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Abstract

Given graphs $G$ and $H$, the generalized Turán number $\text{ex}(G, H)$ is the maximum number of edges in an $H$-free subgraph of $G$. In this paper, we obtain an asymptotic upper bound on $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l})$ for any $n \geq 3$ and $l \geq 2$, where $C_{2l}$ is the cycle of length $2l$ and $CT_n$ is the complete transposition graph which is defined as the Cayley graph on the symmetric group $S_n$ with respect to the set of all transpositions of $S_n$.
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1 Introduction

Throughout this paper graphs are finite and undirected with no loops or multiple edges. The vertex and edge sets of a graph $G$ are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. The numbers of vertices and edges of $G$ are denoted by $v(G)$ and $e(G)$, respectively. The degree of a vertex $x \in V(G)$ in $G$ is denoted by $d_G(x)$, and the edge joining vertices $u$ and $w$ are denoted as an unordered pair $\{u, w\}$. A cycle with $l$ edges is called an $l$-cycle or a cycle of length $l$, where $l \geq 3$. A path with length $l$ is called an $l$-path, where $l \geq 1$. As usual an $l$-cycle is denoted by $C_l$ and an $l$-path by $P_l$. Two graphs $G$ and $H$ are said to be isomorphic if there exists a bijection $f$ from $V(G)$ to $V(H)$ such that $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$ if and only if $\{f(x), f(y)\} \in E(H)$.

Let $G$ and $H$ be graphs. We say that $G$ is $H$-free if there exists no subgraph of $G$ which is isomorphic to $H$. The generalized Turán number $\text{ex}(G, H)$ is the maximum number of edges in an $H$-free spanning subgraph of $G$. This invariant proposed by Erdős [10] is a generalization of the well-known Turán number $\text{ex}(n, H)$ which gives the maximum number of edges in an $H$-free graph with $n$ vertices. In the literature there is a huge amount of work
on Turán numbers and generalized Turán numbers, beginning with Mantel [23] who proved that \( \text{ex}(n, K_3) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor \) and Turán [26] who determined \( \text{ex}(n, K_r) \) for any \( r \geq 3 \), where \( K_r \) is the complete graph with \( r \) vertices. In [13], Erdős and Simonovits obtained an asymptotic formula for \( \text{ex}(n, H) \) in terms of the chromatic number of \( H \). But when \( H \) is bipartite the situation is considerably more complicated, and we can only deduce that \( \text{ex}(n, H) = o(n^2) \). Herein and in the rest of this paper asymptotics are taken as \( n \to \infty \). In general, it is a challenging problem to determine \( \text{ex}(G, H) \) when \( H \) is a bipartite graph, especially when \( H \) is an even cycle. In this regard, two interesting functions that have received much attention are \( \text{ex}(G, K) \) and \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{2l}) \), where \( K_s,t \) is the complete bipartite graph with \( s \) and \( t \) vertices, respectively, in the biparts of its bipartition, and \( Q_n \) is the \( n \)-dimensional hypercube. The problem of determining \( \text{ex}(K_{m,n}, K_s,t) \), proposed by Zarankiewicz in [28], is the analogue of Turán’s original problem (the one of determining \( \text{ex}(K_n, K_s) = \text{ex}(n, K_s) \)) for bipartite graphs, and an excellent survey on this problem can be found in [18]. Besides, some related research was dedicated to showing \( \text{ex}(G, K_{l,t}) \), where \( G \) is some other certain restricted graph. See e.g. [15, 16].

The study of \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{2l}) \) began with a problem raised by Erdős which asks for the maximum number of edges in a \( C_4 \)-free spanning subgraph of \( Q_n \). In [10], Erdős conjectured that \((1 + o(1))e(Q_n)\) should be an upper bound for \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_4) \), and he also asked whether \( o(e(Q_n)) \) edges of \( Q_n \) would ensure the existence of a cycle \( C_{2l} \) for \( l \geq 3 \). The best known upper bound for \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_4) \), obtained by Balogh et al. [3] and improved slightly the bounds of Chung [7] and Wagner [25], is \((0.6068 + o(1))e(Q_n)\). The problem of determining the value of \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{2l}) \) when \( l = 3 \) or \( 5 \) is still open too, and progresses can be found in [1, 2, 3, 7, 8]. For \( l \geq 2 \), upper bounds for \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{4l}) \) and \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{4l+6}) \) were obtained by Chung [7] and Füredi and Özkahya [17], respectively, and their results together imply that \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{2l'}) = o(e(Q_n)) \) for \( l' \geq 6 \) or \( l' = 4 \). In [9], Conlon proved that \( \text{ex}(Q_n, H) = o(e(Q_n)) \) for any graph \( H \) that admits a \( k \)-partite representation. This gives a unified approach to the proof that \( \text{ex}(Q_n, C_{2l'}) = o(e(Q_n)) \) for all \( l' \neq 5 \) no less than 4. The doubled Johnson graphs \( J(n; k, k+1) \), where \( 1 \leq k \leq (n-1)/2 \), form an interesting family of spanning subgraphs of \( Q_n \), and in particular the doubled odd graph \( \tilde{O}_{k+1} := J(2k + 1; k, k+1) \) is known to be distance-transitive. Recently, Cao et al. [6] studied \( \text{ex}(J(n; k, k+1), C_{2l}) \) and proved among other things that \( \text{ex}(\tilde{O}_{k+1}, C_{2l}) = o(e(\tilde{O}_{k+1})) \) for \( l \geq 6 \).

