

# Generating non-jumps from a known one

Jianfeng Hou\*, Heng Li†, Caihong Yang‡, and Yixiao Zhang§

Center for Discrete Mathematics, Fuzhou University, Fujian, 350003, China

August 2, 2022

## Abstract

Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. The real number  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a jump for  $r$  if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and any integer  $m \geq r$ , there exists an integer  $n_0(\epsilon, m)$  satisfying any  $r$ -uniform graph with  $n \geq n_0(\epsilon, m)$  vertices and density at least  $\alpha + \epsilon$  contains a subgraph with  $m$  vertices and density at least  $\alpha + c$ . A result of Erdős, Stone and Simonovits implies that every  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a jump for  $r = 2$ . Erdős asked whether the same is true for  $r \geq 3$ . Frankl and Rödl gave a negative answer by showing that  $1 - \frac{1}{r-1}$  is not a jump for  $r$  if  $r \geq 3$  and  $l > 2r$ . After that, more non-jumps are found using a method of Frankl and Rödl. In this note, we show a method to construct maps  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that preserve non-jumps, if  $\alpha$  is a non-jump for  $r$  given by the method of Frankl and Rödl, then  $f(\alpha)$  is also a non-jump for  $r$ . We use these maps to study hypergraph Turán densities and answer a question posed by Grosu.

## 1 Introduction

For an integer  $r \geq 2$  an  $r$ -uniform hypergraph (henceforth  $r$ -graph)  $\mathcal{H}$  is a collection of  $r$ -subsets of some finite set  $V$ . Let  $d(\mathcal{H}) = |\mathcal{H}| / \binom{|V(\mathcal{H})|}{r}$  denote the *density* of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Given a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $r$ -graphs we say  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -free if it does not contain any member of  $\mathcal{F}$  as a subgraph. The *Turán number*  $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the maximum number of edges in an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free  $r$ -graph on  $n$  vertices. The *Turán density*  $\pi(\mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined as  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F}) / \binom{n}{r}$ ; the existence of the limit was established in [12].

Determining  $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{F})$ , which is perhaps the central topic in extremal combinatorics, is closely related to jumps. Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. The real number  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a *jump* for  $r$  if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and any integer  $m \geq r$ , there exists an integer  $n_0(\epsilon, m)$  satisfying any  $r$ -graph with  $n \geq n_0(\epsilon, m)$  vertices and density at least  $\alpha + \epsilon$  contains a subgraph with  $m$  vertices and density at least  $\alpha + c$ . For graphs, the classical Erdős-Stone-Simonovits Theorem [6, 7] determined the Turán numbers of all non-bipartite graphs asymptotically, which implies that every  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a jump for  $r = 2$ . For  $r \geq 3$ , Erdős [4] proved that every  $\alpha \in [0, r!/r^r)$  is a jump for  $r$  and conjectured that

---

\*Research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12071077).  
Email: jfhou@fzu.edu.cn

†Email: hengli.fzu@gmail.com

‡Email: ych325123@outlook.com

§Email: fzuzyx@gmail.com

**Conjecture 1.1.** *Every  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  is a jump for every  $r \geq 2$ .*

The conjecture was disproved by Frankl and Rödl [9] by showing that  $1 - 1/(l^r - 1)$  is not a jump for  $r$  if  $r \geq 3$  and  $l > 2r$ . After that, more non-jumps were found. Frankl, Peng, Rödl and Talbot [8] showed that  $\frac{5r!}{2r^r}$  is a non-jump for  $r \geq 3$ , and for any integer  $s \geq 1$  and  $l \geq 9s + 6$  the number  $1 - \frac{l}{3} + \frac{3s+2}{l^2}$  is a non-jump for  $r = 3$ . Recently, Yan and Peng [23] show that  $\frac{54r!}{25r^r}$  is a non-jump for  $r \geq 3$  and this is the smallest known non-jump number. Meanwhile, they gave infinitely many irrational non-jumps for every  $r \geq 3$  in the same paper. For more non-jump results, please refer to [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. A well-known open question of Erdős [5] is that whether  $r!/r^r$  is a jump for  $r \geq 3$  and what is the smallest non-jump number? Baber and Talbot [1] showed that every  $\alpha \in [0.2299, 0.2316) \cup [0.2871, 8/27)$  is a jump for  $r = 3$ . However, both questions still remain open.

