

Distribution of colours in rainbow H -free colourings

Zhuo Wu*

Jun Yan†

Abstract

An edge colouring of K_n with k colours is a *Gallai k -colouring* if it does not contain any rainbow triangle. Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales proved that there exists a number $g(k)$ such that $n \geq g(k)$ if and only if for any colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) with $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$, there exist a Gallai k -colouring of K_n with e_i edges having colour i . They also showed that $\Omega(k) = g(k) = O(k^2)$ and posed the problem of determining the exact order of magnitude of $g(k)$. Feffer, Fu and Yan improved both bounds significantly by proving $\Omega(k^{1.5}/\log k) = g(k) = O(k^{1.5})$. We resolve this problem by showing $g(k) = \Theta(k^{1.5}/(\log k)^{0.5})$.

Moreover, we generalise these definitions by considering rainbow H -free colourings of K_n for any general graph H , and the natural corresponding quantity $g(H, k)$. We prove that $g(H, k)$ is finite for every k if and only if H is not a forest, and determine the order of $g(H, k)$ when H contains a subgraph with minimum degree at least 3.

1 Introduction

An edge colouring of K_n using k colours is a map $c : E(K_n) \rightarrow [k]$, where the colour of an edge uv is $c(uv)$. Given a simple graph H and an edge colouring of K_n , we say that this colouring contains a *rainbow copy* of H if there exists a subgraph of K_n isomorphic to H , whose edges all have different colours. Otherwise, we say this colouring is *rainbow H -free*.

For non-negative integers e_1, \dots, e_k , we say the sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) is *n -good* iff $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$. An edge colouring of the complete graph K_n using k colours is said to have *colour distribution sequence* (e_1, \dots, e_k) if exactly e_i edges have colour i for every $i \in [k]$. In this case, we also say that this is an (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n .

In [8], Gyárfás and Simonyi initiated the study of rainbow K_3 -free colourings of K_n . They named these colourings Gallai colourings, referring to Gallai's related work [5] on comparability graphs. Since then, many Ramsey-type results [7, 8, 9] and enumeration results [1, 2, 3] for Gallai colourings have been obtained.

A new avenue of research on the distribution of colours in Gallai colourings was proposed by Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales in [6]. They proved the following theorem, which says that as long as we have sufficiently many vertices, any colour distribution sequence can be realised as a Gallai colouring.

Theorem 1.1 ([6]). *For every integer $k \geq 2$, there exists an integer N such that for all $n \geq N$ and all non-negative integers e_1, \dots, e_k satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$, there exists a Gallai colouring of K_n with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) .*

In [6], Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales denoted the smallest such integer N by $g(k)$. They also gave the estimate $2k - 2 \leq g(k) \leq 8k^2 + 1$, and posed the problem of determining the exact

*Mathematics Institute and DIMAP, University of Warwick, UK. Email: Zhuo.Wu@warwick.ac.uk. Supported by the Warwick Mathematics Institute Centre for Doctoral Training and funding from University of Warwick.

†Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, UK. Email: jun.yan@warwick.ac.uk. Supported by the Warwick Mathematics Institute Centre for Doctoral Training and funding from the UK EPSRC (Grant number: EP/W523793/1).

order of magnitude of $g(k)$. The gap was closed considerably when Feffer, Fu and Yan [4] proved that $\Omega(k^{1.5}/\log k) \leq g(k) \leq O(k^{1.5})$. The first main result of this paper resolves this problem.

Theorem 1.2. $g(k) = \Theta(k^{1.5}/(\log k)^{0.5})$.

Motivated by this result, we study a generalised version of this problem. We first generalise the quantity $g(k)$ to $g(H, k)$ as follows.

Definition 1.3. Let H be a graph and let k be a positive integer. Define $g(H, k)$ to be the smallest integer N , such that for all $n \geq N$ and all non-negative integers e_1, \dots, e_k satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$, there exists a rainbow H -free colouring of K_n with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) . If such N does not exist, define $g(H, k) = \infty$.

Note that setting $H = K_3$ recovers the definition of $g(k)$. Moreover, we have the following simple property of $g(H, k)$.

Lemma 1.4. If H_1 is a subgraph of H_2 , then $g(H_1, k) \geq g(H_2, k)$.

Proof. This follows from the observation that any rainbow H_1 -free graph is also rainbow H_2 -free. \square

The natural questions of interest regarding $g(H, k)$ are the following.

Question 1.5. For what graphs H and integers k is $g(H, k)$ finite? If $g(H, k)$ is finite, What is the order of magnitude for $g(H, k)$ in terms of k ?

It turns out that the behaviour of $g(H, k)$ depends a graph parameter called degeneracy. We recall this definition below.