In this paper, we study the generalized Turán number \( \text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) \) for the complete transposition graph \( CT_n \), where \( n \geq 3 \) and \( l \geq 2 \). The complete transposition graphs are an important family of Cayley graphs which share several interesting properties with hypercubes. For example, both \( CT_n \) and \( Q_n \) are bipartite and arc-transitive, with only integral eigenvalues, and both graphs are popular topologies for interconnection networks [20]. Over the years several aspects of complete transposition graphs such as automorphisms, eigenvalues, connectivity and bisection width have been studied as one can find in, for example, [19, 21, 22, 24, 27]. In general, given a group \( G \) with identity element 1 and an inverse-closed subset \( S \) of \( G \setminus \{1\} \), the Cayley graph \( \text{Cay}(G, S) \) on \( G \) with respect to the connection set \( S \) is defined to be the graph with vertex set \( G \) such that \( x, y \in G \) are adjacent if and only if \( yx^{-1} \in S \). The complete transposition graph \( CT_n \) is defined as the Cayley graph on the
symmetric group $S_n$ whose connection set is the set of all transpositions of $S_n$. That is,

$$V(CT_n) = S_n,$$

$$E(CT_n) = \{ \{x, y\} : x, y \in S_n \text{ and } y = ux \text{ for some transposition } u \text{ of } S_n \}. $$

It follows that $CT_n$ is a connected $\binom{n}{2}$-regular bipartite graph with

$$v := v(CT_n) = n!$$

vertices and

$$e(CT_n) = \frac{v(n)}{2} \binom{n}{2}$$

edges.

The main result in this paper is as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $n$ and $l$ be integers with $n \geq 3$ and $l \geq 2$.

(i) If $l \geq 4$ and $l$ is even, then $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) = O(n^{1 + \frac{2}{l}}) e(CT_n)$.

(ii) If $l \geq 4$ and $l$ is odd, then

$$\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) = \begin{cases} O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) e(CT_n), & \text{if } l = 7, \\ O(n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4(l-3)}}) e(CT_n), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

(iii) If $l = 3$, then $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) \leq (\sqrt{2} - 1 + o(1)) e(CT_n)$.

(iv) If $l = 2$, then $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) \leq \frac{3}{2} e(CT_n)$.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) = o(e(CT_n))$ for $l \geq 4$. This leads to the following Ramsey-type result.

**Corollary 1.2.** Let $t$ and $l$ be integers with $t \geq 1$ and $l \geq 4$. If $CT_n$ is edge-partitioned into $t$ subgraphs, then one of the subgraphs must contain $C_{2l}$ provided that $n$ is sufficiently large (depending only on $t$ and $l$).

In the next section we will prove some basic properties of cycles in the complete transposition graphs. Using these preparations we will prove parts (i)-(ii) and (iii)-(iv) of Theorem 1.1 in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume that $S_n$ is the symmetric group on $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where $n \geq 3$. The identity element of $S_n$ is denoted by id. The support of an element $x \in S_n$ is defined as $\text{supp}(x) = \{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \mid i^x \neq i\}$.

**Definition 2.1.** The support of an edge $\{u, z\}$ of $CT_n$, denoted by $\text{supp}(\{u, z\})$, is defined to be the support of the transposition $zu^{-1}$. That is, $\text{supp}(\{u, z\}) = \text{supp}(zu^{-1})$.  

Since $CT_n$ is a Cayley graph on the symmetric group $S_n$ whose connection set consists of all transpositions, we know that $\text{supp}\{u, z\}$ is a 2-subset of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ for any $(u, z) \in E(CT_n)$, and $\text{supp}\{u, z\} = \text{supp}\{z, u\}$). Note that, for any two incident edges $\{x, u\}$ and $\{x, z\}$ of $CT_n$, we have $|\text{supp}\{x, u\} \cap \text{supp}\{x, z\}| = 0$ or 1. For any subgraph $H$ of $CT_n$, we define

$$\text{supp}(H) := \bigcup_{\{u, z\} \in E(H)} \text{supp}\{u, z\}.$$ 

Let $P = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t)$ be a path in $CT_n$. Setting $w_i = u_i u_{i-1}^{-1}$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, t\}$, we have $u_1 u_1^{-1} = w_t w_{t-1} \cdots w_3 w_2$ and hence $\text{supp}(w_i u_i^{-1}) \subseteq \text{supp}(P)$.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $g$ and $h$ be distinct transpositions of $S_n$. Then the only 4-cycles in $CT_n$ passing through the 2-path $(g, \text{id}, h)$ are $(\text{id}, g, hg, h, \text{id})$ and $(\text{id}, g, gh, h, \text{id})$. In particular, if $gh = hg$, then these 4-cycles are identical and they are the only 4-cycle in $CT_n$ passing through the 2-path $(g, \text{id}, h)$.

**Proof.** Suppose $gh = hg$. Then $|\text{supp}(g) \cap \text{supp}(h)| = 0$. Note that $\text{id}$, $g$ and $h$ are three vertices in $CT_n$. Let $w$ be a common neighbor of the vertices $g$ and $h$ in $CT_n$. Then there exist transpositions $x, y$ such that $xy = yg = w$, implying that $gh = xy$. Since the supports of $g$ and $h$ are disjoint, the equation $gh = xy$ holds if and only if $g = x$ and $h = y$, or $g = y$ and $h = x$. Therefore, $w$ is either the vertex $\text{id}$ or the vertex $gh$. Thus, there exists a unique 4-cycle in $CT_n$ passing through $g, \text{id}$ and $h$, which is $(\text{id}, g, hg = gh, h, \text{id})$.

