



HAL
open science

Ramsey for complete graphs with dropped cliques

Jonathan Chappelon, Luis Pedro Montejano, Jorge Luis Ramírez Alfonsín

► **To cite this version:**

Jonathan Chappelon, Luis Pedro Montejano, Jorge Luis Ramírez Alfonsín. Ramsey for complete graphs with dropped cliques. 2013. hal-00847564v1

HAL Id: hal-00847564

<https://hal.science/hal-00847564v1>

Preprint submitted on 23 Jul 2013 (v1), last revised 12 Dec 2014 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

RAMSEY FOR COMPLETE GRAPHS WITH DROPPED CLIQUES

JONATHAN CHAPPELON, LUIS PEDRO MONTEJANO,
AND JORGE LUIS RAMÍREZ ALFONSÍN

ABSTRACT. Let $K_{[k,t]}$ be the complete graph on k vertices from which a set of edges, induced by a clique of order t , has been dropped. In this note we give two explicit upper bounds for $R(K_{[k_1,t_1]}, \dots, K_{[k_r,t_r]})$ (the smallest integer n such that for any r -edge coloring of K_n there always occurs a monochromatic $K_{[k_i,t_i]}$ for some i). Our first upper bound contains a classical one in the case when $k_1 = \dots = k_r$ and $t_i = 1$ for all i . The second one is obtained by introducing a new edge coloring called χ_r -colorings. We finally discuss a conjecture claiming, in particular, that our second upper bound improves the classical one in infinitely many cases.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K_n be a complete graph and let $r \geq 2$ be an integer. A r -edge coloring of a graph is a surjection from $E(G)$ to $\{0, \dots, r-1\}$ (and thus each color class is not empty). Let $k \geq t \geq 1$ be positive integers. We denote by $K_{[k,t]}$ the complete graph on k vertices from which a set of edges, induced by a clique of order t , has been dropped, see Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. (a) $K_{[5,3]}$ and (b) $K_{[4,2]}$

Let k_1, \dots, k_r and t_1, \dots, t_r be positive integers with $k_i \geq t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$ be the smallest integer n such that for any r -edge coloring of K_n there always occurs a monochromatic $K_{[k_i, t_i]}$ for some i .

In the case when $k_i = t_i$ for some i , we set

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_{i-1}, t_{i-1}], [t_i, t_i], [k_{i+1}, t_{i+1}], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) = t_i$$

since the set of all the edges of $K_{[t_i, t_i]}$ (which is empty) can always be colored with color i . We notice that the case $R([k_1, 1], \dots, [k_r, 1])$ is exactly the classical Ramsey number $r(k_1, \dots, k_r)$ (the smallest integer n such that for any r -edge coloring of K_n there always occurs a monochromatic K_{k_i} for some i). We refer the reader to the excellent survey [6] on Ramsey numbers for small values.

In this note, we investigate general upper bounds for $R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$. In the next section we present a recursive formula that yields to an explicit general upper bound

Date: July 23, 2013.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C55, 05D10.

Key words and phrases. Ramsey number, recursive formula.

The second author was supported by CONACYT.

(Theorem 2.2) generalizing the well-known explicit upper bound due to Graham and Rödl [4] (see equation 2). We also improve our explicit upper bound when $r = 2$ for certain values of k_i, t_i (Proposition 2.4).

In Section 3, we shall present another general explicit upper bound for $R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$ (Theorem 3.8) by introducing a new edge coloring called χ_r -colorings. We end by discussing a conjecture that is supported by graphical and numerical results.

