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This thesis consists of four parts, each regarding a topic from extremal combinatorics. While only Chapters 2 and 3 are directly related, each in some way concerns the concept of thresholds, whether providing a new sharp threshold result for regular properties (in the case of Chapter 2), proving specific graph theoretic thresholds (in the case of Chapter 5), or showing how different thresholds are related (as in Chapters 3 and 4).

In Chapter 2, we answer a question of Cameron, Frankl, and Kantor from 1989, extending a result of Ellis and Narayanan. They verified a conjecture of Frankl, that any 3-wise intersecting family of subsets of \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} admitting a transitive automorphism group has cardinality \(o(2^n)\). However, a construction of Frankl demonstrates that the same conclusion need not hold under the weaker constraint of being regular. We show that the restriction of admitting a transitive automorphism group may be relaxed significantly: we prove that any 3-wise intersecting family of subsets of \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} that is regular and increasing has cardinality \(o(2^n)\).

In Chapter 3, we prove a conjecture of Talagrand, itself a fractional version of the “expectation-threshold” conjecture of Kahn and Kalai. We show that for any increasing family \(\mathcal{F}\) on a finite set \(X\), we have \(p_c(\mathcal{F}) = O(q_f(\mathcal{F}) \ln \ell(\mathcal{F}))\), where \(p_c(\mathcal{F})\) and \(q_f(\mathcal{F})\) are the threshold and “fractional expectation-threshold” of \(\mathcal{F}\), and \(\ell(\mathcal{F})\) is the maximum size of a minimal member of \(\mathcal{F}\). This easily implies several heretofore difficult results and
conjectures in probabilistic combinatorics, including thresholds for perfect hypergraph
matchings (Johansson–Kahn–Vu), bounded degree spanning trees (Montgomery), and
bounded degree graphs (new). We also resolve (and vastly extend) the “axial” version
of the random multi-dimensional assignment problem (earlier considered by Martin–
Mézard–Rivoire and Frieze–Sorkin). Our approach builds on a breakthrough of Alweiss,
Lovett, Wu and Zhang on the Erdős–Rado “Sunflower Conjecture.”

In Chapter 4, we address a special case of a conjecture of Talagrand relating the
“expectation” and “fractional-expectation” thresholds of an increasing family $\mathcal{F}$ of a
finite set $X$. The full conjecture implies the equivalence of the so-called “fractional
expectation-threshold” conjecture shown in Chapter 3 to the “expectation-threshold”
conjecture of Kahn and Kalai. The conjecture discussed in this chapter states there is
a fixed $J$ such that if $p \in [0, 1]$ admits $\lambda : X \to [0, 1]$ with

$$\sum_{S \subseteq F} \lambda_S \geq 1 \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{F}$$

and

$$\sum_S \lambda_S p^{|S|} \leq 1/2$$

(a.k.a. $\mathcal{F}$ is weakly $p$-small), then $p/J$ admits such a $\lambda$ taking values in \{0, 1\} ($\mathcal{F}$ is
$(p/J)$-small). Talagrand showed this when $\lambda$ is supported on singletons and suggested,
as a more challenging test case, proving it when $\lambda$ is supported on pairs. This chapter
presents such a proof.

Expanding on work on the rigidity of random graph structures going back to Erdős
and Rényi, Chapter 5 introduces a new notion of “local” rigidity. Say $H$ is locally
t-rigid if all its induced subgraphs on $t$ vertices are rigid. Then for what $t = t(n, p)$
is $G_{n,p}$ is locally $t$-rigid? To answer this question, we produce machinery which allows
for more careful analysis of the probability of appearance of non-trivial automorphisms
based on their “type.” In particular, for any cycle type, $\lambda$, we give a threshold $t(\lambda)$
for the appearance of automorphisms of that type such that, if $m(\lambda)$ is the size of the
largest induced subgraph of $G_{n,1/2}$ whose automorphism group has a permutation of
type $\lambda$, then with high probability $m < t + \sqrt{5n \log n}$ for all $\lambda$ (and with high probability
$|t - m| < \sqrt{5n \log n}$ for any fixed choice of $\lambda$).
Preface

The result given in Chapter 2 is joint work with Jeff Kahn and Bhargav Narayanan and has previously been published as [20]. The results in Chapter 3 are joint work with Jeff Kahn, Bhargav Narayanan, and Jinyoung Park and are contained in [21] which is under review for publication. The result given in Chapter 4 is joint work with Jeff Kahn and Jinyoung Park.
Acknowledgements

No one can do it alone and, fortunately, I’ve had the help of more people than I can possibly list here.

Thank you to all my fellow graduate students. For all the support, whether I was asking for help or needed a place to vent. For the games, the random conversations, for providing a community for the last 6 years that I know I will miss.

I’d especially like thank the following people: Matthew Russell and Nathan Fox, for keeping me sane by driving me insane. Jinyoung Park, for being my co-author in this final year; I look forward to reading whatever you work on next. Yonah Biers-Ariel and Justin Semonsen, for providing an office of help and distraction (in possibly disproportionate measures) for the past 4 years, and for being wonderful friends, hopefully for many more years to come. Pat Devlin, for always being an infuriating source of amazing help, and without whom this document might still be in four distinct pieces.

Érik de Amorim and Abigail Raz, for being the best roommates I could have asked for, and becoming two of my closest friends. Érik, I will miss never knowing what topic a conversation will turn to next, from every branch of math under the sun, to philosophy, into dying laughing at the dumbest thing. Keep being insane, but try to be less Brazilian. Abigail, for being a source of support in every aspect of life and someone I knew I could turn to for anything. For being someone I could share with, whether it was a love of sports or fiction, thoughts on the world around us, or even just what happened that day. Thank you.

My mom, who made every step of this journey possible. For being there for me whenever I needed you and being patient with me when I was too stubborn to admit I did. My dad, for being a treasure trove of knowledge that I never got tired of exploring. For each drive to someplace random that turned into a deep discussion on something...
random. To both of you, for encouraging my curiosity at every turn, for changing “I
don’t know” into “let’s figure it out.”

All of the Frankstons and Warshaws, for your support along the way.

All the amazing teachers who helped me get to this point. While there have been
too many to count, I’d particularly like to thank: Meredith Haas, for seeing a kid who
couldn’t pay attention in calculus and handing him an analysis book. Ira Gessel and
Olivier Bernardi for introducing me to research, and all the frustrations and wonders
therein. Ervin Győri for giving me my first taste of extremal combinatorics and getting
me hooked. To Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow, for teaching me to love the classical world
and ensuring I got a BA in the liberal arts, not just math.

Thank you to Mike Saks, Bhargav Narayanan, and Gil Kalai for serving on my
committee, and for all your patience in bearing with a longer process than you signed
up for.

Finally, thank you to my advisor, Jeff Kahn, for everything. I really can’t thank you
enough for all the teaching, advice, and sharing of knowledge about math and being a
mathematician, coupled with patience that went beyond the call of duty.
Dedication

To Michael Hanau,

for guiding me through math when it stopped making sense.
# Table of Contents

- **Abstract** .................................................... ii
- **Preface** .................................................... iv
- **Acknowledgements** ......................................... v
- **Dedication** ................................................... vii

1. **Introduction** ................................................. 1

2. **On regular 3-wise intersecting families** ................. 6
   - 2.1. Introduction ............................................. 6
   - 2.2. Preliminaries ........................................... 7
   - 2.3. Proof of the main result ............................... 9
   - 2.4. Conclusion .............................................. 12

3. **Thresholds versus fractional expectation-thresholds** .... 14
   - 3.1. Preliminaries ............................................ 14
   - 3.2. Little things ............................................ 18
   - 3.3. Main Lemma ............................................. 19
   - 3.4. Small uniformities .................................... 23
   - 3.5. Proof of Theorem 3.1.5 ................................. 24
   - 3.6. Proof of Theorem 3.1.6 ................................. 26
   - 3.7. Applications ............................................ 28
   - 3.8. Concluding remarks ................................... 32

4. **On a problem of M. Talagrand** .......................... 34
   - 4.1. Introduction ............................................. 34
   - 4.2. Framework .............................................. 37
Chapter 1
Introduction

This thesis consists of four papers, each of which is given its own chapter. Here we give a brief high-level overview of each topic, leaving details to their individual chapters. At the end of this chapter we collect some common notation and conventions that are used throughout.

Chapter 2 is primarily concerned with intersecting families: for an integer $r \geq 2$, a family of sets $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be $r$-wise intersecting if any $r$ of the sets in $\mathcal{A}$ have nonempty intersection. There is by now a large body of work studying the extremal properties of families of sets under various intersection requirements; we refer the reader to the surveys [9, 45] for an overview. A common theme that arises when studying the extremal properties of intersecting families is that the extremal constructions are often highly asymmetric; indeed, this is the case with many of the classical results in the field, such as the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem [13] and the Ahlswede–Khachatrian theorem [1] to name just two. It is therefore natural to ask what, if anything, changes when one considers intersecting families subject to requirements of “symmetry”, and this is the line of questioning that we pursue here.

Specifically, we expand upon work of Ellis and Narayanan to answer a question of Cameron, Frankl, and Kantor from 1989, showing that any 3-wise intersecting family of subsets of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ that is regular and increasing has cardinality $o(2^n)$. The main technical tool that we develop to prove this is a lemma demonstrating the existence of threshold-type behaviour for increasing regular families.

Chapters 3 and 4 both address the so-called “expectation-threshold” and fractional
“expectation-threshold” of an increasing family. Thresholds have been a—maybe the—central concern of the study of random discrete structures (random graphs and hypergraphs, for example) since its initiation by Erdős and Rényi [15], with much work around identifying thresholds for specific properties (see [4, 30]), though it was not observed until [5] that every increasing family $\mathcal{F}$ admits a threshold (in the Erdős–Rényi sense; see below). See also [24] for developments, since [23], on the very interesting question of sharpness of thresholds.

The focus of Chapter 3 is the proof of a conjecture of Talagrand [53] that is a fractional version of the “expectation-threshold” conjecture of Kalai and Kahn [33]. For an increasing family $\mathcal{F}$ on a finite set $X$, we write (with definitions below) $p_c(\mathcal{F})$, $q_f(\mathcal{F})$, and $\ell(\mathcal{F})$ for the threshold, fractional expectation-threshold, and size of a largest minimal element of $\mathcal{F}$. In this language, our main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.0.1.** There is a universal $K$ such that for every finite $X$ and increasing $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^X$,

$$p_c(\mathcal{F}) \leq K q_f(\mathcal{F}) \ln \ell(\mathcal{F}).$$

As we will see, $q_f(\mathcal{F})$ is a more or less trivial lower bound on $p_c(\mathcal{F})$, and Theorem 1.0.1 says this bound is never far from the truth. (Apart from the constant $K$, the upper bound is tight in many of the most interesting cases; see 3.7.)

The second main result in Chapter 3 is Theorem 3.1.6 which was motivated by work of Frieze and Sorkin [26] on the “random multi-dimensional assignment problem.” The statement is postponed until the chapter itself.

In Chapter 4 we present initial work towards another conjecture of Talagrand which, together with Theorem 1.0.1, would give the Kahn-Kalai “expectation-threshold” conjecture. Specifically, Talagrand proposed that $q(\mathcal{F}) = O(q_f(\mathcal{F}))$ for any increasing family $\mathcal{F}$ of a finite set $X$. We approach this statement from a slightly different point of view and verify it for a special case.

We say a non-negative weight assignment $\lambda : 2^X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ certifies $\mathcal{F}$ is weakly $p$-small if for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $\sum_{S \subseteq F} \lambda_S \geq 1$ and $\sum_{S} \lambda_S p^{|S|} \leq 1/2$. If, additionally, $\lambda$ is the indicator function for some collection $\mathcal{G}$, then we say the collection $\mathcal{G}$ certifies $\mathcal{F}$ is...
Thus, the statement \( q(F) = O(q_f(F)) \) is equivalent to showing that there is some universal \( J > 0 \) such that given any \( \lambda \) and \( p \), if \( \lambda \) certifies \( F \) is weakly \( p \)-small, then there is a \( G \) which certifies \( F \) is \( p/J \)-small. Talagrand showed the statement holds when \( \lambda \) is supported on singletons and suggested pairs as a further test case. We verify that the statement holds when restricted to \( \text{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq (X^2) \).

Finally, in Chapter 3 we present a method for analyzing the appearance of non-trivial automorphisms in random graphs. We say a graph \( H \) is rigid (sometimes referred to as asymmetric) if its automorphism group, denoted \( \text{Aut}(H) \), is trivial (i.e. consists only of the identity map). The Erdős-Rényi random graph, denoted \( G_{n,p} \), is the random graph on \( n \) vertices where edges are present independently, each with probability \( p \). Early in their work on these random structures, Erdős and Rényi [16] showed the following result.

**Theorem 1.0.2** (Erdős-Rényi ’63). Asymptotically almost all labelled graphs on \( n \) vertices are rigid, i.e.

\[
\Pr[|\text{Aut}(G_{n,1/2})| = 1] = 1 - o(1).
\]

This result has since been extended to \( G_{n,p} \) as follows.

**Theorem 1.0.3.** For \( 1/2 \geq p = \frac{\ln n + \omega(1)}{n} \),

\[
\Pr[|\text{Aut}(G_{n,p})| = 1] = 1 - o(1).
\]

(Note that the lower bound on \( p \) is best possible as isolated vertices begin to appear in \( G_{n,p} \) when \( p \) is below this threshold.)

An analogous result for the random graph with \( m \) edges, \( G_{n,m} \), was originally announced by Erdős and Rényi in [16], though we are unaware of its subsequent publication. Wright’s work counting unlabelled \( m \)-edge graphs [57, 58] produced the following stronger result.

---

1 As the automorphism group of \( G \) is identical to that of its complement, \( \overline{G} \), we will usually assume \( p \leq 1/2 \).
Theorem 1.0.4 (Wright ’74). For \( \binom{n}{2}/2 \geq m = \frac{n}{2} (\ln n + \omega(1)) \), asymptotically almost all unlabelled \( m \)-edge graphs on \( n \) vertices are rigid.

More recently, the random \( d \)-regular graph, \( G_{n,d} \), was shown to be rigid by Kim, Vu, and Sudakov \[36\].

Theorem 1.0.5. For \( 3 \leq d \leq n - 4 \),

\[
\Pr [ |\text{Aut}(G_{n,d})| = 1 ] = 1 - o(1).
\]

See also \[39\] \[6\] for other recent work.

The work in this chapter was motivated by a desire to extend these lines of inquiry to a notion of “local” rigidity. Say \( H \) is locally \( t \)-rigid if all its induced subgraphs on \( t \) vertices are rigid. The question is then, for what \( t = t(n,p) \) is \( G_{n,p} \) is locally \( t \)-rigid w.h.p.\[2\]

We expand upon techniques in \[36\] \[46\] to show the following essentially optimal result in the case \( p = 1/2 \).

Lemma 1.0.6. \( G_{n,1/2} \) is locally \( (n/2 + \sqrt{5n \log n}) \)-rigid w.h.p.

This follows from a much stronger general result on what “types” of automorphisms exist among all induced subgraphs of a given size \( t \) (stated formally as Theorem \[5.3.1\]). We also give a similar (but weaker) result for general \( p \) (which we expect can be strengthened to produce a similar result to our main theorem for some restricted ranges of \( p \)).

Notation and Conventions. Given a finite set \( X \), write \( 2^X \) for the power set of \( X \) and, for \( p \in [0,1] \), \( \mu_p \) for the product measure on \( 2^X \) given by \( \mu_p(S) = p^{|S|}(1-p)^{|X\setminus S|} \).

An \( \mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^X \) is increasing if \( B \supseteq A \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{F} \). For \( \mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^X \) we use \( \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \) for the increasing family generated by \( \mathcal{G} \), namely \( \{ B \subseteq X : \exists A \in \mathcal{G}, B \supseteq A \} \).

If \( \mathcal{F} \) is increasing (and \( \mathcal{F} \neq 2^X, \emptyset \)), then \( \mu_p(\mathcal{F})(:= \sum \{ \mu_p(S) : S \in \mathcal{F} \}) \) is strictly increasing in \( p \), and we define the threshold, \( p_c(\mathcal{F}) \), to be the unique \( p \) for which \( \mu_p(\mathcal{F}) = 1/2 \). (This is finer than the original Erdős–Rényi notion, according to which \( p^* = p^*(n) \)

\[2\] With high probability, i.e. with probability tending to 1 as \( n \to \infty \).
is a threshold for $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_n$ if $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \to 0$ when $p \ll p^*$ and $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \to 1$ when $p \gg p^*$.

That $p_c(\mathcal{F})$ is always an Erdős–Rényi threshold follows from [5].

Throughout we use $\ln$ for the natural logarithm and reserve $\log$ for $\log_2$. 
Chapter 2
On regular 3-wise intersecting families

Joint work with Jeff Kahn and Bhargav Narayanan.

2.1 Introduction

For a positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us write $[n]$ for the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and $2^{[n]}$ for the power-set of $[n]$. We say that a family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is symmetric if the automorphism group of $\mathcal{A}$ is transitive on $[n]$, regular if every element of $[n]$ belongs to the same number of sets in $\mathcal{A}$, and increasing if $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under taking supersets. We stress that the families we shall study in this chapter will be non-uniform, i.e., their members need not all be of the same size; for related work on uniform intersecting families, see the paper of Ellis, Kalai and Narayanan [11] addressing the symmetric case, and the results of Ihringer and Kupavskii [29] addressing the regular case.

The family $\{x \subseteq [n] : |x| > n/2\}$ is a symmetric 2-wise intersecting family containing a positive fraction of all the sets in $2^{[n]}$. Ellis and Narayanan [12], verifying a conjecture of Frankl [19], proved that symmetric $r$-wise intersecting families must be significantly smaller when $r \geq 3$; more precisely, they showed the following.

