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#### Abstract

We show that there exist linear 3-uniform hypergraphs with $n$ vertices and $\Omega\left(n^{2}\right)$ edges which contain no copy of the $3 \times 3$ grid. This makes significant progress on a conjecture of Füredi and Ruszinkó. We also discuss connections to proving lower bounds for the $(9,6)$ Brown-Erdős-Sós problem and to a problem of Solymosi and Solymosi.


## 1 Introduction

In recent years there has been some interest in Turán-type results for linear hypergraphs [4, 5, 6]. In this paper, all hypergraphs are 3 -uniform. For a family $\mathcal{H}$ of 3 -uniform hypergraphs, we let ex $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{lin}}(n, \mathcal{H})$ denote the maximum number of edges in a linear 3 -uniform $\mathcal{H}$-free hypergraph on $n$ vertices. When $\mathcal{H}$ has a single element $H$, we will write $\operatorname{ex}_{\text {lin }}(n, H)$. Arguably, the interest in problems of this type is motivated by the famous Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture [1, 2], which states that, for every $k \geq 3$, if $\mathcal{H}_{k+3, k}$ is the set of all 3 -uniform hypergraphs with $k$ edges and at most $k+3$ vertices (such hypergraphs are called $(k+3, k)$-configurations $)$, then ${ }^{1} \operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{k+3, k}\right)=o\left(n^{2}\right)$. So far, this conjecture has only been proven in the case $k=3$. This is a celebrated result of Ruzsa and Szemerédi [7], which became known as the $(6,3)$ theorem. Ruzsa and Szemerédi [7] have also given a construction which shows that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{6,3}\right) \geq n^{2-o(1)}$, implying that the exponent 2 in the $(6,3)$ theorem cannot be improved. For $k \geq 4$, the Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture remains widely open despite considerable effort, with the best approximate result recently obtained in [3] (see also [8, 10]).

It is easy to check that $\mathcal{H}_{6,3}$ contains only one linear hypergraph: the triangle $\mathbb{T}$, which is the hypergraph with vertices $1,2,3,4,5,6$ and edges $\{1,2,3\},\{3,4,5\},\{5,6,1\}$. Thus, the aforementioned results of Ruzsa and Szemerédi [7] are equivalent to the statement $n^{2-o(1)} \leq \operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}(n, \mathbb{T}) \leq o\left(n^{2}\right)$.

It is natural to try and prove that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{k+3, k}\right) \geq n^{2-o(1)}$ for every $k \geq 3$, which would mean that, in a sense, the Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture is optimal. For $k=4,5$, such a lower bound follows from the simple observation that every $(7,4)$ - or $(8,5)$-configuration contains a $(6,3)$-configuration. Similar considerations were used in [5] to handle the cases $k=7,8$. For $k=6$, however, such arguments could not be used, since there exists a $(9,6)$-configuration which contains no ( 6,3 )-configuration; this is the $3 \times 3$ grid $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$, which is the 3-uniform hypergraph whose vertices are the nine points in a $3 \times 3$ point array, and whose edges correspond to the 6 horizontal and vertical lines of this array. It

[^0]is not hard to verify ${ }^{2}$ (see also [5]) that every linear ( 9,6 )-configuration either contains a triangle $\mathbb{T}$ or is isomorphic to $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$. Hence, $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{9,6}\right) \geq \operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n,\left\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right\}\right)$. This relation has led Füredi and Ruszinkó [4] to study extremal problems related to the grid. In particular, they conjectured that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right)=\left(\frac{1}{6}-o(1)\right) n^{2}$, and, more strongly, that for every large enough admissible $n$, there exists a Steiner triple system of order $n$ which is $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}-$ free. Using a standard probabilistic alterations argument, Füredi and Ruszinkó [4] showed that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right)=\Omega\left(n^{1.8}\right)$. This was then slightly improved (as a special case of a more general result) to $\Omega\left(n^{1.8} \log ^{1 / 5} n\right)$ by Shangguan and Tamo [9]. Here we make significant progress on the conjecture of Füredi and Ruszinkó [4], by showing that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right)=\Omega\left(n^{2}\right)$.