2. THE UPPER BOUND

The following recursive inequality is classical in Ramsey theory

$$(1) \quad r(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r) \leq r(k_1 - 1, k_2, \dots, k_r) + r(k_1, k_2 - 1, \dots, k_r) + \dots + r(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r - 1) - (r - 2)$$

In the same spirit, we have the following.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $r \geq 2$ and let k_1, \dots, k_r and t_1, \dots, t_r be positive integers with $k_i \geq t_i + 1 \geq 2$ for all i . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) &\leq R([k_1 - 1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \\ &\quad + R([k_1, t_1], [k_2 - 1, t_2], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad + R([k_1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r - 1, t_r]) - (r - 2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us take any r -edge coloring of K_N with

$$N \geq R([k_1 - 1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) + \dots + R([k_1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r - 1, t_r]) - (r - 2).$$

Let v a vertex of K_N and let $\Gamma_i(v)$ be the set of all vertices joined to v by an edge having color i for each $i = 1, \dots, r$. We claim that there exists index $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that

$$|\Gamma_i(v)| \geq R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_i - 1, t_i], \dots, [k_r, t_r]).$$

Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} N - 1 = d(v) = \sum_{j=1}^r |\Gamma_j(v)| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^r (R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_i - 1, t_i], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) - 1) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^r (R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_i - 1, t_i], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) - r) \\ &\leq N + (r - 2) - r = N - 2 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Now, suppose that $|\Gamma_i(v)| \geq R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_i - 1, t_i], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$ for an index i . By definition of $R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_i - 1, t_i], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$ we have that the complete graph induced by $\Gamma_i(v)$ contains either a subset of vertices inducing a copy $K_{[k_j, t_j]}$ having all edges with color j , for some $j \neq i$, and we are done or a subset of vertices inducing $K_{[k_i - 1, t_i]}$ having all edges with color i . Adding vertex v to $K_{[k_i - 1, t_i]}$ we obtain the desired copy of $K_{[k_i, t_i]}$ having all edges colored with color i . \square

A similar recursive inequality has been treated in [7] in a more general setting (by considering a family of graphs intrinsically constructed via two operations *disjoin unions* and *joins*, see also [5] for the case $r = 2$). Although the latter could be used to obtain Lemma 2.1, the arguments used here give a different and a more straight forward proof. Moreover, our approach yield us to the following general upper bound for $R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r])$. The latter was not treated in [7] at all (suitable values/bounds needed to upper bound the recursion given in [7] for such general family seem to be very difficult to estimate).

Theorem 2.2. *Let $r \geq 2$ be a positive integer and let k_1, \dots, k_r and t_1, \dots, t_r be positive integers such that $k_i \geq t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then,*

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{t_i\} \binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r)}{k_1 - t_1, k_2 - t_2, \dots, k_r - t_r}$$

where $\binom{n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_r}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r}$ is the multinomial coefficient defined by $\binom{n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_r}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r} = \frac{(n_1 + \dots + n_r)!}{n_1! n_2! \dots n_r!}$, for all nonnegative integers n_1, \dots, n_r .

Proof. We suppose that t_1, \dots, t_r are fixed. We proceed by induction on $k_1 + \dots + k_r$, using Lemma 2.1. In the case where $k_j = t_j$, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we already know that

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_{j-1}, t_{j-1}], [t_j, t_j], [k_{j+1}, t_{j+1}], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) = t_j,$$

and, since $k_i - t_i \geq 0$ for all i ,

$$\binom{k_1 + \dots + k_{i-1} + k_{i+1} + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_{i-1} + t_{i+1} + \dots + t_r)}{k_1 - t_1, \dots, k_{j-1} - t_{j-1}, 0, k_{j+1} - t_{j+1}, \dots, k_r - t_r} \geq 1.$$

Therefore

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) = t_j \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} t_i \binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r)}{k_1 - t_1, k_2 - t_2, \dots, k_r - t_r}$$

in this case. Now, suppose that $k_i > t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. By Lemma 2.1 and by induction hypothesis, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) &\leq R([k_1 - 1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \\ &\quad + R([k_1, t_1], [k_2 - 1, t_2], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad + R([k_1, t_1], [k_2, t_2], \dots, [k_r - 1, t_r]) - (r - 2) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} t_i \left(\binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r) - 1}{k_1 - t_1 - 1, k_2 - t_2, \dots, k_r - t_r} \right) \\ &\quad + \binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r) - 1}{k_1 - t_1 - 1, k_2 - t_2 - 1, \dots, k_r - t_r} \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad + \binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r) - 1}{k_1 - t_1 - 1, k_2 - t_2, \dots, k_r - t_r - 1} - (r - 2) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} t_i \binom{k_1 + \dots + k_r - (t_1 + \dots + t_r)}{k_1 - t_1, k_2 - t_2, \dots, k_r - t_r}, \end{aligned}$$