The above results about non-jumps depends on a approach given by Frankl and Rödl [9]: First, construct a sequence of  $r$ -graph  $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  (call it non-jump  $r$ -graph sequence in Section 2) each of whose Lagrangian is greater than  $\alpha/r!$ , then choose a specific graph  $\mathcal{G}_t$  such that the Lagrangian of its induced subhypergraphs with fixed vertices is at most  $\alpha/r!$ , at last use a lemma given by Frankl and Rödl [9] to get a contradiction, call it Frankl-Rödl method. In this note, we show a method to construct infinitely many maps  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that preserve non-jumps and prove that

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose that  $r \geq 3$  is an integer and  $\alpha$  is a known non-jump for  $r$  given by the Frankl-Rödl method. Then we can generate infinitely many reals  $f(\alpha)$  which are non-jumps for  $r$ .*

The method used in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is motivated by Liu and Pikhurko [14], who defined an operation of patterns to study hypergraph Turán densities. We will define the union of two patterns and show that the resulting pattern still preserves some properties of the original one. It also has applications in hypergraph Turán densities. Now, we list one. For every integer  $r \geq 2$ , define

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)} &:= \{\pi(\mathcal{F}): \mathcal{F} \text{ is a finite family of } r\text{-graphs}\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)} &:= \{\pi(\mathcal{F}): \mathcal{F} \text{ is a (possibly infinite) family of } r\text{-graphs}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Grosu [11] asked the following question.

**Question 1.3** (see Grosu [11]). *For any  $r \geq 3$  find a polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  such that for any Turán density  $x$  for  $r$ -graphs,  $f(x)$  is also a Turán density for  $r$ -graphs.*

In fact, the arguments in [11] with a minor modification imply that  $1 - \frac{1-a}{2^{r-1}} \in \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$  if  $a \in \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ . We generalize this by showing

**Theorem 1.4.** *For an integer  $r \geq 2$ , if  $a \in \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ , then  $1 - \frac{1-a}{m^{r-1}} \in \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$  for each integer  $m \geq 2$ .*

We remark that if  $\alpha$  is a non-jump for  $r$ , then for any constant  $c > 0$  there exists a Turán density  $\gamma$  such that  $\gamma \in (\alpha, \alpha + c]$ . By Theorem 1.2 and the fact that  $f(x) = 1 - \frac{1-x}{m^{r-1}}$  is a linear strictly monotone increasing function on  $[0, 1]$ , we have

**Corollary 1.5.** *If  $\alpha$  is a non-jump for  $r$ , then for each integer  $m \geq 2$ ,  $1 - \frac{1-\alpha}{m^{r-1}}$  is also a non-jump for  $r$ .*

The rest of the paper is organized as follow. In Section 2 we introduce some preliminary definitions and results about patterns, and define the union of patterns. In Section 3, we give a property of the union of two patterns and prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.4.

## 2 Pattern and the union

### 2.1 Pattern

In this subsection, we introduce some preliminary definitions and results about patterns. Pikhurko [22] defined patterns to study the possible hypergraph Turán densities. In this note, we give the special case of patterns. The general case can be found in [22]. Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer and  $S$  be a finite set. A  $r$ -multiset  $E$  on  $S$  is an unordered collection of  $r$  elements from  $S$  with repetitions allowed. For  $i \in S$ , we use  $E(i)$  denote the multiplicity of  $i$  in  $E$ . An  $r$ -uniform *pattern* (henceforth  $r$ -pattern) is a pair  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  where  $m$  is a positive integer,  $\mathcal{E}$  is a collection of  $r$ -multisets on  $[m]$ . For  $i \in [m]$  and  $s = 0, 1, \dots, r$ , let  $\mathcal{E}^{i,s} = \{E \in \mathcal{E} : E(i) = s\}$ . Let  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  be disjoint sets and let  $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$ . The *profile* of an  $r$ -set  $S \subseteq V$  (with respect to  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ ) is the  $r$ -multiset on  $[m]$  that contains element  $i$  with multiplicity  $|S \cap V_i|$  for every  $i \in [m]$ . For an  $r$ -multiset  $E \subseteq [m]$  let  $E((V_1, \dots, V_m))$  consist of all  $r$ -subsets of  $V$  whose profile is  $E$ . We call this  $r$ -graph the *blowup* of  $E$  and the  $r$ -graph

$$\mathcal{E}((V_1, \dots, V_m)) := \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} E((V_1, \dots, V_m))$$

is called the *blowup* of  $\mathcal{E}$  (with respect to  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ ). We say an  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $P$ -*construction* it is a blowup of  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Let  $S$  be a subset of  $[m]$ , we use  $P[S] = (|S|, \mathcal{E}[S])$  to denote the induced subpattern with respect to  $S$ , where  $\mathcal{E}[S] = \{E \in \mathcal{E} : E \text{ is a multiset on } S\}$ . For  $i \in [m]$  let  $P - i$  be the pattern obtained from  $P$  by *removing index*  $i$ , that is, we remove  $i$  from  $[m]$  and delete all multisets containing  $i$  from  $\mathcal{E}$  (and relabel the remaining indices to form the set  $[m - 1]$ ). Note that these are special cases of the more general definitions from [22].

