

# Fan-complete Ramsey numbers

Fan Chung\* and Qizhong Lin†

## Abstract

We consider Ramsey numbers  $r(G, H)$  with tight lower bounds, namely,

$$r(G, H) \geq (\chi(G) - 1)(|H| - 1) + 1,$$

where  $\chi(G)$  denotes the chromatic number of  $G$  and  $|H|$  denotes the number of vertices in  $H$ . We say  $H$  is  $G$ -good if the equality holds.

In this paper, we prove that the fan-graph  $F_n = K_1 + nK_2$  is  $K_p$ -good if  $n \geq 27p^2$ , improving previous tower-type lower bounds for  $n$  due to Li and Rousseau (1996). The join graph  $G + H$  is defined by adding all edges between the disjoint vertex sets of  $G$  and  $H$ . Let  $nH$  denote the union graph of  $n$  disjoint copies of  $H$ . We show that  $K_1 + nH$  is  $K_p$ -good if  $n$  is sufficiently large. We give a stronger lower bound inequality for Ramsey number  $r(G, K_1 + F)$  for the case of  $G = K_p(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ , the complete  $p$ -partite graph with  $a_1 = 1$  and  $a_i \leq a_{i+1}$ . In particular, using a stability-supersaturation lemma by Fox, He and Wigderson (2021), we show that for any fixed graph  $H$ ,

$$r(G, K_1 + nH) = \begin{cases} (p-1)(n|H| + a_2 - 1) + 1 & \text{if } n|H| + a_2 - 1 \text{ or } a_2 - 1 \text{ is even,} \\ (p-1)(n|H| + a_2 - 2) + 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$  with  $a_i$ 's satisfying some mild conditions and  $n$  is sufficiently large. The special case of  $H = K_1$  gives an answer to Burr's question (1981) about the discrepancy of  $r(G, K_{1,n})$  from  $G$ -goodness for sufficiently large  $n$ . All bounds of  $n$  we obtain are not of tower-types.

*Keywords:* Ramsey goodness; Stability-supersaturation lemma

## 1 Introduction

For graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , the Ramsey number  $r(G, H)$  is the smallest positive integer  $N$  such that any graph on  $N$  vertices contains  $G$  as a subgraph, or its complement contains  $H$  as a subgraph. A classic result of Chvátal [8] states

$$r(K_p, T_n) = (p-1)(n-1) + 1, \tag{1}$$

where  $K_p$  is the complete graph on  $p$  vertices and  $T_n$  is a tree with  $n$  vertices. Let  $H$  be a connected graph with  $n$  vertices. Since the graph consists of  $p-1$  disjoint copies of  $K_{n-1}$  is  $H$ -free and its complement is  $K_p$ -free, one can easily derive (see [10])

$$r(K_p, H) \geq (p-1)(n-1) + 1. \tag{2}$$

---

\*Department of Mathematics, University of California at San Diego, United States of America. Email: fan@ucsd.edu.

†Center for Discrete Mathematics, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, 350108, P. R. China. Email: linqizhong@fzu.edu.cn. Supported in part by NSFC (No. 12171088) and NSFFJ (No. 2022J0143).

For a graph  $H$ , let  $\chi(H)$  be the chromatic number of  $H$ , and  $s(H)$  the *chromatic surplus* of  $H$ , i.e., the minimum size of a color class over all proper vertex-colorings of  $H$  with  $\chi(H)$  colors. e.g.,  $s(K_p) = 1$ . Burr [4] improved the lower bound in (2) by showing

$$r(G, H) \geq (\chi(G) - 1)(|H| - 1) + s(G), \quad (3)$$

where  $H$  is a connected graph with  $|H| \geq s(G)$  vertices. A graph  $H$  is said to be  $G$ -good if the equality in (3) holds. For example, all trees are  $K_p$ -good from the result of Chvátal [8].

Burr and Erdős [5] initiated the study of Ramsey goodness problems that have since attracted the attention of many researchers. For various generalizations of the goodness problems, the reader is referred to the survey [13] by Conlon, Fox and Sudakov.

For graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , let  $G + H$  be the join graph obtained from two graphs  $G$  and  $H$  by connecting the disjoint vertices of  $G$  and  $H$  completely. Denote  $nH$  by the union graph of  $n$  disjoint copies of  $H$ . For example, the fan graph, also called the friendship graph, is  $F_n = K_1 + nK_2$ .

As an early application of the Erdős-Simonovits stability lemma [15, 16, 29], Li and Rousseau [24] showed that for any fixed graphs  $G$  and  $H$  and sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$r(K_2 + G, K_1 + nH) = (\chi(G) + 1)n|H| + 1. \quad (4)$$

This implies that  $K_1 + nH$  is  $(K_2 + G)$ -good for sufficiently large  $n$ . In particular,  $F_n$  is  $K_p$ -good for  $p \geq 3$  and sufficiently large  $n$ . However, the original stability results utilize a modified form of progressive induction and, therefore, the lower bound for  $n$  in (4) is quite large as a form of tower type.

As a special case, the fan-complete Ramsey number has attracted much of attention. In particular, it is known that  $F_n$  is  $K_p$ -good for  $p = 3, 4, 5, 6$  and  $n \geq p$ , see [24, 31, 7, 23]. In [22], the authors claimed that  $F_n$  is  $K_p$ -good if  $n > cp^2$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , but the paper contains a critical error in [22, Lemma 2.3] (lines 4–6, page 66, while using induction without enough vertices in the neighborhood of a vertex).

A related generalization of (1) concerns the book graph  $B_{k,n}$  (or  $B_{n-k}^{(k)}$ ) on  $n$  vertices which consists of  $n - k$  copies of  $K_{k+1}$  all sharing a common  $K_k$ . Using the regularity lemma [32], Nikiforov and Rousseau [25] showed that large books are  $K_p$ -good. Furthermore, extending the method used in [25], Nikiforov and Rousseau [26] obtained a number of general goodness results. However, all the bounds on  $n$  of these results are of tower-types since the proofs rely on the regularity lemma. Recently, using a stability-supersaturation lemma instead of the regularity lemma, Fox, He and Wigderson [19] proved that  $B_{k,n}$  is  $K_p$ -good if  $n \geq 2^{k^{10p}}$ , and we will later use a somewhat better lower bound for  $n$  (but not exactly for  $r(K_p, B_{k,n})$ ) in the proof of the main theorems.

In this paper, we first prove the following theorem whose proof can be found in Section 2.

**Theorem 1.1** *For any graph  $H$ ,  $K_1 + nH$  is  $K_p$ -good if  $n \geq cpl/|H|$  where  $\ell = r(K_p, H)$  and  $c = (3 + 3\sqrt{2})^2 \approx 52.456$ . Namely,  $r(K_p, K_1 + nH) = (p - 1)n|H| + 1$  for  $n \geq cpl/|H|$ .*

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1.

**Corollary 1.1** *If  $n \geq Cp^2$ , then  $F_n$  is  $K_p$ -good where  $C = (3 + 3\sqrt{2})^2/2 \approx 26.228$ .*

The second part of this paper concerns improvements/generalizations of the lower bounds of Chvátal and Burr in (2) and (3). Since these two inequalities are rather easy to prove and, in

particular, (3) seems to be rather weak, a natural question is to seek general lower bounds and find families of graphs achieving such bounds. Nevertheless, there are some obvious obstacles.

