

Generalized Zykov's Theorem

Rajat Adak¹ and L. Sunil Chandran²

¹rajatadak@iisc.ac.in

²sunil@iisc.ac.in

^{1,2}Department of Computer Science and Automation, Indian Institute of Science,
Bangalore, India

Abstract

For a simple graph G , let n denote its number of vertices, and let $N(G, K_t)$ denote the number of copies of K_t in G . Zykov's theorem (1949) asserts that for any K_{r+1} -free graph and $t \geq 2$,

$$N(G, K_t) \leq \binom{r}{t} \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)^t$$

We generalize Zykov's bound within a vertex-based localization framework.

For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, let $c(v)$ denote the order of the largest clique containing v . In this paper, we show that

$$N(G, K_t) \leq n^{t-1} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t}$$

We further show that equality holds if and only if G is a regular complete multipartite graph. Note that if we impose the condition that, G is K_{r+1} -free, then $c(v) \leq r$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Thus, plugging $c(v) = r$ for all $v \in V(G)$, we retrieve Zykov's bound.

Keywords: Extremal Graph Theory, Zykov's Theorem, Localization, Transfer function

1 Introduction

Typical problems in extremal graph theory aim to maximize or minimize certain graph parameters under prescribed structural constraints, and to characterize the graphs that attain these extremal values. Let m and n denote the size and order of the graph, respectively. One of the foundational results in extremal graph theory is the following classical theorem:

Theorem 1.1. (Turán [18]) *Let G be a K_{r+1} -free graph on n vertices. Then,*

$$m \leq \frac{n^2(r-1)}{2r},$$

with equality if and only if G is a regular complete r -partite graph.

Let $N(G, K_t)$ denote the number of copies of the clique K_t in the graph G . Turán's theorem was later generalized by Zykov [22] in 1949, who established an upper bound on $N(G, K_t)$ for every $t \geq 2$ in any K_{r+1} -free graph G .

Theorem 1.2. (Zykov [22]) *Let G be a K_{r+1} -free graph on n vertices. Then for any $t \geq 2$,*

$$N(G, K_t) \leq \binom{r}{t} \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)^t$$

Equality holds if and only if G is a regular complete r -partite graph.

Note 1.3. Note that taking $t = 2$, in Theorem 1.2, we get $N(G, K_2) = m$ and $\binom{r}{2} \left(\frac{n}{r}\right)^2 = \frac{n^2(r-1)}{2r}$. Thus, we can recover Turán's bound from Zykov's bound.

1.1 Localization

Recently, Bradač [6] and Malec and Tompkins [15] introduced the notion of *localization* as a framework for strengthening and generalizing classical extremal graph bounds. Traditional extremal results typically depend on global parameters—such as the clique number, the order of the largest clique, as in Theorem 1.1 and 1.2.

The localization approach begins by defining a *localization function*. For example, the clique number of a graph G is a global parameter, but it can be localized by assigning to each edge $e \in E(G)$ a value $w(e)$ equal to the size of the largest clique containing e . Similarly, the circumference, another global parameter, can be localized by assigning to each edge the length of the longest cycle containing it (and value 2 if it is a cut-edge). Many other global parameters, such as the length of the longest path, the maximum degree, and the girth, can be localized in analogous ways. In this manner, localization replaces global constraints with suitable local weight functions defined on edges, vertices, or other graph elements.

Bradač [6] and Malec and Tompkins [15] gave an edge-based localization of Theorem 1.1;

Theorem 1.4. (Bradač [6] and Malec-Tompkins [15]) *Let G be a graph on n vertices. Then,*

$$\sum_{e \in E(G)} \frac{w(e)}{w(e) - 1} \leq \frac{n^2}{2}$$

Equality holds if and only if G is a regular complete multipartite graph.

