

# The Multicolor Induced Size-Ramsey Number of Long Subdivisions\*

Ramin Javadi<sup>†</sup>Yoshiharu Kohayakawa<sup>‡</sup>Meysam Miralaei<sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

For a positive integer  $k$  and a graph  $H$ , the  $k$ -color induced size-Ramsey number  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H, k)$  is the minimum integer  $m$  for which there exists a graph  $G$  with  $m$  edges such that for every  $k$ -edge coloring of  $G$ , the graph  $G$  contains a monochromatic copy of  $H$  as an induced subgraph. For a graph  $H$  with the edge set  $E(H)$  and a function  $\sigma : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , the subdivision  $H^\sigma$  is obtained by replacing each  $e \in E(H)$  with a path of length  $\sigma(e)$ . We prove that for all integers  $k, D \geq 2$ , there exists a constant  $c = c(k, D)$  such that the following holds. Let  $H$  be any graph with maximum degree  $D$  and let  $H^\sigma$  be a subdivision of  $H$  with  $\sigma(e) > c \log_D n$  for every  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $n$  is the order of  $H^\sigma$ . Then,  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = e^{O(k \log k)} D^9 \log(D) n$ . If each  $\sigma(e)$  is even and larger than  $c \log_D n$ , this bound improves to  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = O(k^{342} \log^9(k) D^9 \log D) n$ . We also find improved bounds for the non-induced size-Ramsey number of long subdivisions.

## 1 Introduction

For given graphs  $H$  and  $G$ , and a positive integer  $k$ , we say that  $G$  is  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H$ , denoted by  $G \rightarrow (H)_k$ , if for every edge coloring of  $G$  with  $k$  colors, there exists a monochromatic subgraph of  $G$  isomorphic to  $H$ . Ramsey's pioneering work [36] established that for any graph  $H$  and any positive integer  $k$ , there exists a graph  $G$  such that  $G \rightarrow (H)_k$ . Such a graph  $G$  is called a  $k$ -Ramsey graph for  $H$ . The minimum number of vertices of such a graph  $G$ , which clearly can be taken to be a complete graph, is the *Ramsey number*  $R(H, k)$ . In other words,

$$R(H, k) = \min\{|V(G)| : G \rightarrow (H)_k\}.$$

While this perspective focuses on minimizing the number of vertices, an alternative viewpoint—initiated by Erdős, Faudree, Rousseau, and Schelp [18]—seeks to minimize the number of edges. This leads to the notion of the *size-Ramsey number*. For a graph  $H$  and integer  $k \geq 2$ , the *multicolor size-Ramsey number*  $\widehat{R}(H, k)$  is the minimum number of edges in any graph  $G$  that is  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H$ . More formally,

$$\widehat{R}(H, k) = \min\{|E(G)| : G \rightarrow (H)_k\}.$$

One of the central problems in this area is to determine for which families of graphs the size-Ramsey number grows linearly with the number of vertices. Erdős [17] asked this question in the

\*Research partially supported by FAPESP (2023/03167-5), CAPES (Finance Code 001) and INSF (4032328)

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, 84156-83111, Iran. E-mail: rjavadi@iut.ac.ir. This work is based upon research funded by Iran National Science Foundation (INSF) under project No. 4032328

<sup>‡</sup>Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, 05508-090 São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: yoshi@ime.usp.br. Partially supported by CNPq (407970/2023-1, 420838/2025-2, 315258/2023-3)

<sup>§</sup>Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, 05508-090 São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: m.miralaei@ime.usp.br. Supported by FAPESP (2023/04895-4)

case of paths. Beck [4] proved that  $\widehat{R}(P_n, 2) < 900n$ , that is, the size-Ramsey number of paths is linear. This line of work has since been extended to various graph families: cycles [9, 25, 27, 29], bounded-degree trees [20, 24, 32], powers of paths and cycles [10, 22], bounded powers of bounded-degree trees (equivalently graphs of bounded treewidth and maximum degree) [7, 30, 31], and logarithmic subdivisions of bounded-degree graphs [14]. On the negative side, Rödl and Szemerédi [38] constructed graphs on  $n$  vertices with maximum degree 3 and size-Ramsey number at least  $n \log^c n$ , for a small constant  $c > 0$ . This lower bound has been improved to  $cne^{c\sqrt{\log n}}$  for some  $c > 0$  by Tikhomirov [39]. Thus, the linearity of size-Ramsey numbers does not extend universally to bounded degree graphs.

A parallel research direction concerns the dependence of  $\widehat{R}(H, k)$  on the number of colors  $k$ . For paths  $P_n$  it is known that  $\widehat{R}(P_n, k) = \Theta(k^2 \log k)n$  (see [5] for the lower bound and [15, 34] for the upper bound).

For cycles, Haxell, Kohayakawa, and Łuczak [25], using regularity methods, proved that  $\widehat{R}(C_n, k) \leq Cn$  where  $C$  is a constant of tower type on  $k$ . Subsequently, Javadi and Miralaei [29] established that  $\widehat{R}(C_n, k) = O(k^{120} \log^2 k)n$  for even  $n$  and  $\widehat{R}(C_n, k) = \Omega(2^k)n = O(2^{16k^2+2\log k})n$  for odd  $n$ . This result improved a result by Javadi, Khoeini, Omidi, and Pokrovskiy [27]. More recently, Bradač, Draganić, and Sudakov [9] resolved the odd cycle case by proving  $\widehat{R}(C_n, k) = e^{O(k)}n$ . They also improved the even cycle case by proving that  $\widehat{R}(C_n, k) = O(k^{102})n$ .

It is natural to consider the induced analogues of the above quantities. For given graphs  $H$  and  $G$ , and a positive integer  $k$ , we say that  $G$  is *induced Ramsey for  $H$* , denoted by  $G \rightarrow_{\text{ind}} (H)_k$ , if for every  $k$ -edge coloring of  $G$ , there exists a monochromatic induced subgraph of  $G$  isomorphic to  $H$ . The *multicolor induced Ramsey number*  $R_{\text{ind}}(H, k)$  and the *multicolor induced size-Ramsey number*  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H, k)$  are defined to be the minimum number of vertices (respectively edges) in a graph  $G$  such that  $G \rightarrow_{\text{ind}} (H)_k$ . The existence of Ramsey-induced graphs was proved independently by Deuber [11], Erdős, Hajnal, and Pósa [19] and Rödl [37]. Although the size-Ramsey number of graphs has been studied for a long time, less is known about the induced version. By a result of Draganić, Krivelevich and Glock [13], we know that  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(P_n, k) = O(k^3 \log^4 k)n$ . The above-mentioned result of Haxell, Kohayakawa and Łuczak [25] is in fact proved in the induced setting, and hence  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(C_n, k) \leq Cn$ , where  $C$  has a tower type dependence on  $k$ . This result was improved recently by Bradač, Draganić, and Sudakov [9], who proved that if  $n$  is even, then  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(C_n, k) = O(k^{102})n$  and if  $n$  is odd, then  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(C_n, k) = e^{O(k \log k)}n$ . Recently, Girão and Hurley [21] proved that for every tree  $T$  with maximum degree  $\Delta$ , we have  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(T, k) = O_{k, \Delta}(n)$ , where the implied constant in the big- $O$  notation is a small polynomial in  $k$  and  $\Delta$ . A remarkable result of Hunter and Sudakov [26] establishes that  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H, k) = O_{\Delta, w, k}(n)$  for any graph  $H$  with  $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$  and treewidth at most  $w$ , where the implied constant is quite large, owing to the use of regularity arguments (they also give an alternative approach that leads to smaller constants in the case of trees and blow-up of trees). Finally, Aragão, Campos, Dahiya, Filipe and Marciano [2] proved that  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H, k) = e^{O(k \log k)}n$  for any  $n$ -vertex graph  $H$ , confirming a conjecture of Erdős [16] in a strong form. In this paper, we focus on estimating the induced size-Ramsey number of long subdivisions of bounded degree graphs.

Given a graph  $H$  and a function  $\sigma : E(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , the *subdivision  $H^\sigma$*  is obtained by replacing each edge  $e \in E(H)$  with a path of length  $\sigma(e)$ . Pak [35] studied the size-Ramsey number of long subdivisions of bounded degree graphs, which, roughly speaking, are subdivided graphs  $H^\sigma$  where  $\sigma(e) = \Omega(\log |V(H^\sigma)|)$  for every  $e \in E(H)$  and the maximum degree of  $H$  is bounded. He posed the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1.1.** [35] *For every  $k, D \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $C, L > 0$  such that if  $H$  is a graph with  $\Delta(H) \leq D$  and  $\sigma(e) \geq L \log(|V(H^\sigma)|)$  for all  $e \in E(H)$ , then  $\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) \leq C|V(H^\sigma)|$ .*

Pak [35] came close to proving Conjecture 1.1: he proved that

$$\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) = O(|V(H^\sigma)| \log^3 |V(H^\sigma)|).$$

In the special case where  $H$  is a fixed graph and  $\sigma(e)$  tends to infinity for every  $e \in E(H)$ , the conjecture was verified by Donadelli, Haxell, and Kohayakawa [12].

Finally, Draganić, Krivelevich, and Nenadov [14] confirmed Conjecture 1.1. Their proof is based on Szemerédi’s regularity lemma and makes no attempt to optimize the constants  $C$  and  $L$ .

In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1.1 in the induced setting with the goal of obtaining good explicit bounds on the constants, in particular avoiding the use of the regularity lemma. Our main theorem provides upper bounds on  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k)$  with constants that are exponential, and in certain cases polynomial, in  $k$  and  $D$ , depending on the structural restrictions imposed on the subdivision.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $k, D \geq 2$  be integers and  $H^\sigma$  be a subdivision of a graph  $H$  with maximum degree  $D$  and let  $n = |V(H^\sigma)|$ . Then there exists an integer  $n_0 = n_0(k, D)$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$  the following hold.*

- *If  $\sigma(e)$  is an even integer larger than  $8 \log_D n + Ck^7 \log^2(kD)$  for any  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $C$  is a suitably large absolute constant, then*

$$\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = O(k^{342} \log^9(k) D^9 \log D) n.$$

- *If  $\sigma(e)$  is an arbitrary integer larger than  $12 \log_D n + e^{Ck \log k} \log^2 D$  for any  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $C$  is a suitably large absolute constant, then*

$$\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = e^{O(k \log k)} D^9 (\log D) n.$$

Our proof follows the approach of Bradač, Draganić and Sudakov [9]: let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $s$ -uniform hypergraph with  $N$  vertices and  $CN$  random hyperedges,  $C = C(k, D)$ , with some appropriate properties including a sparsity condition on small subsets and linearity (every two hyperedges share at most one vertex). Then our host graph (the induced Ramsey graph proving our bounds) is the graph obtained from  $\mathcal{H}$  by replacing every hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}$  with a copy of a gadget graph  $F$  which has  $s$  vertices and is an induced-Ramsey graph for some short cycles.

To work in the induced set-up, we follow the approach of Girão and Hurley [21], where an induced extension setting of the Friedman–Pippenger theorem on tree embeddings is obtained by applying a certain “*pre-emptive greedy algorithm*”. Suppose that we wish to embed a tree in a host graph as an induced subgraph by successively adding pendant edges. During the embedding, some vertices appear whose neighbors are mostly unusable since either these neighbors are already used or adding them violates “inducedness”. We call these vertices “critical vertices”. Following ideas from [21], we pre-empt this situation simultaneously reserving some neighbors for these critical vertices, to be used in future if required.

