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Abstract

The Turán problem asks for the largest number of edges in an $n$-vertex graph not containing a fixed forbidden subgraph $F$. We construct a new family of graphs not containing $K_{s,t}$, for $t = C^s$, with $\Omega(n^{2-1/s})$ edges matching the upper bound of Kövári, Sós and Turán.

1 Introduction

The Turán problem. Let $F$ be a fixed graph. The Turán problem asks for the value of $\text{ex}(n, F)$, the largest number of edges in an $n$-vertex graph not containing a copy of $F$ as a subgraph. The classic theorem of Erdős and Stone [12] gives an asymptotic for $\text{ex}(n, F)$ when $F$ is not bipartite.

For bipartite $F$, much less is known. Even the simplest case when $F$ is a complete bipartite graph $K_{s,t}$ is open. Specifically, Kövári, Sós and Turán [19] proved that

$$\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) = O_{s,t}(n^{2-1/s}).$$

Obviously, we may reverse the roles of $s$ and $t$ to obtain $\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) = O_{s,t}(n^{2-1/t})$, which is superior if $t < s$. So, from now on we discuss only the case $t \geq s$. Though the implicit constant in the big-Oh notation has been improved by Füredi [15], the Kövári–Sós–Turán bound remains the only upper bound on $\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t})$. Many researchers conjecture that the Kövári–Sós–Turán bound is tight (e.g., [19, p. 52], [11, p. 6], [14, p. 257], [16, Conjecture 2.24]). However, apart from the numerous results for $s = 2$ and $s = 3$ (see [16, Section 3] for a survey), there are only two constructions attaining Kövári–Sós–Turán bound for general $s > 3$. The first is due to Alon, Rónyai and Szabó [2] who, improving on the previous construction by Kollár, Rónyai and Szabó [18], showed that

$$\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) = \Omega_s(n^{2-1/s}) \quad \text{if } t > (s-1)!. \quad (1)$$

The construction is a clever use of norms over finite fields. The second, more recent class of constructions originating from [4] uses random varieties. It has hitherto provided inferior dependence of $t$ on $s$. For example, [4] obtains (1) only for $t \geq s^{4s}$. The advantage of these constructions is their flexibility, see [8, 5, 20, 17, 6, 24] for some of the variations and applications.

In this work, we use a novel version of the random algebraic method to construct graphs that match the Kövári–Sós–Turán bound for $t$ that is only exponential in $s$.
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Theorem 1. Let \( s \geq 2 \). Then
\[
\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) = \Omega_s(n^{2-1/s}) \quad \text{if } t > 9^s \cdot s^{4s^2/3}.
\]

The Zarankiewicz problem. Closely related to the Turán problem for \( K_{s,t} \)-free graphs is the problem of Zarankiewicz [25]. It is the asymmetric version of the Turán problem. It is well-known that in the study of the order of growth of \( \text{ex}(n, F) \) we may assume that the \( n \)-vertex graph is bipartite. To distinguish the two parts of a bipartite graph, we shall call them \textit{left} and \textit{right}. A copy of \( K_{s,t} \) in a bipartite graph \( G \) can be situated in two ways: either the \( s \) vertices are in the left part, or the \( s \) vertices are in the right part. In the Zarankiewicz problem, we forbid only the former case. So, we say that \( G \) is a \textit{sided graph} if it is bipartite with distinguished left and right parts, and say that Zarankiewicz problem asks for the estimate on the number of edges in a sided graph not containing \( K_{s,t} \), which is regarded as a sided graph with \( s \) vertices on the left and \( t \) vertices on the right.

An important consequence of making the graph bipartite with distinguished parts is that the two parts can (possibly) be of very unequal size. This often occurs in applications (see e.g. [1, 23]). With this in mind, define \( z(m, n; s, t) \) as the largest number of edges in a sided graph with \( m \) vertices on the left and \( n \) vertices on the right that contains no sided \( K_{s,t} \). The bound of Kövári, Sós and Turán for the Zarankiewicz problem takes the form
\[
z(m, n; s, t) = O_s(mn^{1-1/s}).
\]

In the symmetric case when \( m = n \), the best known constructions for Zarankiewicz problem are the same as the best bipartite constructions for the Turán problem. This is not so for our approach: we are able to take the advantage of the fact that only one orientation of \( K_{s,t} \) is forbidden to obtain a lower bound on \( z(n, n; s, t) \) that is superior to the corresponding bound for \( \text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) \) in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. a) Suppose \( s, t, m, n, k \geq 3 \) are integers satisfying
\[
\frac{\log m \leq s^{k-2}}{k \log s}, \quad \text{and } k \leq \frac{s \log s}{2 \log^2 s}.
\]
Then
\[
z(m, n; s, t) = \Omega_s(mn^{1-1/s}) \quad \text{if } t > k^s \cdot e^{2s/\log s}.
\]
In particular, \( z(n, n; s, t) = \Omega_s(n^{2-1/s}) \) for \( t > 3^{s+o(s)} \).

b) For each \( s \geq 3 \) there is a constant \( c_s > 0 \) such that if \( \log m \leq c_s t^{1+2\log s} \), then
\[
z(m, n; s, t) = \Omega_s(mn^{1-1/s}).
\]

Part (b) is an improvement on the result of Conlon [7], who proved the \( \Omega_s(mn^{1-1/s}) \) bound under the condition \( \log m \leq c_s t^{1/(s-1)} \). In the same article, Conlon asked if the bound holds for \( \log m \leq t/s \), which would be tight if true.

Paper organization. We begin by collecting the algebraic tools we require in Section 2. The concept of an \( m \)-independent set, which is central to the proof of Theorem 1, is introduced in Section 3. The \( m \)-independent varieties used in Theorem 1 are constructed in Sections 4 and 5. Finally, in Sections 6 and 7 we prove Theorems 1 and 2 respectively.
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2 Algebraic tools

To make this paper maximally accessible, we tried to keep the use of algebra to the minimum. In particular, we use counting arguments even when similar algebraic arguments could have provided slightly superior numeric constants. Despite this, we require basic familiarity with algebraic geometry on the level of the first chapter of Shafarevich’s book [21]. We collect the other algebraic tools in this section.

Varieties and their $\mathbb{F}_q$-points. The integer $q$ will denote a prime power. We shall work exclusively with fields $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. All varieties in this paper are quasi-projective over the field $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. We write $V(f_1,\ldots,f_t)$ for the projective variety cut out by homogeneous polynomials $f_1,\ldots,f_t$. We denote the vector space of homogeneous polynomials of degree $m$ in $b+1$ variables with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q$ by $\mathbb{F}_q[x_0,\ldots,x_b]_m$. We shall also work with products of projective spaces $\mathbb{P}^a \times \mathbb{P}^b$. The space of bihomogeneous polynomials of bidegree $(m,m')$ on such a product will be denoted by $\mathbb{F}_q[x_0,\ldots,x_a]_m \otimes \mathbb{F}_q[x_0,\ldots,x_b]_{m'}$.

