UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Vertex Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed graphs

Das, Shagnik; Morris, Patrick; Treglown, Andrew

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vertex Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed graphs

Shagnik Das[1] | **Patrick Morris[1]** | **Andrew Treglown[2]**

[1]Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[2]School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Correspondence

Andrew Treglown, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.
Email: a.c.treglown@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

Given graphs F, H and G, we say that G is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey if every red/blue vertex coloring of G contains a red copy of F or a blue copy of H. Results of Łuczak, Ruciński and Voigt, and Kreuter determine the threshold for the property that the random graph $G(n, p)$ is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey. In this paper we consider the sister problem in the setting of *randomly perturbed graphs*. In particular, we determine how many random edges one needs to add to a dense graph to ensure that with high probability the resulting graph is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey for all pairs (F, H) that involve at least one clique.

KEYWORDS

Ramsey theory, random graphs, randomly perturbed structures

1 | INTRODUCTION

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, a sequence of (not necessarily distinct) graphs $H_1, \ldots, H_\ell$, and a graph G, we say that G is $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-*Ramsey* if for every ℓ-coloring of the *vertices* of G, there is some $i \in [\ell]$ for which G contains a copy of H_i whose vertices are all colored in the ith color. Similarly, we say G is $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)$-*Ramsey* if for every ℓ-coloring of the *edges* of G, there is some $i \in [\ell]$ for which G contains a copy of H_i whose edges are all colored in the ith color. In the case when $\ell = 2$ we take the convention that the colors used are red and blue. If $H_1 = \cdots = H_\ell = H$ we write, for example, $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey as $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey.

The classical question in Ramsey theory is to establish the smallest $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the complete graph K_n on n vertices is $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)$-Ramsey. In general, by Ramsey's theorem such an n is known to always exist, but relatively few such *Ramsey numbers* are known precisely. In contrast to

this, the analogous question in the setting of vertex colorings is completely trivial. Indeed, the pigeon-hole principle implies K_n is $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey if $n = v(H_1) + \cdots + v(H_\ell) - \ell + 1$, while it is not $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey if n is any smaller.

1.1 | Vertex Ramsey properties of random graphs

On the other hand, vertex Ramsey questions are natural in the setting where the host graph is sparser. In particular, in the early 1990s Łuczak, Ruciński and Voigt [20] investigated vertex Ramsey properties of random graphs. Recall that the random graph $G(n, p)$ has vertex set $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and each edge is present with probability p, independently of all other choices. To state their result we must introduce the notion of the 1-density of a graph.

Definition 1.1 (1-density). For a graph H, the *1-density* of H is defined to be

$$m_1(H) := \max \left\{ \frac{e_J}{v_J - 1} : J \subseteq H, v_J \geq 2 \right\},$$

where here e_J and v_J denotes the number of edges and vertices in J respectively.

The following result shows that the 1-density of H is the parameter that governs the threshold for the property that $G(n, p)$ is $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey. Recall that an event occurs in $G(n, p)$ with high probability (w.h.p.) if its probability tends to 1 as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem 1.2 (Łuczak, Ruciński and Voigt [20]). *Let $\ell \geq 2$ and let H be a graph with at least one edge and that is not a matching if $\ell = 2$. Then there exist constants $c, C > 0$, such that if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, p)$ is $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey and if $p \leq cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, p)$ is not $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey.*

Intuitively, Theorem 1.2 states that a typical "sparse" n-vertex graph, that is, one with density at most $cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$, is not $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey; while a typical "dense" n-vertex graph, that is, one with density at least $Cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$, is $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey.

The following result of Kreuter [17] provides an asymmetric generalization of Theorem 1.2. To state it we require an asymmetric version of the 1-density.

Definition 1.3 (Kreuter densities). Given two graphs F and H with at least one edge, such that $m_1(F) \leq m_1(H)$ we define

$$m_K(F, H) := \max \left\{ \frac{m_1(F) + e_J}{v_J} : J \subseteq H, v_J \geq 2 \right\}.$$

Note that simple calculations imply that $m_1(F) \leq m_K(F, H) \leq m_1(H)$ and thus if $m_1(F) = m_1(H)$ then $m_K(F, H)$ is also the same value.

Theorem 1.4 (Kreuter [17]). *Let $\ell \geq 2$ and $H_1, \ldots, H_\ell$ be graphs such that $m_1(H_1) \leq \ldots \leq m_1(H_\ell)$. Suppose further that $H_{\ell-1}$ and H_ℓ contain at least one edge and H_ℓ is not a matching if $\ell = 2$. Then there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that*

- *if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_K(H_{\ell-1}, H_\ell)}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, p)$ is $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey;*
- *if $p \leq cn^{-1/m_K(H_{\ell-1}, H_\ell)}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, p)$ is not $(H_1, \ldots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey.*

Note that there has been significant interest in (edge) Ramsey properties of random graphs also. See [24] for an analog of Theorem 1.2 in this setting and, for example, [15, 21] for results on asymmetric Ramsey properties of random graphs.

1.2 | Randomly perturbed graphs

Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 give us information on the vertex Ramsey properties of *typical graphs* of a given density. In this paper, we are interested in measuring *how far away* a dense graph is from having a given vertex Ramsey property. The model of randomly perturbed graphs, introduced by Bohman, Frieze and Martin [4], provides a framework for studying such questions. In their model one starts with a dense graph and then adds a given number of random edges to it. A natural problem in this setting is to determine how many random edges are required to ensure that the resulting graph w.h.p. satisfies a given property.

Over recent years there has been a wealth of research in the area of randomly perturbed graphs, including results on embedding (spanning) subgraphs (e.g., Hamilton cycles, spanning trees and subgraphs of bounded degree) in such graphs (see e.g., [2–6, 8, 9, 13, 18, 19, 22]). In 2006, Krivelevich, Sudakov and Tetali [19] initiated the study of (edge) Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed graphs. Combining their work with recent results of the first and third authors [7] and of Powierski [23], we now know the number of random edges one needs to add to an n-vertex graph of positive density to w.h.p. ensure the resulting graph is (K_r, K_s)-Ramsey for all values of (r, s), except for the case when $r = 4$ and $s \geq 5$. See [7] for other results on this topic.

In this paper, we focus on vertex Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed graphs; in particular we resolve the $(K_r, H)_v$-Ramsey problem for $r \geq 2$ and arbitrary H. To state our results we first introduce the following notation.

Definition 1.5. Fix some $d \in [0, 1]$. Then for a pair of graphs (F, H), we say that $p = p(n)$ is a *perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold function* for the pair (F, H) at density d if:

(i) For any $q(n) = \omega(p(n))$ and any sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of graphs of density[1] at least d with $v_{G_n} = n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with high probability $G_n \cup G(n, q)$ is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey.

(ii) There exists a sequence of n-vertex graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of density at least d, such that if $q(n) = o(p(n))$, then with high probability $G_n \cup G(n, q)$ is not $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey.

We denote by $p(n; F, H, d)$, the[2] perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold function for (F, H) at density d. If there exist $C, c > 0$ such that $q(n) \geq Cp(n)$ suffices for (i) and $q(n) \leq cp(n)$ suffices for (ii), we say that the threshold function is *sharp*. If it is the case that every sufficiently large graph of density at least d is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey then we define $p(n; F, H, d) := 0$.

Note we can analogously define the perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold function for the ℓ-colored case; that is, given graphs $H_1, \ldots, H_\ell$ we define the threshold $p(n; H_1, \ldots, H_\ell, d)$ in the natural way. If $H_1 = \cdots = H_\ell = H$ we write $p(n; H_1, \ldots, H_\ell, d)$ as $p(n; H, \ell, d)$.

Example 1.6. Casting Theorem 1.4 into this notation, we have that $p(n; F, H, 0) = n^{-1/m_K(F,H)}$, for a pair of graphs F, H with $m_1(F) \leq m_1(H)$ (when $E(F)$ is nonempty and H is not a matching) and this threshold is sharp.

---

[1]Here we refer to the standard density of G. That is $d(G) = \frac{e_G}{\binom{v_G}{2}}$.

[2]As is the case in random graph theory, the threshold function is not uniquely determined but rather determined up to constants.

Before we state our main result it is instructive to consider the following result of Krivelevich, Sudakov and Tetali [19], which determines how many random edges need to be added to a dense graph to force the appearance of H as a subgraph. In our vertex-Ramsey framework, this corresponds to making the graph $(K_1, H)_v$-Ramsey. The corresponding threshold probability requires the following definition.

Definition 1.7. For a graph H, the appearance threshold for H in the random graph $G(n, p)$ is determined by the parameter

$$m(H) := \max \left\{ \frac{e_J}{v_J} : J \subseteq H, v_J > 0 \right\}.$$

Now, given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$m(H; k) := \min_{H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k = H} \max_{i : H_i \neq \emptyset} m(H_i),$$

where the minimum is over all partitions of H into k induced subgraphs.[3]

Suppose that G is a graph of density more than $1 - 1/(k - 1)$ and we wish to find a copy of H in $G \cup G(n, p)$. Informally, we partition H into k parts $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ that are as sparse as possible, with the idea being to use the (few) edges of $G(n, p)$ to build the parts H_i, and then find the edges between parts in the dense graph, thereby completing a copy of H. Note that $m(H; k) = 0$ if and only if $\chi(H) \leq k$, in which case we can partition H into k independent sets. Then we do not require any random edges; the dense graph itself will already contain H.

Theorem 1.8 (Krivelevich, Sudakov and Tetali [19]). *Let $0 < d < 1$ be fixed and let $k \geq 2$ be the unique integer satisfying $1 - 1/(k - 1) < d \leq 1 - 1/k$. Let H be a graph with at least one edge. Then*

$$p(n; K_1, H, d) = n^{-1/m(H;k)},$$

where here, and throughout, we follow the convention that $n^{-1/0} := 0$.

Our main result (Theorem 1.11) essentially resolves the $(H_1, H_2)_v$-Ramsey problem for randomly perturbed graphs for all pairs (H_1, H_2) involving at least one clique. To state this result we define some notation capturing the probabilistic vertex Ramsey thresholds for all pairs of graphs.

Definition 1.9. Given graphs F and H, we write

$$\beta(F, H) := \begin{cases} m_K(F, H) & \text{if } m_1(F) \leq m_1(H), e(F) \geq 1, \\ m_K(H, F) & \text{if } m_1(H) < m_1(F), e(H) \geq 1, \\ m(H) & \text{if } e(F) = 0, e(H) \geq 1, \\ m(F) & \text{if } e(H) = 0, e(F) \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } e(F) = e(H) = 0. \end{cases}$$

---

[3]By a partition of H into k induced subgraphs, we mean there are k (possibly empty) graphs $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ such that each H_i is an induced subgraph of H, the H_i are all pairwise vertex-disjoint, and $V(H) = V(H_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(H_k)$.