Before closing this section, we remark that, although the main focus of this paper is on induced size-Ramsey numbers, our approach also leads to a new proof of Conjecture 1.1, without the use of regularity methods. Our proof leads to the numerical constants given in the theorem below.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $k, D \geq 2$  be integers and  $H^\sigma$  be a subdivision of a graph  $H$  with maximum degree  $D$  and let  $n = |V(H^\sigma)|$ . Then there exists an integer  $n_0 = n_0(k, D)$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$  the following hold.*

- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an even integer larger than  $8 \log_D n + Ck^3 \log^2 D$  for any  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $C$  is a suitably large absolute constant, then

$$\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) = O(k^{34} D^5 \log D)n$$

- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an arbitrary integer larger than  $2 \log_2^2 k \log_D n + Ck^4 2^{2k} \log^2 D$  for any  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $C$  is a suitably large absolute constant, then

$$\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) = O(2^{34k} k^6 \log^5(k) D^5 \log D)n$$

## Conventions and notation

The set of integers  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  is denoted by  $[n]$ . For a graph  $G$ , we write  $V(G)$ ,  $E(G)$ ,  $v(G)$  and  $e(G)$  for the vertex set, edge set, the number of vertices and the number of edges of  $G$ , respectively. For  $v \in V(G)$ , by  $N_G(v)$  we mean the set of all neighbors of  $v$  in  $G$  and the degree of  $v$  is  $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$ . Vertices with degree one are called *leaves* of  $G$ . Also, the average degree of  $G$  is  $\bar{d}(G) = 2e(G)/v(G)$ . For a subset  $S \subseteq V(G)$ , we define the neighborhood of  $S$  as  $N_G(S) = (\bigcup_{u \in S} N_G(u)) \setminus S$ . Also, the induced subgraph  $G[S]$  of  $G$  on  $S$  is the graph obtained from  $G$  by deleting all vertices in  $V(G) \setminus S$ . For a number  $\gamma > 0$ , we say that the graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a  $\gamma$ -*expander* if for every subset  $S \subseteq V$  with  $|S| \leq |V|/2$ , we have  $|N_G(S)| \geq \gamma|S|$ .

For a positive integer  $D$ , a full  $D$ -ary tree is a rooted tree whose all non-leaf vertices have  $D$  children. For a rooted tree  $T$ , the distance of a vertex  $v \in V(T)$  from the root is called the depth of  $v$  and the maximum depth of a vertex in  $V(T)$  is called the height of  $T$ . If a rooted tree has only one vertex (the root), its height is zero. If  $A, B \subseteq V(G)$ , then  $E_G(A, B) = \{xy \in E(G) : x \in A, y \in B\}$  is the set of edges connecting a vertex of  $A$  to a vertex of  $B$ . Also,  $e_G(A, B) = |E_G(A, B)|$ . We drop the subscript  $G$  whenever there is no ambiguity.

A hypergraph is said to be *linear* if any two hyperedges intersect in at most one vertex. A (Berge) *cycle* of length  $k$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ , where  $k \geq 2$ , is a sequence  $v_1 E_1 v_2 E_2 \dots v_k E_k$  of distinct vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  and distinct hyperedges  $E_1, \dots, E_k$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $v_1 \in E_1 \cap E_k$  and  $v_i \in E_{i-1} \cap E_i$  for all  $2 \leq i \leq k$ . The *girth* of  $\mathcal{H}$ , denoted  $\text{girth}(\mathcal{H})$ , is the length of the shortest cycle in  $\mathcal{H}$ . In particular, any hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\text{girth}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$  is linear.

Given functions  $f(n)$ ,  $g(n)$  and  $h(n)$ , we write  $f(n) = \Omega(h(n))$  (resp.  $f(n) = O(g(n))$ ) if there exist absolute constant  $C > 0$  such that  $f(n) \geq Ch(n)$  (resp.  $f(n) \leq Cg(n)$ ) for all sufficiently large  $n$ . All logarithms are taken to base  $e$ , unless stated. Throughout the paper, we omit floor and ceiling symbols whenever they are not essential.

## 2 Tools

In this section, we provide some tools that will be used in the follow-up sections.

An  $s$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  is called *bipartite* if  $V(\mathcal{H})$  can be partitioned into two sets  $(X, Y)$  such that any hyperedge in  $E(\mathcal{H})$  intersects  $X$  in exactly one vertex. For a subset  $I \subseteq X$ , we define the *neighbourhood*  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(I)$  of  $I$  as follows:

$$N_{\mathcal{H}}(I) = \{A \subseteq Y : A \cup \{x\} \in E(\mathcal{H}) \text{ for some } x \in I\}.$$

In a bipartite hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with bipartition  $(X, Y)$ , a *matching* saturating  $X$  is a collection of hyperedges which are mutually disjoint and their union contains  $X$ . For a collection  $\mathcal{Y}$  of subsets of  $Y$ , a *transversal* of  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a subset  $T \subseteq Y$  which intersects all members of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The minimum size of a transversal of  $\mathcal{Y}$  is denoted by  $\tau(\mathcal{Y})$ . The following theorem by Haxell [23] provides a sufficient condition for a bipartite hypergraph to have a matching saturating  $X$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** [23] *Let  $s \geq 2$  be an integer and  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $s$ -uniform bipartite hypergraph with bipartition  $(X, Y)$ . Suppose that for every  $I \subseteq X$ , we have*

$$\tau(N_{\mathcal{H}}(I)) \geq (2s - 3)(|I| - 1) + 1.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{H}$  admits a matching saturating  $X$ .*

We need a simple corollary of the above theorem. Given an  $s$ -uniform bipartite hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with bipartition  $(X, Y)$  and a positive integer  $D$ , by a  $D$ -matching saturating  $X$ , we mean a collection of hyperedges  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq E(\mathcal{H})$  such that each vertex  $x \in X$  is in exactly  $D$  hyperedges of  $\mathcal{M}$  and the sets  $M \setminus X$  ( $M \in \mathcal{M}$ ) are mutually disjoint.

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $s \geq 2$  and  $D$  be positive integers and  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $s$ -uniform bipartite hypergraph with bipartition  $(X, Y)$ . Suppose that for every  $I \subseteq X$ , we have*

$$\tau(N_{\mathcal{H}}(I)) \geq (2s - 3)(D|I| - 1) + 1.$$

*Then,  $\mathcal{H}$  admits a  $D$ -matching saturating  $X$ .*

The above corollary follows immediately from Theorem 2.1 by replacing each vertex  $x$  of  $X$  with  $D$  new vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_D$  and replacing each hyperedge containing  $x$  with  $D$  new hyperedges each containing one  $x_i$ .

We use the following version of Chernoff's bound in proving the next lemma.

**Theorem 2.3.** (Chernoff's bound) *Let  $X$  be a binomial random variable with  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mu$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq (1 - \delta)\mu] \leq \exp\left(\frac{-\delta^2\mu}{2}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

The following lemma is a generalization of a result by Alon and Spencer (see Proposition 5.5.3 in [1]), which provides a sufficient condition for the existence of a large independent set in a multipartite graph. The relevance and applicability of a result such as Lemma 2.4 below in induced embedding problems was nicely highlighted in the proof of [21, Lemma 2.13]. Lemma 2.4 will be used in the proof of Lemma 6.1 in Section 6, which parallels [21, Lemma 2.13] in our set-up.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $d, a \geq 3$  and  $t \geq 2$  be some positive integers and  $G$  be a  $t$ -partite graph with  $t$ -partition  $(A_1, \dots, A_t)$  such that  $|A_i| = a$  for each  $i \in [t]$ . Also, suppose that*

- $G$  is  $d$ -degenerate,
- for each  $i, j \in [t]$ ,  $i \neq j$ , we have  $e_G(A_i, A_j) \leq 1$ , and
- the maximum degree  $\Delta_G$  of  $G$  satisfies  $\Delta_G \leq \exp(a/(200d))$ .

*Then, for each  $i \in [t]$ , there exists a subset  $A'_i \subseteq A_i$  with  $|A'_i| \geq a/(100d)$  and  $\bigcup_{i \in [t]} A'_i$  is a stable set in  $G$ .*

*Proof.* First, we orient the edges of  $G$  in such a way that the in-degree of each vertex is at most  $d$  (which can be done since  $G$  is  $d$ -degenerate). Let  $\vec{G}$  be this oriented graph. Now, we randomly and independently select each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  with probability  $p = 1/d$ . Let  $S$  be the set of chosen vertices. Now, if there exists an edge from  $u$  to  $v$  for some vertices  $u, v \in S$ , we remove  $v$  from  $S$ . Let  $S'$  be the set of remaining vertices in  $S$  and  $A'_i = S' \cap A_i$ , for all  $i \in [t]$ . It is

evident that  $\bigcup_{i \in [t]} A'_i$  is a stable set in  $G$ . For a vertex  $v \in V$ , if  $v \in S'$ , then  $v \in S$  and all its in-neighbors are not in  $S$ . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(v \in S') \geq p(1-p)^d \geq p \exp\left(\frac{-pd}{1-p}\right) \geq \frac{1}{e^2 d}.$$

Now, note that since  $e(A_i, A_j) \leq 1$ , every two vertices  $u, v$  in  $A_i$  have no common in-neighbor. Therefore, events  $(u \in A'_i)$  and  $(v \in A'_i)$  are independent and thus  $|A'_i|$  is a binomial random variable with  $\mathbb{E}(|A'_i|) \geq e^{-2}d^{-1}a$ . Now, applying Chernoff's inequality (Theorem 2.3) with  $\delta = 9/10$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|A'_i| \leq \frac{a}{100d}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|A'_i| \leq \frac{a}{10e^2d}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-81a}{200e^2d}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-a}{20d}\right).$$

Now, we apply Lovász's Local Lemma (LLL) as follows. For each  $i \in [t]$ , let  $B_i$  be the event that  $|A'_i| < a/(100d)$ . Also, for  $i \in [t]$ , let  $S_i = A_i \cup \bigcup_{j \in [t]} A_j$ , where the union ranges over  $j \in [t]$  such that there is an arc from a vertex in  $A_j$  to some vertex in  $A_i$  in  $\vec{G}$ . We define a graph  $\Gamma$  on the  $B_i$  ( $i \in [t]$ ) by joining  $B_i$  and  $B_j$  with an edge if and only if  $S_i \cap S_j \neq \emptyset$ . One can check that  $\Gamma$  is a dependency graph for the events  $B_i$ , and that  $\Delta = \Delta(\Gamma) \leq a\Delta_G^2$ . Also, since  $d \leq \Delta_G$ , we have  $a \geq 200d \ln d$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} e\mathbb{P}(B_i)\Delta &\leq \exp\left(1 - \frac{a}{20d}\right)a \exp\left(\frac{a}{100d}\right) \\ &= a \exp\left(1 - \frac{a}{25d}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 200d \ln d \exp(1 - 8 \ln d) \\ &= 200 \ln d \frac{e}{d^7} < 1, \end{aligned}$$

where Inequality  $(*)$  holds because  $a \geq 200d \ln d$  and the function  $f(a) = a \exp(1 - a/(25d))$  is decreasing with respect to  $a$ . Hence, by LLL,  $\mathbb{P}(\bigcap_i \overline{B_i}) > 0$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

### 3 Host graph

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an  $s$ -uniform linear hypergraph. Also, let  $F$  be a graph on  $s$  vertices. *The substitution*  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  of  $F$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ , is a graph whose vertex set is the vertex set of  $\mathcal{H}$  and every hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}$  is replaced with a copy of  $F$ .

Our host graph is a graph  $\mathcal{H}(F)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}$  has a linear number of hyperedges with some properties including sparsity condition on small subsets (see Conditions (P4) and (P4') in the lemma below) and  $F$  is a Ramsey (or induced-Ramsey) graph for some cycles (see Table 1).

First, we need the following lemma which guarantees the existence of a hypergraph with some specific properties. It is a modified version of Lemma 4.4 in [9]. Indeed in [9, Lemma 4.4] it was shown that if  $0 < \alpha \leq 10^{-3}c^{-2}s^{-4}$ , then there exists an  $s$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  satisfying (P1)–(P3) and (P4)'. In the following lemma we replace the Property (P4)' with a new Property (P4), however, this strengthened property holds only under the more restrictive condition  $0 < \alpha \leq 10^{-4}c^{-5}s^{-15}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $s, g \geq 4$  and  $c \geq 1$  be given integers and set  $0 < \alpha \leq 10^{-4}c^{-5}s^{-15}$ . Then, there exists a constant  $N_0 := N_0(s, g, c, \alpha)$  such that for any integer  $N \geq N_0$ , there is an  $s$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $N$  vertices, such that the following properties hold.*

(P1)  $e(\mathcal{H}) \in [cN/2, cN]$ .