**Theorem 2.1.1.** If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a symmetric 3-wise intersecting family, then $|\mathcal{A}| = o(2^n)$.

On the other hand, a projective-geometric construction of Frankl [19] shows that there exist regular 3-wise intersecting subfamilies of $2^{[n]}$ containing a positive fraction of all the sets in $2^{[n]}$, so the conclusion of Theorem 2.1.1 no longer holds when one considers regular families instead of symmetric ones.

Here, we investigate the middle ground between symmetric and regular families.
following Cameron, Frankl and Kantor [7]: they proved that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a 4-wise intersecting family that is both regular and increasing, then $|\mathcal{A}| = o(2^n)$, and asked what one can say about regular 3-wise intersecting families. Our main result answers this question by showing that the conclusion of Theorem 2.1.1 does hold for regular families, provided again that they are increasing.

**Theorem 2.1.2.** If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a 3-wise intersecting family that is both regular and increasing, then $|\mathcal{A}| = o(2^n)$.

Of course, Theorem 2.1.2 implies Theorem 2.1.1 to see this, note that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a symmetric 3-wise intersecting family, then $\{y : x \subseteq y \text{ for some } x \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is a 3-wise intersecting family containing $\mathcal{A}$ that is both regular and increasing.

It is worth highlighting that in both [12] and the present work, Fourier analysis plays a crucial, if invisible, role: indeed, the proof of Theorem 2.1.1 hinges on a sharp threshold result of Friedgut and Kalai [25], while here, to prove the stronger assertion of Theorem 2.1.2 we in turn rely on the somewhat heavier machinery of Friedgut’s junta theorem [22]. The main new technical tool that we develop to prove Theorem 2.1.2 is a lemma demonstrating the existence of threshold-type behaviour under some rather mild conditions; this result (see Lemma 2.3.1) might be of some independent interest.

This chapter is organised as follows. We collect the various tools we require in Section 2.2. The proof of Theorem 2.1.2 follows in Section 2.3. We conclude in Section 2.4 with a brief discussion of open problems.

### 2.2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly describe the notions and tools we shall require for our arguments.

We abbreviate $\mu_2$ by $\mu$, and note that this is just the normalised counting measure.

For a family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, we write $I(\mathcal{A}) = \{x \cap y : x, y \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for the family of all possible intersections of pairs of sets from $\mathcal{A}$. We require the following proposition from [12]; we include a short proof for completeness.

**Proposition 2.2.1.** For any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, if $\mu_p(\mathcal{A}) \geq \delta$, then $\mu_{p^2}(I(\mathcal{A})) \geq \delta^2$. 
Proof. Let $x$ and $y$ be two random elements of $2^{[n]}$ drawn independently according to the distribution $\mu_p$. It is then clear that $x \cap y$ has distribution $\mu_{p^2}$, so we have

$$\mu_{p^2}(I(A)) = P(x \cap y \in I(A)) \geq P(x, y \in A) = \mu_p(A)^2,$$

proving the proposition.

We shall require the notions of influences and juntas. First, given $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, we say that an element $i \in [n]$ is pivotal for $A$ at $x \in 2^{[n]}$ if exactly one of $x$ and $x \triangle \{i\}$ lies in $A$, and for $0 \leq p \leq 1$, we define the total influence $I_p(A)$ of $A$ at $p$ to be the expected number of pivotal elements for $A$ at a random set $x \in 2^{[n]}$ drawn according to the distribution $\mu_p$. The following fundamental formula was originally observed independently by Margulis [42] and Russo [48].

**Proposition 2.2.2.** If $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is increasing, then

$$\frac{d}{dp}\mu_p(A) = I_p(A)$$

for all $0 < p < 1$.

Next, for $J \subseteq [n]$, a family $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is said to be a $J$-junta if the membership of a set in $A$ is determined by its intersection with $J$, or in other words, if $x \in A$ and $x \cap J = y \cap J$ for some $y \in 2^{[n]}$, then this implies that $y \in A$. The following result due to Friedgut [22] will be our main tool.

**Theorem 2.2.3.** For each $C > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, there exists $K > 0$ such that the following holds for all $\varepsilon \leq p \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ with $I_p(A) \leq C$, there exists a set $J \subseteq [n]$ with $|J| \leq K$ and a $J$-junta $B \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that $\mu_p(A \Delta B) \leq \varepsilon$.

Finally, we say that two families $A, B \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ are cross-intersecting if $x \cap y \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in A$ and $y \in B$. We need the following simple fact also used in [12].

**Proposition 2.2.4.** If $A, B \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ are cross-intersecting, then

$$\mu_p(A) + \mu_{1-p}(B) \leq 1$$

for any $0 \leq p \leq 1$. 
Proof. Since $A$ and $B$ are cross-intersecting, it is clear that $A \subseteq 2^{[n]} \setminus \bar{B}$, where $\bar{B} = \{[n] \setminus x : x \in B\}$. Therefore,

$$\mu_p(A) \leq \mu_p(2^{[n]} \setminus \bar{B}) = 1 - \mu_p(\bar{B}) = 1 - \mu_{1-p}(B).$$

2.3 Proof of the main result

Our proof of Theorem 2.1.2 borrows ideas from both [7] and [12]. Before turning to the proof, let us briefly explain what is lost, relative to the argument in [12], by dropping the requirement of symmetry: for a family $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ that is both symmetric and increasing, a result of Talagrand [49] guarantees that the total influence $I_p(A)$ is large whenever $\mu_p(A)$ is bounded away from both 0 and 1, which ensures, by Proposition 2.2.2, that the derivative of $\mu_p(A)$ with respect to $p$ is also large under these circumstances; this is no longer the case when one considers regular families as opposed to symmetric ones. A replacement for this fact, the main new ingredient here, is the following lemma asserting a somewhat weaker version of this threshold behaviour under milder conditions.

Lemma 2.3.1. For any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, the following holds for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is both regular and increasing, and $\mu(A) \geq \delta$, then $\mu_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(A) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.

Proof. In what follows, we fix $\eta = \varepsilon\delta/(2 + \delta)$ and additionally suppose that $n$ is large enough for all our estimates to hold; in particular, constants suppressed by the asymptotic notation may depend on $\varepsilon$ and $\delta$ but, of course, not on $n$.

Since $\mu(A) = \mu_{\frac{1}{2}}(A) \geq \delta$ and $\mu_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(A) \leq 1$, it follows from Proposition 2.2.2 that there exists $q \in [1/2, 1/2 + \varepsilon]$ such that $I_q(A) \leq 1/\varepsilon$. Theorem 2.2.3 now implies that there exists $J \subseteq [n]$ with $|J| = K$ and a $J$-junta $B \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that $\mu_q(A \triangle B) \leq \eta$, where $K$ is a constant depending only on $\varepsilon$ and $\delta$.

Let us set up some notation before we proceed. For $i \in [n]$, let $A_i$ denote the family of those sets in $A$ containing $i$, and for $y \subseteq J$, define the fibre $A(y)$ of $A$ over $y$ by

$$A(y) = \{x \setminus y : x \in A \text{ and } x \cap J = y\}.$$  

Also, let $B'$ be the family on $J$ determining $B$, i.e., $x \in 2^{[n]}$ belongs to $B$ if and only if $x \cap J$ belongs to $B'$. 
We first note that, as $\mathcal{A}$ is regular, the sets $\mathcal{A}_i$ are all roughly half as large as $\mathcal{A}$; a similar observation is used in [7].

**Claim 2.3.2.** For each $i \in [n]$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{A})/2 \leq \mu(\mathcal{A}_i) \leq \mu(\mathcal{A})/2 + O(1/\sqrt{n})$.

**Proof.** The first inequality follows from the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ is increasing, so it suffices to verify the second. Let $Z$ be a set drawn uniformly at random from $\mathcal{A}$, and for $i \in [n]$, let $Z_i$ be the indicator of the event $\{i \in Z\}$. We shall rely on the properties of the binary entropy $H(\cdot)$ of a random variable; see [43] for the basic notions. It follows from the sub-additivity of entropy that $H(Z) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n H(Z_i)$. Clearly, we have

\[ H(Z) = \log |\mathcal{A}| = n + \log(\mu(\mathcal{A})) \geq n + \log \delta, \]

and, writing $\vartheta$ for the common value of $|\mathcal{A}_i|/|\mathcal{A}|$ for all $i \in [n]$, we also have

\[ H(Z_i) = -\vartheta \log \vartheta - (1 - \vartheta) \log(1 - \vartheta) \]

for each $i \in [n]$. It is now easy to verify from the sub-additivity estimate above that $\vartheta = 1/2 + O(1/\sqrt{n})$, proving the claim.

Next, we observe that all the fibres of $\mathcal{A}$ have roughly the same size as well. Let us write $\sigma_p$ for the $p$-biased measure on the power set of $J$ and $\tau_p$ for the $p$-biased measure on the power set of $[n] \setminus J$, so that $\mu_p = \sigma_p \times \tau_p$, and again, we abbreviate $\sigma_{1/2}$ and $\tau_{1/2}$ by $\sigma$ and $\tau$ respectively.

**Claim 2.3.3.** For all $y \subseteq J$, we have $\tau(\mathcal{A}(y)) = \mu(\mathcal{A}) + o(1)$.

**Proof.** We note that

\[ \mu(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{y \subseteq J} \sigma(y)\tau(\mathcal{A}(y)), \]

and that $\sigma(y) = 2^{-K}$ for all $y \subseteq J$. For any $i \in y \subseteq J$, we have $\mathcal{A}(y \setminus \{i\}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(y)$ because $\mathcal{A}$ is increasing, so

\[ \tau(\mathcal{A}(y)) \geq \tau(\mathcal{A}(y \setminus \{i\})). \]

Since $|J| = K = O(1)$, to prove the claim, it clearly suffices to show that for any $i \in y \subseteq J$, we have

\[ \tau(\mathcal{A}(y)) \leq \tau(\mathcal{A}(y \setminus \{i\})) + o(1); \]
indeed, this would imply that

$$\tau(A(y)) = \tau(A(\emptyset)) + o(|y|) = \tau(A(\emptyset)) + o(1)$$

for each $y \subseteq J$, and the claim would follow.

Fix $i \in J$, and note that

$$\mu(A_i) = \sum_{i \in y \subseteq J} \sigma(y) \tau(A(y)),$$

so we have

$$\mu(A_i) - \mu(A)/2 = 2^{-K-1} \sum_{i \in y \subseteq J} (\tau(A(y)) - \tau(A(y \setminus \{i\}))).$$

We know from Claim 2.3.2 that $\mu(A_i) - \mu(A)/2 = O(1/\sqrt{n})$, so for each $y \subseteq J$ containing $i$, we have

$$\tau(A(y)) - \tau(A(y \setminus \{i\})) = O(1/\sqrt{n}),$$
as required. \(\square\)

We may now complete the proof of the lemma. Recall that we earlier fixed $q \in [1/2, 1/2 + \varepsilon]$ and a $J$-junta $B \subseteq 2^n$ such that $\mu_q(A \triangle B) \leq \eta$, and defined $B'$ to be the family on $J$ determining $B$.

First, note that

$$\mu_q(A \triangle B) = \sum_{y \in B'} \sigma_q(y) (1 - \tau_q(A(y))) + \sum_{y \notin B'} \sigma_q(y) (\tau_q(A(y))).$$

Since $A$ is increasing, we see from Claim 2.3.3 that $\tau_q(A(y)) \geq \tau(A(y)) \geq \delta/2$ for all $y \subseteq J$. Therefore, since $\mu_q(A \triangle B) \leq \eta$, we see that

$$\sum_{y \notin B'} \sigma_q(y) \leq 2\eta/\delta,$$

which implies that

$$\mu_q(B) = \sum_{y \in B'} \sigma_q(y) \geq 1 - 2\eta/\delta.$$

Again, since $\mu_q(A \triangle B) \leq \eta$ and $\eta = \varepsilon \delta/(2 + \delta)$, it follows that

$$\mu_{1+\varepsilon}(A) \geq \mu_q(A) \geq 1 - 2\eta/\delta - \eta = 1 - \varepsilon,$$

proving the lemma. \(\square\)
Armed with Lemma 2.3.1, we may now prove Theorem 2.1.2; the proof below by and large follows the argument in [12], with Lemma 2.3.1 serving as a substitute for the sharp threshold result used there.

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.2.** We need to show for any fixed $\delta > 0$, that for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a 3-wise intersecting family that is both regular and increasing, then $\mu(A) < \delta$; hence, suppose for a contradiction that $n$ is sufficiently large and that $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a family as just described with $\mu(A) \geq \delta$.

Let us fix $\varepsilon = \min\{1/4, \delta^2/2\}$. First, since $A$ is increasing, Lemma 2.3.1 tells us that

$$\mu_{\frac{3}{4}}(A) \geq \mu_{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}(A) \geq 1 - \varepsilon > 1 - \delta^2.$$ 

Next, by Proposition 2.2.1, we have

$$\mu_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathcal{I}(A)) \geq \delta^2.$$ 

Finally, since $A$ is a 3-wise intersecting family, $A$ and $\mathcal{I}(A)$ are cross-intersecting, so we conclude from Proposition 2.2.4 that

$$\mu_{\frac{3}{4}}(A) \leq 1 - \mu_{\frac{1}{4}}(\mathcal{I}(A)) \leq 1 - \delta^2,$$

yielding a contradiction, and establishing the result.

\[ \square \]

### 2.4 Conclusion

The best bound for Theorem 2.1.2 that we may read out of the argument here is rather poor on account of our reliance on the junta theorem; it would therefore be interesting to improve this. Concretely, it would be good to decide if any 3-wise intersecting family $A \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ that is both regular and increasing must satisfy

$$\log |A| \leq n - cn^\delta,$$

where $c, \delta > 0$ are universal constants; as evidenced by the constructions in [12], a bound of this type would be the best one could hope for. We ought to point out that we do not yet know how to prove an estimate of the above form even for symmetric 3-wise intersecting families; what is known however is that such an estimate does
hold for symmetric 4-wise intersecting families, as was shown by Cameron, Frankl and Kantor [7].
Chapter 3

Thresholds versus fractional expectation-thresholds

Joint work with Jeff Kahn, Bhargav Narayanan, and Jinyoung Park.

3.1 Preliminaries

Following [50, 51, 53], we say $F$ is $p$-small if there is a $G \subseteq 2^X$ such that $F \subseteq \langle G \rangle := \{T : \exists S \in G, S \subseteq T\}$ and

$$\sum_{S \in G} p^{\|S\|} \leq 1/2. \quad (3.1)$$

Then $q(F) := \max\{p : F \text{ is } p\text{-small}\}$, which we call the expectation-threshold of $F$ (note the term is used slightly differently in [33]), is a trivial lower bound on $p_c(F)$, since for $G$ as above and $T$ drawn from $\mu_p$,

$$\mu_p(F) \leq \mu_p(\langle G \rangle) \leq \sum_{S \in G} \mu_p(T \supseteq S) = \sum_{S \in G} p^{\|S\|} = \mathbb{E}[\{S \in G : S \subseteq T\}]. \quad (3.2)$$

The following statement, the main conjecture (Conjecture 1) of [33], says that for any $F$, this trivial lower bound on $p_c(F)$ is close to the truth.

**Conjecture 3.1.1.** There is a universal $K$ such that for every finite $X$ and increasing $F \subseteq 2^X$,

$$p_c(F) \leq K q(F) \ln |X|. \quad (3.3)$$

We should emphasize how strong this is (from [33]: “It would probably be more sensible to conjecture that it is *not* true”). For example, it easily implies—and was largely motivated by—Erdős–Rényi thresholds for (a) perfect matchings in random $r$-uniform hypergraphs, and (b) appearance of a given bounded degree spanning tree in a random graph. These have since been resolved: the first—*Shamir’s Problem*, circa 1980—in [31], and the second—a mid-90’s suggestion of Kahn—in [44]. Both arguments
are difficult and specific to the problems they address (e.g. they are utterly unrelated 
either to each other or to what we do here). See Section 3.7 for more on these and 
other consequences.

Talagrand [50, 53] suggests relaxing “p-small” by replacing the set system \( G \) above 
by what we may think of as a fractional set system, \( g \): say \( F \) is weakly \( p \)-small 
if there is a \( g : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) such that

\[
\sum_{S \subseteq T} g(S) \geq 1 \quad \forall T \in F \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{S \subseteq X} g(S)p^{|S|} \leq 1/2.
\]

Then \( q_f(\mathcal{F}) := \max\{p : \mathcal{F} \text{ is weakly } p\text{-small}\} \), the fractional expectation-threshold for 
\( \mathcal{F} \), satisfies

\[
q(\mathcal{F}) \leq q_f(\mathcal{F}) \leq p_c(\mathcal{F}) \tag{3.3}
\]

(the first inequality is trivial and the second is similar to (3.2)), and Talagrand [53] 
Conjectures 8.3 and 8.5] proposes a sort of LP relaxation of Conjecture 3.1.1 and 
then a strengthening thereof. The first of these, the following, replaces \( q \) by \( q_f \) in 
Conjecture 3.1.1, the second, which adds replacement of \(|X|\) by the smaller \( \ell(\mathcal{F}) \), is our 
Theorem 1.0.1.

**Conjecture 3.1.2.** There is a universal \( K \) such that for every finite \( X \) and increasing 
\( \mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^X \),

\[
p_c(\mathcal{F}) \leq Kq_f(\mathcal{F}) \ln |X|.
\]

Talagrand further suggests the following “very nice problem of combinatorics,” 
which implies equivalence of Conjectures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 as well as of Theorem 1.0.1 
and the corresponding strengthening of Conjecture 3.1.1.

**Conjecture 3.1.3.** There is a universal \( K \) such that, for any increasing \( \mathcal{F} \) on a finite 
set \( X \), \( q(\mathcal{F}) \geq q_f(\mathcal{F})/K \).