It is easy to see that the notion of a pattern is a generalization of hypergraphs, since every  $r$ -graph is a pattern in which  $\mathcal{E}$  is a collection of (ordinary)  $r$ -sets. Thus, we use  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$  to denote the pattern with respect to  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$ . For many families  $\mathcal{F}$  the extremal  $\mathcal{F}$ -free constructions are usually a blowup of some simple patterns. For example, let  $P_B = (2, \{\{\{1, 2, 2\}\}, \{\{1, 1, 2\}\}\})$  (here we use  $\{\{\}\}$  to distinguish it from ordinary sets). Then a  $P_B$ -construction is a 3-graph  $\mathcal{H}$  whose vertex set can be partitioned into two parts  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  such that  $\mathcal{H}$  consists of all triples that have nonempty intersections with both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . A famous result in Hypergraph Turán problem shows that the pattern  $P_B$  characterizes the structure of (large) extremal constructions that do not contain a Fano plane (see [3, 10, 13]).

Denote by  $\Delta_{m-1}$  the standard  $(m - 1)$ -dimensional simplex, i.e.,

$$\Delta_{m-1} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in [0, 1]^m : x_1 + \dots + x_m = 1\}.$$

For a pattern  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  let the *Lagrange polynomial* of  $\mathcal{E}$  be

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) := r! \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{x_i^{E(i)}}{E(i)!}.$$

In other words,  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$  gives the asymptotic edge density of a large blowup of  $\mathcal{E}$ , given its relative part sizes  $x_i$ . The *Lagrangian* of  $P$  is defined as follows:

$$\lambda(P) := \max \{ \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) : (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1} \}.$$

Since  $\Delta_{m-1}$  is compact, a well known theorem of Weierstraß implies that the restriction of  $x$  to  $\Delta_{m-1}$  attains a maximum value. Thus  $\lambda(P)$  is well-defined. We call  $P$  *minimal* if  $\lambda(P-i)$  is strictly smaller than  $\lambda(P)$  for every  $i \in [m]$ . Note that if  $P$  is minimal and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$  is a vector that maximizes  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$ , then  $x_i > 0$  for  $i \in [m]$ . In particular, for an  $r$ -graph  $G$ , the *Lagrangian* of  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined as  $\lambda(\mathcal{G}) = \lambda(P_{\mathcal{G}})$ .

**Fact 2.1.** *Let  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $r$ -pattern. For  $S \subseteq [m]$ ,  $\lambda(P) \geq \lambda(P[S])$ .*

The following lemma is simple, whose short proof is included here for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $P$  be a  $r$ -pattern. If  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $P$ -construction, then  $\lambda(P) \geq \lambda(\mathcal{G})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $r$ -pattern and  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $P$ -construction. Notice that for a  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$  (or  $r$ -pattern  $P$ )  $\lambda(\mathcal{G})$  (or  $\lambda(P)$ ) equals the maximum edge density of its blowup. So, it suffices to show any blowup of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a subgraph of some  $P$ -construction on  $|V(\mathcal{G})|$  vertices. Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $P$ -construction,  $\mathcal{G}$  has a partition  $V(\mathcal{G}) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$  such that for each  $e \in \mathcal{G}$ , the profile of  $e$  with respect to  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  is contained in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{G}'$  is a blowup of  $\mathcal{G}$  where each vertices  $v$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  is replaced by a set  $W_v$  in  $\mathcal{G}'$ . Let  $V'_i = \cup_{v \in V_i} W_v$ . Then  $V'_1, \dots, V'_m$  is a partition of  $V(\mathcal{G}')$  and the profile of each  $e \in \mathcal{G}'$  with respect to  $V'_1, \dots, V'_m$  is also contained in  $\mathcal{E}$ . This means that  $\mathcal{G}'$  is a subgraph of the  $P$ -construction  $\mathcal{E}(V'_1, \dots, V'_m)$ .  $\blacksquare$

We remark that the inequality in Lemma 2.2 can be strictly true. For example, consider the 3-pattern  $P = (2, \{\{1, 1, 2\}\})$  and a  $P$ -construction  $\mathcal{G}$  with exactly one edge  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ . Clearly,

$$\lambda(P) = \max \{ 3x_1^2 x_2 : (x_1, x_2) \in \Delta_1 \} = 4/9 > 2/9 = \lambda(\mathcal{G}).$$

Now we give some results about non-jump, Frankl and Rödl [9] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a number  $\lambda_0$  to be a jump.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The following two properties are equivalent.*

- (a)  $\lambda_0$  is a jump for  $r$ .
- (b) There exists some finite family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $r$ -uniform graphs satisfying  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) \leq \lambda_0$  and  $\lambda(F) > \lambda_0$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 2.4.** *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer, and  $(P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of  $r$ -patterns. We call  $(P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $(k, \lambda_0)$ -sequence if there exists a positive real number sequence  $(\epsilon(t))_{t=1}^{\infty}$  such that the following holds:*

- (1)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(P_t) = \lambda_0$ ,
- (2)  $\lambda(P_t) \geq \lambda_0 + \epsilon(t)$  for all  $t$ , and
- (3)  $\lambda(P_t[S]) \leq \lambda_0$  for every  $t$  and subset  $S \in \binom{[m_t]}{k}$ .