(P2)  $\Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq 8cs$ .

(P3) The girth of  $\mathcal{H}$  is larger than  $g$ .

(P4) For any  $A \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  with  $|A| \leq \alpha N$ , we have  $\sum_{h \in E(\mathcal{H})} |h \cap A| < \frac{5}{2}|A|$ , where the sum is over all hyperedges  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$  with  $|h \cap A| \geq 2$ .

Also, if  $0 < \alpha \leq 10^{-3}c^{-2}s^{-4}$ , then there exists an  $s$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  satisfying (P1)–(P3) along with the following property.

(P4') For any  $A \subseteq V(\mathcal{H}')$  with  $|A| \leq \alpha N$ , there are at most  $2|A|$  hyperedges in  $\mathcal{H}'$  which intersect  $A$  in at least two vertices.

*Proof.* We take  $V = [N]$  and randomly and independently pick  $m = \lfloor cN \rfloor$  subsets of size  $s$  from  $V$  as hyperedges of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then, we remove duplicate hyperedges, a hyperedge from each Berge cycle of length at most  $g$  and all hyperedges incident to a vertex of degree more than  $8cs$ . Conditions (P2) and (P3) hold trivially. Also, one can verify that Condition (P1) holds with high probability (the proof of (P1)–(P3) is the same as the proof of Lemma 4.4 in [6] and we omit it). We just prove that  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies (P4) with positive probability.

Fix a subset  $A \subseteq V$  with  $|A| = a \leq \alpha N$ . We say that  $A$  is a bad subset if

$$\sum_{h \in E(\mathcal{H})} |h \cap A| \geq \frac{5}{2}a,$$

where the sum is over all hyperedges  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$  with  $|h \cap A| \geq 2$ . If  $A$  is bad, then there is a vector of non-negative integers  $\mathbf{a} = (a_2, \dots, a_s)$ , such that  $2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil$  and for each  $2 \leq i \leq s$ , there are  $a_i$  hyperedges in  $E(\mathcal{H})$  which intersect  $A$  in exactly  $i$  vertices. Also, define  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{i=2}^s a_i$ . For each hyperedge  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|h \cap A| = i) = \frac{\binom{a}{i} \binom{N-i}{s-i}}{\binom{N}{s}} \leq \binom{a}{i} \left(\frac{s}{N}\right)^i \leq \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^i.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A \text{ is bad}) &\leq \sum_{2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil} \binom{\lfloor cN \rfloor}{a_2} \binom{\lfloor cN \rfloor - a_2}{a_3} \dots \\ &\quad \binom{\lfloor cN \rfloor - a_2 - \dots - a_{s-1}}{a_s} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\sum_i ia_i} \\ &= \sum_{2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil} \frac{\lfloor cN \rfloor!}{a_2! \dots a_s! (\lfloor cN \rfloor - a_2 - \dots - a_s)!} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a} \\ &\leq \sum_{2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil} \frac{(cN)^{\sigma(\mathbf{a})}}{a_2! \dots a_s!} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a} \\ &\leq \sum_{2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil} \frac{(ecN)^{\sigma(\mathbf{a})}}{(a_2)^{a_2} \dots (a_s)^{a_s}} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a} \\ &\stackrel{*}{\leq} \sum_{2a_2 + \dots + sa_s = \lceil (5/2)a \rceil} \left(\frac{(s-1)ecN}{\sigma(\mathbf{a})}\right)^{\sigma(\mathbf{a})} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{5}{4}a\right)^s \left(\frac{4escN}{5a}\right)^{\frac{5}{4}a} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where Inequality (\*) holds because the denominator in (3.1) is  $\exp(-H(a_2, \dots, a_s))$  in which  $H$  is the Entropy function and  $H$  is maximized whenever all  $a_i$ 's are equal. Also, the last inequality holds because  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) \leq 5a/4$  and the function  $f(x) = ((s-1)ecN/x)^x$  is increasing for  $x \leq (s-1)cN$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\exists A : A \text{ is bad}) &\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\alpha N} \binom{N}{a} \left(\frac{5}{4}a\right)^s \left(\frac{4escN}{5a}\right)^{\frac{5}{4}a} \left(\frac{as}{N}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}a} \\
&\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\alpha N} \left(\frac{Ne}{a}\right)^a \left(\frac{5}{4}a\right)^s \left(50s^{15}c^5\left(\frac{a}{N}\right)^5\right)^{\frac{a}{4}} \\
&\leq \sum_{a=1}^{\alpha N} \left(\frac{5}{4}a\right)^s \left(3000s^{15}c^5\frac{a}{N}\right)^{\frac{a}{4}} \\
&= \sum_{a=1}^{s^4-1} \left(\left(\frac{5a}{4}\right)^{\frac{4s}{a}} 3000s^{15}c^5\frac{a}{N}\right)^{\frac{a}{4}} + \sum_{a=s^4}^{\alpha N} \left(\left(\frac{5a}{4}\right)^{\frac{4s}{a}} 3000s^{15}c^5\frac{a}{N}\right)^{\frac{a}{4}} \\
&\leq \sum_{a=1}^{s^4-1} \left(\left(\frac{5a}{4}\right)^{\frac{4s}{a}} 3000s^{15}c^5\frac{a}{N}\right)^{\frac{a}{4}} + \sum_{a=s^4}^{\alpha N} (6000s^{15}c^5\alpha)^{\frac{a}{4}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because if  $f(a, s) = (5a/4)^{(4s/a)}$ , then  $f(a, s) \leq f(s^4, s) \leq 2$ , for all  $a \geq s^4$ . In the last line, the first summation tends to zero as  $N$  goes to infinity and since  $6000s^{15}c^5\alpha < 6/10$  and  $s \geq 4$ , the second summation is less than  $1/4$ . Hence, (P4) holds with probability bigger than  $3/4$ .  $\square$

We apply the hypergraphs  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{H}'$  to prove upper bounds for the induced size-Ramsey number and the size-Ramsey number of a subdivision of a bounded degree graph, respectively (see Theorems 3.5 and 3.6). We also need the bounds on the order and size of the gadget graph  $F$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** [9] *For every positive integer  $k$ , there is a graph  $F$  which is induced  $k$ -Ramsey for  $C_6$  with  $v(F) = O(k^6)$  and  $e(F) = O(k^9)$ . Also, there is a graph  $F$  which is induced  $k$ -Ramsey for  $C_5$  with  $e(F) = e^{O(k \log k)}$ .*

**Lemma 3.3.** *There exists a constant  $C$ , such that for every positive integer  $k$ , the complete graph on  $\lceil Ck^{3/2} \rceil$  vertices is  $k$ -Ramsey for  $C_6$ . In particular,  $R(C_6, k) = O(k^{3/2})$  and  $\widehat{R}(C_6, k) = O(k^3)$ .*

*Proof.* Due to Bondy and Simonovits [8], we have  $\text{ex}(n, C_6) = C'n^{4/3}$ , for some constant  $C'$ . Let  $F$  be the complete graph on  $\lceil 9(C'k)^{3/2} \rceil$  vertices. Then, in every  $k$ -edge coloring of  $F$ , there exists a monochromatic subgraph with at least  $e(F)/k > 9^{4/3}C'^3k^2 = C'v(F)^{4/3}$  edges. Hence,  $F$  contains a monochromatic copy of  $C_6$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** [3] *For every positive integer  $k$  and every  $k$ -edge coloring of the complete graph on  $4^k + 1$  vertices, there exists a monochromatic odd cycle of length at most  $2\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1$ .*

We divide the non-induced and induced size-Ramsey problems of subdivisions into two cases: the case that all subdivisions are of even length and the case that the subdivisions are of arbitrary length. In the case that all subdivisions are of even length, i.e.  $\sigma(e)$  is even for all

Case	Gadget graph $F$	$s = v(F)$	$e(F)$
Induced Case			
Even Subdivision	Induced $k$ -Ramsey for $C_6$	$O(k^6)$	$O(k^9)$
General Subdivision	Induced $k$ -Ramsey for $C_5$	$e^{O(k \log k)}$	$e^{O(k \log k)}$
Non-induced Case			
Even Subdivision	$k$ -Ramsey for $C_6$	$O(k^{3/2})$	$O(k^3)$
General Subdivision	complete graph on $4^k + 1$ vertices	$4^k + 1$	$2^{4k-1} + 2^{2k-1}$

Table 1: Gadget graph in the case of even and general subdivision.

Parameter	Values for Induced version	Values for Non-induced version
Hypergraph	$\mathcal{H}$	$\mathcal{H}'$
$c$	$10^7 k s^4 \ln(s) D$	even case: $10^3 k s^2 D$ general case: $10^3 (2 \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1) k s^2 D$
$\alpha$	$10^{-4} c^{-5} s^{-15}$	$10^{-3} c^{-2} s^{-4}$
$N$	$\lceil 10^{13} c^7 s^{22} k \ln(sD) D n \rceil$	$\lceil 10^{13} c^3 s^9 k \ln(k) D \ln(sD) n \rceil$
$g$	$\lceil 10^{10} s k \ln^2(sD) \rceil$	$\lceil 10^{10} s k \ln(k) \ln(sD) \rceil$

Table 2: Setting values of parameters in applying Lemma 3.1.

$e \in E(H)$ , we take  $F$  as the graph which is  $k$ -induced-Ramsey (resp.  $k$ -Ramsey) for the 6-cycle (given in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3). Also, in the general case, where the lengths of subdivisions are odd or even, we take  $F$  as the graph which is  $k$ -induced-Ramsey (resp.  $k$ -Ramsey) for the 5-cycle (resp. an odd cycle of length at most  $2 \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1$ ) given in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4 (see Table 1). Also, hereafter, the parameters in Lemma 3.1 are chosen as in Table 2.

Our main result for the induced size-Ramsey is as follows.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $k, D \geq 2$  be two integers and  $H^\sigma$  be a subdivision of a graph  $H$  with maximum degree  $D$  such that  $v(H^\sigma) = n$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the hypergraph given in Lemma 3.1 with parameters in Table 2. Then, there exists a positive integer  $n_0 = n_0(k, D)$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$ , the following holds.*

- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an even integer larger than  $8 \log_D(n) + \Omega(k^7 \log^2(kD))$  for any  $e \in E(H)$  and  $F$  is an induced  $k$ -Ramsey graph for  $C_6$  given in Lemma 3.2, then  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  is induced  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H^\sigma$ . In particular,  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = O(k^{342} \log^9(k) D^9 \log D) n$ .
- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an arbitrary integer larger than  $12 \log_D(n) + e^{\Omega(k \log k)} \log^2 D$  for any  $e \in E(H)$  and  $F$  is an induced  $k$ -Ramsey graph for  $C_5$  given in Lemma 3.2, then  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  is induced  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H^\sigma$ . In particular,  $\widehat{R}_{\text{ind}}(H^\sigma, k) = e^{O(k \log k)} D^9 \log(D) n$ .

For the non-induced size-Ramsey, these bounds can be substantially improved.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $k, D \geq 2$  be two integers and  $H^\sigma$  be a subdivision of a graph  $H$  with maximum degree  $D$  such that  $v(H^\sigma) = n$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{H}'$  be the hypergraph given in Lemma 3.1 with parameters in Table 2. Then, there exists a positive integer  $n_0 = n_0(k, D)$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$ , the following holds.*

- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an even integer larger than  $8 \log_D(n) + \Omega(k^3 \log^2 D)$  for any  $e \in E(H)$  and  $F$  is a  $k$ -Ramsey graph for  $C_6$  given in Lemma 3.3, then  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$  is  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H^\sigma$ . In particular,  $\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) = O(k^{34} D^5 \log D) n$ .