(That is, weakly \( p \)-small implies \((p/K)\)-small.)

Note the interest here is in Conjecture 3.1.3 for its own sake and as the most likely 
route to Conjecture 3.1.1 all applications of the latter that we’re aware of follow just 
as easily from Theorem 1.0.1.
**Spread hypergraphs and spread measures.** In this chapter, a hypergraph on the (vertex) set $X$ is a collection $\mathcal{H}$ of subsets of $X$ (edges of $\mathcal{H}$), with repeats allowed. For $S \subseteq X$, we use $\langle S \rangle$ for $\{T \subseteq X : T \supseteq S\}$, and for a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on $X$, we write $\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle$ for $\cup_{S \in \mathcal{H}} \langle S \rangle$. We say $\mathcal{H}$ is $\ell$-bounded (resp. $\ell$-uniform or an $\ell$-graph) if each of its members has size at most (resp. exactly) $\ell$, and $\kappa$-spread if

$$|\mathcal{H} \cap \langle S \rangle| \leq \kappa^{-|S|} |\mathcal{H}| \quad \forall S \subseteq X. \quad (3.4)$$

(Note that edges are counted with multiplicities on both sides of (3.4).)

A major advantage of the fractional versions (Conjecture 3.1.2 and Theorem 1.0.1) over Conjecture 3.1.1—and the source of the present relevance of [3]—is that they admit, via linear programming duality, reformulations in which the specification of $q_f(\mathcal{F})$ gives a usable starting point. Following [53], we say a probability measure $\nu$ on $2^X$ is $q$-spread if

$$\nu(\langle S \rangle) \leq q^{|S|} \quad \forall S \subseteq X.$$

Thus a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is $\kappa$-spread iff uniform measure on $\mathcal{H}$ is $q$-spread with $q = \kappa^{-1}$.

As observed by Talagrand [53], the following is an easy consequence of duality.

**Proposition 3.1.4.** For an increasing family $\mathcal{F}$ on $X$, if $q_f(\mathcal{F}) \leq q$, then there is a $(2q)$-spread probability measure on $2^X$ supported on $\mathcal{F}$. \qed

This allows us to reduce Theorem 1.0.1 to the following alternate (actually, equivalent) statement. In this chapter, with high probability (w.h.p.) means with probability tending to 1 as $\ell \to \infty$.

**Theorem 3.1.5.** There is a universal $K$ such that for any $\ell$-bounded, $\kappa$-spread hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on $X$, a uniformly random $((K\kappa^{-1}\ln \ell)|X|)$-element subset of $X$ belongs to $\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle$ w.h.p.

The easy reduction is given in Section 3.2.

**Assignments.** The second main result of this chapter provides upper bounds on the minima of a large class of hypergraph-based stochastic processes, somewhat in the spirit of [52] (see also [51] [54]), saying that in “smoother” settings, the logarithmic corrections of Conjectures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Theorem 1.0.1 are not needed.
For a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on $X$, let $\xi_x$ ($x \in X$) be independent random variables, each uniform from $[0,1]$, and set

$$\xi_\mathcal{H} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{x \in S} \xi_x$$

(3.5)

and $Z_\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{E}[\xi_\mathcal{H}]$.

**Theorem 3.1.6.** There is a universal $K$ such that for any $\ell$-bounded, $\kappa$-spread hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, we have $Z_\mathcal{H} \leq K\ell/\kappa$, and $\xi_\mathcal{H} \leq K\ell/\kappa$ w.h.p.

These bounds are often tight (again up to the value of $K$). The distribution of the $\xi_x$’s is not very important; e.g. it’s easy to see that the same statement holds if they are Exp(1) random variables, as in the next example.

Theorem 3.1.6 was motivated by work of Frieze and Sorkin [26] on the “axial” version of the random $d$-dimensional assignment problem. This asks (for fixed $d$ and large $n$) for estimation of

$$Z_d^A(n) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \sum_{x \in S} \xi_x \right],$$

(3.6)

where the $\xi_x$’s ($x \in X := [n]^d$) are independent Exp(1) weights and $S$ ranges over “axial assignments,” meaning $S \subseteq X$ meets each axis-parallel hyperplane ($\{x \in X : x_i = a\}$ for some $i \in [d]$ and $a \in [n]$) exactly once. For $d = 2$ this is classical; see [26] for its rather glorious history. For $d = 3$ the deterministic version was one of Karp’s [34] original NP-complete problems. Progress on the random version has been limited; see [26] for a guide to the literature.

Frieze and Sorkin show (regarding bounds; they are also interested in algorithms) that for suitable $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2$

$$c_1 n^{-(d-2)} < Z_d^A(n) < c_2 n^{-(d-2)} \ln n.$$  

(3.7)

(The lower bound is easy and the upper bound follows from the Shamir bound of [31].)

In present language, $Z_d^A(n)$ is essentially (that is, apart from the difference in the distributions of the $\xi_x$’s) $Z_\mathcal{H}$, with $\mathcal{H}$ the set of perfect matchings of the complete, balanced $d$-uniform $d$-partite hypergraph on $dn$ vertices (that is, the collection of $d$-sets meeting each of the pairwise disjoint $n$-sets $V_1, \ldots, V_d$). This is easily seen to be
\( \kappa \)-spread with \( \kappa = (n/e)^{d-1} \) (apart from the nearly irrelevant \( d \)-particity, it is the \( \mathcal{H} \) of Shamir’s Problem), so the correct bound is an instance of Theorem 3.1.6.

**Corollary 3.1.7.** \( Z_d^A(n) = \Theta(n^{-(d-2)}) \).

Frieze and Sorkin also considered the “planar” version of the problem, in which \( S \) in (3.6) meets each line \( \{ x \in X : x_j = y_j \ \forall j \neq i \} \) for some \( i \in [d] \) and \( y \in X \) exactly once; and one may of course generalise from hyperplanes/lines to \( k \)-dimensional “subspaces” for a given \( k \in [d-1] \). It’s easy to see what to expect here, and one may hope Theorem 3.1.6 will eventually apply, but we at present lack the technology to say the relevant \( \mathcal{H} \)’s are suitably spread (see Section 3.8).

**Organisation.** Section 3.2 includes minor preliminaries and the derivation of Theorem 1.0.1 from Theorem 3.1.5. The heart of our argument, Lemma 3.3.1 is proved in Section 3.3. Our approach here strengthens that of the recent breakthrough of Alweiss, Lovett, Wu and Zhang [3] on the Erdős–Rado “Sunflower Conjecture” [14]. Section 3.4 adds one small technical point (more or less repeated from [3]), and the proofs of Theorems 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 are given in Sections 3.5 and 3.6. Finally, Section 3.7 outlines a few applications and Section 3.8 discusses unresolved questions.

### 3.2 Little things

**Usage.** As is usual, we use \([n]\) for \( \{1,2,\ldots,n\} \), \( 2^X \) for the power set of \( X \), \( \binom{X}{r} \) for the family of \( r \)-element subsets of \( X \), and \([S,T]\) for \( \{ R : S \subseteq R \subseteq T \} \). Our default universe is \( X \), with \(|X| = n\).

In what follows we assume \( \ell \) and \( n \) are somewhat large (when there is an \( \ell \) it will be at most \( n \)), as we may do since smaller values can be handled by adjusting the \( K \)’s in Theorems 3.1.5 and 3.1.6. Asymptotic notation referring to some parameter \( \lambda \) (usually \( \ell \)) is used in the natural way: implied constants in \( O(\cdot) \) and \( \Omega(\cdot) \) are independent of \( \lambda \), and \( f = o(g) \) (also written \( f \ll g \)) means \( f/g \) is smaller than any given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) for large enough values of \( \lambda \). Following a standard abuse, we usually pretend large numbers are integers.
For \( p \in [0, 1] \) and \( m \in [n] \), \( X_p \) and \( X_m \) are (respectively) a \( p \)-random subset of \( X \) (drawn from \( \mu_p \)) and a uniformly random \( m \)-element subset of \( X \). The latter is not entirely kosher, since we will also see sequences \( X_i \); but we will never see both interpretations in close proximity, and the overlap should cause no confusion.

In a couple places it will be helpful to assume uniformity, which we will justify using the next little point.

**Observation 3.2.1.** If \( \mathcal{H} \) is \( \ell \)-bounded and \( \kappa \)-spread, and we replace each \( S \in \mathcal{H} \) by \( M \) new edges, each consisting of \( S \) plus \( \ell - |S| \) new vertices (each used just once), then for large enough \( M \), the resulting \( \ell \)-graph \( G \) is again \( \kappa \)-spread.

**Derivation of Theorem 1.0.1 from Theorem 3.1.5.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be as in Theorem 1.0.1 with \( \mathcal{G} \) its set of minimal elements, let \( \ell \) with \( \ell(\mathcal{F}) \leq \ell = O(\ell(\mathcal{F})) \) be large enough that the exceptional probability in Theorem 3.1.5 is less than 1/4 and let \( \nu \) be the \((2q)\)-spread probability measure promised by Proposition 3.1.4 where \( q = q_f(\mathcal{F}) \). We may assume \( \nu \) is supported on \( \mathcal{G} \) (since transferring weight from \( S \) to \( T \subseteq S \) doesn’t destroy the spread condition) and that \( \nu \) takes values in \( \mathbb{Q} \). We may then replace \( \mathcal{G} \) by \( \mathcal{H} \) whose edges are copies of edges of \( \mathcal{G} \), and \( \nu \) by uniform measure on \( \mathcal{H} \).

Setting \( m = ((2Kq \ln \ell)n) \) and \( p = 2m/n \) (with \( n = |X| \) and \( K \) as in Theorem 3.1.5), we then have (using Theorem 3.1.5 with \( \kappa = 1/(2q) \))

\[
\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \geq P(X_p \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle) \geq P(|X_p| \geq m)P(X_m \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle) \geq 3P(|X_p| \geq m)/4 > 1/2,
\]

implying \( p_c(\mathcal{F}) < p = 4Kq \ln \ell \). (Note \( \mathcal{H} q\)-spread with \( \emptyset \notin \mathcal{H} \) implies \( q \geq 1/n \), so that \( m \) is somewhat large and \( P(|X_p| \geq m) \approx 1 \).)

**Remark 3.2.2.** This was done fussily to cover smaller \( \ell \) in Theorem 1.0.1; if \( \ell \to \infty \), then it gives \( P(X_p \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle) \to 1 \).

### 3.3 Main Lemma

Let \( \gamma \) be a slightly small constant (e.g. \( \gamma = 0.1 \) suffices), and let \( C_0 \) be a constant large enough to support the estimates that follow. Let \( \mathcal{H} \) be an \( r \)-bounded, \( \kappa \)-spread
hypergraph on a set $X$ of size $n$, with $r, \kappa \geq C_2^0$. Set $p = C/\kappa$ with $C_0 \leq C \leq H_0$ (so $p \leq 1/C_0$), $r' = (1-\gamma)r$ and $N = \binom{n}{np}$. Finally, fix $\psi : \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \to \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $\psi(Z) \subseteq Z$ for all $Z \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle$; set, for $W \subseteq X$ and $S \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\chi(S,W) = \psi(S \cup W) \setminus W;$$

and say the pair $(S,W)$ is bad if $|\chi(S,W)| > r'$ and good otherwise.

The heart of our argument is the following lemma (improving [3, Lemma 5.7]), regarding which a little orientation may be helpful. We will (in Theorems 3.1.5 and 3.1.6) be choosing a random subset of $X$ in small increments and would like to say we are likely to be making good progress toward containing some $S \in \mathcal{H}$. Of course such progress is not to be expected for a typical $S$, but this is not the goal: having chosen a portion $W$ of our eventual set, we just need the remainder to contain some $S \setminus W$, and may focus on those that are more likely (basically meaning small). The key idea (introduced in [3] and refined here) is that a general $S \setminus W$, while not itself small, will, in consequence of the spread assumption, typically contain some small $S' \setminus W$. (In fact $\chi(S,W)$ will usually be one of these: an $S' \setminus W$ contained in $S \setminus W$ will typically be small, so we don't need to steer this choice.) We then replace each “good” $S \setminus W$ by $\chi(S,W)$ and iterate, a second nice feature of the spread condition being that it is not much affected by this substitution.

**Lemma 3.3.1.** For $\mathcal{H}$ as above, and $W$ chosen uniformly from $\binom{X}{np}$,

$$E[|\{S \in \mathcal{H} : (S,W) \text{ is bad}\}] \leq |\mathcal{H}|C^{-r/3}.$$

**Proof.** It is enough to show, for $s \in (r',r]$,

$$E[|\{S \in \mathcal{H} : (S,W) \text{ is bad and } |S| = s\}|] \leq (\gamma r)^{-1}|\mathcal{H}|C^{-r/3}, \quad (3.8)$$

or, equivalently, that

$$|\{(S,W) : (S,W) \text{ is bad and } |S| = s\}| \leq (\gamma r)^{-1}N|\mathcal{H}|C^{-r/3}. \quad (3.9)$$

(Note $\gamma r = r - r'$ bounds the number of $s$ for which the set in question can be nonempty, whence the negligible factors $(\gamma r)^{-1}$.)
We now use $\mathcal{H}_s = \{S \in \mathcal{H} : |S| = s\}$. Let $B = \sqrt{C}$ and for $Z \supseteq S \in \mathcal{H}_s$ say $(S, Z)$ is pathological if there is $T \subseteq S$ with $t := |T| > r'$ and

$$\left|\{S' \in \mathcal{H}_s : S' \in [T, Z]\}\right| > B^r|\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-t}p^{s-t}. \quad (3.10)$$

From now on we will always take $Z = W \cup S$ (with $W$ as in Lemma 3.3.1); thus $|Z|$ is typically roughly $np$ and, since $\mathcal{H}$ is $\kappa$-spread, $|\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-t}p^{s-t}$ is a natural upper bound on what one might expect for the l.h.s. of (3.10).

Note that in proving (3.9) we may assume $s \leq n/2$: we may of course assume $|\mathcal{H}_s|$ is at least the r.h.s. of (3.8); but then for an $S \in \mathcal{H}_s$ of largest multiplicity, say $m$, we have

$$m \leq \kappa^{-s}|\mathcal{H}| \leq \kappa^{-s}\gamma r C^{r/3}|\mathcal{H}_s| \leq \kappa^{-s}\gamma r C^{r/3}m2^n,$$

which is less than $m$ if $s > n/2$ (since $\kappa > C$).

We bound the nonpathological and pathological parts of (3.9) separately; this (with the introduction of “pathological”) is the source of our improvement over [3].

**Nonpathological contributions.** We first bound the number of $(S, W)$ in (3.9) with $(S, Z)$ nonpathological. This basically follows [3], but “nonpathological” allows us to bound the number of possibilities in Step 3 below by the r.h.s. of (3.10), where [3] settles for something like $|\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-t}$.

**Step 1.** There are at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{n}{np+i} \leq \binom{n+s}{np+s} \leq Np^{-s} \quad (3.11)$$

choices for $Z = W \cup S$.

**Step 2.** Given $Z$, let $S' = \psi(Z)$. Choose $T := S \cap S'$, for which there are at most $2^{|S'|} \leq 2^r$ possibilities, and set $t = |T| > r'$. (If $t \leq r'$ then $(S, W)$ cannot be bad, as $\chi(S, W) = S' \setminus W \subseteq T$.)

**Step 3.** Since we are only interested in nonpathological choices, the number of possibilities for $S$ is now at most

$$B^r|\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-t}p^{s-t}.$$
Step 4. Complete the specification of \((S,W)\) by choosing \(W \cap S\), the number of possibilities for which is at most \(2^s\).

In sum, since \(s \leq r\) and \(t > r' = (1-\gamma)r\), the number of nonpathological possibilities is at most

\[
2^{r+s}N|\mathcal{H}||B^r(p\kappa)^{-t} \leq N|\mathcal{H}|(4B)^rC^{-t} < N|\mathcal{H}|[4BC^{-(1-\gamma)}]^r. \tag{3.12}
\]

**Pathological contributions.** We next bound the number of \((S,W)\) as in (3.9) with \((S,Z)\) pathological. The main point here is Step 4.

**Step 1.** There are at most \(|\mathcal{H}|\) possibilities for \(S\).

**Step 2.** Choose \(T \subseteq S\) witnessing the pathology of \((S,Z)\) (i.e. for which (3.10) holds); there are at most \(2^s\) possibilities for \(T\).

**Step 3.** Choose \(U \in [T,S]\) for which

\[
|\mathcal{H}_s \cap [U, (Z \setminus S) \cup U]| > 2^{-(s-t)}B^r|\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-t}p^{s-t}. \tag{3.13}
\]

(Here the left hand side counts members of \(\mathcal{H}_s\) in \(Z\) whose intersection with \(S\) is precisely \(U\). Of course, existence of \(U\) as in (3.13) follows from (3.10).) The number of possibilities for this choice is at most \(2^{s-t}\).

**Step 4.** Choose \(Z \setminus S\), the number of choices for which is less than \(N(2/B)^r\). To see this, write \(\Phi\) for the r.h.s. of (3.13). Noting that \(Z \setminus S\) must belong to \(\bigcup_{np}^s (X \setminus S) \cup (X \setminus S) \cup \cdots \cup (X \setminus S)\), we consider, for \(Y\) drawn uniformly from this set,

\[
P(|\mathcal{H}_s \cap [U, Y \cup U]| > \Phi). \tag{3.14}
\]

Set \(|U| = u\). We have

\[
|\mathcal{H}_s \cap \langle U \rangle| \leq |\mathcal{H} \cap \langle U \rangle| \leq |\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-u},
\]

while, for any \(S' \in \mathcal{H}_s \cap \langle U \rangle\),

\[
P(Y \supseteq S' \setminus U) \leq \left(\frac{np}{n-s}\right)^{s-u}
\]

(of course if \(S' \cap S \neq U\) the probability is zero); so

\[
\vartheta := \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{H}_s \cap [U, Y \cup U]|] \leq |\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-u}\left(\frac{np}{n-s}\right)^{s-u} \leq |\mathcal{H}|\kappa^{-u}(2p)^{s-u}
\]
(since $n - s \geq n/2$). Markov’s Inequality then bounds the probability in (3.14) by $\vartheta/\Phi$, and this bounds the number of possibilities for $Z \setminus S$ by $N(\vartheta/\Phi)$ (cf. (3.11)), which is easily seen to be less than $N(2/B)^r$.