As a special case for  $C_4 = K_2(2, 2)$ , the graph  $K_{1,n}$  is not  $C_4$ -good for all large  $n$  since

$$n + \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil + 1 \geq r(C_4, K_{1,n}) \geq n + \lfloor n^{1/2} - 6n^{11/40} \rfloor,$$

where the upper bound can be derived from the Turán number of  $C_4$  and the lower bound can be found in [6] using probabilistic argument. Füredi [21] showed (unpublished) that  $r(C_4, K_{1,n}) = n + \lceil n^{1/2} \rceil$ , for infinitely many  $n$ .

Let  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$  denote the complete  $p$ -partite graph with vertices consisting of  $p$  parts of sizes  $a_1, \dots, a_p$ . Burr [4, Theorem 10] showed that  $K_{1,n}$  is not  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ -good if  $a_i \geq 2$  for all  $i$ . After noting from [9] that the star fails to be  $K_2(1, a_2)$ -good by at least  $a_2 - 2$ , Burr [4] asked the question of determining when the *discrepancy* of  $r(G, K_{1,n})$  from  $G$ -goodness grows for  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ .

To address this question, we will first derive the following lower bound that improves the inequality of Burr in (3) in some cases.

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $G = K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$  where  $1 = a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_p$ . For any graph  $F$  of order  $n \geq 2a_2$ ,*

$$r(G, K_1 + F) \geq \begin{cases} (p-1)(n + a_2 - 1) + 1 & \text{if } n + a_2 - 1 \text{ or } a_2 - 1 \text{ is even,} \\ (p-1)(n + a_2 - 2) + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we will show that the above lower bound is sharp in some general setting:

**Theorem 1.3** *For any fixed graph  $H$ , integers  $p \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq pb^2/\delta$ . Let  $1 = a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{p-1} \leq b$  and  $a_p \leq \delta n$  be positive integers, and let  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ . Then*

$$r(G, K_1 + nH) = \begin{cases} (p-1)(n|H| + a_2 - 1) + 1 & \text{if } n|H| + a_2 - 1 \text{ or } a_2 - 1 \text{ is even,} \\ (p-1)(n|H| + a_2 - 2) + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we may take  $\delta$  with  $0 < \delta < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{400a|H|+2p^4}, (100a^p p^{14p})^{-A} \right\}$ , where  $a = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$  and  $A = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$ .

We remark that the special case of  $H = K_1$  in Theorem 1.3 gives an answer to Burr's question about the discrepancy of  $r(G, K_{1,n})$  from  $G$ -goodness for sufficiently large  $n$ .

The following corollary improves (4) since for any fixed graph  $G$  with chromatic number  $p$ ,  $K_2 + G$  is a subgraph of  $K_{p+2}(1, 1, a_1, \dots, a_p)$  for some  $a_1, \dots, a_p$ . Furthermore, the lower bound on  $n$  we obtain is not of tower-type.

**Corollary 1.2** *For any fixed graph  $H$ , integers  $p \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq pb^2/\delta$ . Let  $1 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{p-1} \leq b$  and  $a_p \leq \delta n$  be positive integers. If  $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ , then  $K_1 + nH$  is  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ -good.*

In this paper, we use the following notation: For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ , we use  $e(G)$  to denote the number of edges  $|E|$  in  $G$ . For  $X \subseteq V$ , we use  $e(X)$  to denote the number of edges in  $X$ , and let  $G[X]$  denote the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $X$ . For two disjoint subsets  $X, Y \subseteq V$ , we use  $e(X, Y)$  to denote the number of edges between  $X$  and  $Y$ .

For a vertex  $v \in V$ , we denote by  $N_X(v)$  the neighborhood of  $v$  in  $X$ , and let  $d_X(v) = |N_X(v)|$ . In particular, the neighborhood of a vertex  $v$  in  $G$  is denoted by  $N_G(v) = N_V(v)$  and the degree of  $v$  in  $G$  is  $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$ .  $A \sqcup B$  denotes the disjoint union of  $A$  and  $B$ . A complete  $p$ -partite graph with vertex set  $\sqcup_{i=1}^p V_i$ , where  $|V_i| = a_i$ , is denoted by either  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$  or  $K_{a_1, \dots, a_p}$ . Let  $[p] = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . For undefined terminology, the reader is referred to [3].

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let  $K_p(s)$  denote the complete  $p$ -partite graph  $K_p(\underbrace{s, \dots, s}_p)$ . In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we need the following lemma, which will also be applied in Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $p \geq 2$ , and let  $\Gamma$  be a subgraph of  $K_p(s)$  which has  $z < s^2$  non-edges. Then  $\Gamma$  contains at least*

$$s^{p-2}(s^2 - z)$$

*distinct copies of  $K_p$ .*

**Proof.** Note that there are  $s^p$  distinct copies of  $K_p$  in  $K_p(s)$  and each non-edge of  $\Gamma$  destroys at most  $s^{p-2}$  distinct copies of  $K_p$ . Therefore, if there are  $z$  non-edges of  $\Gamma$ , then there are still at least  $s^p - z \cdot s^{p-2}$  distinct copies of  $K_p$  remaining. The Lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** The lower bound follows from (3), so we will focus on the upper bound in the following. Let  $N = (p-1)hn + 1$ , where  $h = |H|$  is the order of graph  $H$  and  $n \geq (3 + 3\sqrt{2})^2 p\ell/h$  with  $\ell = r(K_p, H)$ . The assertion is clear for  $p = 1, 2$ , so we may assume  $p \geq 3$ . Assume to the contrary that there exists a graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N$  vertices such that  $\Gamma$  is  $K_p$ -free and its complement  $\bar{\Gamma}$  contains no copy of  $K_1 + nH$ . We shall show that this leads to a contradiction.

Let  $V$  denote the vertex set of  $\Gamma$ . For any vertex  $v \in V$ , we have

$$d_{\bar{\Gamma}}(v) < r(K_p, nH) \leq h(n-1) + \ell, \quad (5)$$

where the second inequality follows from the induction on  $n \geq 1$ . Thus

$$d_{\Gamma}(v) = N - 1 - d_{\bar{\Gamma}}(v) \geq N - h(n-1) - \ell \geq (p-2)hn + h - \ell. \quad (6)$$

We apply the degree majorization algorithm used by Erdős [17] and Füredi [20]. Let  $V_0^+ = V$ . For  $i \geq 1$ , pick a vertex  $v_i \in V_{i-1}^+$  such that  $v_i$  has the maximum degree in  $\Gamma[V_{i-1}^+]$ , and let  $V_i = V_{i-1}^+ \setminus N_{\Gamma}(v_i)$  and  $V_i^+ = V_{i-1}^+ \cap N_{\Gamma}(v_i)$ . The procedure stops in  $r$  steps when there is no more vertices remaining. Clearly,  $V_1, \dots, V_{r-1}, V_r = V_{r-1}^+$  form a partition of  $V$ . Note that  $r \leq p-1$  since  $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$  induces a complete graph. Combining  $|V_i| \leq h(n-1) + \ell$  from (5) and  $(p-2)(h(n-1) + \ell) < N$ , we have  $r \geq p-1$ . Therefore, we conclude  $r = p-1$ .