The graphs we shall construct in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 will consist of the $\mathbb{F}_q$-points of certain varieties. We denote the $\mathbb{F}_q$-points of a variety $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b$ by $V(\mathbb{F}_q)$ or (if the variety $V$ is a complicated expression) by $V \cap \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q)$. We shall use the following bounds on the number of $\mathbb{F}_q$-points.

Lemma 3 (Weakening of [9, Corollary 3.3]). Suppose $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b$ is a $k$-dimensional variety of degree $d$. Then $|V(\mathbb{F}_q)| \leq d|\mathbb{P}^k(\mathbb{F}_q)|$.

Lemma 4. a) Let $m_1,\ldots,m_r$ be positive integers, and let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a non-empty set. Suppose that $g_1,\ldots,g_r \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0,\ldots,x_b]$ are random homogeneous polynomials of degrees $\deg g_i = m_i$. Then

$$\Pr \left[ |Y \cap V(g_1,\ldots,g_r)| \leq \frac{|Y|}{2q^r} \right] \leq \frac{4q^r}{|Y|}.$$  

(2)

b) The same holds for bihomogeneous polynomials, i.e., if $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^a(\mathbb{F}_q) \times \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a non-empty set and $g_1,\ldots,g_r$ are random bihomogeneous polynomials of bidegree $\deg g_i = (m_i,m'_i)$ with $m_i,m'_i \geq 1$, then (2) holds.

Proof. For a point $y \in Y$, let $R_y$ be the indicator random variable of the event $y \in V(g_1,\ldots,g_r)$. Let $y,y' \in Y$ be two distinct points. We claim that $\mathbb{E}[R_y] = \mathbb{E}[R_{y'}] = 1/q^r$ and that the random variables $R_y$ and $R_{y'}$ are independent. To see this in the case (a), apply the change of coordinates so that $y = [1:0:0: \ldots:0]$ and $y' = [0:1:0: \ldots:0]$. The polynomial $g_i$ vanishes at $y$ if and only if the coefficient of $x_0^{m_i}$ vanishes. Similarly, $g_i(y') = 0$ if and only if the coefficient of $x_1^{m'_i}$ vanishes. In the case (b), write $y = (y_a,y_b)$ and $y' = (y'_a,y'_b)$ with $y_a,y'_a \in \mathbb{P}^a(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $y_b,y'_b \in \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Since $y \neq y'$ we may assume that $y_b \neq y'_b$ (by swapping the roles of $\mathbb{P}^a$ and $\mathbb{P}^b$ if necessary). We can then change
the coordinates on \( \mathbb{P}^b \) in the same way as in the case (a), and observe that vanishing of \( g_i \) at \( y \) and \( y' \) depends on disjoint sets of coefficients. This proves the claim.

Let \( R = \sum_{y \in Y} R_y \). From the pairwise independence of the \( R_y \)'s, it follows that

\[
\text{Var}[R] = \sum_{y \in Y} \text{Var}[R_y] = \frac{1}{q}(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma})|Y| \leq |Y|/q^r.
\]

Since \( \mathbb{E}[R] = \sum_{y} \mathbb{E}[R_y] = |Y|/q^r \), Chebyshev’s inequality then implies that

\[
\text{Pr}[|R| - |Y|/q^r] \geq \lambda \sqrt{|Y|/q^r} \leq \lambda^{-2},
\]

and the lemma follows upon taking \( \lambda = \sqrt{|Y|/4q^r}. \)

**Bézout’s inequality.** For a reducible variety \( V \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b \), define the total degree \( \text{deg}(V) \) to be the sum of the degrees of the irreducible components of \( V \).

**Lemma 5** (Bézout’s inequality, [13, p. 228, Example 12.3.1]). Let \( V \) and \( W \) be two varieties in \( \mathbb{P}^b \). Then

\[
\text{deg}(V \cap W) \leq \text{deg}(V) \text{deg}(W).
\]

**Hilbert functions.** For a homogeneous ideal \( I \), the Hilbert function \( H_I(m) \) is defined as the codimension of \( I_m \overset{\text{def}}{=} I \cap \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \) in \( \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \). Equivalently, if \( I = I(V) \) is the homogeneous ideals of polynomials vanishing on a variety \( V \), then \( H_I(m) \) is the dimension of the subspace of functions on \( V \) induced by all homogeneous polynomials of degree \( m \).

We shall use the following bound on the Hilbert function.

**Lemma 6.** Let \( V \) be a variety of dimension \( k \) in \( \mathbb{P}^b \). Then its Hilbert function satisfies

\[
H_I(V)(m) \geq \binom{m+k}{k}.
\]

Though more general bounds are known (e.g. [22, Theorem 2.4]), we give a proof for completeness.

**Proof.** By [21, Theorem 1.15 and Corollary 1.6] there is a linear projection \( \pi : V \to \mathbb{P}^k \), which is finite and surjective. Then the pullback of a homogeneous polynomial of degree \( m \) on \( \mathbb{P}^k \) is a homogeneous polynomial of degree \( m \) on \( V \). The result follows since the space of homogeneous degree-\( m \) polynomials on \( \mathbb{P}^k \) is of dimension \( \binom{m+k}{m} \), and the pullback map has trivial kernel.

We use Hilbert functions to bound the probability that a random polynomial vanishes on a given variety.

**Lemma 7.** Let \( V \) be any variety in \( \mathbb{P}^b \). Let \( g \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b] \) be a random homogeneous degree-\( m \) polynomial. Then the probability that \( g \) vanishes on \( V \) is

\[
\text{Pr}[g|_V = 0] \leq q^{-H_I(V)(m)}.
\]

**Proof.** By the definition of the Hilbert function, \( H_I(V)(m) \) is the codimension (over \( \mathbb{F}_q \)) of \( I(V)_m \) in \( \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \). This implies that the codimension of \( I(V)_m \cap \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b] \) in \( \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \) is at least \( H_I(V)(m) \). Since \( \text{Pr}[g|_V = 0] = \text{Pr}[g \in I(V)_m \cap \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]] \), the lemma follows. \( \square \)
3 Definition and uses of \( m \)-independence

If \( t \) is small compared to \( b \), then the Hilbert function of \( t \) generic points in \( \mathbb{P}^b \) is \( H_{I(\{p_1, \ldots, p_t\})}(m) = t \) for \( m \geq 1 \). The point sets with \( H_{I(\{p_1, \ldots, p_t\})}(m) = t \) enjoy important independence property. The key to our construction of Turán graphs will be a bound on the dimension of the locus of sets \( \{p_1, \ldots, p_t\} \) that lack this property.