We call an  $r$ -pattern sequence  $(P_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is *non-jump sequence* on  $\lambda_0$  if for any constant  $k > 0$ , there exist a constant  $t(k)$  such that  $(P_t)_{t=t(k)}^\infty$  is a  $(k, \lambda_0)$ -sequence. For  $r$ -graphs, we have corresponding definitions. We remark that  $\lambda_0$  is a non-jump through the Frankl-Rödl method mentioned in Introduction is to construct a non-jump  $r$ -graph sequence  $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  on  $\lambda_0$ . In the following, we show Frankl-Rödl method also holds for patterns.

**Lemma 2.5.** *If there exists an  $r$ -pattern sequence  $(P_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  which is a non-jump sequence on  $\lambda_0$ , then  $\lambda_0$  is a non-jump for  $r$ .*

*Proof.* By contradiction, suppose that  $\lambda_0$  is a jump for  $r$ . By Lemma 2.3, there exists a finite collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $r$ -graphs satisfying  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) \leq \lambda_0$  and  $\lambda(F) > \lambda_0$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $k = \max\{|V(F)| : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Since  $(P_t)_{t=1}^\infty$  is a non-jump sequence on  $\lambda_0$ , there exist  $t(k)$  such that  $(P_t)_{t=t(k)}^\infty$  is a  $(k, \lambda_0)$ -sequence. This means there exists a positive constant  $\epsilon(t(k))$  such that  $\lambda(P_{t(k)}) \geq \lambda_0 + \epsilon(t(k))$ . So, for a sufficiently large  $n$ , we can find a  $P_{t(k)}$ -construction  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{E}(V_1, \dots, V_m)$  with  $n$  vertices and edge density at least  $\lambda_0 + \epsilon(t(k))/2$ . It follows from the fact  $\pi(\mathcal{F}) \leq \lambda_0$  that there exists a subset  $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{G})$  with  $|S| = k$  such that  $\mathcal{G}[S]$  contains some  $r$ -graph  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Suppose that the profiles of  $\mathcal{G}[S]$  (with respect to  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ ) is  $S_f$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}[S]$  is a  $P_{t(k)}[S_f]$ -construction. By Lemma 2.2 and the fact that  $\lambda(P_{t(k)}[S_f]) \leq \lambda_0$ ,

$$\lambda(F) \leq \lambda(\mathcal{G}[S]) \leq \lambda(P_{t(k)}[S_f]) \leq \lambda_0,$$

a contradiction. ■

## 2.2 Union of patterns

In this subsection, we define the union of two patterns and study its properties. To study the hypergraph Turán densities that have arbitrarily large algebraic degree, Liu and Pikhurko [14] give an ingenious approach by defining an operation on the pattern. Let  $r \geq 3$  and  $s \geq 1$  be two integers, and  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $r$ -pattern. An  $(r + s)$ -pattern  $P + s = (m + s, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$  is defined in the following way: for every  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  we insert the  $s$ -set  $\{m + 1, \dots, m + s\}$  into  $E$ , and let  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$  denote the resulting family of  $(r + s)$ -multisets. The new pattern  $P + s$  has many elegant properties. For example, if  $P$  is minimal, then so is  $P + s$ , and  $\lambda(P + s)$  can be determined completely with respect to  $\lambda(P)$ . Motivated by it, we define the union of two patterns by the following.

**Definition 2.6.** *Let  $r > 0$  be an integer. Given two  $r$ -patterns  $P_1 = (m_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $P_2 = (m_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$ , the union of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  on  $i$ , denoted by  $P_1 \oplus_i P_2$ , is a  $r$ -pattern  $(m_1 + m_2 - 1, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$ , such that  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$  is a collection of  $r$ -multisets on  $\{1, \dots, i - 1, i_1, \dots, i_{m_2}, r + 1, \dots, m_1\}$  that is defined in the following way:*

- (a) if  $E = \{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , then  $\{i_{a_1}, \dots, i_{a_r}\} \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}$ ;
- (b) if  $E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,0}$ , then  $E \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}$ ;
- (c) for every  $s \in [r]$  and  $E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,s}$ ,  $(E \setminus i^{(a)}) \cup A \in \widehat{\mathcal{E}}$  for all  $a$ -multisets  $A$  in  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{m_2}\}$ , where  $i^{(a)}$  denotes the multiset  $\underbrace{\{i, \dots, i\}}_a$ .

**Remarks.**

- By the definition of  $P_1 \oplus_i P_2$ , we know if an  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $(P_1 \oplus_i P_2)$ -construction, then there exists a partition  $V(\mathcal{H}) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{m_1}$  such that the following holds:

- (a) the induced subgraph  $\mathcal{H}[V_i]$  is a  $P_2$ -construction, and
- (b)  $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}[V_i]$  consists of all  $r$ -sets whose profiles are in  $\mathcal{E}_1$ .