Note that for  $i \in [p-1]$  and  $x \in V_i$ ,  $d_{V_{i-1}^+}(x) \leq d_{V_{i-1}^+}(v_i) = |V_i^+|$  from the choice of vertex  $v_i$ . Thus we have  $2e(V_i) + e(V_i, V_i^+) = \sum_{x \in V_i} d_{V_{i-1}^+}(x) \leq |V_i||V_i^+|$ . By adding up both sides of the inequality, we have

$$e(\Gamma) + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} e(V_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} |V_i||V_i^+| \leq e(T_{N, p-1}),$$

where  $T_{N,p-1}$  denotes the Turán Graph on  $N$  vertices containing no  $K_p$  with the maximum number of edges. Combining with the fact that  $e(\Gamma) \geq \frac{N}{2}(N - h(n-1) - \ell)$  from (6), we conclude that the total number of internal edges satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} e(V_i) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{p-1}\right) \frac{N^2}{2} - \frac{N}{2}(N - h(n-1) - \ell) \leq \frac{N}{2}(\ell - h) := m. \quad (7)$$

Now, let us take a partition  $\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-1} V_i$  such that it attains the minimal number of the internal edges. Thus, we must have that

$$\text{for each vertex } v \in V_i \text{ and } j \neq i, d_{V_i}(v) \leq d_{V_j}(v), \quad (8)$$

since otherwise there exists a vertex  $v \in V_i$  with  $d_{V_i}(v) > d_{V_j}(v)$  for some  $j \neq i$ , and we can then put  $v$  into  $V_j$  to get a smaller total number of internal edges, which is not possible.

From (6) and (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} e(V_i, V_j) &= e(\Gamma) - \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} e(V_i) \\ &\geq \frac{N}{2}(N - h(n-1) - \ell) - m \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{p-1}\right) \frac{N^2}{2} - 2m. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Using  $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (|V_i| - \frac{N}{p-1})^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} |V_i|^2 - \frac{N^2}{p-1}$ , we have, for each  $i \in [p-1]$ ,

$$\left| |V_i| - \frac{N}{p-1} \right| \leq 2\sqrt{m}, \quad (10)$$

since otherwise  $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} |V_i|^2 > \frac{N^2}{p-1} + 4m$  and so

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} e(V_i, V_j) \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} |V_i||V_j| = \frac{1}{2} \left( N^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} |V_i|^2 \right) < \frac{1}{2} \left( N^2 - \frac{N^2}{p-1} \right) - 2m,$$

which contradicts (9).

For distinct  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq p-1$ , we define  $z_{i,j} = |V_i||V_j| - e(V_i, V_j)$ , which is the number of non-edges between  $V_i$  and  $V_j$ . Then we must have

$$z = \sum_{i < j} z_{i,j} \leq 2m \quad (11)$$

since  $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} |V_i||V_j| - z = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} e(V_i, V_j) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{p-1}) \frac{N^2}{2} - 2m$  from (9) and the fact that  $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p-1} |V_i||V_j|$  is at most the Turán number of  $K_p$ -free graph on  $N$  vertices.

In the following, we will show that for each vertex  $v \in V_i$ ,  $d_{V_i}(v) \leq \sqrt{2m}$ . Suppose to the contrary that without loss of generality there exists some vertex  $v \in V_1$  having  $s > \sqrt{2m}$  neighbors in its own part  $V_1$ . It follows from (8) that  $v$  also has at least  $s$  neighbors in each of the other parts. Let  $U_i = N_\Gamma(v) \cap V_i$  denote the neighborhood of  $v$  in  $V_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ .

Clearly,  $|U_i| \geq s > \sqrt{2m}$ . It follows by Lemma 2.1 that there are at least

$$s^{p-3}(s^2 - z) \geq s^{p-3}(s^2 - 2m)$$

copies of  $K_{p-1}$  in the neighborhood of  $v$ . Therefore,  $\Gamma$  definitely contains a copy of  $K_p$ , which leads to a contradiction.

Let  $t = (2 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{m} + \ell - h$ . We claim that

$$\text{for each vertex } v \in V_i \text{ and } j \neq i, d_{V_j}(v) \geq |V_j| - t. \quad (12)$$

On contrary, suppose that some vertex  $v \in V_i$  has at least  $t$  non-neighbors in  $V_j$ . From the above,  $v$  has at least  $|V_i| - \sqrt{2m} - 1$  non-neighbors in  $V_i$ . Note that  $|V_i| \geq \frac{N}{p-1} - 2\sqrt{m}$  from (10). In total, the number of non-neighbors of  $v$  is at least

$$t + |V_i| - \sqrt{2m} - 1 \geq \frac{N}{p-1} + \ell - h > h(n-1) + \ell.$$

This contradicts (5) that  $d_{\bar{\Gamma}}(v) \leq h(n-1) + \ell - 1$ .

Suppose that there exists an edge  $uv \in V_1$ . Let  $W_i$  denote the common neighborhood of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $V_i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq p-1$ . Then, from (12) and  $|V_i| > hn - 2\sqrt{m}$ , we have that for each  $2 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,

$$|W_i| \geq |V_i| - 2t \geq hn - (6 + 2\sqrt{2})\sqrt{m} - 2\ell + 2h > \sqrt{2m},$$

where the last inequality follows from  $m = \frac{N}{2}(\ell - h) < \frac{1}{2}(p-1)\ell hn$ , and  $n \geq (3 + 3\sqrt{2})^2 p\ell/h$  by the assumption. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2.1 again to get a copy  $K_{p-2}$  in the common neighborhood of  $u$  and  $v$ , which leads to a contradiction. Consequently,  $V_1$  forms an independent set. Similarly,  $V_i$  forms an independent set for each  $2 \leq i \leq p-1$ .

Now, on the average, there is some part  $V_i$  of size at least  $\lceil N/(p-1) \rceil = hn + 1$  which forms an independent set from the above. Therefore, we can definitely get a copy of  $K_1 + nH$  in the complement of  $\Gamma$ . The final contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

### 3 Improving lower bounds

The lower bound for  $r(G, K_1 + F)$  in Theorem 1.2 is by construction.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let  $\Lambda$  be an  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular triangle-free graph of order  $n + a_2 - 1$ , and let  $\Lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ , be disjoint copies of  $\Lambda$  with vertex sets  $V_i$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the graph obtained from  $\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-1} \Lambda_i$  by adding all edges between  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq p-1$ . Then the complement of  $\Gamma$  contains no  $K_1 + F$  since  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is  $(n-1)$ -regular. In the following, we will prove that  $\Gamma$  contains no  $K_1 + K_{p-1}(a_2)$  by induction on  $p \geq 2$ .