**Definition 8.** We say that points \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \in \mathbb{P}^b \) are \( m \)-**dependent** if \( H_{I(\{p_1, \ldots, p_t\})}(m) < t \). We furthermore say that they are **minimally \( m \)-dependent** if no proper subset of these points is \( m \)-dependent.

**Definition 9.** A set \( X \subset \mathbb{P}^b \) is called **\( s \)-wise \( m \)-independent** if no \( s \) distinct points of \( V \) are \( m \)-dependent.

Though we define \( m \)-dependence via Hilbert functions, there are two other ways to think about the concept that will be useful. The first way is to think of a homogeneous degree-\( m \) polynomial \( f \) on \( \mathbb{P}^b \) as a linear form in its coefficients. Specialization of \( f \) to \( f(p) \) gives distinct linear forms for distinct \( p \in \mathbb{P}^b \). It is easy to see from the definition of \( m \)-dependence that the points \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \) are \( m \)-dependent if and only if \( f(p_1), \ldots, f(p_t) \) are linearly dependent as linear forms in \( \binom{b+m}{m} \) variables.

The second way to understand \( m \)-dependence is via linear forms. To each point \( p \in \mathbb{P}^b \) one can associate a linear form \( \ell \) in \( b+1 \) variables defined by \( \ell(x) \triangleq \langle x, p \rangle \). Because points in the projective space are defined only up to a multiplication by a non-zero scalar, this linear form is too defined up to a multiplication by a non-zero scalar. If \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \in \mathbb{P}^b \) are any \( t \) points, and \( \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_t \) are the corresponding linear forms in \( b+1 \) variables, then \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \) are \( m \)-dependent if and only if \( \ell_1(x)^m, \ldots, \ell_t(x)^m \) are linearly dependent. Indeed, the coefficients in the equations \( f(p_1) = 0, \ldots, f(p_t) = 0 \) are precisely the coefficients in the forms \( \ell_1(x)^m, \ldots, \ell_t(x)^m \) and so this criterion for \( m \)-dependence is equivalent to the criterion from the last paragraph.

If points \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \) are not \( m \)-dependent, we say that they are **\( m \)-independent**.

The usefulness of these definitions comes from the combination of two simple observations:

**Proposition 10.** Suppose that \( v_1, \ldots, v_s \in \mathbb{P}^a(\mathbb{F}_q) \) are \( m \)-independent points. Pick a random polynomial \( g \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_a]_m \otimes \mathbb{F}_q[y_0, \ldots, y_b]_{m'} \) uniformly among all bihomogeneous polynomials of bidegree \( (m, m') \) on \( \mathbb{P}^a \times \mathbb{P}^b \). Then \( s \) random polynomials \( g(v_1, y), \ldots, g(v_s, y) \in \mathbb{F}_q[y_0, \ldots, y_b]_m \) are mutually independent.

**Proof.** Write \( g \) as \( g(x, y) = \sum_{|\beta|=m'} y^\beta g_\beta(x) \). Since the coefficient of \( y^\beta \) in \( h(v_i, y) \) is \( g_\beta(v_i) \), it suffices to show that \( g_\beta(v_1), \ldots, g_\beta(v_s) \) are independent for every \( \beta \).

Think of \( g_\beta(v_1) \) as a linear function of the coefficients of \( g_\beta \). By the alternative definition of \( m \)-independence discussed above, the linear functions \( g_\beta(v_1), \ldots, g_\beta(v_s) \) are linearly independent. Since the coefficients of \( g_\beta \) are chosen independently and uniformly from \( \mathbb{F}_q \), this implies that \( g_\beta(v_1), \ldots, g_\beta(v_s) \) are independent. \(\Box\)

Define the function

\[
M_k(t) \triangleq \min \left\{ m : \binom{m+k}{k} \geq t \right\}.
\]

Recall that a variety \( W \) is said to be of **pure dimension** \( k \) if all of its irreducible components are of dimension \( k \).
Proposition 11. Let $0 \leq s \leq k \leq b$ be integers, and let $W \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b$ be a variety of pure dimension $k$ and degree at most $D$.

a) If $h_1, \ldots, h_s$ are independent random homogeneous polynomials of degree $m$ in $b + 1$ variables and $\mathbb{F}_q$-coefficients, then

$$\Pr[\dim(W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_s)) > k - s] \leq Cq^{-\left(\frac{k-s+1+m}{m}\right)},$$

where the constant $C = C(k, m, D) > 0$ depends only on $k, m$ and $D$.

b) Let $T$ and $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s$ be positive integers satisfying $\delta_i \geq M_{k-i+1}(T)$. If $h_1, \ldots, h_s$ are independent random homogeneous polynomials of degrees $\deg h_i = \delta_i$ in $b + 1$ variables and $\mathbb{F}_q$-coefficients, then

$$\Pr[\dim(W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_s)) > k - s] \leq Cq^{-T},$$

where the constant $C = C(T, s, D, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s) > 0$ depends only on $t, s, D$ and on the polynomial degrees $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s$.

Proof. Part (a) is the special case of part (b) with $T = \left(\frac{k-s+1+m}{m}\right)$ and $\delta_1 = \cdots = \delta_s = m$. So, it suffices to prove part (b).

We may assume that $W$ is irreducible, for otherwise we may apply the result to its irreducible components. The proof is by induction on $s$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the set of all irreducible components of $W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_{s-1})$. Since $W$ is irreducible, $\dim(U) \geq k - s + 1$ for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$. So, from Lemmas 6 and 7 we see that, for $U \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\Pr[h_s \text{ vanishes on } U] \leq q^{-\left(\frac{k-s+1+m}{k-s+1}\right)} \leq q^{-\left(\frac{k-s+1+M_{k-s+1}(T)}{k-s+1}\right)} \leq q^{-T}.$$  

Bézout’s inequality tells us that $|\mathcal{U}| \leq D \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \delta_i$, and hence the probability that $h_s$ vanishes on some component of $W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_{s-1})$ is at most $D \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} \delta_i \cdot q^{-T}$. By the induction hypothesis, $W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_{s-1})$ is of dimension exceeding $k - s + 1$ with probability $C(t, s-1, D, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{s-1})q^{-T}$, and so the probability that $W \cap V(h_1, \ldots, h_{s-1}, h_s)$ is of dimension exceeding $k - s$ is at most

$$\deg(W)m^{s-1}q^{-t} + C(t, s-1, D, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{s-1})q^{-T},$$

which is at most $C(T, s, D, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s)q^{-\left(\frac{k-s+1+m}{m}\right)}$ for suitable $C(T, s, D, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_s)$.