- For a set  $T = \{i_1, \dots, i_t\} \subseteq [m_1]$ , we can define the *union*  $P_1 \oplus_T P_2$  of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  on  $T$  similarly. If an  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $(P_1 \oplus_T P_2)$ -construction, then there exists a partition  $V(\mathcal{H}) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_{m_1}$  such that the following holds:

- (a) the induced subgraph  $\mathcal{H}[V_i]$  is a  $P_2$ -construction for each  $i \in T$ , and
- (b)  $\mathcal{H} \setminus \cup_{i \in T} \mathcal{H}[V_i]$  consists of all  $r$ -sets whose profiles are in  $\mathcal{E}_1$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $P_1 \oplus_i P_2 = (m_1 + m_2 - 1, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$  be the union of two  $r$ -patterns  $P_1 = (m_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $P_2 = (m_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  on  $i \in [m_1]$ , and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1+m_2-1}$ . Then*

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}),$$

where  $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} x_{i_j}$ .

*Proof.* For a multisets  $A$  on  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{m_2}\}$ , let  $x_A = \prod_{a \in A} x_a$ . Then for  $s \in [r]$

$$\sum_{A \text{ is a } s\text{-multisets on } \{i_1, \dots, i_{m_2}\}} x_A = (x_{i_1} + \dots + x_{i_{m_2}})^s = x_i^s \quad (1)$$

Considering the  $r$ -multisets in  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$ , we have

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) = r! (f(x) + g(x)) \quad (2)$$

where

$$f(x) = \sum_{E=\{a_1, \dots, a_r\} \in \mathcal{E}_2} \prod_{j=1}^{m_2} \frac{x_{i_j}^{E(j)}}{E(j)!} = \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}})}{r!}, \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,0}} \prod_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{x_j^{E(j)}}{E(j)!} + \sum_{s=1}^r \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,s}} \sum_{A \text{ is a } s\text{-multisets on } \{i_1, \dots, i_{m_2}\}} \left( \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^{m_1} \frac{x_j^{E(j)}}{E(j)!} \right) \times \frac{x_A}{s!} \\ &= \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,0}} \prod_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{x_j^{E(j)}}{E(j)!} + \sum_{s=1}^r \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}_1^{i,s}} \prod_{j=1}^{m_1} \frac{x_j^{E(j)}}{E(j)!} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1})}{r!}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that the second equation in  $g(x)$  hold by (1). Combining (2), (3) and (4), we complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

For a subset we can also get the following similar result by Lemma 2.7 and induction on the size of the subset.

**Corollary 2.8.** Let  $T \subseteq [m_1]$ ,  $P_1 = (m_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $P_2 = (m_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  be two  $r$ -patterns. If  $P_1 \oplus_T P_2 = (m_1 + |T|(m_2 - 1), \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$  is the union of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  on  $T$  and  $x \in \Delta_{m_1 + |T|(m_2 - 1)}$ , then

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \sum_{i \in T} \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}),$$

where  $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} x_{i_j}$  for each  $i \in T$ .

The following interesting result shows that the Lagrangian of  $P_1 \oplus_i P_2$  is not related to the structure of  $P_2$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $P_1 \oplus_i P_2 = (m_1 + m_2 - 1, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$  be the union of two  $r$ -patterns  $P_1 = (m_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $P_2 = (m_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  on  $i \in [m_1]$  with  $\lambda = \lambda(P_2)$ . Then

$$\lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2) = \max\{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x) + \lambda x_i^r : x = (x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1 - 1}\}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$f(\lambda) = \max\{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x) + \lambda x_i^r : x = (x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1 - 1}\}.$$

By Weierstraß's Theorem,  $f(\lambda)$  is well-defined. Firstly, we prove  $\lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2) \leq f(\lambda)$ . Suppose that  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1 + m_2 - 1}$  satisfies  $\lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2) = \lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x)$ . Let  $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} x_{i_j}$ . Then  $(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1 - 1}$ , and so by Lemma 2.7,

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}), \quad (5)$$

If  $x_i = 0$ , then  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}) = 0$ , and so

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) \leq f(\lambda),$$

we are done. Suppose that  $x_i > 0$ . Then  $y = (\frac{x_{i_1}}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_{i_{m_2}}}{x_i}) \in \Delta_{m_2 - 1}$ . Since  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}})$  is homogenous, we have

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}\left(\frac{x_{i_1}}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_{i_{m_2}}}{x_i}\right) x_i^r \leq \lambda x_i^r,$$

which together with (5) yields that

$$\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \lambda x_i^r \leq f(\lambda).$$

Next, we prove the other side, i.e.,  $\lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2) \geq f(\lambda)$ . Suppose that  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_{m_1})$  is a vector in  $\Delta_{m_1 - 1}$  such that  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(y) + \lambda y_i^r = f(\lambda)$ . If  $y_i = 0$ , then

$$f(\lambda) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(y) \leq \lambda(P_1) \leq \lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2),$$

we are done. Assume that  $y_i > 0$ . Let  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_{m_2})$  be a vector in  $\Delta_{m_2 - 1}$  that maximizes  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x)$ . For  $j \in [m_1]$  and  $j \neq i$ , let  $x_i = y_i$ . For  $j \in [m_2]$ , let  $x_{i_j} = y_i \times z_j$ . Then  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1 + m_2 - 1}$ . Again, by Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(P_1 \oplus_i P_2) &\geq \lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}}(x) \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m_2}}) \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) + \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_2}(z_1, \dots, z_{m_2}) y_i^r \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(y_1, \dots, y_m) + \lambda y_i^r \\ &= f(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