Step 5. Complete the specification of $(S, W)$ by choosing $S \cap W$, which can be done in at most $2^s$ ways.

Combining (and slightly simplifying), we find that the number of pathological possibilities is at most

$$|\mathcal{H}|N(16/B)^r.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.15)

Finally, the sum of the bounds in (3.12) and (3.15) is less than the $(\gamma r)^{-1}N|\mathcal{H}|C^{-r/3}$ of (3.9).

3.4 Small uniformities

As in [3, Lemma 5.9], very small set sizes are handled by a simple Janson bound:

**Lemma 3.4.1.** For an $r$-bounded, $\kappa$-spread $G$ on $Y$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$P(Y_\alpha \not\in \langle G \rangle) \leq \exp \left[ - \left( \sum_{t=1}^{r} \binom{r}{t} (\alpha \kappa)^{-t} \right) \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.16)

**Proof.** We may assume $G$ is $r$-uniform, since modifying it according to Observation 3.2.1 doesn’t decrease the probability in (3.16). Denote members of $G$ by $S_i$ and set $\zeta_i = 1_{\{Y_\alpha \supseteq S_i\}}$. Then

$$\mu := \sum E[\zeta_i] = |G| \alpha^r$$

and

$$\Lambda := \sum \sum \{E[\zeta_i \zeta_j] : S_i \cap S_j \neq \emptyset\} \leq |G| \sum_{t=1}^{r} \binom{r}{t} \kappa^{-t} |G| \alpha^{2r-t} = \mu^2 \sum_{t=1}^{r} \binom{r}{t} (\alpha \kappa)^{-t}$$

(where the inequality holds because $G$ is $\kappa$-spread), and Janson’s Inequality (e.g. [30, Thm. 2.18(ii)]) bounds the probability in (3.16) by $\exp[-\mu^2/\Lambda]$.

**Corollary 3.4.2.** Let $G$ be as in Lemma 3.4.1, let $t = \alpha|Y|$ be an integer with $\alpha \kappa \geq 2r$, and let $W = Y_t$. Then

$$P(W \not\in \langle G \rangle) \leq 2 \exp[-\alpha \kappa/(2r)].$$
Proof. Lemma 3.4.1 gives
\[ \exp[-\alpha \kappa/(2r)] \geq \mathbb{P}(Y_\alpha \not\in \langle G \rangle) \geq \mathbb{P}(|Y_\alpha| \leq t)\mathbb{P}(W \not\in \langle G \rangle) \geq \mathbb{P}(W \not\in \langle G \rangle)/2, \]
where we use the fact that any binomial \( \xi \) with \( \mathbb{E}[(\xi)] \in \mathbb{Z} \) satisfies \( \mathbb{P}(\xi \leq \mathbb{E}[\xi]) \geq 1/2 \); see e.g. [10].

### 3.5 Proof of Theorem 3.1.5

It will be (very slightly) convenient to prove the theorem assuming \( H \) is \((2\kappa)\)-spread. Let \( \gamma \) and \( C_0 \) be as in Section 3.3 and \( H \) as in the statement of Theorem 3.1.5 and recall that asymptotics refer to \( \ell \). We may of course assume that \( \kappa \geq 2\gamma^{-1}C_0 \ln \ell \) (or the result is trivial with a suitably adjusted \( K \)).

Fix an ordering “\( \prec \)” of \( H \). In what follows we will have a sequence \( H_i \), with \( H_0 = H \) and
\[ H_i \subseteq \{ \chi_i(S, W_i) : S \in H_{i-1} \}, \]
where \( W_i \) and \( \chi_i \) will be defined below (with \( \chi_i \) a version of the \( \chi \) of Section 3.3). We then order \( H_i \) by setting
\[ \chi_i(S, W_i) \prec_i \chi_i(S', W_i) \iff S \prec_{i-1} S'. \]
(See each member of \( H_i \) ultimately inherits its position in \( \prec_i \) from some member of \( H \). This is not very important: we will be applying Lemma 3.3.1 repeatedly, and the present convention just provides a concrete \( \psi \) for each stage of the iteration.)

Set \( C = C_0 \) and \( p = C/\kappa \), define \( m \) by \( (1-\gamma)^m = \sqrt{\ln \ell/\ell} \), and set \( q = \ln \ell/\kappa \). Then \( \gamma^{-1} \ln \ell \sim m \leq \gamma^{-1} \ln \ell \) and Theorem 3.1.5 will follow from the next assertion.

**Claim 3.5.1.** If \( W \) is a uniform \(((mp + q)n)\)-subset of \( X \), then \( W \in \langle H \rangle \) w.h.p.

**Proof.** Set \( \delta = 1/(2m) \). Let \( r_0 = \ell \) and \( r_i = (1-\gamma)r_{i-1} = (1-\gamma)^i r_0 \) for \( i \in [m] \). Let \( X_0 = X \) and, for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \), let \( W_i \) be uniform from \( \binom{X_{i-1}}{np} \) and set \( X_i = X_{i-1} \setminus W_i \). (Note the assumption \( \kappa \geq 2\gamma^{-1}C_0 \ln \ell \) ensures \( |X_m| \geq n/2 \).)

For \( S \in H_{i-1} \) let \( \chi_i(S, W_i) = S' \setminus W_i \), where \( S' \) is the first member of \( H_{i-1} \) contained in \( W_i \cup S \) (with \( H_{i-1} \) ordered by \( \prec_{i-1} \)). Say \( S \) is good if \( |\chi_i(S, W_i)| \leq r_i \) (and bad
otherwise), and set
\[ H_i = \{ \chi_i(S, W_i) : S \in H_{i-1} \text{ is good} \}. \]

Thus \( H_i \) is an \( r_i \)-bounded collection of subsets of \( X_i \) and inherits the ordering \( \prec_i \) as described above.

Finally, choose \( W_{m+1} \) uniformly from \( \binom{X_m}{nq} \). Then \( W := W_1 \cup \cdots \cup W_{m+1} \) is as in Claim 3.5.1. Note also that \( W \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \) whenever \( W_{m+1} \in \langle \mathcal{H}_m \rangle \). (More generally, \( W_1 \cup \cdots \cup W_i \cup Y \in \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \) whenever \( Y \subseteq X_i \) lies in \( \langle \mathcal{H}_i \rangle \).

So to prove the claim, we just need to show
\[ \mathbb{P}(W_{m+1} \in \langle \mathcal{H}_m \rangle) = 1 - o(1) \quad (3.17) \]
(where the \( \mathbb{P} \) refers to the entire sequence \( W_1, \ldots, W_{m+1} \)).

For \( i \in [m] \) call \( W_i \) successful if \( |H_i| \geq (1 - \delta)|H_{i-1}| \), call \( W_{m+1} \) successful if it lies in \( \langle \mathcal{H}_m \rangle \), and say a sequence of \( W_i \)'s is successful if each of its entries is. We show a little more than (3.17):
\[ \mathbb{P}(W_1, \ldots, W_{m+1} \text{ is successful}) = 1 - \exp\left[ -\Omega(\sqrt{\ln \ell}) \right]. \quad (3.18) \]

For \( i \in [m] \), according to Lemma 3.3.1 (and Markov’s Inequality),
\[ \mathbb{P}(W_i \text{ is not successful} | W_1, \ldots, W_{i-1} \text{ is successful}) < \delta^{-1}C^{-r_i-1/3}, \]
since \( W_1, \ldots, W_{i-1} \) successful implies \( |\mathcal{H}_{i-1}| > (1 - \delta)^m|\mathcal{H}| > |\mathcal{H}|/2 \), which, since \( |\mathcal{H}_{i-1} \cap \langle I \rangle| \leq |\mathcal{H} \cap \langle I \rangle| \) and we assume \( \mathcal{H} \) is \((2\kappa)\)-spread), gives the spread condition (3.4) for \( \mathcal{H}_{i-1} \). Thus
\[ \mathbb{P}(W_1, \ldots, W_m \text{ is successful}) > 1 - \delta^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} C^{-r_i-1/3} > 1 - \exp\left[ -\sqrt{\ln \ell} \right] \quad (3.19) \]
(using \( r_m = \sqrt{\ln \ell} \).

Finally, if \( W_1, \ldots, W_m \) is successful, then Corollary 3.4.2 (applied with \( \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H}_m \), \( Y = X_m \), \( \alpha = nq/|Y| \geq q \), \( r = r_m \), and \( W = W_{m+1} \) gives
\[ \mathbb{P}(W_{m+1} \notin \langle \mathcal{H}_m \rangle) \leq 2 \exp\left[ -\sqrt{\ln \ell}/2 \right], \quad (3.20) \]
and we have (3.18) and the claim. \( \square \)
3.6 Proof of Theorem 3.1.6

We assume the setup of Theorem 3.1.6 with $\gamma$ and $C_0$ as in Section 3.3 and $\kappa \geq C_0^2$ (or there is nothing to prove). We may assume $H$ is $\ell$-uniform, since the construction of Observation 3.2.1 produces an $\ell$-uniform, $\kappa$-spread $G$ with $\xi_G \geq \xi_H$. In particular this gives

$$|H|\ell = \sum_{x \in X} |H \cap \langle x \rangle| \leq n\kappa^{-1}|H|. \quad (3.21)$$

We first assume $\kappa$ is slightly large, precisely

$$\kappa \geq \ln^3 \ell; \quad (3.22)$$

the similar but easier argument for smaller values will be given at the end. (The bound in (3.22) is convenient but there is nothing delicate about this choice.)

Claim 3.6.1. For $\kappa$ as in (3.22) and $C_0 \leq C \leq \gamma\kappa/(4\ln \ell)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_H > (3C/\gamma)\ell/\kappa) < \exp[−(\ln \ell \ln C)/4].$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1.6 in regime (3.22) given Claim 3.6.1. The “w.h.p.” statement is immediate (take $C = C_0$). For the expectation, $Z_H$, set $t = (3C_0/\gamma)\ell/\kappa$ and $T = 3\ell/(4\ln \ell)$. By Claim 3.6.1 we have, for all $x \in [t, T]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_H > x) \leq f(x) := \exp[−\ln \ell \ln(\gamma\kappa x/3\ell)/4] = (bx)^a = b^a x^a,$$

where $a = −(\ln \ell)/4$ and $b = \gamma\kappa/3\ell$. Noting that $\xi_H \leq \ell$, we then have

$$Z_H \leq t + \int_t^T \mathbb{P}(\xi_H > x)dx + \ell\mathbb{P}(\xi_H > T) \leq t + \int_t^T f(x)dx + \ell f(T) = O(\ell/\kappa).$$

Here $t = O(\ell/\kappa)$ and the other terms are much smaller: the integral is less than $−1/(a+1)b^a t^{a+1} = O(1/\ln \ell)C_0^a t$, while (3.22) easily implies that $f(T) = (\gamma\kappa/(4\ln \ell))^a$ is $o(1/\kappa)$.

Proof of Claim 3.6.1. Terms not defined here (beginning with $p = C/\kappa$ and $W_i$; note $C$ is now as in Claim 3.6.1, rather than set to $C_0$) are as in Section 3.5 but we (re)define $m$ by $(1−\gamma)^m = \ln \ell/\ell$ and set $q = \ln C \ln^2 \ell/\kappa$, noting that (3.21) gives $p \geq C\ell/n$. 

\[\square\]
It's now convenient to generate the $W_i$'s using the $\xi_x$'s in the natural way: let

$$a_i = \begin{cases} (ip)n & \text{if } i \in \{0\} \cup [m], \\ (mp + q)n & \text{if } i = m + 1, \end{cases}$$

and let $W_i$ consist of the $x$'s in positions $a_{i-1} + 1, \ldots, a_i$ when $X$ is ordered according to the $\xi_x$'s.

**Proposition 3.6.2.** With probability $1 - e^{-\Omega(C \ell)}$,

$$\xi_x \leq \varepsilon_i := \begin{cases} 2ip & \text{if } i \in \{0\} \cup [m] \\ 2(mp + q) & \text{if } i = m + 1 \end{cases}$$

for all $i$ and $x \in W_i$. \hspace{1cm} (3.23)

**Proof.** Failure at $i \geq 1$ implies

$$|\xi^{-1}[0, \varepsilon_i]| < a_i. \hspace{1cm} (3.24)$$

But $|\xi^{-1}[0, \varepsilon_i]|$ is binomial with mean $\varepsilon_i n = 2a_i \geq 2C \ell$, so the probability that (3.24) occurs for some $i$ is less than $\exp[-\Omega(C \ell)]$ (see e.g. \cite[Theorem 2.1]{30}). \hfill \Box

We now write $W_i$ for $W_1 \cup \cdots \cup W_i$.

**Proposition 3.6.3.** If $W_{m+1} \in \langle H_m \rangle$, then $W$ contains some $S \in \mathcal{H}$ with

$$|S \setminus W_i| \leq r_i \forall i \in [m].$$

**Proof.** Suppose $W \supseteq S_m \in \mathcal{H}_m$. By construction (of the $\mathcal{H}_i$'s) there are $S_{m-1}, \ldots, S_0 =: S$ with $S_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$ and $S_i = S_{i-1} \setminus W_i$, whence $S_i = S \setminus W_i$ for $i \in [m]$; and $S_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$ then gives the proposition. \hfill \Box

We now define “success” for $(\xi_x : x \in X)$ to mean that $W_1, \ldots, W_{m+1}$ is successful in our earlier sense and (3.23) holds. Notice that with our current values of $m$ and $q$ (and $r_m = \ell (1 - \gamma)^m = \ln \ell$), we can replace the error terms in (3.19) and (3.20) by essentially $\delta^{-1} C^{-\ln \ell/3}$ and $e^{-\left(\ln C \ln \ell\right)/2}$, which with Proposition 3.6.2 bounds the probability that $(\xi_x : x \in X)$ is not successful by (say) $\exp[-(\ln \ell \ln C)/4]$.

We finish with the following observation.

**Proposition 3.6.4.** If $(\xi_x : x \in X)$ is successful then $\xi_{\mathcal{H}} \leq (3C/\gamma) \ell/\kappa$. 

Proof. For $S$ as in Proposition 3.6.3, we have (with $W_0 = \emptyset$ and $\varepsilon_0 = 0$)

$$
\xi_H \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \varepsilon_i |S \cap W_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} (\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i-1})|S \setminus W_{i-1}|
$$

$$
\leq 2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} (1 - \gamma)^{i-1}p + (1 - \gamma)^m q \right] \ell
$$

$$
\leq 2\left[ C/(\gamma \kappa) + (\ln \ell/\ell)(\ln C \ln^2 \ell / \ell)\ell \right] \ell < (3C/\gamma) \ell / \kappa.
$$

This completes the proof of Claim 3.6.1 (and of Theorem 3.1.6 when $\kappa$ satisfies (3.22)).

Finally, for $\kappa$ below the bound in (3.22) (actually, for $\kappa$ up to about $\ell / \ln \ell$), a subset of the preceding argument suffices. We proceed as before, but now only with $C = C_0$ (so $p = C_0 / \kappa$), stopping at $m$ defined by $(1 - \gamma)^m = 1/\kappa$ (so $m \approx \gamma^{-1} \ln \kappa$). The main difference here is that there is no “Janson” phase: $W_1, \ldots, W_m$ is successful with probability $1 - \exp[-\Omega(\ell / \kappa)]$, and when it is successful we have (as in the proof of Proposition 3.6.4, now just taking $W_{m+1} = X \setminus W_m$)

$$
\xi_H \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i-1})|S \setminus W_{i-1}| + |S \cap W_{m+1}| < 2(C_0/(\gamma \kappa)) \ell + \ell / \kappa
$$

(so also $Z_H \leq O(\ell / \kappa) + \exp[-\Omega(\ell / \kappa)] \ell = O(\ell / \kappa)$).

3.7 Applications

Much of the significance of Theorem 1.0.1—and of the skepticism with which Conjecture 3.1.1 was viewed in [33]—derives from the strength of their consequences, a few of which we discuss (briefly) here.

For this discussion, $K^r_n = \binom{V}{r}$ is the complete $r$-graph on $V = [n]$, and $H^r_{n,p}$ is the $r$-uniform counterpart of the usual binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$. Given $r, n$ and an $r$-graph $H$, we use $G_H$ for the collection of (unlabeled) copies of $H$ in $K$ and $\mathcal{F}_H$ for $\langle G_H \rangle$. As usual, $\Delta$ is maximum degree.

As noted earlier, Conjecture 3.1.1 was motivated especially by Shamir’s Problem (since resolved in [33]), and the conjecture that became Montgomery’s theorem [44]. Very briefly: for $n$ running over multiples of a given (fixed) $r$, Shamir’s Problem asks
for estimation of $p_c(F_H)$ when $H$ is a perfect matching ($n/r$ disjoint edges), and \[31\] proves the natural conjecture that this threshold is $\Theta(n^{-(r-1)} \ln n)$; and \[44\] shows that for fixed $d$, the threshold for $G_{n,p}$ to contain a given $n$-vertex tree with maximum degree $d$ is $\Theta(n^{-1} \ln n)$, where the implied constant in the upper bound depends on $d$ (though it probably shouldn’t). In both of these—and in most of the other examples mentioned following Theorem 3.7.1 (all but the one from \[37\])—the lower bounds derive from the coupon-collectorish requirement that the (hyper)edges cover the vertices, and it is the upper bounds that are of interest. See \[31, 44\] for some account of the history of these problems.