Combining these two observations we obtain the following handy result.

Lemma 12. Let $0 \leq s \leq k \leq b$ be integers. Suppose that $W \subseteq \mathbb{P}^b$ is a variety of pure dimension $k$, and $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^a(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is an $s$-wise $m$-independent set of size $|X| \leq c'(m, s, \deg W)$ where $c' = c'(m, s, \deg W) > 0$ is sufficiently small. Let $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_a]_m \otimes \mathbb{F}_q[y_0, \ldots, y_b]_m$ be a random bihomogeneous polynomial of bidegree $(m, m)$ on $\mathbb{P}^a \times \mathbb{P}^b$. Then the following holds with probability at least $\frac{4}{5}$: For every $s$ distinct points $v_1, \ldots, v_s \in X$ the variety

$$\{w \in W : g(v_1, w) = \cdots = g(v_s, w) = 0\}$$

is of dimension $k - s$.

Proof. By Proposition 11(a) and the union bound over all $(v_1, \ldots, v_s) \in X^s$, the probability that $X$ does not satisfy this is at most $|X|^s \cdot C(m, s, \deg W)q^{-\left(\frac{k-s+1+m}{m}\right)} \leq (c')^s C(m, s, \deg W)$. So, choosing $c'$ small enough works. 

□
4 Construction of $m$-independent varieties

For positive integers $b, m, t$, let
\[
\Phi_t(b, m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(p_1, \ldots, p_t) \in (\mathbb{P}^b)^t : p_1, \ldots, p_t \text{ are minimally } m\text{-dependent}\},
\]
\[
\phi_t(b, m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim \Phi_t(b, m).
\]

Note that $\Phi_t(b, m)$ is indeed a variety. This follows from the equivalence of $m$-dependence of points and linear dependence of the linear $m$-th powers of respective linear forms, which we discussed above.

We shall upper bound the functions $\phi_t$ in the next section. But first we show how to use these bounds to construct $m$-independent varieties.

**Lemma 13.** Suppose that $b, m, Z, s \geq 1$ are integers satisfying
\[
Z > \frac{1}{t - 1} \phi_t(b, m) \quad \text{for all } t = m + 2, m + 3, \ldots, s.
\]

Let $f_1, \ldots, f_Z$ be generic degree-$m$ homogeneous polynomials in $b + 1$ variables. Then the variety $V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ is $s$-wise $m$-independent.

**Proof.** In view of Lemma 18(a) it suffices to show that $V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ contains no set of $t$ minimally $m$-dependent points for every $m + 2 \leq t \leq s$.

Note that whenever points $p_1, \ldots, p_t \in \mathbb{P}^b$ are minimally $m$-dependent, their Hilbert function satisfies $H_I((p_1, \ldots, p_t))(m) = t - 1$. Indeed, $H_I((p_1, \ldots, p_t))(m) \leq t - 1$ follows from the definition of $m$-dependence, and $H_I((p_1, \ldots, p_t))(m) \geq t - 1$ follows from minimality. This means that the vector space $I((p_1, \ldots, p_t))_m$ is of codimension $t - 1$ in $\mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m$, and $I((p_1, \ldots, p_t))^Z_m$ is of codimension $Z(t - 1)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m)^Z$.

Since $Z(t - 1) > \phi_t(b, m)$, we can use the algebraic version of the union bound to deduce that for generic degree-$m$ homogeneous polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_Z$, the variety $V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ does not contain any minimally $m$-dependent set $\{p_1, \ldots, p_t\}$. Indeed, write $F \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m^Z$ and regard it as a variety with polynomials’ coefficients as indeterminants. Define the variety
\[
V \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(f_1, \ldots, f_Z, p_1, \ldots, p_t) \in F \times \Phi_t(b, m) : f_i(p_j) = 0 \text{ for all } i, j\}.
\]

Consider the projection of $V$ onto $F$. Our claim is that the fiber of a generic $\vec{f} \in F$ is empty. If it is not so, then $\dim V \geq \dim F$. However, for the projection onto the $\Phi_t(b, m)$ factor, every fiber is of codimension $Z(t - 1)$, and so $\dim V \leq \dim \Phi_t(b, m) + (\dim F - Z(t - 1)) < \dim F$, which is a contradiction, proving our claim.

**Lemma 14.** Suppose that $b, m, Z$ are integers satisfying the condition (3) and $b - Z \geq 1$, and assume that $q \geq q_0(b, m, Z)$ is sufficiently large in terms of $b, m, Z$. Then there exist degree-$m$ polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_Z \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m$ such that the variety $V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ is $s$-wise $m$-independent, is of pure dimension $b - Z$, and contains at least $\frac{1}{q} q^{b-Z}$ many $\mathbb{F}_q$-points.

**Proof.** We shall choose each $f_1, \ldots, f_Z$ uniformly at random from $\mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m$. Let
\[
B \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) : V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \text{ is not } s\text{-wise } m\text{-independent}\}
\]
\[
\subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m^Z.
\]
The set \( B \) is a variety, for we can think of as the image of the projection of the bigger variety

\[
B' \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ (f_1, \ldots, f_Z, p_1, \ldots, p_s) : f_i(p_j) = 0 \text{ for all } i, j \} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \times \Phi_t(b, m)
\]

onto the first factor.

Furthermore, recall that \( \Phi_t(b, m) \) is defined by the linear dependence of the \( m \)-th powers of the linear forms associated to the points \( p_i \). Since the number of linear forms and the numbers of variables therein do not depend on \( q \), using Bézout’s inequality we may obtain an upper bound on the degree \( B' \) (and hence on the degree of \( B \)) that is independent of \( q \) (but depends on \( b, m \) and \( Z \)).

By Lemma 13, \( B \) is of codimension at least 1 in \( \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \). By Lemma 3, a random element \( \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \ldots, x_b]_m \) is in \( B \) with probability \( O(1/\deg B) \). Since \( \deg B \) is independent of \( q \), this probability is \( O(1/q) \).

Similarly, since \( V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \) is of codimension \( Z \) for generic polynomials \( f_1, \ldots, f_Z \), it follows that \( V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \) is of smaller codimension with probability \( O(1/q) \) for random polynomials \( f_1, \ldots, f_Z \). Furthermore, since \( V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \) is defined by \( Z \) polynomials, no component of it can have codimension more than \( Z \) (see [21, Corollary 1.14]), and so \( V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \) is of pure dimension \( b - Z \).