- If  $\sigma(e)$  is an arbitrary integer larger than  $2 \log_2^2(k) \log_D(n) + \Omega(k^4 2^{2k} \log^2 D)$  for any  $e \in E(H)$  and  $F$  is the complete graph on  $2^{2k} + 1$  vertices, then  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$  is  $k$ -Ramsey for  $H^\sigma$ . In particular,  $\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) = O(2^{34k} k^6 \ln^5 k D^5 \log D)n$ .

We will prove Theorem 3.5. The proof of Theorem 3.6 is very similar and we postpone it to the appendix. So, the rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.5.

## 4 Auxiliary graphs $G$ and $G'$

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the hypergraph provided in Lemma 3.1. Also, let  $\ell$  be equal to 6 in the even case and equal to 5 in the general case and  $F$  be the graph which is induced  $k$ -Ramsey for  $C_\ell$  (given in Lemma 3.2). In order to prove Theorem 3.5, as in [9], we define an auxiliary graph  $G$  as follows. The vertex set of  $G$  is the same as the vertex set of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Fix an arbitrary  $k$ -edge coloring of  $\mathcal{H}(F)$ . For each hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}$ , in its corresponding copy of  $F$ , there exists a monochromatic induced copy of  $C_\ell$ . We pick one of these  $\ell$ -cycles and add an edge in  $G$  between two vertices at distance two in the  $\ell$ -cycle. Also, we color this edge in  $G$  by the same color as the  $\ell$ -cycle. So, we have a  $k$ -edge-colored graph  $G$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is linear, each edge  $e \in E(G)$  is contained in a unique hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}$ , which we denote by  $h(e)$ .

In the following lemma, we list some properties of the graph  $G$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *The graph  $G$  defined as above has the following properties.*

(Q1)  $v(G) = v(\mathcal{H}) = N$ ,  $e(G) = e(\mathcal{H}) \in [cN/2, cN]$ , and  $\Delta(G) \leq \Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq 8cs$ .

(Q2) For any  $A \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|A| \leq \alpha N$ , we have  $e_G(A) \leq (5/4)|A|$ .

(Q3)  $G$  contains a monochromatic subgraph  $G'$  such that

- $v(G') \geq \alpha N$ ,
- the average degree of  $G'$  is at least  $c/(2k) = (10^7/2)Ds^4 \ln s$ , and
- $G'$  is a  $\gamma$ -expander graph, where  $\gamma \geq (10^4 sk \log_2(sD))^{-1}$ .

In order to prove the lemma, we need the following result from [33] (see also [9]).

**Lemma 4.2.** [9, 33] *Let  $c_1 > c_2 > 1$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , and  $\Delta > 0$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph on  $N$  vertices satisfying*

1.  $|E|/|V| \geq c_1$ ,
2. for every subset  $U \subseteq V$  of size  $|U| \leq \alpha N$ , we have  $e_G(U) \leq c_2|U|$ , and
3.  $\Delta(G) \leq \Delta$ .

*Then  $G$  contains an induced subgraph  $G' = (V', E')$  on at least  $\alpha N$  vertices with  $|E'|/|V'| \geq (c_1 + c_2)/2$  which is a  $\gamma$ -expander, where  $\gamma = (c_1 - c_2)/(2\Delta \lceil \log_2(1/\alpha) \rceil)$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Property (Q1) immediately follows from the definition of  $G$  and (Q2) follows from (P4). Now, let  $G_{\text{red}}$  be the monochromatic subgraph of  $G$  with the maximum number of edges. So,  $e(G_{\text{red}}) \geq e(G)/k$ . Apply Lemma 4.2 with  $G = G_{\text{red}}$ ,  $c_1 = c/(2k)$ ,  $c_2 = 5/4$  and let  $G'$  be the induced subgraph of  $G_{\text{red}}$  guaranteed by the lemma.

Since  $c = 10^7 Dks^4 \ln s$ , we have  $\bar{d}(G') \geq c_1 = (10^7/2)Ds^4 \ln s$ . Finally,  $G'$  a  $\gamma$ -expander for

$$\gamma \geq \frac{c_1 - 5/4}{16cs \lceil \log_2(1/\alpha) \rceil} \geq \frac{c}{64cks \log_2(1/\alpha)} = \frac{1}{64sk \log_2(10^4 c^5 s^{15})} \geq \frac{1}{10^4 sk \log_2(sD)}.$$

□

We also need a couple of definitions.

**Definition 4.3.** For a subgraph  $J$  of our auxiliary graph  $G$ , the *closure*  $\text{cl}(J)$  of  $J$  is the subset of  $V(G)$  consisting of the union of all hyperedges  $h(e)$  for all  $e \in E(J)$ . Also, set  $\text{cl}_1(J) = \text{cl}(J)$  and for each integer  $k \geq 2$ , the  $k$ th *closure*  $\text{cl}_k(J)$  of  $J$  is the subset of  $V(G)$  consisting of the union of all hyperedges in  $\mathcal{H}$  which intersect  $\text{cl}_{k-1}(J)$ .

Here, we define the notion of an induced-good embedding in the graph  $G$  with respect to the hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Definition 4.4.** A subgraph  $J$  of  $G$  is said to be an *induced-good subgraph* of  $G$  (with respect to  $\mathcal{H}$ ) if

- for every  $e_1, e_2 \in E(J)$ , if  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are not adjacent, then  $h(e_1) \cap h(e_2) = \emptyset$ ,
- for every  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$ , if  $|h \cap \text{cl}(J)| \geq 2$ , then there exists an edge  $e \in E(J)$  such that  $h = h(e)$ .

Also, an embedding  $\phi : H \hookrightarrow G$  is called induced-good if  $\phi(H)$  is an induced-good subgraph of  $G$ .

Note that the second property of goodness implies that if  $J$  is an induced-good subgraph of  $G$ , then  $J$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ .

Let  $L_1 = \lfloor (\ell-1)/2 \rfloor$  and  $L_2 = \lceil (\ell+1)/2 \rceil$ . In order to find a monochromatic induced copy of  $H^\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$ , the idea is to first find a monochromatic induced copy of  $H^{\sigma'}$  as an induced-good subgraph of  $G$ , for some  $\sigma'$ . The following lemma shows how we can convert an  $H^{\sigma'}$  in  $G$  to an  $H^\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose that  $H^{\sigma'}$  is a monochromatic induced-good subgraph of  $G$  such that  $\sigma(e)/L_2 \leq \sigma'(e) \leq \sigma(e)/L_1$ , for all  $e \in E(H)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  contains a monochromatic copy of  $H^\sigma$  as an induced subgraph.*

*Proof.* By definition of  $G$ , for each edge  $e$  in  $E(G)$ , there is an  $\ell$ -cycle in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  of the same color whose vertices are in  $h(e)$  and the endpoints of  $e$  are at distance two in the  $\ell$ -cycle. Therefore, we can find two induced paths in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  of lengths  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  between the endpoints of  $e$ .

Now, suppose that  $H^{\sigma'}$  is a monochromatic induced-good subgraph of  $G$  and let  $uv \in E(H)$  and  $P$  be a monochromatic  $uv$ -path of length  $\sigma'(uv)$  in  $H^{\sigma'}$ . So, for each edge  $e \in E(P)$ , we can find two paths in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  of lengths  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  between the endpoints of  $e$  with the same color as  $e$ . Because of the first property of goodness and linearity of  $\mathcal{H}$ , these paths do not intersect each other except for their endpoints. Now, for each edge  $e \in E(P)$ , we select one of the paths of lengths  $L_1$  or  $L_2$  so that the union of these paths forms a path of length  $\sigma(e)$  in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  between  $u$  and  $v$ .

Therefore,  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  contains  $H^\sigma$  as a monochromatic subgraph. We just need to prove that  $H^\sigma$  is an induced subgraph. Suppose that  $e = xy$  is an edge in  $E(\mathcal{H}(F)) \setminus E(H^\sigma)$  where  $x, y \in V(H^\sigma)$  and let  $x, y$  be in a hyperedge  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$ . Then,  $h$  intersects  $\text{cl}(H^{\sigma'})$  in at least two vertices  $x, y$ . Thus, by the second property of goodness,  $h = h(e')$  for some  $e' \in E(H^{\sigma'})$ . Also, let  $x \in h(e_1)$  and  $y \in h(e_2)$  for some  $e_1, e_2 \in E(H^{\sigma'})$ . So,  $h(e')$  intersects  $h(e_1)$  and  $h(e_2)$  in  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. Consequently, by the first property of goodness,  $e'$  is adjacent to  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  in  $G$  and by linearity of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $e' \cap e_1 = \{x\}$  and  $e' \cap e_2 = \{y\}$ . Hence,  $e' = xy$ . This is impossible because  $E(G)$  and  $E(\mathcal{H}(F))$  are disjoint. This contradiction implies that  $H^\sigma$  is an induced subgraph of  $\mathcal{H}(F)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Critical sets

Let  $G'$  be the graph defined in Lemma 4.1. In a good part of our embedding process, we shall grow induced-good subgraphs of maximum degree  $D$  in  $G'$  by adding pendant edges. However, during the embedding, some vertices appear whose neighbors are not mostly usable for extending the subgraph (since either these neighbors are inside the already embedded graph, or adding them violates goodness conditions). We call these vertices critical vertices. So, we need to simultaneously reserve some neighbors for critical vertices. Let us define this notion more precisely.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $J$  be a subgraph of  $G'$ . For a vertex  $v \in V(G')$ , a neighbor  $u$  in  $N_{G'}(v)$  is called an *induced-available* neighbor of  $v$  (with respect to  $J$ ) if  $h(uv) \setminus \{v\}$  does not intersect  $\text{cl}_2(J)$ . The set of all induced-available neighbors of  $v$  is denoted by  $A_J^{\text{ind}}(v)$ .

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $d, d' \geq 2$  be integers and let  $J$  be a subgraph of  $G'$ . We define the set  $C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J)$  of  $(d, d')$ -critical vertices of  $J$  by the following iterative procedure.

**Step 0.** Set  $J_0 := J$  and let  $X_0$  be the set of all non-leaf vertices of  $J_0$ .

**Step  $i \geq 1$ .** Given  $J_{i-1}$  and  $X_0, \dots, X_{i-1}$ . Define

$$X_i = \{v \in V(G') \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} X_j : |N_{G'}(v) \setminus A_{J_{i-1}}^{\text{ind}}| \geq d\}.$$

Indeed,  $X_i$  is the set of all vertices in  $V(G') \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} X_j$  which have at least  $d$  neighbours in  $G'$  that are not induced-available with respect to  $J_{i-1}$  (see Figure 1). For every vertex  $v \in X_i$ , choose arbitrarily  $d'$  edges of  $G'$  incident with  $v$  (if  $\deg_{G'}(v) < d'$ , then no edge is added) and let  $J_i$  be the graph obtained from  $J_{i-1}$  by adding these selected edges over all vertices of  $X_i$ . Continue the iteration until some  $X_i$  is empty. We then define

$$C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J) := \bigcup_{i \geq 0} X_i.$$

It should be noted that the  $(d, d')$ -critical set of  $J$  is not unique, because in each step the  $d'$  incident edges to new vertices are chosen arbitrarily.

As in [21], it is crucial that the set of critical vertices does not explode as we proceed. We shall confirm this fact in our next lemma, the proof of which is based on the sparsity property (P4) of the hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ . A lemma similar to Lemma 5.3 below appears in [21].

