Monochromatic Clique Decompositions of Graphs

Henry Liu
Centro de Matemática e Aplicações
Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
Campus de Caparica, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal
h.liu@fct.unl.pt

Oleg Pikhurko
Mathematics Institute and DIMAP
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom
http://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/staff/O.Pikhurko

Teresa Sousa
Departamento de Matemática and Centro de Matemática e Aplicações
Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
Campus de Caparica, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal
tmjs@fct.unl.pt

January 23, 2014

Abstract

Let G be a graph whose edges are coloured with k colours, and $\mathcal{H} = (H_1, \ldots, H_k)$ be a k-tuple of graphs. A *monochromatic $\mathcal{H}$-decomposition* of G is a partition of the edge set of G such that each part is either a single edge or forms a monochromatic copy of H_i in colour i, for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\phi_k(n, \mathcal{H})$ be the smallest number ϕ, such that, for every order-n graph and every k-edge-colouring, there is a monochromatic $\mathcal{H}$-decomposition with at most ϕ elements. Extending the previous results of Liu and Sousa ["Monochromatic K_r-decompositions of graphs", to appear in *Journal of Graph Theory*], we solve this problem when each graph in $\mathcal{H}$ is a clique and $n \geq n_0(\mathcal{H})$ is sufficiently large.

Keywords: Monochromatic graph decomposition; Turán Number; Ramsey Number

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are finite, undirected and simple. For standard graph-theoretic terminology the reader is referred to [3].

Given two graphs G and H, an *H-decomposition* of G is a partition of the edge set of G such that each part is either a single edge or forms a subgraph isomorphic to H. Let $\phi(G, H)$ be the smallest possible number of parts in an H-decomposition of G. It is easy to see that, if H is non-empty, we have $\phi(G, H) = e(G) - \nu_H(G)(e(H) - 1)$, where $\nu_H(G)$ is the maximum number of pairwise edge-disjoint copies of H that can be packed into G. Dor and Tarsi [4] showed that if H has a component with at least 3 edges then it is NP-complete to determine if a graph G admits a partition into copies of H. Thus, it is NP-hard to compute the function $\phi(G, H)$ for such H. Nonetheless, many exact results were proved about the extremal function

$$\phi(n, H) = \max\{\phi(G, H) \mid v(G) = n\},$$

which is the smallest number such that any graph G of order n admits an H-decomposition with at most $\phi(n, H)$ elements.

This function was first studied, in 1966, by Erdős, Goodman and Pósa [6], who proved that $\phi(n, K_3) = t_2(n)$, where K_s denotes the complete graph (clique) of order s, and $t_{r-1}(n)$ denotes the number of edges in the *Turán graph* $T_{r-1}(n)$, which is the unique $(r-1)$-partite graph on n vertices that has the maximum number of edges. A decade later, Bollobás [2] proved that $\phi(n, K_r) = t_{r-1}(n)$, for all $n \geq r \geq 3$.

Recently Pikhurko and Sousa [13] studied $\phi(n, H)$ for arbitrary graphs H. Their result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. [13] *Let H be any fixed graph of chromatic number $r \geq 3$. Then,*

$$\phi(n, H) = t_{r-1}(n) + o(n^2).$$

Let $\text{ex}(n, H)$ denote the maximum number of edges in a graph on n vertices not containing H as a subgraph. The result of Turán [20] states that $T_{r-1}(n)$ is the unique extremal graph for $\text{ex}(n, K_r)$. The function $\text{ex}(n, H)$ is usually called the *Turán function* for H. Pikhurko and Sousa [13] also made the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2. [13] *For any graph H of chromatic number $r \geq 3$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(H)$ such that $\phi(n, H) = \text{ex}(n, H)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*

A graph H is *edge-critical* if there exists an edge $e \in E(H)$ such that $\chi(H) > \chi(H - e)$, where $\chi(H)$ denotes the *chromatic number* of H. For $r \geq 4$, a *clique-extension of order* r is a connected graph that consists of a K_{r-1} plus another vertex, say v, adjacent to at most $r-2$ vertices of K_{r-1}. Conjecture 1.2 has been verified by Sousa for some edge-critical graphs, namely, clique-extensions of order $r \geq 4$ ($n \geq r$)

[18] and the cycles of length 5 ($n \geq 6$) and 7 ($n \geq 10$) [17, 19]. Later, Özkahya and Person [12] verified the conjecture for all edge-critical graphs with chromatic number $r \geq 3$. Their result is the following.

