

The anti-Ramsey number for paths

Long-Tu Yuan*

Abstract

We determine the exactly anti-Ramsey number for paths. This confirms a conjecture posed by Erdős, Simonovits and Sós in 1970s.

Key words: Anti-Ramsey numbers; paths.

AMS Classifications: 05C35.

1 Introduction

A subgraph of an edge-colored graph is *rainbow* if all of its edges have different colors. For a given graph H , the anti-Ramsey number $\text{AR}(n, H)$ of H is the maximum number of colors in an edge-colored K_n such that K_n does not contain a copy of rainbow H .

The anti-Ramsey number was introduced by Erdős, Simonovits and Sós [3]. In the same paper, they observed that if we color a copy of K_{k-2} in K_n with different colors and color the remaining edges a new color, then K_n contains no rainbow paths on k vertices. Let $X \subseteq V(K_n)$ with size $\lfloor (k-3)/2 \rfloor$ and let $i = 1$ if k is odd and $i = 2$ if k is even. If we color the edges incident X with different colors and color the remaining edges with i new colors, then we can easily check that K_n does not contain rainbow paths on k vertices. Hence, they asked whether those two configurations are best possible.

Denote by P_k the path on k vertices. Let $t = \lfloor (k-3)/2 \rfloor$. In [18], Simonovits and Sós determined $\text{AR}(n, P_k)$ for $n \geq c_1 t^2$, where c_1 is a constant. They also claimed that their result held for $n \geq 5t/2 + c_2$, where c_2 is a constant (without proof). The exactly anti-Ramsey number for paths is still not know. For other related results on this topic we refer the interested readers to a survey of Fujita, Magnant, and Ozeki [6] and some new results as [4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21].

The main result of this paper is the following theorem which settles an old conjecture posed by Erdős, Simonovits and Sós [3] almost fifty years ago.

Theorem 1 . *Let P_k be a path on k vertices and $\ell = \lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor$. If $n \geq k \geq 5$, then*

$$\text{AR}(n, P_k) = \max \left\{ \binom{k-2}{2} + 1, \binom{\ell-1}{2} + (\ell-1)(n-\ell+1) + \epsilon \right\},$$

where $\epsilon = 1$ if k is odd and $\epsilon = 2$ otherwise.

The extremal results of an n -vertex graph proved by stability results usually need n to be sufficiently large. Our proof of Theorem 1 bases on a recently result of Füredi, Kostochka, Luo and Verstraëte [7, 8] holding for graphs with arbitrary number of vertices. Hence, we can apply the stability results to determine the exactly anti-Ramsey number for paths. It is very interesting to obtain other exactly extremal result by stability method.

*School of Mathematical Sciences and Shanghai Key Laboratory of PMMP, East China Normal University, 500 Dongchuan Road, Shanghai 200240, P.R. China. Email: ltyuan@math.ecnu.edu.cn. Supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 11901554 and Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality (No. 18dz2271000, 19jc1420100).

2 Notation and basic lemmas

Given two graphs G and H , we say that G is H -free if G does not contain a copy of H as a subgraph. For a given graph H , the Turán number $\text{ex}(n, H)$ of H is the maximum number of edges in an n -vertex H -free graph. Similarly, the connected Turán number of a given graph H , denoted by $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n, H)$, is the maximum number of edges of an n -vertex H -free connected graph. The anti-Ramsey problem is strongly connected with the Turán problem. So we introduce some results about Turán problem first.

Erdős and Gallai [2] first studied the Turán numbers of paths. Later, Faudree and Schelp [5] and independently Kopylov [13] improved Erdős and Gallai's result to the following.

Theorem 2 (Faudree, Schelp [5] and Kopylov [13]) *Let $n \geq k$. Then $\text{ex}(n, P_k) = s \binom{k-1}{2} + \binom{r}{2}$, where $n = s(k-1) + r$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-2$. Moreover, the extremal graphs are characterized.*

For connected graphs without containing a copy of P_k , Balister, Györi, Lehel and Schelp [1] and independently Kopylov [13] proved the following theorem.

We first introduce the following graphs which play an important role in extremal problems for paths and cycles. For integers $n \geq k \geq 2a$, let $H(n, k, a)$ be the n -vertex graph whose vertex set is partitioned into three sets A, B, C such that $|A| = a, |B| = n - k + a$ and $|C| = k - 2a$ and the edge set consists of all edges between A and B together with all edges in $A \cup C$. Let $h(n, k, a) = e(H(n, k, a))$.