Suppose $gh \neq hg$. Then $|\text{supp}(g) \cap \text{supp}(h)| = 1$. Without loss of generality we may assume $g = (1, 2)$, and $h = (1, 3)$. Let $w$ be a common neighbor of the vertices $g$ and $h$ in $CT_n$. Then there exist transpositions $x, y$ such that $xy = gh = w$, implying that $xy = gh = (1, 2)(1, 3) = (1, 2, 3)$. If we decompose $(1, 2, 3)$ into the product of two transpositions of $S_n$, then the supports of these two transpositions must lie in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and contain exactly one common letter. Therefore, the only ways to decompose $(1, 2, 3)$ into the product of two transpositions of $S_n$ are $(1, 2, 3) = (1, 3)(2, 3) = (2, 3)(1, 2) = (1, 2)(1, 3)$. Hence, we have $x = (1, 3)$ and $y = (2, 3)$, or $x = (2, 3)$ and $y = (1, 2)$, or $x = (1, 2)$ and $y = (1, 3)$, yielding $w \in \{\text{id}, (1, 3, 2), (1, 2, 3)\}$. Therefore, there are exactly two 4-cycles in $CT_n$ passing through $g, \text{id}$ and $h$, namely $(\text{id}, g, hg, h, \text{id})$ and $(\text{id}, g, gh, h, \text{id})$. \hfill $\Box$

It is well known that any permutation in $S_n$ can be expressed as a product of transpositions, and for each $g \in S_n$ the map $\hat{g} : h \mapsto hg$, $h \in S_n$ defines an automorphism of $CT_n$. Hence Lemma 2.2 implies the following result.

**Corollary 2.3.** Let $(u, x, z)$ be a 2-path in $CT_n$. If $|\text{supp}\{x, u\} \cap \text{supp}\{x, z\}| = 0$, then there is a unique 4-cycle in $CT_n$ containing $(u, x, z)$, namely $\{x, z, zx^{-1}u, u, x\}$; and if $|\text{supp}\{x, u\} \cap \text{supp}\{x, z\}| = 1$, then there are exactly two 4-cycles in $CT_n$ containing $(u, x, z)$, namely $\{x, z, zx^{-1}u, u, x\}$ and $\{x, z, ux^{-1}z, u, x\}$.

Denote by $n(C_4)$ the number of 4-cycles in $CT_n$. Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 together imply the following result.

**Corollary 2.4.** The following hold.
(i) The length of a shortest cycle in \( CT_n \) is 4.

(ii) For any edge \( \{u, z\} \) of \( CT_n \), there are exactly \( \frac{1}{4}(n-2)(n+1) \) cycles of length 4 in \( CT_n \) containing \( \{u, z\} \).

(iii) \( n(C_4) = \frac{1}{8}(n-2)(n+1)e(CT_n) \).

**Proof.** Since \( CT_n \) is bipartite, it does not contain any 3-cycle. On the other hand, 4-cycles exist in \( CT_n \) by Lemma 2.2. So any shortest cycle in \( CT_n \) has length 4 as stated in (i).

For any edge \( \{u, z\} \) of \( CT_n \), there are exactly \( \binom{n-2}{2} \) 2-paths \( (u, z, w) \) such that \( |\text{supp}(\{u, z\}) \cap \text{supp}(\{z, w\})| = 0 \), and there are exactly \( n-2 \) 2-paths \( (u, z, w) \) such that \( |\text{supp}(\{u, z\}) \cap \text{supp}(\{z, w\})| = 1 \). Hence, by Corollary 2.3, the number of 4-cycles containing any given edge of \( CT_n \) is equal to \( \binom{n-2}{2} + 2(n-2) = \frac{1}{2}(n-2)(n+1) \) as claimed in (ii). We obtain (iii) from (ii) immediately. \( \square \)

Let

\[ \mathcal{F}_0 = \{ \text{all transpositions of } S_n \} \]

and

\[ \mathcal{F}_i = \{ x \in \mathcal{F}_0 \mid i \in \text{supp}(x) \} \]

for each \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). Clearly, in \( S_n \) any pair of transpositions with joint supports are contained in one of \( \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_n \). In addition, \( \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_n \) contains all transpositions of \( S_n \) and each transposition of \( S_n \) appears exactly three times in \( \mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_n \).

The following auxiliary graphs will play an important role in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Definition 2.5.** Let \( G \) be a spanning subgraph of \( CT_n \). For each \( i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) and each \( x \in S_n \), define \( G^i_x \) to be the graph with vertex set \( V(G^i_x) = \{ yx \in S_n \mid y \in \mathcal{F}_i \} \) such that for \( u, z \in V(G^i_x) \), \( u \) and \( z \) are adjacent if and only if \( |\text{supp}(\{x, u\}) \cap \text{supp}(\{z, x\})| = \delta_i \) and there exists a vertex \( w \) with \( w \neq x \) such that \( (u, w, z) \) is a 2-path in \( G \), where \( \delta_0 = 0 \) and \( \delta_i = 1 \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

By the definition of \( G^i_x \), it is clear that

\[
\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} v(G^i_x) = 3v \cdot \binom{n}{2},
\]

where as before \( v = n! \) is the number of vertices of \( CT_n \). Since \( |V(G^i_x) \cap V(G^j_x)| = 1 \) and \( |E(G^i_x) \cap E(G^j_x)| = 0 \) for any \( i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) with \( i \neq j \), we have \( |E(G^i_x) \cap E(G^j_x)| = 0 \) for any \( i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \) with \( i \neq j \). Hence

\[
\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} e(G^i_x) \geq \sum_{w \in V(G)} \left( \frac{d_G(w)}{2} \right),
\]

where the right-hand side gives the number of 2-paths in \( G \).