That is, $\beta(F, H)$ is defined so that $n^{-1/\beta(F,H)}$ is the threshold for the property that $G(n, p)$ is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey. We can now define our perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold, which is an extension of Definition 1.7.

Definition 1.10. Given $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$ and a graph H, define

$$m^*(K_r, H; k) := \max_{r_1 + \cdots + r_k \leq r-1} \min_{H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k = H} \max_{i: H_i \neq \emptyset} \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i).$$

Here the first maximum is taken over all tuples $(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ of nonnegative integers that sum to at most $r - 1$; the minimum is over all partitions of H into k induced subgraphs; the final maximum is over all i such that H_i contains at least one vertex.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $0 < d < 1$ be fixed and let $k \geq 2$ be the unique integer satisfying $1 - 1/(k-1) < d \leq 1 - 1/k$. Given any $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and any graph H we have*

$$p(n; K_r, H, d) = n^{-1/m^*(K_r, H; k)}.$$

Note that Theorem 1.11 is general in the sense that it covers the full range of densities $d \in (0, 1)$ (not just small values of d). Further, Theorem 1.8 is precisely the $r = 1$ case of Theorem 1.11.

By computing the values of $m^*(K_s, K_t; 2)$ one obtains from Theorem 1.11 the following more explicit result for pairs of cliques, where for $a \leq b \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\Psi(n; a, b) := n^{-\frac{1}{m_K(K_a, K_b)}}$.

Corollary 1.12. *Let $3 \leq s \leq t$, $d \in (0, 1/2)$. Then*

$$p(n; K_s, K_t, d) = \begin{cases} \Psi(n; t-1, t-1) = n^{-\frac{2}{t-1}} & \text{if } s = t; & (i) \\ \Psi(n; t-s, s) & \text{if } \frac{t+1}{2} \leq s < t; & (ii) \\ \Psi(n; s, t/2) & \text{if } 3 \leq s \leq t/2 \text{ and } t = 2t' \text{ is even;} & (iii) \\ \Psi(n; \lfloor \frac{s+1}{2} \rfloor, \frac{t+1}{2}) & \text{if } 3 \leq s \leq (t-1)/2 \text{ and } t = 2t' - 1 \text{ is odd. } & (iv) \end{cases}$$

Moreover, these thresholds can be taken to be sharp whenever $s \notin \{t/2, t\}$. □

Although Theorem 1.11 does not always guarantee sharp thresholds, by analyzing its proof one can see that, in all cases except when $s \in \{t/2, t\}$, the threshold in Corollary 1.12 is determined by Theorem 1.4, which does provide a sharp result. Hence, we obtain the moreover part of the corollary. On the other hand, when $s \in \{t/2, t\}$, the threshold probability is not sharp. Indeed, this is since the threshold comes from the appearance of a subgraph, which does not have a sharp threshold.[4]

Recall that in the random graph setting one needs $\Theta(n^{2-1/m_K(K_s, K_t)})$ random edges to ensure $G(n, p)$ is $(K_s, K_t)_v$-Ramsey. Corollary 1.12 demonstrates that one needs far fewer random edges to make any dense n-vertex graph $(K_s, K_t)_v$-Ramsey. However, the precise number of random edges depends (in a rather subtle way) on arithmetic properties of the pair (s, t).

---

[4]More precisely, consider the case when $s = t$. Let G be the complete balanced bipartite graph on n vertices with classes A and B. Given any constant C, define $p = C\Psi(n; t-1, t-1)$. If we color A red and B blue, $G \cup G(n, p)$ has a monochromatic copy of K_t if and only if $G(n, p)[A]$ or $G(n, p)[B]$ contains K_t as a subgraph. The probability of this occurring is bounded away from both 0 and 1, showing the lack of a sharp threshold. The case when $s = t/2$ is similar.

1.3 | Some intuition for vertex Ramsey problems in randomly perturbed graphs

In this section our aim is to convince the reader that the vertex Ramsey problem for randomly perturbed graphs is in general more subtle than its counterpart in the random graph setting.

In Theorem 1.2 the threshold is *universal* in the following sense: the threshold for $G(n, p)$ being $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey is the point above which every linear sized subset of $G(n, p)$ w.h.p. contains a copy of H. It is easy to see that this property guarantees a graph is $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey (as one of the color classes in any vertex ℓ-coloring will have linear size). Thus, crucially the "reason" for the location of the threshold is the *same* for every graph H (that is not a matching). Moreover, this reason is independent of the number of colors used.

Similarly, the threshold in Theorem 1.4 is universal. Indeed, given *any* sequence of graphs $H_1, \dots, H_\ell$ as in the theorem, the intuition behind the threshold for the property of $G(n, p)$ being $(H_1, \dots, H_\ell)_v$-Ramsey is the same: the threshold is the point at which the expected number of vertex-disjoint copies of H_ℓ is roughly the same order of magnitude as the maximal order of a $H_{\ell-1}$-free subgraph of $G(n, p)$. (See the discussion in [17].) Again this threshold does not depend on the number ℓ of colors.

On the other hand, the intuition behind where the parameter $m^*(K_r, H; k)$ comes from is more involved than the intuition for Theorems 1.2 and 1.4; we discuss this more when proving Theorem 1.11. Moreover, the threshold for the perturbed vertex Ramsey problem can depend on the number of colors. Indeed, we saw in Corollary 1.12 that for every $r \geq 3$ and $d \in (0, 1/2)$ the number of random edges required to ensure an n-vertex graph of density d is w.h.p. $(K_r, 2)_v$-Ramsey is significantly smaller than $p(n; K_r, 2, 0)$; that is, significantly smaller than the number of edges needed to ensure $G(n, p)$ is w.h.p. $(K_r, 2)_v$-Ramsey. On the other hand, given any $\ell \geq 4$, we actually have that $p(n; K_r, \ell, d) = p(n; K_r, \ell, 0)$ for all $d \in (0, 1/2]$. In fact, this phenomenon is part of a more general observation.

Observation 1.13. Let $\ell \geq 4$ and H be graph with at least one edge. Let $d \in (0, 1/2]$. Then

$$p(n; H, \ell, d) = n^{-1/m_1(H)} = p(n; H, \ell, 0).$$

Indeed, if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$ for some constant C, Theorem 1.2 shows that $G(n, p)$ itself will be $(H, \ell)_v$-Ramsey w.h.p., and hence this is an upper bound on the perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold.

For the lower bound, take G to be a complete balanced bipartite n-vertex graph with vertex classes A and B. By Theorem 1.2, if $p \leq cn^{-1/m_1(H)}$ for some constant c, then with high probability both $G(n, p)[A]$ and $G(n, p)[B]$ are not $(H, 2)_v$-Ramsey. This therefore implies there exists a 4-coloring of the vertices of $G \cup G(n, p)$ without a monochromatic copy of H.

Given $\ell, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \geq 2k$, and any $d \in (0, 1 - 1/k)$, notice that by considering the complete balanced k-partite n-vertex graph, one can similarly conclude that $p(n; H, \ell, d) = p(n; H, \ell, 0)$ for any graph H with at least one edge.

1.4 | Notation

Throughout the paper we omit floors and ceilings whenever this does not affect the argument. Further, we use standard graph theory and asymptotic notation. In particular, for a graph G, $v(G)$ denotes the number of vertices of G and $e(G)$ the number of edges of G; note that we often condense this notation to v_G and e_G respectively. We say a graph is *nonempty* if it has a nonempty vertex set, and unless otherwise specified, we shall take the vertex set to be $[v_G] := \{1, 2, \dots, v_G\}$. Given a hypergraph $\mathbf{H}$ and a set $I \subset V(\mathbf{H})$, $\deg_{\mathbf{H}}(I)$ denotes the number of edges of $\mathbf{H}$ that contain the set I.

Given a set X and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $\binom{X}{r}$ for the set of all subsets of X of size r. Similarly, if V is a set of vertices and F is a graph, we denote by $\binom{V}{F}$ the set of all possible copies of F supported on vertices in V. Here we consider these copies of F to be distinct if they have distinct sets of edges, so $\left|\binom{V}{F}\right| = \binom{|V|}{v_F} \frac{v_F!}{\mathrm{aut}(F)}$, where $\mathrm{aut}(F)$ is the number of automorphisms of F. We also use the notation $\binom{G}{F}$ to denote the set of copies of F in a graph G.

1.5 | Organization of the paper

In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.11, handling the 0-statement in Section 2.1 and the 1-statement in Section 2.2. In the latter section, we shall require a "robust" version of the 1-statement of Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 2.8), which we prove in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4 we give some concluding remarks.

2 | PROOF OF THE PERTURBED THRESHOLD

In this section we prove Theorem 1.11. We present the arguments for the 0- and 1-statements in separate subsections below.

2.1 | The 0-statement

Here we will show the existence of a graph G of density at least d such that, when $p = o\left(n^{-1/m^*(K_r, H; k)}\right)$, with high probability the vertices of $G \cup G(n, p)$ can be two-colored without a red copy of K_r or a blue copy of H.

2.1.1 | Kreuter's Theorem for families

In showing the existence of a good coloring, we will use the 0-statement of Theorem 1.4, which shows that $G(n, p)$ can be vertex-colored while avoiding monochromatic subgraphs. However, in our application, we will have to avoid several subgraphs in the same color class, and therefore need the following generalization of Theorem 1.4 to families of graphs.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be two finite families of nonempty graphs, and let*

$$m = m_K(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{H}) := \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}, H \in \mathcal{H}} \beta(F, H).$$

If $p = o\left(n^{-1/m}\right)$, then with high probability there is a red/blue-coloring of the vertices of $G(n, p)$ without a red copy of any graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and without a blue copy of any $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

We remark that Proposition 2.1 is tight, since if $p = \omega\left(n^{-1/m}\right)$, then with high probability $G(n, p)$ is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey by Theorem 1.4, where (F, H) is the minimizing pair in the definition of m.

The proof of Proposition 2.1 is nearly identical to the proof of the 0-statement of Theorem 1.4; that is, the case when both $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ each contain a single graph. We therefore simply sketch the key idea here and refer the reader to [17] for the details.

First we handle the degenerate cases. Suppose one of the families, say $\mathcal{F}$, contains a graph F with no edges. The parameter $\beta(F, H)$ is then the appearance threshold for the graph H in $G(n, p)$, and so if $p = o\left(n^{-1/m}\right)$, we have that with high probability $G(n, p)$ has no copy of any graph from $\mathcal{H}$, and so we can color all its vertices blue. The other degenerate case is when all graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ have edges, but both families contain matchings, say F and H. In this case, $\beta(F, H) = 1$. If $p = o\left(n^{-1}\right)$, then with

high probability $G(n, p)$ is bipartite. We can thus two-color its vertices such that each color class is an independent set, and thus has no copy of any graph from $\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{H}$.