Let  $V = \sqcup_{i=1}^{p-1} V_i$ . It is true for  $p = 2$  since  $\Lambda$  is  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular. So we may assume that  $p \geq 3$  and the assertion holds for smaller  $p$ . Suppose that, on contrary,  $\Gamma$  contains a subgraph  $K_1 + K_{p-1}(a_2)$  with vertex set  $\{u_0\} \sqcup (\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-1} U_i)$ . We can relabel the  $V_i$ 's so that  $u_0$  is in  $V_{p-1}$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is  $K_3$ -free,  $V_{p-1}$  can only contain vertices in at most one of the  $U_i$ 's. Furthermore, since  $\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-2} \Lambda_i$  can not contain  $K_1 + K_{p-2}(a_2)$  from the inductive hypothesis,  $V_{p-1}$  must contain some vertices in  $\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-1} U_i$ . Let  $U_{p-1}$  denote the set with  $U_{p-1} \cap V_{p-1} \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $\Lambda$  is  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular, then there exists a vertex in  $U_{p-1}$  not in  $V_{p-1}$ . Moreover, we have  $\sqcup_{i=1}^{p-2} U_i \subseteq V \setminus V_{p-1}$ . This guarantees a copy of  $K_1 + K_{p-2}(a_2)$  in  $V \setminus V_{p-1}$ , which contradicts the inductive hypothesis. Therefore,  $\Gamma$  contains no  $K_1 + K_{p-1}(a_2)$  as claimed.

In order to show  $r(G, K_1 + F) > (p-1)(n + a_2 - 1)$ , it remains to construct  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular triangle-free graphs of order  $n + a_2 - 1$ . We consider the following three cases:

*Case 1:*  $n + a_2 - 1$  is even.

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two sets of vertices of size  $\lambda = (n + a_2 - 1)/2$ , say,  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_\lambda\}$  and  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_\lambda\}$ . Let  $\Lambda = \Lambda(X, Y)$  be a bipartite graph with two parts  $X$  and  $Y$ , in which  $x_k$  is adjacent to  $y_\ell$  if and only if  $\ell = k + i \pmod{\lambda}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, a_2 - 2$ . So  $\Lambda$  is an  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular  $K_3$ -free graph as desired since  $n \geq a_2 - 1$ .

*Case 2:*  $a_2 - 1 = 2k$  is even.

For this case, we consider the following construction by Sidorenko [28] for solving a problem of Erdős (see [27]). Let  $\mu = n + a_2 - 1$ , and let  $\Lambda$  be the graph whose vertex set is  $\mathbb{Z}_\mu$ , where any two vertices  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_\mu$  are connected by an edge if and only if

$$(i - j) \in \{\pm k, \pm(k+1), \dots, \pm(2k-1)\},$$

where  $n \geq 2a_2 - 4$  and  $\mu \geq 6k - 2$ . It follows that  $\Lambda$  is an  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular  $K_3$ -free graph of order  $\mu$  as desired. Note that if  $n < 2a_2 - 4$ , then such a graph  $\Lambda$  constructed as above may contain a triangle (e.g., when  $a_2 = 3$  and  $n = 1$ ).

*Case 3:* Both  $n + a_2 - 1$  and  $a_2 - 1$  are odd.

We can use the same construction as Case 1 for a regular triangle-free graph on  $n + a_2 - 2$  vertices with degree  $(a_2 - 1)$  by noting  $n \geq 2a_2$ .

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.  $\square$

Let  $G = K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ , where  $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_p$ , and let  $G_1 = K_{p-1}(a_1, \dots, a_{p-1})$ . A result of Burr [4, Theorem 5] states that for any connected graph  $H$  on  $n$  vertices,

$$r(G, H) \geq r(G_1, H) + n - 1. \quad (13)$$

The following can be viewed as a slight improvement of (13) for the case of  $H = K_1 + F$ .

**Corollary 3.1** *Let  $G = K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$  where  $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_p$ , and let  $G_1 = K_{p-1}(a_1, \dots, a_{p-1})$ . If  $a_1 = 1$ , then for any graph  $F$  of order  $n \geq 2a_2$ , we have*

$$r(G, K_1 + F) \geq \begin{cases} r(G_1, K_1 + F) + n + a_2 - 1 & \text{if } n + a_2 - 1 \text{ is even,} \\ r(G_1, K_1 + F) + n + a_2 - 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** We first consider the case when  $n + a_2 - 1$  is even. Let  $\Gamma_1$  be a graph on  $r(G_1, K_1 + F) - 1$  vertices which contains no  $G_1$  and its complement is  $(K_1 + F)$ -free. Let  $\Gamma_2$  be an  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular bipartite graph of order  $n + a_2 - 1$  as constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.3. It is not difficult to verify that  $\Gamma_2$  is  $K_{s,t}$ -free for any  $s, t$  with  $s + t \geq a_2 + 1$  since  $n \geq 2a_2$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be the join graph  $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma$  is  $(K_1 + F)$ -free because its maximum degree is  $n - 1$ .

We want to show that  $\Gamma$  contains no copy of  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ . Suppose that, on the contrary,  $\Gamma$  contains  $G$  as a subgraph. Let the vertex set of  $G$  be denoted as the disjoint union of  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_p$  where  $|V_i| = a_i$ ,  $V_1 = \{u\}$  and any edge of  $G$  is between  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  for some  $i \neq j$ .

*Case 1:*  $v$  is in  $\Gamma_2$ .

Since  $\Gamma_2$  is  $K_{1,a_2}$ -free and  $\Gamma_2$  is bipartite, at most one of the  $V_i$ 's contains vertices in  $\Gamma_2$ . Therefore,  $\Gamma_1$  must contain a copy of  $K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_{p-1})$ . This leads to a contradiction of the inductive assumption on  $p$ .

Case 2:  $v$  is in  $\Gamma_1$ .

Since  $\Gamma_2$  is bipartite, at most two of the  $V_i$ 's contain vertices in  $\Gamma_2$ . Since  $\Gamma_2$  is  $K_{s,t}$ -free for any  $s, t$  with  $s + t \geq a_2 + 1$ ,  $\Gamma_1$  must contain a copy of  $K_p(1, a_2 - s', a_3 - t' + 1, \dots, a_p)$  with  $s' + t' \leq a_2$ . Note that  $a_2 - s' + a_3 - t' + 1 \geq a_3$ , which implies that  $\Gamma_1$  contains a copy of  $K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_{p-1})$ . This again leads to a contradiction.

Therefore we conclude that  $\Gamma$  contains no copy of  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ .

For the case of  $n + a_2 - 1$  odd, we use the same construction of  $\Gamma_2$  with  $n + a_2 - 2$  vertices satisfying the conditions that  $\Gamma_2$  is bipartite and  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular. The proof is similar and will be omitted here.  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The following lemma, which is essentially due to Erdős [14], states that if a graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N$  vertices contains  $\Omega(N^p)$  copies of  $K_p$ , then one can find a copy of  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$  in  $\Gamma$  with one part of size linear in  $N$ . We here give a proof with specified bounds for various parameters, which will be used later in the proof of Theorem 1.3. The methods of the proof are similar to those in [19, Lemma 4.2].

**Lemma 4.1 (Erdős [14])** *For any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , and for integers  $p \geq 2$ ,  $b \geq 1$ , and  $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_{p-1} \leq b$ , there exists some  $\eta > 0$  such that the following holds for all large  $N$ . If  $\Gamma$  is a  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ -free graph on  $N$  vertices with  $a_p \leq \delta N$ , then  $\Gamma$  has at most  $\eta N^p$  copies of  $K_p$ .*

Moreover, we may take  $\eta = \delta^{1/(a_1 a_2 \dots a_{p-1})}$ , and  $N \geq \max\{p^2, b^2/\delta\}$ .

