

# The Linear $q$ -Hypergraph Process

Sayok Chakravarty<sup>1</sup> and Nicholas Spanier<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department and Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, University of Illinois Chicago

April 3, 2024

## Abstract

We analyze a random greedy process to construct  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraphs using the differential equation method. We show for  $q = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ , that this process yields a hypergraph with  $\frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)}(1 - o(1))$  edges. We also give some bounds for maximal linear hypergraphs.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 $F$ -free processes and the Differential Equation Method

The differential equation method for graph processes was popularized by Wormald in 1999 [13] to analyze random graph processes. Random graph processes have been well studied in various contexts [6, 12, 7, 1, 2, 10]. The survey [3] provides an accessible introduction to the differential equation method. A common application of the differential method is the analysis of the  $\mathcal{F}$ -free process where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of graphs. This is random process which creates a graph  $G_i$  on  $n$  vertices by adding edges uniformly at random one at a time so  $G_i$  contains no subgraph in the family  $\mathcal{F}$ . The case in which  $\mathcal{F}$  is a single graph has been studied for graphs including  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  to give lower bounds on the Ramsey numbers  $r(3, t)$  and  $r(4, t)$  [4, 8, 11].

This paper uses the differential equation method to construct approximate partial Steiner systems. An  $(n, q, t)$  partial Steiner system is a family  $\mathcal{H} \subset \binom{[n]}{q}$  so that any  $t$  subset is contained in at most one element of  $\mathcal{H}$ . It is easy to see that  $|\mathcal{H}| \leq \frac{\binom{n}{t}}{\binom{q}{t}}$ . When  $|\mathcal{H}| = \frac{\binom{n}{t}}{\binom{q}{t}}(1 - o(1))$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we say  $\mathcal{H}$  is an approximate Steiner system. Theorem 7.1 of [13] uses the differential equation method to show that a greedy matching of a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph will use almost all of the vertices given certain degree conditions are satisfied. The problem of finding an  $(n, q, t)$  partial Steiner system on  $[n]$  can be viewed as finding a matching in a particular  $k$ -uniform hypergraph. In [13], Wormald analyzes the greedy packing process to construct a hypergraph matching. He comments that while the proof only works for fixed  $k$ , one should be able to allow  $k$  to grow as a function of the number of vertices and get an analogous result. Wormald's result suggests the greedy packing process could construct a  $(n, q, 2)$  approximate partial Steiner system for  $q = o(\sqrt[3]{\log n})$ . We explain the connection between Wormald's result and our result in Section 1.2. Our main contribution is that we show that an  $\mathcal{F}$ -free process constructs an  $(n, q, 2)$  approximate partial Steiner system for  $q = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

Bohman and Warnke showed there exists approximate partial Steiner triple systems with high girth by analyzing an  $F$ -free process [5]. Our work uses their approach to analyze the process of  $q$ -uniform graphs where  $q$  may depend on  $n$ .

## 1.2 $q$ -Linear Process

A hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  is called linear if for any  $A, B \in E(\mathcal{H})$  we have  $|A \cap B| \leq 1$ . In other words, any pair of vertices appears in at most one edge. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $q$ -uniform. Then

$$|E(\mathcal{H})| \leq \frac{\binom{n}{q}}{\binom{q}{2}} = \frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)} \text{ as the } \binom{q}{2} \text{ pairs in each edge are distinct.}$$

Consider the following simple randomized greedy algorithm for constructing a maximal  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraph where we add one edge at each step. Let  $\mathcal{H}_i$  be the hypergraph at step  $i$  and let  $e_i$  be the edge added at step  $i$

1. Let  $\mathcal{H}_0$  be the empty  $q$ -uniform hypergraph on  $[n]$ .
2. For  $i \geq 1$ , at step  $i$  pick  $e_i$  uniformly at random from the set

$$\left\{ e \in \binom{[n]}{q} : |e \cap e_j| \leq 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq i-1 \right\}$$

and form  $\mathcal{H}_i$  by adding  $e_i$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{i-1}$ .

We call this the  $q$ -linear process. We analyze the stopping time of this algorithm for various values of  $q$  that may depend on  $n$ . Our first result gives a lower bound on sizes of maximal linear hypergraphs. Note that such lower bounds give a lower bound on the stopping time of the  $q$ -linear process.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraph on  $[n]$  that is maximal (i.e. no edge can be added to  $\mathcal{H}$  while maintaining linearity). Then  $e(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{n(n-q+1)}{q(q-1)^2} = \frac{n^2}{q^3}(1 - o(1))$ .*

Observe that Proposition 1 shows that any maximal partial  $(n, q, 2)$  Steiner system has at least  $\frac{n^2}{q^3}$  edges. In particular the  $q$ -linear process must continue for at least  $\frac{n^2}{q^3}$  steps.