We may therefore assume that every graph in $\mathcal{F}$ has edges, and that $\mathcal{H}$ does not contain a matching, bringing us to the setting of Theorem 1.4. The proof now follows a similar scheme to other 0-statement proofs in random Ramsey settings, for example, [15]. One begins by supposing for a contradiction that you cannot red/blue-color the graph $G(n, p)$ avoiding red copies of graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ and blue copies of graphs in $\mathcal{H}$. Using this fact one can define some set $\mathcal{G}$ of graphs obtained by "gluing together" copies of graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ and in $\mathcal{H}$ in certain ways, and show that $G(n, p)$ must contain a graph in $\mathcal{G}$. In [17] $\mathcal{G}$ is defined by way of an algorithm that finds a copy of some $G \in \mathcal{G}$ in $G(n, p)$. In order to do this they pass to a "critical" subgraph G' of $G(n, p)$ which is minimal (in terms of copies of graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$) with respect to the property of not being able to 2-color G' avoiding red copies of graphs in $\mathcal{F}$ and blue copies of graphs in $\mathcal{H}$. In G', one can see that for every copy T of a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{H}$ and every vertex v of T, there is a copy of a graph in the other family which intersects T exactly at the vertex v [17, Claim 1]. The algorithm [17, Procedure Hypertree] which builds a subgraph J of G' is then defined by repeatedly adding copies of some $F \in \mathcal{F}$ or $H \in \mathcal{H}$, so that the copy intersects the previous copy in exactly one vertex. The proof then works by analyzing this procedure and the graphs in $\mathcal{G}$ that can be found using this procedure. In particular, one keeps track of a function $f(i)$ which controls the exponent of the expected number of J_i, where J_i is the graph found in G' after i steps of the algorithm. The procedure will stop if the $f(i)$ gets too small or if the procedure continues for roughly $\log n$ steps. This will lead to a contradiction, as the graphs in $\mathcal{G}$ which are the possible outcomes of this procedure are all dense graphs and are either large or satisfy a very strong density condition [17, Claim 5] and hence are very unlikely to occur in $G(n, p)$ at this density. One can also bound the size of $\mathcal{G}$ [17, Claim 6] so that a union bound will guarantee that with high probability no such graph in $\mathcal{G}$ is found in $G(n, p)$. In the calculations involved in the analysis [17, Claims 2,3 and 4] of the effect on f in each step of the algorithm, there are some minor changes in our setting as we have to consider the possibility of any member of our family being added by the algorithm to update the J_i. However, it can be seen that adding a "denser" graph than the graph which is in the minimizing pair for the definition of m will only help the situation, in that the function f can only decrease further, meaning that the resulting J_i is at most as likely to appear in $G(n, p)$ as the J_i obtained by adding the minimizing graph as in the calculations in [17].

2.1.2 | Proof of the 0-statement

We may assume that $m^*(K_r, H; k) > 0$, as otherwise there is no 0-statement to prove. We take the dense graph G_n to be the balanced complete k-partite graph on n vertices, which has density at least $1 - \frac{1}{k}$, and let $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k$ be the k vertex classes.

Let $(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ be the maximizing vector in Definition 1.10. For each $i \in [k]$, we define a family of nonempty subgraphs of H by

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \left\{ H' : \emptyset \neq H' \subseteq H, \, \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H') \geq m^*(K_r, H; k) \right\}.$$

Claim 2.2. *For each i, $H \in \mathcal{H}_i$.*

Proof. Suppose $H \notin \mathcal{H}_j$ for some $j \in [k]$, and consider the partition $H = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$, where $H_i = H$ if $i = j$ and $H_i = \emptyset$ otherwise. We then have

$$\max_{i : H_i \neq \emptyset} \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i) = \beta(K_{r_j+1}, H) < m^*(K_r, H; k),$$

which contradicts the definition of $m^*(K_r, H; k)$. ∎

In particular, each of the families $\mathcal{H}_i$ is nonempty. We can now describe, for each $i \in [k]$, our coloring of the vertices in V_i. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{K_{r_i+1}\}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_i$. By definition of $\mathcal{H}_i$, we have $\min_{F \in \mathcal{F}, H' \in \mathcal{H}_i} \beta(F, H') \geq m^*(K_r, H; k)$. Since $p = o\left(n^{-1/m^*(K_r,H;k)}\right) = o\left(|V_i|^{-1/m^*(K_r,H;k)}\right)$, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that with high probability we can color V_i such that $G(n, p)[V_i]$ has neither a red K_{r_i+1} nor a blue graph from $\mathcal{H}_i$. The following claim shows this gives a valid coloring of $G_n \cup G(n, p)$, completing the proof of the 0-statement.

Claim 2.3. *With this coloring, $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ has neither a red K_r nor a blue H.*

Proof. By construction, the largest red clique in V_i is of order at most r_i. The largest red clique in $V(G_n \cup G(n, p)) = \cup_i V_i$ therefore has at most $\sum_i r_i \leq r - 1$ vertices, and hence the coloring is red-K_r-free.

Suppose there was a blue copy of H, and let $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$ be the partition of H induced by the parts V_i. By definition of $m^*(K_r, H; k)$, there is some part $i \in [k]$ with $\beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i) \geq m^*(K_r, H; k)$ (and $H_i \neq \emptyset$). It then follows that $H_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$, but our coloring of $G(n, p)[V_i]$ avoids blue copies of any graph in $\mathcal{H}_i$, contradicting the existence of this blue copy of H. ∎

2.2 | The 1-statement

To prove the 1-statement of Theorem 1.11, we need to show that whenever $p = \omega\left(n^{-1/m^*(K_r,H;k)}\right)$, $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ will with high probability be $(K_r, H)_v$-Ramsey. When G_n is the complete k-partite graph, as it was in the proof of the 0-statement, this amounts to finding the sparse parts of the graphs in $G(n, p)[V_i]$, which can then be joined together since we have a complete k-partite graph.

However, in our more general setting, G_n is an arbitrary graph of density $d > 1 - 1/(k - 1)$. By employing Szemerédi's Regularity Lemma [25], we shall find some structure in G_n that mimics the behavior of a complete k-partite graph. These structural results, together with probabilistic tools concerning the random graph $G(n, p)$, are collected in the following subsections, before being used in the proof of Theorem 1.11 in Sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

2.2.1 | Structure in dense graphs

Our application of the Regularity Lemma follows the standard lines. We present here the necessary definitions and properties of regular pairs, referring the reader to the survey of Komlós and Simonovits [16] for further details.

Definition 2.4. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, a graph G and two disjoint vertex sets $A, B \subset V(G)$, the pair (A, B) is ε-regular if for every $X \subseteq A$ and $Y \subseteq B$ with $|X| > \varepsilon |A|$ and $|Y| > \varepsilon |B|$, we have $|d(X, Y) - d(A, B)| < \varepsilon$, where $d(S, T) := e(S, T)/(|S| |T|)$ for any vertex sets S and T.

In essence, the edges between a regular pair "look random," in the sense that they are very well distributed. The next lemma showcases some beneficial properties of these regular pairs: small sets of vertices typically have many common neighbors, and subsets of regular pairs inherit a large degree of regularity. We omit the proofs of these facts, which can be found in [16].

Lemma 2.5. *Let (A, B) be an ε-regular pair in a graph G with $d(A, B) = d$.*

(i) If $\ell \geq 1$ and $(d - \varepsilon)^{\ell-1} > \varepsilon$, then

$$\left| \left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_\ell) \in A^\ell : |\cap_i N(x_i) \cap B| \leq (d - \varepsilon)^\ell |B| \right\} \right| \leq \ell \varepsilon |A|^\ell.$$

(ii) If $\gamma > \varepsilon$, and $A' \subset A$ and $B' \subset B$ satisfy $|A'| \geq \gamma |A|$ and $|B'| \geq \gamma |B|$, then (A', B') is an ε'-regular pair of density d', where $\varepsilon' := \max\{\varepsilon/\gamma, 2\varepsilon\}$ and $|d' - d| < \varepsilon$.

Szemerédi's Regularity Lemma then famously asserts that the vertices of any sufficiently large graph can be partitioned into a large but bounded number of parts, such that almost all pairs of parts are ε-regular. We shall not require the full strength of the Regularity Lemma, but only the following corollary, which follows in combination with Turán's Theorem [26].

Proposition 2.6. *For every $k \geq 2$ and $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ with $\alpha \geq 6\varepsilon$, there is some $\eta := \eta(k, \alpha, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $n_0 := n_0(k, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ such that, if $n \geq n_0$ and G is an n-vertex graph of density at least $1 - 1/(k-1) + 2\alpha$, then there are pairwise disjoint vertex sets $V_1, \ldots, V_k \subset V(G)$ with $|V_1| = \cdots = |V_k| \geq \eta n$ such that, for each $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, the pair (V_i, V_j) is ε-regular of density at least α.*

2.2.2 | Probabilistic tools

While Proposition 2.6 gives us the desired structure in the dense graph, we also require a couple of results about the random graph. The first of these counts the number of copies of a fixed graph H in $G(n, p)$. Following [10], we define the following parameter for H and $p = p(n)$,

$$\Phi(H, p) = \Phi_{H,p} := \min_{J \subseteq H, e_J > 0} n^{v_J} p^{e_J}. \tag{2.1}$$

The lemma below shows that we are very unlikely to have significantly fewer copies of H than expected.

Lemma 2.7 (Janson's inequality). *Let H be a nonempty graph, $p = p(n)$ and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{H}$ be some family of $\Omega(n^{v_H})$ potential copies of H on $[n]$. Letting X be the random variable that counts the number copies of H in $\mathcal{H}$ which appear in $G(n, p)$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq 3\mathbb{E}[X]/4] \leq \exp(-\Omega(\Phi_{H,p})).$$

The proof of this lemma follows almost immediately from the main result of [11] (see also [10, Theorem 2.14]). Indeed, for each potential copy $S \in \mathcal{H}$ of H, let X_S be the indicator random variable for the event that S appears in $G(n, p)$. Then $X = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{H}} X_S$ and [10, Theorem 2.14] implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq 3\mathbb{E}[X]/4] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{E}[X]^2}{32\Delta}\right),$$

with

$$\Delta := \sum_{(S,S') \in \mathcal{H}^2 : E(S) \cap E(S') \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{E}[X_S X_{S'}].$$

Lemma 2.7 then follows upon noticing that $\Delta = O\left(\mathbb{E}[X]^2/\Phi_{H,p}\right)$ as done, for example, in [10, Theorem 3.9].

