-tuple $\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right)$ is red if $\phi$ is a proper edge-coloring on all pairs among $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right\}$, that is, each of the $k-1$ colors appears as a perfect matching. Otherwise we color it blue.

Notice that the coloring $\chi$ does not contain a red $B^{k}$. Indeed let $S, T \subset[N]$ such that $|S|=|T|=$ $k-1$ and $S \cap T=\emptyset$. If, for all $v \in T$, the $k$-tuples of the form $S \cup\{v\}$ are red, then the set of edges $\{u\} \times T$ is monochromatic with respect to $\phi$ for any $u \in S$. Hence, $\chi$ could not have colored $\{u\} \cup T$ red for any $u \in S$.

For a given $k$-tuple $v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k} \in[N]$, the probability that $\chi\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right)=$ blue is at most $1-(1 /(k-$ 1)) ${ }^{\binom{k}{2}}$. By the same argument as above, the expected number of monochromatic blue copies of $K_{n}^{k}$ with respect to $\chi$ is less than 1 for an appropriate choice of $c=c(k)$. Hence, there is a coloring $\chi$ with no red $B^{k}$ and no blue $K_{n}^{k}$. Therefore

$$
r_{k}(B, n)>2^{c n}
$$

and the proof is complete.
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