In addition to Proposition 1, notice that there is a trivial lower bound for the size of a maximal  $(n, q, 2)$  partial Steiner system of  $\frac{n}{q}$  by a counting argument. Notice that since  $\frac{n}{q} > \frac{n^2}{q^3}$  when  $q > \sqrt{n}$  then once  $q > \sqrt{n}$  the trivial lower bound is better than the bound from Proposition 1. Furthermore, when the trivial lower bound is better than the bound from Proposition 1, Proposition 2 says exactly how long the process continues asymptotically.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraph on  $[n]$  with  $q \geq \sqrt{2n}$ . Then  $e(\mathcal{H}) < q$ . Further, if  $\mathcal{H}$  is maximal then  $e(\mathcal{H}) = \Theta(\frac{n}{q})$ .*

The problem of finding an  $(n, q, t)$  partial Steiner system on  $[n]$  can be viewed as finding a matching in a  $\binom{q}{t}$ -uniform hypergraph  $H$  where  $V(H) = \binom{[n]}{t}$  and for each  $S \in \binom{[n]}{q}$   $H$  has an edge which corresponds to all of the  $t$ -sets in  $S$ . In [13] Wormald defines the greedy packing process on a hypergraph  $H$  as the process which picks an edge from  $H$  one at a time uniformly at random and then deletes all the vertices in the chosen edge and continues until there are no edges remaining. We state Wormald's result below:

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph with  $\nu$  vertices where  $k$  is a fixed constant. Assume  $\nu < r^C$  for some constant  $C$ ,  $\delta = o(r^{1/3})$  and  $r = o(\nu)$ . Also if  $d(v)$  is the degree of vertex  $v$  in  $H$  then assume  $|d(v) - r| \leq \delta$ . Then for any  $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{9k(k-1)+3}$  a.a.s. at most  $\frac{\nu}{r^{\epsilon_0}}$  vertices remain at the end of the greedy packing process applied to  $H$ .*

Based on the connection between partial Steiner systems on  $[n]$  and matchings in the hypergraph  $H$ , the number of unused vertices in the greedy packing process is the number of unused pairs at the end of the  $q$ -linear process. Note that the correspondences between the greedy packing process and the  $q$ -linear process is given by  $\nu = \binom{n}{2}$  and  $k = \binom{q}{2}$ . Hence, for the partial Steiner system to have  $(1 - o(1))\frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)}$  edges, Wormald's result suggests that if  $k$  were allowed to grow as a function of  $\nu$  then we would need that  $\frac{\nu}{r^{\epsilon_0}} = o(n^2)$ . Then using the fact that  $r = o(\nu) = o(n^2)$  and  $\epsilon_0 = O(\frac{1}{k^2}) = O(\frac{1}{q^4})$ , we would need that  $q = o(\sqrt[4]{\log n})$ .

Our main result allows us to still get almost all of the edges until  $q$  is  $o(\sqrt{\log n})$ , giving an improvement over the expected result from Wormald 1999 [13].

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $q = o(\sqrt{\ln n})$  and let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $q$ -uniform hypergraph on  $[n]$  obtained from the  $q$ -linear process. Then whp  $|E(\mathcal{H})| \geq \frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)}(1 - o(1))$ .*

Note that for  $q$  between  $\sqrt{\log n}$  and  $\sqrt{2n}$  all we know about the  $q$ -linear process is the lower bound from Proposition 1.

In Section 2 of this paper, we will prove Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 and in Section 3 we will prove Theorem 4. Throughout this paper, we will use the notation  $f(n) \ll g(n)$  to mean  $f(n) = o(g(n))$ .

## 2 Auxiliary Results

We will begin by proving Proposition 1

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraph on  $[n]$  that is maximal. Consider the graph  $G$  on  $[n]$  whose edge set is pairs that are not present in any edge of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $G$  is  $K_q$ -free as a  $K_q$  in  $G$  corresponds to an edge that can be added to  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\binom{n}{2} = e(\mathcal{H})\binom{q}{2} + e(G)$ . Hence, by Turan's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} e(\mathcal{H}) &= \binom{q}{2}^{-1} \left( \binom{n}{2} - e(G) \right) \\ &\geq \binom{q}{2}^{-1} \left( \binom{n}{2} - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{q-1} \right) \frac{n^2}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{n(n-q+1)}{q(q-1)^2} \end{aligned}$$