Second, we shall make use of the vertex Ramsey properties of $G(n, p)$. However, a couple of complications arise in our application. We shall need the monochromatic subgraphs we find to interact well with the deterministic base graph, and shall therefore require them to be suitably well-located. Moreover, we will need to appeal to the Ramsey properties of the random graph over various vertex subsets. The following theorem is thus a "robust" version of the 1-statement of Theorem 1.4, which guarantees the existence of "good" monochromatic copies of subgraphs, and shows that the Ramsey properties hold with sufficiently high probability to be applied several times.

Theorem 2.8. *Let F and H be graphs with $0 < m_1(F) \leq m_1(H)$. Then there exist $\delta_0, c > 0$ such that for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, $t = t(n) \leq \exp(n^c)$ and $\eta_0 > 0$, there exists a $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose that*

$$\mathcal{V} = \{(U_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{H}_i) : i \in [t]\}$$

is a collection of triples such that for each i, $U_i \subseteq [n]$ with $|U_i| \geq \eta_0 n$, $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \binom{U_i}{F}$ with $\left|\binom{U_i}{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_i\right| \leq \delta|U_i|^{v_F}$ and $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq \binom{U_i}{H}$ with $\left|\binom{U_i}{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}_i\right| \leq \delta|U_i|^{v_H}$. Then, if $p \geq Cn^{-1/m_K(F,H)}$, the following holds with high probability in $G(n, p)$. For any two-coloring of $[n]$ and every $i \in [t]$, there is either a red copy $S \in \mathcal{F}_i$ of F or a blue copy $T \in \mathcal{H}_i$ of H.

Notice that, unlike in Theorem 1.4, Theorem 2.8 allows for both F and H to be matchings. The proof is similar to that of the 1-statement of Theorem 1.4, but this strengthened version requires a few additional ideas and some careful analysis of the failure probabilities at each step. We defer these details until Section 3.2, and instead complete the proof of Theorem 1.11 next.

2.2.3 | An algorithm for the 1-statement

Recall that to prove the 1-statement of Theorem 1.11, we need to show that whenever G_n is an n-vertex graph of density $d > 1 - 1/(k - 1)$, and $p = \omega\left(n^{-1/m^*(K_r, H; k)}\right)$, then with high probability $G(n, p)$ is such that every vertex coloring of $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ gives rise to a red copy of K_r or a blue copy of H. To do this, we use an algorithm that, given a vertex coloring of $G_n \cup G(n, p)$, returns one of the desired monochromatic subgraphs. We motivate and describe the algorithm in this subsection, while in the next we prove that, with high probability, $G(n, p)$ is such that the algorithm succeeds for every vertex coloring.

By Proposition 2.6, we can find a k-tuple of vertex sets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k$ such that each pair is ε-regular and reasonably dense. We then aim to use the Ramsey properties of $G(n, p)[V_i]$ to find suitable monochromatic subgraphs that can be pieced together to form a red K_r or a blue H.

However, a naïve application of Theorem 1.4 will not work. Indeed, by definition of $m^*(K_r, H; k)$, there is some vector $(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ with $\sum_i r_i \leq r - 1$ and some partition $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$ such that $p = \omega(n^{-1/\beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)})$ for all i with $H_i \neq \emptyset$. We can therefore expect that, for each i, we find a red K_{r_i+1} or a blue H_i in any vertex coloring of $G(n, p)[V_i]$.

If these monochromatic subgraphs were all of the same color, then we could hope to combine them to form a red clique (which would in fact be of size $r + k - 1$, significantly larger than required) or a blue copy of H. However, we could well find red cliques in some parts and blue subgraphs in others, which would leave us unable to complete either of the desired graphs.

Instead, we must use the full power of Definition 1.10, which provides a suitable partition $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$ not just for *some* vector $(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$, but rather for *all* vectors $(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ satisfying $\sum_i r_i \leq r - 1$. We shall therefore proceed in stages, incrementally either increasing the size of a red clique or finding the next piece needed for a blue copy of H. We let r_i denote the size of the largest red clique we have found in V_i thus far, starting with $\vec{r} = \vec{0}$.

Given the current vector $\vec{r}$, we let $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$ be the corresponding minimizing partition of H. We then go through the parts in turn, applying the $(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)_v$-Ramsey property of $G(n, p)[V_i]$ to find a blue H_i or a red K_{r_i+1}. In the former case, we proceed to the next part. If we make it through each of the k parts, we will have found all the parts H_i needed to build a blue copy of H.

Otherwise, in the latter case, we have increased the size of our red clique. We then update the vector $\vec{r}$ and the corresponding partition of H, return to the first part V_1, and resume the process. Since this increases the size of our red clique, we will have built a red K_r if this latter case occurs r times.

There are still technicalities that need to be dealt with—for instance, to ensure we can combine the monochromatic structures we find, we will need to restrict ourselves to the common neighborhoods of the parts we have already found. This further requires us to only consider subgraphs with many common neighbors in all other parts, which is why we need the more robust 1-statement of Theorem 2.8. In the following subsection, we provide the formal details of this algorithm and use the tools we have collected to prove that it runs successfully.

2.2.4 | Proof of correctness

Given $\alpha > 0$ and $p = \omega(n^{-1/m^*(K_r,H;k)})$, our goal is to show that for any n-vertex graph G_n of density $d \geq 1 - 1/(k-1) + 2\alpha$, the graph $G_n \cup G(n,p)$ is with high probability $(K_r,H)_v$-Ramsey. Applying Proposition 2.6 to G_n with some suitably small[5] regularity parameter ε gives k pairwise-disjoint vertex sets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k$, such that each pair (V_i, V_j) is ε-regular of density at least α. We initiate by setting $U_j = V_j$ for $j \in [k]$. The sets U_i will keep track of where we look to find certain subgraphs.

At several stages in the algorithm, we will, for some i, find a (constant sized) subgraph $\Gamma \subset G(n,p)[U_i]$, and will then want to shrink all the other parts U_j to the common neighbors in G_n of the vertices of Γ. We shall therefore call Γ *popular* (with respect to some choice of $U_j \subseteq V_j$ for $j \in [k]$) if its vertices have at least $(\frac{\alpha}{2})^{v_\Gamma}|U_j|$ common G_n-neighbors in each $U_j, j \neq i$. Lemma 2.5 ensures that most potential copies of Γ will be popular, and that when we shrink the sets U_j to their large common neighborhoods, the pairs will remain ε'-regular with density at least $\frac{\alpha'}{2}$. By choosing the initial value of ε small enough, we can ensure that all subsequent values of ε' remain small.

We first find copies of the subgraphs of K_r and H that are likely to have appeared in $G(n,p)$. Let $t := \max\{s \in [r] : m(K_s) \leq m^*(K_r,H;k)\}$ and let $\mathcal{G} := \{H[U] : U \subseteq V(H), m(H[U]) \leq m^*(K_r,H;k)\}$. We then define the graph Γ to be the disjoint union of v_H copies of K_t together with one copy of each graph in $\mathcal{G}$. Then, for each $i \in [k]$ in turn, find a popular copy Γ_i of Γ in $G(n,p)[U_i]$, and shrink all other parts U_j to the common neighbors of $V(\Gamma_i)$ in U_j. Note that, at the end of this process, for all i the graph Γ_i remains in the set U_i.

We can now start the procedure outlined in the previous subsection. Given an arbitrary red/blue coloring of the vertices of $G_n \cup G(n,p)$, we shall denote by R_i the largest red clique found in $G(n,p)[U_i]$ thus far, initially setting $R_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in [k]$. The vector $\vec{r}$ will be defined by $r_i := v_{R_i}$, so we begin with $\vec{r} = \vec{0}$.

The outer loop of the algorithm runs as long as $\sum_i r_i \leq r - 1$, which means we have not yet found a red K_r. In this case, we take the minimizing partition $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$ for the vector $\vec{r}$ in Definition 1.10, and try to find a blue copy of H according to this partition.

The inner loop of the algorithm runs over $i \in [k]$. If $H_i = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to find in $G(n,p)[U_i]$, and so we proceed to the next part. Otherwise, since, as we shall soon show, $G(n,p)[U_i]$ is robustly $(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)_v$-Ramsey, we will find a popular blue H_i or a popular red K_{r_i+1}. If we have a blue H_i, we let B_i be this copy of H_i, shrink all other parts U_j to the common neighbors of $V(B_i)$, and then proceed to the next part.

On the other hand, if we find a red K_{r_i+1}, then we have increased the size of our red clique. We then set R_i to be this larger clique and shrink all other parts U_j to the common neighbors of $V(R_i)$. We update the vector $\vec{r}$, replacing r_i with $r_i + 1$, and then break the inner loop and proceed to the next iteration of the outer loop (trying to find the new optimal partition of H, starting in U_1).

---

[5]For our purposes, it suffices to take $\varepsilon = \frac{\delta'}{4k^2 r v_H(r+2^{v_H})}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^{2kr v_H(r+2^{v_H})}$, where δ' is the minimum value of δ_0 from Theorem 2.8 when the graph F is a clique on at most r vertices and the graph H in the theorem is a subgraph of our given graph H.

Since we shrink to common neighborhoods at each step, we ensure that the pieces we find in $G(n, p)[V_i]$ can be combined to form the graphs we need in $G_n \cup G(n, p)$. In particular, if the inner loop were to run through all k steps, then $\cup_i B_i$ would give a blue copy of H. On the other hand, each iteration of the outer loop increases the size of our red clique, and after r iterations $\cup_i R_i$ would give a red K_r. Thus, after finitely many steps, the algorithm must return either a blue H or a red K_r. Moreover, since the running time of the algorithm is bounded, the suitably small ϵ we required at the beginning is some constant depending on r, k and H, independent of the actual course taken by the algorithm.

To complete the proof, we need to show that with high probability, $G(n, p)$ is such that the algorithm succeeds in finding all the necessary subgraphs at each step of the algorithm. Firstly, let us consider the subgraphs Γ_i which we find at the beginning of the algorithm. If Γ is an independent set, clearly one can find these popular copies. Otherwise, noting that $m(\Gamma) \le m^*(K_r, H; k)$, Lemma 2.7 ensures that we find these popular copies with high probability.