since we have the following multinomial identity

$$\binom{n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_r}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r} = \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_r - 1}{n_1, \dots, n_{i-1}, n_i - 1, n_{i+1}, \dots, n_r}$$

for all positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r . □

Let $R_r([k, t]) = R(\underbrace{[k, t], \dots, [k, t]}_r)$.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $k \geq t \geq 2$ and $r \geq 2$ be integers. Then,*

$$R_r([k, t]) \leq t \binom{r(k-t)}{k-t, \dots, k-t}.$$

An immediate consequence of the above corollary (when $t = 1$) is the following classical upper bound due to Graham and Rödl [4] that was obtained by using (1).

$$(2) \quad R_r([k, 1]) \leq \frac{(rk-r)!}{((k-1)!)^r}.$$

2.1. Case $r = 2$. When $r = 2$, it is the exact values of the recursive sequence generated from $u_{t,k} = u_{k,t} = t (= R_2([t, t]))$ for all $k \geq t$ and following the recursive identity $u_{k_1, k_2} = u_{k_1-1, k_2} + u_{k_1, k_2-1}$ for all $k_1, k_2 \geq t + 1$.

We investigate with more detail the cases $R([s, 2], [t, 2])$ (resp. $R([s, 2], [t, 1])$), that is, the smallest integer n such that for any 2-edge coloring of K_n there always occurs a monochromatic $K_s - \{e\}$ or $K_t - \{e\}$ (resp. a monochromatic $K_s - \{e\}$ or K_t). These cases have been extensively studied and values/bounds for specific s and t are known, see Table 1 obtained from [6].

| | $K_3 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_4 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_5 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_6 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_7 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_8 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_9 \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_{10} \setminus \{e\}$ | $K_{11} \setminus \{e\}$ |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| $K_3 \setminus \{e\}$ | 3 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 19 |
| $K_4 \setminus \{e\}$ | 5 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 28 | [29,38] | 34 | 41 | |
| $K_5 \setminus \{e\}$ | 7 | 13 | 22 | [31,39] | [40,66] | | | | |
| $K_6 \setminus \{e\}$ | 9 | 17 | [31,39] | [45,70] | [59,135] | | | | |
| $K_7 \setminus \{e\}$ | 13 | 28 | [40,66] | [59,135] | 251 | | | | |
| K_3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 17 | 21 | 25 | 31 | [37,39] | [42,47] |
| K_4 | 7 | 11 | 19 | [27,34] | [37,52] | 77 | 105 | 143 | 187 |
| K_5 | 9 | 16 | [30,34] | [43,67] | 112 | 186 | 277 | 418 | 586 |
| K_6 | 11 | 21 | [37,53] | 114 | 205 | 385 | 621 | 1035 | 1551 |
| K_7 | 13 | [28,31] | [51,84] | 197 | 394 | 768 | 1339 | 2355 | 3766 |
| K_8 | 15 | 42 | 123 | 306 | 659 | 1382 | 2562 | 4844 | 8223 |

TABLE 1. Known bounds and values of $R([s, 2], [t, 2])$ and $R([s, 2], [t, 1])$.

Proposition 2.4. (a) $R([3, 2], [3, 2]) = R([3, 2], [2, 1]) = 3$,

(b) $R([3, 2], [k, 2]) = 2k - 3$ and $R([3, 2], [k, 1]) = 2k - 1$,

(c) $R([4, 2], [k, 2]) \leq k^2 - 2k - 39$ for each $k \geq 11$ and

(d) $R([4, 2], [k, 1]) \leq k^2 - 22$ for each $k \geq 9$.