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $d, d' \geq 2$  be two positive integers such that  $d = 20sd'$ . Also, let  $J$  be a subgraph of  $G'$  where  $e(J) \leq \alpha N/(22s) - d'$ . Also, let  $X_0$  be the set of all non-leaves of  $J$ . Then,  $|C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J)| < |X_0| + e(J)/d'$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $x_1, \dots, x_t$  are the first  $t$  vertices outside  $X_0$  which are added to the critical set of  $J$  and for the contrary suppose that  $t = \lceil e(J)/d' \rceil$ . Let  $\widehat{J}$  be the graph obtained from  $J$  by adding  $d'$  arbitrary neighbors for each  $x_i$ ,  $i \in [t]$ . By the definition, each  $x_i$  has  $d$  many neighbors  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d}$  such that for each  $j \in [d]$ ,  $h(x_i x_{i_j}) \setminus \{x_i\}$  intersects  $\text{cl}_2(\widehat{J})$ . Define two subsets  $E_1, E_2 \subseteq E(\mathcal{H})$  and a subset  $Y \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  as follows. Let  $E_1$  be the set of all hyperedges  $h(x_i x_{i_j})$  for  $i \in [t]$  and  $j \in [d]$ . For each  $h(e) \in E_1$ , if  $h(e)$  does not intersect  $\text{cl}(\widehat{J})$ , then there is a hyperedge  $h$  which intersects  $h(e)$  and  $\text{cl}(\widehat{J})$ . Add this hyperedge  $h$  to the set  $E_2$  and add a vertex in  $h \cap h(e)$  to the set  $Y$ . Also, set  $A = \text{cl}(\widehat{J}) \cup Y$ . Every hyperedge  $h(e) \in E_1$  intersects  $A$  in at least two vertices. Also,

$$\sum_{h \in E_2} |h \cap Y| \geq |Y|.$$




Figure 1: Critical Vertices. The neighbors  $v_1, v_2$  of  $v$  are not induced-available since  $h(vv_1) \setminus \{v\}$  and  $h(vv_2) \setminus \{v\}$  intersect  $V(J)$ . Also,  $v_3$  and  $v_d$  are not induced-available because  $h(vv_3) \setminus \{v\}$  intersects  $\text{cl}(J)$  and  $h(vv_d) \setminus \{v\}$  intersects  $\text{cl}_2(J)$ .

Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{h:|h \cap A| \geq 2} |h \cap A| \geq 2|E_1| + |Y|. \quad (5.1)$$

On the other hand,

$$|A| = |\text{cl}(\widehat{J})| + |Y| \leq e(J)s + td's + td = e(J)s + 21td's \leq 22e(J)s + 21d's \leq \alpha N.$$

Then, by (P4), we have

$$\sum_{h:|h \cap A| \geq 2} |h \cap A| < \frac{5}{2}|A| = \frac{5}{2}(|\text{cl}(\widehat{J})| + |Y|) \leq \frac{5}{2}(e(J)s + td's + |Y|) \leq 5td's + \frac{5}{2}|Y|.$$

Now, combining with (5.1) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}|E_1| \leq 2|E_1| - \frac{3}{2}|Y| < 5td's,$$

where the first inequality holds because  $|Y| \leq |E_1|$ . On the other hand,  $|E_1| \geq td/2$ . Thus,  $d < 20d's$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6 Extending good embedding

In this section, we develop a machinery for extending an induced-good embedding by adding trees pending from its vertices (See Figure 2). The following lemma, which is heavily inspired in [21, Lemma 2.13], is a key component in this machinery. The graph  $G'$  is the graph given in Lemma 4.1.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $s \geq 3$  and  $D \geq 2$  be integers and  $K$  be an induced-good subgraph of  $G'$ . Also, let  $C \subseteq V(G')$  be a subset of vertices such that  $|C| \leq \alpha N / (10^5 D s^3 \ln s)$ . If for each vertex  $v \in C$  we have  $|A_K^{\text{ind}}(v)| \geq 10^5 D s^3 \ln s$ , then  $K$  can be extended to a subgraph  $\widehat{K}$ , where  $\widehat{K}$  is obtained from  $K$  by adding some disjoint rooted trees  $T_1, \dots, T_c$ , where  $c = |V(K) \cap C|$  with roots in  $V(K) \cap C$  such that*

- $\widehat{K}$  is an induced-good subgraph of  $G'$ .
- Every non-leaf vertex of the  $T_i$  is in  $C$  and has  $D$  children.
- No leaf of the  $T_i$  is in  $C$ .

*Proof.* If  $V(K) \cap C = \emptyset$ , then we can take  $\widehat{K} = K$  and all conditions hold. Now, suppose that  $V(K) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . For each vertex  $v \in C$ , choose  $10^5 D s^3 \ln s$  induced-available neighbors with respect to  $K$  and let  $K^*$  be the graph of union of all these edges.

Now, we define an auxiliary bipartite hypergraph  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  as follows. First, let  $C'$  be a disjoint copy of  $C$  of new vertices and let  $V(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) = C' \cup \text{cl}(K^*)$ . Also, for every edge  $e = xy \in E(K^*)$ , if  $x \in C$ , we put the hyperedge  $h(e) \setminus \{x\} \cup \{x'\}$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , where  $x'$  is the copy of  $x$  in  $C'$ . So, if  $x, y \in C$ , then there are two hyperedges in  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ , namely  $h(e) \setminus \{x\} \cup \{x'\}$  and  $h(e) \setminus \{y\} \cup \{y'\}$ . The hypergraph  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  is bipartite, since every hyperedge intersects  $C'$  in one vertex. Also, every vertex  $x' \in C'$  is contained in at least  $10^5 D s^3 \ln s$  hyperedges. Let  $D' = 10^4 D s^2 \ln s$ . Now, we apply Corollary 2.2 for the bipartite hypergraph  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ . First, suppose that for every set  $I' \subseteq C'$ , we have

$$\tau(N_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(I')) \geq (2s - 3)(D'|I'| - 1) + 1. \quad (6.1)$$

(We will later prove that the inequality holds.) Then, by Corollary 2.2,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  admits a  $D'$ -matching, i.e. for each vertex  $x' \in C'$ , we can choose  $D'$  hyperedges  $h_1^{x'}, \dots, h_{D'}^{x'}$  incident with  $x'$  such that for every  $x', y' \in C'$  and every  $i, j \in [D']$ , the sets  $h_i^{x'} \setminus \{x'\}$  and  $h_j^{y'} \setminus \{y'\}$  are disjoint.

Now, for every  $x \in C$ , let  $A_x$  be the set of  $D'$  neighbors of  $x$  in  $h_1^{x'}, \dots, h_{D'}^{x'}$ . We define an auxiliary graph  $L$  with the vertex set  $\cup_{x \in C} A_x$  where two arbitrary vertices  $u \in A_x$  and  $v \in A_y$  are adjacent if there exists a hyperedge  $h \in E(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$  ( $h \neq h(u), h(v)$ ) intersecting both sets  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$ . The graph  $L$  satisfies the following properties. (We will check these properties at the end of the proof.)

- $e_L(A_x, A_y) \leq 1$  for every two vertices  $x, y \in C$ .
- $L$  is  $3s^2$ -degenerate.
- The maximum degree of  $L$ ,  $\Delta_L$ , is at most  $(10s)^8 D$ .

We are going to apply Lemma 2.4 by setting  $G = L$ ,  $\Delta_L \leq (10s)^8 D$ ,  $d = 3s^2$ ,  $a = D'$  and  $t = |C|$ . So, for each  $x \in C$ , we can find a subset  $A'_x \subseteq A_x$ , such that  $|A'_x| \geq D' / (300s^2) > D$  and  $L$  induces an stable set on  $\cup_{x \in C} A'_x$ . (Note that we have  $a = D' \geq 600 s^2 \ln \Delta_L$  and so the last condition of Lemma 2.4 is satisfied.) So, for every  $x, y \in C$  and every  $u \in A'_x$  and  $v \in A'_y$ , we have  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$  are disjoint and there is no hyperedge  $h \in E(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ , where  $h$  intersects both  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$ . Now, we construct a forest  $\tilde{K}$  as follows.

First, we pick a vertex  $x \in C \cap V(K)$ . The vertex  $x$  has  $D$  neighbors in  $A'_x$ . We add all these neighbors to  $\tilde{K}$  and orient all edges from  $x$  to its neighbors. If these neighbors of  $x$  are outside of  $C$ , then we stop here and go to the next vertex in  $C \cap V(K)$ . If one of these neighbors, say  $y$ , is in  $C$ , then we continue from  $y$ , so  $y$  has  $D$  neighbors in  $A'_y$ . We continue this process by adding these neighbors to  $\tilde{K}$  and orienting the edges from  $y$  until all leaves are outside of  $C$ .




Figure 2: Extension of an induced-good embedding.

Let us call the obtained graph  $\tilde{K}$ . We have to show that  $\tilde{K}$  is a forest. First, note that every vertex has in-degree at most one. Otherwise, if a vertex  $x$  has two in-neighbors  $y_1, y_2$ , then  $x \in A'_{y_1} \cap A'_{y_2}$ . This contradicts the fact that these sets are disjoint. We also need to show that if  $x, y \in C$  are adjacent, then  $xy$  cannot be oriented in both directions. To see this, suppose that  $xy$  is oriented in both directions, so  $y \in A'_x$  and  $x \in A'_y$  and thus  $h(xy) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(xy) \setminus \{y\}$  are disjoint. This contradicts the fact that  $s \geq 3$ .

Hence, every connected component of  $\tilde{K}$  is unicyclic. So, the only case that  $\tilde{K}$  is not a forest, is that when a vertex  $x \in C \cap V(K)$  has in-degree one. However, this is impossible, because the out-neighbors of each vertex in  $\tilde{K}$  are induced-available with respect to  $K$  and so are not in  $V(K)$ . Hence,  $\tilde{K}$  is a forest. Now, we define  $\hat{K}$  to be the union of  $K$  and  $\tilde{K}$ . By the construction, it is clear that leaves of  $\tilde{K}$  are not in  $C$  and every non-leaf vertex of  $\tilde{K}$  is in  $C$  and has  $D$  children. So, it remains to prove that  $\hat{K}$  is induced-good. To see this, first let  $e_1, e_2 \in E(\hat{K})$  be two non-adjacent edges. If either  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  are in  $E(K)$ , then  $h(e_1) \cap h(e_2) = \emptyset$ , because  $K$  is induced-good and the edges of  $\tilde{K}$  are induced-available with respect to  $K$ . Also, suppose that  $e_1 = xu$  and  $e_2 = yv$  are in  $E(\tilde{K})$ . We know that  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$  are disjoint. We need to show that  $x \notin h(yv)$  and  $y \notin h(xu)$ . Suppose that  $x \in h(yv)$ , then  $x \notin V(K)$  (since  $v$  is an induced-available neighbor of  $y$  with respect to  $K$ ). Thus,  $x \in A'_z$  for some  $z \in C$  and  $v \in A'_y$ . Hence,  $h(zx) \setminus \{z\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$  are disjoint, but  $x$  is in both sets, which is a contradiction. This shows that  $h(xu) \cap h(yv) = \emptyset$ .

Now, suppose that for some  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$ , we have  $|h \cap \text{cl}(\hat{K})| \geq 2$  and  $h \neq h(e)$ , for any  $e \in E(\hat{K})$ . So,  $h$  intersects some hyperedges  $h(xu)$  and  $h(yv)$  for some  $xu, yv \in E(\hat{K})$ . If  $xu, yv \in E(K)$ , then this is impossible because  $K$  is induced-good. If  $xu \notin E(K)$  and  $yv \in E(K)$ , then this is impossible because  $u$  is an induced-available neighbor of  $x$  with respect to  $K$ . Finally, suppose that  $xu, yv \notin E(K)$ . Then,  $u \in A'_x$  and  $v \in A'_y$ , so either  $h$  intersects  $h(xu)$  in just  $x$ , or  $h$  intersects  $h(yv)$  in just  $y$ . By symmetry, assume that the former occurs. If  $x \in V(K)$ , then this is in contradiction with the fact that  $v$  is an induced-available neighbor of  $y$  and if  $x \notin V(K)$ , then  $x \in A'_z$ , for some  $z \in C$  and so  $h$  intersects both  $h(zx) \setminus \{z\}$  (in  $x$ ) and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$ . This is in contradiction with the choice of the sets  $A'_z$ ,  $z \in C$ . Hence,  $\hat{K}$  is induced-good and the proof is complete.