If we use Corollary 2.8 and the idea in the proof of Lemma 2.9, then we have

**Corollary 2.10.** *Let  $P_1 \oplus_T P_2 = (m_1 + m_2 - 1, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$  be the union of two  $r$ -patterns  $P_1 = (m_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $P_2 = (m_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  on  $T \subseteq [m_1]$  with  $\lambda = \lambda(P_2)$ . Then*

$$\lambda(P_1 \oplus_T P_2) = \max \left\{ \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x) + \lambda \left( \sum_{i \in T} x_i^r \right) : x = (x_1, \dots, x_{m_1}) \in \Delta_{m_1-1} \right\}.$$

### 3 The proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 using the following result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  be a minimal pattern with  $\lambda(P) < 1$ , and  $(P_t = (m_t, \mathcal{E}_t))_{t=1}^{\infty}$  be a  $(k, \lambda_0)$ -sequence. Then  $(P \oplus_i P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $(k, f(\lambda_0))$ -sequence for every  $i \in [m]$ , where*

$$f(\lambda_0) = \max \{ \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) + \lambda_0 x_m^r : x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1} \}.$$

*Proof.* By symmetry, it suffices to show  $(P \oplus_m P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $(k, f(\lambda_0))$ -sequence. Let  $P \oplus_m P_t = (m + m_t - 1, \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t)$ . For  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , we define the function

$$\phi(x, \lambda) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) + \lambda x_m^r. \quad (6)$$

For  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$f(\lambda_1) = \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} \left( \phi(x, \lambda_1) - \phi(x, \lambda_2) + \phi(x, \lambda_2) \right) \leq \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} |\phi(x, \lambda_1) - \phi(x, \lambda_2)| + f(\lambda_2).$$

By symmetry,

$$f(\lambda_2) \leq \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} |\phi(x, \lambda_1) - \phi(x, \lambda_2)| + f(\lambda_1).$$

This means that

$$|f(\lambda_1) - f(\lambda_2)| \leq \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} |\phi(x, \lambda_1) - \phi(x, \lambda_2)| \leq |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|.$$

Thus,  $f(\lambda)$  is a continuous function of  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , which together with  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(P_t) = \lambda_0$  yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda(P_t)) = f \left( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(P_t) \right) = f(\lambda_0). \quad (7)$$

Combining (7) and Lemma 2.9, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(P \oplus_m P_t) = f(\lambda_0)$ .

Now we verify (2) of Definition 2.6. Recall that  $(P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $(k, \lambda_0)$ -sequence. There exists a positive real number sequence  $(\epsilon(t))_{t=1}^{\infty}$  such that for all  $t$ ,  $\lambda(P_t) \geq \lambda_0 + \epsilon(t)$ . Notice that  $\phi(x, \lambda)$  is linear as a function of  $\lambda$ . The function  $f(\lambda)$  is non-decreasing. By Claim 2.9, we have

$$\lambda(P \oplus_m P_t) = f(\lambda(P_t)) \geq f(\lambda_0 + \epsilon(t)). \quad (8)$$

So if  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$  is a vector that maximizes  $\phi(x, \lambda_0)$ , then

$$\lambda(P \oplus_m P_t) \geq f(\lambda_0 + \epsilon(t)) \geq \phi(x, \lambda_0 + \epsilon(t)) = f(\lambda_0) + \epsilon(t) x_m^r. \quad (9)$$

Notice that  $x_m > 0$ , since otherwise,  $\phi(x, \lambda_0) = \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) < \lambda(P)$  by the fact that  $P$  is minimal, a contradiction. Thus,  $\lambda(P \oplus_m P_t) \geq f(\lambda_0) + \epsilon'(t)$  by letting  $\epsilon'(t) = \epsilon(t) x_m^r$ .