Now we show that with high probability $G(n, p)[U_i]$ will always be robustly $(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)_v$-Ramsey, which we will mostly achieve through use of Theorem 2.8. However, this only applies when $r_i, e(H_i) \ge 1$. For the degenerate cases, we will need to make use of the graphs Γ_i we found at the beginning. Suppose first that $r_i = 0$. By definition, we have $m^*(K_r, H; k) \ge \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i) = \beta(K_1, H_i) = m(H_i)$, and so H_i appears in Γ_i. Then either this copy of H_i is completely blue, or we find a red K_1, and so $\Gamma_i \subseteq G(n, p)[U_i]$ is indeed $(K_1, H_i)_v$-Ramsey. The other case, when $e(H_i) = 0$, follows similarly. This time we have $m^*(K_r, H; k) \ge \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i) = m(K_{r_i+1})$, and so Γ_i contains v_H copies of K_{r_i+1}. Either one of them is completely red, in which case we are done, or we have v_H blue vertices, which in particular gives a blue copy of H_i.

This leaves us with the case when both K_{r_i+1} and H_i have edges. Again, by definition, we have $m^*(K_r, H; k) \ge \beta(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)$. Thus, since $p = \omega(n^{-1/m^*(K_r, H; k)})$, Theorem 1.4 shows we should expect $G(n, p)[U_i]$ to be $(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)_v$-Ramsey. However, we need this to be true for all sets U_i that could arise, and also need to find popular monochromatic copies of K_{r_i+1} or H_i, and thus we apply Theorem 2.8 instead.

Note that there is some constant $s = s(r, H; k)$ such that the sets U_i that arise are the common neighborhoods of a set of at most s vertices, and hence there are at most n^s many possibilities for the sequence $(U_i : i \in [k])$. In particular, this is far fewer than the $\exp(n^c)$ allowed by Theorem 2.8. Moreover, as these are always neighborhoods of popular subgraphs, there is some constant $\eta_0 > 0$ such that $|U_i| \ge \eta_0 n$.

Thus, given a set $\Gamma \subseteq \bigcup_j V_j$ of at most s vertices, we let, for each $j \in [k]$, $U_j \subseteq V_j$ be the common neighbors (in G_n) of $\Gamma \setminus V_j$. Provided $|U_j| \ge \eta_0 n$ for each j, we then define, for every $i \in [k]$, a triple $(U', \mathcal{F}', \mathcal{H}') \in \mathcal{U}$, where we take $U' = U_i$, we let $\mathcal{F}'$ be all possible popular (with respect to the U_j) copies of K_{r_i+1} in U_i, and let $\mathcal{H}'$ be all possible popular copies of H_i in U_i. Lemma 2.5 (and our choice of small ϵ) ensures that $\left| \binom{U_i}{K_{r_i+1}} \setminus \mathcal{F}' \right| \le \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 |U_i|^{r_i+1}$ and $\left| \binom{U_i}{H_i} \setminus \mathcal{H}' \right| \le \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 |U_i|^{v_{H_i}}$.

We therefore satisfy all the requirements of Theorem 2.8, and can conclude that with high probability, the random graph $G(n, p)$ has the property that whenever we require $G(n, p)[U_i]$ to be $(K_{r_i+1}, H_i)_v$-Ramsey, it will be. As there are only finitely many pairs (K_{r_i+1}, H_i) to consider, it follows that the algorithm succeeds with high probability overall, completing the proof.

3 | ROBUST RAMSEY PROPERTIES OF RANDOM GRAPHS

The aim of this section is to give a proof of Theorem 2.8. Although our proof here is similar to that of Kreuter [17], we choose to give the details as the argument is somewhat delicate and our proof departs from the original in some key steps. In particular, instead of using Turán's theorem to estimate

the maximal size of a set of vertex-disjoint copies of a given graph (as done by Kreuter [17]), we use a probabilistic approach (as in [1, Lemma 7.3.1]) which allows us to analyse the relevant subgraph counts at every step of the proof and guarantee that we find monochromatic copies of the graphs on the desired vertex sets. We first give some probabilistic tools and intermediate lemmas before embarking on the proof.

3.1 | Probabilistic tools

3.1.1 | Chebyshev's inequality

We will use the following well known inequality, see, for example, [1, Chapter 4].

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ is a finite set of events in some probability space and for each $i \in I$, let X_i be the indicator random variable for the event A_i. Write $i \sim j$ if the events A_i and A_j are not independent. Further, let $X := \sum_{i \in I} X_i$ be the sum of the indicator random variables and define*

$$\Delta := \sum_{i \sim j} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j],$$

where the sum is over all ordered pairs (i, j) (including diagonal terms). Then for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq t] \leq \frac{\Delta}{t^2}.$$

3.1.2 | Janson's inequality for a refined random graph

We are primarily concerned with the appearance of a subgraph H in a random graph $G(n, p)$. While it is easy to compute the probability of a given copy of H being present in $G(n, p)$, it is inconvenient that these copies need not be independent—two copies that share edges will be positively correlated.

To smooth the analysis, we will artificially introduce a filtering stage, where we select each copy of H independently, and then only focus on the selected copies of H that appear in $G(n, p)$. Formally, let $\rho(H; q) : \binom{[n]}{H} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a function that randomly assigns 1 with probability q and 0 with probability $1 - q$ to each copy of H in K_n, independently of the other choices. Recalling that $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}$ denotes the family of all copies of H appearing in $G(n, p)$, we let $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ denote the random subfamily consisting of selected copies of H in $G(n, p)$.

The following lemma shows that even when we are only interested in some dense collection of "good" copies of H, we are still very likely to have many of them appear in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let H be a graph with at least one edge, $p = p(n), q = q(n)$, and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{H}$ be some family of $\Omega(n^{v_H})$ potential copies of H on $[n]$. Letting $X_q := \left| \mathcal{H} \cap \binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q \right|$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}[X_q \leq \mathbb{E}[X_q]/2] \leq \exp(-\Omega(\Phi_{H,p})) + \exp(-\Omega(q n^{v_H} p^{e_H})),$$

where $\Phi_{H,p}$ is as defined in (2.1).

The lemma follows from an application of Lemma 2.7, which gives concentration for the number of copies $S \in \mathcal{H}$ of H that appear in $G(n, p)$. Each copy is then kept with probability q, independently of the others, and so Chernoff's inequality (see e.g., [10, Theorem 2.1]) gives concentration for the number of these copies that appear in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$.

3.1.3 | An exponential upper tail bound

Janson's inequality (Lemma 2.7) allows us to conclude that the probability that the number of embeddings of a graph H in $G(n, p)$ is significantly smaller than its expectation is exponentially small. On the other hand, one can use Lemma 3.1 to give a bound on the probability that the number of copies of H is much higher than expected. However, the concentration given by Lemma 3.1 is not enough for our purposes. We therefore need the following bound for the upper tail of the distribution of subgraph counts in random graphs. This is a simplification of the main result in [12] and the proof is almost identical. The only departing point from the exposition in [12] is that Lemma 3.3 allows us to apply the result to the number of copies of H on prescribed vertex subsets[6] (as opposed to the total number of copies of H in $G(n, p)$). This results in a factor of $1/\epsilon^m$ in the upper bound of $\mathbb{E}[X^m]$ in the proof of [12, Theorem 1.2], which can be counteracted by choosing a smaller constant $c > 0$ below.

Lemma 3.3. *Let H be a graph with at least one edge, $\epsilon > 0$ and $p = p(n)$ such that $\Phi := \Phi_{H,p} \geq 1$. Then there exists some $c = c(H, \epsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \binom{[n]}{H}$ be some family of ϵn^{v_H} potential copies of H. Letting X be the random variable that counts the number copies $S \in \mathcal{H}$ which appear in $G(n, p)$ on $[n]$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq 2\mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \exp\left(-c\Phi^{\frac{1}{e_H}}\right).$$

3.1.4 | Kim-Vu polynomial concentration

The last tool we need is the result of Kim and Vu [14] (see also [1, Section 7.8]). We state here a simplified version which is catered to our purposes.

Lemma 3.4. *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $c := 8^{-1}(4k!)^{-1/(2k)}$, and let $\mathbf{H} = (V, E)$ be a k-uniform hypergraph with $|V| = N$, $|E| = M$. Now consider the set V' obtained by keeping each vertex of V with some probability $q = q(N) \in [0, 1]$, independently of the other vertices. We are interested in the random variable $Y := e_{\mathbf{H}[V']}$ and we fix $\mu := \mathbb{E}[Y] = Mq^k$. Then setting*

$$v := \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \max_{I \in \binom{[N]}{i}} \deg_{\mathbf{H}}(I)q^{k-i},$$

we have that if $v \leq \mu$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|Y - \mu| \geq \frac{\mu}{2}\right) \leq 2e^2 N^{k-1} \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{\mu}{v}\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}\right).$$

3.2 | Proof of Theorem 2.8

Toward proving Theorem 2.8, we first prove some lemmas. For a fixed nonempty graph H, we define

$$\mathcal{H}(H) := \{H_1 \cup H_2 : H_1 \equiv H_2 \equiv H, V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) \neq \emptyset, H_1 \cup H_2 \not\equiv H\}$$

to be the set of graphs that can be obtained by taking the union of two distinct copies of H which intersect in at least one vertex. Recall also the definition of $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ from Section 3.1.2.

---

[6]In fact, although we will only use this result to restrict to copies of H that lie on prescribed vertex sets, note that the statement could be applied in more generality, to an arbitrary (large enough) family of potential copies.

Lemma 3.5. *Let H be a graph with at least one edge, and let $\Phi' := \min\{n, \Phi_{H,p}\}$. Then there exists $C = C(H) > 0$ such that the following holds for all $q = q(n,p)$ such that $q \leq \Phi'/(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})$. Let $X_H = \left|\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q\right|$ be the number of selected copies of H in $G(n,p)$, and for each $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}(H)$, let $Y_{\overline{H}}$ be the random variable counting the number of intersecting pairs of copies of H in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ whose union is isomorphic to $\overline{H}$. Then we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}(H)} Y_{\overline{H}} \geq \frac{C\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2}{\Phi'}\right) \leq \frac{C\Phi'}{\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2}.$$

Proof. This is a simple application of Chebyshev's inequality, Lemma 3.1. The proof of [10, Theorem 3.29] contains a similar calculation.