■

Next, we prove Proposition 2.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a  $q$ -uniform linear hypergraph on  $[n]$ . Let  $e(\mathcal{H}) = m$  and let  $E(\mathcal{H}) = \{e_i : i \in [m]\}$ . Now define  $\mathcal{H}_i$  as the  $q$ -uniform hypergraph on  $[n]$  with  $E(\mathcal{H}_i) = \{e_j : j \in [i]\}$ . Define  $V_i = [n] \setminus \cup_{j=1}^i e_j$  be the set of vertices not used by any edge in  $\mathcal{H}_i$ . Now notice that since  $\mathcal{H}$  is linear,  $|e_{i+1} \cap \cup_{j=1}^i e_j| \leq i$ , so  $|V_i \setminus V_{i+1}| \geq q - i$ . Now let  $V_0 = [n]$  and notice that  $\forall i \in [m]$

$$\begin{aligned} |V_i| &= n - \sum_{j=1}^i |V_{j-1} \setminus V_j| \\ &\leq n - \sum_{j=1}^i q - (j-1) \\ &= n - iq + \frac{1}{2}i(i-1) \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $f(x) = n - qx + \frac{1}{2}x(x-1)$  and notice that  $f(i) \geq |V_i|$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . Also, notice that  $|V_i|$  is a non-negative integer for all  $i \in [m]$  since it is the number of vertices not used in any edge of  $\mathcal{H}_i$ . Then notice that  $f(q) = n - \frac{1}{2}q^2 - \frac{1}{2}q < 0$  since  $q \geq \sqrt{2n}$ , so if  $m \geq q$  this would lead to a contradiction since  $|V_q| \leq f(q) < 0$  but  $|V_q| \geq 0$ . Thus  $m < q$ .

Now notice that  $\sum_{i=1}^m |V_{i-1} \setminus V_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m (q - (i-1)) = mq - \frac{1}{2}m(m-1)$  and further,  $\sum_{i=1}^m |V_{i-1} \setminus V_i| \leq n$ . Thus we get that  $m(q - \frac{1}{2}(m-1)) \leq n$  but since  $m-1 < q$  then  $m(q - \frac{1}{2}q) \leq n$ . Thus  $m \leq \frac{2n}{q}$  so  $m = O(\frac{n}{q})$ .

Next, assume  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is maximal and notice that every new edge uses at most  $q$  vertices not used by other edges, and there cannot be  $q$  unused vertices because  $\mathcal{H}$  is maximal. Thus  $m > \frac{n-q}{q} = \Omega(\frac{n}{q})$ . Thus  $e(\mathcal{H}) = \Theta(\frac{n}{q})$ . ■

### 3 Analysis of the $q$ -Linear Process

We prove Theorem 4 using the differential equation method.

#### 3.1 Trajectories and Definitions

To understand  $q$ -linear process we need to track the codegree of sets  $A \subset [n]$ . The codegree of  $A$  at step  $i$  is the number of  $B \subset [n]$  with  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  so that  $A \cup B$  can be added to  $\mathcal{H}_{i-1}$ . Towards this end, for each  $J \subset [n]$  with  $|J| = j \in \{0\} \cup [q-1]$  consider the sets:

$$\begin{aligned} H(i) &:= \left\{ e \in \binom{[n]}{q} : |e \cap e_k| \leq 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq i-1 \right\} \\ P_j(i) &:= \left\{ J \in \binom{[n]}{j} : J \subset e \text{ for some } e \in H(i) \right\} \\ Y_J(i) &:= \begin{cases} \left\{ K \in \binom{[n] \setminus J}{q-j} : J \cup K \in H(i) \right\} & J \in P_j(i+1) \\ Y_J(i-1) & J \notin P_j(i+1) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here  $P_j(i)$  represents  $j$  sets which can still be a subset of a new edge at step  $i$ , and  $Y_J(i)$  represents the codegree of a set in  $P_j(i)$  with the convention that if  $J \notin P_j(i)$  then we freeze  $Y_J$  at its current value. We are particularly interested in  $Y_\emptyset(i)$  as this gives the number of available edges at step  $i$ , and we give this set another name  $H(i)$  for clarity.

Next we will define trajectory functions which we expect the random variables  $|Y_J(i)|$  to follow. Observe that after  $i$  steps the proportion of pairs that are not in any edge is

$\frac{\binom{n}{2} - i\binom{q}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} = 1 - \frac{iq(q-1)}{n(n-1)}$ . Our heuristic is that the probability that a pair is not in any edge at step  $i$  is  $1 - \frac{iq(q-1)}{n(n-1)}$  and the events that distinct pairs are not in any edges are mutually independent. Now we will define a continuous time variable  $t$  which relates to discrete steps by  $t(i) = t_i = \frac{i}{n(n-1)}$  and define the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) &:= 1 - q(q-1)t \\ y_j(t) &:= \binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}} \forall j \in [q-1] \cup \{0\} \\ h(t) &:= \binom{n}{q} p^{\binom{q}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $p$  is a continuous valued function which matches our heuristic for the probability that a pair is not in an edge together at step  $i$  when  $t = \frac{i}{n(n-1)}$ . Further, notice that if our heuristic is close to true, then  $y_j(t)$  gives the approximate size of  $Y_J(i)$  when  $t = \frac{i}{n(n-1)}$  given that  $J \in P_j$ . Also note that  $h(t) = y_0(t)$ .