In the following, we prove that  $\lambda((P \oplus_m P_t)[S]) \leq f(\lambda_0)$  for every  $S \in \binom{[m+m_t-1]}{k}$ . Fix a subset  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \in \binom{[m+n_t-1]}{k}$ . Let  $(P \oplus_m P_t)[S] = (k, \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t[S])$ . Now we show  $\lambda((P \oplus_m P_t)[S]) \leq f(\lambda_0)$ . Let  $(x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_k}) \in \Delta_{k-1}$  be a vector that maximizes  $\lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t[S]}(x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_k})$ . Let  $x'_i = x_i$  for  $i \in S$ ,  $x'_i = 0$  for  $i \in [m+n_t-1] \setminus S$ , and  $y = \sum_{i=m}^{m+m_t-1} x'_i$ . Then  $(x'_1, \dots, x'_{m+m_t-1}) \in \Delta_{m+m_t-2}$ , and by Observation 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda((P \oplus_m P_t)[S]) &= \lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t[S]}(x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_k}) \\ &= \lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t}(x'_1, \dots, x'_{m+m_t-1}) \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x'_1, \dots, x'_{m-1}, y) + \lambda_{\mathcal{E}_t}(x'_m, \dots, x'_{m+m_t-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Again, if  $y = 0$ , then  $\lambda((P \oplus_m P_t)[S]) \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x'_1, \dots, x'_{m-1}, y) \leq f(\lambda_0)$ , we are done. Otherwise, it follows from  $|S \cap [m, m+m_t-1]| \leq k$  and  $\lambda(P_t[S]) \leq \lambda_0$  that

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{E}_t}\left(\frac{x'_m}{y}, \dots, \frac{x'_{m+m_t-1}}{y}\right) \leq \lambda(P_t[S]) \leq \lambda_0,$$

which together with (10) yields

$$\lambda((P \oplus_m P_t)[S]) \leq \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x'_1, \dots, x'_{m-1}, y) + \lambda_0 y^r \leq f(\lambda_0).$$

All the arguments above shows that  $(P \oplus_m P_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a  $(k, f(\lambda_0))$ -sequence, which completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.  $\blacksquare$

Now we prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* For a minimal pattern  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$ , let

$$f_i(\lambda) = \max\{\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) + \lambda x_i^r : x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}\}$$

Suppose that  $\alpha$  is a non-jump for  $r$  given by the Frankl-Rödl method. Then there exists a non-jump sequence  $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  on  $\lambda_0$ , then we have  $(P \oplus_i P_{\mathcal{G}_t})_{t=1}^{\infty}$  is a non-jump sequence on  $f_i(\alpha)$  for every  $i \in [m]$  by Theorem 3.1. By Lemma 2.5,  $f_i(\alpha)$  is a non-jump for each  $i \in [m]$ , which completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.  $\blacksquare$

We end this section by the following remarks.

- Let  $m, r$  be integers with  $m \geq r \geq 2$ , and let  $P^m = (m, \mathcal{E}^m)$  be a  $r$ -pattern by letting  $\mathcal{E}^m$  be a collection of all  $r$ -sets of  $[m]$ . This means that if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $P^m$ -construction if and only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a complete  $m$ -partite  $r$ -graph. For  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$  and  $S \in \binom{[m]}{r}$ , let  $x_S = \prod_{i \in S} x_i$ . Then  $\lambda_{\mathcal{E}^m}(x) = \sum_{S \in \binom{[m]}{r}} x_S$ . For every non-jump number  $\alpha$  obtained by the Frankl-Rödl method, we have

$$f_m(\alpha) = \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} \left\{ \sum_{S \in \binom{[m]}{r}} x_S + \alpha x_m^r \right\}$$

is a non-jump for  $r$ .

- Suppose  $\alpha$  is a known non-jump number obtained by the Frankl-Rödl method. If a minimal pattern  $P$  in the proof of Theorem 1.2 satisfies  $\lambda(P) \leq \alpha$ , then the resulting value  $f(\alpha)$  maybe equal  $\alpha$ . However, if  $\lambda(P) > \alpha$ , then we can obtain a non-jump number  $f(\alpha)$  that is strictly greater than  $\alpha$ .
- We can replace the  $i \in [m]$  in the proof of Theorem 1.2 with the subset  $T \subseteq [m]$ , and then we can get more functions.

## 4 An application to Turán density

In Section 2, we have defined the union of two patterns, and studied its properties. Beside finding non-jumps, it has many applications to Turán densities. In this section, we list one and prove Theorem 1.4. First, we give some fundamental theorems on Turán densities. Define

$$\Lambda^{(r)} := \{\lambda(\mathcal{G}) : \mathcal{G} \text{ is an } r\text{-graph}\}$$

for every integer  $r \geq 2$ . Pikhurko [22] proved the following result.

**Theorem 4.1** (see Pikhurko [22]).  $\Lambda^{(r)} \subseteq \Pi_{\text{fin}}^{(r)}$ .

It was shown by Brown and Simonovits [2] that  $\Lambda^{(r)}$  is dense in  $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ . As the latter is a closed set, Grosu [11] showed that the closure of  $\Lambda^{(r)}$  is  $\Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ . Namely, it was proved that

**Lemma 4.2** (see Grosu [11]).  $\overline{\Lambda}^{(r)} = \Pi_{\infty}^{(r)}$ .

Next we apply Lemma 4.2 to prove Theorem 1.4

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer. By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show that if  $a \in \overline{\Lambda}^{(r)}$ , then  $1 - \frac{1-a}{m^{r-1}} \in \overline{\Lambda}^{(r)}$  for each integer  $m \geq 2$ .