In [2], Adak and Chandran initiated the use of the localization framework for generalizing extremal graph problems by assigning weights to vertices. In [4], the same authors developed a vertex-based localization of a *stronger* variant of Theorem 1.1 and characterized the extremal graphs.

Definition 1. Let $c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a weight function on the vertices of the graph, such that $c(v)$ is the order of the largest clique containing the vertex v , in the graph.

Theorem 1.5. (Adak-Chandran [4]) *Let G be a graph on n vertices. Then,*

$$m \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{c(v) - 1}{c(v)} \right\rfloor$$

There have been several developments in the localization framework in recent years. In [20], Zhao and Zhang applied edge-based localization, for the circumference of the graph, to generalize the Erdős–Gallai theorem for cycles [8], while the corresponding path theorem was localized in [15]. Kirsch and Nir [11] established localized versions of several generalized Turán-type results, including a localization of Zykov’s theorem.

Theorem 1.6. (Kirch-Nir [11]) *Let $t \geq 2$. For each $T \cong K_t$, define*

$$\alpha_G(T) = \max\{k : T \subseteq V(S) \text{ for some } S \subseteq G \text{ such that } S \cong K_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad w_G(T) = \frac{\alpha_G(T)^t}{\binom{\alpha_G(T)}{t}}.$$

Then $w_G(T)$ is well-defined and decreasing in $\alpha_G(T)$, and

$$\sum_{T \cong K_t} w_G(T) \leq n^t$$

with equality if and only if G is a balanced multipartite graph with at least t parts.

In the above inequality, the authors obtained a lower bound on n^t . If we further assume that G is K_{r+1} -free, then for every $T \cong K_t$ we have $\frac{r^t}{\binom{r}{t}} \leq w_G(T)$ which along with the above inequality yields Zykov’s bound.

Their method assigns weights to the K_t -cliques in order to localize Zykov’s bound. Although inequalities as in Theorem 1.6 are often not intuitive to interpret, they produce distribution-type statements from which interesting results can be derived for specific settings. These bounds resemble, in spirit, classical inequalities such as the LYM inequality (a generalization of Sperner’s lemma) or the Kraft inequality.

In contrast, we obtain a intuitive generalization of Zykov’s bound by assigning weights to the vertices of the graph rather than to the K_t -copies. This leads directly to an upper bound on $N(G, K_t)$, matching the intent of the original theorem. Although both bounds provide localizations of Zykov’s theorem, they are independent and neither implies the other.

Adak and Chandran [3] developed a vertex-based localization of Luo’s theorems [14], which themselves generalize the classical Erdős–Gallai bounds. In [1], the same authors provided localized bounds for planar graphs with finite girth, as well as localizations of generalized Turán-type results due to [19] and [7].

Furthermore, the localization framework has recently been extended to hypergraphs [21], and it has also been applied to generalize spectral inequalities as in [13, 12, 9], underscoring its versatility and broad applicability within extremal graph theory.

Bradač [6] adopted the strategy of Nikiforov [17] and Khadzhiivanov [10], which builds on the Motzkin–Straus [16] analytical proof of Turán’s theorem. This approach was later adapted by Aragão and Souza [5], who obtained a localized version of the graph Maclaurin inequality. Using the same strategy, Liu and Ning developed localized variants of the spectral Turán theorem in [13] and [12].

We adapt this argument to give a vertex-based localization of Theorem 1.2. The challenge here is to design the appropriate function that works in this setting.

2 Our Result

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a graph on n vertices. Then for any $t \geq 2$,*

$$N(G, K_t) \leq n^{t-1} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t}$$

Equality holds if and only if G is a regular complete multipartite graph.

Note 2.2. Note that if G is K_{r+1} -free then $c(v) \leq r$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Thus, plugging r in place of $c(v)$ in Theorem 2.1 results Theorem 1.2.