Proof. (a) Let us show that $R([3, 2], [3, 2]) = 3$ (the proof for $R([3, 2], [2, 1]) = 3$, is analogous). For, we notice that $K_{[3,2]}$ is the graph consisting of three vertices, one of degree 2 and two of degree 1, and so $R([3, 2], [3, 2]) > 2$. Now, for any 2-coloring of the edges of K_3 there is always a vertex with two incident edges with the same color, giving the desired $K_{[3,2]}$.

(b) We first prove that $R([3, 2], [k, 2]) \leq 2k - 3$. For, we iterate inequality of Lemma 2.1 obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
 R([3, 2], [k, 2]) &\leq R([2, 2], [k, 2]) + R([3, 2], [k - 1, 2]) \\
 &= 2 + R([3, 2], [k - 1, 2]) \\
 &\leq 2 + R([2, 2], [k - 1, 2]) + R([3, 2], [k - 2, 2]) \\
 &= 2 + 2 + R([3, 2], [k - 2, 2]) \\
 &\leq \cdots \leq \underbrace{2 + \cdots + 2}_{k-3} + R([3, 2], [3, 2]) \\
 &= 2(k - 3) + 3 = 2k - 3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that $R([3, 2], [k, 2]) > 2k - 4$. For, take a perfect matching of $K_{2(k-2)}$. We color the edges belonging to the matching in red and all others in blue. We have neither a red $K_{[3,2]}$ (since there are not vertex with two incident edges in red) nor a blue $K_{[k,2]}$ since any subset of k vertices forces to have at least two red edges.

(It can be proved that $R([3, 2], [k, 1]) = 2k - 1$ by using completely similar arguments as above).

(c) It is known [3] that $R([4, 2], [10, 2]) = 41$. By using the latter and the recurrence of Lemma 2.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 R([4, 2], [k, 2]) &\leq \sum_{i=11}^k R([3, 2], [i, 2]) + R([4, 2], [10, 2]) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=11}^k (2i - 3) + 41 = (k - 10)(k + 11) - 3(k - 10) + 41 = k^2 - 2k - 39.
 \end{aligned}$$

(d) It is known [1] that $R([4, 2], [8, 1]) = 42$. By using the latter and the recurrence of Lemma 2.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 R([4, 2], [k, 1]) &\leq \sum_{i=9}^k R([3, 2], [i, 1]) + R([4, 2], [8, 1]) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=9}^k (2i - 1) + 42 = (k - 8)(k + 9) - (k - 8) + 41 = k^2 - 22.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

3. χ_r -COLORINGS

An r -edge coloring of K_n is said to be a χ_r -coloring, if there exists a labeling of $V(K_n)$ with $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and a function $\phi : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, r - 1\}$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ the edge $\{i, j\}$ has color t if and only if $\phi(i) = t$.

Remark 3.1. (a) Notice that the value $\phi(n)$ do not play any role in the coloring.

(b) A *monochromatic* edge coloring (all edges have the same color $0 \leq t \leq r - 1$) of K_n is a χ_r -coloring. Indeed, it is enough to take any vertex labeling and to set $\phi(i) = t$ for all i .

(c) There exist r -edge colorings of K_n that are not χ_r -coloring. For instance, it can be checked that for any labeling of $V(K_3)$ there is not a suitable function ϕ giving three different colors to the edges of K_3 .

Example 3.2. A 2-coloring of K_3 with two edges of the same color and the third one with different color is a χ_2 -coloring. Indeed, If the edges $\{1, 2\}$ and $\{1, 3\}$ are colored with color 0 and the edge $\{2, 3\}$ with color 1 then we take $\phi(1) = 0, \phi(2) = 1$ and $\phi(3) = 1$.

Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $\chi_r(k)$ be the smallest integer n such that for any r -edge-coloring of $K_N, N \geq n$ there exist a clique of order k in which the induced r -edge coloring is a χ_r -coloring.

Remark 3.3. $\chi_r(k)$ always exists. Indeed, by Ramsey's theorem, for any r -edge coloring of K_N , $N \geq R_r(K_k)$ there exist a clique order k that is monochromatic which, by Remark 3.1 (b), is a χ_r -coloring.