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( G \) be a spanning subgraph of \( CT_n \). Let \( l \) be an integer with \( l \geq 3 \). If there exists an \( l \)-cycle in \( G^i_x \) for some \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( x \in V(CT_n) \), then there exists a \( 2l \)-cycle in \( G \).
Proof. Assume that \( C = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_l, u_{l+1} = u_1) \) is an \( l \)-cycle in \( G_x^i \). By the definition of \( G_x^i \), for each \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, l\} \) there exists \( w_j \in V(C_{T_n}) \) such that \((u_j, w_j, u_{j+1})\) is a 2-path in \( G \). By Corollary 2.3, we have \( w_j = u_j x^{-1} u_{j+1} = u_{j+1} x^{-1} u_j \) if \( i = 0 \), and \( w_j \in \{u_j x^{-1} u_{j+1}, u_{j+1} x^{-1} u_j\} \) if \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

We claim that \( w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_l \) are pairwise distinct. Suppose to the contrary that \( w_j = w_k \) with \( j < k \). Since there are at most two cycles of length 4 containing \((x, u_j, w_j)\), we have \( s = j + 1 \). If \( i = 0 \), then \(|\text{supp}(\{x, u_j\}) \cap \text{supp}(\{x, u_{j+1}\})| = 0\), which implies that \((xu_j^{-1})(u_{j+1} x^{-1}) = (u_{j+1} x^{-1})(xu_j^{-1}) = u_{j+1} u_j^{-1} = w_j^{-1} w_{j+1} = u_{j+1} u_j^{-1} u_{j+1} x^{-1} u_{j+2} = u_j^{-1} u_{j+2} \neq \text{id}\), a contradiction. If \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \), then

\[
\{u_j x^{-1} u_{j+1}, u_{j+1} x^{-1} u_j\} \cap \{u_{j+1} x^{-1} u_{j+2}, u_{j+2} x^{-1} u_{j+1}\} \neq \emptyset.
\]

Assume that \( u_j = (i, t_0) x, u_{j+1} = (i, t_1) x \) and \( u_{j+2} = (i, t_2) x \), where \( t_0, t_1, t_2 \) are distinct elements of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i\} \). Then

\[
\{(i, t_0, t_1) x, (i, t_1, t_0) x\} \cap \{(i, t_1, t_2) x, (i, t_2, t_1) x\} \neq \emptyset,
\]

which is impossible.

Since \( C_{T_n} \) is a bipartite graph, we have \( \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_l\} \cap \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_l\} = \emptyset \). Since \( w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_l \) are pairwise distinct and the 2-path \((u_j, w_j, u_{j+1})\) is in \( G \) for \( j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, l\} \), it follows that \((u_1, w_1, u_2, w_2, \ldots, u_l, w_l, u_{l+1} = u_1)\) is a \( 2l \)-cycle in \( G \). \( \square \)

3 Proof of the main result when \( l \geq 4 \)

We prove parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.1 in this section.

3.1 \( 4k \)-cycle-free subgraphs of \( C_{T_n} \)

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (i). Suppose \( G \) is a \( C_{4k} \)-free spanning subgraph of \( C_{T_n} \) with maximum number of edges, where \( k \geq 2 \). Then \( d_G(w) \geq 1 \) for each \( w \in V(G) \). Since \( G \) is \( C_{4k} \)-free, by Lemma 2.6, \( G_x^i \) is \( C_{2k} \)-free for any \( x \in V(C_{T_n}) \) and \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \). Thus from the main theorem in [4] by Bondy and Simonovits it follows that \( G_x^i \) has at most \( c_k (v(G_x^i))^{1+\frac{1}{k}} \) edges, where \( c_k \) is a positive constant relying on \( k \) only. Therefore, we have

\[
\sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \sum_{i=0}^n e(G_x^i) \leq c_k v \cdot \left( \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{k}} + n(n-1)^{1+\frac{1}{k}} \right) \leq c'_k v \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{k}}.
\]

On the other hand, by (2) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

\[
\sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \sum_{i=0}^n e(G_x^i) \geq \sum_{w \in V(G)} \left(\frac{d_G(w)}{2}\right)^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w)
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{2v} \left( \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w).
\]

(4)
Since $\sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w) = 2e(G)$, it follows from (3) and (4) that
\[
\frac{2e(G)^2}{v} - e(G) \leq c'_k v \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{k}},
\]
or equivalently,
\[
e(G)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} c'_k v^2 \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1+\frac{1}{k}} + e(G)\frac{v}{2}.
\]
Set $\pi = e(G)/e(CT_n)$. Observe that $0 < \pi < 1$. Since $e(CT_n) = \frac{v(n)}{2(2)}$, the inequality above yields
\[
\pi^2 \leq 2c'_k \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{-1+\frac{1}{k}} + \pi \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{-1}.
\]
So there exists a constant $c$ depending on $k$ such that
\[
\pi \leq cn^{-1+\frac{1}{k}}.
\]
Therefore, we have
\[
ex(CT_n, C_{4k}) = e(G) = \pi e(CT_n) \leq cn^{-1+\frac{1}{k}} e(CT_n),
\]
as desired in part (i) of Theorem 1.1.