Let us fix some $\overline{H} = H_1 \cup H_2 \in \mathcal{H}(H)$ and show that $Y_{\overline{H}} \geq C'\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2/\Phi'$ with probability at most $\overline{C}\Phi'/\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2$ for some $C', \overline{C} > 0$. The conclusion will then follow by a union bound, as there are only finitely many possible $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}(H)$. First, let us upper bound the expectation of $Y_{\overline{H}}$ as follows. Defining $J = H_1 \cap H_2$ as the intersection of the two copies of H that comprise $\overline{H}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{\overline{H}}] \leq q^2 n^{v_{(H_1 \cup H_2)}} p^{e_{(H_1 \cup H_2)}} = \frac{q^2 n^{2v_H} p^{2e_H}}{n^{v_J} p^{e_J}} \leq \frac{C'\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2}{2\Phi'},$$

for some appropriately defined $C' > 0$, using that $v_J \geq 1$ and $n^{v_J} p^{e_J} \geq \Phi_{H,p}$ if $e_J \neq 0$. We now turn to concentration and look to apply Lemma 3.1. In order to do this, we need an upper bound estimate on Δ, which counts the expected number of nonindependent pairs of copies of $\overline{H}$, each of whose two copies of H are in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$. In particular, it counts the number of pairs of copies of $\overline{H}$ which overlap in at least one edge. So let us fix some graph $H^* = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_1' \cup H_2'$ such that both $H_1 \cup H_2$ and $H_1' \cup H_2'$ are copies of $\overline{H}$, each H_i and H_i' is copy of H, and $H_1 \cup H_2$ intersects $H_1' \cup H_2'$ in at least an edge, and let Y_{H^*} count the number of quadruples of copies of H in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ whose union is isomorphic to H^*. There are finitely many such H^*, and we have the upper bound $\Delta \leq \sum_{H^*} \mathbb{E}[Y_{H^*}]$.

Given such a configuration H^*, let $\tilde{x}$ be 2 if $H^* = H_1 \cup H_2 = H_1' \cup H_2'$ is a single copy of $\overline{H}$, 1 if $H_i = H_j'$ in H^* for some $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and 0 otherwise. In other words, $\tilde{x}$ indicates the number of "repeated" copies of H in H^*. Swapping the indices 1 and 2 if necessary, let $J_1 = H_1 \cap H_2$, $J_2 = H_1' \cap (H_1 \cup H_2)$ and $J_3 = H_2' \cap (H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_1')$ such that each J_i contains at least one vertex. This is possible due to the fact that H_1 and H_2 intersect in at least a vertex in $\overline{H}$ and the two copies of $\overline{H}$ intersect in at least an edge. Then we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{H^*}] \leq q^{4-\tilde{x}} n^{v_{(H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_1' \cup H_2')}} p^{e_{(H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_1' \cup H_2')}}$$

$$= \frac{q^{4-\tilde{x}} n^{4v_H} p^{4e_H}}{n^{v_{J_1} + v_{J_2} + v_{J_3}} p^{e_{J_1} + e_{J_2} + e_{J_3}}}$$

$$\leq C'' \mathbb{E}[X_H]^{4-\tilde{x}}/(\Phi')^{3-\tilde{x}}$$

$$\leq C'' \mathbb{E}[X_H]^2/\Phi',$$

for appropriately defined $C'' > 0$, using that at least $\tilde{x}$ of J_2 and J_3 are copies of H, and using that $\mathbb{E}[X_H] \leq qn^{v_H}p^{e_H} \leq \Phi'$ in the final step (recall that by hypothesis $q \leq \Phi'/(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})$). Thus, summing over all possible H^*, we get that $\Delta \leq \tilde{C}\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2/\Phi'$ for some $\tilde{C} > 0$ and by Lemma 3.1,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_{\overline{H}} \geq \frac{C'\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2}{\Phi'}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(Y_{\overline{H}} \geq \mathbb{E}[X_{\overline{H}}] + \frac{C'\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2}{2\Phi'}\right) \leq \frac{\overline{C}\Phi'}{\mathbb{E}[X_H]^2},$$

for $\overline{C} = 4\tilde{C}/C'^2$. Thus summing over all $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}(H)$ and taking a union bound on the failure probabilities, we can choose $C > 0$ appropriately so that the statement of the lemma is satisfied. ∎

Let $\bigsqcup^k H$ denote the graph obtained by taking k vertex-disjoint copies of H. We say that a set $K \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ is a *transversal* of a copy S of $\bigsqcup^k H$ if K contains one vertex from each of the copies of H that comprise S. Further, given $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$, we say a copy of $\bigsqcup^k H$ on $[n]$ is $\mathcal{K}$-*spanning* if it contains a set from $\mathcal{K}$ as a transversal.

Lemma 3.6. *Let H be a graph with at least one edge, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$. Set $\delta_1 := \delta(kv_H)^k$. Then there exists a $c > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $p = p(n) \geq n^{-1/m(H)}$ and $q = q(n, p)$ satisfy $qn^{v_H}p^{e_H} > (\log n)^{3k}$ then the following holds for all $n \geq n_0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{K} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ is such that $|\mathcal{K}| \leq \delta n^k$. Letting Y be the random variable that counts the number of $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$, composed of copies of H in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \geq 4\delta_1(n^{v_H}p^{e_H}q)^k) \leq \exp\left(-c\Phi(H,p)^{\frac{1}{ke_H}}\right) + \exp\left(-c\,(qn^{v_H}p^{e_H})^{\frac{1}{2k}}\right).$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the lemma in the case when $|\mathcal{K}| = \delta n^k$. For this, we split the analysis of $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ into looking at the random edges given by $G(n,p)$ and the random function $\rho(H;q) : \binom{[n]}{H} \to \{0, 1\}$ separately. Firstly consider the $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ in the complete graph K_n. There are at most $\delta_1 n^{kv_H}$ such copies and each appears with probability p^{ke_H}. Thus, in expectation, the number of $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ in $G(n,p)$ is at most $\delta_1(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^k$. Moreover, Lemma 3.3 tells us that the count of such copies in $G(n,p)$ is at most twice this with probability at least $1 - \exp\left(-c_{3.3}\Phi^{\frac{1}{ke_H}}\right)$, where $c_{3.3} = c(H, \delta)$ as given by Lemma 3.3 and $\Phi = \Phi\left(\bigsqcup^k H, p\right)$. Now note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi\left(\bigsqcup^k H, p\right) &= \min\left\{\prod_{i \in [k]} n^{v_{J_i}}p^{e_{J_i}} : J = \bigsqcup_{i \in [k]} J_i \subseteq \bigsqcup^k H, e_J > 0\right\} \\
&\geq \min\left\{n^{v_{J_j}}p^{e_{J_j}} : J = \bigsqcup_{i \in [k]} J_i \subseteq \bigsqcup^k H, e_{J_j} > 0\right\} \\
&\geq \Phi(H, p),
\end{aligned}$$

where we split subgraphs $J \subseteq \bigsqcup^k H$ according to their subgraphs J_i in the ith copy of H in $\bigsqcup^k H$ and in the second step we single out a $j = j(J)$ such that $J_j \subseteq J$ has a nonempty edge set.

Applying Lemma 3.3 also to the counts of $\bigsqcup^{k'} H$, for smaller values of k', we can conclude that there exists a $c' > 0$ so that, with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(-c'\Phi(H,p)^{\frac{1}{ke_H}}\right),$$

there are at most $2\delta_1(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^k$ $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ in $G(n,p)$ and there are at most $2(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^{k'}$ copies of $\bigsqcup^{k'} H$ in $G(n,p)$ for all $1 \leq k' \leq k - 1$. On the other hand there are at least $\delta n^{kv_H}/(2kv_H)!$ $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ in K_n. So by Lemma 2.7 there is a $c'' > 0$ such that with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(-c''\Phi(H,p)\right),$$

there are at least $2\delta_2(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^k$ $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ in $G(n,p)$ where $\delta_2 := \delta/4(2kv_H)!$.

Now we condition on all these events occurring in $G(n, p)$ and turn to analyse the effect of $\rho(H, q)$. We know that the probability that each copy of H in a $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copy of $\bigsqcup^k H$ is selected in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ with probability q^k, and we will obtain concentration via a simple application of Lemma 3.4. Indeed, consider the auxiliary k-uniform hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}$ whose vertex set is given by copies of H in $G(n, p)$ and whose edge set is given by copies of H which comprise a $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copy of $\bigsqcup^k H$. From above we have that $\boldsymbol{H}$ has at most $2n^{v_H}p^{e_H}$ vertices (the copies of H in $G(n, p)$) and between $2\delta_2(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^k$ and $2\delta_1(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^k$ edges. We also know, from the concentration on the number of copies of $\bigsqcup^{k'} H$ in $G(n, p)$, that for any set I of i copies of H with $1 \leq i \leq k$, the number of edges of $\boldsymbol{H}$ containing I is at most $2(n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^{k-i}$. Thus, Lemma 3.4 tells us that conditioning on the outcome of $G(n, p)$ as above, with probability at least

$$1 - 2e^2 (2n^{v_H}p^{e_H})^{k-1} \exp\left(-c_{3.4} (\delta_2 n^{v_H}p^{e_H}q)^{\frac{1}{2k}}\right),$$

the number of $\mathcal{K}$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^k H$ whose copies of H are all selected in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ is at most $4\delta_1(n^{v_H}p^{e_H}q)^k$, where $c_{3.4}$ is the constant given by Lemma 3.4. The conclusion then follows from a simple calculation on the error probability that either the counts in $G(n, p)$ are not as desired or the count in $\binom{G(n,p)}{H}_q$ is too high, given that we get the desired counts in $G(n, p)$. $\qquad\blacksquare$

We now turn to proving Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. It suffices to prove the theorem in the case when $p = Cn^{-1/m_K(F,H)}$ for some sufficiently large $C > 0$. We begin with a calculation. Let

$$\ell := \min_{J \subseteq H, e_J > 0} \left(v_J - \frac{e_J}{m_K(F, H)}\right), \tag{3.1}$$

so that $Cn^\ell \leq \Phi_{H,p} \leq C^{e_H}n^\ell$. Letting $c_1 := m_1(F)/m_K(F, H) > 0$, we have that $c_1 \leq \ell \leq 1$. Indeed let J be the minimizing subgraph of H in the definition of ℓ and let J' be the maximizing subgraph of H in the definition of $m_K(F, H)$. The lower bound on ℓ then follows from the fact that

$$v_J m_K(F, H) - e_J \geq v_J \left(\frac{m_1(F) + e_J}{v_J}\right) - e_J = m_1(F). \tag{3.2}$$

The upper bound on ℓ follows because

$$m_1(F) \leq m_K(F, H) = \frac{m_1(F) + e_{J'}}{v_{J'}} \implies \frac{m_1(F)}{m_1(F) + e_{J'}} \leq \frac{1}{v_{J'}}, \tag{3.3}$$

and hence

$$\ell \leq v_{J'} - \frac{e_{J'}}{m_K(F, H)} = v_{J'}\left(1 - \frac{e_{J'}}{m_1(F) + e_{J'}}\right) = v_{J'}\left(\frac{m_1(F)}{m_1(F) + e_{J'}}\right) \leq 1.$$