Now with these trajectory functions, we define our targeted stopping time  $m_0$  and the error we allowed on the trajectories  $\epsilon_j$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
f &:= (\log \log n)^2 \\
\beta &:= \frac{1}{6q^2} \\
m_0 &:= \lfloor \frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)}(1 - n^{-\beta}) \rfloor \\
\epsilon_j &:= \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} q^f p^{-\binom{j}{2}-2\binom{q}{2}} \\
\epsilon_H &:= \epsilon_0
\end{aligned}$$

Now to prove Theorem 4, we prove the following lemma:

**Lemma 5.** *For all  $0 \leq i \leq m_0$ , and for all  $j \in [q-1] \cup \{0\}$  we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
||H(i) - h(t_i)| &\leq \epsilon_H \\
||Y_J(i) - y_j(t_i)| &\leq \epsilon_j \forall J \in P_j(i)
\end{aligned}$$

whp

Now notice that if  $\epsilon_H(t) = o(h(t))$  and  $\epsilon_j(t) = o(y_j(t))$ , this will show that whp  $H \sim h$  and  $Y_J \sim y_j$ , which since  $h(t_{m_0}) \gg 1$  this will prove Theorem 4. Let  $\mathcal{G}_i$  be the event that all the estimates in Lemma 5 hold for all  $j \leq i$ .

To see that  $\epsilon_j(t) = o(y_j(t))$  for all  $j \in [q-1] \cup \{0\}$  notice that for all  $t \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\epsilon_j(t)}{y_j(t)} &= \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} q^f p^{-\binom{j}{2}-2\binom{q}{2}}}{\binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2}-\binom{j}{2}}} \\
&= q^f n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} p^{-3\binom{q}{2}} \\
&\leq q^f n^{-1+6\beta\binom{q}{2}} = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Where last statement in the above follows from our choices of  $f$  and  $\beta$ . Notice that since we want  $n^{-\beta} = o(1)$  then we need  $\beta = \omega(\frac{1}{\log n})$ , and we also need  $\beta = \Theta(\frac{1}{\binom{q}{2}})$ . Thus we need that  $\binom{q}{2} = o(\log n)$  which holds since we assumed  $q = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

To prove Lemma 5, we will define the following random variable where  $J \in \binom{[n]}{j}$  for  $j \in [q-1] \cup \{0\}$ :

$$Y_J^\pm(i) = \begin{cases} |Y_J(i) - (y_j(t_i) \pm \epsilon_j)| & \mathcal{G}_{i-1} \text{ holds} \\ Y_J^\pm(i-1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

### 3.2 Expected One-Step Change of $Y_J$

Let  $\Delta Y_J(i) = |Y_J(i+1)| - |Y_J(i)|$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_i$  be the natural filtration of the process at step  $i$ . We refer to  $\Delta Y_J(i)$  as the one step change of  $Y_J(i)$ .

We now show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta Y_J(i) | \mathcal{F}_i] = -\frac{1}{|H(i)|} \left( \sum_{K \in Y_J(i)} \left( \sum_{S \subset J, T \subset K, |S|+|T| \geq 2, |T| \geq 1} (-1)^{|S|+|T|} (|S| + |T| - 1) |Y_{S \cup T}(i)| \right) \right)$$

Observe that  $\Delta Y_J(i)$  is the number of elements in the codegree of  $Y_J(i)$  that are made unavailable by the addition of  $e_i$  to  $\mathcal{H}_{i-1}$ . We show that for fixed  $K \in Y_J(i)$  the number of edges

$e_i$  that causes  $K \notin Y_J(i+1)$  is

$$\sum_{S \subset J, T \subset K, |S|+|T| \geq 2, |T| \geq 1} (-1)^{|S|+|T|} (|S| + |T| - 1) |Y_{S \cup T}(i)|$$

Suppose  $e \in H(i)$  is such that  $|e \cap J| = k$  and  $|e \cap K| = \ell$  such that  $k + \ell \geq 2$ . We show that if  $k = 0, 1$  then  $e$  is counted once in the sum and that if  $k \geq 2$  then  $e$  is counted 0 times in the sum.