\[\Box\]

### 3.2 $(4k+2)$-cycle-free subgraphs of $CT_n$

In this subsection we assume that $G$ is a $C_{4k+2}$-free spanning subgraph of $CT_n$ and $a$ and $b$ are integers with $a, b \geq 2$ such that $4a + 4b = 4k + 4$, where $k \geq 2$. Note that a cycle of length $4a$ in $G$ can not intersect a cycle of length $4b$ in $G$ at a single edge, for otherwise their union would contain a cycle of length $4k + 2$. In what follows we will give an upper bound as well as a lower bound on the number of $4a$-cycles in $G$. These bounds will be used in the proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.1 at the end of this subsection.

**Lemma 3.1.** For any $2l$-cycle $C$ in $CT_n$, where $l \geq 2$, we have $|\text{supp}(C)| \leq 2l$.

**Proof.** Let $C = (u_0, u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{2l} = u_0)$ be a $2l$-cycle in $CT_n$. Set $w_i = u_i u_{i-1}^{-1}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2l\}$. Then $\text{supp}\{u_i, u_{i+1}\} = \text{supp}(w_i)$ and $\text{supp}(C) = \cup_{i=1}^{2l} \text{supp}(w_i)$. Observe that $w_{2l}w_{2l-1} \cdots w_2 w_1 = \text{id}$. So for any $x \in \text{supp}(C)$ there exist distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2l\}$ such that $x \in \text{supp}(w_i) \cap \text{supp}(w_j)$. Hence $|\text{supp}(C)| \leq 2l$. \[\Box\]

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $C$ and $C'$ be cycles of lengths $4a$ and $4b$ in $G$, respectively. If $C$ and $C'$ have at least one common edge, then $|\text{supp}(C) \cap \text{supp}(C')| \geq 3$. 


Proof. Suppose \( \{u_1, u_2\} \) is a common edge of \( C \) and \( C' \). Since \( G \) is a \((4a + 4b - 2)\)-cycle-free subgraph of \( CT_n \), there exists a vertex \( u_3 \) of \( G \) such that \( u_3 \in (V(C) \cap V(C')) \setminus \{u_1, u_2\} \). Since \( \text{supp}(u_3u_1^{-1}) \subseteq \text{supp}(C) \cap \text{supp}(C') \) and \( u_3 \neq u_2 \), we have

\[
\text{supp}(\{u_1, u_2\}) \neq \text{supp}(u_3u_1^{-1}).
\]

This together with \( \text{supp}(\{u_1, u_2\}) \subseteq \text{supp}(C) \cap \text{supp}(C') \) implies that \( |\text{supp}(C) \cap \text{supp}(C')| \geq 3 \).

For any graphs \( H \) and \( L \), define \( N(H, L) \) to be the number of subgraphs of \( H \) which are isomorphic to \( L \).

**Lemma 3.3.** We have

\[
N(G, C_{4a}) = O(n^{4a-3})e(G) + O(n^{4a-1+1}).
\]

Moreover, if \( a = b \), then \( N(G, C_{4a}) = O(n^{4a-3})e(G) \).

**Proof.** Denote by \( \mathcal{C} \) the set of cycles of length \( 4a \) in \( G \) and \( \mathcal{C}_e \) the set of cycles in \( \mathcal{C} \) containing a given edge \( e \). Note that \( |\mathcal{C}| = N(G, C_{4a}) \). Let \( E = \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} E(C) \). Let \( E_1 \) be the set of edges in \( E \) that are contained in a cycle of length \( 4b \) in \( G \), and let \( E_2 := E \setminus E_1 \). Then \( E = E_1 \cup E_2 \) and

\[
4aN(G, C_{4a}) = \sum_{e_1 \in E_1} |\mathcal{C}_{e_1}| + \sum_{e_2 \in E_2} |\mathcal{C}_{e_2}|.
\]

(5)

Assume that \( e = \{u_1, u_{4a}\} \). Observe that for any \( 4a \)-cycle \((u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{4a}, u_1)\), there is a unique sequence \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_{4a-1})\) of length \( 4a - 1 \) such that \( A_i = \text{supp}(\{u_i, u_{i+1}\}) \) for any \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 4a - 1\} \). For each \( B \in \{\text{supp}(C^*) \mid C^* \in \mathcal{C}_{e_1}\} \), there are \( \binom{|B|}{2} 4a - 1 \) sequences \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_{4a-1})\) of length \( 4a - 1 \) such that \( A_i \subseteq B \) and \( |A_i| = 2 \) for each \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 4a - 1\} \), and hence there are at most \( \binom{|B|}{2} 4a - 1 \) \( 4a \)-cycles \( C \) containing \( e \) such that \( \text{supp}(C) = B \).