For  $m \geq 2$ , let  $P = (m, \mathcal{E})$  be a  $r$ -pattern with  $\mathcal{E} = [m]^{(r)} \setminus \{\{i^{(r)}\} : i \in [m]\}$ , where  $[m]^{(r)}$  denotes all  $r$ -multiset on  $[m]$ . For  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$ ,

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) = r! \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{x_i^{E(i)}}{E(i)!} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^r. \quad (11)$$

For a  $r$ -graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , consider the pattern  $P \oplus_{[m]} P_{\mathcal{G}} = (m|V(\mathcal{G})|, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$ . By Corollary 2.10 and (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(P \oplus_{[m]} P_{\mathcal{G}}) &= \max \left\{ \lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(x) + \lambda(\mathcal{G}) \left( \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^r \right) : x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Delta_{m-1} \right\} \\ &= 1 - (1 - \lambda(\mathcal{G})) \max_{x \in \Delta_{m-1}} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^r \\ &= 1 - \frac{1 - \lambda(\mathcal{G})}{m^{r-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Thus, if  $a \in \Lambda^{(r)}$ , then  $1 - \frac{1-a}{m^{r-1}} \in \Lambda^{(r)}$ . Suppose that  $a \in \overline{\Lambda}^{(r)} \setminus \Lambda^{(r)}$ . Then there exists a sequence of  $r$ -graphs  $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\mathcal{G}_t) = a$ . Considering the pattern  $P \oplus_{[m]} P_{\mathcal{G}_t}$ , we have  $1 - \frac{1 - \lambda(\mathcal{G}_t)}{m^{r-1}} \in \Lambda^{(r)}$ , which together with

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \lambda(\mathcal{G}_t)}{m^{r-1}} \right) = 1 - \frac{1-a}{m^{r-1}}$$

yields that  $1 - \frac{1-a}{m^{r-1}} \in \overline{\Lambda}^{(r)}$ . ■

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank Dr. Xizhi Liu for bringing this topic to our attention and his fruitful discussions.

## References

- [1] R. Baber and J. Talbot. Hypergraphs do jump. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 20(2):161–171, 2011.
- [2] W. G. Brown and M. Simonovits. Digraph extremal problems, hypergraph extremal problems, and the densities of graph structures. *Discrete mathematics*, 48(2-3):147–162, 1984.
- [3] D. De Caen and Z. Füredi. The maximum size of 3-uniform hypergraphs not containing a Fano plane. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory. Series B*, 78(2):274–276, 2000.
- [4] P. Erdős. On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 2(3):183–190, 1964.
- [5] P. Erdős. On some extremal problems on r-graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 1(1):1–6, 1971.
- [6] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits. A limit theorem in graph theory. In *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*. Citeseer, 1965.
- [7] P. Erdős and A. H. Stone. On the structure of linear graphs. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 52(12):1087–1091, 1946.
- [8] P. Frankl, Y. Peng, V. Rödl, and J. Talbot. A note on the jumping constant conjecture of erdős. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 97(2):204–216, 2007.
- [9] P. Frankl and V. Rödl. Hypergraphs do not jump. *Combinatorica*, 4(2):149–159, 1984.
- [10] Z. Füredi and M. Simonovits. Triple systems not containing a Fano configuration. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 14(4):467–484, 2005.
- [11] C. Grosu. On the algebraic and topological structure of the set of turán densities. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 118:137–185, 2016.
- [12] G. O. H. Katona, T. Nemetz, and M. Simonovits. On a graph problem of Turán (In Hungarian). *Matematikai és fizikai lapok*, 15:228–238, 1964.
- [13] P. Keevash and B. Sudakov. The Turán number of the Fano plane. *Combinatorica*, 25(5):561–574, 2005.
- [14] X. Liu and O. Pikhurko. Hypergraph turán densities can have arbitrarily large algebraic degree. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05576*, 2022.
- [15] Y. Peng. Non-jumping numbers for 4-uniform hypergraphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 23(1):97–110, 2007.
- [16] Y. Peng. Subgraph densities in hypergraphs. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*, 27(2):281–297, 2007.
- [17] Y. Peng. Using lagrangians of hypergraphs to find non-jumping numbers (ii). *Discrete mathematics*, 307(14):1754–1766, 2007.
- [18] Y. Peng. A note on non-jumping numbers. *Australasian journal of combinatorics*, 41:3, 2008.

- [19] Y. Peng. Using lagrangians of hypergraphs to find non-jumping numbers (i). *Annals of Combinatorics*, 12(3):307–324, 2008.
- [20] Y. Peng. On jumping densities of hypergraphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 25(5):759–766, 2009.
- [21] Y. Peng and C. Zhao. Generating non-jumping numbers recursively. *Discrete applied mathematics*, 156(10):1856–1864, 2008.
- [22] O. Pikhurko. On possible Turán densities. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 201(1):415–454, 2014.
- [23] Z. Yan and Y. Peng. Non-jumping turán densities of hypergraphs. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2112, 2021.