Let  $k = 0$ . Then  $e$  is counted

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) = 1$$

times.

Let  $k = 1$ . Then  $e$  is counted

$$\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) + \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^{m+1} m = 1$$

times.

Let  $k \geq 2$ . Then  $e$  is counted

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 1 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1 + m_2 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} (-1)^{m_1+m_2} (m_1 + m_2 - 1) = 0$$

times.

We leave the proof of the combinatorial identities used above for the appendix.

### 3.3 Supermartingale and Submartingale Properties

We now show that  $\Delta Y_J^+(i)$  is a supermartingale. We first note that

$$\Delta Y_J^+(i) = (Y_J(i+1) - Y_J(i)) - (y_j(t_{i+1}) - y_j(t_i)) - (\epsilon_j(t_{i+1}) - \epsilon_j(t_i))$$

Since by Taylor's theorem

$$y_j(t_{i+1}) - y_j(t_i) = \frac{y_j'(t_i)}{n(n-1)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{y_j''(c)}{n^2(n-1)^2}$$

for some  $c \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ , and similarly

$$\epsilon_j(t_{i+1}) - \epsilon_j(t_i) = \frac{\epsilon_j'(t_i)}{n(n-1)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\epsilon_j''(c)}{n^2(n-1)^2}$$

for some  $c \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ , then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta Y_J^+(i) | \mathcal{F}_i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\Delta Y_J(i) | \mathcal{F}_i] - \frac{y_j'(t_i)}{n(n-1)} - \frac{\epsilon_j'(t_i)}{n(n-1)} + \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |y_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} + \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |\epsilon_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} \quad (1)$$

Note that in the event  $\mathcal{G}_{i-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta Y_J(i) | \mathcal{F}_i] &\leq \frac{y_j(t_i) + \epsilon_j(t_i)}{h(t_i) - \epsilon_h(t_i)} \sum_{m=2}^q \left( \binom{q}{m} - \binom{j}{m} \right) (m-1) ((-1)^{m+1} y_m(t_i) + \epsilon_m(t_i)) \\ &\sim \sum_{m=2}^q \left( \binom{q}{m} - \binom{j}{m} \right) (m-1) \left( (-1)^{m+1} \frac{y_j y_m}{h} + \frac{y_j \epsilon_m}{h} \right) \end{aligned}$$

To show that  $\{Y_J^+(i)\}$  is a supermartingale, we need to verify that  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta Y_J^+(i) | \mathcal{F}_i] \leq 0$ . We do this by showing that the negative terms in (1) are larger than the positive terms. We do this by showing the following:

**Lemma 6.** *The following hold*

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} \frac{y_j y_2}{h} &= \frac{y'_j}{n(n-1)} \\
\binom{q}{2} \frac{y_j \epsilon_2}{h} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)} \\
\binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j y_m}{h} &\ll \frac{1}{q} \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)} \text{ for } m \geq 3 \\
\binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j \epsilon_m}{h} &\ll \frac{1}{q} \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)} \text{ for } m \geq 3 \\
\frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |y''_j(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} + \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |\epsilon''_j(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} &\ll \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)}
\end{aligned}$$

We leave the proofs of these statements for the appendix.

### 3.4 Absolute Bound on One-Step Change

We will now give an absolute bound on the one step change of  $Y_J^+$ . First, notice that

$$|\Delta Y_J^+(i)| \leq |\Delta Y_J(i)| + \sup_{t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]} \frac{|y'_j(t)|}{n(n-1)} + \sup_{t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]} \frac{|\epsilon'_j(t)|}{n(n-1)}$$

We will start by bounding  $|\Delta Y_J(i)|$ . Notice that since  $Y_J$  only changes when an available edge containing  $J$  becomes unavailable, then existing edges can only cause the absolute change in  $Y_J(i)$  to be smaller since sets that would have been removed from the codegree of  $J$  were already not in the codegree of  $J$ . Thus WLOG we may assume  $i = 0$ , and now we will consider three types of edges,  $e$ , which can be added, edges where  $|e \cap J| \geq 2$ , edges where  $|e \cap J| = 1$ , and edges where  $|e \cap J| = 0$ . First, since we freeze  $Y_J$  once  $J$  has an intersection with an existing edge of size at least 2, in the case where  $|e \cap J| \geq 2$  we get that  $\Delta Y_J(0) = 0$ . Next, when  $|e \cap J| = 1$  we get the following:

$$|\Delta Y_J(0)| \leq \binom{q-1}{1} \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$$