2.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Definition 2. Let Δ^{n-1} be the simplex defined as:

$$\Delta^{n-1} = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \geq 0 \ \forall i \in [n] \text{ and } \|x\|_1 = 1\}$$

Definition 3. For a graph G with n vertices and a vector $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$, define the functions $\Phi(G, x)$, $A(G, x)$, $B(G, x)$ such that:

$$A(G, x) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{x_v}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t}$$

$$B(G, x) = \sum_{K_t \subseteq G} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v$$

$$\Phi(G, x) = A(G, x) - B(G, x)$$

Definition 4. For $i, j \in V(G)$ and $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$ define;

$$\delta_{ij}(x) = \left(\frac{1}{c(i)^t} \binom{c(i)}{t} - \frac{1}{c(j)^t} \binom{c(j)}{t} \right) - \left(\sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(i)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v - \sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(j)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v \right) \quad (1)$$

Note that for all $i, j \in V(G)$, $\delta_{ij}(x) = -\delta_{ji}(x)$.

Definition 5. We define a *transfer function* on Δ^{n-1} , which will play a crucial role throughout the paper. For $i, j \in V(G)$ and $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$, the transfer function transfers an amount $\epsilon \geq 0$ from the j -th coordinate to the i -th coordinate of x . Formally,

$$T_\epsilon^{ij}(x) = x + \epsilon(e_i - e_j).$$

Note that if $0 \leq \epsilon \leq x_j$, then it is easy to verify that $T_\epsilon^{ij}(x) \in \Delta^{n-1}$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Phi(G, x) = \min\{\Phi(G, y) \mid y \in \Delta^{n-1}\}$, that is, $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$ be a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$. If $i, j \in \text{Supp}(x)$ and i is not adjacent to j , then $\delta_{ij}(x) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $i, j \in \text{Supp}(x)$ such that i is not adjacent to j in G . Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\epsilon \leq \min\{x_i, x_j\}$. Let $y = T_\epsilon^{ij}(x)$ and $y' = T_\epsilon^{ji}(x)$.

Let $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, and $y' = (y'_1, y'_2, \dots, y'_n)$. It is easy to verify that, $y, y' \in \Delta^{n-1}$. Since x is a minimizer, we have:

$$\Phi(G, y) - \Phi(G, x) \geq 0 \quad (2)$$

Since $\Phi(G, \cdot) = A(G, \cdot) - B(G, \cdot)$, it is easy to see that:

$$\Phi(G, y) - \Phi(G, x) = (A(G, y) - A(G, x)) - (B(G, y) - B(G, x)) \quad (3)$$

Since $y_i = x_i + \epsilon$, $y_j = x_j - \epsilon$, and $y_k = x_k$ for all $k \notin \{i, j\}$ we have;

$$\begin{aligned} A(G, y) - A(G, x) &= \frac{y_i - x_i}{c(i)^t} \binom{c(i)}{t} + \frac{y_j - x_j}{c(j)^t} \binom{c(j)}{t} \\ &= \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{c(i)^t} \binom{c(i)}{t} - \frac{1}{c(j)^t} \binom{c(j)}{t} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Because vertices i and j are non-adjacent, no copy of K_t in G can contain both simultaneously. Consequently, every K_t must contain either exactly one of these vertices or neither. Observe that those copies disjoint from $\{i, j\}$ cancel out and do not affect the difference $B(G, y_\epsilon) - B(G, x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} B(G, y) - B(G, x) &= \sum_{\substack{K_t \subseteq G \\ i \in V(K_t)}} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} y_v - \sum_{\substack{K_t \subseteq G \\ i \in V(K_t)}} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v + \sum_{\substack{K_t \subseteq G \\ j \in V(K_t)}} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} y_v - \sum_{\substack{K_t \subseteq G \\ j \in V(K_t)}} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v \\ &= (y_i - x_i) \sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(i)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v + (y_j - x_j) \sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(j)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v \\ &= \epsilon \left(\sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(i)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v - \sum_{K_{t-1} \subseteq N(j)} \prod_{v \in V(K_{t-1})} x_v \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

From definition 4 and using eqs. (3) to (5) we get that $\Phi(G, y) - \Phi(G, x) = \epsilon \delta_{ij}(x)$. Thus from eq. (2) we get $\epsilon \delta_{ij}(x) \geq 0$.

