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Abstract. We consider the effect of subtracting edges from complete graphs on the “tightness” of the Kruskal-Katona upper bounds for the numbers of complete subgraphs.

Introduction. In graph theory, knowing the number of complete subgraphs with \( r \) vertices that a graph \( g \) has, limits the number of its complete subgraphs with \( s \) vertices, for \( s > r \). A useful upper bound was given by J. Kruskal in [5], rediscovered by G. Katona in [4]. This, so-called Kruskal-Katona bound is not always tight (see [2]); however, there are obvious cases when it is a tight bound, for example, complete graphs. In [1], B. Bollobás proved a theorem that provided some additional graphs where these bounds are tight.

Definition. If \( x \) is a non-negative integer its \( r \)-canonical representation is \( \binom{n}{r} + \binom{m}{r-1} + ... + \binom{u}{r-j} \), where \( n \) is chosen as large as possible with \( \binom{n}{r} < x \), then \( m \) is chosen as large as possible with \( \binom{m}{r-1} < (x - \binom{n}{r}) \), ..., etc., and, \( x = \binom{n}{r} + \binom{m}{r-1} + ... + \binom{u}{r-j} \). We shall denote the \( r \)-canonical representation of \( x \) by \([x]_r^r\). If \( r < s \), let \([x]_s^r\) be the result of replacing \( r \) by \( s \) in the \( r \)-canonical representation of \( x \), that is, \([x]_s^r = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{m}{s-1} + ... + \binom{u}{s-j} \).

It is easy to see that \( n > m > ... > u \). Also, any binomial coefficient whose top entry is less than its bottom entry is taken to be 0.

Definition. \( K_r \) shall denote the complete graph with \( r \) vertices, that is the graph with \( r \) vertices with an edge between any pair of its vertices. If \( g \) is a graph and \( r > 1 \), \( k_r(g) \) will denote the number of its \( K_r \) subgraphs.

The following theorem is a consequence of Theorem 1 in Kruskal[5].

Theorem 1. If \( r < s \) and \( g \) is any graph with \( k_r(g) \leq x \), then \( k_s(g) \leq [x]_s^r \).

The upper bound in Theorem 1 is known as the Kruskal-Katona bound and it is not always tight (see [2]).

Since this upper bound isn’t always tight, we shall introduce the following notation due to B. Bollobás [1].

Definition. If \( r < s \), \( k_s(k_r \leq x) \) is the maximum number of \( K_s \) subgraphs in a graph that has at most \( x \), \( K_r \) subgraphs.

It is easy to see that \( h(x) = k_s(k_r \leq x) \) is a non-decreasing function of \( x \).
The following then is just a restatement of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1.** If \( r < s \), then \( k_s(k_r \leq x) \leq \lfloor x \rfloor^s_r \).

It is known that equality is not always achieved in the above theorem; for example, see [2]. However, the following result is due to B. Bollobás [1]. We include the proof of this theorem of Bollobás, since we shall make use of it in what follows.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose \( r < s < n \). If \( \lfloor x \rfloor^r_s = \binom{n}{r} + \binom{m}{r-1} \), we have \( k_s(k_r \leq x) = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{m}{s-1} = \lfloor x \rfloor^s_r \).

**Proof.** Surely, \( k_s(k_r \leq x) \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{m}{s-1} = \lfloor x \rfloor^s_r \), by Theorem 1. To show equality, consider the graph \( g \), obtained by joining a new vertex to \( m \) vertices of the complete graph, \( K_n \). Clearly, \( k_s(g) = \binom{n}{r} + \binom{m}{r-1} \) and \( k_s(g) = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{m}{s-1} \).

Suppose now that instead of adding to a complete graph a vertex and edges, we start with a complete graph and subtract edges from it. Suppose, for example, we subtract from the complete graph, \( K_n \), a vertex and \( p \) edges connected to that vertex, where \( p < n \). In effect, we are left with a graph isomorphic to the complete graph, \( K_{n-1} \) with a new vertex joined by \( m = n - p \) edges to \( K_{n-1} \). Thus we get the following as a corollary to Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** If graph \( g \) is obtained by deleting \( p \) edges from the complete graph \( K_n \), \( p < n \), where all \( p \) edges are incident to a single vertex, then \( k_s(g) = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n-p}{s-1} \).