Theorem 1.3 (See Theorem 3 from [12]). *For any edge-critical graph H with chromatic number $r \geq 3$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(H)$ such that $\phi(n, H) = \mathrm{ex}(n, H)$, for all $n \geq n_0$. Moreover, the only graph attaining $\mathrm{ex}(n, H)$ is the Turán graph $T_{r-1}(n)$.*

Recently, as an extension of Özkahya and Person's work, Allen, Böttcher, and Person [1] improved the error term obtained by Pikhurko and Sousa in Theorem 1.1. In fact, they proved that the error term $o(n^2)$ can be replaced by $O(n^{2-\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Furthermore, they also showed that this error term has the correct order of magnitude. Their result is indeed an extension of Theorem 1.3 since the error term $O(n^{2-\alpha})$ that they obtained vanishes for every edge-critical graph H.

Motivated by the recent work about H-decompositions of graphs, a natural problem to consider is the Ramsey (or coloured) version of this problem. More precisely, let G be a graph on n vertices whose edges are coloured with k colours, for some $k \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{H} = (H_1, \ldots, H_k)$ be a k-tuple of fixed graphs, where repetition is allowed. A *monochromatic $\mathcal{H}$-decomposition* of G is a partition of its edge set such that each part is either a single edge, or forms a monochromatic copy of H_i in colour i, for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{H})$ be the smallest number, such that, for any k-edge-colouring of G, there exists a monochromatic $\mathcal{H}$-decomposition of G with at most $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{H})$ elements. Our goal is to study the function

$$\phi_k(n, \mathcal{H}) = \max\{\phi_k(G, \mathcal{H}) \mid v(G) = n\},$$

which is the smallest number ϕ such that, any k-edge-coloured graph of order n admits a monochromatic $\mathcal{H}$-decomposition with at most ϕ elements. In the case when $H_i \cong H$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, we simply write $\phi_k(G, H) = \phi_k(G, \mathcal{H})$ and $\phi_k(n, H) = \phi_k(n, \mathcal{H})$.

The function $\phi_k(n, K_r)$, for $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 3$, has been studied by Liu and Sousa [11], who obtained results involving the Ramsey numbers and the Turán numbers. Recall that for $k \geq 2$ and integers $r_1, \ldots, r_k \geq 3$, the *Ramsey number for* $K_{r_1}, \ldots, K_{r_k}$, denoted by $R(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$, is the smallest value of s, such that, for every k-edge-colouring of K_s, there exists a monochromatic K_{r_i} in colour i, for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. For the case when $r_1 = \cdots = r_k = r$, for some $r \geq 3$, we simply write $R_k(r) = R(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$. Since $R(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ does not change under any permutation of $r_1, \ldots, r_k$, without loss of generality, we assume throughout that $3 \leq r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_k$. The Ramsey numbers are notoriously difficult to calculate, even though, it is known that their values are finite [15]. To this date, the values of $R(3, r_2)$ have been determined exactly only for $3 \leq r_2 \leq 9$, and these are shown in the following table [14].

r_2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$R(3, r_2)$	6	9	14	18	23	28	36

The remaining Ramsey numbers that are known exactly are $R(4,4) = 18$, $R(4,5) = 25$, and $R(3,3,3) = 17$. The gap between the lower bound and the upper bound for other Ramsey numbers is generally quite large.

For the case $R(3,3) = 6$, it is easy to see that the only 2-edge-colouring of K_5 not containing a monochromatic K_3 is the one where each colour induces a cycle of length 5. From this 2-edge-colouring, observe that we may take a 'blow-up' to obtain a 2-edge-colouring of the Turán graph $T_5(n)$, and easily deduce that $\phi_2(n, K_3) \geq t_5(n)$. See Figure 1.



Figure 1. The 2-edge-colouring of K_5, and its blow-up

This example was the motivation for Liu and Sousa [11] to study K_r-monochromatic decompositions of graphs, for $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$. They have recently proved the following result.