Note that, since x is a minimizer, and $y' \in \Delta^{n-1}$, we also have $\Phi(G, y') - \Phi(G, x) \geq 0$. Thus using similar analysis as above we get that $\Phi(G, y') - \Phi(G, x) = \epsilon \delta_{ji} \geq 0$.

From definition 4 we have $\delta_{ij} = -\delta_{ji}$. Therefore, $\epsilon \delta_{ji} \geq 0 \implies \epsilon \delta_{ij} \leq 0$. But we already have $\epsilon \delta_{ij} \geq 0$. Thus, $\epsilon \delta_{ij} = 0$, and since $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\delta_{ij} = 0$. \square

Corollary 1. *Let $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$ be a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$. If $i, j \in \text{Supp}(x)$ and i is not adjacent to j , then both $y = T_{x_j}^{ij}(x)$ and $y' = T_{x_i}^{ji}(x)$ are also minimizers of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$.*

Proof. Following similar steps as in Lemma 2.1 we get that, $\Phi(G, y) - \Phi(G, x) = x_j \delta_{ij}$ and $\Phi(G, y') - \Phi(G, x) = x_i \delta_{ji}$. But $\delta_{ij} = \delta_{ji} = 0$, since i and j are not adjacent. Therefore, $\Phi(G, y) - \Phi(G, x) = \Phi(G, y') - \Phi(G, x) = 0$. Thus, y and y' are minimizers of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$ be a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$. If $S \subseteq \text{Supp}(x)$ is an independent set of G , then transferring the total amount from all coordinates indexed by S to the coordinate of a single vertex in S produces another minimizer. Therefore, if $i \in S$, we can construct another minimizer $z = x + \sum_{t \in S \setminus \{i\}} x_t(e_i - e_t)$ by shifting the total amount in S to the vertex i .*

Proof. This follows by repeatedly applying corollary 1 to (i, t) with $t \in S \setminus \{i\}$, transferring the remaining weight from t to i . In this way, all the weight on the coordinates indexed by S is successively merged onto the i^{th} coordinate, while preserving minimality throughout. \square

Corollary 3. *If $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$ is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ with minimal support, then $G[\text{Supp}(x)]$ is a clique.*

Proof. Suppose not, then there exists $i, j \in \text{Supp}(x)$ such that i is not adjacent to j . Thus from corollary 1, $y = T_{x_j}^{ij}(x)$ is a minimizer. Note that $y_i = x_i + x_j$, $y_j = 0$ and $y_k = x_k$ for all $k \notin \{i, j\}$. Thus $\text{Supp}(y) \subsetneq \text{Supp}(x)$. This contradicts the minimality of $\text{Supp}(x)$. Thus $\text{Supp}(x)$ induces a clique in G . \square

2.1.1 Proof of Inequality

Now we are all set to prove the inequality of Theorem 2.1.

Proof. Let x be a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ with minimal support. From corollary 3 we obtain that $G[\text{Supp}(x)]$ is a clique. Let $|\text{Supp}(x)| = k$. Clearly, $c(v) \geq k$ for all $v \in \text{Supp}(x)$. It is easy to see that $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^t} \binom{x}{t}$ is an increasing function for $x \geq 1$. Thus, for all $v \in \text{Supp}(x)$ we have:

$$\frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} \geq \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} \quad (6)$$

Since for all $i \notin \text{Supp}(x)$, $x_i = 0$ we get that:

$$B(G, x) = \sum_{K_t \subseteq V(G)} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v = \sum_{K_t \subseteq \text{Supp}(x)} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v \quad (7)$$