In fact, Theorem 1.0.1 gives not just Montgomery’s theorem, but its natural extension to $r$-graphs and more. (Strictly speaking, Montgomery proves more than the original conjecture—see Section 3.8—and we are not so far recovering this stronger result.) Say an $r$-graph $F$ is a forest if it contains no cycle, meaning distinct vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ and distinct edges $e_1, \ldots, e_k$ such that $v_{i-1}, v_i \in e_i \forall i$ (with subscripts mod $k$). A spanning tree is then a forest of size $(n - 1)/(r - 1)$. For a (general) $r$-graph $F$, let $\rho(F)$ be the maximum size of a forest in $F$ and set

$$\varphi(F) = \max\{1 - \rho(F')/|F'| : \emptyset \neq F' \subseteq F\}.$$  

**Theorem 3.7.1.** For each $r$ and $c$ there is a $K$ such that if $H$ is an $r$-graph on $[n]$ with $\Delta(H) \leq d$ and $\varphi(H) \leq c/\ln n$, then

$$p_c(F_H) < Kdn^{-(r-1)} \ln |H|.$$  

This gives $p_c(F_H) = \Theta(n^{-(r-1)} \ln n)$ if $H$ is a perfect matching (as in Shamir’s Problem), or a “loose Hamiltonian cycle” (a result of \[10\], to which we refer for definitions and history of the problem), and $p_c(F_H) < Kdn^{-(r-1)} \ln n$ if $H$ is a spanning tree with $\Delta(H) \leq d$. For fixed $d$ the latter is the aforementioned $r$-graph generalization of \[44\] (or a slight improvement thereof in that the dependence on $d$—which, again, is probably unnecessary—is explicit), and for $d = n^{\Omega(1)}$ it is a result of Krivelevich \[37\] Theorem 1], which is again tight up to value of $K$ see \[37\] Theorem 2].

The last application we discuss here was suggested to us by Simon Griffiths and Rob Morris. Set $c_d = (d!)^{2/(d(d+1))}$ and $p^*(d, n) = c_d n^{-2/(d+1)} (\ln n)^{2/(d(d+1))}$.  


Theorem 3.7.2. For fixed $d$ and $H$ any graph on $[n]$ with $\Delta(H) \leq d$,

$$p_c(F_H) < (1 + o(1))p^*(d, n).$$  \hfill (3.25)

When $(d + 1) \mid n$ and $H$ is a $K_{d+1}$-factor (that is, $n/(d+1)$ disjoint $K_{d+1}$’s), $p^*(d,n)$ is the asymptotic value of $p_c(F_H)$. Here (3.25) with $O(1)$ in place of $1+o(1)$ was proved in [31], while the asymptotics are given by the combination of [32] and [17, 27]; we state this in a form convenient for use below:

Theorem 3.7.3. For fixed $d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, and $n$ ranging over multiples of $d + 1$, if $p > (1 + \varepsilon)p^*(d, n)$, then $G_{n,p}$ contains a $K_{d+1}$-factor w.h.p.

Interest in $p_c(F_H)$ for $H$ as in Theorem 3.7.2 dates to at least 1992, when Alon and Füredi [2] showed the upper bound $O(n^{-1/d}(\ln n)^{1/d})$, and has intensified since [31], motivated by the idea that $K_{d+1}$-factors should be the worst case. See [17, 18] for history and the most recent results; with $O(1)$ in place of $1 + o(1)$, Theorem 3.7.2 is conjectured in [18] and in the stronger “universal” form (see Section 3.8) in [17].

Theorem 3.7.3 probably extends to $r$-graphs and $d$ of the form $\tbinom{s-1}{r-1}$. This just needs extension of Theorem 1 of [17] to $r$-graphs (suggested at the end of [17]), which (with [32]) would give asymptotics of the threshold for $\mathcal{H}_{n,p}$ to contain a $K_s^r$-factor (where $K_s^r$ is the complete $r$ graph on $s$ vertices).

Each of Theorems 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 begins with the following easy observations. (The first, an approximate converse of Proposition 3.1.4, is the trivial direction of LP duality.)

Observation 3.7.4. If an increasing $\mathcal{F}$ supports a $q$-spread measure, then $q_f(\mathcal{F}) < q$.

(More precisely, $q_f(\mathcal{F})$ is the least $q$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ supports a probability measure $\nu$ with $\nu(|S|) \leq 2q^{|S|} \forall S$.)

Observation 3.7.5. Uniform measure on $\mathcal{G}_H$ is $q$-spread if and only if: for $S \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n^r$ isomorphic to a subhypergraph of $H$, $\sigma$ a uniformly random permutation of $V$ and $H_0 \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n^r$ a given copy of $H$,

$$P(\sigma(S) \subseteq H_0) \leq q^{|S|}. \hfill (3.26)$$
Proving Theorem 3.7.1 is now just a matter of verifying (3.26) with \( q = O(dn^{-(r-1)}) \), which we leave to the reader. (It is similar to the proof of (3.28).)

**Proof of Theorem 3.7.2** The next assertion is the main thing we need to check here.

**Lemma 3.7.6.** There is \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon_d > 0 \) such that if \( H \) is as in Theorem 3.7.2 and has no component isomorphic to \( K_{d+1} \), then

\[
q_f(F_H) \leq n^{-(2/(d+1)+\varepsilon)} = q.
\]  

(3.27)

**Proof.** We just need to show (3.26) for \( q \) as in (3.27) and \( S, H_0 \) as in Observation 3.7.5, say with \( W = V(S) \), \( s = |S| \), and \( f \) the size of a spanning forest of \( S \). We may of course assume \( S \) has no isolated vertices, so \( w := |W| \leq 2f \). We show

\[
\mathbb{P}(\sigma(S) \subseteq H_0) < (e^2d/n)^f
\]  

(3.28)

and

\[
\frac{f}{s} \geq \frac{2(d+1)}{(d+2)d} = \frac{2}{d+1} + \varepsilon_0,
\]  

(3.29)

where \( \varepsilon_0 = 1/((d+2)(d+1)d) \), implying that for any \( \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 \), (3.26) holds for large enough \( n \).

**Proof of (3.28).** Let \( \alpha, \beta : W \to V \) be, respectively, a uniform injection and a uniform map. Then

\[
(d/n)^f \geq \mathbb{P}(\beta(S) \subseteq H_0) \geq \mathbb{P}(\beta \text{ is injective})\mathbb{P}(\beta(S) \subseteq H_0 | \beta \text{ is injective})
\]

\[
= (n)_w n^{-w} \mathbb{P}(\alpha(S) \subseteq H_0) > e^{-2f} \mathbb{P}(\sigma(S) \subseteq H_0).
\]

**Proof of (3.29).** We may of course assume \( S \) is connected, in which case we have \( f = w - 1 \) and upper bounds on \( s \): \( \binom{w}{2} \) if \( w \leq d \); \( \binom{w+1}{2} - 1 \) if \( w = d + 1 \); and \( wd/2 \) if \( w \geq d + 2 \). The corresponding lower bounds on \( f/s \) are \( 2/d, 2d/((d+2)(d+1) - 2) \) and \( 2(d+1)/((d+2)d) \), the smallest of which is the last.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.7.6.

We are now ready for Theorem 3.7.2. Let \( \varsigma = \varsigma_n \) be some slow \( o(1) \) (e.g. \( 1/\ln n \)). By Theorem 3.7.3 there is \( p_1 \sim p^*(d,n) \) such that if \( (d+1) | m > (1 - \varsigma)n \) then \( G_{m,p_1} \)
contains a $K_{d+1}$-factor w.h.p., while by Lemma 3.7.6 and Theorem 1.0.1 (or, more precisely, Remark 3.2.2), there is $p_2$ with $p^*(d, n) \gg p_2 \gg n^{-(2/(d+1)+\varepsilon)}$ such that if $m \geq \varsigma n$ then for any given $m$-vertex $H'$ with $\Delta(H') \leq d$, $G_{m,p_2}$ contains (a copy of) $H'$ w.h.p.

Let $H_1$ be the union of the copies of $K_{d+1}$ in $H$ (each of which must be a component of $H$), $H_2 = H - H_1$, and $n_i = |V(H_i)|$ (so $n_1 + n_2 = n$). Let $G_1 \sim G_{n,p_1}$ and $G_2 \sim G_{n,p_2}$ be independent on the common vertex set $V = [n]$ and $G = G_1 \cup G_2$. Then $G \sim G_{n,p}$ with $p = 1 - (1 - p_1)(1 - p_2) \sim p^*(d, n)$, and we just need to show $G \supseteq H$ w.h.p. In fact we find each $H_i$ in the corresponding $G_i$, in order depending on $n_2$: if $n_2 \geq \varsigma n$, then w.h.p. $G_1$ contains $H_1$, say on vertex set $V_1$, and w.h.p. $G_2[V \setminus V_1]$ contains $H_2$; and if $n_2 < \varsigma n$, then w.h.p. $G_2$ contains $H_2$ on some $V_2$, and w.h.p. $G_1[V \setminus V_2]$ contains $H_1$.

3.8 Concluding remarks

In closing we briefly mention (or recall) a few unresolved issues related to the present work.

A. First, of course, it would be nice to prove Conjecture 3.1.3 which now implies Conjecture 3.1.1. In Chapter 4 we present some progress towards this result.

B. It would be interesting to understand whether, in Shamir’s and related problems, the $\ln \ell$ emerging from our argument somehow reflects the coupon-collector requirement (edges cover vertices) that drives the lower bounds. Partly as a way of testing this, one might try to see if the present machinery can be extended to apply directly (rather than via [47, 27]) to questions where coupon collector considerations (correctly) predict a smaller gap, as in the fractional powers of $\ln n$ in Theorem 3.7.3.

C. The arguments of [44] and [18] give stronger “universality” results; e.g. [44] says that the appropriate $G_{n,p}$ w.h.p. contains every tree respecting the degree bound. Whether this can be proved along present lines remains unclear; if so, it would seem to be more a question of managing some understanding of the class of universal graphs (with, of course, a view to the spread) than of extending Theorem 1.0.1.
D. As mentioned following Corollary 3.1.7, what prevents us from extending to other values of the dimension \( k \) is inadequate control of the spread. (Here it doesn’t really matter whether we think of “assignments” or of the threshold for containing a member of the \( \mathcal{H} \) in (3.5).) The difficulty is the same for the related problem of thresholds for existence of designs. We don’t have anything to suggest in the way of a remedy and just indicate one issue, for simplicity sticking to Steiner triple systems (STS’s; see [55] for background); thus \( X = \mathcal{K}^3_n \) (with \( n \equiv 1 \) or \( 3 \) \pmod{6}), \( \mathcal{H} \) is the hypergraph of STS’s, and for the spread (which should be \( \Theta(1/n) \)), we may take

\[
\kappa = \min_{S \subseteq X} \left( |\mathcal{H}|/|\mathcal{H} \cap \langle S \rangle| \right)^{1/|S|}.
\]  

(3.30)

Results of Linial and Luria [38] (upper bound) and Keevash [35] (lower bound) give

\[
|\mathcal{H}| = ((1 + o(1))n/e^2)^{n^2/6}.
\]  

(3.31)

Viewed enumeratively this is very satisfactory, having been an old conjecture of Wilson [56]. But for present purposes, even ignoring our weaker understanding of \( |\mathcal{H} \cap \langle S \rangle| \) (the number of completions of a partial STS \( S \)), it is not enough: even if this quantity is, as one expects, roughly \((n/e^2)^{n^2/6-|S|}\), the r.h.s. of (3.30) can be dominated by the “error” factor \((1 + o(1))^{n^2/(6|S|)}\) if \( S \) is slightly small and the \( o(1) \) in (3.31) is negative.

E. Finally, we recall a related conjecture from [33] (stated there only for graphs, but this shouldn’t matter). For \( \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_H \) as in Section 3.7, let \( p_E(\mathcal{F}) \) be the least \( p \) such that for every \( H' \subseteq H \) the expected number of (unlabeled) copies of \( H' \) in \( \mathcal{H}_{n,p} \) is at least 1. Then \( p_E(\mathcal{F})/2 \) is again a trivial lower bound on \( p_c(\mathcal{F}) \)—and, where it makes sense, probably more intuitive than \( q(\mathcal{F}) \) or \( q_f(\mathcal{F}) \)—and from [33 Conjecture 2] we have:

**Conjecture 3.8.1.** There is a universal \( K \) such that for every \( \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_H \) as above,

\[
p_c(\mathcal{F}) \leq Kp_E(\mathcal{F}) \ln |X|.
\]

Again, we can presumably replace \( \ln |X| \) by \( \ln |H| \), as would now follow from a positive answer to the obvious question: do we always have \( q_f(\mathcal{F}) = O(p_E(\mathcal{F})) \)?
Chapter 4

On a problem of M. Talagrand

Joint work with Jeff Kahn and Jinyoung Park.

4.1 Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is the relation between the following two notions of M. Talagrand \[50, 51, 53\]. (Our focus is Conjecture 4.1.4 and our main result is Theorem 4.1.6; we will come to these following some motivation.)

We assume throughout that \( \mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V \) is increasing and not equal to \( 2^V, \emptyset \). Say \( \mathcal{F} \) is \( p \)-small if there is a \( G \subseteq 2^V \) such that

\[
\langle G \rangle \supseteq \mathcal{F}
\]

(4.1)

(that is, each member of \( \mathcal{F} \) contains a member of \( G \)) and

\[
\sum_{S \in G} p^{|S|} \leq 1/2,
\]

(4.2)

and set \( q(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{p : \mathcal{F} \text{ is } p\text{-small}\} \). Say \( \mathcal{F} \) is weakly \( p \)-small if there is a \( \lambda : 2^V \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to [0, 1] \) such that

\[
\sum_{S \subseteq F} \lambda_S \geq 1 \ \forall F \in \mathcal{F}
\]

(4.3)

and

\[
\sum_S \lambda_S p^{|S|} \leq 1/2,
\]

(4.4)

and set \( q_f(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{p : \mathcal{F} \text{ is weakly } p\text{-small}\} \). As in Chapter 3, we refer to \( q(\mathcal{F}) \) and \( q_f(\mathcal{F}) \) (respectively) as the expectation-threshold and fractional expectation-threshold of \( \mathcal{F} \). Notice that

\[
q(\mathcal{F}) \leq q_f(\mathcal{F}) \leq p_c(\mathcal{F}).
\]

(4.5)
Here the first inequality is trivial and the second holds since for $\lambda$ as in \eqref{eq:4.3} and \eqref{eq:4.4},

$$
\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \mu_p(F) \sum_{S \subseteq F} \lambda_S \leq \sum_{S} \lambda_S \mu_p(\langle S \rangle) = \sum_{S} \lambda_S |S|^{p |S|} \leq 1/2 \quad (4.6)
$$

(where $\langle S \rangle = \langle \{S\} \rangle$).

Thus each of $q$, $q_f$ is a lower bound on $p_c$ (and one that’s easily understood in many cases of interest; see \cite{21}). The next two conjectures—respectively the main conjecture (Conjecture 1) of \cite{33} and a sort of LP relaxation thereof suggested by Talagrand \cite{53, Conjecture 8.3}—say that these bounds are never far from the truth.

**Conjecture 4.1.1.** There is a universal $K$ such that for every finite $V$ and increasing $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$,

$$
p_c(\mathcal{F}) < Kq(\mathcal{F}) \ln |V|.
$$

**Conjecture 4.1.2.** There is a universal $K$ such that for every finite $V$ and increasing $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$,

$$
p_c(\mathcal{F}) < Kq_f(\mathcal{F}) \ln |V|.
$$

Talagrand \cite{53, Conjecture 8.5} also proposes the following strengthening of Conjecture 4.1.2 in which $\ell(\mathcal{F})$ is the maximum size of a minimal member of $\mathcal{F}$.

**Conjecture 4.1.3.** There is a universal $K$ such that for every finite $V$ and increasing $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^V$,

$$
p_c(\mathcal{F}) < Kq_f(\mathcal{F}) \ln \ell(\mathcal{F}).
$$

Conjecture 4.1.3 is shown in Chapter \cite{3} to which we also refer for discussion of the very strong consequences that originally motivated Conjecture 4.1.1 but follow just as easily from Conjecture 4.1.2.

Here we are interested in the following conjecture of M. Talagrand \cite{53, Conjecture 6.3], which says that the parameters $q$ and $q_f$ are in fact not very different.

**Conjecture 4.1.4.** There is a fixed $L$ such that, for any $\mathcal{F}$, $q(\mathcal{F}) \geq q_f(\mathcal{F})/L$.

(In other words, weakly $p$-small implies $(p/L)$-small.) This of course implies equivalence of Conjectures 4.1.2 and 4.1.1 as well as of Conjecture 4.1.3 and the corresponding
strengthening of Conjecture 4.1.1, so in particular, in view of [21], would now supply a proof of Conjecture 4.1.1. (At present this implication is probably the strongest motivation for Conjecture 4.1.4, but we have long been interested in the conjecture for its own sake.)

The following mild reformulation of Conjecture 4.1.4 will be convenient.

**Conjecture 4.1.5.** There is a fixed $J$ such that for any $V, p$ and $\lambda : 2^V \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\{A \subseteq V : \sum_{S \subseteq A} \lambda_S \geq \sum_{S} \lambda_S(Jp)^{|S|}\}$$

is $p$-small.

As Talagrand observes, even simple instances of Conjecture 4.1.4 are not easy to establish. He suggests two test cases, which in the formulation of Conjecture 4.1.5 become:

(i) $V = \binom{[n]}{2} = E(K_n)$ and (for some $k$) $\lambda$ is the indicator of \{copies of $K_k$ in $K_n$\};

(ii) $\lambda$ is supported on 2-element sets.