Theorem 3 (Balister, Györi, Lehel, Schelp [1] and Kopylov [13]) *Let $n \geq k$ and $s = \lfloor (k-2)/2 \rfloor$. Then $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n, P_k) = \max\{h(n, k-1, 1), h(n, k-1, s)\}$. Moreover, the extremal graph is either $H(n, k-1, 1)$ or $H(n, k-1, s)$.*

Let $n \geq k$ and $\ell = \lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor$ be positive integers. Define

$$ar(n, k) = \max\{h(k, k-1, 1) - 1, h(n, k-1, \ell-1) - i\},$$

where $i = 0$ if k is odd and $i = 1$ if k is even. Then Theorem 1 states that if the number of colors in an edge-colored K_n is at least $ar(n, k) + 1$, then K_n contains a rainbow copy of P_k . The following lemma only needs Theorems 2, 3 and some basic calculations. We move its proof to Appendix A.

Lemma 4 *Let $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq 3$ and $t \geq 1$. Let $n_0 \geq k_1 - 1, n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t \geq 1$ and $n = \sum_{i=0}^t n_i \geq k_1 + k_2 - 1 \geq 5$. Then*

$$\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_i, P_{k_2}) + t - 1 \leq ar(n, k_1 + k_2 - 1).$$

Very recently, Füredi, Kostochka, Luo and Verstraëte [7, 8] considered the stability results of the well-known Erdős-Gallai theorems on cycles and paths. Let \mathcal{C}_k be the set of cycles of length at least k . Let G be an n -vertex connected P_k -free (n -vertex 2-connected \mathcal{C}_k -free) graph. Their results state that if $e(G)$ is close to the maximum value of number of edges of n -vertex connected P_k -free (2-connected \mathcal{C}_k -free) graphs, then G must be a subgraph of some well-specified graphs. We will use the following two corollaries of the main theorems in [7, 8] (Theorem 1.6 in [7] and Theorem 2.3¹ in [8], also see results in

¹Theorem 2.3 in [8] states the stability result for 2-connected \mathcal{C}_k -free graphs. Note that if we add new a vertex and join it to all vertices of a connected P_k -free graph, then the obtained graph is 2-connected \mathcal{C}_k -free. Theorem 2.3 in [8] can be extended to stability result for connected P_k -free graphs as Theorem 1.6 was extended by Theorem 1.4 in [7].

[16, 17]). We divide their results basing on the parity of k for the purpose of proving our main result.

Corollary 5 (Füredi, Kostochka, Luo and Verstraëte [7, 8]) *Let $k \geq 9$ be odd and $\ell = (k - 1)/2$. Let G be an n -vertex connected graph without containing a path on k vertices. Then $e(G) \leq \max\{h(n, k - 1, 2), h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)\}$ unless G is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$.*

Corollary 6 (Füredi, Kostochka, Luo and Verstraëte [7, 8]) *Let $k \geq 6$ be even and $\ell = \lfloor (k - 1)/2 \rfloor$. Let G be an n -vertex connected graph without containing path on k vertices. Then $e(G) < \max\{h(n, k - 1, 2) + 1, h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)\}$ unless*

- (a) G is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$, or
- (b) G is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, \ell)$, or
- (c) G is an acyclic² P_6 -free graph when $k = 6$, or
- (d) $G = H(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)$.

Remark. For $k = 6$ in Corollary 6, see Theorem 5.1(4) in [7]. Actually, the result we used here is extended by Theorem 5.1(4) in [7] as Theorem 1.6 was extended by Theorem 1.4 in [7]. Corollary 6(d) ($e(G) = h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)$) is not proved in [7, 8]. We can prove this with a little more effort. We refer the readers to [17] for a short proof of stability results of the Erdős-Gallai theorems from which one can easily get Corollary 6(d).

We also need the following simple lemma³ (see Lemma 2.2 in [20]).

Lemma 7 *Let G be a bipartite graph with classes A and B . Let $|A| = |B| = \ell$. If $e(G) \geq (\ell - 1)\ell + 2$, then G contains a cycle of length 2ℓ .*

3 Proof of Theorem 1

The *representing graph* of a graph G with an edge coloring c is a spanning subgraph of G obtained by taking one edge of each color of c . For a set of edges E of G , we use $c(E)$ to denote the colors of edges in E . For a set of colors \mathcal{C} , when an edge e is colored by a color in \mathcal{C} , we say e is colored by \mathcal{C} for short. Given a graph G , we use $T(G)$ to denote the set of its cut edges.