Let \( Y = \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q) \). Applying Lemma 4(a) we see that

\[
\Pr[|V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z) \cap \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q)| \leq \frac{1}{2} q^{b-Z}] \leq 4q^{Z-b}.
\]

Since \( b - Z \geq 1 \), this is also \( O(1/q) \), and so random polynomials satisfy the conclusion of the lemma with probability \( 1 - O(1/q) \). \( \square \)

5 Upper bound on \( \phi_t(b, m) \)

For the purpose of proving an exponential bound in Theorem 1, we need only a bound of the form

\[ \phi_t(b, m) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)bt \]

that is valid for small \( t \). We go a step further: our bound shows that, for moderately large \( b \), the quantity \( \frac{1}{t} \phi_t(b, m) \) appearing in Lemma 13 is largest when \( t = m + 2 \). Though our bound on \( \phi_t(b, m) \) is likely to be far from being sharp, this means that a stronger bound on \( \phi_t(b, m) \) would not lead to a smaller base of exponent in Theorem 1.

**Lemma 15.** Let \( V \) be a vector space, \( v \in V \) and \( S \subseteq V \). Exactly one of the following alternatives holds:

a) there exists a partition \( S = S_1 \cup \ldots \cup S_d \) satisfying \( v \notin \text{span}(S_1) \cup \cdots \cup \text{span}(S_d) \),

b) there exists a set \( T \subseteq S \) and a natural number \( D \) such that \( |T| > d(D - 1) \) and the span of every \( D \)-element subset of \( T \) contains \( v \).

**Proof.** Let \( M \) be the linear matroid on the set \( S \cup \{ v \} \). Then part (a) is equivalent to the statement that the contracted matroid \( M/\{v\} \) can be partitioned into \( d \) independent sets. Our claim is then the special case of the result of Edmonds [10] applied to the matroid \( M/\{v\} \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 16.** Let \( m, t \) be integers satisfying \( m \geq 2 \) and \( t \geq 3 \). Suppose that the characteristic of \( \mathbb{F}_q \) is more than \( m \), and \( t \) points \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \in \mathbb{P}^b \) are minimally \( m \)-dependent. Then \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \) span a linear space of dimension at most \( \frac{2}{m+2} t - 1 \).
This lemma is inspired by a result of Białynicki-Birula and Schinzel [3, Theorem 2]. In particular, the polarization idea that we use in our proof is implicit in theirs. Their argument could be adapted to prove a bound of $t/2$ in place of $\frac{2}{m+2} t - 1$, which would suffice for an exponential bound in Theorem 1.

**Proof of Lemma 16.** Define linear forms $\ell_i(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \langle p_i, x \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. From the discussion following the definition of $m$-dependence in Section 3 we know that $m$-dependence of $p_1, \ldots, p_t$ is equivalent to linear dependence between $\ell_1(x)^m, \ldots, \ell_t(x)^m$.

Since $p_1, \ldots, p_t$ are minimally $m$-dependent, no proper subset of $\ell_1(x)^m, \ldots, \ell_t(x)^m$ is linearly dependent, and so all the coefficients in this linear relation are non-zero. Since the $\ell_i$’s are defined only up to a scalar, we may rescale them so that

$$\ell_1(x)^m + \cdots + \ell_t(x)^m = 0.$$ 

Since $m! \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_q$, we may polarize this relation: let $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be $m$ vectors of indeterminants, make the substitution $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_m$, and consider only the multilinear terms. We obtain

$$\prod_{j=1}^{m} \ell_1(x_j) + \cdots + \prod_{j=1}^{m} \ell_t(x_j) = 0. \quad (4)$$

Note that the minimality assumption implies that the points $p_1, \ldots, p_t$ are distinct, and hence the the linear forms $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_t$ are pairwise linearly independent.

Let $r$ be the dimension of the vector space spanned by the forms $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_t$. Note that $r - 1$ is the dimension of the linear space spanned by the points $p_1, \ldots, p_t$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the last $r$ forms $\ell_{t-r+1}, \ell_{t-r+2}, \ldots, \ell_t$ are linearly independent.

Denote by $L$ the set of remaining forms, i.e., $L \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{t-r} \}$. Suppose that we can partition $L$ into $m-1$ many sets $L_1, \ldots, L_{m-1}$ such that $\bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \text{span}(L_j)$ does not contains every one of $\ell_{t-r+1}, \ell_{t-r+2}, \ldots, \ell_t$. Pick a generic $b_j \in L_j$, for each $j$, and substitute $b_j$ for $x_j$ in (4) to obtain

$$c_{t-r+1} \ell_{t-r+1}(x_m) + \cdots + c_t \ell_t(x_m) = 0,$$

where $c_i = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \ell_i(b_j)$. Since the $b_j$’s are generic, $c_i \neq 0$ whenever $\ell_i \not\in \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} \text{span}(L_j)$. In particular, not all coefficients $c_{t-r+1}, \ldots, c_t$ are zero. Because the forms $\ell_{t-r+1}$ through $\ell_t$ are linearly independent, this is a contradiction, and so no partition of $L$ into $L_1, \ldots, L_{m-1}$ as above exists.

Hence, according to Lemma 15, for every $j = t - r + 1, \ldots, t$ there is a subset $T_j \subseteq L$ and an integer $D_j \geq 1$ such that $|T_j| > (m-1)(D_j - 1)$ and the span of every $D_j$-element subset of $T_j$ contains $\ell_j$. Note that the last condition implies that

$$T_j \subseteq \text{span} T' \quad \text{for every } T' \subset T_j \text{ of size } |T'| \geq D_j. \quad (5)$$

In particular, $\dim \text{span} T_j \leq D_j$. Since $\ell_j$ is pairwise linearly independent with the elements of $T_j$, it follows that $D_j \geq 2$.