Now we turn to the proof of the theorem. We first fix constants. We fix $\delta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\delta_0 < \frac{1}{32 \cdot v_F!(4(2v_H)!v_F v_H)^{v_F}} \tag{3.4}$$

and $c > 0$ such that $c < \frac{c_1}{4v_F e_F e_H}$. Further, for each $0 \le i \le t$ we fix $\eta_i := |U_i|/n$ so that $\eta_i \ge \eta_0$ for all i. Further, fix

$$\gamma_i := \frac{(1/(v_H!) - \delta)^2 (\eta_0 \eta_i)^{v_H}}{16 C_{3.5}}$$

for all $0 \le i \le t$, where $C_{3.5} = C_{3.5}(H)$ is the constant obtained from Lemma 3.5. By considering a large enough constant C, we expose $G(n,p)$ in two rounds so that $G(n,p) = G_1(n,p_1) \cup G_2(n,p_2)$, with $p_1, p_2 \ge C' n^{-1/m_K(F,H)}$ for C' such that $C' > \frac{2 \log v_H}{\gamma_0^{v_F}}$. Let us briefly sketch the proof which splits into proving two main claims. The first claim states that with high probability in G_1, for each $i \in [t]$, there is a (large) subfamily $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i$ of pairwise vertex-disjoint copies of H, all of whose edges appear in G_1. We define

$$\mathcal{W}_i := \{W \subset U_i : |W \cap T| = 1 \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{D}_i\} \tag{3.5}$$

to be the sets which can be obtained by choosing one vertex from each copy of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$. The second claim is that with high probability in G_2, for each i and each set $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$, there is a copy of F which lies in $\binom{W}{F} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$ whose edges appear in G_2. The proof then follows easily from these two claims. Indeed, consider a red/blue coloring of $G(n,p) = G_1 \cup G_2$ and some $i \in [t]$. If there is no blue copy of H in $\mathcal{H}_i$ then in particular, every copy of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$ must contain a red vertex. By choosing one red vertex in each copy T of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$, we get a set $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$ which is entirely red. The second claim then tells us that this set hosts a copy of F which lies in $\mathcal{F}_i$ and so we are done. It remains to prove the two claims above.

In order to prove the first claim, it will be useful to consider only the selected copies $\binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$ as introduced in Section 3.1.2. As these copies all appear in $G_1(n,p_1)$, it will suffice to find a suitable family $\mathcal{D}_i \subseteq \binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$. So we fix

$$q := \frac{\eta_0^{v_H}(1/(v_H!) - \delta)}{4 C_{3.5}} \left(\frac{n^\ell}{n^{v_H} p_1^{e_H}} \right) = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_0}{C_{3.5}}} \left(\frac{n^\ell}{n^{v_H} p_1^{e_H}} \right).$$

Now we apply Lemma 3.5, observing that $\Phi' \ge n^\ell$ due to our calculation at the beginning of this proof ($\Phi' = \Phi_{H,p_1} \ge n^\ell$ if $\ell < 1$ and $\Phi' = n^\ell = n$ if $\ell = 1$). As the expected number of copies of H in $\binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$ is $\Omega(q n^{v_H} p_1^{e_H}) = \Omega(n^\ell)$, we have that with high probability (with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\ell})$) there are at most

$$\frac{C_{3.5} q^2 n^{2v_H} p_1^{2e_H}}{n^\ell} = \gamma_0 n^\ell$$

overlapping copies of H in $\binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$. For a given $i \in [t]$, we can conclude from Lemma 3.2 that with high probability there at least

$$\frac{(1/(v_H!) - \delta) q |U_i|^{v_H} p_1^{e_H}}{2} \ge 2\gamma_i n^\ell$$

copies of H in $\mathcal{H}_i \cap \binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$. As this holds with probability at least $1 - \exp(-n^{c_1})$, we have that this holds for all $i \in [t]$ with high probability. Thus we obtain a family $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathcal{H}_i$ of vertex-disjoint copies of H by taking the copies in $\mathcal{H}_i \cap \binom{G_1(n,p_1)}{H}_q$ and deleting one copy from any pair of overlapping copies. Our calculations above guarantee that with high probability, for every $i \in [t]$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has size at least $\tilde{n}_i := \gamma_i n^\ell$, and we restrict each family to one of size exactly $\tilde{n}_i$.

We now turn to the second exposure, namely $G_2 = G_2(n, p_2)$, and look to prove that for every $i \in [t]$ and every set $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$ there is a copy of F in $\binom{W}{F} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$ which appears in G_2, where $\mathcal{W}_i$ is as defined in (3.5). Fixing an $i \in [t]$ and a $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$, we consider G_2 restricted to W. We look to apply Lemma 2.7 and so need a lower bound on the parameter

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_i := \Phi_{F, p_2} = \min_{I \subseteq F, e_I > 0} \tilde{n}_i^{v_I} p_2^{e_I},$$

which is calculated with respect to the vertex set W. As at the beginning of the proof, we set $J \subset H$ to be the minimizing subgraph in the definition of ℓ (3.1) and use that for all $I \subseteq F$ with $e_I > 0$, we have that

$$\ell m_K(F, H) = v_J m_K(F, H) - e_J \geq m_1(F) \geq \frac{e_I}{v_I - 1},$$

by (3.2). Rearranging, we obtain that

$$v_I - \frac{e_I}{\ell m_{K(F,H)}} \geq 1,$$

and so

$$\min_{I \subseteq F, e_I > 0} \left(\ell v_I - \frac{e_I}{m_K(F, H)} \right) \geq \ell.$$

We conclude that $\tilde{\Phi}_i \geq \tilde{\Phi}_0 \geq \gamma_0^{v_F} C' n^\ell$. As $t \leq \exp(n^c)$ and for each i, and $|\mathcal{W}_i| = (v_H)^{\tilde{n}_i} \leq \exp(n^\ell \log v_H)$, we can take a union bound and conclude from Lemma 2.7 that for all choices of $i \in [t]$ and $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$, we have that there are at least $\frac{\tilde{n}_i^{v_F} p_2^{e_F}}{2}$ copies of F on W in G_2 with high probability. Note here that we used that $C' > \frac{2 \log v_H}{\gamma_0^{v_F}}$. It remains to prove that for each $i \in [t]$ and W one of these copies of F belongs to $\mathcal{F}_i$.

To this end we define $\mathcal{B}_i := \binom{U_i}{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_i$ to be the copies of F which do not lie in our desired collection. We will upper bound the number of copies S of F in $\mathcal{B}_i$ which appear in G_2, such that each vertex of S lies in a different copy of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$. In order to do this, we return to analyse our construction of $\mathcal{D}_i$ and in particular our use of $\binom{G_1(n, p_1)}{H}_q$. Let $\mathcal{K}_i$ be the collection of v_F-sets in U_i which host a copy of F in $\mathcal{B}_\geq$ and note that $|\mathcal{K}_i| \leq \delta |U_i|^{v_F}$. We say a set $K \in \mathcal{K}_i$ is *dangerous* if each vertex of K is contained in a distinct copy of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$. In order to be dangerous, a set K has to lie in a transversal of a copy of $\bigsqcup^{v_F} H$, composed of copies of H in $\binom{G_1(n, p_1)[U_i]}{H}_q$ (see the paragraph before Lemma 3.6 for the relevant definitions). Therefore in order to upper bound the number of dangerous sets, it suffices to upper bound the number of $\mathcal{K}_i$-spanning copies of $\bigsqcup^{v_F} H$ in $\binom{G_1(n, p_1)[U_i]}{H}_q$. It follows then from Lemma 3.6 that for all $i \in [t]$, there are at most

$$4\delta(v_F v_H)^{v_F} (|U_i|^{v_H} p_1^{e_H} q)^{v_F} = \frac{(v_F v_H)^{v_F} \cdot 2^{2v_F + 2} \delta}{(1/(v_H!) - \delta)^{v_F}} \tilde{n}_i^{v_F} \overset{(3.4)}{\leq} \frac{\tilde{n}_i^{v_F}}{8 v_F!}$$

dangerous sets with high probability, using that $\delta < \delta_0$. As for a fixed $i \in [t]$, this holds with probability $1 - \exp\left(-\Omega\left(n^{\frac{\ell}{2v_F e_H}} \right) \right)$ and $t \leq \exp(n^c)$, we can conclude that there at most $\tilde{n}_i^{v_F}/(8 v_F!)$ dangerous sets for each $i \in [t]$ with high probability.

Finally, we calculate how many copies of F in G_2 are hosted on dangerous sets. For a fixed i, we consider G_2 restricted to the vertex set $D_i := \cup_{T \in \mathcal{D}_i} V(T)$. We have that $|D_i| = v_H \tilde{n}_i$ and from the

previous paragraph we may assume that there are at most $\tilde{n}_i^{v_F}/8$ potential copies of F on dangerous sets in D_i. Each of these appears with probability $p_2^{e_F}$ and by Lemma 3.3 we have that with probability at least $1 - \exp\left(-\Omega\left(n^{\frac{\ell}{e_F}}\right)\right)$, there are at most $\tilde{n}_i^{v_F}p_2^{e_F}/4$ copies of F in G_2 which are hosted on dangerous sets. The failure probability here follows from a calculation of the appropriate Φ_{F,p_2} similar to the calculation of $\tilde{\Phi}$ above. Thus we can take a union bound to conclude that for all $i \in [t]$, there are at most $\tilde{n}_i^{v_F}p_2^{e_F}/4$ copies of $F \in \mathcal{B}_i$ which lie in D_i, whose edges appear in G_2 and whose vertices are contained in distinct copies of H in $\mathcal{D}_i$. Thus with high probability, for all $i \in [t]$ and for all $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$, there is a copy $T \in \binom{W}{F} \cap \mathcal{F}_i$ of F, whose edges appear in G_2, as required. ∎

4 | CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have determined, at essentially every density d, the perturbed vertex Ramsey threshold $p(n; K_r, H, d)$ for cliques versus arbitrary graphs. One could investigate how these thresholds change with the introduction of additional colors, but the most pressing problem that remains open is to extend our results to all pairs of graphs (F, H), with the symmetric case $F = H$ of particular interest. Our methods do provide lower and upper bounds on the threshold in the general case, which we discuss below.

We start with the 1-statement, where we wish to know what p ensures $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ is $(F, H)_v$-Ramsey when G_n is a graph of density more than $1 - 1/(k - 1)$. Recall that in our algorithmic proof of the 1-statement in Theorem 1.11, we worked in an ε-regular k-tuple in G_n, using the vertex Ramsey properties of the random graph in each part to iteratively grow a red clique or try to build a copy of H.