Definition 8 Given a graph G with an edge coloring c , we say that the pair (G, c) is a *good edge coloring* if there is a connected representing graph L_n of G with a non-empty set of cut edges $X \subseteq T(L_n)$ such that each $e \in E(G)$ between components of $L_n - X$ are colored by $c(X)$.

Lemma 9 *Let G be a graph with an edge coloring c and let \mathcal{L}_n be the set of connected representing graphs of c . If $\mathcal{C}_0 = \bigcap_{L_n \in \mathcal{L}_n} \{c(e) : e \in T(L_n)\}$ is not empty, then (G, c) is a good edge coloring with a representing graph L_n^* and a set of cut edges $X \subseteq T(L_n^*)$ such that $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq c(X)$.*

Proof. Let $L_n^0 \in \mathcal{L}_n$ be a representing graph of G . Since $\mathcal{C}_0 = \bigcap_{L_n \in \mathcal{L}_n} \{c(e) : e \in T(L_n)\}$ is not empty, L_n^0 is connected with at least one cut edge. We obtain a subgraph of L_n^0 by the following procedure. Delete the edges of L_n^0 colored by \mathcal{C}_0 and denote the obtained graph by L_n^1 . Let \mathcal{C}_1 be the colors of the edges of G between any two components of L_n^1 .

²We say a graph is *acyclic* if it is connected without containing a cycle.

³The lemma maybe appears in some old paper, but I do not find it.

Delete the edges of L_n colored by \mathcal{C}_1 and denote the obtained graph by L_n^2 . We go on this procedure and finally obtain a minimal spanning subgraph L_n^t of L_n for some integer t .

It is enough to show that the edges of G between any two components of L_n^t are colored by $c(X)$ with $X \subseteq T(L_n^0)$. We will show that L_n^i is obtained from L_n^0 by deleting edges of $T(L_n^0)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. This will complete our proof of the lemma. Suppose for contrary that there is an edge $e'_{\ell_0} \in E(G)$ between two components of $L_n^{\ell_0}$ not colored by $c(T(L_n^0))$. We choose ℓ_0 as small as possible. Clearly, we have $\ell_0 > 0$ and each L_n^i for $i < \ell_0$ is obtained from L_n^0 by deleting edges from $T(L_n^0)$. Then we may add e'_{ℓ_0} to L_n^0 and delete the edge e_{ℓ_0} of L_n^0 colored by $c(e'_{\ell_0})$. Since e_{ℓ_0} is not a cut edge of L_n^0 , the obtained graph $\tilde{L}_n^1 \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is connected. Moreover, by the minimality of ℓ_0 , \tilde{L}_n^1 contains a cycle containing an edge e_{ℓ_1} of $T(L_n)$ colored by \mathcal{C}_{ℓ_1} with $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \ell_0 - 1$. We choose ℓ_1 as small as possible. If $\ell_1 = 0$, then e_{ℓ_1} is colored by \mathcal{C}_0 and e_{ℓ_1} is not a cut edge of \tilde{L}_n^1 . This is a contradiction to definition of \mathcal{C}_0 . Let $\ell_1 \geq 1$. Then, from \tilde{L}_n^1 , after deleting the edge e_{ℓ_1} and adding an edge e'_{ℓ_1} colored by $c(e_{\ell_1})$ between the components of $L_n^{\ell_1}$, the obtained graph $\tilde{L}_n^2 \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is connected. Moreover, \tilde{L}_n^2 contains a cycle containing one edge e_{ℓ_2} of $T(L_n)$ colored by \mathcal{C}_{ℓ_2} with $\ell_2 < \ell_1$. If $\ell_2 = 0$, then get a contradiction to definition of \mathcal{C}_0 . Otherwise, we may go on the above procedure until we have $\ell_s = 0$ for some s . Thus there is an edge $e_{\ell_s} \in T(L_n)$ colored by \mathcal{C}_0 and this edge is not a cut edge for $\tilde{L}_n^s \in \mathcal{L}_n$. This final contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 9. ■

Let c be an edge coloring of K_n with maximum number of colors such that K_n contains no copy of rainbow P_k . Taking a representing graph L_n of K_n with a maximum component. The configurations before Theorem 1 show that $e(L_n) \geq ar(n, k)$. Suppose that

$$e(L_n) \geq ar(n, k) + 1. \quad (1)$$

We will finish our proof of Theorem 1 by contradictions.