Let

$$W_j \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{span} \bigcup_{i \leq j} T_j.$$
If \( T_j \not\subseteq W_{j-1} \), then from (5) it follows that
\[
|T_j \setminus W_{j-1}| \geq (m-2)(D_j - 1) + \dim(W_j) - \dim(W_{j-1}).
\]
Because \( \dim(W_j) - \dim(W_{j-1}) \leq \dim \text{span} T_j \leq D_j \), this implies that
\[
|T_j \setminus W_{j-1}| \geq (\dim(W_j) - \dim(W_{j-1})) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{(m-2)(D_j - 1)}{D_j}\right) \geq (\dim(W_j) - \dim(W_{j-1})) \cdot \frac{m}{2}. \tag{6}
\]
Note that this inequality holds also if \( T_j \subseteq W_{j-1} \), as in that case the right side vanishes. The summation of (6) over all \( j \) telescopes, and we obtain
\[
|L| \geq \sum_{j=t-r+1}^{t} |T_j \setminus W_{j-1}| \geq (\dim(W_t) - \dim(W_0)) \cdot \frac{m}{2} = \frac{rm}{2}.
\]
Since \( |L| = t - r \), this completes the proof. \( \square \)

Define
\[
\Phi'_t(b,m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(p_1,\ldots,p_t) \in \Phi_t(b,m) : \text{points } p_1,\ldots,p_t \text{ span } \mathbb{P}^b\},
\]
\[
\phi'_t(b,m) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \dim \Phi'_t(b,m).
\]

**Lemma 17.** Suppose that \( m \geq 3 \) is non-zero in \( \mathbb{F}_q \). Then \( \phi'_t(b,m) \leq (t - b - 1)(b + 1). \)

**Proof.** For notational brevity, let \( \mathcal{L} \) denote the set of all linear forms in \( b+1 \) variables. Let
\[
U \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} \in \mathcal{L}^t : \text{span}\{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} = \mathcal{L} \},
\]
\[
W_t \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} \in U : \ell_1(x)^m + \cdots + \ell_t(x)^m = 0 \}.
\]

From the proof of the preceding lemma we know that \( \dim \Phi'_t(b,m) \leq \dim W_t \). We shall upper bound \( \dim W_t \) by bounding the dimension of the tangent space at every point of \( W_t \).

Let \( \{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} \in W_t \). Since \( \ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t \) span \( \mathcal{L} \), by renumbering the forms, we may assume that the forms \( \ell_1,\ldots,\ell_{b+1} \) span \( \mathcal{L} \). Furthermore, by applying a linear change of coordinates, we may also assume that \( \ell_i(x) = x_{i-1} \) for each \( i = 1,2,\ldots,b+1 \). Then \( (\Delta_1,\ldots,\Delta_t) \in \mathcal{L}^t \) is in the tangent space to \( W_t \) at point \( \{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} \in W_t \) if and only if
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{b+1} \Delta_i(x)x_{i-1}^{m-1} + \sum_{i=b+2}^{t} \Delta_i(x)\ell_i(x)^{m-1} = 0.
\]
Since \( m \geq 3 \), the monomials appearing in \( \Delta_1(x)x_0^{m-1},\ldots,\Delta_{b+1}(x)x_b^{m-1} \) are distinct. This implies that the tangent space to \( W_1 \) at \( \{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t\} \) is of codimension at least \( (b+1)^2 \). Therefore,
\[
\phi'_t(b,m) \leq \dim W_t \leq t(b+1) - (b+1)^2 = (t - b - 1)(b + 1). \quad \square
\]
Lemma 18. Suppose that \( t, b, m \geq 3 \) are integers, and suppose that the characteristic of \( \mathbb{F}_q \) exceeds \( m \). Then

\begin{align*}
\text{a)} & \quad \Phi_t(b, m) = \emptyset \text{ if } t \leq m + 1, \text{ and} \\
\text{b)} & \quad \phi_t(b, m) \leq \lfloor \frac{2}{m+2} t \rfloor (b + \frac{m-2}{m+2} t) \text{ if } m + 2 \leq t \leq b.
\end{align*}

Proof. From Lagrange interpolation it follows that no set of \( m + 1 \) or fewer points is \( m \)-dependent. Hence \( \Phi_t(b, m) = \emptyset \) if \( t \leq m + 1 \).

Let \( r' = \lfloor \frac{2}{m+2} t - 1 \rfloor \). Let \( \text{Gr}(r, \mathbb{P}^b) \) be the Grassmanian of linear subspaces of dimension \( r \) in \( \mathbb{P}^b \). We then have

\[
\phi_t(b, m) \leq \max_{r \leq r'} \left( \phi'_t(r, m) + \dim \text{Gr}(r, \mathbb{P}^b) \right) \quad \text{by Lemma 16}
\]

\[
\leq \max_{r \leq r'} \left( (t - r - 1)(r + 1) + (r + 1)(b - r) \right) \quad \text{by Lemma 17}
\]

\[
= \max_{r \leq r'} (t + b - 2r - 1)(r + 1).
\]

Without the restriction on \( r \), the maximum of the quadratic \( (t + b - 2r - 1)(r + 1) \) is achieved when \( r = \frac{t+b-3}{4} \). Since \( b \geq t \), the value \( \frac{t+b-3}{4} \) is larger than \( r' \), and so

\[
\phi_t(b, m) \leq (t + b - 2r' - 1)(r' + 1) \leq (t + b - \frac{4}{m+2} t) \lfloor \frac{2}{m+2} t \rfloor \]  

\( \Box \)

6 Construction for the Turán problem

Lemma 19. Let \( r, s, Z \geq 1 \) be integers. Let \( \ell \) be a prime. Set \( b = r + s + Z \). Suppose that \( b, m, Z, r \) satisfy the inequalities \( \binom{m+1+r}{m} \geq s^2 \), \( m \geq 3 \) as well as the condition (3) for every field of characteristic \( \ell \). Then, for every sufficiently large \( n \) there is a graph with \( \Theta(n) \) vertices and \( \Omega(n^{2-1/s}) \) edges that is \( K_{r,t} \)-free for \( t > m^{s+Z} \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{M}_r(s^2) \).

Proof. Let \( q \) be the power of \( \ell \) satisfying \( n \leq q^s < \ell^s n \).

Let \( f_1, \ldots, f_Z \) be polynomials as in Lemma 14. Let \( \delta_i \equiv M_{r-i+1}(s^2) \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, r \). Let \( h_1, \ldots, h_r \) and \( h'_1, \ldots, h'_r \) be two independent collections of random homogeneous polynomials on \( \mathbb{P}^b \) with \( \mathbb{F}_q \)-coefficients of degrees \( \deg h_i = \deg h'_i = \delta_i \). Let \( g \) be a random bihomogeneous \( \mathbb{F}_q \)-polynomial on \( \mathbb{P}^b \times \mathbb{P}^b \) of bidegree \( (m, m) \).