**Proof.** We define  $\eta_s$ , for  $s = 1, \dots, p-1$ , inductively by choosing  $\eta_p = \delta$  and  $\eta_{p-s} = (\eta_{p-s+1})^{1/a_{p-s}}$ . We will show by induction that a  $K_{s+1}(a_{p-s}, \dots, a_{p-1}, \delta N)$ -free graph  $\Gamma$  contains at most  $\eta_{p-s} N^{s+1}$  copies of  $K_{s+1}$ .

For the base case of  $s = 1$ , we want to show that a  $K_2(a_{p-1}, \delta N)$ -free graph  $\Gamma$  contains at most  $\eta_{p-1} N^2$  edges with  $\eta_{p-1} = \delta^{1/a_{p-1}}$ . This obviously holds if  $a_{p-1} = 1$ . We may assume  $a_{p-1} \geq 2$ . If  $2e(\Gamma)/N \leq a_{p-1}^2$ , then we are done since  $e(\Gamma) < a_{p-1}^2 N \leq b^2 N \leq \delta N^2 \leq \delta^{1/a_{p-1}} N^2$ . We may assume  $2e(\Gamma)/N \geq a_{p-1}^2$ . We apply the double-counting method. Since any  $a_{p-1}$  vertices have at most  $\delta N$  common neighbors, there are at most  $\delta N \binom{N}{a_{p-1}} < \delta N^{a_{p-1}+1}/a_{p-1}!$  copies of  $K_{1, a_{p-1}}$ . Moreover, a vertex of degree  $d$  contributes  $\binom{d}{a_{p-1}}$  copies of  $K_{1, a_{p-1}}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\delta N^{a_{p-1}+1}}{a_{p-1}!} > \sum_{v \in V} \binom{d_\Gamma(v)}{a_{p-1}} \geq N \binom{2e(\Gamma)/N}{a_{p-1}} \geq \frac{N}{a_{p-1}! e} \left( \frac{2e(\Gamma)}{N} \right)^{a_{p-1}}$$

by Jensen's inequality and the fact that

$$\binom{t}{p} \geq \frac{t^p}{p!e}$$

for  $t \geq p^2$ . Therefore,  $e(\Gamma) < \delta^{1/a_{p-1}} N^2$ , and we may take  $\eta_{p-1} = \delta^{1/a_{p-1}} = \eta_p^{1/a_{p-1}}$  as desired. The base case is proved.

Suppose the assertion holds for the cases of  $s' < s$ . We will show that a  $K_{s+1}(a_{p-s}, \dots, a_{p-1}, \delta N)$ -free graph  $\Gamma$  contains at most  $\eta_{p-s} N^{s+1}$  copies of  $K_{s+1}$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $\Gamma$  contains at least  $\eta_{p-s} N^{s+1}$  copies of  $K_{s+1}$ . For every  $s$ -set of vertices  $S$ , let  $\text{ext}(S)$  be the



set of vertices  $v$  such that  $S \cup \{v\}$  forms a  $K_{s+1}$  in  $\Gamma$ . Note that the sum of  $|\text{ext}(S)|$  over all  $s$ -sets  $S$  is exactly  $s+1$  times the number of  $K_{s+1}$  in  $\Gamma$ . By the assumption, this sum is therefore more than  $(s+1)\eta_{p-s}N^{s+1}$ . Thus, the average value of  $|\text{ext}(S)|$  is greater than  $(s+1)\eta_{p-s}N^{s+1}/\binom{N}{s} > (s+1)!\eta_{p-s}N$ . Again by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{S \subset V: |S|=s} \binom{\text{ext}(S)}{a_{p-s}} \geq \binom{N}{s} \binom{(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}N}{a_{p-s}}.$$

If  $a_{p-s} = 1$ , then  $\binom{N}{s} \binom{(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}N}{a_{p-s}} / \binom{N}{a_{p-s}} \geq \eta_{p-s}N^s$  provided  $N \geq s^2$ . For  $a_{p-s} \geq 2$ , we choose  $N \geq \max\{s^2, a_{p-s}^2/[(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}]\}$ , and we have

$$\binom{N}{s} \binom{(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}N}{a_{p-s}} / \binom{N}{a_{p-s}} \geq \frac{N^s}{s!e} \cdot \frac{[(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}N]^{a_{p-s}}}{a_{p-s}!e} \cdot \frac{a_{p-s}!}{N^{a_{p-s}}} > \eta_{p-s}^{a_{p-s}} N^s.$$

Consequently, we conclude that there is some  $a_{p-s}$ -set  $T$  such that the common neighborhood of  $T$  has more than  $\eta_{p-s}^{a_{p-s}} N^s = \eta_{p-s+1} N^s$  copies of  $K_s$ . By the inductive assumption, there is a copy of  $K_s(a_{p-s+1}, \dots, a_p)$  in the common neighborhood of  $T$ . Together with  $T$  this yields a copy of  $K_{s+1}(a_{p-s}, \dots, a_p)$  in  $\Gamma$ , which leads to a contradiction. Therefore we have shown that a  $K_{s+1}(a_{p-s}, \dots, a_{p-1}, \delta N)$ -free graph  $\Gamma$  contains at most  $\eta_{p-s} N^{s+1}$  copies of  $K_{s+1}$  for  $N \geq \max\{s^2, a_{p-s}^2/[(s+1)!\eta_{p-s}]\}$  and

$$\eta := \eta_1 = \eta_2^{1/a_1} = \dots = \eta_p^{1/(a_1 a_2 \dots a_{p-1})} = \delta^{1/(a_1 a_2 \dots a_{p-1})}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

We will apply the following *stability-supersaturation lemma* by Fox, He and Wigderson [19, Theorem 3.1] (in a slightly different form) to obtain the desired structures for graphs forbidding some special classes of graphs. Similar approaches are often referred to as combinations of the stability theorem [15, 16, 29] and the supersaturation result [18]. This stability-supersaturation lemma implies that if a graph  $\Gamma$  has slightly smaller minimum degree than the  $K_p$ -free Turán graph and has few copies of  $K_p$ , then it is close to the Turán graph.

**Lemma 4.2 (Fox, He and Wigderson [19])** *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and every integer  $p \geq 2$ , there exist  $\eta, \gamma > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $N \geq 10$ . Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a graph on  $N$  vertices with minimum degree at least  $(1 - \frac{1}{p-1} - \gamma)N$  and at most  $\eta N^p$  copies of  $K_p$ . Then there is a partition  $V(\Gamma) = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} V_i$  such that the following hold:*

- (i)  $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} e(V_i) \leq \varepsilon \binom{N}{2}$ .
- (ii)  $||V_i| - \frac{N}{p-1}| \leq \sqrt{2\varepsilon}N$ .
- (iii)  $e(V_i, V_j) \geq (1 - p^2\varepsilon)|V_i||V_j|$ .
- (iv) For each  $v \in V_i$ ,  $d_{V_i}(v) \leq d_{V_j}(v)$ .

Moreover, we may take  $\gamma = \min\{\frac{1}{2p^2}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$  and  $\eta = p^{-10p}\varepsilon$ .

Note that Conlon, Fox and Sudakov [12, Corollary 3.4] obtained a stronger result by using the minimum degree condition instead of the average degree condition and by using the graph removal lemma (see e.g. Conlon and Fox [11]), which, however, requires tower-type bounds in the parameters.