Claim. L_n is connected.

Proof. Suppose for contrary that L_n is not connected. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the components of L_n with $|C_1| \geq |C_2| \geq \dots \geq |C_\ell|$. We choose L_n as following. For $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, subject to the choice of C_i , we choose C_{i+1} with $|V(C_{i+1})| = s_{i+1}$ maximum first and then $|E(C_{i+1})| = t_{i+1}$ maximum.

Let $T(C_1)$ be the set of cut edges of C_1 . Then $T(C_1)$ is not empty. Otherwise, C_1 is 2-connected. Let $X = V(C_1)$ and $Y = V(L_n) \setminus V(C_1)$. Choose an edge xy in K_n with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Let L'_n be the representing graph obtained from L_n by adding the edge xy and deleting the edge in L_n with color $c(xy)$. Then L'_n contains a component with size $s_1 + 1$, a contradiction to our choice of L_n . Moreover, each edge between X and Y are colored by $T(C_1)$.

Let \mathcal{L}_n^* be the set of representing graphs of K_n containing a component with s_1 vertices and t_1 edges. Let

$$\mathcal{C}^* = \bigcap_{L'_n \in \mathcal{L}_n^*} \{c(e) : e \in T(L'_n[C_1])\}.$$

Then each edge of K_n between X and Y is colored by a color in \mathcal{C}^* . Otherwise, as the above argument (for some $L'_n \in \mathcal{L}_n^*$), there is a representing graph containing a component with size $s_1 + 1$, a contradiction. In particular, we show that \mathcal{C}^* is not empty. Hence, it follows from Lemma 9 that the pair $(c, K_n[C_1])$ is a good coloring with a representing graph $L_n^1[C_1]$ and a set of cut edges $X_1 \subseteq T(L_n^1[C_1])$ such that $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq c(X_1)$. Let P^1 be a longest path in $L_n^1[C_1] - X_1$ on k_1 vertices. Without loss of generality, let C_1 be the component of $L_n^1[C_1] - X_1$ containing a copy of P_{k_1} . Assume $L_n^1 - X_1 - V(\tilde{C}_1)$ contains a path \tilde{P}^1 on $k - k_1$ vertices. Since each edge between P^1 and \tilde{P}^1 are colored by $c(X_1)$, K_n contains a rainbow copy of P_k , a contradiction. Thus $L_n^1 - X_1 - V(\tilde{C}_1)$ is P_{k-k_1} -free. If $(k-1)/2 \leq k_1 \leq k-3$,

then since the number of components of $L_n^1 - X_1$ is at least $|c(X_1)| + 2$, by Lemma 4, we have $e(L_n^1) \leq ar(n, k)$, a contradiction to (1). If $k_1 = k - 2$, then $L_n^1 - X_1 - V(\tilde{C}_1)$ is an independent set. In this case we can consider $K_n[C_1]$ since it contains $ar(n, k) + 1$ colors. Suppose that $k_1 < (k - 1)/2$. Then we consider the subgraph G_2 of $G_1 = K_n$ obtained by deleting $V(C_1)$ and the edges colored by $c(E(C_1))$. Then as the previous argument, by Lemma 9, the pair $(c, G_2[C_2])$ is a good coloring with a representing graph $L_n^2[C_2]$ and a set of cut edges $X_2 \subseteq T(L_n^2[C_2])$. Let \tilde{C}_2 be the component of $L_n^2[C_2] - X_2$ containing a longest path P^2 on k_2 vertices. If $(k - 1)/2 \leq k_2 \leq k - 3$, then by Lemma 4, we have $e(L_n^2) \leq ar(n, k)$, a contradiction (other components of $L_n^2 - X_1 - X_2$ do not contain a path on $k - k_2$ vertices). If $k_1 = k - 2$, then $L_n^1 - X_1 - X_2 - V(\tilde{C}_2)$ is an independent set. Hence we can consider $K_n[C_1 \cup C_2]$ since $K_n[C_1 \cup C_2]$ contains $ar(n, k) + 1$ colors. Suppose that $k_2 < (k - 1)/2$. We may go on this procedure and obtain X_ℓ such that $L_n^\ell[C_\ell] - X_\ell$ (X_ℓ can be an empty set) contains a longest path P^ℓ on $k_\ell < (k - 1)/2$ vertices or $k - 2$ vertices. If P^ℓ has less than $(k - 1)/2$ vertices then each component of $L_n - \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell X_i$ does not contain a path on at least $(k - 1)/2$ vertices, where $L_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell L_n^i[C_i]$. Moreover, the number of components of $L_n - \bigcup_{i=1}^\ell X_i$ is $\sum_{i=1}^\ell (c(X_i) + 1)$. Thus, since $\lceil (k - 1)/2 \rceil - 1 \leq k - 3$, by Lemma 4, we have $e(L_n) \leq ar(n, k)$, a contradiction to (1). If P^ℓ has $k - 2$ vertices, then each of C_i is a tree for $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$. Let x_1x_2 be a pendent edge of C_1 , where x_1 is a leaf of C_1 . If there is an edge color by $c(x_1x_2)$ between $V(C_1) \setminus \{x_1\}$ and $L_n - V(C_1)$, then $K_n - \{x_1\}$ contains $ar(n, k) + 1$ colors. Thus we may consider the graph $K_n - \{x_1\}$. Hence the edges between $V(C_1) \setminus \{x_1\}$ and $L_n - V(C_1)$ are not colored by $c(x_1x_2)$. In particular, the edges between x_2 and $L_n - V(C_1)$ are not colored by $c(x_1x_2)$. Thus there is a path on k vertices containing the edge x_1x_2 , a contradiction. The proof of the claim is complete. ■