Now since $\sum_{v \in \text{Supp}(x)} x_v = 1$, using Maclaurin's inequality we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{v \in \text{Supp}(x)} x_v}{k} &\geq \left(\frac{\sum_{K_t \subseteq \text{Supp}(x)} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v}{\binom{k}{t}} \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} \\ \implies \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} &\geq \sum_{K_t \subseteq \text{Supp}(x)} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

From eqs. (7) and (8) we get that:

$$B(G, x) \leq \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} \quad (9)$$

Thus combining eqs. (6) and (9) we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(G, x) &= \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{x_v}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} - \sum_{K_t \subseteq G} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v \\ &\geq \sum_{v \in \text{Supp}(x)} \frac{x_v}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} - \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} - \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Since x is a minimizer, we get that $\Phi(G, y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Delta^{n-1}$

Let $y = (\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n})$. Clearly $y \in \Delta^{n-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(G, y) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} - \sum_{K_t \subseteq G} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} \frac{1}{n} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} - \frac{1}{n^t} N(G, K_t) \geq 0 \\ &\implies N(G, K_t) \leq n^{t-1} \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t}\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Thus, we get the inequality as in Theorem 2.1. \square

2.1.2 Characterizing Extremal Graphs

Since $t \geq 2$, it is easy to check that isolated vertices do not contribute to either side of the bound in Theorem 2.1. Thus we can assume G does not contain any isolated vertices.

• If Part

First, we will show that if G is a regular complete multipartite graph, then we get equality in the bound of Theorem 2.1.

Let G be a regular complete r -partite graph. Clearly $c(v) = r$ for all $v \in V(G)$, therefore G is K_{r+1} -free. The right-hand side of the bound in Theorem 2.1 coincides with the upper bound of Zykov's theorem. Since regular complete r -partite graphs are extremal for Theorem 1.2, we get equality in Theorem 2.1.

• Only If Part

For the other way, we will assume that we have equality in the bound of Theorem 2.1. Thus, we must have equality in eqs. (10) and (11). Thus, we get the following **equality conditions**:

1. From equality in eq. (11) we have $\Phi(G, y) = 0$, where $y = \{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\}$. Thus y is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$.

From the above condition we know that minimum of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ is 0, then for any minimizer $x \in \Delta^{n-1}$, $\Phi(G, \cdot) = 0$. Thus if x is a minimal support minimizer, from eq. (10) we get

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{x_v}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} - \sum_{K_t \subseteq G} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v = 0$$

Thus we must have equality in eqs. (6) and (8), that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{c(v)^t} \binom{c(v)}{t} &= \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} \\ \frac{1}{k^t} \binom{k}{t} &= \sum_{K_t \subseteq \text{Supp}(x)} \prod_{v \in V(K_t)} x_v\end{aligned}$$

2. Equality holds in Maclaurin inequality if and only if all the entries are equal. Thus from the equality of eq. (8) we get that, if x is a minimal support minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ then, for all $v \in \text{Supp}(x)$, $x_v = \frac{1}{|\text{Supp}(x)|}$.

3. From equality in eq. (6), we have that, if x is a minimal support minimizer, then for all $v \in \text{Supp}(x)$, $c(v) = |\text{Supp}(x)|$

Lemma 2.2. *If $z \in \Delta^{n-1}$ is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ and $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is a clique then z is a minimal support minimizer.*

Proof. Suppose z is not a minimal support minimizer, then there exists a minimizer $z' \in \Delta^{n-1}$ such that $\text{Supp}(z') \subsetneq \text{Supp}(z)$ and z' has minimal support. From the equality condition 3, we get that $c(v) = |\text{Supp}(z')| < |\text{Supp}(z)|$ for all $v \in \text{Supp}(z')$. But by assumption the vertices in $\text{Supp}(z')$ are already part of a $|\text{Supp}(z)|$ order clique. Thus, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.3. *If $z \in \Delta^{n-1}$ is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$, then $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is a complete ω_z -partite graph, where ω_z is the clique number of $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$. Furthermore, if $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{\omega_z}$ are the parts of $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$, then for all $k \in [\omega_z]$, $\sum_{v \in V_k} z_v = \frac{1}{\omega_z}$.*

Proof. Suppose there exists a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$ in Δ^{n-1} for which the above statement fails. Let z be such a minimizer with minimal support; that is, for every $z' \in \Delta^{n-1}$ with $\text{Supp}(z') \subsetneq \text{Supp}(z)$, the lemma holds for z' .