We clearly have that $\chi_r(2) = 2$. For $\chi_r(3)$, we first notice that $\chi_r(3) = R_r([3, 2])$ and that $K_{[3,2]}$ is a *star* $K_{1,2}$ (a graph on three vertices, one of degree 2 and two of degree one). Now, Burr and Roberts [2] proved that

$$R(K_{1,q_1}, \dots, K_{1,q_n}) = \sum_{j=1}^n q_j - n + \epsilon$$

where $\epsilon = 1$ if the number of even integers in the set $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ is even, $\epsilon = 2$ otherwise. Therefore, by applying the above formula when $q_i = 2$ for all i , we obtain

$$(3) \quad \chi_r(3) = \begin{cases} r+1 & \text{for } r \text{ even,} \\ r+2 & \text{for } r \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.4. *Let $r \geq 2$ be a positive integer and let k_1, \dots, k_r and t_1, \dots, t_r be positive integers such that $k_i \geq t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then,*

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \leq \chi_r \left(\sum_{i=1}^r (k_i - t_i - 1) + 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{t_i\} \right).$$

Proof. Consider a χ_r -coloring of $K_{\chi_r \left(\sum_{i=1}^r (k_i - t_i - 1) + 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{t_i\} \right)}$. Given the vertex labeling of the χ_r -coloring, we consider the complete graph K' induced by the vertices with labels $1, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^r (k_i - t_i - 1) + 1$ (that is, we remove all the edges induced by the set of vertices T_1 with the $\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{t_i\}$ largest labels). By the pigeonhole principle, there is a set T_2 of at least $k_i - t_i + 1 - 1$ vertices of K' with the same color for some i . Moreover, by definition of χ_r -coloring any edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ with $v_1 \in T_1$ and $v_2 \in T_2$ has color i , giving the desired monochromatic $K_{[k_i, t_i]}$. \square

The following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $r, k \geq 2$ be integers. Then,*

$$R_r([k, 1]) \leq \chi_r(r(k-2) + 2) \text{ and } R_r([k, 2]) \leq \chi_r(r(k-3) + 3).$$

Proposition 3.6. *Let $r, k \geq 2$ be integers. Then,*

$$\chi_r(k) \leq r\chi_r(k-1) - r + 2.$$

Proof. Consider a r -edge coloring of $K_{r\chi_r(k-1) - r + 2}$ and let u be a vertex. Since $d(u) = r\chi_r(k-1) - r + 1$ then there are at least $\left\lceil \frac{r\chi_r(k-1) - r + 1}{r} \right\rceil = \chi_r(k-1)$ set of edges with the same color all incident to u . Now, by definition of $\chi_r(k-1)$, there is a clique H of order $k-1$ which edge coloring is a χ_r -coloring. So, there is a labeling π of $V(H)$, $|V(H)| = k-1$ and a function ϕ giving such coloring. We claim that the r -edge coloring of the clique $H' = H \cup u$ is a χ_r -coloring. Indeed, by taking the label $\pi'(i) = \pi(i) + 1$ for all vertex $i \neq u$ and $\pi'(u) = 1$ and the function $\phi'(1) = 1$ and $\phi'(i) = \phi(i-1)$ for each $i = 2, \dots, k$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let $r, k \geq 2$ be integers. Then,*

$$\chi_r(k) \leq g(k, r) = \begin{cases} r^{k-2} + r^{k-3} + \dots + r^2 + r + 2 = \frac{r^{k-1} - 1}{r - 1} + 1 & \text{for } r \text{ odd,} \\ r^{k-2} + r^{k-4} + r^{k-5} + \dots + r^2 + r + 2 = \frac{r^{k-3} - 1}{r - 1} + r^{k-2} + 1 & \text{for } r \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By equality (3) and by successive applications of Proposition 3.6. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Let $r \geq 2$ be a positive integer and let k_1, \dots, k_r and t_1, \dots, t_r be positive integers such that $k_i \geq t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then,*

$$R([k_1, t_1], \dots, [k_r, t_r]) \leq g(k, r)$$

where

$$k := \sum_{i=1}^r (k_i - t_i - 1) + 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{t_i\}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 3.7. \square

We believe that the above upper bound for $R_r([k, 1])$ is smaller than the one given by Corollary 2.3 (see equation (2)) for some values of k .