Define

\[
L_0 \equiv \{ f_1, \ldots, f_Z, h_1, \ldots, h_r \} \cap \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q),
\]

\[
R_0 \equiv \{ f_1, \ldots, f_Z, h'_1, \ldots, h'_r \} \cap \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q).
\]

Let \( c' = c'(s + Z, s, \deg W) \) be the constant from Lemma 12 applied with \( W = \{ f_1, \ldots, f_Z \} \), and let \( C = C(s^2, s, m^{s+Z}, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_r) \) be the constant from Proposition 11(b). Put \( c \equiv \min \left( \frac{1}{2}, c', (5C)^{-1/s} \right) \). Let \( L \) be a set of size \( \min \langle cq^s, |L_0| \rangle \) chosen canonically from \( L_0 \) (for example, it could be the initial segment of \( L_0 \) in some fixed ordering of \( \mathbb{P}^b \)). Let \( R \) be a similarly defined subset of \( R_0 \) of size \( \min \langle cq^s, |R_0| \rangle \).

Define the bipartite graph \( G \) with parts \( L \) and \( R \) by connecting \( (l, r) \in L \times R \) whenever \( g(l, r) = 0 \).
**Graph $G$ has $\Theta(q^s)$ vertices and $\Omega(q^{2s-1})$ edges.** By Lemma 4(a), both $L_0$ and $R_0$ have at least $\frac{1}{q}q^s$ elements with probability $1 - O(1/q^s)$. Since $c \leq \frac{1}{q}$, this means that

$$\Pr[|L| = |R| = cq^s] \geq 1 - O(q^{-s}).$$ (7)

Since the polynomial $g$ is independent of $L_0$ and $R_0$, it follows, by Lemma 4(b) applied with $Y = L \times R$ to the single random polynomial $g$, that the edge set $E(G) = (L \times R) \cap V(g)$ is of size at least $|L||R|/2q$ with probability at least $1 - O(q^{-2s+1})$. In view of (7), it then follows that

$$\Pr[E(G) \geq \frac{1}{4}c^2q^{2s-1}] \geq 1 - O(q^{-s}).$$ (8)

**Graph $G$ is $K_{s,t}$-free.** Because of the symmetry between the two parts of $G$, it suffices to show that $G$ is very unlikely to contain $K_{s,t}$ with the part of size $s$ embedded into $L$. Since $L \subset V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ and $V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$ is $m$-independent, the set $L$ is $m$-independent. Let $W \overset{\text{def}}{=} V(f_1, \ldots, f_Z)$. Since $(m+1+r) \geq s^2$, Lemma 12 applies, telling us that with probability $\frac{4}{5}$ every variety of the form

$$W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ w \in W : g(l_1, w) = \cdots = g(l_s, w) = 0 \},$$

for distinct $l_1, \ldots, l_s$, is of dimension $\dim W - s = r$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the set of all varieties of the form $W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s}$ for distinct $l_1, \ldots, l_s \in L$. The set $\mathcal{W}$ is random: it depends on the random choice of polynomials $h_1, \ldots, h_r$ (because $L$ depends on these polynomials), and it depends on the polynomial $g$. Crucially, $\mathcal{W}$ does not depend on polynomials $h'_1, \ldots, h'_r$.

So, we may apply Proposition 11(b) to each variety in $\mathcal{W}$ and polynomials $h'_1, \ldots, h'_r$. Note that $\deg(W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s}) \leq \deg(W)m^s \leq m^{s+z}$ by Bézout’s inequality. Therefore, combined with the union bound, the proposition tells us that

$$\Pr[\exists \text{ distinct } l_1, \ldots, l_s \in L \text{ s.t. } \dim(W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s} \cap V(h'_1, \ldots, h'_r)) > 0]$$

$$\leq \Pr[\dim(W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s}) > r \text{ for some } l_1, \ldots, l_s] + \Pr[|L| \neq cq^s] + (cq^s)^s \cdot C(s^2, s, m^{s+z})q^{-s}$$

$$\leq \frac{4}{5} + O(q^{-s}) + c^2C(s^2, s, m^{s+z}).$$

Because the constant $c$ satisfies $c \leq (5C)^{-1/8}$, this probability is at most $\frac{4}{5} + O(q^{-s})$. Note that the variety $W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s} \cap V(h'_1, \ldots, h'_r)$ contains all common neighbors of the vertices $l_1, \ldots, l_s$ in the graph $G$. By Bézout’s inequality, the degree of this variety is at most $\deg(W)m^s \prod_{i=1}^{r} \delta_i < t$, and hence

$$\Pr[\text{some } s \text{ vertices in } L \text{ have } t \text{ common neighbors in } G] \leq \frac{4}{5} + O(q^{-s}).$$

By symmetry, we may derive the same bound with roles of $L$ and $R$ reversed, and so

$$\Pr[G \text{ contains } K_{s,t}] \leq \frac{4}{5} + O(q^{-s}).$$ (9)

Putting (7), (8) and (9) together, it follows that graph $G$ has $\Theta(q^s) = \Theta(n)$ vertices, at least $\Omega(q^{2s-1}) = \Omega(n^{2-1/s})$ edges, and contains no $K_{s,t}$ with probability at least $\frac{4}{5} - O(q^{-s}) > 0$. In particular, such a graph $G$ exists. \hfill $\square$

**Lemma 20.** For every $r \geq 1$ and every $T$, we have $\prod_{k=1}^{r} M_k(T) \leq T^{1+\log r!}$.  
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Proof. Since \( \binom{m+k}{m} \geq \left( \frac{m+1}{k} \right)^k \), the function \( M_k \) satisfies \( M_k(T) \leq \lceil kT^{1/k} \rceil \). The lemma then follows from the inequality \( 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r} \leq 1 + \log r \). \qed

Proof of Theorem 1. We may assume that \( s \geq 100 \), for otherwise the theorem follows from the result of Kollár, Rónyai and Szabó [18] that we mentioned in the introduction. Let \( m \overset{\text{def}}{=} 3 \), \( r \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lceil (6s^2)^{1/3} \rceil \), and \( Z \overset{\text{def}}{=} s + r + 2 \). For this choice, the constant \( Z \) satisfies
\[
5(t-1)Z - 2t(s+r+Z+\frac{1}{2}t) = (t-5)(s+r) + (6t-10) - \frac{2}{5}t^2.
\]
Since \( 6t-10 > \frac{2}{5}t^2 \) for \( t = 5, 6, 7, 8 \) and \( (t-5)(s+r) \geq (t-5)t \geq \frac{2}{5}t^2 \) for \( t \geq 9 \), it follows that
\[
Z > \frac{2t}{5(t-1)}(s+r+Z+\frac{1}{2}t) \quad \text{for all } t = m+2, m+3, \ldots, s.
\]

Let \( \ell = 5 \). From Lemma 18(b) it then follows that \( Z > \frac{1}{5\ell} \phi_t(b, m) \) for all \( t = m+2, m+3, \ldots, s \), whenever the characteristic of \( \mathbb{F}_q \) is \( \ell \).

