# Constructions in Ramsey theory

Dhruv Mubayi<sup>\*</sup>

Andrew Suk<sup>†</sup>

#### 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 kgraphs 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  $r(K_{k+1}^k, K_n^k)$ , improving the previous best known bounds obtained by the authors [18]. In particular, we give the first superexponential lower bound for  $r(K_5^4, K_n^4)$  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  $n = O((\log N)^{1/(k-1)})$ . In Section 4 we study the Ramsey numbers for k-half-graphs versus

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL, 60607 USA. Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1300138. Email: mubayi@uic.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA, 92093 USA. Supported by NSF grant DMS-1500153, an NSF CAREER award, and an Alfred Sloan Fellowship. Email: asuk@ucsd.edu MSC (2010): 05C15, 05C55, 05C65, 05D10, 05D40

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  $r(K_s^k, K_n^k) = r_k(s, n)$ . 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  $s \ge k+1$ ,  $r_2(s, n)$  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

 $\operatorname{twr}_1(x) = x$  and  $\operatorname{twr}_{i+1} = 2^{\operatorname{twr}_i(x)}$ .

By applying the Erdős-Hajnal stepping up lemma in the off-diagonal setting (see [17]), it follows that  $r_k(s,n) \ge \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(\Omega(n))$ , for  $k \ge 4$  and for all  $s \ge 2^{k-1} - k + 3$ . However they conjectured the following.

Conjecture 2.1. (Erdős-Hajnal [12]) For  $s \ge k+1 \ge 5$  fixed,  $r_k(s,n) \ge \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(\Omega(n))$ .

In [5], Conlon, Fox, and Sudakov modified the Erdős-Hajnal stepping-up lemma to show that Conjecture 2.1 holds for all  $s \ge \lceil 5k/2 \rceil - 3$ . 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  $k \ge 4$  and n > 3k, we have

- 1.  $r_k(k+3,n) \ge \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(cn),$ 2.  $r_k(k+2,n) \ge \operatorname{twr}_{k-1}(c\log^2 n),$
- 3.  $r_k(k+1,n) \ge \operatorname{twr}_{k-2}(cn^2).$

Implicit in work of Erdős and Hajnal [12] is the bound  $r_4(5,n) > 2^{cn}$  for some absolute positive constant c. While the authors [18] recently improved this to  $2^{cn^2}$  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,

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

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

$$r_3(4,t) > 2^{ct\log t}.$$
 (1)

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  $t = \lfloor \frac{\log n}{2} \rfloor$ . Let  $\phi$  be a red/blue coloring of the edges of the complete 3-uniform hypergraph on the vertex set  $\{0, 1, \ldots, r_3(4, t) - 2\}$  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  $a_1 < \cdots < a_r$ ,  $\delta(a_1, a_r) = \max_{1 \le j \le r-1} \delta(a_j, a_{j+1})$ .

Given any 4-tuple  $a_1 < \cdots < a_4$  of V, consider the integers  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}), 1 \le i \le 3$ . 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:

$$\chi(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = \begin{cases} \phi(\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3) & \text{if } \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \text{ is monotone} \\ blue & \text{if } \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \text{ is not monotone} \end{cases}$$

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  $\delta_j = \delta(a_j, a_{j+1})$  and suppose that  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$  form a monotone sequence. If  $\chi$  colors every 4-tuple in  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$  red (blue), then  $\phi$  colors every triple in  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\}$  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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}), 1 \le i \le 4$ . Then  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_4$  form a monotone sequence and, by Property C,  $\phi$  colors every triple in  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_4\}$  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  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$  blue. Let  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1})$  for  $1 \le i \le n-1$ . We greedily construct a set  $D_h = \{\delta_{i_1}, \ldots, \delta_{i_h}\} \subset \{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}\}$  and a set  $S_h \subset \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$  such that the following holds.

- 1. We have  $\delta_{i_1} > \cdots > \delta_{i_h}$ .
- 2. For each  $\delta_{i_i} = \delta(a_{i_i}, a_{i_i+1}) \in D_h = \{\delta_{i_1}, \dots, \delta_{i_h}\}$ , consider the set of vertices

$$A = \{a_{i_{j+1}}, a_{i_{j+1}+1}, \dots, a_{i_h}, a_{i_h+1}\} \cup S_h.$$

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,  $S_h = \{a_r, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_{s-1}, a_s\}$  for  $1 \le r < s \le n$ .