If $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is a clique then from Lemma 2.2 we get that z is a minimal support minimizer. Note that, $\omega_z = |\text{Supp}(z)|$ and $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is complete ω_z -partite. Also from the equality condition 2 we have $z_v = \frac{1}{|\text{Supp}(z)|} = \frac{1}{\omega_z}$ for all $v \in \text{Supp}(z)$. Thus we get a contradiction.

Thus assume $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is not a clique. Therefore, there exists $i, j \in \text{Supp}(z)$ such that i and j are not adjacent. From corollary 1, we have $\Phi(G, y) = \Phi(G, z)$, where $y = T_{z_j}^{ij}(z)$. Note that $\text{Supp}(y) = \text{Supp}(z) \setminus \{j\}$, therefore $\text{Supp}(y) \subsetneq \text{Supp}(z)$. Since, y is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$, from our assumption we get that y satisfies the lemma and therefore $G[\text{Supp}(y)]$ is a complete ω_y -partite graph. Let $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{\omega_y}$ be the parts in $G[\text{Supp}(y)]$.

Claim 1. There exists $k \in [\omega_y]$ such that $N(j) \cap P_k = \emptyset$.

Proof. Assume on the contrary, there exists $v_k \in N(j) \cap P_k$ for all $k \in [\omega_y]$. Note that we can define $y^* = (y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_n^*) \in \Delta^{n-1}$ such that $y_{v_k}^* = \sum_{v \in P_k} y_v$ for all $k \in [\omega_y]$ and $y_l^* = 0$ for all $l \notin \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\omega_y}\}$ (that is, for $k \in [\omega_y]$, we transfer all the amount from the coordinates indexed by P_k to the coordinate corresponding v_k). Therefore, $\text{Supp}(y^*) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\omega_y}\}$. Since each P_k is an independent set, from corollary 2, we get that $\Phi(G, y^*) = \Phi(G, y)$. Thus, y^* is a minimizer. Clearly, $\text{Supp}(y^*)$ induces an ω_y -order clique. Therefore, from Lemma 2.2 we get that y^* is a minimal support minimizer. From equality condition 3 we have $c(v_k) = |\text{Supp}(y^*)| = \omega_y$. But from the assumption we get that $\text{Supp}(y^*) \cup \{j\}$ induces an $\omega_y + 1$ -order clique. Since v_k is contained in this clique, we have $c(v_k) \geq \omega_y + 1$, which results a contradiction. \square

Without loss of generality assume $i \in P_1$.

Claim 2. For $k > 1$, $N(j) \cap P_k \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose there exists $k > 1$, such that $P_k \cap N(j) = \emptyset$.

First suppose $|P_1| > 1$. Let $y' = T_{z_i}^{ji}(z)$. Clearly from corollary 1, $\Phi(G, y') = \Phi(G, z)$, that is, y' is also a minimizer. Moreover, $\text{Supp}(y') \subsetneq \text{Supp}(z)$. Thus, from our assumption, the lemma holds for y' . Therefore, $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$ is a complete $\omega_{y'}$ -partite graph. Clearly $P'_1 = P_1 \setminus \{i\}$, $P_2, \dots, P'_k = P_k \cup \{j\}, \dots, P_{\omega_y}$ are maximal independent sets in $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$. It is easy to see that $\{P'_1, P_2, \dots, P'_k, \dots, P_{\omega_y}\}$ form the parts in $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$, therefore $\omega_{y'} = \omega_y$. Note that