By the claim, L_n is a connected graph. We divide the proof basing on the parity of k .

Case 1. k is odd, i.e., $k = 2\ell + 1$.

For $k = 5, 7$, we have $ar(n, k) + 1 > \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n, P_k)$. Hence L_n contains a copy of P_k , a contradiction. Let $k \geq 9$, i.e., $\ell \geq 4$. Note that $ar(n, k) + 1 > \max\{h(n, k - 1, 2), h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)\}$. By Corollary 5 and (1), each connected representing subgraph of K_n is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$.

Let $A \cup B \cup C$ be the partition of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$ in definition. Thus, since L_n is connected, each vertex in B has degree one in L_n . Basic calculation shows that if $n > (5\ell - 1)/2 > (5\ell^2 - 11\ell)/(2\ell - 4)$, then $ar(n, k) + 1 > h(n, k - 1, 1)$, a contradiction. Hence, we can assume $n \leq (5\ell - 1)/2$. By (1), there are at most $n - 2\ell - 1 \leq (5\ell - 1)/2 - 2\ell < 2\ell - 4$ non-edges of L_n inside $A \cup C$. Let L_n^* be the representing graph obtained from L_n by adding an edge e inside B and deleting the edge of L_n colored by $c(e)$. Thus L_n^* contains at most $n - k + 1$ with degree one and hence L_n^* is not a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$, a contradiction when L_n^* is connected. Suppose that L_n^* is not connected. Then L_n^* contains a unique isolated vertex, say x . Let $L_{n-1}^* = L_n^* - \{x\}$. Then we have $e(L_{n-1}^*) \geq ar(n, k) + 1 \geq ar(n - 1, k) + 1$. Go on the previous arguments repeatedly we can finally get a contradiction. The proof of Case 1 is complete.

Case 2. k is even, i.e., $k = 2\ell + 2$.

Note that $ar(n, k) + 1 \geq \max\{h(n, k - 1, 2) + 1, h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)\}$. By Corollary 6 and (1), for each connected representing graph L_n of K_n , we have the following:

- (a) L_n is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$, or
- (b) L_n is a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, \ell)$, or
- (c) L_n is an acyclic P_6 -free graph when $k = 6$, or

- (d) $L_n = H(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)$.