Now to show this bound on  $|\Delta Y_J(0)|$  when  $|e \cap J| = 1$  is larger than our bound when  $|e \cap J| = 0$ , and also to show that this bound is the largest term in the bound for  $Y_J^+(i)$ , we will give a lower bound on the quantity  $(q-1) \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
(q-1) \binom{n-j}{q-j-1} &\geq (q-1) \left( \frac{n-j}{q-j-1} \right)^{q-j-1} \\
&= \Omega(n^{q-j-1} q^{-q+j+2})
\end{aligned}$$

Next, when  $|e \cap J| = 0$  we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta Y_J(0)| &\leq \binom{q}{2} \binom{n-j}{q-j-2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} q^2 \left( \frac{(n-j)e}{q-j-2} \right)^{q-j-2} \\
&= O(n^{q-j-2} e^{q-j-2} q^2) \\
&= o(n^{q-j-1} q^{-q+j+2})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for all  $J$  and for all  $i$  we have that  $|\Delta Y_J(i)| \leq (q-1) \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$

Next, we will bound  $\sup_{t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]} \frac{|y'_j(t)|}{n(n-1)}$ . Notice that for all  $t \in [0, m_0]$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{y'_j(t)}{n(n-1)} \right| &= \left| \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} - 1} \left( \binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} \right) (-q(q-1))}{n(n-1)} \right| \\ &= O\left(\left(\frac{ne}{q-j}\right)^{q-j} q^4 n^{-2}\right) \\ &= O(n^{q-j-2} q^4 e^{q-j}) \\ &= o(n^{q-j-1} q^{-q+j+2}) \end{aligned}$$

Finally we will bound  $\sup_{t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]} \frac{|\epsilon'_j(t)|}{n(n-1)}$ . Now notice that for all  $t \in [0, m_0]$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\epsilon'_j(t)}{n(n-1)} \right| &= \left| \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} q^f p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \left( \binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} \right) (-q(q-1))}{n(n-1)} \right| \\ &= O\left(\left(\frac{ne}{q-j}\right)^{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} q^f (1-q(q-1)) \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}\right)^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} n^{-2} q^4 \\ &= O(n^{q-j-3+3\beta\binom{q}{2} + \beta(\binom{j}{2} + 2\binom{q}{2} + 1)} q^{4+f} e^{q-j}) \\ &= o(n^{q-j-1} q^{-q+j+2}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $|\Delta Y_J(i)| \leq (q-1) \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$  for all  $J$  and  $i$ .

### 3.5 Freedman Inequality

To finish the proof of Lemma 5 we use Freedman's Inequality which we state below [9].

**Theorem 7.** Let  $\{S(i)\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a supermartingale with respect to the filtration  $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ . Writing  $\Delta S(i) = S(i+1) - S(i)$ , suppose that  $\max_{i \geq 0} |\Delta S(i)| \leq C$  and  $\sum_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta S(i)| | \mathcal{F}_i) \leq V$ . Then, for any  $z > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(S(i) \geq S(0) + z \text{ for some } i \geq 0) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{z^2}{2C(V+z)} \right\}$$

Observe that if we set  $S = Y_J^+$  and  $z = -Y_J^+(0) = \epsilon_j(0)$  and show that  $\frac{z^2}{2C(V+z)} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  then we will have shown that  $\mathbb{P}(Y_J^+(i) < 0 \text{ for all } i)$  goes to 1 as  $n$  goes to infinity. This along with the analogous statement of  $Y_J^-$  and a union bound argument will show that the inequalities in Lemma 5 hold.

We now compute  $C$  and  $V$ . From the absolute bound on the one step change in  $Y_J$  we know that

$$|\Delta Y_J(0)| \leq \binom{q-1}{1} \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$$

So we can take  $C = \binom{q-1}{1} \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}$ . Furthermore, Lemma 6 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta Y_J^+(i)| | \mathcal{F}_i) &\leq \frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)} O\left(\frac{\sup_{t \in [0, t_{m_0}]} |\epsilon'_j(t)|}{n(n-1)}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{n(n-1)}{q(q-1)} O\left(\left| \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta\binom{q}{2}} q^f n^{\beta(\binom{j}{2} + 2\binom{q}{2} + 1)} \left( \binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} \right) (-q(q-1))}{n(n-1)} \right|\right) \\ &= O\left(\binom{n-j}{q-j} q^{f+2} n^{-1+6\beta\binom{q}{2}}\right) \end{aligned}$$



Hence, we can set  $V = O\left(\binom{n-j}{q-j} q^{f+2} n^{-1+6\beta(\frac{q}{2})}\right)$ .