For each \( e_1 \in E_1 \) (if \( E_1 \neq \emptyset \)), let \( C' \) be a fixed \( 4b \)-cycle with \( e_1 \in E(C') \). For any \( 4a \)-cycle \( C^* \in \mathcal{C}_{e_1} \), we have \( \text{supp}(e_1) \subseteq \text{supp}(C^*) \) and \( |\text{supp}(C^*) \cap \text{supp}(C')| \geq 3 \) by Lemma 3.2. Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we have

\[
|\{\text{supp}(C^*) \mid C^* \in \mathcal{C}_{e_1}\}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{4a-2} \binom{|\text{supp}(C^*)| - 2}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{4a-1-i} \binom{n - |\text{supp}(C')|}{j},
\]

which implies

\[
|\mathcal{C}_{e_1}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{4a-2} \binom{|\text{supp}(C^*)| - 2}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{4a-2-i} \binom{n - |\text{supp}(C')|}{j} (i + j + 2)^{4a-1} 4a-1
\]

\[
= O(n^{4a-3}).
\]

(6)
For each \( e_2 \in E_2 \) (if \( E_2 \neq \emptyset \)), by Lemma 3.1 again, we have

\[
|\{\text{supp}(C^*) \mid C^* \in \mathcal{C}_{e_2}\}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{4a-2} \binom{n-2}{i},
\]

which implies

\[
|\mathcal{C}_{e_2}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{4a-2} \binom{n-2}{i} \left( \frac{n+2}{2} \right)^{4a-1} = O(n^{4a-2}). \tag{7}
\]

Note that \(|E_1| \leq e(G)|. Note also that \(|E_2| \leq \text{ex}(CT_n, C_{4b})\) as the subgraph induced by \(E_2\) is \(C_{4b}\)-free. Using part (i) of Theorem 1.1 (which has been proved already), we have

\[
|E_2| \leq cn^{-1} + 1 + b e(G)^{CT_n} \text{ for some positive constant } c. \tag{5}
\]

Combining (5), (6) and (7), we obtain

\[
N(G, C_{4a}) \leq \frac{1}{4a} \sum_{e \in E_1} O(n^{4a-3}) + \sum_{e \in E_2} O(n^{4a-2}) \leq O(n^{4a-3}) e(G) + O(vn^{4a-1 + \frac{b}{4}}). \tag{8}
\]

In particular, if \( a = b \), then \(|E_2| = 0\) and hence

\[
N(G, C_{4a}) \leq \frac{1}{4a} \sum_{e \in E_1} O(n^{4a-3}) \leq O(n^{4a-3}) e(G).
\]

This completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Proposition 3.4.** (Erdős and Simonovits [13]) Let \( L \) be a bipartite graph, where there exist vertices \( x \) and \( y \) such that \( L \setminus \{x, y\} \) is a tree. Then there exist constants \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) such that if \( H \) is a graph containing more than \( c_1 v(H)^{\frac{3}{2}} \) edges, then

\[
N(H, L) \geq c_2 \frac{e(H)^{e(L)}}{v(H)^{2e(L) - v(L)}}.
\]

With the help of this proposition and the auxiliary graphs \( G_{x}^{i} \) as defined in Definition 2.5, we now prove a lower bound on \( N(G, C_{4a}) \).

**Lemma 3.5.** We have

\[
N(G, C_{4a}) \geq c v \frac{d^{4a}}{n^{4a}} - O(vn^{2a})
\]

for some positive constant \( c \) depending on \( a \), where \( d = 2e(G)/v \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.6, we have

\[
N(G, C_{4a}) \geq \sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} N(G_{x}^{i}, C_{2a}). \tag{8}
\]
Setting $L = C_{2a}$ in Proposition 3.4, there exist two positive constants $c_1$ and $c_2$ such that

$$N(G_x, C_{2a}) \geq c_2 \left( \frac{(G_x^n)^{2a}}{v(G_x^{n2a})} - \frac{(c_1 v(G_x^{n2a}))^{3/2}}{v(G_x^{n2a})} \right).$$

Combining this with (8), we obtain

$$N(G, C_{4a}) \geq \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_2 \left( \frac{(G_x^{n2a})^2}{v(G_x^{n2a})^2} \right) - \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_1 v(G_x^{n2a}).$$

By H"older's inequality, we then have

$$N(G, C_{4a}) \geq c_2 \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \left( \frac{(G_x^{n2a})^2}{v(G_x^{n2a})^2} \right) - O(vn^{2a})$$

$$\geq c_2 \frac{n^{4a}}{4a} \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \left( \frac{(G_x^{n2a})^2}{v(G_x^{n2a})^2} \right) - O(vn^{2a})$$

$$\geq c_2 \frac{n^{4a}}{4a} \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \left( \frac{(G_x^{n2a})^2}{v(G_x^{n2a})^2} \right) - O(vn^{2a})$$

$$\geq c_2 \frac{n^{4a}}{4a} \left( \sum_{x \in V(C_{T_n})} \frac{(G_x^{n2a})^2}{v(G_x^{n2a})^2} \right) - O(vn^{2a}),$$

where $c_a$ is a positive constant depending on $a$ and inequality (2) is used in the last step. Setting $d = 2e(G)/v$ and applying H"older’s inequality again, we obtain

$$N(G, C_{4a}) \geq c_2 \frac{n^{4a}}{4a} \left( \sum_{x \in V(G)} \frac{d_{G}(w)}{2} \right) - O(vn^{2a})$$

$$= c_2 \frac{n^{4a}}{4a} \left( \frac{d}{2} \right) - O(vn^{2a})$$

$$\geq c_v \frac{d^{4a}}{n^{4a}} - O(vn^{2a})$$

for some positive constant $c$ depending on $a$. This completes the proof. \qed

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii). Suppose $G$ is a $C_{4k+2}$-free spanning subgraph of $C_{T_n}$ with maximum number of edges. Then $\text{ex}(C_{T_n}, C_{2l}) = e(G)$, where $l = 2k + 1$. Set $d = 2e(G)/v$. 