Theorem 1.4. [11]

(a) $\phi_k(n, K_3) = t_{R_k(3)-1}(n) + o(n^2)$*;*

(b) $\phi_k(n, K_3) = t_{R_k(3)-1}(n)$ *for* $k = 2, 3$ *and* n *sufficiently large;*

(c) $\phi_k(n, K_r) = t_{R_k(r)-1}(n)$*, for* $k \geq 2$*,* $r \geq 4$ *and* n *sufficiently large.*

Moreover, the only graph attaining $\phi_k(n, K_r)$ *in cases (b) and (c) is the Turán graph* $T_{R_k(r)-1}(n)$*.*

They also made the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.5. [11] *Let* $k \geq 4$*. Then* $\phi_k(n, K_3) = t_{R_k(3)-1}(n)$ *for* $n \geq R_k(3)$*.*

Here, we will study an extension of the monochromatic K_r-decomposition problem when the clique K_r is replaced by a fixed k-tuple of cliques $\mathcal{C} = (K_{r_1}, \ldots, K_{r_k})$. Our main result, stated in Theorem 1.6, is clearly an extension of Theorem 1.4. Also, it verifies Conjecture 1.5 for sufficiently large n.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $k \geq 2$, $3 \leq r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_k$, and $R = R(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$. Let $\mathcal{C} = (K_{r_1}, \ldots, K_{r_k})$. Then, there is an $n_0 = n_0(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0$, we have*

$$\phi_k(n, \mathcal{C}) = t_{R-1}(n).$$

Moreover, the only order-n graph attaining $\phi_k(n, \mathcal{C})$ is the Turán graph $T_{R-1}(n)$ (with a k-edge-colouring that does not contain a colour-i copy of K_{r_i} for every $1 \leq i \leq k$).

The upper bound of Theorem 1.6 is proved in Section 2. The lower bound follows easily by the definition of the Ramsey number. Indeed, take a k-edge-colouring f' of the complete graph K_{R-1} without a monochromatic K_{r_i} in colour i, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_{R-1}$ be the vertices of the K_{R-1}. Now, consider the Turán graph $T_{R-1}(n)$ with a k-edge-colouring f which is a 'blow-up' of f'. That is, if $T_{R-1}(n)$ has partition classes $V_1, \ldots, V_{R-1}$, then for $v \in V_j$ and $w \in V_\ell$ with $j \neq \ell$, we define $f(vw) = f'(u_j u_\ell)$. Then, $T_{R-1}(n)$ with this k-edge-colouring has no monochromatic K_{r_i} in colour i, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore, $\phi_k(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq \phi_k(T_{R-1}(n), \mathcal{C}) = t_{R-1}(n)$ and the lower bound in Theorem 1.6 follows.

In particular, when all the cliques in $\mathcal{C}$ are equal, Theorem 1.6 completes the results obtained previously by Liu and Sousa in Theorem 1.4. In fact, we get the following direct corollary from Theorem 1.6.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $k \geq 2$, $r \geq 3$ and n be sufficiently large. Then,*

$$\phi_k(n, K_r) = t_{R_k(r)-1}(n).$$

Moreover, the only order-n graph attaining $\phi_k(n, K_r)$ is the Turán graph $T_{R_k(r)-1}(n)$ (with a k-edge-colouring that does not contain a monochromatic copy of K_r).

2 Proof of Theorem 1.6

In this section we will prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.6. Before presenting the proof we need to introduce the tools. Throughout this section, let $k \geq 2$, $3 \leq r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_k$ be an increasing sequence of integers, $R = R(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ be the Ramsey number for $K_{r_1}, \ldots, K_{r_k}$, and $\mathcal{C} = (K_{r_1}, \ldots, K_{r_k})$ be a fixed k-tuple of cliques.

We first recall the following stability theorem of Erdős and Simonovits [5, 16].