Set  $z = \epsilon_j(0) = \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta(\frac{q}{2})} q^f$ . Notice that  $z \ll V$ , so to verify that  $\frac{z^2}{2C(V+z)} \gg 1$ , it suffices to check that  $\frac{z^2}{CV} \gg 1$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z^2}{CV} &= \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j}^2 n^{-2+6\beta(\frac{q}{2})} q^{2f}}{O\left(\binom{n-j}{q-j} q^{f+2} n^{-1+6\beta(\frac{q}{2})}\right) \cdot \binom{q-1}{1} \binom{n-j}{q-j-1}} \\ &= \Omega\left(\frac{n-q+1}{q-j} n^{-1} q^{f-3}\right) \\ &= \Omega\left(\left(1 - \frac{q}{n} + \frac{1}{n}\right) q^{f-4}\right) \\ &= \Omega(q^{f-4}) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f > 4$ , this shows  $\frac{z^2}{CV} \gg 1$ . To get the conclusion of Lemma 5, we show  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{m_0}^c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{m_0}^c) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{J \subset [n], |J| < q} \{Y_J^+(i) \geq 0 \text{ for some } i \geq 0\} \cup \{Y_J^-(i) \leq 0 \text{ for some } i \geq 0\}\right) \\ &\leq 2q \binom{n}{q} e^{-\Omega(q^{f-4})} \\ &\leq 2q \left(\frac{en}{q}\right)^q e^{-\Omega(q^{f-4})} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\log\left(q \left(\frac{en}{q}\right)^q\right) = \log q + q + q \log n - q \log q$$

Since the largest (in the asymptotic sense) term is  $q \log n$  we need to verify that that  $q \log n \ll q^{f-4}$ . To see this note that  $f \gg \frac{\log \log n}{\log q}$ . Hence,  $2q \left(\frac{en}{q}\right)^q e^{-\Omega(q^{f-4})} = o(1)$  and we have  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{m_0}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  which proves Lemma 5.

## 3.6 Appendix

### 3.6.1 Proof of Lemma 6

We now prove Lemma 6.

We first show that  $\left(\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}\right) \frac{y_j y_2}{h} = \frac{y'_j}{n^2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}\right) \frac{y_j y_2}{h} &= \left(\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}\right) \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}} \binom{n-2}{q-2} p^{\binom{q}{2} - 1}}{\binom{n}{q} p^{\binom{q}{2}}} \\ &= \left(\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}\right) \binom{n-j}{q-j} \frac{q(q-1)}{n(n-1)} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} - 1} \\ &= \frac{y'_j}{n(n-1)} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that  $\binom{q}{2} \frac{y_j \epsilon_2}{h} \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)}$ . Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{q}{2} \frac{y_j \epsilon_2}{h} \left( \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} &= \frac{\binom{\binom{q}{2} \binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}} \binom{n-2}{q-2} n^{-1+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^f p^{-\binom{2}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2}}}}{\binom{n}{q} p^{\binom{q}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^f p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \left( \binom{j}{2} + 2\binom{q}{2} \right) (q(q-1))}{n(n-1)} \\ &= \frac{\binom{q}{2}}{\binom{j}{2} + 2\binom{q}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

To prove the rest of Lemma 6, we will first give a lower bound on  $\frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)}$  and then prove this is asymptotically larger than all the remaining terms. First notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\epsilon'_j}{n(n-1)} &= \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^f p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \left( \binom{j}{2} + 2\binom{q}{2} \right) (q(q-1))}{n(n-1)} \\ &= \Omega\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we will compute  $q \binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j y_m}{h}$  where  $3 \leq m \leq q-1$  and show that each of these terms is  $o\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} q \binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j y_m}{h} &= q \binom{q}{m} \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2}} \binom{n-m}{q-m} p^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{m}{2}}}{\binom{n}{q} p^{\binom{q}{2}}} \\ &\leq \binom{n-j}{q-j} q \left( \frac{qe}{m} \right)^m \left( \frac{ne}{q-m} \right)^{q-m} \left( \frac{q}{n} \right)^q p^{-\binom{q}{2}} \\ &\leq \left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-m+\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{2m+1} e^q m^{-m} \right) \\ &= o\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Next, notice that since for all  $3 \leq m \leq q-1$  we have that  $\epsilon_m = o(y_m)$  then

$$q \binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j \epsilon_m}{h} = o\left( q \binom{q}{m} \frac{y_j y_m}{h} \right) = o\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right)$$