(He does show that Conjecture 4.1.4 holds if $\lambda$ is supported on singletons; see Proposition 4.2.1 for a quantified version that will be useful in what follows.)

The very specific (i) above was treated in [8]. Here we dispose of the less structured (ii):

**Theorem 4.1.6.** Conjecture 4.1.5 holds when $\text{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$; in other words, there is a $J$ such that for any graph $G = (V, E)$, $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda : E \to \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\{U \subseteq V : \lambda(G[U]) \geq J^2\lambda(G)p^2\}$$

is $p$-small (where $G[U]$ is the subgraph induced by $U$).

It seems not out of the question that the ideas involved in proving Theorem 4.1.6 can be extended to give Conjecture 4.1.4 in full, but we don’t yet see this.

The rest of this chapter is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.1.6. The most important part of this turns out to be (a quantified version of) the “unweighted” case, where
\(\lambda\) takes values in \(\{0, 1\}\), though deriving Theorem 4.1.6 from this still needs some ideas. A precise statement is given at the end of Section 4.2 following a few preliminaries, and the unweighted and weighted arguments are then given in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 respectively.

### 4.2 Framework

We use \([n]\) for \(\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\), \(2^X\) for the power set of \(X\), and \(\binom{X}{r}\) for the family of \(r\)-element subsets of \(X\), and recall from above that \(\langle A \rangle\) is the increasing family generated by \(A \subseteq 2^X\). For a set \(X\) and \(p \in [0, 1]\), \(X_p\) is the “\(p\)-random” subset of \(X\) in which each \(x \in X\) appears with probability \(p\) independent of other choices. We assume throughout that \(p\) has been specified and usually omit it from our notation.

Graphs here are always simple, and are mainly thought of as sets of edges; thus \(|G|\) is \(|E(G)|\). We use \(\nabla_G(v)\) or \(\nabla_v\) for \(\{e \in E(G) : v \in e\}\); so the degree of \(v\) is \(d_v = |\nabla_v|\). (We also use \(N_G(v)\) for the neighborhood of \(v\) in \(G\).)

The following convention will be helpful. Given a graph \(G\) on \(V\), we associate with each \(U \subseteq V\) a “weighted subset” \(D(U) = D_G(U)\) of \(E(G)\) that assigns to each \(e\) the weight \(|e \cap U|/2\). (We also use \(D_v\) or \(D_G(v)\) for \(D(\{v\})\).) We then have, for any \(\lambda : G \to \mathbb{R}^+\),

\[
\lambda(D(U)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in U} \lambda(\nabla_v)
\]

(e.g. \(|D(U)| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in U} d_v\)). To see why this is natural, notice that

\[
\mathbb{E}\lambda(G[V_p]) = \mathbb{E}\lambda(D(V_p))p
\]

(e.g. \(\mathbb{E}|G[V_p]| = \mathbb{E}|D(V_p)|p\), so that \(\lambda(D(U))p\) is a natural benchmark against which to measure \(\lambda(G[U])\).

For \(A \subseteq 2^V\), the cost of \(A\) (w.r.t. our given \(p\)) is \(C(A) = \sum_{S \in A} p^{|S|}\). We say \(A\) witnesses \(B \subseteq 2^V\) if \(\langle A \rangle \supseteq B\); set

\[
C^*(B) = \min\{C(A) : A\ \text{witnesses} \ B\},
\]

and say \(B\) is witnessable at cost \(\gamma\) if \(C^*(B) \leq \gamma\). Talagrand’s observation that Conjecture 4.1.4 holds for \(\lambda\) supported on singletons may now be stated as:
Proposition 4.2.1. For all $\zeta : V \to \mathbb{R}^{+}$ and $J > 2e$, 
\[
C^{*}(\{U \subseteq V : \zeta(U) \geq J\zeta(V)p\}) < \frac{2e}{(J - 2e)}. 
\tag{4.7}
\]
(The dependence on $J$ is best possible up to constants.)

Proof. We may take $V = [n]$ and assume $\zeta$ is non-increasing (and positive) and $Jp \leq 1$ (since the proof is trivial when $Jp > 1$). Define $R$ by
\[
\frac{1}{Rp} = \lfloor \frac{1}{Jp} \rfloor = a. 
\]

We claim that the collection
\[
A = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \lfloor ak \rfloor \\ k \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]
witnesses the family in (4.7); this gives the proposition since the l.h.s. of (4.7) is then at most
\[
C(A) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( \begin{bmatrix} ak \\ k \end{bmatrix} \right) p^{k} < \sum_{k \geq 1} \left( \frac{e}{R} \right)^{k} < \frac{e}{R - e} < \frac{2e}{J - 2e}
\]
(the last inequality holding since $Jp \leq 1$ implies $R > J/2.$)

To see that the claim holds, observe that its failure implies the existence of some $U = \{u_{1} < u_{2} < \cdots < u_{\ell}\} \subseteq [n]$ with $\zeta(U) \geq J\zeta(V)p$ such that $|U \cap \lfloor ak \rfloor| < k$ for all $k > 0$. But then $u_{i} > ia$ for all $i \in [\ell]$, yielding the contradiction
\[
\zeta(V) > \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{j \in [a]} \zeta(j + ia) \geq a\zeta(U) \geq \zeta(V). \quad \square
\]

We further define
\[
C^{*}_{f}(\mu, T)
\]
to be the infimum of those $\gamma$’s for which, for every $p$ and (simple) graph $G$ (on $V$) with $|G|p^{2} \leq \mu$,
\[
\{U \subseteq V : |G[U]| \geq \max\{T, J|D_{G}(U)|p\}\} \tag{4.8}
\]
is witnessable at cost $\gamma$. In Section 4.3 we will need cost bounds that improve as $T$ grows, even if $T/\mu$ does not, and this need not be the case without the extra condition involving $|D_{G}(U)|$ in (4.8). License to use this condition will be provided in Section 4.4 via the reduction of Theorem 4.1.6 to the following unweighted statement, which we regard as our main point.
**Theorem 4.2.2.** For any $\mu$ and $T = cJ^2\mu$ with

$$ c \geq 256e/J \text{ and } J \geq 8e, $$

and $J_1 = J/(8e)$,

$$ C^*_J(\mu, T) \leq 32c^{-1} \min\{J_1^{-2}, J_1^{-\sqrt{T}/16}\}. $$

(4.10)

(Here and throughout we don’t worry about getting good constants, and try instead to keep the argument fairly clean.)

### 4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2.2

Aiming for simplicity, we first bound the cost in (4.10) assuming $T = 2^{2k+3}$ for some positive integer $k$ and

$$ c = T/(\mu J^2) \geq 64e/J, $$

(4.11)

showing that in this case

$$ C^*_J(\mu, T) \leq 8c^{-1}J_1^{-2k-1-1}. $$

(4.12)

Before proving this, we show that it implies Theorem 4.2.2, which, since $C^*_J(\mu, t)$ is decreasing in $t$, just requires showing that the r.h.s. of (4.10) bounds $C^*_J(\mu, T_0)$ for some $T_0 \leq T$. If $T < 32$ this follows from the trivial

$$ C^*_J(\mu, 1) \leq \mu $$

(4.13)

(take $G = \{x, y\} : xy \in G\})$, since $\mu = T/(cJ^2) < 32c^{-1}J_1^{-2}$, matching the bound in (4.10). Suppose then that $T \geq 32$ and let $T_0 = c_0J^2\mu$ be the largest integer not greater than $T$ of the form $2^{2k+3}$ (with positive integer $k$). We then have $c_0 > c/4$ (supporting (4.11)) and $2^{k-1} > \sqrt{T_0}/8 > \sqrt{T}/16$, and it follows that the bound on $C^*_J(\mu, T_0)$ given by (4.12) is less than the bound in (4.10).

**Proof of (4.12).** We have $T = 2^{2k+3} = cJ^2\mu$ with $J$ as in (4.9) and $c$ as in (4.11), and, with

$$ U := \{U \subseteq V : |G[U]| > \max\{T, J|D_G(U)|p\}\}, $$

(4.14)
want to show that $C^*(U)$ is no more than the bound in (4.12).

A basic challenge for Conjecture 4.1.4 in general is identifying a suitable $G$. In the present instance, each member of $G$ will be a disjoint union of stars, where for present purposes a star at $v$ in $W \subseteq V$ is some $\{v\} \cup S \subseteq W$ with $S \subseteq N_G(v)$. (Where convenient we will also refer to this as the “star $(v, S)$.”) We say such a star is good if

$$|S| \geq Jd_v p/4.$$  \hfill (4.15)

Given $L$, we define

$$L^v = \max\{L, Jd_v p/4\}$$  \hfill (4.16)

and say a star $(v, S)$ is $L$-special if $|S| = L^v$.

For positive integers $b$ and $L$, let $\mathcal{G}(b, L) \subseteq 2^V$ consist of all disjoint unions of $b$ $L$-special stars in $G$. We will specify a particular collection $C$ of pairs $(b, L)$ and set

$$\mathcal{G} = \cup \{\mathcal{G}(b, L) : (b, L) \in C\}.$$  

Theorem 4.2.2 is then given by the following two assertions.

Claim 4.3.1. $\mathcal{G}$ witnesses $U$.

Claim 4.3.2. $C(\mathcal{G})$ is at most the bound in (4.12).

Set (with $i \in [k]$ throughout) $L_i = 2^{i-1}$ and

$$\delta_i = \max\{2^{-(i+2)}, 2^{i-k-3}\} \geq 1/(8L_i),$$  \hfill (4.17)

and notice that

$$\sum \delta_i \leq \sum 2^{-(i+2)} + \sum 2^{i-k-3} \leq 1/2.$$  \hfill (4.18)

Let

$$b_i = \delta_i 4^{-i} T \geq 2^{k-i}.$$  \hfill (4.19)

Finally, set

$$C = \{(b_i, L_i) : i \in [k]\}.$$
Proof of Claim 4.3.1. We are given $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and must show it contains a member of $\mathcal{G}$. Let $U_0 = U$ and for $j = 1, \ldots$ until no longer possible do: let $(v_j, S_j)$, with $S_j = N_{G}(v_j) \cap U_{j-1}$, be a largest good star in $U_{j-1}$, and set $d_j = |S_j|$ and $U_j = U_{j-1} \setminus \{v_j\} \cup S_j$.

The passage from $U_{j-1}$ to $U_j$ deletes at most $d_j^2$ edges containing vertices of $S_j$ of $U_{j-1}$-degree at most $d_j$; any other edge deleted in this step contains $u \in S_j$ with $U_{j-1}$-degree less than $Jd_u p/4$ (or $u$, having $U_{j-1}$-degree greater than $d_j$, would have been chosen in place of $v_j$); and of course each vertex $u$ of the final $U_j$ has $U_j$-degree less than $Jd_u p/4$. We thus have

$$|G[U]| \leq \sum_j d_j^2 + \sum_{v \in U} Jd_v p/4 \leq \sum_j d_j^2 + |G[U]|/2$$

(using the second bound in (4.14)), so

$$\sum_j d_j^2 \geq T/2. \quad (4.20)$$

Set

$$B_i = \begin{cases} \{j : d_j \in [2^{i-1}, 2^i)\} & \text{if } i \in [k-1], \\ \{j : d_j \geq 2^{k-1}\} & \text{if } i = k. \end{cases}$$

(It may be worth noting that, while the $d_j$’s are decreasing, the degrees corresponding to $B_i$ increase with $i$.) In view of (4.20), either $|B_k| \geq 1$ or

$$\sum_{i \in [k-1]} |B_i| 4^i \geq T/2 \geq \sum_{i \in [k-1]} \delta_i T$$

(using (4.18)). Recalling that $b_k = 1$, it follows that for some $i \in [k]$ we have

$$|B_i| \geq b_i. \quad (4.21)$$

On the other hand, since $|S_j| \geq L_i$ for $j \in B_i$, the set $\bigcup\{S_j \cup \{v_j\} : j \in B_i\}$ contains some $W \in \mathcal{G}(b_i, L_i)(\subseteq \mathcal{G})$ whenever $i$ is as in (4.21). This completes the proof of Claim 4.3.1. □

Proof of Claim 4.3.2. We first bound the cost, say $C(b, L)$, of the collection $\mathcal{G}(b, L)$. Set

$$q_v = p \left(\frac{ed_v p}{L_v}\right)^{L_v}.$$
Then $q_v$ bounds the total cost of the set of $L$-special stars at $v$ (as $\left(\frac{d_v}{L^\nu}\right) \leq (ed_v/L^\nu)^L$), and it follows that

$$C(b, L) \leq \sum \left\{ \prod_{v \in B} q_v : B \in \binom{V}{b} \right\}. \quad (4.22)$$

For a given value of $\varphi := \sum_{v \in V} q_v$, the r.h.s. of (4.22) is largest when the $q_v$’s are all equal (this just uses $xy \leq [(x + y)/2]^2$), whence

$$C(b, L) \leq \left(\frac{|V|}{b}\right) \left(\frac{\varphi}{|V|}\right)^b \leq \left(\frac{e\varphi}{b}\right)^b. \quad (4.23)$$

Recalling (4.16), we have

$$q_v \leq d_v p^2 \cdot e \left(\frac{4e}{J}\right)^{L-1},$$

so

$$\varphi \leq 2\mu \cdot \frac{e}{L} \left(\frac{4e}{J}\right)^{L-1}. \quad (4.24)$$

Now using (4.23) and (4.24), recalling that $T = cj^2 \mu$, $L_i = 2^{i-1}$, $b_i = \delta_i 4^{-i} T = \delta_i T/(4L_i^2)$ and $J_1 = J/(8e)$, and for the moment omitting the subscript $i$, we have (with the final inequality (4.25) justified below)

$$C(b, L) \leq \left[ \frac{2e^2 \mu \cdot 4L^2}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta T} \left(\frac{4e}{J}\right)^{L-1} \right]^b$$

$$= \left[ 8e^2 L \cdot \frac{1}{cJ_2^2 \delta} \left(\frac{4e}{J}\right)^{L-1} \right]^b$$

$$= \left[ c^{-1} L \frac{J_i^{L+1}}{2\delta} \right]^b$$

$$\leq \left[ \frac{c}{4} \cdot J_1^{L+1} \right]^{-b}. \quad (4.25)$$

For (4.25), or the equivalent

$$2^{L+4} \delta \geq L, \quad (4.26)$$

it is enough to show $2^{L+1} \geq L^2$ (since $\delta \geq 1/(8L)$; see (4.17)), which is true for positive integer $L$.

Finally, returning to Claim 4.3.2 (and recalling that $L$ and $b$ in the display ending with (4.25) are really $L_i$ and $b_i$), we have

$$C(G) = \sum_{i=1}^k C(b_i, L_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left[ \frac{c}{4} \cdot J_i^{L_i+1} \right]^{-b_i}. \quad (4.27)$$
Since (4.11) implies that $cJ_1/4 \geq 2$, we can use $b_i \geq 2^{k-i}$ from (4.19) to bound the r.h.s. of (4.27) by

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \left[ \frac{cJ_i^{2i+1}+1}{4} \right]^{-2^{k-i}} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} J_i^{-2^{k-1}} \left[ \frac{cJ_i}{4} \right]^{-2^{k-i}}
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{c}{4} J_{1}^{2^{k-1}+1} \right) -1 \left[ \frac{cJ_1}{4} \right]^{1-2^j}
$$

$$
< 8c^{-1} J_1^{-2^{k-1}-1},
$$

matching (4.12) as desired. □

### 4.4 proof of Theorem 4.1.6

We prove the following quantified version of Theorem 4.1.6.

**Theorem 4.4.1.** For any graph $G$ on $V$, $\lambda : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and

$$
R \geq 4096\sqrt{2e}, \quad (4.28)
$$

the set

$$
U_0 = \{ U \subseteq V : \lambda(G[U]) \geq R^2 \lambda(G)p^2 \}
$$

is witnessable at cost $O(1/R)$.

**Proof.** We take $G, \lambda, R$ to be as in the theorem, use $D(U)$ for $D_G(U)$ (defined in Section 4.2), and assume throughout that

$$
U \in U_0.
$$

We first observe that it is enough to prove the theorem assuming

$$
\lambda \text{ takes only values } \theta_i := 2^{-i}, \ i = 1, 2, \ldots , \quad (4.29)
$$

with (4.28) slightly weakened to

$$
R \geq 4096e. \quad (4.30)
$$

Then for a general $\lambda$ (which we may of course scale to take values in $[0, 1]$) and $\lambda'$ given by

$$
\lambda'_S = \max\{ \theta_i : \theta_i \leq \lambda_S \},
$$
\( \mathcal{U}_0 \) as in the theorem is contained in the corresponding collection with \( \lambda \) and \( R^2 \) replaced by \( \lambda' \) and \( R^2/2 \) (which supports (4.30)), since \( U \in \mathcal{U}_0 \) implies \( 2\lambda'(G[U]) > \lambda(G[U]) \geq R^2\lambda(G)p^2 \geq R^2\lambda'(G)p^2 \). So we assume from now on that \( \lambda \) and \( R \) are as in (4.29) and (4.30) (respectively).