Theorem 2.1 (Stability Theorem [5, 16])**.** *Let $r \geq 3$, and G be a graph on n vertices with $e(G) \geq t_{r-1}(n) + o(n^2)$ and not containing K_r as a subgraph. Then, there exists an $(r-1)$-partite graph G' on n vertices with partition classes $V_1, \ldots, V_{r-1}$, where $|V_i| = \frac{n}{r-1} + o(n)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, that can be obtained from G by adding and subtracting $o(n^2)$ edges.*

Next, we recall the following result of Győri [7, 8] about the existence of edge-disjoint copies of K_r in graphs on n vertices with more than $t_{r-1}(n)$ edges.

Theorem 2.2. [7, 8] *Let $r \geq 3$, and G be a graph on n vertices, with $e(G) = t_{r-1}(n) + m$, where $m = o(n^2)$. Then G contains at least $m + O(\frac{m^2}{n^2}) = (1+o(1))m$ edge-disjoint copies of K_r.*

Now, we will consider coverings and packings of cliques in graphs. Let $r \geq 3$ and G be a graph. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the set of all K_r-subgraphs of G. A *K_r-cover* a set of edges of G meeting all elements in $\mathcal{K}$, that is, the removal of a K_r-cover results in a K_r-free graph. A *K_r-packing* in G is a set of pairwise edge-disjoint copies of K_r. The *K_r-covering number* of G, denoted by $\tau_r(G)$, is the minimum size of a K_r-cover of G, and the *K_r-packing number* of G, denoted by $\nu_r(G)$, is the maximum size of a K_r-packing of G. Next, a *fractional K_r-cover* of G is a function $f : E(G) \to \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $\sum_{e \in E(H)} f(e) \geq 1$ for every $H \in \mathcal{K}$, that is, for every copy of K_r in G the sum of the values of f on its edges is at least 1. A *fractional K_r-packing* of G is a function $p : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{K} : e \in E(H)} p(H) \leq 1$ for every $e \in E(G)$, that is, the total weight of K_r's that cover any edge is at most 1. Here, $\mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the set of non-negative real numbers. The *fractional K_r-covering number* of G, denoted by $\tau_r^*(G)$, is the minimum of $\sum_{e \in E(G)} f(e)$ over all fractional K_r-covers f, and the *fractional K_r-packing number* of G, denoted by $\nu_r^*(G)$, is the maximum of $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{K}} p(H)$ over all fractional K_r-packings p.

One can easily observe that

$$\nu_r(G) \leq \tau_r(G) \leq \binom{r}{2} \nu_r(G).$$

For $r = 3$, we have $\tau_3(G) \leq 3\nu_3(G)$. A long-standing conjecture of Tuza [21] from 1981 states that this inequality is not optimal.

Conjecture 2.3. [21] *For every graph G, we have $\tau_3(G) \leq 2\nu_3(G)$.*

Conjecture 2.3 remains open although many partial results have been proved. By using the earlier results of Krivelevich [10], and Haxell and Rödl [9], Yuster [22] proved the following theorem which will be crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.6. In the case $r = 3$, it is an asymptotic solution of Tuza's conjecture.

Theorem 2.4. [22] *Let $r \geq 3$ and G be a graph on n vertices. Then*

$$\tau_r(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{r^2}{4} \right\rfloor \nu_r(G) + o(n^2). \tag{2.1}$$

We now prove the following lemma which states that a graph G with n vertices and at least $t_{R-1}(n) + \Omega(n^2)$ edges falls quite short of being optimal.

Lemma 2.5. *For every $k \geq 2$ and $c_0 > 0$ there are $c_1 > 0$ and n_0 such that for every graph G of order $n \geq n_0$ with at least $t_{R-1}(n) + c_0 n^2$ edges, we have $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) \leq t_{R-1}(n) - c_1 n^2$.*

Proof. Suppose that the lemma is false, that is, there is $c_0 > 0$ such that for some increasing sequence of n there is a graph G on n vertices with $e(G) \geq t_{R-1}(n) + c_0 n^2$ and $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) \geq t_{R-1}(n) + o(n^2)$. Fix a k-edge-colouring of G and let G_i be the subgraph of G on n vertices that contains all edges with colour i, with $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let $m = e(G) - t_{R-1}(n)$, and let $s \in \{0, \ldots, k\}$ be the maximum such that

$$r_1 = \cdots = r_s = 3.$$

Let us very briefly recall the argument from [11] that shows $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) \leq t_{R-1}(n) + o(n^2)$, adopted to our purposes. If we remove a K_{r_i}-cover from G_i for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, then we destroy all copies of K_R in G. By Turán's theorem, at most $t_{R-1}(n)$ edges remain. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) \geq m. \tag{2.2}$$