Lastly, we need to verify that  $\frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |y_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2}$  and  $\frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |\epsilon_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2}$  are also both  $o\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |y_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} &= \frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} (p(0))^{\binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} - 2} \left( \binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} \right) \left( \binom{q}{2} - \binom{j}{2} - 1 \right) (q^2(q-1)^2)}{2n^2(n-1)^2} \\ &= O\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-4} q^8 \right) \\ &= o\left( \binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta} \binom{q}{2} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2} - 2\binom{q}{2} - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sup_{s \in [0, \frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}]} |\epsilon_j''(s)|}{2n^2(n-1)^2} &\leq O\left(\frac{\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-1+3\beta(\frac{q}{2})} q^{f+8} (p(\frac{m_0}{n(n-1)}))^{-\binom{j}{2}-2\binom{q}{2}-2}}{n^2(n-1)^2}\right) \\
&= O\left(\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-5+\beta(6\binom{q}{2}+2)} q^{f+8}\right) \\
&= o\left(\binom{n-j}{q-j} n^{-3+3\beta(\frac{q}{2})} q^{f+4} p^{-\binom{j}{2}-2\binom{q}{2}-1}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.

### 3.6.2 Proof of Combinatorial Identities

We first show that  $\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) = 1$ . Observe that

$$\frac{(1+x)^{\ell} - 1}{x} = \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} x^{m-1}$$

This means

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left[ \frac{(1+x)^{\ell} - 1}{x} \right] = \sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (m-1) x^{m-2}$$

Letting  $x = -1$  yields  $\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) = 1$ .

We now show that  $\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) + \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^{m+1} m = 1$ . Observe that

$$(1+x)^{\ell} = \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} x^m$$

Differentiating and letting  $x = -1$  yields  $\sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^{m+1} m = 0$ , so we have  $\sum_{m=2}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^m (m-1) + \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{m} (-1)^{m+1} m = 1$ .

We now show that

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 1 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1+m_2 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} (-1)^{m_1+m_2} (m_1+m_2-1) = 0$$

We show this by verifying that

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 0 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1+m_2 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} (-1)^{m_1+m_2} (m_1+m_2-1) = 1$$

and the  $m_2 = 0$  part

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, m_1 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{0} (-1)^{0+m_1} (0+m_1-1) = 1$$

This second equality is the same as the first identity we proved. For the first one, observe that

$$\frac{(1+x)^{k+\ell} - 1}{x} = \frac{(1+x)^k (1+x)^{\ell} - 1}{x} = \sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 0 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1+m_2 \geq 1} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} x^{m_1+n_1-1}$$

This implies

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left[ \frac{(1+x)^{k+\ell} - 1}{x} \right] = \sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 0 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1+m_2 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} (m_1+m_2-1) x^{m_1+m_2-2}$$

Substitution  $x = -1$  yields

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_1 \leq k, 0 \leq m_2 \leq \ell, m_1+m_2 \geq 2} \binom{k}{m_1} \binom{\ell}{m_2} (-1)^{m_1+m_2} (m_1+m_2-1) = 1$$

## 4 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dhruv Mubayi for the ideas used in Proposition 2 and his guidance throughout. This work was funded by NSF DMS-1763317.

## References

- [1] Patrick Bennett. The sum-free process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.01644*, 2015.
- [2] Patrick Bennett and Tom Bohman. A note on the random greedy independent set algorithm. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(3):479–502, 2016.
- [3] Patrick Bennett and Andrzej Dudek. A gentle introduction to the differential equation method and dynamic concentration. *Discrete Mathematics*, 345(12):113071, 2022.
- [4] Tom Bohman. The triangle-free process. *Advances in Mathematics*, 221(5):1653–1677, 2009.
- [5] Tom Bohman and Lutz Warnke. Large girth approximate steiner triple systems. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 100(3):895–913, 2019.
- [6] Béla Bollobás and Oliver Riordan. Constrained graph processes. *the electronic journal of combinatorics*, 7:R18–R18, 2000.
- [7] William Duckworth and Nicholas C Wormald. Minimum independent dominating sets of random cubic graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 21(2):147–161, 2002.
- [8] Paul Erdős, Stephen Suen, and Peter Winkler. On the size of a random maximal graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 6(2-3):309–318, 1995.
- [9] David A Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *the Annals of Probability*, pages 100–118, 1975.
- [10] Stefan Glock, Felix Joos, Jaehoon Kim, Marcus Kühn, and Lyuben Lichev. Conflict-free hypergraph matchings. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2991–3005. SIAM, 2023.
- [11] Jeong Han Kim. The ramsey number  $r(3, t)$  has order of magnitude  $t^2/\log t$ . *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 7(3):173–207, 1995.
- [12] Deryk Osthus and Anusch Taraz. Random maximal  $h$ -free graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 18(1):61–82, 2001.
- [13] Nicholas C Wormald et al. The differential equation method for random graph processes and greedy algorithms. *Lectures on approximation and randomized algorithms*, 73:73–155, 1999.