We start with the  $D_0 = \emptyset$  and  $S_0 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ . Having obtained  $D_h = \{\delta_{i_1}, \ldots, \delta_{i_h}\}$  and  $S_h = \{a_r, \ldots, a_s\}, 1 \leq r < s \leq n$ , we construct  $D_{h+1}$  and  $S_{h+1}$  as follows. Let  $\delta_{i_{h+1}} = \delta(a_\ell, a_{\ell+1})$  be the unique largest element in  $\{\delta_r, \delta_{r+1}, \ldots, \delta_{s-1}\}$ , 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  $|\{a_r, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_\ell\}| \geq |S_h|/2$ , then we set  $S_{h+1} = \{a_r, a_{r+1}, \ldots, a_\ell\}$ . Otherwise by the pigeonhole principle, we have  $|\{a_{\ell+1}, a_{\ell+2}, \ldots, a_s\}| \geq |S_h|/2$  and we set  $S_{h+1} = \{a_{\ell+1}, a_{\ell+2}, \ldots, a_s\}$ .

Since  $|S_0| = n$ ,  $t = \lfloor \frac{\log n}{2} \rfloor$  and  $|S_{h+1}| \ge |S_h|/2$  for  $h \ge 0$ , we can construct  $D_{2t} = \{\delta_{i_1}, \ldots, \delta_{i_{2t}}\}$  with the desired properties. By the pigeonhole principle, at least t elements in  $D_{2t}$  have the same label, say *white*. The other case will follow by a symmetric argument. We remove all black labeled elements in  $D_{2t}$ , and let  $\{\delta_{j_1}, \ldots, \delta_{j_t}\}$  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  $\delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}) = \delta_{i_{j_1}}, \delta(a_{j_2}, a_{j_3}) = \delta_{i_{j_2}}, \ldots, \delta(a_{j_t}, a_{j_{t+1}}) = \delta_{i_{j_t}}$ . Therefore we have a monotone sequence

$$\delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}) > \delta(a_{j_2}, a_{j_3}) > \dots > \delta(a_{j_t}, a_{j_{t+1}})$$

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

$$r_4(5,n) \ge 2^{r_3(4,\lfloor \log n/2 \rfloor) - 1} > 2^{2^{c \log n \log \log n}} = 2^{n^{c \log \log n}}$$

for some absolute positive constant c and this establishes the first part of Theorem 2.3.

We next prove Theorem 2.3 for  $k \ge 5$ . 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  $r_4(7,n) > 2^{2^{cn}}$  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  $k \ge 5$  and n sufficiently large, we have

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

*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  $\{0, 1, \ldots, r_{k-1}(k, \lfloor n/6 \rfloor) - 2\}$  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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}), 1 \leq i \leq k-1$ . 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  $\chi(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) = \phi(\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_{k-1})$ . Otherwise if  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$  is not monotone, then let  $\chi(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k)$  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  $\delta_j = \delta(a_j, a_{j+1})$  and suppose that  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$  form a monotone sequence. If  $\chi$  colors every k-tuple in  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$  red (blue), then  $\phi$  colors every (k-1)-tuple in  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\}$  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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}), 1 \le i \le k$ . 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  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k\}$  red by Property D, which is a contradiction. Otherwise,  $\delta_{k-1}$  is the only local extremum and  $\chi(a_2, \ldots, a_{k+1})$  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  $\chi(a_2, \ldots, a_{k+1})$  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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1})$  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  $\{\delta_r, \delta_{r+1}, \ldots, \delta_{r+\lfloor n/6 \rfloor}\}$  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  $\delta_{j_1} = \delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_1+1})$  and  $\delta_{j_2} = \delta(a_{j_2}, a_{j_2+1})$ . Consider the k vertices

$$a_{j_1-1}, a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, a_{j_2+1}, a_{j_2+2}, \dots, a_{j_2+k-3}$$

and the sequence

$$\delta(a_{j_1-1}, a_{j_1}), \delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}), \delta(a_{j_2}, a_{j_2+1}), \dots, \delta(a_{j_2+k-4}, a_{j_2+k-3}).$$

By Property B we have  $\delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}) = \delta_{j_1}$ , and therefore  $\delta(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2})$  is a local maximum and  $\delta(a_{j_2}, a_{j_2+1})$  is a local minimum. Therefore  $\chi(a_{j_1-1}, a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, a_{j_2+1}, \dots, a_{j_2+k-3})$  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  $f_{s,t}^k(N) \ge n$  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,

$$r_k(s,n) = \min\{N : f_{k,s}^k(N) \ge n\}.$$

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  $s \ge 3$  there are positive constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2(s)$  such that

$$c_1 \left(\frac{N\log N}{\log\log N}\right)^{1/2} < f_{s,s+1}^2(N) < c_2(\log N)^{4s^2} N^{1/2}.$$

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

$$c_1(\log_{(k-2)} N)^{1/4} < g(k, N) < c_2(\log N)^{1/(k-2)}$$
(2)

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  $k \ge 14$ . Then  $g(k, N) < O(\log_{(k-13)} N)$ .