Theorem 1. For infinitely many $n$, there exists a linear $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$-free 3 -uniform hypergraph with $n$ vertices and $\left(\frac{1}{16}-o(1)\right) n^{2}$ edges.

Theorem 1 is proved in the following section. Then, in Section 3, we discuss some related open problems.

## 2 The Construction

Construction 2.1. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field and let $X, A \subseteq \mathbb{F}$. Define $H(X, A)$ to be the 3-partite 3-uniform hypergraph with sides $X, Y:=\{x+a: x \in X, a \in A\}$ and $Z:=\{x \cdot a: x \in X, a \in A\}$, and with an edge $(x, x+a, x \cdot a) \in X \times Y \times Z$ for every $x \in X$ and $a \in A$.

We now prove that the hypergraph $H(X, A)$ defined in Construction 2.1 is always $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$-free. We will then show that it contains a dense linear subhypergraph. We denote the vertices of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ by $\left\{p_{i}, q_{i}, r_{i}: 1 \leq i \leq 3\right\}$ and its edges by $\left\{\left\{p_{i}, q_{i}, r_{i}\right\},\left\{p_{i+1}, q_{i+2}, r_{i}\right\}: 1 \leq i \leq 3\right\}$, where (here and later on) indices are taken modulo 3. A 3-partition of a 3-uniform hypergraph $F$ is a partition $V(F)=$ $P \cup Q \cup R$ such that every edge of $F$ contains one element from each of the sets $P, Q, R$. Observe that $\left\{p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3}\right\},\left\{q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3}\right\},\left\{r_{1}, r_{2}, r_{3}\right\}$ is a 3 -partition of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$. It can be verified ${ }^{3}$ that every two 3 -partitions of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ are equivalent, in the sense that there is an automorphism of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ which maps every class of one to a class of the other.

Lemma 2.2. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field and let $X, A \subseteq \mathbb{F}$. Then $H(X, A)$ is $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$-free.
Proof. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $H(X, A)$ contains a copy of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$. Since all 3partitions of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ are equivalent (as explained above), we may assume, without loss of generality, that $p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3} \in X, q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3} \in Y=\{x+a: x \in X, a \in A\}$ and $r_{1}, r_{2}, r_{3} \in Z=\{x \cdot a: x \in X, a \in A\}$. By definition of $H(X, A)$, for every edge $\{x, y, z\} \in E(H)$ (with $x \in X, y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$ ) there is $a \in A$ such that $y=x+a$ and $z=x \cdot a$; hence, $z=x \cdot(y-x)$. It follows that for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we must have $r_{i}=p_{i} \cdot\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right)$ and $r_{i}=p_{i+1} \cdot\left(q_{i+2}-p_{i+1}\right)$. Here and throughout the proof, indices are taken modulo 3. By comparing these two expressions for $r_{i}$, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{i} \cdot\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right)=p_{i+1} \cdot\left(q_{i+2}-p_{i+1}\right) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^1]for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Multiplying (1) by $p_{i+2}$ and then summing over $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we obtain
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{3} p_{i} p_{i+2} \cdot\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{3} p_{i+1} p_{i+2} \cdot\left(q_{i+2}-p_{i+1}\right)
$$

It is easy to see that for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$, both sides have the term $p_{i} p_{i+2} q_{i}$. Cancelling out these terms and rearranging, we get

$$
0=\sum_{i=1}^{3} p_{i}^{2} p_{i+2}-\sum_{i=1}^{3} p_{i+1}^{2} p_{i+2}=\left(p_{1}-p_{2}\right)\left(p_{2}-p_{3}\right)\left(p_{3}-p_{1}\right) .
$$

Hence, there must be $1 \leq i \leq 3$ such that $p_{i+1}=p_{i}$. However, this is impossible as $p_{1}, p_{2}, p_{3} \in X$ must correspond to distinct vertices of a copy of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$. This contradiction completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first prove Theorem 1 with a slightly worse bound, namely, with the fraction $\frac{1}{16}$ replaced by $\frac{1}{18}$. We then explain how our argument can be modified to give $\frac{1}{16}$.