For (b), let $A \cup B \cup C$ be the partition of $H(n, k - 1, \ell)$ in definition, i.e., $|A| = \ell$, $|C| = 1$ and $|B| = n - \ell - 1$. Let $X = A$ and $Y = B \cup C$. By (1) there are at least $(\ell - 1)|B \cup C| + 3$ edges between X and Y . Hence, there exists a vertex y in Y with degree ℓ . Moreover, since $L_n[X, Y \setminus \{y\}]$ contains a subgraph on 2ℓ vertices containing X with $(\ell - 1)\ell + 2$ edges, by Lemma 7, $L_n[X, Y \setminus \{y\}]$ contains a cycle, \tilde{C} , of length 2ℓ . Let yy' be an edge in $K_n[Y]$ with $y' \notin V(\tilde{C})$. Then one can find a rainbow path of length $2\ell + 2$ in $K_n[V(\tilde{C}) \cup \{y, y'\}]$, a contradiction. For (c), we have $e(L_n) \leq n - 1$, contradicts (1). For (d), let $L_n = H(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)$. Let L_n^* be representing graph obtained from L_n by adding an edge e not in L_n and deleting the edge colored by $c(e)$ in L_n . It is obviously that L_n^* contains a copy of P_k , a contradiction. Finally, let L_n be a subgraph of $H(n, k - 1, 1)$. Then we have $e(L_n) \leq h(n, k - 1, 1)$. Combining with (1), we have $n \leq \lfloor (5\ell + 3)/2 \rfloor$ for $\ell \geq 3$. If $k \geq 8$, i.e., $\ell \geq 3$, then by (1), there are at most $n - 2\ell - 2 \leq (5\ell + 3)/2 - 2\ell \leq 2\ell - 3$ non-edges of L_n inside $A \cup C$. We get a contradiction similarly as Case 1. If $k = 6$, then by (1) we have $L_n = H(n, 5, 1)$. Hence, it is easy to check that K_n contains a rainbow copy of P_6 . This final contradiction completes our proof of Theorem 1.

References

- [1] P.N. Balister, E. Győri, J. Lehel, and R.H. Schelp, Connected graphs without long paths, *Discrete Math.* **308** (2008), 4487-4494.
- [2] P. Erdős and T. Gallai, On maximal paths and circuits of graphs, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica* **10(3)** (1959), 337-356.
- [3] P. Erdős, M. Simonovits and V. Sós, Anti-Ramsey theorems, *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai* **10** (1973) 633-642.
- [4] C. Fang, E. Győri, M. Lu and J. Xiao, On the anti-Ramsey number of forests, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **291** (2021), 129-142.
- [5] R.J. Faudree and R.H. Schelp, Path Ramsey numbers in multicolourings. *J. Combin. Theory B* **19** (1975), 150-160.
- [6] S. Fujita, C. Magnant, and K. Ozeki, Rainbow generalizations of Ramsey theory: A survey, *Graphs Combin.*, **26** (2010), 1-30.
- [7] Z. Füredi, A. Kostochka and J. Verstraëte, Stability in the Erdős-Gallai Theorem on cycles and paths, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **121** (2016), 197-228.
- [8] Z. Füredi, A. Kostochka, R. Luo and J. Verstraëte, Stability in the Erdős-Gallai Theorem on cycles and paths, II, *Discrete Math.* **341** (2018), 1253-1263.
- [9] I. Gorgol, Anti-Ramsey numbers in complete split graphs. *Discrete Math.* **339** (2016) 1944-1949.
- [10] R. Gu, J. Li and Y. Shi, Anti-Ramsey numbers of paths and cycles in hypergraphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **34(1)** (2020), 271-307.
- [11] S. Jahanbekam and D.B. West, Anti-Ramsey problems for t edge-disjoint rainbow spanning subgraphs: cycles, matchings, or trees. *J. Graph Theory* **82** (2016) 75-89.
- [12] T. Jiang and O. Pikhurko, Anti-Ramsey numbers of doubly edge-critical graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **61** (2009) 210-218.

- [13] G.N. Kopylov, On maximal paths and cycles in a graph, *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, **18** (1977), 593-596.
- [14] Y. Lan, Y. Shi and Z. Song, Planar anti-Ramsey numbers of paths and cycles *Discrete Math.*, **342** (2019) 3216-3224.
- [15] L. Lu and Z. Wang, Anti-Ramsey number of edge-disjoint rainbow spanning tress, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **34(1)** (2020), 271-307.
- [16] J. Ma and B. Ning, Stability results on the circumference of a graph, *Combinatorica* **40** (2020), 105-147.
- [17] J. Ma and L. Yuan, A clique version of the Erdős-Gallai stability theorems, arXiv:2010.13667v1.
- [18] M. Simonovits and V. Sós, On restricted coloring of K_n , *Combinatorica* **4** (1) (1984), 101-110.
- [19] T. Xie and L. Yuan, On the anti-Ramsey numbers of linear forests, *Discrete Math.*, **343** (2020), 112130.
- [20] L. Yuan and X. Zhang, A Variation of the Erdős-Sós Conjecture in Bipartite Graphs, *Graphs Combin.*, **33** (2017), 503-526.
- [21] L. Yuan and X. Zhang, Anti-Ramsey numbers of graphs with some decomposition family sequences, arXiv:1903.10319.

A Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4 bases on Theorems 2 and 3 and some basic calculations. Let $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq 3$ and $t \geq 1$. Let $n_0 \geq k_1 - 1$, $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_t \geq 1$ and $n = \sum_{i=0}^t n_i \geq k_1 + k_2 - 1 \geq 5$. Since $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_i, P_{k_1}) \leq n_i - 1$ for $k_1 \leq 4$ and $n_i \geq k_1$, the lemma holds easily for $k_1 \leq 4$. Hence, we may suppose that $k_1 \geq 5$.

Claim. Let $m = s(k - 1) + r$ with $s \geq 0$, $k \geq 2$ and $1 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Let $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \dots \geq m_t \geq 1$ and $m = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}(m_i, P_k) + t - 1 \leq \text{ex}(m, P_k) + s$.

Proof. Clearly, we have $\sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}(m_i, P_k) \leq \text{ex}(m, P_k)$. Thus the claim holds trivially for $t - 1 \leq s$. Now suppose that $t - 1 > s$. Then we have $1 \leq m_t \leq m_{t-1} \leq k - 2$. Note that $\text{ex}(n, P_k) = \binom{n}{2}$ for $n \leq k - 1$. By Theorem 2, we have $\text{ex}(m_{t-1}, P_k) + \text{ex}(m_t, P_k) + 1 = \binom{m_{t-1}}{2} + \binom{m_t}{2} + 1 \leq \text{ex}(m_{t-1} + m_t, P_k)$. Thus we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}(m_i, P_k) + t - 1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{t-2} \text{ex}(m_i, P_k) + \text{ex}(m_{t-1} + m_t, P_k) + t - 2.$$

If $t - 2 \leq s$, then we are done. Suppose that $t - 2 > s$. Repeating the above argument $t - s - 2$ times (reorder $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{t-2}, m_{t-1} + m_t$), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}(m_i, P_k) + t - 1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \text{ex}(m'_i, P_k) + \text{ex}\left(\sum_{i=s+1}^{s+2} m'_i, P_k\right) + s \leq \text{ex}(m, P_k) + s,$$

where $1 \leq m'_{s+1} \leq m'_{s+2} \leq k - 2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s+2} m'_i = m$. The proof of the claim is complete. ■

Let $n - n_0 = s'(k_2 - 1) + r'$ with $1 \leq r' \leq k_2 - 1$. By the claim, we have

$$\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \sum_{i=1}^t \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_i, P_{k_2}) + t - 1 \leq \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s'.$$

Let $s_1 = \lfloor (k_1 - 2)/2 \rfloor$. Since $k_2 \geq 3$, we have $s_1 \leq \ell - 1$. We will finish our proof in the following two cases.

Case 1. $k_1 + k_2 - 1$ is odd.

Let $k_1 + k_2 - 1 = k = 2\ell + 1$. Basic calculation shows that $ar(n, k) = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1$ for $n \leq (5\ell - 2)/2$ and $ar(n, k) = h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1)$ for $n \geq (5\ell - 2)/2$. Let $n \leq \lfloor (5\ell - 2)/2 \rfloor$. We divide the proof into the following three subcases:

(a.1) $\text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2}$, i.e, $n_0 = k_1 - 1$. By Theorem 2 and a detailed calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}(n - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & \leq \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{5\ell - 2}{2} \right\rfloor - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}\right) + s' \leq \binom{k_1 + k_2 - 3}{2} + 1 = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

(a.2) $\text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, 1)$. By $k_1 \geq 5$, calculations in [1] show that if k_1 is even, then $k_1 \leq n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ and if k_1 is odd, then $k_1 \leq n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 7)/4$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' = \binom{k_1 - 2}{2} + (n_0 - k_1 + 2) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & < \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}(n - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}) + s' < \binom{k_1 + k_2 - 3}{2} + 1 = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last strict inequality holds similarly as before.

(a.3) $\text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, s_1)$, i.e, $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Let $i_1 = 1$ when k_1 is odd and $i_1 = 0$ when k_1 is even. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & \leq \binom{s_1}{2} + s_1(n_0 - s_1) + i_1 + \text{ex}\left(\frac{5\ell - 2}{2} - n_0, P_{k_2}\right) + s' \\ & < h\left(\frac{5\ell - 2}{2}, k - 1, \ell - 1\right) = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by Theorem 2 and a detailed calculation. Thus the lemma holds for $n \leq (5\ell - 2)/2$ in Case 1.