$y'_v = y_v$ for all $v \notin \{i, j\}$, $y'_i = y_j = 0$, and $y'_j = y_i = z_i + z_j$. As y satisfies the lemma, $\sum_{v \in P_1} y_v = \sum_{v \in P_k} y_v = \frac{1}{\omega_y}$. But then we get $\sum_{v \in P'_1} y'_v < \sum_{v \in P'_k} y'_v$, which results in a contradiction, since the lemma holds for y' and therefore, $\sum_{v \in P'_1} y'_v = \sum_{v \in P'_k} y'_v$.

Now suppose $|P_1| = 1$. Clearly $\{P_2, \dots, P'_k, \dots, P_{\omega_y}\}$ are the parts in $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$, where $P'_k = P_k \cup \{j\}$. Suppose that $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$ is 1-partite, that is, P'_k is the only part. Using corollary 2, by transferring the total amount from the coordinates indexed by P'_k to the coordinate corresponding to a single vertex $v \in P'_k$, we obtain another minimizer whose support consists solely of v . Then, by equality condition 3, we have $c(v) = 1$, therefore, v is an isolated vertex. However, this contradicts our assumption that G has no isolated vertices.

Thus, P'_k is not the only part in $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$. Since the lemma holds for y , we have $\sum_{v \in P_t} y_v = \sum_{v \in P_k} y_v$, where $t \notin \{1, k\}$. Note that, $\sum_{v \in P_t} y_v = \sum_{v \in P_t} y'_v$ and $\sum_{v \in P_k} y_v < \sum_{v \in P'_k} y'_v$. Thus we get, $\sum_{v \in P_t} y'_v < \sum_{v \in P'_k} y'_v$, which results in a contradiction, since y' must also satisfy the lemma. \square

From claim 1, there exists $k \in [\omega_y]$ such that $N(j) \cap P_k = \emptyset$, and from claim 2, for $k > 1$, $N(j) \cap P_k \neq \emptyset$. Thus $N(j) \cap P_1 = \emptyset$.

Claim 3. For $k > 1$, $N(j) \cap P_k = P_k$.

Proof. Suppose for some $k > 1$, there exists $v_k \in P_k$ such that v_k is not adjacent to j . But from claim 2, $P_k \cap N(j) \neq \emptyset$. Thus there exists $u_k \in P_k$ which is adjacent to j . In $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$, where $y' = T_{x_i}^{j,i}(z)$, v_k and u_k are in the same part but $N(v_k) \neq N(u_k)$. This contradicts the fact that $G[\text{Supp}(y')]$ is a complete multipartite graph. \square

Thus from claim 3 we get that j is adjacent to all the vertices in $\bigcup_{i=2}^{\omega_y} P_i$. Also we know that $N(j) \cap P_1 = \emptyset$. Therefore, $G[\text{Supp}(z)]$ is a complete multipartite graph, with parts $V_1 = P_1 \cup \{j\}$, $V_2 = P_2, \dots, V_{\omega_y} = P_{\omega_y}$. Note that $\omega_z = \omega_y$.

Since y satisfies the lemma, we know that, for all $k \in [\omega_z]$, $\sum_{v \in P_k} y_v = \frac{1}{\omega_y}$. Note that $i, j \in V_1$ and we have, $y_v = z_v$ for all $v \notin \{i, j\}$. Therefore, for all $k > 1$ we get,

$$\sum_{v \in V_k} z_v = \sum_{v \in P_k} y_v = \frac{1}{\omega_y} = \frac{1}{\omega_z}$$

Since $\sum_{v \in V(G)} z_v = \sum_{v \in \text{Supp}(z)} z_v = 1$, we get

$$\sum_{v \in V_1} z_v = 1 - \sum_{k=2}^{\omega_y} \left(\sum_{v \in V_k} z_v \right) = 1 - (\omega_y - 1) \frac{1}{\omega_y} = \frac{1}{\omega_z}$$