Combining Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ex}(\frac{d^{4a}}{n^{4a}}) & \leq O(n^{4a-3})e(G) + O(vn^{4a-1+\frac{1}{a}}) + O(vn^{2a}), \\
d^{4a} & \leq O(n^{8a-3})d + O(n^{8a-1+\frac{1}{a}}) + O(n^{6a}).
\end{align*}
\]

Hence \(d = \max \left\{ O(n^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}}), O(n^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}}) \right\} \). This bound is minimized when \(a = 2\) and \(b = k - 1\), and this choice of \((a,b)\) yields \(d = O(n^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})\). Since \(e(G) = \frac{vd}{2}\) and \(e(CT_n) = \frac{v}{2}\binom{n}{2}\), it follows that
\[
e(G) = O(vn^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})
= O(n^{\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})e(CT_n)
= O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})e(CT_n).
\]
(9)

Consider the case when \(a = b = (k + 1)/2\) with \(k\) odd. By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, we have
\[
d^{4a} \leq O(n^{8a-3})d + O(n^{6a}),
\]
which yields
\[
e(G) = O(n^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})
= O(vn^{2-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})
= O(n^{\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}})e(CT_n)
= O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})e(CT_n).
\]
(10)

Observe that when \(k\) is odd we have \(n^{-\frac{1}{4a-1}} \leq n^{\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{4a-1}}\) if and only if \(0 < k < 4.9\). So (10) is a better bound than (9) when \(k = 3\). Therefore, \(e(G) = O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})e(CT_n)\) when \(l = 7\). This completes the proof. \(\Box\)

So far we have completed the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i) and (ii). These results imply that \(\text{ex}(CT_n, C_{2l}) = o(e(CT_n))\) for any fixed positive integer \(l \geq 4\). Thus, for any \(t \geq 1\) and \(l \geq 4\), there exists a positive integer \(n(t,l)\) such that for any \(n > n(t,l)\) and any edge-coloring of \(CT_n\) with \(t\) colors, \(CT_n\) contains a monochromatic copy of \(C_{2l}\), as claimed in Corollary 1.2.

Remark. The theta graph \(\Theta_{i,j,k}\) is the graph with \(i + j + k - 1\) vertices which consists of three internally vertex-disjoint paths between the same pair of vertices with lengths \(i, j\) and \(k\), respectively. As a by-product of the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i) and (ii), we obtain that
\[
\text{ex}(CT_n, \Theta_{4a-1,1,4b-1}) = o(e(CT_n))
\]
for any \(a, b \geq 2\).
Figure 1: Possibilities for $G \cap H$ when $H \in \mathcal{C}_4$.

### 4 Proof of the main result when $l = 2, 3$

In this section, $\mathcal{C}_4$ denotes the set of 4-cycles in $CT_n$, and for each $e \in E(CT_n)$, $(\mathcal{C}_4)_e$ denotes the set of 4-cycles in $CT_n$ containing $e$. Suppose $G$ is a $2l$-cycle-free spanning subgraph of $CT_n$ with maximum number of edges. For any subgraphs $H$ and $L$ of $CT_n$, let $G \cap H$ be the graph with vertex set $V(G) \cap V(H)$ and edge set $E(G) \cap E(H)$.

Note that for any 4-cycle $H \in \mathcal{C}_4$, $G \cap H$ is isomorphic to one of the six graphs in Figure 1.

Denote by $\chi_0, \chi_1, \chi_1^2, \chi_2, \chi_3, \chi_4$ the ratio of the number of 4-cycles $H$ with $G \cap H$ isomorphic to the graphs (1)–(6) in Figure 1 to the total number of 4-cycles in $CT_n$, respectively. Of course we have

$$\chi_0 + \chi_1 + \chi_1^2 + \chi_2 + \chi_3 + \chi_4 = 1. \quad (11)$$

By double counting the cardinality of $\{(e, H) \mid H \in \mathcal{C}_4, e \in E(G \cap H)\}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{C}_4} e(G \cap H) = \sum_{e \in E(G)} |(\mathcal{C}_4)_e|,$$

which by Corollary 2.4 (ii) implies

$$\left(\chi_1 + 2(\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2) + 3 \chi_3 + 4 \chi_4\right) \cdot n(\mathcal{C}_4) = e(G) \cdot \frac{1}{2} (n - 2)(n + 1),$$

where as before $n(\mathcal{C}_4)$ is the number of 4-cycles in $CT_n$. Set $\pi = e(G)/e(CT_n)$. By Corollary 2.4 (iii), we have

$$\chi_1 + 2(\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2) + 3 \chi_3 + 4 \chi_4 = 4 \pi. \quad (12)$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1 (iv).** Suppose $G$ is a $C_4$-free spanning subgraph of $CT_n$ with maximum number of edges. Then $d_G(w) \geq 1$ for any $w \in V(G)$ and $\chi_4 = 0$ as $G$ is $C_4$-free. Hence, by (11) and (12), we have

$$\pi = \frac{1}{4} \left(\chi_1 + 2(\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2) + 3 \chi_3\right) \leq \frac{3}{4} \left(\chi_0 + \chi_1 + \chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2 + \chi_3\right) = \frac{3}{4}.$$ 