Note also that Proposition 4.2.1, with \( \zeta(v) = \lambda(D_v) \) (for which we have \( \zeta(V) = \sum \zeta(v) = \frac{1}{2} \sum \lambda(\nabla_v) = \lambda(G) \) and \( \zeta(U) = \lambda(D(U)) \)), says that the set

\[ \{ U \subseteq V : \lambda(D(U)) \geq R\lambda(G)p \} \]

admits a witness of cost less than \( 6/R \). So we specify such a witness as a first installment on \( G \) and it then becomes enough to show that

\( U^* := \{ U \in \mathcal{U}_0 : \lambda(D(U)) < R\lambda(G)p \} \)

can be witnessed at cost \( O(1/R) \); in fact we will show

\[ C^*(U^*) = O(R^{-2}). \] (4.31)

Set \( G_i = \{ e \in G : \lambda(e) = \theta_i \} \) and write \( D_i(U) \) for \( D_{G_i}(U) \). We then observe, for any \( H \subseteq G \),

\[ \lambda(H) = \sum \theta_i |H \cap G_i|, \]

and abbreviate

\[ w_i = \lambda(G_i) = \theta_i |G_i|, \quad w = \lambda(G) = \sum w_i. \]

Given \( U \), define \( L = L(U), K = K(U), L_i = L_i(U) \) and \( K_i = K_i(U) \) by

\[ \lambda(D(U)) = Lwp, \]
\[ \lambda(G[U]) = KLwp^2, \]
\[ |D_i(U)| = L_i|G_i|p, \] (4.32)

and

\[ |G_i[U]| = K_iL_i|G_i|p^2. \] (4.33)

Then

\[ Lwp = \sum \theta_i |D_i(U)| = \sum L_iw_ip \] (4.34)
and
\[ KLwp^2 = \sum \theta_i |G_i[U]| = \sum K_i L_i w_ip^2. \]

Since \( U \in U_0 \), we have
\[ \sum K_i L_i w_i \geq R^2 w, \tag{4.35} \]
while \( U \in U^* \) gives
\[ L < R. \tag{4.36} \]

Note also that, with
\[ I = I(U) = \{i : K_i > R/2\}, \]
we have
\[ \sum \{K_i L_i w_i : i \in I\} > R^2 w/2, \tag{4.37} \]
as follows from (4.35) and (using (4.34) and (4.36))
\[ \sum \{K_i L_i w_i : i \notin I\} \leq (R/2)Lw < R^2 w/2. \]

Now let \( E_i = |G_i|p^2 \) and, for integer \( \alpha \),
\[ E_\alpha = \{i : E_i \in (2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha]\}. \]

We arrange the \( i \)'s in an array, with columns indexed by \( \alpha \)'s (in increasing order) and column \( \alpha \) consisting of the indices in \( E_\alpha \), again in increasing order. (So \( w_i \)'s within a column decrease as we go down. Note column lengths may vary.) Define \( B_\beta \) to be the set of indices in row \( \beta \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\cdots</th>
<th>( \alpha - 1 )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \alpha + 1 )</th>
<th>\cdots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \vdots )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>( \vdots )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: \( i \) is the \( \beta \)th smallest index in \( E_\alpha \) (when \( |E_\alpha| \geq \beta \)).

Set \( y_i = \theta_i 2^\alpha / p^2 \) (for \( i \in E_\alpha \)) and \( y = \sum_{i \geq 1} y_i \), noting that
\[ y_i/2 < w_i \leq y_i. \]
Set
\[ c^*_\beta = (3/2)^{\beta-1} R^2 / 16 \quad (\beta \geq 1) \]
and \( c_i = c^*_\beta \) if \( i \in B_\beta \). Let \( w^*_\beta \) and \( y^*_\beta \) be (respectively) the sums of the \( w_i \)'s and \( y_i \)'s over \( i \in B_\beta \), and notice that
\[ y^*_{\beta+1} \leq y^*_\beta / 2 \quad \text{for} \quad \beta \geq 1 \]
(since \( i = B_{\beta+1} \cap E_\alpha \) (where we abusively use \( i \) for \( \{i\} \)) implies \( i > j := B_\beta \cap E_\alpha \), whence \( 2y_i \leq y_j \).)

**Claim 4.4.2.** For each \( U \in \mathcal{U}^* \) there is an \( i \in I(U) \) with \( K_i(U)L_i(U) > c_i \).

**Proof.** With \( \sum^* \) denoting summation over \( I \), we have (using (4.37) at the end)
\[
\sum^* c_i w_i \leq \sum c^*_\beta w^*_\beta \leq \sum c^*_\beta y^*_\beta \\
\leq y^*_i (c^*_1 + c^*_2/2 + c^*_3/2^2 + \cdots) \\
\leq y (c^*_1 + c^*_2/2 + c^*_3/2^2 + \cdots) \\
\leq (R^2/4)y < (R^2/2)w < \sum^* K_i(U)L_i(U)w_i.
\]

It follows that if, for each \( i \), \( \mathcal{G}_i \) witnesses
\[ \mathcal{U}_i := \{ U \subseteq V : i \in I(U); \ K_i(U)L_i(U) > c_i \}, \]
then \( \cup \mathcal{G}_i \) witnesses \( \mathcal{U}^* \); so we have
\[
C^*(\mathcal{U}^*) \leq \sum_i C^*(\mathcal{U}_i). \quad (4.38)
\]

On the other hand, if \( (\alpha, \beta) \) is the pair corresponding to \( i \) (that is, \( i \) is the \( \beta \)th entry in column \( \alpha \) of our array), then (see (4.8) for \( C^*_J \))
\[
C^*(\mathcal{U}_i) \leq C^*_R(2^\alpha, T_{\alpha, \beta}), \quad (4.39)
\]
where \( T_{\alpha, \beta} = \max\{c^*_\beta 2^{\alpha-1}, 1\} \); namely, \( |G_i|p^2 = E_i \leq 2^\alpha \), while \( U \in \mathcal{U}_i \) implies (using (4.32), (4.33) and \( i \in I(U) \))
\[
|G_i[U]| = K_i(U)L_i(U)|G_i|p^2 \begin{cases} 
> c_i|G_i|p^2 > c^*_\beta 2^{\alpha-1} \\
= K_i|D_i(U)|p > (R/2)|D_i(U)|p.
\end{cases}
\]
So it is enough to show that the sum of the r.h.s. of (4.39) (over \( \beta \geq 1 \) and integer \( \alpha \)) is \( O(R^{-2}) \).

For \( T_{\alpha,\beta} = 1 \) we bound the r.h.s. of (4.39) by the trivial (4.13), which—since \( T_{\alpha,\beta} = 1 \) iff \( 2^\alpha \leq 32R^{-2}(2/3)^{\beta-1} \)—bounds the contribution of such pairs (to the sum in (4.38)) by

\[
\sum_{\beta \geq 1} \sum_{\alpha: 2^\alpha \leq 2/\sqrt{c_\beta}} 2^\alpha \leq 64R^{-2} \sum_{\beta \geq 1} (2/3)^{\beta-1} = 3 \cdot 64R^{-2}. \tag{4.40}
\]

For \( T_{\alpha,\beta} > 1 \) we use Theorem 4.2.2 with \( T = T_{\alpha,\beta}(= 2^{\alpha-1}c_\beta), \mu = 2^\alpha, J = R/2, \) and (thus)

\[
c = T/((\mu J^2) = c_\beta^*/(2J^2) = (3/2)^{\beta-1}/8.
\]

Note that (4.30) gives \( J \geq 8e \) and \( c \geq 256/e/J \), so (4.9) holds.

For each integer \( s \geq 0 \) let \( T_s = \{ (\alpha, \beta) : T_{\alpha,\beta} \in (2^s, 2^{s+1}] \} \). For each \( \beta \geq 1 \) there is a unique \( \alpha \) such that \( (\alpha, \beta) \in T_s \), and every \( (\alpha, \beta) \) with \( T_{\alpha,\beta} > 1 \) is in some \( T_s \). Let

\[
f(s) = \min\{J_1^{-2}, J_1^{-2s/2-4}\}. Then for fixed \( s \), we have (see (4.10))
\]

\[
\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in T_s} C_{j}^*(2^\alpha, T_{\alpha,\beta}) \leq \sum_{\beta \geq 1} 32e^{-1} f(s) = \sum_{\beta \geq 1} 256 \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\beta-1} f(s) < 3 \cdot 256 f(s), \tag{4.41}
\]

and summing over all \( s \) we get

\[
\sum_{T_{\alpha,\beta} > 1} C_{j}^*(2^\alpha, T_{\alpha,\beta}) < \sum_{s \geq 0} 768 f(s) = \sum_{s \geq 0} 768 \min\{J_1^{-2}, J_1^{-2s/2-4}\} = O(J_1^{-2}). \tag{4.42}
\]

Finally, combining (4.42) and (4.40) gives (4.31).
Chapter 5

Automorphisms of Induced Subgraphs of $G_{n,p}$

Keith Frankston

5.1 Organization

We introduce our core machinery in Section 5.2 (leaving a couple small details to Section 5.5) and use it to prove a slight weakening of Theorem 1.0.3 as an orienting example. In Section 5.3 we prove our main result, Theorem 5.3.1, as well as the more general, but weaker, Theorem 5.3.2. Finally, in Section 5.4 we present some directions for future study, including possibilities for strengthening our current results.

5.2 Machinery

Conventions. Throughout this chapter, $G = G_{n,p}$ is taken to have vertex set $V = [n]$ unless otherwise specified; all subgraphs are induced, with $G[W]$ denoting the induced subgraph of $G$ on $W \subseteq V$; and we view a graph $H$ on $V$ as a subset of $\binom{V}{2}$, so $H[W] = H \cap \binom{W}{2}$.

We say $\varphi$ is a subautomorphism of $G$ if $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(G[W])$ for some $W \subseteq V$; $\varphi$ is said to be of size $|\varphi| := |W|$. We denote a partition of $\ell$ by $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r) \vdash \ell$ (meaning $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_r > 0$ are integers with $\sum \lambda_i = \ell$). We use subpartition of $X$ to mean a collection $\mathcal{S} = \{S\}$ of disjoint subsets of $X$, each of size at least 2 and say $\mathcal{S}$ is of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$ if $\{\lambda_i\} = \{|S|\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$ as multisets. We use the shorthand $\cup \mathcal{S} = \cup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S$ and $\ell(\mathcal{S}) = |\cup \mathcal{S}|$.

W.h.p. statements and asymptotic notation are with respect to $n$; so $f = o(g)$ and $f = \omega(g)$ (also written $f \ll g$ and $f \gg g$) mean $f/g$ and $g/f$ respectively are smaller
than any given \( \varepsilon > 0 \) for large enough \( n \).

For \( \varphi \in \mathfrak{S}_X \) (the symmetric group on \( X \)), we use \( \text{Fix}(\varphi) = \{ x \in X : \varphi(x) = x \} \) for the set of fixed points of \( \varphi \), and \( \mathcal{O}(\varphi) = \{ \{ \varphi^k(x) : k \in \mathbb{Z} \} : x \in X \setminus \text{Fix}(\varphi) \} \) for the set of non-trivial orbits of \( \varphi \). We refer to elements of \( \cup \mathcal{O}(\varphi) = X \setminus \text{Fix}(\varphi) \) as the mobile points of \( \varphi \). We say \( \varphi \) is of type \( \lambda \vdash \ell \) if \( \mathcal{O}(\varphi) \) is of type \( \lambda \) (note that the type of \( \varphi \) depends only on its mobile points).

For a permutation \( \varphi \) of \( V \), we denote by \( \varphi' \) the permutation it induces on \( \binom{V}{2} \). Observe that \( \varphi \) induces a graph automorphism on \( H \subseteq \binom{V}{2} \) iff \( H \cap T \in \{ \emptyset, T \} \) for every \( T \in \mathcal{O}(\varphi') \). If \( |T| = k \), we have
\[
P(G \cap T \in \{ \emptyset, T \}) = p^k + (1 - p)^k =: q_p(k) \tag{5.1}
\]
(recall \( G = G_{n,p} \); we will write \( q \) for \( q_p \) when \( p \) is known), with these events occurring independently for the various \( T \in \mathcal{O}(\varphi') \) (since the orbits partition \( \binom{V}{2} \)).

Note that for \( \varphi \in \text{Aut}(H) \), \( S \in \mathcal{O}(\varphi) \), and \( x \in \text{Fix}(\varphi) \),
\[
\{ \{ x, y \} : y \in S \} \in \mathcal{O}(\varphi')
\]
and therefore
\[
N_H(x) \cap S \in \{ \emptyset, S \} \tag{5.2}
\]
(where \( N_H(x) = \{ y : \{ x, y \} \in H \} \) denotes the neighborhood of \( x \) in \( H \)).

For \( S \subseteq V \), we write
\[
\text{co}_G(S) = \text{co}(S) = \{ x \in V \setminus S : N_G(x) \cap S \in \{ \emptyset, S \} \}, \tag{5.3}
\]
and, more generally, for a subpartition \( \mathcal{S} \) (of \( V \)),
\[
\text{co}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \text{co}(S). \tag{5.4}
\]

Notice that \( \varphi \) is a subautomorphism of \( G \) iff
\[
\text{co}(\mathcal{O}(\varphi)) \supseteq \text{Fix}(\varphi) \tag{5.5}
\]
and \( \varphi|_{\cup \mathcal{O}(\varphi)} \) is an automorphism of \( G[\cup \mathcal{O}(\varphi)] \).
Hence, for a given subpartition $\mathcal{S}$ (of $V$), if $\varphi$ is a subautomorphism of $G$ with $O(\varphi) = \mathcal{S}$, then

$$|\varphi| \leq |\text{co}(\mathcal{S})| + \ell(\mathcal{S})$$

and, clearly, any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(G[\cup\mathcal{S}])$ with $O(\sigma) = \mathcal{S}$ extends to an automorphism of $G[\text{co}(\mathcal{S}) \cup \bigcup \mathcal{S}]$.

Therefore, $G$ admits a size $t$ subautomorphism of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$ iff there is some derangement (permutation with no fixed points) $\sigma$ with $\mathcal{S} := O(\sigma)$ a subpartition of type $\lambda$, satisfying:

$$G \in A(\mathcal{S}, t) := \{ H : |\text{co}_H(\mathcal{S})| \geq t - \ell(\mathcal{S}) \}; \text{ and}$$

$$G \in B(\sigma) := \{ H : \sigma \text{ is a subautomorphism of } H \}. \tag{5.6}$$

We would like to bound, for a given derangement $\sigma$, the probability that both these conditions hold. To do so, we bound their probabilities separately and use the fact that they are independent (since they are determined by $G \cap A$ and $G \cap B$ respectively for some disjoint $A, B \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$).

We first observe that $|\text{co}(\mathcal{S})|$ is distributed binomially. For $S \subseteq V$ and $x \in V \setminus S$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[x \in \text{co}(\mathcal{S})] = q(S) := q(|S|) \left( = p^{|S|} + (1 - p)^{|S|} \right) \tag{5.7}$$

and, more generally, for a subpartition $\mathcal{S}$ of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$ and $x \not\in \bigcup \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[x \in \text{co}(\mathcal{S})] = q(\mathcal{S}) := \prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} q(S) \tag{5.8}$$

$$= \prod \left( p^{\lambda_i} + (1 - p)^{\lambda_i} \right) := q(\lambda) = q.$$

Therefore, since $|V \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{S}| = n - \ell$,

$$|\text{co}(\mathcal{S})| \sim \text{Bin}(n - \ell, q). \tag{5.9}$$

This will allow us to bound

$$\mathbb{P}[G \in A(\mathcal{S}, t)] = \mathbb{P}[\text{Bin}(n - \ell, q) \geq t - \ell] \tag{5.10}$$

using a tail bound.
We then bound $P[G \in B(\sigma)]$ for a derangement $\sigma$. Let $\sigma$ be a derangement with $O(\sigma) = S = \{S_i\}$ of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$ (where $|S_i| = \lambda_i$). By (5.1), we have

$$P[G \in B(\sigma)] = P[\sigma \in \text{Aut}(G[S])] = q(O(\sigma')).$$

So to bound $P[G \in B(\sigma)]$, we want to understand the structure of $O(\sigma')$ in terms of the $\lambda_i's$.

We observe that $\binom{S_i}{2}$ is partitioned in $O(\sigma')$ according to cyclic distance. Let $S_i = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{\lambda_i}\}$ with $\sigma(v_i) = v_{i+1}$ (indices taken modulo $\lambda_i$). Then

$$E_d := \{\{v_k, v_{k+d}\} : k \in [\lambda_i]\} \in O(\sigma')$$

for each $1 \leq d \leq \lambda/2$. Note that $|E_d| = \lambda_i$ for $d < \lambda/2$ and, if $\lambda_i$ is even, $|E_{\lambda_i/2}| = \lambda_i/2$. Thus $\cup E_d = \binom{S_i}{2}$ is a partition into $\lfloor \lambda_i - 1/2 \rfloor$ blocks of size $\lambda_i$, plus a block of size $\lambda_i/2$ when $\lambda_i$ is even.

For any $i \neq j$, $O(\sigma')$ partitions $\{\{x, y\} : x \in S_i, y \in S_j\}$ into $(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)$ blocks of size $[\lambda_i, \lambda_j]$ (where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denote greatest common divisor and least common multiple respectively).

Therefore

$$q(O(\sigma')) = \prod_i g(\lambda_i) \prod_j q([\lambda_i, \lambda_j])^{(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)/2}$$

(5.11)

where

$$g(s) = \begin{cases} 
q(s/2)/q(s) & \text{if } s \text{ is even,} \\
1/\sqrt{q(s)} & \text{if } s \text{ is odd.}
\end{cases}$$

For any $s \geq 2$ and $r > 1$,

$$q(s \cdot r) = p^{sr} + (1 - p)^{sr} < (p^s + (1 - p)^s)^r = q(s)^r$$

(see 5.5.1).
Applying this to (5.11) with \( r = \frac{[\lambda_i \lambda_j]}{\lambda_i} \geq 1 \), we get

\[
q(O(\sigma')) \leq \prod_i g(\lambda_i) \prod_j q(\lambda_i)^{\lambda_j/2}
\]

\[
= \prod_i g(\lambda_i) q(\lambda_i)^{\ell/2}
\]

\[
\leq \prod_i q(\lambda_i)^{\ell/2 - 1}
\]

\[
= q(\lambda)^{\ell^2 - 2} \tag{5.13}
\]

(since \( g(s) \leq 1/q(s) \)). Note that we have equality iff \( \lambda_i = 2 \) for all \( i \) (in which case \( q(O(\sigma')) = (1 - 2p(1 - p))^{(\ell - 2)/4} \)).