Let $p$ be an odd prime power, and set $X:=A:=\mathbb{F}_{p} \backslash\{0\}$. Let $H=H(X, A)$ be the hypergraph from Construction 2.1. By Lemma 2.2, $H$ is $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$-free. We claim that for each edge $e=(x, x+a, x \cdot a) \in$ $E(H) \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$, if $f \in E(H) \backslash\{e\}$ satisfies that $|e \cap f|=2$ then $f=(a, x+a, x \cdot a)$. So let $f=(y, y+b, y \cdot b) \in E(H) \backslash\{e\}$ be such that $|e \cap f|=2$. We cannot have $(x, x+a)=(y, y+b)$ or $(x, x \cdot a)=(y, y \cdot b)$, for otherwise we would have $x=y, a=b$ and hence $e=f$. Therefore, we must have $(x+a, x \cdot a)=(y+b, y \cdot b)$, which gives $y(x+a-y)=x \cdot a$. Solving this quadratic equation for $y$, we get that $y=x$ or $y=a$, and hence $(y, b)=(x, a)$ or $(y, b)=(a, x)$. In the former case, $f=e$, and in the latter case $f=(a, x+a, x \cdot a)$. This proves our claim. It follows that for each $e \in E(H)$ there is at most one other edge $f \in E(H)$ such that $|e \cap f|=2$. By deleting one edge from each such pair $(e, f)$, we obtain a linear sub-hypergraph $H^{\prime}$ of $H$ with $e\left(H^{\prime}\right) \geq \frac{e(H)}{2}=|X||A|=\left(\frac{1}{2}-o(1)\right) p^{2}=\left(\frac{1}{18}-o(1)\right) v(H)^{2}$, where in the last equality we used the fact that $v(H)=3 p-2$ as $|X|=p-1,|Y|=p$ and $Z=p-1$. This shows that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right) \geq\left(\frac{1}{18}-o(1)\right) n^{2}$.

To improve the constant, we choose $X$ and $A$ differently: let $X$ be the set of (non-zero) quadratic residues and $A$ be the set of (non-zero) quadratic non-residues in $\mathbb{F}_{p}$. Evidently, $|X|=|A|=\frac{p-1}{2}$ and $|Y| \leq p$. As $Z=\{x \cdot a: x \in X, a \in A\}=A$, one also has $|Z|=\frac{p-1}{2}$. Altogether we get $v(H)=|X|+|Y|+|Z| \leq 2 p-1$. Moreover, $e(H)=|X||A|=\left(\frac{1}{4}-o(1)\right) p^{2}=\left(\frac{1}{16}-o(1)\right) v(H)^{2}$. Crucially, we observe that $H$ is linear, because for every $e=(x, x+a, x \cdot a) \in E(H)$, the edge $f=(a, x+a, x \cdot a)$ is not in $H$, as $x$ is a quadratic residue while $a$ is not. This completes the proof.

