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\textbf{Abstract}

For \(n\) sufficiently large, we determine the density threshold for an \(n\)-vertex graph to contain \(k\) vertex-disjoint triangles, where \(0 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{3}\). This extends results by Erdős and by Moon, and can be viewed as a density version of the Corrádi-Hajnal theorem.
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1 Introduction

A classic result of Mantel [9] asserts that each $n$-vertex graph $G$ with more than $\left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \right\rceil$ edges contains a triangle $^5$. What happens when the threshold $\left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \right\rceil$ is exceeded? Can we quantify the presence of triangles in $G$?

One natural approach to this broad question is to determine how many triangles is $G$ guaranteed to have, as a parameter of the edge density of $G$. Solving a long-standing open problem, Razborov [11] determined a tight bound $f(\alpha)$ such that each $n$-vertex graph with $\alpha n^2$ edges contains at least $(f(\alpha) + o_{n \to \infty}(1))n^3$ triangles. Note that $f(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$, while by Mantel’s theorem and the Supersaturation Theorem [4], $f(\alpha) > 0$ for $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$. It is striking that the function $f(\alpha)$ exhibits very complicated behaviour.

In this abstract, we deal with a different measure of the presence of triangles. We ask what edge density in an $n$-vertex graph guarantees $k$ vertex-disjoint triangles. Such a collection of triangles is often called a tiling. Prior to our work this question was considered by Erdős [2] and by Moon [10]; the former proved the exact result when $n \geq 400k^2$, and the latter when $n \geq 9k/2+4$. Interestingly, although Moon states that his result ‘almost certainly remains valid for somewhat smaller values of $n$ also’, in fact he almost reaches a natural barrier: the graph which Moon proved to be extremal (the first in Figure 1 below) is only extremal when $n \geq 9k/2 + 3$. We give a precise answer to the question for all values of $k$ when $n$ is greater than an absolute constant $n_0$ in Theorem 2.1 below.

Tiling questions, which can of course be formulated for other graphs than triangles, have received a great deal of attention for a long time already. They typically fall into the following class of problems.

Problem 1.1 Suppose that a density condition $C$ is satisfied for a graph $G$. How many vertex-disjoint copies of a graph $H$ are then guaranteed in $G$?
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The density condition $C$ is usually parametrised by the average degree of $G$ (as is the case in our Theorem 2.1) or by the minimum degree of $G$.

Erdős and Gallai [3] gave a tight bound on the size of a maximum matching (i.e., a tiling with edges) as a function of the average degree. This was recently extended by Grosu and Hladký [5] who determined the asymptotic size of a tiling with a fixed bipartite graph $H$ guaranteed in a graph of given density.

Theorems of Corrádi and Hajnal [1], Hajnal and Szemerédi [6], Komlós [7] and Kühn and Osthus [8] answer Problem 1.1 when the condition $C$ concerns the minimum degree. For example, the Corrádi-Hajnal theorem in its original form asserts that an $n$-vertex graph with minimum degree at least $\frac{2n}{3}$ contains a triangle tiling which covers all but at most two vertices. It is straightforward to deduce the following generalisation. Every $n$-vertex graph $G$ with $\frac{n}{2} < \delta(G) < \frac{2n}{3}$ contains a triangle tiling with at least $2\delta(G) - n$ triangles. This bound is tight, as is shown by unbalanced complete tripartite graphs. Our main result, Theorem 2.1 below, is therefore a density version of the Corrádi-Hajnal theorem.

2 Result

Given an integer $\ell$ and a graph $H$, we write $\ell \times H$ for the disjoint union of $\ell$ copies of $H$. A graph is $\ell \times H$-free if it does not contain $\ell$ vertex disjoint copies of $H$. In Theorem 2.1 we determine the maximal number of edges in a $(k + 1) \times K_3$-free graph on $n$ vertices for every $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{3}$. To this end we identify the extremal structures for this problem, i.e., the graphs which attain this maximal number of edges. These are as follows (see also Figure 1).