Fox, He and Wigderson [19] established that if  $n \geq 2^{k^{10p}}$ , then  $B_{k,n}$  is  $K_p$ -good. In order to give a better lower bound for  $n$  of Theorem 1.3, we will use the following upper bound concerning the book graph  $B_{k,n}$ .

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $p, k, t \geq 1$  be integers. Then  $r(K_p, B_{k,t}) \leq k^p t$ .*

**Proof.** The proof is by induction on  $p \geq 1$ . The assertion is trivial for  $p = 1, 2$ , and so we may assume that  $p \geq 3$  and the assertion holds for smaller  $p$ . Let  $N_p = r(K_p, B_{k,t}) - 1$ , and we consider a graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N_p$  vertices which contains no  $B_{k,t}$  and its complement  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is  $K_p$ -free. Let  $V$  be the vertex set of  $\Gamma$ . By induction, we have  $d_{\bar{\Gamma}}(v) \leq N_{p-1}$  for any vertex  $v \in V$ . Thus, each vertex  $v \in V$  has degree at least  $N_p - N_{p-1} - 1$  in  $\Gamma$ .

We first take an arbitrary vertex  $v_1 \in V$ , and then we choose a neighbor, say  $v_2$ , of  $v_1$  in  $\Gamma$ . Inductively, we can choose  $k$  vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  which form a clique in  $\Gamma$  and the number of the common neighbors of  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  is at least  $N_p - k(N_{p-1} + 1)$ . Since  $\Gamma$  contains no  $B_{k,t}$ , we have

$$N_p - k(N_{p-1} + 1) < t - k.$$

Therefore, it is not difficult to obtain that  $N_p < k^p t$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

We remark that if  $p \geq 5$  is fixed and  $k$  is large, then  $r(K_p, K_k) \geq \Omega(k^{\frac{p+1}{2}}(\log k)^{\frac{1}{p-2}-\frac{p+1}{2}})$  (which is also a lower bound for  $r(K_p, B_{k,t})$ ) by Bohman and Keevash [2], improving the best known lower bound due to Spencer [30] by a factor  $(\log k)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}$ .

We also need the following stability result.

**Lemma 4.4** *For any fixed graph  $H$ , integers  $p \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq pb^2/\delta$ . Let  $1 = a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{p-1} \leq b$  and  $a_p \leq \delta n$  be positive integers, and let  $G = K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ . For any graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N \geq (p-1)n|H|$  vertices containing no copy of  $G$  and its complement  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is  $(K_1 + nH)$ -free, there exists a partition  $V(\Gamma) = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} V_i$  such that each vertex of  $V_i$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $V_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ .*

Moreover, we may take  $\delta$  with  $0 < \delta < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{400a^{H+2}p^4}, (100a^p p^{14p})^{-A} \right\}$ , where  $a = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$  and  $A = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$ .

**Proof.** We assume  $p \geq 3$  since the assertion is trivial for  $p = 2$ . Let  $h$  denote the number of vertices in  $H$  and let  $a = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$ , and  $A = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$ . Let  $\varepsilon = 1/(100a^2 p^4)$ . We may choose  $\delta$  with  $0 < \delta < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{400a^{h+2}p^4}, (100a^p p^{14p})^{-A} \right\}$ . We follow the notation/definition in Lemma 4.2 to select  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  such that  $2a^h \delta \leq \gamma \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and  $\eta = \delta^{1/A} < p^{-10p} \varepsilon$ . Furthermore, we assume that

$$n \geq pb^2/\delta \geq \max \{b^2/\delta, a/\delta\}, \quad (14)$$

and let

$$\ell = r(K_h, G).$$

Note that  $G$  is a subgraph of the book graph  $B_{a, a+\lceil \delta n \rceil}$ , it follows from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\ell = r(K_h, G) \leq r(K_h, B_{a, a+\lceil \delta n \rceil}) \leq a^h(a + \lceil \delta n \rceil) < 2a^h \delta n. \quad (15)$$

Since  $\bar{\Gamma}$  contains no copy of  $K_1 + nK_h$ , we obtain that  $d_{\bar{\Gamma}}(v) < r(G, nK_h) \leq \ell + (n-1)h$  for any

vertex  $v$  in  $\Gamma$ . Therefore for any vertex in  $\Gamma$ ,

$$d_\Gamma(v) = N - 1 - d_{\overline{\Gamma}}(v) \geq N - \ell - (n - 1)h \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{p-1} - \gamma\right)N \quad (16)$$

using  $\gamma \geq 2a^h\delta$ . Moreover, from Lemma 4.1,  $\Gamma$  has at most  $\eta N^p$  copies of  $K_p$  since  $\Gamma$  is  $G$ -free. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that there is a partition  $V(\Gamma) = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} V_i$  such that (i)-(iv) of Lemma 4.2 hold.

Let  $z$  denote the total number of non-edges of  $\Gamma$ . From Lemma 4.2 (iii),

$$z \leq \binom{p-1}{2} p^2 \varepsilon |V_i| |V_j| < p^2 \varepsilon N^2.$$

Let  $s = p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N$ . Clearly,  $z \leq s^2$ . Suppose that some vertex  $v \in V_1$  satisfies  $d_{V_1}(v) \geq 2s$ . Then, Lemma 4.2 (iv) implies that  $d_{V_i}(v) \geq 2s$  for  $2 \leq i \leq p-1$ . Let  $U_i$  denote the neighborhood of  $v$  in  $V_i$ . Then, by Lemma 2.1, the subgraph of  $\Gamma$  induced by  $\sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} U_i$  contains at least

$$(2s)^{p-3}(4s^2 - z) \geq 3 \cdot 2^{p-3}s^{p-1} > (2p)^{p-2}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{p-1}N^{p-1} > \delta^{1/A}N^{p-1} > \delta^{1/(a_2 \cdots a_{p-1})}N^{p-1}$$

distinct copies of  $K_{p-1}$ . Thus, by Lemma 4.1, the neighborhood of  $v$  contains a copy of  $K_{p-1}(a_2, \dots, a_p)$ . This leads to a contradiction to the fact that  $\Gamma$  contains no  $K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$ . Therefore,  $d_{V_1}(v) < 2s = 2p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N$  for each  $v \in V_1$ . Similarly, for any  $2 \leq i \leq p-1$  and  $u \in V_i$ , we have  $d_{V_i}(u) < 2p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N$ .