Definition 1.6. Let H be a graph and let k be a positive integer.

- H is k -degenerate if every subgraph H' of H has a vertex of degree at most k .
- The degeneracy of H is the smallest positive integer k for which H is k -degenerate.

As two examples, 1-degenerate graphs are exactly forests, and every graph with degeneracy at least k contains a subgraph of minimum degree at least k . With this definition in mind, the results we will prove in this paper are the following.

Theorem 1.7. If H is a forest, or equivalently have degeneracy 1, then $g(H, k) = \infty$ for all sufficiently large k .

Theorem 1.8. If H is a graph on m vertices with degeneracy at least 3, then $g(H, k) = \Theta_m(k)$.

Theorem 1.9. If H is a graph on m vertices with degeneracy 2, then

$$\Omega_m(k) \leq g(H, k) \leq O(k^{1.5}/(\log k)^{0.5}).$$

The paper is organised as follows. We prove Theorem 1.7, Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9 in Section 2, Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. Note that the upper bound in Theorem 1.9 also gives the upper bound in Theorem 1.2. Finally, we prove the lower bound of Theorem 1.2 in Section 5.

2 Trees

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.7. Note that any forest is the subgraph of a tree, therefore, by Lemma 1.4, it suffices to prove Theorem 1.7 in the case when H is a tree. In fact, we will prove the following stronger result.

Theorem 2.1. *For every integer $m \geq 2$, there exists a constant $D = D(m)$ such that the following holds: If H be any tree on m vertices, then any edge colouring of K_n such that every colour is used to colour at most $\frac{1}{D} \binom{n}{2}$ edges contains a rainbow copy of H .*

Note that the condition in Theorem 2.1 implies implicitly that $\frac{1}{D} \binom{n}{2} \geq 1$, or equivalently $n \geq \Omega(\sqrt{D})$.

We first show that the Theorem 2.1 implies Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $D = D(m)$ be the constant in Theorem 2.1. Let $k \geq \lfloor 2D \rfloor$ be an integer. For any sufficiently large integer n , assume that $\binom{n}{2} = qk + r$, where $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Set $e_1 = e_2 = \dots = e_{k-r} = q$ and $e_{k-r+1} = \dots = e_k = q + 1$. Then (e_1, \dots, e_k) is n -good and

$$e_i \leq 1 + \frac{1}{k} \binom{n}{2} \leq \frac{1}{D} \binom{n}{2}$$

for all $i \in [k]$. Hence, by Theorem 2.1, any colouring of K_n with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) contains a rainbow copy of H . From definition, this proves $g(H, k) = \infty$. \square

We will prove Theorem 2.1 with $D(m) = (6m)^{6m}$. Given an edge colouring c of K_n and any vertex $v \in V$, let

$$C(v) = \bigcup_{v' \in V \setminus \{v\}} \{c(vv')\}$$

be the set of colours assigned to edges adjacent to v . The following technical lemma shows that at least half of the vertices satisfy $|C(v)| \geq 2m + 1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer and let $D = (6m)^{6m}$. Let c be an edge colouring of K_n such that every colour is used to colour at most $\frac{1}{D} \binom{n}{2}$ edges. Then there are at most $\frac{1}{2}n$ vertices v such that $|C(v)| \leq 2m$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by contradiction. Assume that there is a set V_0 of at least $\frac{1}{2}n$ vertices $v \in V(K_n)$ such that $|C(v)| \leq 2m$. We show by induction that for every integer $0 \leq j \leq 2m$, we can find a subset V_j of V_0 such that

$$\left| \bigcap_{v \in V_j} C(v) \right| \geq j \quad \text{and} \quad |V_j| \geq \frac{n}{2(6m)^j}.$$

The base case follows from the definition of V_0 . Suppose now we have picked V_j as required for some $0 \leq j \leq 2m - 1$. Without loss of generality, assume that

$$\{1, 2, \dots, j\} \subseteq \bigcap_{v \in V_j} C(v).$$

From the assumption, there are at most $\frac{j \binom{n}{2}}{D}$ edges coloured with one of the colours $1, 2, \dots, j$. Hence, by pigeonhole, there exists a vertex $u \in V_j$ such that there are at most $\frac{2j \binom{n}{2}}{D|V_j|}$ edges adjacent to u with colour $1, 2, \dots, j$. Note that for any $u' \in V_j \setminus \{u\}$, the colour $c(uu')$ of the edge uu' must belong to the set $C(u)$, which has size at most $2m$. By pigeonhole again, there exists some colour $q \in C(u) \setminus [j]$ such that at least

$$\frac{|V_j| - 1 - \frac{2j \binom{n}{2}}{D|V_j|}}{2m - j}$$

vertices $u' \in V_j \setminus \{u\}$ satisfy $c(uu') = q$. Set

$$V_{j+1} = \{u' \mid u' \in V_j \setminus \{u\} \text{ and } c(uu') = q.\}$$

We verify that V_{j+1} works.