![Fig. 1. The extremal graphs.](image)

$E_1(n, k)$: Let $X \cup Y_1 \cup Y_2$ with $|X| = k$, $|Y_1| = \lceil \frac{n-k}{2} \rceil$, and $|Y_2| = \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$ be the vertices of $E_1(n, k)$. Insert all edges intersecting $X$, and between $Y_1$ and $Y_2$.

$E_2(n, k)$: Let $X \cup Y_1 \cup Y_2$ with $|X| = 2k + 1$, $|Y_1| = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, and $|Y_2| = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ -
2k−1 (or \(|Y_1| = \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil\), and \(|Y_2| = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor − 2k−1\)) be the vertices of \(E_2(n, k)\). Insert all edges within \(X\), and between \(Y_1\) and \(X \cup Y_2\). If \(n\) is odd, this construction captures two graphs, if \(n\) is even just one.

\(E_3(n, k)\): Let \(X \cup Y_1\) with \(|X| = 2k+1\) and \(|Y_1| = n−2k−1\) be the vertices of \(E_3(n, k)\). Insert all edges intersecting \(X\).

\(E_4(n, k)\): The fourth class of extremal graphs is defined only for \(k \geq \frac{n}{6}−2\). The vertex set is formed by five disjoint sets \(X\), \(Y_1\), \(Y_2\), \(Y_3\), and \(Y_4\), with \(|Y_1| = |Y_3|\), \(|Y_2| = |Y_4|\), \(|Y_1| + |Y_2| = n−3k−2\), and \(|X| = 6k−n+4\). Insert exactly all edges in \(X\), between \(X\) and \(Y_1\cup Y_2\), and between \(Y_1\cup Y_4\) and \(Y_2\cup Y_3\). Thus the choice of \(|Y_1|\) determines a particular graph in the class \(E_4(n, k)\). All graphs in \(E_4(n, k)\) have the same number of edges.

It is straightforward to check that these graphs are edge-maximal subject to not containing \((k+1) \times K_3\). Our theorem now states that for each value of \(k\) one of these constructions is extremal.

**Theorem 2.1** There exists \(n_0\) such that the following holds for all \(n \geq n_0\) and \(k \leq \frac{n}{3}\). Let \(G\) be a \((k+1) \times K_3\)-free graph on \(n\) vertices. Then

\[
e(G) \leq \max_{j \in [4]} e\left(E_j(n, k)\right).
\]

Comparing the numbers of edges of the extremal graphs reveals that, as \(k\) grows from 1 to \(\frac{n}{3}\), the extremal graphs dominate in the following order (for \(n\) sufficiently large). In the beginning \(E_1(n, k)\) has the most edges, but at \(k \approx \frac{2n}{9}\) it is surpassed by \(E_2(n, k)\). At \(k \approx \frac{n}{4}\) the structure \(E_2(n, k)\) ceases to exist and is replaced by \(E_3(n, k)\), and finally at \(k \approx (5 + \sqrt{3})n/22\) the structure \(E_4(n, k)\) takes over. The exact transition values are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(E_1(n, k)) (\rightarrow) (E_2(n, k))</th>
<th>(E_2(n, k)) (\rightarrow) (E_3(n, k))</th>
<th>(E_3(n, k)) (\rightarrow) (E_4(n, k))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\frac{2n-6}{9})</td>
<td>(\frac{n-1}{4})</td>
<td>(\frac{5n-12+\sqrt{4n^2-10n+12}}{22})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.1

We call a pair \((\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{M}')\) a tiling pair if \(\mathcal{T}'\) is a collection of vertex-disjoint triangles in \(G\), if \(\mathcal{M}'\) is a matching in \(G\), and if \(\mathcal{T}'\) and \(\mathcal{M}'\) do not share vertices. Among all the tiling pairs choose a pair \((\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M})\) which (i) maximises \(|\mathcal{T}|\), and among all such pairs, (ii) one which maximises \(|\mathcal{M}|\). Clearly, the set of vertices \(\mathcal{I}\) not covered by \(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{M}\) is independent. By assumption \(|\mathcal{T}| \leq k\).