Thus $\text{ex}(CT_n, C_4) = e(G) = \pi e(CT_n) \leq \frac{3}{4} e(CT_n)$ as desired in part (iv) of Theorem 1.1. \[\Box\]

**Proof of Theorem 1.1 (iii).** Suppose $G$ is a $C_6$-free spanning subgraph of $CT_n$ with maximum number of edges. For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and each $x \in V(CT_n)$, let $H^i_x$ be the subgraph
of $G^i_x$ (see Definition 2.5) induced by the subset $\{u \in V(G^i_x) \mid \{u, x\} \notin E(G)\}$ of $V(G^i_x)$. Then

$$\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} v(H^i_x) = 3 \sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \left( \binom{n}{2} - d_G(x) \right).$$

Since $|E(H^i_x) \cap E(H^j_x)| = 0$ for distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, we have

$$\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} e(H^i_x) + (4\chi_4 + 2\chi_3) \cdot n(C_4) \geq \sum_{w \in V(G)} \left( \frac{d_G(w)}{2} \right). \quad (13)$$

We claim that for any $e \in E(CT_n)$ there are at most two 4-cycles $H$ in $\mathcal{C}_4$ containing $e$ such that $(H \cap G) - e$ is isomorphic to the graph (5) in Figure 1. Suppose to the contrary that there exist three such 4-cycles in $\mathcal{C}_4$, say, $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3$. Suppose $e = \{u, z\}$. Since $G$ is $C_6$-free, we have $(V(C_i) \setminus \{u, z\}) \cap (V(C_j) \setminus \{u, z\}) \neq \emptyset$ for any distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Setting $C_1 = (u, z, x_1, x_2, u)$ and $C_2 = (u, z, x_1, x_3, u)$. If $V(C_3) = \{u, z, x_1, x_4\}$, then there are three 4-cycles containing the 2-path $(u, z, x_1)$, which contradicts Corollary 2.3. If $V(C_3) = \{u, z, x_2, x_3\}$, then there exists a triangle in $G$, a contradiction. This proves our claim. By double counting the number of pairs $(e, H)$ with $e \in E(CT_n)$ and $H \in \mathcal{C}_4$ such that $(G \cap H) - e$ is isomorphic to the graph (5) in Figure 1, we obtain $2e(CT_n) \geq (\chi_3 + 4\chi_4) \cdot n(C_4)$. This together with Corollary 2.4 (iii) implies $\chi_3 + 4\chi_4 \leq 2e(CT_n)/n(C_4) = 16/(n - 2)(n + 1)$. Therefore,

$$2\chi_3 + 4\chi_4 = o(1). \quad (14)$$

Since $G$ is $C_6$-free and $H^i_x$ is a subgraph of $G^i_x$, by Lemma 2.6, $H^i_x$ contains no 3-cycles for any $x \in V(CT_n)$ and $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$. So by Mantel’s theorem [23] we have $e(H^i_x) \leq \binom{n}{2} - d_G(x)/4$ and $e(H^i_x) \leq (n - 1)^2/4$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Since $|E(H^i_x) \cap E(H^j_x)| = 0$ for distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} e(H^i_x) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left( \binom{n}{2} - d_G(x) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} n(n - 1)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left( \binom{n}{2}^2 + n(n - 1)^2 - 2 \binom{n}{2} d_G(x) + d_G(x)^2 \right).$$

Since $\sum_{x \in V(G)} d_G(x) = 2e(G)$, it follows that

$$\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} e(H^i_x) \leq \frac{v}{4} \binom{n}{2} - \left( \binom{n}{2} e(G) + \frac{vn(n - 1)^2}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} d_G(x)^2. \quad (15)$$

One the other hand, by (13) and (14), we have

$$\sum_{x \in V(CT_n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} e(H^i_x) \geq \sum_{w \in V(G)} \left( \frac{d_G(w)}{2} \right) - o(n(C_4)), \quad (16)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w)^2 - e(G) - o(n(C_4)).$$
Combining (15) with (16), we have

\[
\frac{v}{4} \left( \binom{n}{2} \right)^2 - \binom{n}{2} e(G) + \frac{vn(n-1)^2}{4} \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w)^2 - e(G) - o(n(C_4))
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{4v} \left( \sum_{w \in V(G)} d_G(w) \right)^2 - e(G) - o(n(C_4))
\]

\[
= \frac{e(G)^2}{v} - e(G) - o(n(C_4)).
\]

Dividing both sides by \( \frac{v}{4} \binom{n}{2}^2 \), we then obtain

\[
1 - \frac{2e(G)}{e(CT_n)} + \frac{4}{n} - \frac{e(G)^2}{e(CT_n)^2} + \frac{2e(G)}{e(CT_n)\binom{n}{2}} + o(1) \geq 0.
\]

Recall that \( \pi = e(G)/e(CT_n) \). Since \( 0 < \pi < 1 \), \( \frac{4}{n} = o(1) \) and \( 2\pi/\binom{n}{2} = o(1) \), we have \( 1 - 2\pi - \pi^2 + o(1) \geq 0 \), which implies \( \pi \leq \sqrt{2} - 1 + o(1) \). Therefore, we have \( e(G) = \pi e(CT_n) \leq (\sqrt{2} - 1 + o(1)) e(CT_n) \) as desired in part (iii) of Theorem 1.1. \( \square \)
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