*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

$$g(k, 2^N) < k \cdot g(k-1, N),$$

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

$$g(k+1, 2^{\lceil \log N \rceil}) < (k+1)g(k, \lceil \log N \rceil)$$
  
<  $2^{k}(k+1)! \log_{(k-13)} \lceil \log N \rceil$   
<  $2^{k+1}(k+1)! \log_{(k-12)} N.$ 

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' on N vertices for which  $\alpha_k(H') = g(k-1,N)$ . Note that this exists by definition of g(k-1,N). We will use H' to produce a  $K_{k+2}^k$ -free k-graph H on  $2^N$  vertices with  $\alpha_{k+1}(H) < k\alpha_k(H') = kg(k-1,N)$ .

Let  $V(H') = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$  and  $V(H) = \{0, 1, \dots, 2^N - 1\}$ . 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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1}), 1 \leq i \leq s-1$ . For  $e = (a_1, \ldots, a_s)$ , 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  $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) \in E(H)$  if and only if  $(\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}) \in E(H')$ . Otherwise if  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{k-1}$  is not monotone, then  $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) \in E(H)$  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,  $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k) \in E(H)$  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  $\delta_j = \delta(a_j, a_{j+1})$  and suppose that  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}$  form a monotone sequence. If every k-tuple in  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_r\}$  is in E(H) (in  $\overline{E}(H)$ ), then every (k-1)-tuple in  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{r-1}\}$  is in E(H') (in  $\overline{E}(H')$ ).

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

**Lemma 3.3.** Given  $e = (a_1, \ldots, a_7)$  with  $a_1 < \cdots < a_7$ , let  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1})$  for  $1 \le i \le 6$ . If m(e) = 4, then there is an  $a_i$  such that  $2 \le i \le 6$  and  $m(e - a_i) = 2$ .

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\delta_2$  is a local minimum, so  $\delta_1 > \delta_2 < \delta_3 > \cdots$ . Then we have  $m(e-a_4) = 2$ . Indeed, since  $\delta_4$  is a local minimum, Property B implies  $\delta(a_3, a_5) = \delta_3$ . If  $\delta_5 > \delta_3$ , then we have  $\delta_2 < \delta(a_3, a_5) < \delta_5$  and therefore  $m(e-a_4) = 2$ . If  $\delta_5 < \delta_3$ , then we have  $\delta(a_3, a_5) > \delta_5 > \delta_6$  which again implies that  $m(e-a_4) = 2$ .

Now suppose that  $\delta_2$  is a local maximum, so  $\delta_1 < \delta_2 > \delta_3 < \cdots$ . Then we have  $m(e - a_3) = 2$ . Indeed, by Property B we have  $\delta(a_2, a_4) = \delta_2$ . If  $\delta_4 < \delta_2$ , then we have  $\delta(a_2, a_4) > \delta_4 > \delta_5$  which implies  $m(e - a_3) = 2$ . If  $\delta_4 > \delta_2$ , then we have  $\delta_1 < \delta(a_2, a_4) < \delta_4$  which again implies  $m(e - a_3) = 2$ .

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  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1})$  for all  $1 \le i \le k+1$ . Given the sequence  $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_{k+1}$ , let us consider the number of locally monotone elements in  $D = \{\delta_2, \ldots, \delta_k\}$ .

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  $\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{k+1}\}$  is an edge in H' which is a contradiction since H' 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  $e \subset \{a_1, \ldots, a_{k+2}\}$  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  $|\{a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}\}| \geq 7$  or  $|\{a_{i+2}, \ldots, a_{k+2}\}| \geq 7$ . Let us only consider the former case, the latter being symmetric. By Lemma 3.3, there is an element  $a_j \in \{a_2, \ldots, a_6\} \subset \{a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}\}$  such that for  $e' = (a_1, \ldots, a_7)$ ,  $m(e' - a_j) = 2$ . Then any k-tuple  $e \subset \{a_1, \ldots, a_{k+2}\} \setminus \{a_i\}$  that includes vertices