By Theorem 2.4, if we remove a maximum K_{r_i}-packing from each G_i, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) &\leq e(G) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\binom{r_i}{2} - 1 \right) \nu_{r_i}(G_i) \\ &\leq t_{R-1}(n) + m - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\binom{r_i}{2} - 1}{\lfloor r_i^2/4 \rfloor} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) + o(n^2) \\ &\leq t_{R-1}(n) + m - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=s+1}^{k} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) + o(n^2) \;\leq\; t_{R-1}(n) + o(n^2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Note that $(\binom{r}{2} - 1)/\lfloor r^2/4 \rfloor \geq 5/4$ for $r \geq 4$ and is equal to 1 for $r = 3$.

Let us derive a contradiction from this by looking at the properties of our hypothetical counterexample G. First, all inequalities that we saw have to be equalities within an additive term $o(n^2)$. In particular, the slack in (2.2) is $o(n^2)$, that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) = m + o(n^2). \tag{2.4}$$

Also, $\sum_{i=s+1}^{k} \tau_{r_i}(G_i) = o(n^2)$. In particular, we have that $s \geq 1$. To simplify the later calculations, let us re-define G by removing a maximum K_{r_i}-packing from G_i for each $i \geq s+1$. The new graph is still a counterexample to the lemma if we decrease c_0 slightly.

Suppose that we remove, for each $i \leq s$, an arbitrary (not necessarily minimum) K_3-cover F_i from G_i such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} |F_i| \leq m + o(n^2). \tag{2.5}$$

Let $G' \subseteq G$ be the obtained K_R-free graph. (Recall that we assumed that G_i is K_{r_i}-free for all $i \geq s+1$.) Let $G_i' \subseteq G_i$ be the colour classes of G'. We know by (2.5) that $e(G') \geq t_{R-1}(n) + o(n^2)$. Since G' is K_R-free, we conclude by the Stability Theorem (Theorem 2.1) that there is a partition $V(G) = V(G') = V_1 \dot\cup \ldots \dot\cup V_{R-1}$ such that

$$\forall\, i \in \{1, \ldots, R-1\}, \quad |V_i| = \frac{n}{R-1} + o(n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad |E(T) \setminus E(G')| = o(n^2), \tag{2.6}$$

where T is the complete $(R-1)$-partite graph with parts $V_1, \ldots, V_{R-1}$.

Next, we essentially expand the proof of (2.1) for $r = 3$ and transform it into an algorithm that produces K_3-coverings F_i of G_i, with $1 \leq i \leq s$, in such a way that (2.5) holds but (2.6) is impossible whatever $V_1, \ldots, V_{R-1}$ we take, giving the desired contradiction.

Let H be an arbitrary graph of order n. By the LP duality, we have that

$$\tau_r^*(H) = \nu_r^*(H). \tag{2.7}$$

By the result of Haxell and Rödl [9] we have that

$$\nu_r^*(H) = \nu_r(H) + o(n^2). \tag{2.8}$$

Krivelevich [10] showed that

$$\tau_3(H) \leq 2\tau_3^*(H). \tag{2.9}$$

Thus, $\tau_3(H) \leq 2\nu_3(H) + o(n^2)$ giving (2.1) for $r = 3$.

The proof of Krivelevich [10] of (2.9) is based on the following result.

Lemma 2.6. *Let H be an arbitrary graph and $f : E(H) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a minimum fractional K_3-cover. Then $\tau_3(H) \le \frac{3}{2}\tau_3^*(H)$ or there is $xy \in E(H)$ with $f(xy) = 0$ that belongs to at least one triangle of H.*

Proof. If there is an edge $xy \in E(H)$ that does not belong to a triangle, then necessarily $f(xy) = 0$ and xy does not belong to any optimal integer K_3-cover. We can remove xy from $E(H)$ without changing the validity of the lemma. Thus, we can assume that every edge of H belongs to a triangle.