Now, we check that Inequality (6.1) holds. Fix a subset  $I' \subseteq C'$  and let  $T$  be a transversal set for  $N_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(I')$  where  $|T| = \tau(N_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(I'))$ . For the contrary, suppose that  $|T| \leq (2s-3)(D'|I'|-1)$ . Also, let  $I = \{x \in C : x' \in I'\}$  and  $A := I \cup T$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{E} = \{h(xy) \in E(\mathcal{H}) : xy \in E(K^*), x \in I\}$ . For every hyperedge  $h(xy) \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $h(xy) \setminus \{x\}$  intersects  $T$ . So,  $h(xy)$  intersects  $A$  in at least two vertices including  $x$  itself.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= |I| + |T| \leq |I| + (2s - 3)(D'|I| - 1) \\ &< 2sD'|I| \leq 2sD'|C| \\ &\leq \alpha N. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (P4) we have,

$$\frac{10^5 Ds^3 \ln s |I|}{2} \leq |\mathcal{E}| \leq 2|A| < 4sD'|I|.$$

This is a contradiction. So, Inequality (6.1) holds.

Finally, we check the properties of the graph  $L$ . First, suppose that  $e_L(A_x, A_y) \geq 2$ , so there are two hyperedges  $h, h'$  such that  $h$  intersects  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$  and  $h'$  intersects  $h(xu') \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv') \setminus \{y\}$ , for some  $u, u' \in A_x$  and  $v, v' \in A_y$ . But this comes to a Berge cycle of length at most 6, as  $(h(xu), h, h(yv), h(yv'), h', h(xu'), h(xu))$ , a contradiction with (P3) in Lemma 3.1. Hence,  $e_L(A_x, A_y) \leq 1$ .

Now, we prove that  $L$  is  $3s^2$ -degenerate. Suppose that  $U$  is a subset of  $V(L)$ . Let  $A = \bigcup_{x \in C, u \in A_x \cap U} h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$ . Then, for every edge  $uv \in E_L(U)$ , where  $u \in A_x \cap U$  and  $v \in A_y \cap U$ , there exists a hyperedge  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$  which intersects both  $h(xu) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $h(yv) \setminus \{y\}$ . Therefore,  $h$  intersects  $A$  in at least two vertices. On the other hand, we have  $|A| \leq s|U| \leq s|V(L)| \leq s|C|D' \leq \alpha N$ . So, by (P4), we have

$$e_L(U) \leq \sum_{h \in E(\mathcal{H})} \binom{|h \cap A|}{2} \leq \frac{s}{2} \sum_{\substack{h \in E(\mathcal{H}) \\ |h \cap A| \geq 2}} |h \cap A| \leq \frac{5}{4}s|A| \leq \frac{5}{4}s^2|U|.$$

This means that the average degree of  $L[U]$  is at most  $3s^2$  and so  $L$  is  $3s^2$ -degenerate.

Finally, we compute the maximum degree of  $L$ ,  $\Delta_L$ . Let  $u \in A_x$  be a vertex in  $V(L)$ . Note that there are at most  $s\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}$  hyperedges intersecting  $h(xu)$ . Each of these hyperedges contains  $s$  vertices. So,  $\Delta_L \leq s^2\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}$  (note that the upper bound is not  $s^2\Delta_{\mathcal{H}}^2$  because the sets  $h_i^{x'} \setminus \{x'\}$  and  $h_j^{y'} \setminus \{y'\}$  are disjoint). Hence,

$$\Delta_L \leq s^2\Delta_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 8cs^3 \leq (10s)^8 D.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 7 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Recall that  $\ell$  is equal to 6 in the even case and equal to 5 in the general case. Also,  $L_1 = \lfloor (\ell - 1)/2 \rfloor$  and  $L_2 = \lceil (\ell + 1)/2 \rceil$ . In this section, we want to show how we can find an induced-good embedding of  $H^{\sigma'}$  in  $G'$  (defined in Lemma 4.1) such that  $\sigma(e)/L_2 \leq \sigma'(e) \leq \sigma(e)/L_1$  for all  $e \in E(H)$ . This, along with Lemma 4.5, implies the existence of an induced monochromatic copy of  $H^{\sigma}$  in  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  and Theorem 3.5 is proved.

Note that, by Lemma 4.1,  $G'$  has the average degree at least  $(10^7/2)Ds^4 \ln s$ , so there is an induced subgraph  $G''$  of  $G'$  with  $\delta(G'') \geq (10^7/4)Ds^4 \ln s$ . In addition, the sparsity property (Q2) is also valid for  $G''$ .

We fix an ordering on  $E(H)$  as  $e_1, \dots, e_m$  and we embed  $H^{\sigma'}$  in  $G'$  in  $m$  steps. Let us call the vertices of  $V(H)$ , the *original vertices* of  $H^{\sigma'}$  and the vertices that appear after subdivisions the *internal vertices* of  $H^{\sigma'}$ . All original vertices are embedded in the graph  $G''$ . In Step  $i$ , if  $e_i = ab \in E(H)$ , we embed a path of length  $\sigma'(e)$  between  $a$  and  $b$  in  $G'$  following an approach in [9]. This step consists of three phases, as follows (see Figure 3).

Set  $d' = 10^5 Ds^3 \ln s$  and  $d = 20 \times 10^5 Ds^4 \ln s$ .




Figure 3: Scheme of the embedded graph.

1. In the first phase, we grow two disjoint trees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  from the roots  $a$  and  $b$  in  $G''$ , where  $T_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , consists of a path  $P_j$  of length  $\lceil \sigma(e)/(2L_2) \rceil$  along with a tree  $T_j'$  with maximum degree  $D$  and  $|V(T_j')| = \lceil \alpha N/(50s) \rceil$ .

Now, let  $R_j$  be the set of vertices of  $T_j'$  in the last  $\lceil \log_D(\alpha N/(50s)) \rceil - \lfloor \log_D n \rfloor$  levels. Therefore, the height of  $T_j' - R_j$  is at most  $\log_D(n)$  and so,  $v(T_j' - R_j) \leq 2n$ . Also,  $|R_j| \geq \alpha N/(60s)$ .

2. In the second phase, we find a path  $P'$  of length at most  $10^9 sk \ln^2(sD)$  in  $G'$  from a vertex of  $R_1$  to a vertex of  $R_2$  and complete the path between  $a$  and  $b$ , and
3. In the third phase, we delete extra vertices of  $T_1'$  and  $T_2'$  (i.e. vertices of  $T_1'$  and  $T_2'$  except the  $ab$ -path) from the embedded subgraph.

## 7.1 Phase 1. Growing the trees

We always keep two subgraphs  $J_i$  and  $K_i$  of  $G'$  and a set of vertices  $F_i \subseteq V(G' - K_i)$ , where  $J_i$  is a subgraph of  $K_i$  and the following properties hold: (see Figure 4)

- (A1)  $J_i$  is the already embedded subgraph and  $K_i$  is a supergraph of  $J_i$ . Both graphs are induced-good subgraphs of  $G'$  and consist of the graph  $H_i := H^{\sigma'}[e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}]$  and some disjoint trees that are rooted at the original vertices of  $H_i$ . All vertices of these trees are in  $V(G'')$ .
- (A2) Any non-internal non-leaf vertex  $v$  of  $K_i$  has at least  $D - \deg_{H_i}(v)$  children in  $K_i \setminus J_i$  (if  $v \notin V(H_i)$ , then  $\deg_{H_i}(v) = 0$ ).
- (A3) All vertices in  $F_i$  are forbidden and will never be used in the embedded subgraph. Also,  $\text{cl}(K_i) \setminus V(K_i) \subseteq F_i$ .




Figure 4: Subgraphs  $J_i$  and  $K_i$  and the forbidden set  $F_i$ . Red (bold) edges are edges of  $K_i \setminus J_i$ .

(A4) We have  $C_i := C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i) = C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(K_i)$ . Also, if  $N_i$  is the set of non-leaf vertices of  $K_i$ , then  $N_i \subseteq C_i \subseteq F_i \cup N_i$ .

Now, suppose that we have already embedded the graph  $H_i := H^{\sigma'}[e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}]$  and kept the graphs  $J_i, K_i$  and the subset  $F_i$  with the above properties. First, assume that both  $a, b$  are in  $V(H_i)$ . We are going to grow trees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  from  $a$  and  $b$  by adding leaves one by one. Let  $v$  be the vertex to which we are going to add a leaf (in the beginning  $v = a$  or  $v = b$ ). We consider two cases:

(1) If  $v \in C_i$ , then by (A4),  $v$  is a non-leaf of  $K_i$  and by (A2),  $v$  has at least one neighbor  $u$  in  $K_i \setminus J_i$ . So, we can extend  $J_i$  by adding the edge  $uv$ . Thus, the critical vertices do not change<sup>1</sup>. Now, we update  $J_i = J_i + uv$ ,  $K_i := K_i$  and  $F_i := F_i$ .

(2) Now, suppose that  $v \notin C_i$ . So, by (A4), it has at most  $d - 1$  neighbors which are not induced-available with respect to  $K_i$  and since  $\delta(G'') \geq d + d'$ , it has at least  $d' + 1 = 10^5 D s^3 \ln s + 1$  induced-available neighbors with respect to  $K_i$ . If we set  $J'$  to be the graph obtained from  $J_i$  by adding  $d'$  of induced-available neighbors of  $v$ , then  $C' := C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J')$  has some new vertices including  $v$ . Let  $\widehat{C} = C' \setminus C_i$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} e(J') &\leq e(H^\sigma) + v(T'_1) + v(T'_2) + d' \\ &\leq nD + \frac{\alpha N}{25s} + 2 + d' \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha N}{22s} - d'. \end{aligned}$$

So, by Lemma 5.3, we have  $|\widehat{C}| \leq \alpha N / (22sd')$ . Moreover, for each vertex  $u \in \widehat{C}$  (since  $u \notin C_i$ ) there exist at least  $d'$  induced-available neighbors with respect to  $K_i$ . Thus, applying Lemma 6.1 with  $K := K_i$  and  $C := \widehat{C}$ , we can obtain a graph  $\widehat{K}$  such that all leaves of  $\widehat{K}$  are in  $V(G'') \setminus C'$

<sup>1</sup>That holds because the edges of  $K_i$  are among  $d'$  edges chosen in the construction of the critical set (Definition 5.2).

and all non-leaves of  $\widehat{K}$  have  $D$  children. Now, let  $u$  be a neighbor of  $v$  in  $\widehat{K} \setminus J_i$  and update  $J_i := J_i + vu$ ,  $K_i := \widehat{K}$  and  $F_i := F_i \cup (\text{cl}(\widehat{K}) \cup \widehat{C}) \setminus (V(\widehat{K}))$ . It is clear that all conditions (A1)-(A4) remain valid.

Now, suppose that either  $a$  or  $b$ , say  $a$ , is not in  $V(H_i)$ , then we choose an arbitrary vertex in  $V(G'') \setminus (V(K_i) \cup F_i)$  as the vertex  $a$  (in Phase 3, we will see that this set is non-empty). By (A4),  $a$  is not in  $C_i$ . By a similar argument as above, using Lemma 6.1 with  $K = K_i \cup \{a\}$  and  $C = \widehat{C}$ , we can obtain  $\widehat{K}$  and then update  $J_i := J_i + au$ ,  $K_i := \widehat{K}$  and  $F_i := F_i \cup (\text{cl}(\widehat{K}) \cup \widehat{C}) \setminus (V(\widehat{K}))$ , where  $u$  is a neighbor of  $a$  in  $\widehat{K}$ . Again, one may check that (A1)-(A4) are still valid.