## 3 Concluding Remarks And Open Problems

- Another problem raised in [4] is to prove that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{9,6}\right) \geq n^{2-o(1)}$. This problem remains open. Recalling that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{9,6}\right) \geq \operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n,\left\{\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}\right\}\right)$, we see, in light of Lemma 2.2, that it suffices to find a choice of sets $X, A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p},|X|,|A| \geq p^{1-o(1)}$, such that the hypergraph $H(X, A)$ has no triangles (i.e., no copies of $\mathbb{T}$ ). For this, one needs that there are no $x \in X$ and distinct $a, b, c \in A$ such that $(x+a-b) \cdot b=x \cdot c$.
- There is another construction of a linear 3-uniform grid-free hypergraph with $\Omega\left(n^{2}\right)$ edges. For sets $X, A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p}$, define a 3-partite hypergraph with sides $X, Y, Z$ by placing the edge $\left(x, x+a, x+a^{2}\right) \in X \times Y \times Z$ for every $x \in X, a \in A$. Here one needs to be more careful: unlike Construction 2.1, this hypergraph can contain a copy of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$, but only if there are $x_{1}, x_{2} \in X$ and $a \in A$ satisfying $4 x_{1}+4 a=4 x_{2}+1$. Let us prove this. Consider a copy of
$\mathbb{G}_{3,3}$ with vertices $\left\{p_{i}, q_{i}, r_{i}: 1 \leq i \leq 3\right\}$, as described before Lemma 2.2. Here, this copy corresponds to the equations $r_{i}-p_{i}=\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right)^{2}$ and $r_{i}-p_{i+1}=\left(q_{i+2}-p_{i+1}\right)^{2}$ for $i=1,2,3$. Hence, $p_{i}+\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right)^{2}=p_{i+1}+\left(q_{i+2}-p_{i+1}\right)^{2}$. Substituting $u_{i}:=p_{i+1}-p_{i}$ and $v_{i}:=q_{i}-p_{i+1}(i=1,2,3)$, we get $\left(v_{i}+u_{i}\right)^{2}=u_{i}+\left(v_{i+2}-u_{i}\right)^{2}$, and, after rearranging,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2}-1\right) u_{i}=v_{i+2}^{2}-v_{i}^{2} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, if $2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2} \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$, then in equation (2) we can divide and get $u_{i}=$ $\left(v_{i+2}^{2}-v_{i}^{2}\right) /\left(2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2}-1\right)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Summing this over $i$ and using the fact that $u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}=\left(p_{2}-p_{1}\right)+\left(p_{3}-p_{2}\right)+\left(p_{1}-p_{3}\right)=0$, we get

$$
0=\sum_{i=1}^{3} u_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{v_{i+2}^{2}-v_{i}^{2}}{2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2}-1}=\frac{-2\left(v_{3}-v_{1}\right)\left(v_{1}-v_{2}\right)\left(v_{2}-v_{3}\right)}{\left(2 v_{1}+2 v_{3}-1\right)\left(2 v_{2}+2 v_{1}-1\right)\left(2 v_{3}+2 v_{2}-1\right)} .
$$

Hence, there must be $1 \leq i \leq 3$ such that $v_{i+2}=v_{i}$. Plugging this into (2) and using that $2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2} \neq 1$, we get that $u_{i}=p_{i+1}-p_{i}=0$, which is impossible as $p_{i}, p_{i+1}$ are distinct vertices. Therefore, there must be $1 \leq i \leq 3$ such that $2 v_{i}+2 v_{i+2}=1$, hence also $v_{i+2}^{2}-v_{i}^{2}=0$ by (2). Plugging $v_{i+2}=1 / 2-v_{i}$ into $v_{i+2}^{2}-v_{i}^{2}=0$, we get that $v_{i}=1 / 4$, hence $q_{i}-p_{i+1}=1 / 4$. Now, recall that by construction, $p_{i}, p_{i+1} \in X$ and $q_{i}=p_{i}+a$ for some $a \in A$. Hence, we have our desired solution to $4 x_{1}+4 a=4 x_{2}+1$ with $x_{1}, x_{2} \in X, a \in A$. So in order for the hypergraph to be $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$-free, it suffices to choose $X, A$ that avoid such solutions; for example, one can take $X=A=\{1, \ldots,\lfloor p / 8\rfloor\}$.
This construction can also be a candidate for showing that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{9,6}\right) \geq n^{2-o(1)}$. Again, the issue is choosing $X, A$ so as to avoid triangles, which in this case correspond to solutions to the equation $a+c^{2}-c=b^{2}$ with distinct $a, b, c \in A$. Thus, in order to show that $\operatorname{ex}_{\operatorname{lin}}\left(n, \mathcal{H}_{9,6}\right) \geq$ $n^{2-o(1)}$, it suffices to show that there exists $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p},|A|=p^{1-o(1)}$, with no non-trivial solution to this equation.