If not all the edges to be deleted are incident with a single vertex, the situation is not as simple; for example, suppose just two edges are deleted, but these edges are not incident. These graphs, complete graphs with two non-incident edges removed, are the same as the Turan graphs, \( T(n, n-2) \). (The Turan graph \( T(n, k) \) is the graph formed by partitioning a set of \( n \) vertices into \( k \) subsets with sizes as equal as possible (differing by at most 1) and connecting two vertices by an edge if and only if they belong to different sets of the partition. This follows because the partition sets of \( T(n, n-2) \) can be taken to be: \{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}, \{5\}, \{6\}, ..., \{n\}; so only edges (1, 2) and (3, 4) are forbidden.)

Next, consider the \( g \), below, the complete graph on 12 vertices with edges (1,2) and (3,4) deleted. Let’s compute the numbers of \( K_3 \) and \( K_4 \) subgraphs of \( g \).
There are 200 $K_3$ subgraphs ($\binom{12}{3} - 2(10)$) and 406 $K_4$ subgraphs ($\binom{12}{4} - 2\binom{10}{2} + 1$); however, the Kruskal-Katona bound for the $K_4$ subgraphs, for any graph with 200 $K_3$ subgraphs is $[200]^3 = 407$ which is only one more than the actual number of $K_4$ subgraphs in $g$. This is true in general, that is, if we consider, $K_n$ with two non incident edges deleted, there are ($\binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)$) $K_3$ subgraphs and ($\binom{n}{4} - 2\binom{n-2}{2} + 1$) $K_4$ subgraphs. If $x = \left(\binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)\right)$, then it is not difficult to show that $x = \left(\binom{n-1}{3} + \binom{n-4}{2} + \binom{n-5}{1}\right)$ and hence, $[x]^3_4 = \left(\binom{n-1}{4} + \binom{n-4}{3} + \binom{n-5}{2}\right)$.

Using a computer algebra program, such as Mathematica or using the Pascal identity judiciously, it can be shown that $\left(\binom{n}{4} - 2\binom{n-2}{2} + 1\right) = \binom{n-1}{4} + \binom{n-4}{3} + \binom{n-5}{2}$. One may show that the number of $K_4$ subgraphs in $T(n,n-2)$ is one less than the Kruskal-Katona bound, $[x]^3_4$, where $x$ is the number of $K_3$ subgraphs of $T(n,n-2)$.

Thus, $k_4(k_3 \leq x) \geq [x]^3_4 - 1$, when $x = \left(\binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)\right)$, $n > 6$. Since it is always the case that $k_4(k_3 \leq x) \leq [x]^3_4$, we have proved the following result.

**Theorem 4.** If $x = \left(\binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)\right)$, $[x]^3_4 - 1 \leq k_4(k_3 \leq x) \leq [x]^3_4$, $n > 6$.

It is our opinion that these Turan graphs, $T(n,n-2)$, are “maximal examples,” in that one cannot find graphs with greater numbers of $K_4$ subgraphs given their number $x$ of $K_3$ subgraphs, that is, we conjecture that their number of $K_4$ subgraphs is the best that can be achieved for general graphs with $x$ $K_3$ subgraphs.

**Conjecture.** If $n > 6$, and $x = \left(\binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)\right)$, then $k_4(k_3 \leq x) = [x]^3_4 - 1$.

It is to be stressed that the above results and conjecture only apply to $K_3$, $K_4$ subgraphs. Presumably the results would be different for other $K_r$, $K_s$ subgraphs with $r < s$. For example, for $K_3$, $K_5$ subgraphs, and the Turan graphs, $T(n,n-2)$ we have the following table that was generated in Mathematica using the methods in [3].
This suggests that the number of $K_5$ subgraphs in $T(n, n-2)$ given $x = \binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)$, $K_3$ subgraphs is $(n-5)$ less than the Kruskal-Katona bound $\lceil x \rceil^3$. The number of $K_5$ subgraphs of $K_n$ is $\binom{n}{5} - 2\binom{n-2}{3} + (n-4)$; while the K-K bound $\lceil x \rceil^3 = \binom{n-1}{5} + \binom{n-4}{4} + \binom{n-5}{3}$. On subtracting $(n-5)$ from $\lceil x \rceil^3$ and simplifying, it must be shown that: $\binom{n}{5} - 2\binom{n-2}{3} + (2n-9) = \binom{n-1}{5} + \binom{n-4}{4} + \binom{n-5}{3}$. This can be verified, in general, using a computer algebra system, such as Mathematica. Hence we have proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.** If $x = \binom{n}{3} - 2(n-2)$, then $k_5(k_3 \leq x) \geq \binom{n}{5} - 2\binom{n-2}{3} + (n-4)$.

Whether or not $k_5(k_3 \leq x) = \binom{n}{5} - 2\binom{n-2}{3} + (n-4)$, for some or all values of $n > 6$, is an open problem. Other combinations also yield interesting results that might be investigated.
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