Now we may assume that $n \geq \lceil (5\ell - 2)/2 \rceil$. Note that $\text{ex}(n', P_{k_2}) + s'_1 - \text{ex}(n' - 1, P_{k_2}) - s'_2 \leq k_2 - 2 \leq \ell - 1$, where $s'_1 = \lceil n'/(k_2 - 1) \rceil - 1$ and $s'_2 = \lceil (n' - 1)/(k_2 - 1) \rceil - 1$. We divide the proof into the following three subcases:

(b.1) $\text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2}$, i.e, $n_0 = k_1 - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + s' \binom{k_2 - 1}{2} + \binom{r'}{2} + s' \\ & < h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell - 2)/2 \rceil$.

(b.2) $\text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, 1)$, i.e, $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{excon}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & = \binom{k_1 - 2}{2} + (n_0 - k_1 + 2) + s' \binom{k_2 - 1}{2} + \binom{r'}{2} + s' \\ & < h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell - 2)/2 \rceil$.

(b.3) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, s_1)$, i.e. $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Let $i_1 = 1$ when k_1 is odd and $i_1 = 0$ when k_1 is even. Recall that $s_1 \leq \ell - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ &= \binom{s_1}{2} + s_1(n - s_1) + i_1 + s' \binom{k_2 - 1}{2} + \binom{r'}{2} + s' \\ &< h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell - 2)/2 \rceil$. We finish the proof of the lemma for Case 1.

Case 2. $k_1 + k_2 - 1$ is even.

Let $k_1 + k_2 - 1 = k = 2\ell + 2$. Basic calculation shows that $a(n, k) = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1$ for $n \leq (5\ell + 2)/2$ and $a(n, k) = h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1) - 1$ for $n \geq (5\ell + 2)/2$. Let $n \leq \lfloor (5\ell + 2)/2 \rfloor$. We divide the proof into the following three subcases:

(a.1) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2}$, i.e. $n_0 = k_1 - 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}(n - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & \leq \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{5\ell + 2}{2} \right\rfloor - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}\right) + s' < \binom{k_1 + k_2 - 3}{2} + 1 = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

(a.2) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, 1)$, i.e. $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' = \binom{k_1 - 2}{2} + (n_0 - k_1 + 2) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & < \binom{k_1 + k_2 - 3}{2} + 1 = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

(a.3) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, s_1)$, i.e. $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Let $i_1 = 1$ when k_1 is odd and $i_1 = 0$ when k_1 is even. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & \leq \binom{s_1}{2} + s_1(n_0 - s_1) + i_1 + \text{ex}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{5\ell + 2}{2} \right\rfloor - n_0, P_{k_2}\right) + s' \\ & < h\left(\left\lfloor \frac{5\ell + 2}{2} \right\rfloor, k - 1, \ell - 1\right) = h(k, k - 1, 1) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \geq \lceil (5\ell + 2)/2 \rceil$. Recall that $\text{ex}(n', P_{k_2}) + s'_1 - \text{ex}(n' - 1, P_{k_2}) - s'_2 \leq k_2 - 2 \leq \ell - 1$. We divide the proof into the following three subcases:

(b.1) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2}$, i.e. $n_0 = k_1 - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + \text{ex}(n - k_1 + 1, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ & = \binom{k_1 - 1}{2} + s' \binom{k_2 - 1}{2} + \binom{r'}{2} + s' < h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell + 2)/2 \rceil$.

(b.2) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, 1)$, i.e, $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \leq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' &= \binom{k_1 - 2}{2} + (n_0 - k_1 + 2) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ &< \binom{\ell - 1}{2} + (\ell - 1)(n - \ell + 1) + 1 = h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell + 2)/2 \rceil$.

(b.3) $\text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) = h(n_0, k_1, s_1)$, i.e, $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 10)/4$ for even k_1 and $n_0 \geq (5k_1 - 7)/4$ for odd k_1 . Let $i_1 = 1$ when k_1 is odd and $i_1 = 0$ when k_1 is even. Recall that $s_1 \leq \ell - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ex}_{\text{con}}(n_0, P_{k_1}) + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' &= \binom{s_1}{2} + s_1(n_0 - s_1) + i_1 + \text{ex}(n - n_0, P_{k_2}) + s' \\ &< \binom{\ell - 1}{2} + (\ell - 1)(n - \ell + 1) + 1 = h(n, k - 1, \ell - 1) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the strict inequality holds by $n \geq \lceil (5\ell + 2)/2 \rceil$. The proof is thus complete. ■