Thus, for all $k \in [\omega_z]$,

$$\sum_{v \in V_k} z_v = \frac{1}{\omega_z}$$

Thus, z satisfies Lemma 2.3, which contradicts our initial assumption. \square

From the equality condition 1, we obtain that $y = \{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\}$ is a minimizer of $\Phi(G, \cdot)$. Here $\text{Supp}(y) = V(G)$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3, the graph G must be complete multipartite. Let V_p and

V_q be any two parts of G . Using Lemma 2.3 again, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V_p} \frac{1}{n} = \sum_{v \in V_q} \frac{1}{n} \implies \frac{|V_p|}{n} = \frac{|V_q|}{n} \implies |V_p| = |V_q|$$

Since V_p and V_q were chosen arbitrarily, it follows that all parts of G have the same size. Thus, G is a regular complete multipartite graph.

References

- [1] Rajat Adak and L. Sunil Chandran. Localization: A framework to generalize extremal problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20946*, 2025.
- [2] Rajat Adak and L Sunil Chandran. Vertex-Based Localization of Erdős-Gallai Theorems for Paths and Cycles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01501*, 2025.
- [3] Rajat Adak and L Sunil Chandran. Vertex-Based Localization of generalized Turán Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20936*, 2025.
- [4] Rajat Adak and L Sunil Chandran. Vertex-Based Localization of Turán’s Theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02806*, 2025.
- [5] Lucas Aragão and Victor Souza. Localised graph Maclaurin inequalities. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 28(3):1021–1033, 2024.
- [6] Domagoj Bradač. A generalization of Turán’s theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08923*, 2022.
- [7] Debsoumya Chakraborti and Da Qi Chen. Exact results on generalized Erdős-Gallai problems. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 120:103955, 2024.
- [8] Pál Erdős and Tibor Gallai. On maximal paths and circuits of graphs. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. v10*, pages 337–356, 1959.
- [9] M. Rajesh Kannan, Hitesh Kumar, and Shivaramakrishna Pragada. Localization of spectral turán-type theorems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.01409*, 2025.
- [10] N Khadzhivanov. Inequalities for graphs. *Comptes rendus de l’Academie Bulgare des sciences*, 1977.
- [11] Rachel Kirsch and JD Nir. A Localized Approach to Generalized Turán Problems. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 31(3), September 2024.
- [12] Lele Liu and Bo Ning. A new spectral Turán theorem for weighted graphs and consequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26410*, 2025.
- [13] Lele Liu and Bo Ning. Local properties of the spectral radius and perron vector in graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 176:241–253, 2026.

- [14] Ruth Luo. The maximum number of cliques in graphs without long cycles. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 128:219–226, 2018.
- [15] David Malec and Casey Tompkins. Localized versions of extremal problems. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 112:103715, 2023.
- [16] Theodore S Motzkin and Ernst G Straus. Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of turán. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 17:533–540, 1965.
- [17] Vladimir Nikiforov. An extension of maclaurin’s inequalities. *arXiv preprint math/0608199*, 2006.
- [18] Paul Turán. On an extremal problem in graph theory. *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok*, 48:436–452, 1941.
- [19] David R Wood. On the maximum number of cliques in a graph. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 23(3):337–352, 2007.
- [20] Kai Zhao and Xiao-Dong Zhang. Localized version of hypergraph Erdős-Gallai Theorem. *Discrete Mathematics*, 348(1):114293, 2025.
- [21] Kai Zhao and Xiao-Dong Zhang. Localized version of hypergraph erdős-gallai theorem. *Discret. Math.*, 348(2):114293, 2025.
- [22] A A Zykov. On some properties of linear complexes. *Matematicheskii Sbornik, Novaya Seriy.*