$$\{a_t : 1 \le t \le 7, t \ne j\} \cup \{a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}\}$$

satisfies  $1 \le m(e) < k - 4$ . 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  $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_7\}$  and  $B = \{a_8, \ldots, a_{14}\}$  to obtain vertices  $a_i \in A$  and  $a_j \in B$  such that  $m(\{a_1, \ldots, a_7\} \setminus \{a_i\}) = 2$  and  $m(\{a_8, \ldots, a_{14}\} \setminus \{a_j\}) = 2$ . In particular, this implies that for  $e = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{k+2}\} \setminus \{a_i, a_j\}$ , 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  $\alpha_{k+1}(H) < k\alpha_k(H')$ . Set n = kt where  $t = \alpha_k(H')$ . Let us assume for contradiction that there are vertices  $a_1 < \cdots < a_n$  that induce a (k+1)-independent set in H. Let  $\delta_i = \delta(a_i, a_{i+1})$  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  $t = \alpha_k(H')$ , the t+1 vertices  $\{\delta_j, \ldots, \delta_{j+t}\}$  contain a copy of  $K_k^{k-1}$  in H'. 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  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$  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  $a_1^*, \ldots, a_{k+1}^* \in \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$  such that for  $\delta_i^* = \delta(a_i^*, a_{i+1}^*)$ , 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

 $e = a_{i_1}, a_{i_1+1}, a_{i_3}, a_{i_3+1}, a_{i_5}, a_{i_5+1}, \dots, a_{i_k}, a_{i_k+1}.$ 

Note that the pairs  $(a_{i_1}, a_{i_1+1}), (a_{i_3}, a_{i_3+1}), (a_{i_5}, a_{i_5+1}), \ldots$  correspond to local minima. By Property B,  $\delta(a_{i_1+1}, a_{i_3}) = \delta_{i_2}, \delta(a_{i_3+1}, a_{i_5}) = \delta_{i_4}, \ldots$  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

$$\delta(a_{i_1}, a_{i_1+1}) < \delta(a_{i_1+1}, a_{i_3}) > \delta(a_{i_3}, a_{i_3+1}) < \delta(a_{i_3+1}, a_{i_5}) > \cdots$$

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

$$a_1, a_{i_1}, a_{i_1+1}, a_{i_3}, a_{i_3+1}, a_{i_5}, a_{i_5+1}, \dots, a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_{k-1}+1}$$

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

$$a_1, a_{i_2}, a_{i_2+1}, a_{i_4}, a_{i_4+1}, \dots, a_{i_k}, a_{i_k+1}$$

satisfies the claim.

By Claim 3.4, we obtain k + 1 vertices  $h = (a_1^*, \ldots, a_{k+1}^*)$  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  $\delta(a_1^*, a_3^*), \delta_3^*, \ldots, \delta_k^*$ . Therefore  $m(e - a_i) \ge k - 4$  and  $e \in E(H)$ . A symmetric argument for the

case i = k implies that  $e \in E(H)$ . Therefore we can assume  $3 \le i \le k-1$ . By Property B, we have  $\delta(a_{i-1}^*, a_{i+1}^*) = \max\{\delta_{i-1}^*, \delta_i^*\}$ . Let us consider the two cases.

Case 1. Suppose  $\delta(a_{i-1}^*, a_{i+1}^*) = \delta_{i-1}^*$ . 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  $3 \le i < k - 1$  then m(e) = k - 4. Hence  $m(e) \ge k - 4$  and therefore  $e \in E(H)$ .

Case 2. Suppose  $\delta(a_{i-1}^*, a_{i+1}^*) = \delta_i^*$ . 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  $3 < i \le k - 1$  then m(e) = k - 4. Hence  $m(e) \ge k - 4$  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  $K_4^3 \setminus e$  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  $r(K_4^3 \setminus e, K_n^3) < (n!)^2$ . On the other hand, they also gave a construction that shows  $r(K_4^3 \setminus e, K_n^3) > 2^{cn}$  for some constant c > 0. Improving either of these bounds is a very interesting open problem, as  $K_4^3 \setminus e$  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 2k - 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  $K_4^3 \setminus e$  as  $B^3 = K_4^3 \setminus e$ .

The goal of this section is to obtain upper and lower bounds for  $r(B^k, K_n^k)$  that parallel the known state of affairs for  $K_4^3 \setminus e$ . 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  $r(B^k, K_n^k) = r_k(B, n)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** For  $k \ge 4$ , we have  $r_k(B, n) \le (n!)^{k-1}$ .