## 7.2 Phase 2. Connecting the trees

Now, we want to find an induced-good path in  $G'$  from a vertex of  $R_1$  to a vertex of  $R_2$  and add it to  $J_i$ . First, for every vertex  $v$  in  $V(K_i) \setminus C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i \setminus (R_1 \cup R_2))$ , remove all children of  $v$  from  $K_i$ . Now, since  $v(J_i \setminus (R_1 \cup R_2)) \leq 5n$ , by Lemma 5.3 and (A4), we have  $e(K_i) \leq 6nD$ . Also, note that

$$|\text{cl}_3(K_i)| \leq |\text{cl}_2(K_i)| \Delta_G s \leq |\text{cl}(K_i)| \Delta_G^2 s^2 \leq 6nD \Delta_G^2 s^3 \leq 384Dc^2s^5n.$$

Now for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , set  $A_j := R_j$ . As long as,  $|A_j| \leq |V(G')|/2$ , let  $A_j := A_j \cup N_{G'}(A_j) \setminus \text{cl}_3(K_i)$ . Since  $G'$  is  $\gamma$ -expander with  $\gamma \geq (10^4 sk \log_2(sD))^{-1}$ , after  $t$  steps, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_j| &\geq (1 + \gamma)^t |R_j| - \frac{(1 + \gamma)^t - 1}{\gamma} |\text{cl}_3(K_i)| \geq \frac{(1 + \gamma)^t}{\gamma} (\gamma |R_j| - |\text{cl}_3(K_i)|) \\ &\geq \frac{(1 + \gamma)^t}{\gamma} \left( \frac{\gamma \alpha N}{60s} - 384Dc^2s^5n \right) \geq \frac{\alpha N}{100s} (1 + \gamma)^t. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the last inequality, we assume  $\gamma \alpha N \geq 6 \times 10^4 Dc^2s^6n$ .

Therefore, after at most  $t = \lceil \ln(50s\alpha^{-1}) / \ln(1 + \gamma) \rceil \leq \lceil 2 \ln(50s\alpha^{-1}) / \gamma \rceil$  steps,  $|A_j|$  passes  $|V(G')|/2$ . Hence,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  contain a vertex  $x$  in common. This implies that there is a path  $P'$  of length at most  $2 \lceil 2 \ln(50s\alpha^{-1}) / \gamma \rceil \leq 10^9 sk \ln^2(sD)$  between a vertex  $x_1$  in  $R_1$  and a vertex  $x_2$  in  $R_2$ .

Now, set  $J_i := J_i \cup P'$ . First, we show that  $J_i$  is an induced-good subgraph. Let  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  be two nonadjacent edges in  $J_i$ . If either  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  is in  $E(J_i \setminus (R_1 \cup R_2 \cup P'))$ , then  $h(e_1) \cap h(e_2) = \emptyset$ , since  $J_i$  before adding  $P'$  was induced-good and in the construction of  $P'$ ,  $V(P')$  does not intersect  $\text{cl}_2(K_i)$ . Now, suppose that both  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  belong to  $E(R_1 \cup R_2 \cup P')$ . As the height of  $R_j$  is  $\lceil \log_D(\alpha N / (50s)) \rceil - \lfloor \log_D n \rfloor \leq 10^4 \log_D(sD)$  and  $v(P') \leq 10^9 sk \ln^2(sD)$ , if  $h(e_1) \cap h(e_2) \neq \emptyset$ , then there would be a Berge cycle in  $\mathcal{H}$  of length at most  $10^{10} sk \ln^2(sD)$  which is in contradiction with Property (P3).

Now, we have to check the second condition of induced-goodness. Suppose that  $h \in E(\mathcal{H})$  and  $|h \cap \text{cl}(J_i)| \geq 2$ , say  $h \cap h(e_1) \neq \emptyset$  and  $h \cap h(e_2) \neq \emptyset$  for some  $e_1, e_2 \in E(J_i)$ . We have to show that  $h = h(e)$  for some  $e \in E(J_i)$ . Again if either  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  is in  $E(J_i \setminus (R_1 \cup R_2 \cup P'))$ , then  $h = h(e)$  for some  $e \in E(J_i)$  since  $J_i$  before adding  $P'$  was induced-good and in the construction of  $P'$ ,  $V(P')$  does not intersect  $\text{cl}_3(K_i)$ . Now, if both  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  belong to  $E(R_1 \cup R_2 \cup P')$ , then, by a similar argument as above,  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a Berge cycle of length at most  $10^{10} sk \ln^2(sD)$  which is in contradiction with Property (P3).

Finally, we are going to update  $K_i$  and  $F_i$  as follows. Let  $C^* := C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i) \setminus (V(P') \cup C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i \setminus P'))$ . For every vertex  $v \in C^*$  there exist  $d' + 1 = 10^5 Ds^3 \ln s + 1$  induced-available neighbors with respect to  $K_i$ . At most one of these neighbors is not induced-available for  $K_i \cup P'$ , as otherwise there would be a Berge cycle of length at most  $v(P') + 6 \leq 10^9 sk \ln^2(sD) + 6$ , which

contradicts Property (P3). So, for each vertex  $v \in C^*$  choose  $d'$  induced-available neighbors with respect to  $K_i \cup P'$  and apply Lemma 6.1 by setting  $K = K_i \cup P'$  and  $C = C^*$  to extend  $K_i$  to  $\widehat{K}$ . (Note that  $e(J_i) \leq nD + 2\lceil \alpha N / (50s) \rceil + v(P') \leq \alpha N / (22s) - d'$  and thus by Lemma 5.3, we have  $|C^*| \leq \alpha N / (22sd')$ .) Now, set  $K_i := K_i \cup P' \cup \widehat{K}$  and  $F_i := F_i \cup (\text{cl}(K_i) \cup C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i)) \setminus V(K_i)$ .

Hence, we have a path  $P$  starting from  $a$ , going through  $T_1$ , continuing from a vertex in  $R_1$  through the path  $P'$  and then traversing to  $b$  through  $T_2$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sigma(e)}{L_2} \leq v(P) &\leq \frac{\sigma(e)}{L_2} + 2 \left\lceil \log_D \left( \frac{\alpha N}{50s} \right) \right\rceil + v(P') \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma(e)}{L_2} + 2 \log_D(n) + 10^4 \log_D(sD) + 10^9 sk \ln^2(sD) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma(e)}{L_2} + 2 \log_D(n) + 1.1 \times 10^9 sk \ln^2(sD) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma(e)}{L_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because  $\sigma(e) \geq \eta \log_D(n) + 10^{10} sk \ln^2(sD)$ , where  $\eta = 8$  for the even case and  $\eta = 12$  in the general case.

### 7.3 Phase 3. Rolling backward

In the final phase, we are going to clean the graph  $J_i$  and remove extra vertices in  $K_i \cup F_i$ . First, set  $H_{i+1} := H_i + P$ ,  $U := V(J_i) \setminus V(H_{i+1})$ , and  $J_{i+1} := J_i - U = H_{i+1}$ . Let  $C := C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_i) \setminus C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_{i+1})$  and for every  $v \in C$ , remove all children of  $v$  from  $K_i$ . Now, let  $K_{i+1}$  be the graph obtained from  $K_i$  by removing all connected components which do not intersect  $J_{i+1}$ . Finally, define  $F_{i+1} := (\text{cl}(K_{i+1}) \cup C_{d,d'}^{\text{ind}}(J_{i+1})) \setminus V(K_{i+1})$ . Note that after this cleaning phase, we have  $|V(J_{i+1})| = |V(H_{i+1})| \leq n$ . Also, by Lemma 5.3 and (A4),  $|E(K_{i+1})| \leq D(1 + 1/d')n$  and  $|F_{i+1}| \leq [sD(1 + 2/d')]n$ . Since  $|V(G'')| \geq \alpha N$ , we have  $V(G'') \setminus (V(K_{i+1}) \cup F_{i+1})$  is non-empty.

## 8 Concluding remark

In Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 we distinguish two cases: the case in which the parity of  $\sigma(e)$  ( $e \in E(H)$ ) is arbitrary and the case in which  $\sigma(e)$  is even for every  $e \in E(H)$ . Naturally, in the latter case  $H^\sigma$  is a bipartite graph. In a companion paper [28], we consider the case in which  $H^\sigma$  is bipartite, *without* imposing the hypothesis that  $\sigma(e)$  is even for every  $e$ . In [28], we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 8.1.** *Let  $k, D \geq 2$  be integers, and let  $H$  be a graph with maximum degree  $D$ . Suppose  $H^\sigma$  is a subdivision of  $H$  with  $\sigma(e) \geq 2 \log_{D-1} n$  for every  $e \in E(H)$ , where  $n = v(H^\sigma)$ . Furthermore, suppose  $H^\sigma$  is bipartite. Then*

$$\widehat{R}(H^\sigma, k) \leq k^{400D \log D} n.$$

Our approach in [28] is entirely different from the approach in this paper.

**Remark 8.2.** *The results in this paper are in fact universality statements. Let us say that a graph  $G$  is  $k$ -partition induced universal for a class of graphs  $\mathcal{H}$  if, under every  $k$ -edge coloring of  $G$ , there is some fixed color such that for every member  $H$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ , the graph  $G$  contains an induced copy of  $H$  that is monochromatic with that color. We note that our proof in fact shows that the graphs  $\mathcal{H}(F)$  in Theorem 3.5 are  $k$ -partition induced universal for the classes of graphs  $H^\sigma$  described in that result. An analogous remark holds for Theorem 3.6.*

## References

- [1] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The probabilistic method*, fourth ed., Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2016. MR 3524748
- [2] L. Aragão, M. Campos, G. Dahia, R. Filipe, and J. P. Marciano, *An exponential upper bound for induced Ramsey numbers*, 2025. Available as arXiv:2509.22629.
- [3] M. Axenovich, W. Cames van Batenburg, O. Janzer, L. Michel, and M. Rundström, *An improved upper bound for the multicolour Ramsey number of odd cycles*, 2025. Available as arXiv:2510.17981.
- [4] J. Beck, *On size Ramsey number of paths, trees, and circuits. I*, J. Graph Theory **7** (1983), no. 1, 115–129. MR 693028
- [5] C. Beke, A. Li, and J. Sahasrabudhe, *The multicolour size-Ramsey number of a path*, 2025. Available as arXiv:2511.16656.
- [6] I. Ben-Eliezer, M. Krivelevich, and B. Sudakov, *The size Ramsey number of a directed path*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **102** (2012), no. 3, 743–755. MR 2900815
- [7] S. Berger, Y. Kohayakawa, G. S. Maesaka, T. Martins, W. Mendonça, G. O. Mota, and O. Parczyk, *The size-Ramsey number of powers of bounded degree trees*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. (N.S.) **88** (2019), no. 3, 451–456. MR 4012850
- [8] J. A. Bondy and M. Simonovits, *Cycles of even length in graphs*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **16** (1974), 97–105. MR 340095
- [9] D. Bradač, N. Draganić, and B. Sudakov, *Effective bounds for induced size-Ramsey numbers of cycles*, Combinatorica **44** (2024), no. 5, 1011–1039. MR 4805886
- [10] D. Clemens, M. Jenssen, Y. Kohayakawa, N. Morrison, G. O. Mota, D. Reding, and B. Roberts, *The size-Ramsey number of powers of paths*, J. Graph Theory **91** (2019), no. 3, 290–299. MR 3957380
- [11] W. Deuber, *Generalizations of Ramsey’s theorem*, Infinite and finite sets (Colloq., Keszthely, 1973; dedicated to P. Erdős on his 60th birthday), Vols. I, II, III, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, vol. Vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam-London, 1975, pp. 323–332. MR 369127
- [12] J. Donadelli, P. E. Haxell, and Y. Kohayakawa, *A note on the size-Ramsey number of long subdivisions of graphs*, Theor. Inform. Appl. **39** (2005), no. 1, 191–206. MR 2132587
- [13] N. Draganić, S. Glock, and M. Krivelevich, *Short proofs for long induced paths*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **31** (2022), no. 5, 870–878. MR 4472292
- [14] N. Draganić, M. Krivelevich, and R. Nenadov, *Rolling backwards can move you forward: on embedding problems in sparse expanders*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **375** (2022), no. 7, 5195–5216. MR 4439502
- [15] A. Dudek and P. Prałat, *Note on the multicolour size-Ramsey number for paths*, Electron. J. Combin. **25** (2018), no. 3, Paper No. 3.35, 5. MR 3853887
- [16] P. Erdős, *Problems and results on finite and infinite graphs*, Recent advances in graph theory (Proc. Second Czechoslovak Sympos., Prague, 1974), Academia, Prague, 1975, pp. 183–192. (loose errata). MR 389669