In fact, for any \( s \geq 2 \), (5.12) implies

\[
q(s) \leq q(2)^{s/2},
\]

and thus

\[
q(\lambda) = \prod_i q(\lambda_i) \leq \prod_i q(2)^{\lambda_i/2} = \prod_i (1 - 2p(1 - p))^{\lambda_i/2} = (1 - 2p(1 - p))^{\ell/2}. \tag{5.14}
\]

Combining (5.14) with (5.13), we get

\[
\mathbb{P}[\sigma \in \text{Aut}(G[\cup S])] \leq (1 - 2p(1 - p))^{(\ell - 2)/4}. \tag{5.15}
\]

Similarly, we use (5.11) to produce a lower bound for \( \mathbb{P}[G \in B(\sigma)] \):

\[
q(O(\sigma'))^2 \geq \prod_i g(\lambda_i)^2 \prod_j q(\lambda_i \lambda_j) \tag{5.16}
\]

\[
> \prod_i q(\lambda_i \ell) \tag{5.17}
\]

\[
> \prod_i (1 - p)^{\lambda_i \ell} \left( = (1 - p)^{\ell^2} \right)
\]

\[
\geq \prod_i q(\lambda_i)^{2\ell} \tag{5.18}
\]

\[
= q(\lambda)^{2\ell},
\]

where (5.16) and (5.17) are implied by the trivial inequality \( q(a)q(b) > q(ab) \), and (5.18) holds since \( (1 - p)^s \geq q(s)^2 \) for \( p \leq 1/2 \) and \( s \geq 2 \) (see 5.5.2). (We may opt to use the lower bound \( (1 - p)^{\ell^2} \) when an expression in terms of \( p \) is useful.)
Putting everything together, we get the following two-sided bound for a fixed derangement $\sigma$ of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$:

$$q(\lambda)^\ell \leq \mathbb{P}[G \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma)] \leq q(\lambda)^{\ell/2}. \quad (5.19)$$

As an easy application, we show the following slightly weaker version of Theorem 1.0.3.

**Lemma 5.2.1.** For all $1/2 \geq p = \frac{2 \ln n + \omega(1)}{n}$, w.h.p. $G = G_{n,p}$ is rigid.

**Proof.** Let $p = \frac{2(\ln n + c)}{n}$ for $c = c(n) = \omega(1)$. Given $S$ of type $\lambda \vdash \ell$, we can crudely bound

$$q(S) = \prod_i q(\lambda_i) \leq q(2)^{\frac{\ell}{2}}$$

(see (5.14)), implying

$$\mathbb{P}[|\text{co}(S)| = n - \ell] \leq (1 - 2p(1 - p))^{\ell(n - \ell)}. \quad (5.21)$$

We can bound the number of derangements on $\ell$ vertices by $\binom{n}{\ell}! < n^\ell$. Taking a union bound over all such derangements and combining (5.15) with (5.21), this gives

$$n^\ell(1 - 2p(1 - p))^{\ell(n - \ell) + (\frac{\ell}{2})} \leq \exp[\ell \ln n - p(1 - p)(n - \ell/2 - 1)]$$

$$\leq \exp \left[ \ell \left( \ln n - \frac{2(\ln n + c)}{n} \cdot \frac{n}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$= \exp[-c\ell]$$

(5.22)

(since $p(1 - p)$ is increasing for $p \leq 1/2$).

Therefore the probability that $G$ is rigid is

$$1 - \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \exp[-c\ell] = 1 - o(1).$$

This result is essentially best possible with the present approach, as

$$\mathbb{E} |\text{Aut}(G)| > \mathbb{P}[G = \emptyset] \cdot n! = \exp[(n(\ln n - pn/2 - O(1))] \gg 1$$

for $p = \frac{2 \ln n - \omega(1)}{n}$. 

\[\square\]
5.3 Main Results

We start with an essentially tight result in the special case \( p = 1/2 \). In this case, we define the weight of \( \varphi \), a subautomorphism of type \( \lambda \vdash \ell \), to be

\[
w(\varphi) = w(\lambda) := \sum_i (\lambda_i - 1) \tag{5.23}\]

(i.e. the number of mobile points minus the number of non-trivial orbits) and observe that

\[
q(\lambda) = 2^{-w(\lambda)}. \tag{5.24}
\]

**Theorem 5.3.1.** W.h.p. every subautomorphism \( \varphi \) of \( G = G_{n,1/2} \) satisfies \( w(\varphi) \leq (2 + \omega(1)) \log n \) and \( |\varphi| \leq 2^{-w} + \sqrt{5n \log n} \).

**Proof.** We will actually show that w.h.p. every \( \varphi \) satisfies

\[
w(\varphi) \leq 2 \log n + 5
\]

and

\[
|\varphi| < 2^{-w(\varphi)}n + \Delta(n, w(\varphi)), \tag{5.25}
\]

where

\[
\Delta(n, w) = \max\{2w(\log n - w/2 + \log \log n), 3\sqrt{w^2 - n \log n}\}. \tag{5.26}
\]

Since there are fewer than \( n^\ell \) derangements on \( \ell \) vertices, it suffices to show, for every derangement \( \sigma \) of size \( \ell \), that the probability that \( \sigma \) extends to a subautomorphism of size \( t = t(n, w(\sigma)) := 2^{-w(\sigma)}n + \Delta(n, w(\sigma)) \) is less than \( \delta(\ell) n^{-\ell} \) where \( \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \delta(\ell) = o(1) \) (here we take \( \delta(\ell) = 2^{-\ell} / \log n \) for ease).

Given \( \lambda \vdash \ell \), we set \( w = w(\lambda) \), \( \Delta = \Delta(n, w) \) and \( t = t(n, w) \) and note that

\[
\ell/2 \leq w < \ell. \tag{5.27}
\]

Thus, given a derangement \( \sigma \) with \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O}(\sigma) \) of type \( \lambda \vdash \ell \geq 2 \), we want to show (recall [5.6])

\[
P[G \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S}, t)] \cdot P[G \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma)] \cdot (2n)^{\ell} \log n \leq 1.
\]
Combining (5.19) with (5.24) gives
\[ P[G \in B(\sigma)] \leq 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}}. \] (5.28)

Since \( w < \ell \) (see (5.27)), we have
\[ -w\frac{\ell - 2}{2} = -\frac{\ell w}{2} + w < -\frac{w}{\ell} (\frac{w}{2} - 1). \]

Therefore
\[
\log \left[ P[G \in B(\sigma)] \cdot (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] \leq \log \left[ 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] \\
= \ell (\log n + 1) - w(\ell/2 - 1) + \log \log n \\
< \ell (\log n + 2 - w/2 + \log \log n/\ell),
\] (5.29)

which is less than 0 for \( w > 2 \log n + 5 \). Hence, when \( w > 2 \log n + 5 \),
\[ P[G \in B(\sigma)] \cdot (2n)^{\ell} \log n \leq 1, \]
so w.h.p. every subautomorphism of \( G \) has weight at most \( 2 \log n + 5 \).

We may therefore assume \( w \leq 2 \log n + 5 \), so (using \( \ell \leq 2w \) and (5.26))
\[ \ell/\Delta \leq 1/(\log n - w/2 + \log \log n) < 2/ \log \log n =: \varepsilon(n) \ll 1. \]

Thus (see (5.10))
\[ P[G \in A(S, t)] = P[|\text{co}(S)| \geq t - \ell] \\
= P[\text{Bin}(n - \ell, q) \geq nq + \Delta - \ell] \] (5.30)
\[ \leq P[\text{Bin}(n, q) \geq nq + (1 - \varepsilon)\Delta]. \]

We use Chernoff’s inequality [30, Theorem 2.1],
\[ P[\text{Bin}(n, q) \geq nq + \Delta] \leq \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta^2}{2(nq + \Delta/3)} \right], \] (5.31)
the r.h.s. of which we bound by
\[ B(n, q, \Delta) := \max\left\{ \exp \left[ -\frac{\Delta^2}{4nq} \right], \exp \left[ -\frac{3\Delta}{4} \right] \right\}; \] (5.32)

Using the two alternatives for \( \Delta \) (see (5.26)), we show that either expression in (5.32) is strong enough to imply
\[ B(n, q, (1 - \varepsilon)\Delta) \cdot 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \leq 1. \]
We use $\Delta \geq 2w(\log n - w/2 + \log \log n)$ to show
\[
\exp \left[ -\frac{3(1 - \varepsilon)\Delta}{4} \right] 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \leq 1,
\]
which is equivalent to each of
\[
\left( -\frac{3(1 - \varepsilon)\Delta \log e}{4} \right) + \log \left[ 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] \leq 0
\]
and
\[
\frac{4}{3 \log e} \log \left[ 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \Delta.
\] (5.33)

Using (5.29), we have
\[
\frac{4}{3 \log e} \log \left[ 2^{-w\frac{\ell - 2}{2}} (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] < \frac{4}{3 \log e} \ell (\log n + 2 - w/2 + \log \log n/\ell)
\]
\[
< (1 - \varepsilon)2w(\log n - w/2 + \log \log n) \quad (5.34)
\]
\[
\leq (1 - \varepsilon) \Delta
\]
(where (5.34) holds since $(1 - \varepsilon) > 4/(3 \log e)$, $2w \geq \ell$, and $\log \log n > 2 + \log \log n/\ell$), giving (5.33) as desired.

Similarly, we use $\Delta \geq 3\sqrt{w2^{-w}n \log n}$ to show
\[
\exp \left[ -\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)2\Delta^2}{4nq} \right] (2n)^{\ell} \log n \leq 1,
\]
which is implied by each of
\[
\left( -\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)2\Delta^2 \log e}{4nq} \right) + \log \left[ (2n)^{\ell} \log n \right] \leq 0
\]
and
\[
\sqrt{\frac{4n2^{-w}}{\log e} \ell (\log n + 1 + \log \log n/\ell)} \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \Delta.
\] (5.35)

Since $\log n + 1 + \log \log n < (1 + \varepsilon) \log n$ (very crudely) and $\ell \leq 2w$,
\[
\sqrt{\frac{4}{\log e} \ell 2^{-w}n (\log n + 1 + \log \log n/\ell)} < \sqrt{\frac{8(1 + \varepsilon)}{\log e} w2^{-w}n \log n}
\]
\[
< 3(1 - \varepsilon) \sqrt{w2^{-w}n \log n} \quad (5.36)
\]
\[
\leq (1 - \varepsilon) \Delta
\]
(where (5.36) holds since $3(1 - \varepsilon) > \sqrt{8(1 + \varepsilon)/\log e}$), giving (5.35).
A couple remarks regarding Theorem 5.3.1:

- A relatively straightforward argument shows that $\Delta$ is essentially tight for fixed $\ell$. In particular, for fixed $\lambda \vdash \ell$, there exists $C = C(\lambda)$ such that w.h.p. $G$ admits a subautomorphism $\varphi$ of type $\lambda$ with $|\varphi| > n2^{-w} + \Delta/C$. (Note $\Delta/C = \Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})$.)

- Similarly, we get $|\varphi| \leq (1 + o(1))2 \log^2 n$ for $w(\varphi) \approx \log n$, which is off by at most $\log n$ since w.h.p. $\omega(G) \sim 2 \log n$ (where $\omega(G)$ is the size of a largest clique in $G$).

We close this section with a weaker result for general $p = p(n)$.

**Theorem 5.3.2.** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $G = G_{n,p}$ with $1/2 \geq p \gg \ln^2 n$. W.h.p.

$$|\varphi| < (q(O(\varphi)) + \varepsilon)n$$

for every subautomorphism $\varphi$ of $G$.

**Proof.** We may assume $p > \frac{20 \ln^2 n}{\varepsilon^2 n}$. We want to show that w.h.p. no $\varphi$ violating (5.37) is a subautomorphism of $G$. It suffices to show, for any derangement $\sigma$ on $\ell$ vertices and $t = t(n, \sigma) := (q(O(\sigma)) + \varepsilon)n$, that $P[G \in B(\sigma)] \cdot P[G \in A(O(\sigma), t)]$ is less than $\delta(\ell)n^{-\ell}$ for $\sum_{\ell \geq 2} \delta(\ell) = o(1)$ (here $\delta(\ell) = n^{-\ell}$ for simplicity).

We split into two cases depending on $\ell$. If $\ell p > 10 \ln n$, then (5.15) gives

$$P[G \in B(\sigma)] \leq \exp \left[-\ell \left( \frac{\ell - 2}{2} \right) p(1 - p) \right] < \exp \left[-\ell^2 p/5 \right] < n^{-2\ell}.$$

We are left with cases where $\ell \leq 10 \ln n/p < \varepsilon^2 n/(2 \ln n)$. In such cases, we use

$$P[G \in A(O(\sigma), t)] = P[\text{Bin}(n - \ell, q) \geq (q + \varepsilon)n - \ell]$$

(see (5.10)). We apply Hoeffding’s inequality to bound (5.38) by

$$\exp \left[-2(\varepsilon n - (1 - q)\ell)^2 \right] < \exp[-\varepsilon^2 n] < n^{-2\ell}$$

(since $2\ell \ln n < \varepsilon^2 n$).  \qed
We give the following as an immediate corollary.

**Corollary 5.3.3.** For any \(\varepsilon, p > 0\), w.h.p. \(G_{n,p}\) is locally \(((1 - 2p(1-p) + \varepsilon)n)\)-rigid.

**Proof of Corollary 5.3.3.** For \(p\) as in Theorem 5.3.2 we simply observe that

\[
q(O(\varphi)) \leq (1 - 2p(1-p))
\]

for any non-trivial permutation \(\varphi\). If \(p = O\left(\frac{\ln^2 n}{n}\right)\), then \(n(1 - 2p(1-p) + \varepsilon) > n\) and the statement holds vacuously.

### 5.4 Further Questions

**A.** While Theorem 5.3.2 holds vacuously for \(p \ll 1/n\) (since then \(q_p(\lambda) \geq q(n) = 1 - o(1)\), so \((q + \varepsilon)n > n\), it is unclear what can be said for \(\Omega(1/n) = p = O(\ln^2 n/n)\).

**B.** It would be interesting to extend our results to \(G_{n,d}\) in analogy with Kim-Sudakov-Vu [36]. There has also been work on the rigidity of Preferential Attachment graphs (see e.g. [41]) and it would be interesting to see if an analogous result regarding local rigidity is possibly there.

**C.** It seems likely that existing results on the asymmetry of \(G_{n,p}\) (e.g. Theorem 1.0.3 as well as the much stronger theorem on the rigidity of the 2-core of \(G\) due to Linial and Mosheiff [39]) can be extended to the following “hitting time” result.

**Conjecture 5.4.1.** Let \(e_1, \ldots, e_N\) be a uniformly random ordering of the pairs \(\binom{V}{2}\) (where \(|V| = n\) and \(N = \binom{n}{2}\)) and \(G_t = \{e_1, \ldots, e_t\}\). Let

\[
T_0 = \min\{t : G_t \text{ has at most one isolated vertex}\}; \quad \text{and} \quad T_1 = \max\{t : \overline{G}_t \text{ has at most one isolated vertex}\}.
\]

Then w.h.p. \(G_t\) is rigid for all \(t \in [T_0, T_1]\).

Clearly \(G_t\) is non-rigid for all \(t < T_0\). Although \(G_{T_0}\) is non-rigid when it has no isolates (as this implies the exposure process went from 2 isolates to 0 isolates at step \(T_0\), so \(G_{T_0}\) contains vertices \(x, y\) adjacent only to each other), this occurs with probability \(O(1/n)\). (Of course, the same comments apply to \(G_{T_1}\).)
While our machinery seems promising for showing $G_{T_0}$ is rigid, it seems not so easy to couple $G_t$ and $G_{n,p}$ (for $p = t/N$) in a manner which respects rigidity (as rigidity is a highly non-monotone property).

5.5 Minor Inequalities

5.5.1

We want to show

$$p^{sr} + (1 - p)^{sr} < (p^s + (1 - p)^s)^r$$

for $s, r \geq 1$. It suffices to show

$$\frac{(a + b)^r}{a^r + b^r} = \frac{(1 + b/a)^r}{1 + (b/a)^r} = \frac{(1 + \gamma)^r}{1 + \gamma^r} > 1$$

for $\gamma = b/a > 0$ and $r > 1$. Taking derivatives of top and bottom w.r.t. $\gamma$ and comparing, we get $r(1 + \gamma)^{r-1} > r\gamma^{r-1}$ and are done as the ratio is 1 for $\gamma = 0$.

5.5.2

We want to show

$$(1 - p)^{s/2} \geq p^s + (1 - p)^s$$

for $s \geq 2$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1/2$. Setting $s = 2r$, this is equivalent to showing

$$1 \geq \left(\frac{p^2}{1 - p}\right)^r + (1 - p)^r$$

(5.39)

for $r \geq 1$. At $r = 1$, this becomes

$$(1 - p) \geq p^2 + (1 - p)^2$$

$$p(1 - 2p) \geq 0,$$

which holds for $p \leq 1/2$. Thus it suffices to show that the derivative of the r.h.s. of (5.39) with respect to $r$ is negative:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{p^2}{1 - p}\right)^r + (1 - p)^r = \left(\frac{p^2}{1 - p}\right)^r \ln \left(\frac{p^2}{1 - p}\right) + (1 - p)^r \ln(1 - p) < 0.$$ 

This clearly holds since $p^2/(1 - p) < 1$. 
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