We have \( \binom{m+1+t}{m} = \binom{r+1}{3} \geq (r+1)^3/6 \geq s^2 \), and so the result follows from Lemmas 19 and 20, the estimation
\[
\frac{r!\left(s^2\right)^{1+\log r}}{2s^{1/2}(r/e)^r} \cdot \left(s^2\right)^{1+\log r} \leq \frac{2}{3}x^{r+2+2\log r} \leq s^r \quad \text{for } s \geq 23,
\]
and the inequality \( 3^{r+2}s^r \leq s^{3r/2} \leq s^{4s^{2/3}} \) that is valid for \( s \geq 100 \).

7 Construction for the Zarankiewicz problem

This is similar, but simpler than the construction for the Turán problem from the preceding section because we do not need Lemmas 14 and 18.

Lemma 21. Let \( r, s, T \geq 1 \) be integers satisfying \( T \leq \binom{r+1+m}{m} \). Then, for every sufficiently large \( n \) there is a sided graph with \( \Theta(n^{r/m}) \) vertices on the left, \( \Theta(n) \) vertices on the right, and \( \Omega(n^{T/s^2+1-1/s}) \) edges that contains no sided \( K_{s,t} \) for \( t > m^s \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} M_i(T) \).

Proof. Unlike in the construction of Turán graphs, we do not need to worry about field characteristic. So, let \( q \) be the power of 2 satisfying \( n \leq q^s < 2^n \). Let \( b \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{r+s}{2} \).

Set \( \delta_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} M_{r-i+1}(T) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, r \). Let \( c' = c'(m, s, 1) \) be the constant from Lemma 12, and let \( C = C(T, s, m^s, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_r) \) be the constant from Proposition 11(b). Put \( c \overset{\text{def}}{=} \min(c', (5C)^{-1/s}) \). Pick \( a \geq 1 \) and an \( s \)-wise \( m \)-independent set \( L \) in \( \mathbb{P}^a(\mathbb{F}_q) \) of size \( cq^{T/s} \) arbitrarily. For example, we may choose \( a = cq^{T/s} \) and let \( L \) consist of linearly independent points.

We next pick several random polynomials with coefficients in \( \mathbb{F}_q \). Let \( g \) be a random bihomogeneous polynomial on \( \mathbb{P}^a \times \mathbb{P}^b \) of bidegree \( (m, m) \), and let \( h'_1, \ldots, h'_r \) be random independent homogeneous polynomials on \( \mathbb{P}^b \) of degrees \( \deg h'_1 = \delta_i \). Let
\[
R \overset{\text{def}}{=} V(h'_1, \ldots, h'_r) \cap \mathbb{P}^b(\mathbb{F}_q).
\]

Define the sided graph \( G \) with the left part \( L \) and the right part \( R \) by connecting \( (l, r) \in L \times R \) whenever \( g(l, r) = 0 \).
Invoking Lemma 12 with $W = \mathbb{P}^b$ we see that, with probability $\frac{2}{3}$, every variety of the form

$$W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ w \in \mathbb{P}^b : g(l_1, w) = \cdots = g(l_s, w) = 0 \},$$

for distinct $l_1, \ldots, l_s \in L$, has dimension $b - s = r$. By Bézout’s inequality, $\deg W_{l_1, \ldots, l_s} \leq m^s$, and so the union bound and Proposition 11(b) together imply that

$$\Pr[G \text{ contains sided } K_{s, t}] \leq \frac{2}{3} + O(q^{-s}), \quad (10)$$

where we used that $c \leq (5C)^{-1/s}$, similarly to the corresponding step in the proof of Lemma 19.

Also, from Proposition 11(b) applied to $W = \mathbb{P}^b$ we learn that $\Pr[\dim \mathbf{V}(h'_1, \ldots, h'_s) > s] = O(q^{-s})$.

In view of Lemma 3, this implies that

$$\Pr[|R| = O_s(q^s)] \geq 1 - O(q^{-s}). \quad (11)$$

Finally, by applying Lemmas 4(a) and 4(b), it follows that

$$\Pr[|E(G)| \geq \frac{1}{4}c q^{T/s + s - 1}] \geq \frac{1}{4}c q^s \Pr[|R| \geq \frac{1}{4}c q^s | |E(G)| \geq \frac{1}{4}c q^{T/s} \cdot 1/q^{s-1} | |R| \geq 1/2q^s]$$

$$\geq (1 - O(q^{-s}))(1 - O(q^{-s+1} q^{-T/s})) = 1 - O(q^{-s+1}). \quad (12)$$

From (10), (11), (12) we see that there exists a sided graph with $cq^{T/s}$ vertices on the left, $O_s(q^s)$ vertices on the right, and at least $\frac{1}{4}cq^{T/s + s - 1}$ edges.

**Proof of Theorem 2(a).** Let $T \overset{\text{def}}{=} s^2 \log n m$, and $r \overset{\text{def}}{=} [s/ \log^2 s]$. Note that these constants satisfy $(r+1+k) \geq (s/ \log^2 s)^k/k! \geq s^2 \log n m$. We then use Lemma 21 with $k$ in place of $m$, and appeal to Lemma 20 to bound

$$\prod_{i=1}^r M_i(r) \leq T^{1+\log r} r! \leq s^{(1+\log r)k r^s} \leq s^{(1+\log s) \frac{r}{2 \log^2 s} (s/ \log^2 s)^{s/ \log^2 s} \leq e^{2s/ \log s}$$

to obtain the stated result.

**Proof of Theorem 2(b).** Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer to be chosen shortly. Let $r \overset{\text{def}}{=} [s/ \log s]$, and $T \overset{\text{def}}{=} (r+1+k)$ Note that there are constants $c''''$ and $c'''''$ such that

$$c'''' k^r \leq T/s^2 \leq c''''' k^r,$$

and choose $k$ to be the smallest integer so that $c'''' k^r \geq \log n m$.

Applying Lemma 21 with $k$ in place of $m$, we obtain a sided graph whose left part is of size $\Omega(n^{T/s^2}) = \Omega(n^{c'''' k^r}) = \Omega(m)$ and the right part is of size $\Theta(n)$, matching the Kövári, Sós, Turán bound for $K_{s, t}$-free graphs for $t > k^s \prod_{i=1}^r M_i(r)$. Since

$$k^s \prod_{i=1}^r M_i(r) \leq k^s r^r T^{1+\log r} = O_s(k^{s+2r+\log r}) = O_s(k^{r+2r+\log s}) = O_s(\log n m)^{1+2 \log s}.$$ 

Choosing the smallest $k$ so that $c'''' k^r \geq \log n m$ completes the proof.
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