- A related conjecture of Solymosi and Solymosi [10] states that every (large enough) 3-uniform hypergraph with $n$ vertices and $\Omega\left(n^{2}\right)$ edges contains a 2 -core on at most 9 vertices, where a 2 -core is a hypergraph with minimum degree 2 . This conjecture is closely related ${ }^{4}$ to the case $k=6$ of the Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture, since a 2 -core on 9 vertices has at least 6 edges.
Let $H$ be the 3 -partite hypergraph with sides $X, Y, Z$, all equal to $\mathbb{F}_{p}$, and with edge-set $\left\{(x, x+a, x+2 a) \in X \times Y \times Z: x, a \in \mathbb{F}_{p}\right\}$. Alternatively, this is the hypergraph whose edges are all triples $(x, y, z) \in X \times Y \times Z$ satisfying $y=(x+z) / 2$. By a somewhat lengthy case analysis, one can show that $H$ avoids all 2 -cores on at most 9 vertices except for the grid $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$. Thus, the hypergraph corresponding to a linear relation (namely, the relation $y=(x+z) / 2$ ) avoids all but one of the 2 -cores on at most 9 vertices, whereas in order to avoid $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ one needs a non-linear relation (as in Construction 2.1 or in the construction described in the previous item). It would be interesting to understand the connection between the structure of a configuration $F$ and the relation which can be used to define a hypergraph which avoids $F$.

We note that inspite of the above construction, it is plausible that the Solymosi-Solymosi conjecture is true; namely, that while there exist dense linear hypergraphs which avoid any individual 2 -core on at most 9 vertices (and even hypergraphs which avoid all but one of them), avoiding all such 2-cores in a dense linear hypergraph is impossible.

[^2]
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    ${ }^{1}$ The Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture is usually stated about general (i.e., not necessarily linear) hypergraphs, but it is well-known that it suffices to consider linear hypergraphs. Indeed, if a hypergraph $H$ contains no $(k+3, k)$-configuration, then every pair of vertices is contained in at most $k-1$ edges, so $H$ has a linear subhypergraph with at least $e(H) /(k-1)=$ $\Omega(e(H))$ edges.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Indeed, let $H$ be a linear (9,6)-configuration avoinding $\mathbb{T}$. First, observe that $H$ has maximum degree 2, for if $\{a, b, c\},\{a, d, e\},\{a, f, g\}$ are three edges containing $a$, then there can be only one edge containing the remaining two vertices (as $H$ is linear), so there must be an edge which contains two vertices from $\{b, c, d, e, f, g\}$, which gives a $\mathbb{T}$. Now, as $e(H)=6$, all degrees in $H$ must be 2. Consider the two edges $\{a, b, c\},\{a, d, e\}$ containing some vertex $a$. Let $f, g, h, i$ be the four remaining vertices. Each of the four remaining edges must contain two vertices from $\{f, g, h, i\}$ and one from $\{b, c, d, e\}$. Every vertex from $\{b, c, d, e\}$ must be covered once by these edges, and every vertex from $\{f, g, h, i\}$ twice. Hence, the pairs from $\{f, g, h, i\}$ which are covered by these edges must form a $C_{4}$. Since $H$ is $\mathbb{T}$-free, $b$ and $c$ must be contained in opposite edges of this $C_{4}$, and the same for $d$ and $e$. This gives a $\mathbb{G}_{3,3}$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Indeed, every 3 -partition of $\mathbb{G}_{3 \times 3}$ is either obtained from the 3-partition $(P, Q, R)$ by permuting its classes, or equals ( $\left.\left\{p_{1}, q_{3}, r_{2}\right\},\left\{p_{2}, q_{1}, r_{3}\right\},\left\{p_{3}, q_{2}, r_{1}\right\}\right)$ or one of its permutations.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Strictly speaking, the Solymosi-Solymosi conjecture does not imply the case $k=6$ of the Brown-Erdős-Sós conjecture, since the former allows the 2 -core to have less than 9 vertices, and hence less than 6 edges.