- [17] ———, *On the combinatorial problems which I would most like to see solved*, *Combinatorica* **1** (1981), no. 1, 25–42. MR 602413
- [18] P. Erdős, R. J. Faudree, C. C. Rousseau, and R. H. Schelp, *The size Ramsey number*, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **9** (1978), no. 1-2, 145–161. MR 479691
- [19] P. Erdős, A. Hajnal, and L. Pósa, *Strong embeddings of graphs into colored graphs*, *Infinite and finite sets (Colloq., Keszthely, 1973; dedicated to P. Erdős on his 60th birthday)*, Vols. I, II, III, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, vol. Vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam-London, 1975, pp. 585–595. MR 382049
- [20] J. Friedman and N. Pippenger, *Expanding graphs contain all small trees*, *Combinatorica* **7** (1987), no. 1, 71–76. MR 905153
- [21] A. Girão and E. Hurley, *Embedding induced trees in sparse expanding graphs*, 2024. Available as arXiv:2406.04260.
- [22] J. Han, M. Jenssen, Y. Kohayakawa, G. O. Mota, and B. Roberts, *The multicolour size-Ramsey number of powers of paths*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **145** (2020), 359–375. MR 4117868
- [23] P. E. Haxell, *A condition for matchability in hypergraphs*, *Graphs Combin.* **11** (1995), no. 3, 245–248. MR 1354745
- [24] P. E. Haxell and Y. Kohayakawa, *The size-Ramsey number of trees*, *Israel J. Math.* **89** (1995), no. 1-3, 261–274. MR 1324465
- [25] P. E. Haxell, Y. Kohayakawa, and T. Łuczak, *The induced size-Ramsey number of cycles*, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **4** (1995), no. 3, 217–239. MR 1356576
- [26] Z. Hunter and B. Sudakov, *Induced Ramsey problems for trees and graphs with bounded treewidth*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **153** (2025), no. 9, 3677–3693. MR 4936326
- [27] R. Javadi, F. Khoeini, G. R. Omidi, and A. Pokrovskiy, *On the size-Ramsey number of cycles*, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **28** (2019), no. 6, 871–880. MR 4015660
- [28] R. Javadi, Y. Kohayakawa, and M. Miralaei, *The multicolor size-Ramsey number of bipartite long subdivisions*, 2025, in preparation.
- [29] R. Javadi and M. Miralaei, *The multicolor size-Ramsey numbers of cycles*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **158** (2023), no. part 2, 264–285. MR 4508181
- [30] T. Jiang, K. G. Milans, and D. B. West, *Degree Ramsey numbers for cycles and blowups of trees*, *European J. Combin.* **34** (2013), no. 2, 414–423. MR 2994408
- [31] N. Kamcev, A. Liebenau, D. R. Wood, and L. Yepremyan, *The size Ramsey number of graphs with bounded treewidth*, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **35** (2021), no. 1, 281–293. MR 4223216
- [32] X. Ke, *The size Ramsey number of trees with bounded degree*, *Random Structures Algorithms* **4** (1993), no. 1, 85–97. MR 1192528
- [33] M. Krivelevich, *Expanders—how to find them, and what to find in them*, *Surveys in combinatorics 2019*, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, vol. 456, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2019, pp. 115–142. MR 3967294

- [34] ———, *Long cycles in locally expanding graphs, with applications*, *Combinatorica* **39** (2019), no. 1, 135–151. MR 3936195
- [35] I. Pak, *Mixing time and long paths in graphs*, *Proceedings of the 13th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2002)*, 2002, pp. 321–328.
- [36] F. P. Ramsey, *On a problem of formal logic*, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (2)* **30** (1929), no. 4, 264–286. MR 1576401
- [37] V. Rödl, *The dimension of a graph and generalized ramsey theorems*, Ph.D. thesis, Master’s thesis, Charles University, 1973.
- [38] V. Rödl and E. Szemerédi, *On size Ramsey numbers of graphs with bounded degree*, *Combinatorica* **20** (2000), no. 2, 257–262. MR 1767025
- [39] K. Tikhomirov, *On bounded degree graphs with large size-Ramsey numbers*, *Combinatorica* **44** (2024), no. 1, 9–14. MR 4707562

## A Proof of Theorem 3.6

Here, we give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.6. The proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 3.5, we just need to modify the definition of goodness and critical set to match with the non-induced setting. We omit some proofs which are very similar to the induced setting.

For the host graph, consider the hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  given in Lemma 3.1 satisfying conditions (P1)–(P3) and (P4') with parameters given in Table 2. Also, we set  $F$  as the gadget graph given in Table 1 and take  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$  as the host graph. Now, we define the auxiliary graph  $G$  as follows (since for the general case, we take  $F$  as a Ramsey graph for an odd cycle of unknown length, the auxiliary graph is a bit different with the induced case).

The vertex set of  $G$  is the same as the vertex set of  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Fix an arbitrary  $k$ -edge coloring of  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$ . In the case of even subdivisions, the definition is similar to the induced setting. For each hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}'$ , in its corresponding copy of  $F$ , there exists a monochromatic copy of  $C_6$ . We pick one of these cycles and add an edge in  $G$  between two vertices at distance two in the 6-cycle. Also, we color this edge in  $G$  by the same color of the 6-cycle in  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$ .

Now, for the case of general subdivisions, for each hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}'$ , in its corresponding copy of  $F$ , there exists a monochromatic odd cycle of length at most  $2\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1$ . Let  $\ell$  be the most frequent length among these monochromatic cycles. Therefore, for each hyperedge whose corresponding copy of  $F$  contains a monochromatic cycle  $C_\ell$ , we pick one of these cycles and add an edge in  $G$  between two vertices at distance  $(\ell - 1)/2$  in the  $\ell$ -cycle in  $F$ . Also, we color this edge in  $G$  by the same color of the  $\ell$ -cycle. In the case of even subdivision, we define  $\ell = 6$ . We also define  $L_1 = \lfloor (\ell - 1)/2 \rfloor$  and  $L_2 = \lceil (\ell + 1)/2 \rceil$ .

The following lemma is the counterpart of Lemma 4.1 which elaborates the properties of the graph  $G$ .

**Lemma I.** *The graph  $G$  defined as above has the following properties.*

- (Q1)  $v(G) = v(\mathcal{H}') = N$  and  $\Delta(G) \leq \Delta(\mathcal{H}') \leq 8cs$ . Also, in the case of even subdivision,  $e(G) = e(\mathcal{H}') \in [cN/2, cN]$  and in the general case,  $e(G) \in [cN/(4\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2), cN]$ .
- (Q2) For any  $A \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|A| \leq \alpha N$ , we have  $e_G(A) \leq 2|A|$ .
- (Q3)  $G$  contains a monochromatic subgraph  $G'$  such that

$$- v(G') \geq \alpha N,$$

- the average degree of  $G'$  is at least  $500 s^2 D$ , and
- $G'$  is a  $\gamma$ -expander graph, where  $\gamma \geq (10^4 sk \log_2(sD))^{-1}$  for the even case and  $\gamma \geq (10^4 sk \log_2 k \log_2(sD))^{-1}$  for the general case.

We also change the definition of good subgraph where in the non-induced setting we drop the second condition in Definition 4.4.

**Definition II.** A subgraph  $J$  of  $G$  is said to be a *good subgraph* of  $G$  (with respect to  $\mathcal{H}'$ ) if for every  $e_1, e_2 \in E(J)$ , if  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are not adjacent, then  $h(e_1) \cap h(e_2) = \emptyset$ . Also, an embedding  $\phi : H \hookrightarrow G$  is good, if  $\phi(H)$  is called a good subgraph of  $G$ .

Now, Lemma 4.5 is valid for the non-induced setting.

**Lemma III.** Suppose that  $H^{\sigma'}$  is a monochromatic good subgraph of  $G$  such that  $\sigma(e)/L_2 \leq \sigma'(e) \leq \sigma(e)/L_1$ , for all  $e \in E(H)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{H}'(F)$  contains a monochromatic copy of  $H^\sigma$  as a subgraph.

We also need to define available neighbors in the non-induced setting (see Definition 5.1).

**Definition IV.** Let  $J$  be a subgraph of  $G'$ . A neighbor  $u$  of a vertex  $v \in V(G')$  is called an *available* neighbor of  $v$  (with respect to  $J$ ), if  $h(uv) \setminus \{v\}$  does not intersect  $\text{cl}(J)$ . The set of all available neighbors of  $v$  is denoted by  $A_J(v)$ .

The definition of critical set is the same as Definition 5.2, by replacing the term ‘induced-available’ with ‘available’. Given two positive integers  $d, d' \geq 2$  and a subgraph  $J$  of  $G'$ , the set of  $(d, d')$ -critical vertices of  $J$  is denoted by  $C_{d,d'}(J)$ .

Now, the non-induced counterpart of Lemma 5.3 can be stated as follows.

**Lemma V.** Let  $d, d' \geq 2$  be two positive integers such that  $d = 10 sd'$ . Also, let  $J$  be a subgraph of  $G'$  where  $e(J) \leq \alpha N/(2s) - d'/2$ . Also, let  $X_0$  be the set of all non-leaves of  $J$ . Then,  $|C_{d,d'}(J)| \leq |X_0| + e(J)/d'$ .

The proof of Lemma V is similar to that of Lemma 5.3. We just have to apply (P4') instead of (P4). Finally, we need a variant of Lemma 6.1 to extend good embeddings, which is as follows.

**Lemma VI.** Let  $s \geq 3$  and  $D \geq 2$  be integers and  $K$  be a good subgraph of  $G'$ . Also, let  $C \subseteq V(G')$  be a subset of vertices such that  $|C| \leq \alpha N/(2sD)$ . If for each vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $|A_K(v)| \geq 8sD$ , then  $K$  can be extended to a subgraph  $\widehat{K}$ , where  $\widehat{K}$  is obtained from  $K$  by adding some disjoint trees  $T_1, \dots, T_t$ , where  $t = |V(K) \cap C|$ , with roots in  $V(K) \cap C$  such that

- $\widehat{K}$  is a good subgraph of  $G'$ .
- Every non-leaf vertex of  $T_i$ 's is in  $C$  and has  $D$  children.
- No leaf of  $T_i$ 's is in  $C$ .

The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 6.1, but we apply (P4') instead of (P4) and we use Corollary 2.2 by taking  $D' = D$  (we do not need Lemma 2.4).

Now, we have all ingredients to prove Theorem 3.6. The trajectory of the proof is the same as the proof in Section 7. We are going to find  $H^{\sigma'}$  as a good subgraph in  $G'$ . Note that, by Lemma I,  $G'$  has the average degree at least  $500 s^2 D$ , so there is an induced subgraph  $G''$  of  $G'$  with  $\delta(G'') \geq 250 s^2 D$ .

We follow the proof by setting  $d' = 8sD$  and  $d = 80s^2D$  and parameters  $N, \alpha, c, g$  as in Table 2 (the non-induced column). Everywhere we use Lemmas V and VI instead of Lemmas 5.3 and 6.1, respectively. Also, in Phase 2, we use  $\text{cl}_2(K_i)$  instead of  $\text{cl}_3(K_i)$ .

This concludes our sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.6.