In the general setting, when we seek a red copy of F instead, we can adopt the same approach. The main difference is that there are many ways we could try to build F over the k parts. To keep track of these, we define a *partial partition of F* to be a partition of the vertices $V(F) = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_k \cup W$, where $W \neq \emptyset$. This represents the stage in the algorithm where we have found red subgraphs $F[U_i]$ in the parts V_i, and W represents the vertices of F that are still missing. Thus, when we try to extend this red subgraph, we will require $G(n, p)[V_i]$ to be $(F[U_i \cup \{u_i\}], H_i)_v$-Ramsey for some optimal choice of $u_i \in W$ and partition $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$. In this way, we either get one vertex closer to having a red copy of F, or we find one of the parts we need for a blue copy of H. Our proof then shows that, if we write $p(n; F, H, d) =: n^{-1/m^*(F,H;k)}$, we have

$$m^*(F, H; k) \leq \max_{\substack{V(F)=U_1\cup\cdots\cup U_k\cup W; \\ W\neq\emptyset}} \min_{\substack{H=H_1\cup\cdots\cup H_k; \\ u_1,\ldots,u_k\in W}} \max_{i:H_i\neq\emptyset} \beta(F[U_i \cup \{u_i\}], H_i). \tag{4.1}$$

Note that when $F = K_r$, all that matters is the size $|U_i|$ and not the set U_i itself, since each induced subgraph of K_r is itself a clique. Hence we recover the bound of Theorem 1.11.

Unfortunately, this upper bound need not be tight. For instance, when F and H are complete bipartite graphs, it is not hard to see that $m^*(F, H; 4) = 0$. However, by considering sets U_i that, for each i, span both color classes of F, we can ensure that each subgraph $F[U_i]$ has edges, which results in the right-hand side of (4.1) being positive.

One issue with (4.1) is that it considers *all* partial partitions of F, but we need only maximize over those that could feasibly arise in the algorithm. While it may not be easy to describe these partitions explicitly, we can construct the family of feasible partial partitions recursively.

To do so formally, we define the *extension function f* which, given the sets $U_1, \ldots, U_k$ of a partial partition of F, returns the vertices $(u_1, \ldots, u_k) \in W^k$ that are used to extend the red subgraph. For each such extension function, we can build the family $\mathcal{F}(f)$ of feasible partitions in the following way. We start with $(\emptyset, \cdots, \emptyset) \in \mathcal{F}(f)$. Then, for each $i \in [k]$, we add $(U_1, \ldots, U_{i-1}, U_i \cup \{f(\vec{U})_i\}, U_{i+1}, \ldots, U_k)$ to $\mathcal{F}(f)$, provided this is still a partial (and not complete) partition of F. Note that this represents the larger red subgraph we would obtain if, in $G(n, p)[V_i]$, we would find a monochromatic red subgraph when applying the $(F[U_i \cup \{f(\vec{U})_i\}], H_i)_v$-Ramsey property.

We then need only maximize over the feasible partitions $\mathcal{F}(f)$, and can choose the extension function f that gives the lowest possible threshold. That is, we have the upper bound

$$m^*(F, H; k) \leq \min_f \max_{(U_1, \ldots, U_k) \in \mathcal{F}(f)} \min_{H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k} \max_{i : H_i \neq \emptyset} \beta(F[U_i \cup \{f(\vec{U})_i\}], H_i). \tag{4.2}$$

Note again that in the case $F = K_r$, the choice of extension function f is irrelevant, since all that matters are the sizes $|U_i|$.

This is strictly better than (4.1), as one can find an extension function f that shows $m^*(F, H; 4) = 0$ whenever F and H are bipartite. Unfortunately, even (4.2) need not be tight, as we should also have $m^*(F, H; 3) = 0$ for such F and H, but the right-hand size is positive when we only have three parts. It would therefore be very interesting to find a sharper bound for the 1-statement. A useful step in that direction could be to characterize which extension functions f are optimal for a given graph F.

In the other direction, we can provide lower bounds on $m^*(F, H; k)$ by generalizing the coloring we gave in proving the 0-statement of Theorem 1.11. We shall once again take G_n to be a complete k-partite graph, and will describe how one can color the vertices of the random graphs $G(n, p)[V_i]$ to avoid both a red F and a blue H in $G_n \cup G(n, p)$.

To this end, we call a k-tuple $(\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_k)$ of families of nonempty graphs a *k-cover* of F if, for any k-partition $V(F) = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_k$ of the vertices of F, there is some $i \in [k]$ such that $F[U_i] \in \mathcal{F}_i$. That is, a k-cover is a collection of induced subgraphs that are bound to appear in any k-partition of F.

Given this definition, we have the following lower bound.

$$m^*(F, H; k) \geq \max_{(\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_k) \ k\text{-cover of } F} \min_{H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k} \max_{i : H_i \neq \emptyset} \min_{F' \in \mathcal{F}_i} \beta(F', H_i). \tag{4.3}$$

When $F = K_r$, this recovers the bound from Theorem 1.11, since we have k-covers of the form $\mathcal{F}_i = \{K_{r_i+1}, \ldots, K_r\}$, where $\sum_i r_i = r - 1$.

To describe the coloring in the general case, fix a maximizing k-cover $(\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_k)$, let β^* be the right-hand side of (4.3), and let $p = o(n^{-1/\beta^*})$. For each $i \in [k]$, we define $\mathcal{H}_i = \{H' \subseteq H : \forall F' \in \mathcal{F}_i, \beta(F', H') \geq \beta^*\}$. As before, one can argue that $H \in \mathcal{H}_i$, and so these families are all nonempty. Applying Proposition 2.1, we can color the vertices of $G(n, p)[V_i]$ so as to avoid any red graph from $\mathcal{F}_i$ and any blue graph from $\mathcal{H}_i$.

It is now tautological that this coloring of $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ has neither a red F nor a blue H. Suppose for contradiction there is a red copy of F, partitioned as $F = F_1 \cup \cdots \cup F_k$. Since $(\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_k)$ is a k-cover of F, there is some i with $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$, but then there is no red F_i in $G(n, p)[V_i]$. On the other hand, if there is a blue H, partitioned as $H = H_1 \cup \cdots \cup H_k$, then we must have some $i \in [k]$ such that $H_i \neq \emptyset$ and $\beta(F', H_i) \geq \beta^*$ for all $F' \in \mathcal{F}_i$. But then $H_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$, and so there is no blue H_i in $G(n, p)[V_i]$ either.

The challenge arises from the fact that when F is not a clique, there could be many ways to partition it into k induced subgraphs, and so there will be a wide variety of complicated k-covers. This makes it hard to analyse (4.3), and in particular to compare it to the upper bound of (4.2). Indeed, it is not obvious at first sight that the right-hand side of (4.2) is at least that of (4.3). To close the gap between

the bounds, it would help to better understand the k-covers of a graph F, and to see if there are different colorings of $G_n \cup G(n, p)$ that show (4.3) is not tight.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The probabilistic method*, Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, 4th ed., Wiley, New York, 2015.
2. J. Balogh, A. Treglown, and A. Wagner, *Tilings in randomly perturbed dense graphs*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **28** (2019), 159–176.
3. T. Bohman, A. Frieze, M. Krivelevich, and R. Martin, *Adding random edges to dense graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms. **24** (2004), 105–117.
4. T. Bohman, A. Frieze, and R. Martin, *How many edges make a dense graph Hamiltonian?*, Random Structures Algorithms. **22** (2003), 33–42.
5. J. Böttcher, J. Han, Y. Kohayakawa, R. Montgomery, O. Parczyk, and Y. Person, *Universality for bounded degree spanning trees in randomly perturbed graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms. **55** (2019), 854–864.
6. J. Böttcher, R. Montgomery, O. Parczyk, and Y. Person, *Embedding spanning bounded degree graphs in randomly perturbed graphs*, Mathematika. **66** (2020), 422–447.
7. S. Das and A. Treglown, *Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed graphs: Cliques and cycles*, Combin. Probab. Comput. (to appear).
8. A. Dudek, C. Reiher, A. Ruciński, and M. Schacht, *Powers of Hamiltonian cycles in randomly augmented graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms. **56** (2020), 122–141.
9. J. Han, P. Morris, and A. Treglown, *Tilings in randomly perturbed graphs: Bridging the gap between Hajnal-Szemerédi and Johansson-Kahn-Vu*, Random Structures Algorithms. (to appear).
10. S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński, *Random graphs*, Wiley-Interscience series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 2000.
11. S. Janson, *Poisson approximation for large deviations*, Random Structures Algorithms. **1** (1990), 221–229.
12. S. Janson, K. Oleszkiewicz, and A. Ruciński, *Upper tails for subgraph counts in random graphs*, Israel J. Mathematics. **142** (2004), 61–92.
13. F. Joos and J. Kim, *Spanning trees in randomly perturbed graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms. **56** (2020), 169–219.
14. J.H. Kim and V.H. Vu, *Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications*, Combinatorica. **20** (2000), 417–434.
15. Y. Kohayakawa and B. Kreuter, *Threshold functions for asymmetric Ramsey properties involving cycles*, Random Structures Algorithms. **11** (1997), 245–276.
16. J. Komlós and M. Simonovits, *Szemerédi's regularity lemma and its applications in graph theory*. Combinatorics, Paul Erdős is eighty (Keszthely, Hungary, 1993) *(D. Miklós, V.T. Sós, T. Szönyi, eds.)*, Bolyai Math. Stud., Budapest, Vol. 2, 1996, pp. 295–352.
17. B. Kreuter, *Threshold functions for asymmetric Ramsey properties with respect to vertex colorings*, Random Structures Algorithms. **9** (1996), 335–348.
18. M. Krivelevich, M. Kwan, and B. Sudakov, *Bounded-degree spanning trees in randomly perturbed graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **31** (2017), 155–171.
19. M. Krivelevich, B. Sudakov, and P. Tetali, *On smoothed analysis in dense graphs and formulas*, Random Structures Algorithms. **29** (2006), 180–193.
20. T. Łuczak, A. Ruciński, and B. Voigt, *Ramsey properties of random graphs*, J. Combin. Theoy, Ser. B. **56** (1992), 55–68.
21. F. Mousset, R. Nenadov, and W. Samotij, *Towards the Kohayakawa-Kreuter conjecture on asymmetric Ramsey properties*, Combin. Probab. Comput. (to appear).

22. R. Nenadov and M. Trujić, *Sprinkling a few random edges doubles the power*, 2018 arXiv:1811.09209.

23. E. Powierski, *Ramsey properties of randomly perturbed dense graphs*, 2019, arXiv:1902.02197.

24. V. Rödl and A. Ruciński, *Threshold functions for Ramsey properties*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **8** (1995), 917–942.

25. E. Szemerédi, *Regular partitions of graphs*. Proc. Colloque Inter. C.N.R.S. No 260—Problèmes Combinatoires et Théorie des Graphes, Orsay, pp. 399–401, 1978.

26. P. Turán, *On an extremal problem in graph theory (in Hungarian)*, Math. Fiz. Lapok. **48** (1941), 436–452.