Indeed, the first condition holds as

$$\{1, 2, \dots, j, q\} \subseteq \bigcap_{v \in V_{j+1}} C(v).$$

For the second condition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{j+1}| &\geq \frac{|V_j| - 1 - \frac{2j \binom{n}{2}}{D|V_j|}}{2m - j} \\ &\geq \frac{|V_j| - 1 - \frac{2j(n-1)(6m)^j}{D}}{2m} && \text{by } |V_j| \geq \frac{n}{2(6m)^j} \\ &\geq \frac{|V_j| - 1 - \frac{n}{(6m)^{2m}}}{2m} && \text{by } D = D(m) = (6m)^{6m} \\ &\geq \frac{|V_j|}{6m} \geq \frac{n}{2(6m)^{j+1}}, && \text{by } |V_j| \geq \frac{n}{2(6m)^j} \end{aligned}$$

as required. Hence, we can pick the sets V_0, V_1, \dots, V_{2m} by induction.

Note that for any $u \in V_{2m}$, we have

$$2m \geq |C(u)| \geq \left| \bigcap_{v \in V_{2m}} C(v) \right| \geq 2m.$$

Hence, there exists a set C of size $2m$ such that $C(u) = C$ for all $u \in V_{2m}$. In particular, for any two vertices $u, u' \in V_{2m}$, the colour of the edge uu' must belong to this set C . Therefore, we have

$$\binom{|V_{2m}|}{2} \leq 2m \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{D}.$$

However,

$$\binom{|V_{2m}|}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4} |V_{2m}|^2 \geq \frac{n^2}{16(6m)^{4m}} \geq \frac{n^2}{(6m)^{5m}} > 2m \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{D},$$

a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.2. \square

Now we can prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We will show that $D(m) = (6m)^{6m}$ works. Proceed by induction on m . The case $m = 2$ is trivial. Suppose we have already established the theorem for all trees with fewer than m vertices. Since H is a tree, it has a leaf v_0 . Let the vertices in H be $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}$, and suppose the unique edge adjacent to v_0 is v_0v_1 . Let $H' = H - v_0$.

Let G' be the subgraph of K_n induced by the set of vertices v satisfying $|C(v)| \geq 2m + 1$, then G' contains at least $\frac{1}{2}n$ vertices by Lemma 2.2. From assumption, each colour is used at most

$$\frac{\binom{n}{2}}{D(m)} \leq \frac{\binom{|v(G')|}{2}}{D(m-1)}$$

times in G' . Therefore, we may apply induction hypothesis to find a rainbow copy of H' in G' . Suppose vertex v_i in H' is embedded to vertex u_i in G' for all $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Note that

$$\left| \bigcup_{v \in V \setminus \{u_2, \dots, u_{m-1}\}} \{c(u_1v)\} \right| \geq |C(u_1)| - (m-2) \geq m-1.$$

Hence, we can find a vertex $u_0 \in V \setminus \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{m-1}\}$ such that the edge u_0u_1 has a different colour to all $m-2$ edges in this rainbow copy of H' . It follows that there exists a rainbow copy of H in K_n with vertices u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{m-1} . \square

3 Graphs with degeneracy at least 3

In this section we look at the case when H is a graph with degeneracy at least 3 and prove Theorem 1.8. We begin with the lower bound.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $n \geq m \geq 3$ and $e_1, \dots, e_k \geq 0$ are integers such that (e_1, \dots, e_k) is n -good and*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{e_i}{2} < \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{m(m-1)(m-2)}.$$

Then any (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n contains a rainbow copy of K_m .

Proof. Fix an (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n . For each $i \in [k]$, let E_i be the set of edges in K_n that has colour i . Pick a size m subset U of $[n]$ uniformly at random. For each $i \in [k]$ and any distinct edges $e, e' \in E_i$, the probability that both e and e' are in U is either $\frac{\binom{n-3}{m-3}}{\binom{n}{m}} = \frac{m(m-1)(m-2)}{n(n-1)(n-2)}$ if e and e' share a vertex, or $\frac{\binom{n-4}{m-4}}{\binom{n}{m}} = \frac{m(m-1)(m-2)(m-3)}{n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)} \leq \frac{m(m-1)(m-2)}{n(n-1)(n-2)}$ if they don't. Using a union bound, we see that the expected number of monochromatic edge pairs in U is at most

$$\frac{m(m-1)(m-2)}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^k \binom{e_i}{2} < 1.$$