The proof idea is simple. To obtain a bound on \(e(G)\), we work with the quantities \(e(G[\mathcal{T}])\), \(e(G[\mathcal{M}])\), and further \(e(G[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{M}])\), \(e(G[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I}])\), and
\( e(G[M, I]) \). To get the bound (1) we aim to establish inequalities involving combinations of the edge counts above.

In fact, we will need to split the set \( T \) further as follows. We say that an edge \( e \) of \( M \) \textit{sees} a triangle \( T \) of \( T \) when a vertex of \( T \) forms a triangle with \( e \), and similarly that a vertex \( v \) of \( I \) \textit{sees} \( T \) when \( v \) together with two vertices of \( T \) forms a triangle. Then we set \( T_1 \) to be the triangles of \( T \) which are seen by at least two \( M \)-edges and \( T_2 \) the triangles of \( T \setminus T_1 \) which are seen by either at least two \( I \)-vertices, or one \( I \)-vertex and one \( M \)-edge.

Let us illustrate our methods for the proof of Theorem 2.1 by establishing the bound 
\[
e(G[T_1]) \leq 7 |T_1|^2 + 3 |T_1|
\]
(where \( |T_1| \) counts the triangles in \( T_1 \)), which is one of the easier bounds we use. For this bound it suffices to show that between any pair of triangles of \( T_1 \) there are at most seven edges. Suppose, then, that there are two triangles \( uvw \) and \( u'v'w' \) of \( T_1 \) with at least eight edges between them. By definition of \( T_1 \), there are distinct (and hence disjoint) edges \( xy \) and \( x'y' \) of \( M \) which see respectively \( uvw \) and \( u'v'w' \); let us assume that they form triangles with \( u \) and \( u' \) respectively. Now \( v, w, v' \) and \( w' \) induce a subgraph of \( G \) with at least five edges and thus containing a triangle, say \( vvw' \). Finally \( vvw', xyu, x'y'u' \) and \( T \setminus \{ uvw, u'v'w' \} \) form a triangle tiling with more triangles than \( T \), contradicting the definition of \( (T, M) \).

We are able to obtain all bounds involving \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) by similarly short arguments. However, just as the extremal structure \( E_4(n, k) \) is the most complicated of our four structures, so we need significantly more complex arguments to handle the triangles \( T \setminus (T_1 \cup T_2) \) to which it corresponds. We partition these remaining triangles of \( T \) into a ‘sparse part’ \( T_3 \) and a ‘dense part’ \( T_4 \) by applying the following algorithm. We start with \( D \) equal to the set of all triangles in \( T \setminus (T_1 \cup T_2) \), and \( S = \emptyset \). If there is a triangle in \( D \) which sends at most \( 8(|D| - 1) \) edges to the other triangles in \( D \), we move it to \( S \). We repeat until \( D \) contains no more such triangles. We then set \( T_3 = S \) and \( T_4 = D \).

The motivation behind this last partition is the following. The construction of \( T_3 \) already guarantees that \( e(G[T_3]) + e(G[T_3, T_4]) \) is small enough for our purposes. On the other hand, within the set \( T_4 \) we have not only a high density of edges but even a ‘minimum degree’ condition between triangles: every triangle in \( T_4 \) sends more than \( 8(|T_4| - 1) \) edges to the other triangles in \( T_4 \). It is much easier to work with this latter condition than simply an edge density condition. This enables us to find complex structures in \( T_4 \) (using up to 27 triangles) whose existence together with the maximality of \( T \) and a substantial amount of additional technical work yields the required upper bound on \( e(G[T_4 \cup M \cup I]) \).
Last, let us remark that we were able to prove (1) only for large graphs. This is caused by the usage of the Stability Method of Simonovits [12] in our proof. It is plausible that the bound holds for all graphs and the assumption is only an artefact of our proof.
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