Suppose that some vertex  $v \in V_i$  satisfies  $d_{V_j}(v) \leq (1 - 4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon})|V_j|$  for some  $j \neq i$ . From the above, the vertex  $v$  has at least  $|V_i| - 2p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N - 1$  non-neighbors in  $V_i$ . Thus the total number of non-neighbors of  $v$  is at least  $4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}|V_j| + |V_i| - 2p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N - 1$ , which is at least

$$(1 + 4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left( \frac{N}{p-1} - \sqrt{2\varepsilon}N \right) - 2p\sqrt{\varepsilon}N - 1 > \left( \frac{1}{p-1} + \varepsilon \right) N,$$

since  $\varepsilon = 1/(100a^2p^4)$ . By noting  $\gamma \leq \varepsilon/2$ , we have a contradiction to the fact that the minimum degree of  $\Gamma$  is at least  $(1 - \frac{1}{p-1} - \gamma)N$  from (16). Therefore, for each vertex  $v \in V_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p-1$ , we have

$$d_{V_j}(v) > (1 - 4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon})|V_j| \text{ for } j \neq i. \quad (17)$$

Now, suppose to the contrary that the assertion of the lemma does not hold. Without loss of generality, we may assume that there exists some vertex  $v_1 \in V_1$  such that  $v_1$  has  $a_2$  neighbors in  $V_1$ . It follows from (17) that the vertex  $v_1$  and these  $a_2$  neighbors must have at least  $(1 - 4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}(a_2 + 1))|V_2|$  common neighbors in  $V_2$ . Note that

$$|V_i| - a \cdot 4p^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}|V_i| \geq (1 - 4ap^2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left( \frac{N}{p-1} - \sqrt{2\varepsilon}N \right) > hn/2 > \delta n > a_3 \quad (18)$$

by using the facts that  $a = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i$ ,  $\delta < 1/2$ ,  $\varepsilon = 1/(100a^2p^4)$ , and  $||V_i| - \frac{N}{p-1}| \leq \sqrt{2\varepsilon}N$  for each  $i \in [p-1]$ , from Lemma 4.2 (ii). Therefore, the vertex  $v_1$  and its  $a_2$  neighbors in  $V_1$  must have at least  $a_3$  common neighbors in  $V_3$ . We can then inductively apply (17) and (18) to obtain a copy of  $K_p(1, a_2, \dots, a_p)$  in  $\Gamma$ , which leads to a contradiction. The assertion is proved.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** The lower bound follows from Theorem 1.2. It suffices to establish

the upper bounds. We rely heavily on Lemma 4.4 and we follow all the definitions in its proof. In particular, we choose  $n \geq pb^2/\delta$  where  $0 < \delta < \min\{\frac{1}{400a^{h+2}p^4}, (100a^p p^{14p})^{-A}\}$ . Recall  $G = K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ .

*Case 1:* Either  $nh + a_2 - 1$  or  $a_2 - 1$  is even.

For this case, let  $N_1 = (p-1)(hn + a_2 - 1) + 1$ . Assume to the contrary, there exists a graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N_1$  vertices such that  $\Gamma$  is  $G$ -free and its complement  $\bar{\Gamma}$  contains no copy of  $K_1 + nH$ . From Lemma 4.4, there exists a partition  $V(\Gamma) = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} V_i$  such that the following holds:

(\*) *Each vertex of  $V_i$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $V_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ .*

We may assume that  $V_1$  is the largest part among  $V_1, \dots, V_{p-1}$ . Thus  $|V_1| \geq \lceil \frac{N}{p-1} \rceil \geq hn + a_2$ . From (\*), any vertex  $x \in V_1$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $V_1$ . Therefore, there exists an independent set  $W \subset V_1$  with

$$|W| \geq |V_1|/a_2 \geq hn/a_2 + 1,$$

and any vertex in  $W$  has at least  $(hn + a_2 - 1) - (a_2 - 1) = hn$  non-neighbors in  $V_1$ . Fix a vertex  $w \in W$ , and let  $X$  be the non-neighborhood of  $w$  in  $V_1$ . Clearly,  $|X| \geq hn$ .

**Claim 4.1**  *$X$  contains  $n$  disjoint independent sets of size  $h$ .*

**Proof.** Set  $|X \setminus W| = \ell + n_1h + h'$ , where  $0 \leq h' < h$  and  $\ell = r(K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p), K_h)$ . Since there is no  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ , we then can find at least  $n_1 + 1$  disjoint independent sets of size  $h$  in  $X \setminus W$ . Let  $X_0$  denote the remaining vertices in  $X \setminus W$  by deleting the vertices of these disjoint independent sets of size  $h$ . Then  $|X_0| < \ell < 2h\delta n$  from (15). From (\*), each vertex  $x \in X_0$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $W \setminus \{w\}$  and therefore, there is a subset  $W_1$  of  $W \setminus \{w\}$  consisting of vertices non-adjacent to any vertex in  $X_0$  satisfying

$$|W_1| \geq |W \setminus \{w\}| - (a_2 - 1)\ell \geq hn/a_2 - 2ha_2\delta n \geq (h-1)\ell$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $\delta$  is sufficiently small. Thus any vertex  $x \in X_0$  and  $h-1$  vertices of  $W_1$  form an independent set of size  $h$ . Let  $W_0 \subset W_1$  be the set consisting of the vertices that have been accounted for. The remaining vertices in  $W \setminus W_0$  clearly forms an independent set. Since  $|X| \geq hn$ , we can definitely obtain  $n$  disjoint independent sets of size  $h$  as desired.  $\square$

Claim 4.1 implies that  $X \cup \{w\}$  yields a copy of  $K_1 + nK_h$  in the complement of  $\Gamma$  with center  $w$ . This leads to a contradiction.

*Case 2:* Both  $nh + a_2 - 1$  and  $a_2 - 1$  are odd.

For this case, let  $N_2 = (p-1)(hn + a_2 - 2) + 1$ . Assume to the contrary, there exists a graph  $\Gamma$  on  $N_2$  vertices such that  $\Gamma$  is  $G$ -free and its complement  $\bar{\Gamma}$  contains no copy of  $K_1 + nH$ . We shall show that this will lead to a contradiction. From Lemma 4.4, there exists a partition  $V(\Gamma) = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} V_i$  such that each vertex of  $V_i$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $V_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ .

If there exists some part  $V_i$  has size at least  $hn + a_2$ , then we are done by a similar argument as in Case 1. So we may assume that  $|V_i| \leq hn + a_2 - 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p-1$ . There must exist one part, say  $V_1$ , of size at least  $\lceil \frac{N_2}{p-1} \rceil = hn + a_2 - 1$ . Thus,  $|V_1| = hn + a_2 - 1$ .

**Claim 4.2** *Each vertex of  $V_1$  has exactly  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $V_1$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose, on the contrary, there is a vertex  $w \in V_1$  that has at most  $a_2 - 2$  neighbors in  $V_1$ . Then it has at least  $hn$  non-neighbors in  $V_1$ . Let  $X$  be the non-neighborhood of  $w$  in  $V_1$ . Clearly,  $|X| \geq hn$ . Since any vertex  $x \in X$  has at most  $a_2 - 1$  neighbors in  $X$ , there is an independent set  $W \subset X$  with  $|W| \geq |X|/a_2 \geq hn/a_2$ . By a similar argument as in Claim 4.1,  $X$  contains  $n$  disjoint independent sets of size  $h$ , which together with  $w$  yield a copy of  $K_1 + nK_h$  in the complement of  $\Gamma$  which is impossible.  $\square$

From Claim 4.2, we conclude that the subgraph of  $\Gamma$  induced by  $V_1$  is  $(a_2 - 1)$ -regular. However, such a subgraph of order  $hn + a_2 - 1$  does not exist since both  $hn + a_2 - 1$  and  $a_2 - 1$  are odd. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

## 5 Problems and remarks

As a central subject in combinatorics, the problem of determining the exact values of Ramsey numbers is notoriously difficult. The study of goodness of Ramsey numbers follows an opposite path, in search of graphs that can achieve the (relatively weak) lower bounds or with small discrepancies. The main results in this paper is along this line of approaches. Nevertheless, numerous questions remain, some of which we mention here.