Suppose that $f(xy) > 0$ for every edge xy of H, for otherwise we are done. Take a maximum fractional K_3-packing p. Recall that it is a function that assigns a weight $p(xyz) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to each triangle xyz of H such that for every edge xy the sum of weights over all K_3's of H containing xy is at most 1, that is,

$$\sum_{z \in \Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y)} p(xyz) \le 1, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\Gamma(v)$ denotes the set of neighbours of the vertex v in H.

This is the dual LP to the minimum fractional K_3-cover problem. By the complementary slackness condition (since f and p are optimal solutions), we have equality in (2.10) for every $xy \in E(H)$. This and the LP duality imply that

$$\tau_3^*(H) = \nu_3^*(G) = \sum_{xyz} p(xyz) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{xy \in E(H)} \sum_{z \in \Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y)} p(xyz) = \frac{1}{3} e(H).$$

On the other hand $\tau_3(H) \le \frac{1}{2} e(H)$: take a bipartite subgraph of H with at least half of edges; then the remaining edges form a K_3-cover. Putting the last two inequalities together, we obtain the required result. □

Let $1 \le i \le s$. We now describe an algorithm for finding a K_3-cover F_i in G_i. Initially, let $H = G_i$ and $F_i = \emptyset$. Repeat the following.

Take a minimum fractional K_3-cover f of H. If the first alternative of Lemma 2.6 is true, pick a K_3-cover of H of size at most $\frac{3}{2}\tau_3^*(H)$, add it to F_i and stop. Otherwise, fix some edge $xy \in E(H)$ returned by Lemma 2.6. Let F' consist of all pairs xz and yz over $z \in \Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y)$. Add F' to F_i and remove F' from $E(H)$. Repeat the whole step (with the new H and f).

Consider any moment during this algorithm, when we had $f(xy) = 0$ for some edge xy of H. Since f is a fractional K_3-cover, we have that $f(xz) + f(yz) \ge 1$ for every $z \in \Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y)$. Thus, if H' is obtained from H by removing 2ℓ such pairs, where $\ell = |\Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y)|$, then $\tau_3^*(H') \le \tau_3^*(H) - \ell$ because f when restricted to $E(H')$ is still a fractional cover (although not necessarily an optimal one). Clearly, $|F_i|$ increases by 2ℓ during this operation. Thus, indeed we obtain, at the end, a K_3-cover F_i of G_i of size at most $2\tau_3^*(G_i)$.

Also, by (2.7) and (2.8) we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} |F_i| \leq 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} \nu_3(G_i) + o(n^2).$$

Now, since all slacks in (2.3) are $o(n^2)$, we conclude that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \nu_3(G_i) \leq \frac{m}{2} + o(n^2)$$

and (2.5) holds. In fact, (2.5) is equality by (2.4).

Recall that G_i' is obtained from G_i by removing all edges of F_i and G' is the edge-disjoint union of the graphs G_i'. Suppose that there exist $V_1, \ldots, V_{R-1}$ satisfying (2.6). Let $M = E(T) \setminus E(G')$ consist of *missing* edges. Thus, $|M| = o(n^2)$.

Fix small $c_2 > 0$. Let

$$X = \{x \in V(T) \mid \deg_M(x) \geq c_2 n\}.$$

Clearly,

$$|X| \leq 2|M|/c_2 n = o(n).$$

Observe that, for every $1 \leq i \leq s$, if the first alternative of Lemma 2.6 holds at some point, then the remaining graph H satisfies $\tau_3^*(H) = o(n^2)$. Indeed, otherwise by $\tau_3(G_i) \leq 2\tau_3^*(G_i) - \tau_3^*(H)/2 + o(n^2)$ we get a strictly smaller constant than 2 in (2.9) and thus a gap of $\Omega(n^2)$ in (2.3), a contradiction. Therefore, all but $o(n^2)$ edges in F_i come from some *parent edge* xy that had f-weight 0 at some point.

When our algorithm adds pairs xz and yz to F_i with the same parent xy, then it adds the same number of pairs incident to x as those incident to y. Let $\mathcal{P}$ consist of pairs xy that are disjoint from X and were a parent edge during the run of the algorithm. Since the total number of pairs in F_i incident to X is at most $n|X| = o(n^2)$, there are $|F_i| - o(n^2)$ pairs in F_i such that their parent is in $\mathcal{P}$.