Conjecture 3.9. Let $r \geq 3$ be an integer. Then, for all $3 \leq k \leq r^{3/2} + r - 1$

$$g((r(k-2) + 2), r) < \binom{r(k-1)}{k-1, k-1, \dots, k-1} = \frac{(rk-r)!}{((k-1)!)^r}.$$

We have checked the validity of the above conjecture for all $3 \leq r \leq 150$ by computer calculations. Conjecture 3.9 is also supported graphically, by considering the continual behaviour of

$$f(k, r) = g((r(k-2) + 2), r) - \frac{(rk-r)!}{((k-1)!)^r}.$$

To see that, we may use the fact that $\Gamma(z+1) = z!$ when z is a nonnegative integer, obtaining

$$f(k, r) = g((r(k-2) + 2), r) - \frac{\Gamma(r(k-1) + 1)}{\Gamma^r(k)}$$

where $\Gamma(z)$ is the well-known *gamma* function¹, see Figure 2.

We have also checked (by computer) that for each $3 \leq r \leq 150$ there is an interval I_r (increasing as r is growing) such that for each $k \geq 3, k \in I_r$ the function $g(r(k-3) + 3, r)$ (resp. $g(r(k-4) + 4, r)$) is a smaller upper bound for $R_r([k, 2])$ (resp. for $R_r([k, 3])$) than the corresponding ones obtained from Corollary 2.3. In view of the latter, we pose the following

Question 3.10. Let $t \geq 1$ and $r \geq 3$ be integers. Is there a function $c(r)$ such that for all $3 \leq k \leq c(r)$

$$g(r(k-t) + t, r) < t \binom{r(k-t)}{k-t, k-t, \dots, k-t} ?$$

¹The gamma function is defined as $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^{+\infty} t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$. Moreover, $\Gamma(z+1) = z!$ when z is a nonnegative integer.




FIGURE 2. Behaviours of $f(4, k)$ avec $8 \leq k < 10$ (left) and $f(5, k)$ avec $12 \leq k < 13$ (right). We notice that due to the scaling used in the figures (in order to plot the minimum) the function f seems very close to zero but in fact it is very far apart, $f(4, 8) \leq -1,8 \times 10^{29}$ for the left one and $f(5, 12) \leq -5,7 \times 10^{72}$ for the right one.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Boza, Nuevas Cotas Superiores de Algunos Números de Ramsey del Tipo $r(K_m, K_n - e)$, in *Proceedings of the VII Jornada de Matemática Discreta y Algoritmica, JMDA 2010*, Castro Urdiales, Spain, July 2010.
- [2] S.A. Burr, J.A. Roberts, On Ramsey numbers for stars, *Utilitas Math.*, **4** (1973), 217–220.
- [3] V. Chvátal, F. Harary, Generalized Ramsey theory for graphs. II Small diagonal numbers, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **32** (1972), 389–394.
- [4] R. Graham and V. Rödl, Numbers in Ramsey theory, *Surveys in Combinatorics 1987*, 123, London Mathematics Society Lecture Note Series (1987) 111–153.
- [5] Y.R. Huang, K. Zhang, New upper bounds for Ramsey numbers, *European J. Combin.* **19**(3) (1998), 391–394.
- [6] S.P. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, *Electron. J. Combin.* **1** (1994), Dynamic Survey 1, 30 pp (electronic).
- [7] L. Shi, K. Zhang, A bound for multicolor Ramsey numbers, *Discrete Math.* **226**(1-3) (2001), 419–421.

UNIVERSITÉ MONTPELLIER 2, INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE MODÉLISATION DE MONTPELLIER, CASE COURRIER 051, PLACE EUGÈNE BATAILLON, 34095 MONTPELLIER CEDEX 05, FRANCE.

E-mail address: jonathan.chappelon@um2.fr

E-mail address: luispedro81@yahoo.com.mx

E-mail address: jramirez@math.univ-montp2.fr