**Problem 5.1** *Find a characterization for graphs  $H$  that is  $K_p$ -good. Namely, determine the family of graphs  $H$  satisfying  $r(K_p, H) = (p - 1)(|H| - 1) + 1$ .*

So far, it is known that this family includes connected graphs with bounded maximum degree and small bandwidth [1], connected graphs with bounded degeneracy satisfying certain locally sparse conditions [26], etc., but the list is far from complete. We remark that trees are included in the above list (as seen in (1)), belonging to the family of bounded degeneracy. The *degeneracy*  $d(H)$  of a graph  $H$  is the smallest natural number  $d$  such that every induced subgraph of  $H$  has a vertex of degree at most  $d$ . For example, a tree has degeneracy 1.

**Problem 5.2** *Find a characterization for graphs  $H$  that is  $K_p(1, 2, a_3, \dots, a_p)$ -good.*

The main theorems in this paper provide some hints in this direction.

**Problem 5.3** *Give some classifications for graphs  $H$  with low discrepancies from  $G$ -goodness.*

Of course, this problem may be too general or too hard to tackle. Here we just intend to point out numerous possible directions.

**Problem 5.4** Corollary 1.1 shows that if  $n \geq Cp^2$ , then  $F_n$  is  $K_p$ -good where  $C \approx 26.228$ .

*It would be interesting to improve the lower bound of  $n$  further, e.g., is it true for  $n \geq \Omega(p)$ ? Moreover, it would be interesting to improve the lower bounds of  $n$  in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3.*

**Problem 5.5** Nikiforov and Rousseau [26] established  $K_p$ -goodness for several families of graphs, for which the lower bounds on the number  $n$  of vertices are of tower-types since the proofs rely on Szemerédi's regularity lemma [32], Nikiforov and Rousseau raised the question of what the best possible lower bound for  $n$  is. Fox, He and Wigderson [19] asked if it is possible to completely eliminate the use of the regularity lemma from the proof of [26, Theorem 2.1].

*A somewhat weak problem is to eliminate the use of the regularity lemma to derive the following statement.*

*For any fixed graph  $H$ , and fixed integers  $p \geq 3$ ,  $k \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $1 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{p-1} \leq b$  and  $a_p \leq \delta n$  be positive integers. If  $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ , then  $K_k + nH$  is  $K_p(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ -good.*

## References

- [1] P. Allen, G. Brightwell and J. Skokan, Ramsey-goodness – and otherwise, *Combinatorica* 33 (2013), 125–160.
- [2] T. Bohman and P. Keevash, The early evolution of the H-free process, *Invent. Math.* 181 (2010), 291–336.
- [3] J. Bondy and U. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, Springer, 2008.
- [4] S. Burr, Ramsey numbers involving graphs with long suspended paths, *J. London Math. Soc.* 2 (1981), 405–413.
- [5] S. Burr and P. Erdős, Generalizations of a Ramsey-theoretic result of Chvátal, *J. Graph Theory* 7 (1983), 39–51.
- [6] S. Burr, P. Erdős, R. J. Faudree, C. C. Rousseau and R. H. Schelp, Some complete bipartite graph–tree Ramsey numbers, *Ann. Discrete Math.* 41 (1989), 79–90.
- [7] Y. Chen and Y. Zhang, The Ramsey numbers of fans versus a complete graph of order five, *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl.* 2 (2014), 66–69.
- [8] V. Chvátal, Tree-complete graph Ramsey numbers, *J. Graph Theory* 1 (1977), 93.
- [9] V. Chvátal and F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. II, Small off-diagonal numbers, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 32 (1972), 389–394.
- [10] V. Chvátal and F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. III, Small off-diagonal numbers, *Pacific J. Math.* 41 (1972), 335–345.
- [11] D. Conlon and J. Fox, Graph removal lemmas, *Surveys in combinatorics 2013*, 1–49. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 409, *Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge*, 2013.
- [12] D. Conlon, J. Fox and B. Sudakov, Short proofs of some extremal results III, *Random Structures Algorithms* 57 (2020), 958–982.
- [13] D. Conlon, J. Fox and B. Sudakov, Recent developments in graph Ramsey theory, *Surveys in combinatorics 2015*, 49–118. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 424, *Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge*, 2015.
- [14] P. Erdős, On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs, *Israel J. Math.* 2 (1964), 183–190.
- [15] P. Erdős, Some recent results on extremal problems in graph theory, 1967 *Theory of graphs (Internat. Sympos., Rome, 1966)*, pp. 117–123 (English); pp. 124–130 (French) *Gordon and Breach, New York; Dunod, Paris*.
- [16] P. Erdős, On some new inequalities concerning extremal properties of graphs, 1968, *Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966)* pp. 77–81, *Academic Press, New York*.
- [17] P. Erdős, On the graph theorem of Turán, *Mat. Lapok* 21 (1970), 249–251 (in Hungarian).
- [18] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits, Supersaturated graphs and hypergraphs, *Combinatorica* 3 (1983), 181–192.

- [19] J. Fox, X. He and Y. Wigderson, Ramsey goodness of books revisited, arXiv:2109.09205v1, 2021.
- [20] Z. Füredi, A proof of the stability of extremal graphs, Simonovits' stability from Szemerédi's regularity, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 115 (2015), 66–71.
- [21] Z. Füredi, personal communication.
- [22] A. Hamm, P. Hazelton and S. Thompson, On Ramsey and star-critical Ramsey numbers for generalized fans versus  $nK_m$ , *Discrete Appl. Math.* 305 (2021), 64–70.
- [23] S. Kadota, T. Onozuka and Y. Suzuki, The graph Ramsey number  $R(F_\ell, K_6)$ , *Discrete Math.* 342 (2019), 1028–1037.
- [24] Y. Li and C. C. Rousseau, Fan-complete graph Ramsey numbers, *J. Graph Theory* 23 (1996), 413–420.
- [25] V. Nikiforov and C. C. Rousseau, Large generalized books are  $p$ -good, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 92 (2004), 85–97.
- [26] V. Nikiforov and C. C. Rousseau, Ramsey goodness and beyond, *Combinatorica* 29 (2009), 227–262.
- [27] R. D. Ringeisen and F. S. Roberts (eds.), Problem Session, Applications of Discrete Mathematics, Proceedings of the Third Conference on Discrete Mathematics, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina, May 14–16, 1986, (SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1988) 221–222.
- [28] A. F. Sidorenko, Triangle-free regular graphs, *Discrete Math.* 91 (1991), 215–217.
- [29] M. Simonovits, A method for solving extremal problems in graph theory, stability problems, 1968 *Theory of Graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966)* pp. 279–319, *Academic Press, New York*.
- [30] J. Spencer, Asymptotic lower bounds for Ramsey functions, *Discrete Math.* 20 (1997), 69–76.
- [31] Surahmat, E. T. Baskoro and H. J. Broersma, The Ramsey numbers of fans versus  $K_4$ , *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* 43 (2005), 96–102.
- [32] E. Szemerédi, Regular partitions of graphs, *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976)*, pp. 399–401, Colloq. Internat. CNRS, 260, *CNRS, Paris*, 1978.
- [33] P. Turán, Eine Extremalaufgabe aus der Graphentheorie [in Hungarian], *Math Fiz. Lapok* 48 (1941), 436–452.