Let us show that y_0 and y_1 belong to different parts V_j for every pair $y_0y_1 \in \mathcal{P}$. Suppose on the contrary that, say, $y_0, y_1 \in V_1$. For each $2 \leq j \leq R-1$ pick an arbitrary $y_j \in V_j \setminus (\Gamma_M(x) \cup \Gamma_M(y))$. Since $y_0, y_1 \notin X$, the possible number of choices for y_j is at least

$$\frac{n}{R-1} - 2c_2 n + o(n) \geq \frac{n}{R-1} - 3c_2 n.$$

Let

$$Y = \{y_0, \dots, y_{R-1}\}.$$

By the above, we have at least $(\frac{n}{R-1} - 3c_2 n)^{R-2}$ choices of Y. Note that by the definition, all edges between $\{y_0, y_1\}$ and the rest of Y are present in $E(G')$. Thus, the number of sets Y containing at least one edge of M different from $y_0 y_1$ is at most

$$|M| \times n^{R-4} = o(n^{R-2}).$$

This is $o(1)$ times the number of choices of Y. Thus, for almost every Y, $H = G'[Y]$ is a clique (except perhaps the pair $y_0 y_1$). In particular, there is at least one such choice of Y; fix it. Adding back the pair $y_0 y_1$ coloured i to H (if it is not there already), we obtain a k-edge-colouring of the complete graph H of order R. By the definition of $R = R(r_1, \dots, r_k)$, there must be a monochromatic triangle on abc of colour $h \le s$. (Recall that we assumed at the beginning that G_j is K_{r_j}-free for each $j > s$.) But abc has to contain an edge from the K_3-cover F_h, say ab. This edge ab is not in G' (it was removed from G). If a, b lie in different parts V_j, then $ab \in M$, a contradiction to the choice of Y. The only possibility is that $ab = y_0 y_1$. Then $h = i$. Since both $y_0 c$ and $y_1 c$ are in G'_i, they were never added to the K_3-cover F_i by our algorithm. Therefore, $y_0 y_1$ was never a parent, which is the desired contradiction.

Thus, every $xy \in \mathcal{P}$ connects two different parts V_j. For every such parent xy, the number of its children in M is at least half of all the children. Indeed, for every pair of children xz and yz, at least one connects two different parts; this child necessarily belongs to M. Thus,

$$|F_i \cap M| \ge \frac{1}{2}\,|F_i| + o(n^2).$$

Recall that parent edges that intersect X produce at most $2n|X| = o(n^2)$ children. Therefore,

$$|M| \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{s} |F_i| + o(n^2) \ge \frac{m}{2} + o(n^2) = \Omega(n^2),$$

contradicting (2.6). This contradiction proves Lemma 2.5. □

We are now able to prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1.6. Let $n_0 = n_0(r_1, \dots, r_k)$ be sufficiently large to satisfy all the inequalities we will encounter. Let G be a k-edge-coloured graph on $n \ge n_0$ vertices. We will show that $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) \le t_{R-1}(n)$ with equality if and only if $G = T_{R-1}(n)$, and G does not contain a monochromatic copy of K_{r_i} in colour i for every $1 \le i \le k$.

Let $e(G) = t_{R-1}(n) + m$, where m is an integer. If $m < 0$, we can decompose G into single edges and there is nothing to prove.

Let $m = 0$. If G contains a monochromatic copy of K_{r_i} in colour i for some $1 \le i \le k$, then G admits a monochromatic $\mathcal{C}$-decomposition with at most $t_{R-1}(n) - \binom{r_i}{2} + 1 < t_{R-1}(n)$ parts and we are done. Otherwise, the definition of R implies that G does not contain a copy of K_R. Therefore, $G = T_{R-1}(n)$ by Turán's theorem and $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) = t_{R-1}(n)$ as required.