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

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

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' < n. Let  $k \ge 4$  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  $|E_R| \leq N/k$ . 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  $N/k < |E_R| < \frac{(1-\frac{1}{k})^{k-1}N^k}{kn^{k-1}}$ . Then by Lemma 4.2,  $K_N^k$  contains a blue clique of size n.

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

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

The last inequality follows from the fact that  $k \ge 4$ . 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  $N = 2^{cn}$  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  $\chi : {[N] \choose k} \rightarrow$ {red, blue} be a red/blue coloring on the k-subsets of [N], where  $\chi(v_1, \ldots, v_k) = \text{red if } v_1, \ldots, v_k$ 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  $\chi(v_1, \ldots, v_k) =$  blue is clearly at most  $1 - 1/2^{\binom{k}{2}}$ .

Let  $T = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$  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  $|S| = c'n^2$  where c' = c'(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  $\left(1 - 1/2^{\binom{k}{2}}\right)^{|S|} \leq \left(1 - 1/2^{\binom{k}{2}}\right)^{c'n^2}$ . Therefore the expected number of monochromatic blue copies of  $K_n^k$  in  $\chi$  is at most

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

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

$$r_k(B,n) > 2^{cn}.$$

The case when k is even. Assume k is even and set  $N = 2^{cn}$  where c = c(k) will be determined later. Consider the coloring  $\phi : {\binom{[N]}{2}} \to \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ , 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  $\chi : {\binom{[N]}{k}} \to \{\text{red, blue}\}$ , where the k-tuple  $(v_1, \ldots, v_k)$  is red if  $\phi$  is a proper edge-coloring on all pairs among  $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ , 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  $\chi(v_1, \ldots, v_k) =$  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

$$r_k(B,n) > 2^{cn}$$

and the proof is complete.

Acknowledgment. We thank the referee for helpful comments.

#### References

 M. Ajtai, J. Komlós, E. Szemerédi, A note on Ramsey numbers, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 29 (1980), 354–360.

 $\Box$ 

- [2] T. Bohman, The triangle-free process, Adv. Math. 221 (2009), 1653–1677.
- [3] T. Bohman, P. Keevash, The early evolution of the *H*-free process, *Invent. Math.* 181 (2010), 291–336.
- [4] D. Conlon, J. Fox, B. Sudakov, personal communication.
- [5] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, An improved bound for the stepping-up lemma, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161 (2013), 1191–1196.
- [6] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, Hypergraph Ramsey numbers, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 23 (2010), 247–266.
- [7] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and B. Sudakov, Short proofs of some extremal results, Combin. Probab. Comput. 23 (2014), 8–28.
- [8] A. Dudek, D. Mubayi, On generalized Ramsey numbers for 3-uniform hypergraphs, J. Graph Theory 76 (2014), 217–223.
- [9] A. Dudek, T. Retter, V. Rödl, On generalized Ramsey numbers of Erdős and Rogers, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 109 (2014), 213–227.
- [10] J. Fox, J. Pach, B. Sudakov, A. Suk, Erdős-Szekeres-type theorems for monotone paths and convex bodies, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* 105 (2012), 953–982.
- [11] P. Erdős, Some remarks on the theory of graphs, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53 (1947), 292–294.
- [12] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, On Ramsey like theorems, problems and results, in Combinatorics (Proc. Conf. Combinatorial Math., Math. Inst., Oxford, 1972), pp. 123–140, Inst. Math. Appl., Southhend-on-Sea, 1972.
- [13] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, R. Rado, Partition relations for cardinal numbers, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 16 (1965), 93–196.
- [14] P. Erdős, R. Rado, Combinatorial theorems on classifications of subsets of a given set, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 3 (1952), 417–439.
- [15] P. Erdős, C.A. Rogers, The construction of certain graphs, Canad. J. Math. 14 (1962), 702– 707.
- [16] P. Erdős, G. Szekeres, A combinatorial problem in geometry, Compos. Math. 2 (1935), 463–470.
- [17] R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, J. H. Spencer: Ramsey Theory, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York, 1990.
- [18] D. Mubayi, A. Suk, Off-diagonal hypergraph Ramsey numbers, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 125 (2017), 168–177.
- [19] J. Spencer, Turán theorem for k-graphs, Disc. Math. 2 (1972), 183–186.
- [20] G. Wolfowitz,  $K_4$ -free graphs without large induced triangle-free subgraphs, *Combinatorica* **33** (2013), no. 5, 623–631.