Now, let $m > 0$. If there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that $m \ge c_0 n^2$, then we have $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) < t_{R-1}(n)$ by Lemma 2.5. Otherwise, we have $m = o(n^2)$. In this case, by Theorem 2.2 with $r = R$, the graph G contains at least $m + O(\frac{m^2}{n^2}) > \frac{m}{2}$ edge-disjoint copies of K_R. Since each K_R contains a monochromatic copy of K_{r_i} in the colour-i graph G_i, for some $1 \le i \le k$, this implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \nu_3(G_i) > \frac{m}{2}$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k}(\binom{r_i}{2} - 1)\nu_3(G_i) \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2\nu_3(G_i) > m$. We have

$$\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) = e(G) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \binom{r_i}{2} \nu_3(G_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \nu_3(G_i) < t_{R-1}(n),$$

giving the required. □

Remark. By analysing the above argument, one can also derive the following stability property for every fixed family $\mathcal{C}$ of cliques as $n \to \infty$: every graph G on n vertices with $\phi_k(G, \mathcal{C}) = t_{R-1}(n) + o(n^2)$ is $o(n^2)$-close to the Turán graph $T_{R-1}(n)$ in the edit distance.

Acknowledgements

Henry Liu and Teresa Sousa acknowledge the support from FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal), through the projects PTDC/MAT/113207/2009 and PEst-OE/MAT/UI0297/2011 (CMA). Oleg Pikhurko was supported by ERC grant 306493 and EPSRC grant EP/K012045/1.

References

[1] P. Allen, J. Böttcher, and Y. Person. An improved error term for minimum H-decompositions of graphs. *Submitted.*

[2] B. Bollobás. On complete subgraphs of different orders. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 79(1):19–24, 1976.

[3] B. Bollobás. *Modern graph theory*, volume 184 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[4] D. Dor and M. Tarsi. Graph decomposition is NP-complete: a complete proof of Holyer's conjecture. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(4):1166–1187, 1997.

[5] P. Erdős. Some recent results on extremal problems in graph theory. (Results). Theory Graphs, Int. Symp. Rome 1966, 117-123 (English), 124-130 (French), 1967.

[6] P. Erdős, A. W. Goodman, and L. Pósa. The representation of a graph by set intersections. *Canad. J. Math.*, 18:106–112, 1966.

[7] E. Győri. On the number of edge-disjoint triangles in graphs of given size. In *Combinatorics (Eger, 1987)*, volume 52 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, pages 267–276. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.

[8] E. Győri. On the number of edge disjoint cliques in graphs of given size. *Combinatorica*, 11(3):231–243, 1991.

[9] P. E. Haxell and V. Rödl. Integer and fractional packings in dense graphs. *Combinatorica*, 21(1):13–38, 2001.

[10] M. Krivelevich. On a conjecture of Tuza about packing and covering of triangles. *Discrete Math.*, 142(1-3):281–286, 1995.

[11] H. Liu and T. Sousa. Monochromatic K_r-decompositions of graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, to appear.

[12] L. Özkahya and Y. Person. Minimum H-decompositions of graphs: edge-critical case. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 102(3):715–725, 2012.

[13] O. Pikhurko and T. Sousa. Minimum H-decompositions of graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 97(6):1041–1055, 2007.

[14] S. P. Radziszowski. Small Ramsey numbers. *Electron. J. Comb.*, DS01:research paper ds1, 27, 1996.

[15] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 30:264–286, 1930.

[16] M. Simonovits. A method for solving extremal problems in graph theory, stability problems. In *Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966)*, pages 279–319. Academic Press, New York, 1968.

[17] T. Sousa. Decompositions of graphs into 5-cycles and other small graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 12:Research Paper 49, 7 pp. (electronic), 2005.

[18] T. Sousa. Decompositions of graphs into a given clique-extension. *Ars Combin.*, 100:465–472, 2011.

[19] T. Sousa. Decompositions of graphs into cycles of length seven and single edges. *Ars Combin.*, to appear.

[20] P. Turán. On an extremal problem in graph theory. *Mat. Fiz. Lapok*, 48:436–452, 1941.

[21] Zs. Tuza. In *Finite and Infinite Sets*, volume 37 of *Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai*, page 888. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1984.

[22] R. Yuster. Dense graphs with a large triangle cover have a large triangle packing. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 21:952–962, 2012.