Hence, there exists a realisation of U such that the complete graph induced by the m vertices in U is rainbow. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let H be a graph on m vertices. Then $g(H, k) \geq k/m^3$ for all sufficiently large k .*

Proof. When $m \leq 2$, the theorem is trivial. When $m \geq 3$, let $n = \lfloor k/m^3 \rfloor$ and assume k is large enough so that $\binom{n}{2} \geq k$. Suppose that $\binom{n}{2} = qk + r$, where $0 \leq r \leq k-1$. Set $e_1 = e_2 = \dots = e_{k-r} = q$ and $e_{k-r+1} = \dots = e_k = q+1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \binom{e_i}{2} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2} \left(\binom{n}{k} + 1 \right) \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{k} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\binom{n}{2}^2}{k^2} < \frac{n^4}{4k} \leq \frac{n^3}{4m^3} \\ &\leq \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{m(m-1)(m-2)}. \end{aligned}$$

So by Lemma 3.1, we can find a rainbow copy of K_m , and hence a rainbow copy of H in this colouring of K_n . \square

For the upper bound, we first prove it under the stronger assumption that H has minimum degree at least 3.

Lemma 3.3. *Let H be a graph on m vertices with minimum degree at least 3. Assume $n \geq 2k$ and (e_1, \dots, e_k) is an n -good sequence. Then there exists a rainbow H -free (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n .*

Proof. We prove this by induction on k . Note that every graph H with minimum degree 3 contains at least 6 edges, so any colouring using less than 6 colours will be rainbow H -free. Thus the statement is trivially true for all $k \leq 5$. Assume now $k \geq 6$.

Without loss of generality, assume $e_1 \geq \dots \geq e_k > 0$. Then $e_1 \geq \frac{1}{k} \binom{n}{2} \geq n-1$ and $e_k \leq \frac{1}{k} \binom{n}{2}$. Let $t \geq 1$ be the smallest integer satisfying $\binom{t}{2} + t(n-t) \geq e_k$. By minimality, $\binom{t-1}{2} + (t-1)(n-t+1) < e_k$, and thus

$$\binom{t}{2} + t(n-t) - e_k < n-t \leq e_1.$$

This means that we can colour e_k of the $\binom{t}{2} + t(n-t)$ edges adjacent to v_{n-t+1}, \dots, v_n in K_n with colour k , and colour the remaining ones with colour 1.

Also, since

$$\binom{\frac{n}{k}}{2} + \frac{n}{k} \left(n - \frac{n}{k}\right) = \frac{n}{2k} \left(2n - \frac{n}{k} - 1\right) \geq \frac{n}{2k} (n-1) = \frac{1}{k} \binom{n}{2} \geq e_k,$$

we have $t \leq \frac{n}{k}$ and thus $n-t \geq n(1 - \frac{1}{k}) \geq 2(k-1)$. Let $e'_1 = e_1 - \binom{t}{2} - t(n-t) + e_k$ and $e'_i = e_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k-1$. It is easy to verify that $(e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_{k-1})$ is an $(n-t)$ -good sequence. Hence, we can use induction hypothesis to find a rainbow H -free (e'_1, \dots, e'_{k-1}) -colouring of K_{n-t} . Combining this with the colouring above for edges adjacent to v_{n-t+1}, \dots, v_n , we obtain an (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n .

We claim that this colouring is rainbow H -free. Indeed, let H' be any subgraph of K_n isomorphic to H . If all vertices of H' are from v_1, \dots, v_{n-t} , then it is not rainbow by the inductive construction. Otherwise, H' contains least one of v_{n-t+1}, \dots, v_n . But edges adjacent to each of these vertices can only have colour 1 or k , so H' not rainbow as $H' \cong H$ has minimum degree 3. \square

We can now deduce Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let H be a graph on m vertices with degeneracy at least 3. Then H must contain a subgraph H' with minimum degree at least 3. Lemma 3.3 implies that $g(H', k) \leq 2k$. So by Lemma 1.4, $g(H, k) \leq g(H', k) \leq 2k$, which gives the upper bound. The lower bound follows from Corollary 3.2. \square

4 Graphs with degeneracy 2

In this section, we study the case when H is a graph with degeneracy 2 and prove Theorem 1.9. We only need to prove the upper bound as the lower bound follows from Corollary 3.2. Let H be a graph with degeneracy 2. To prove an upper bound of the form $g(H, k) \leq N$, we need to construct a rainbow H -free (e_1, \dots, e_k) -colouring of K_n for every $n \geq N$ and every n -good sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) . It turns out that repeated suitable applications of the following colouring steps would work.

Definition 4.1. Suppose we have a complete graph K_n and a sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i \geq \binom{n}{2}$.

- A standard colouring step on K_n involves splitting it into K_t and K_{n-t} for some $1 \leq t \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and colouring all $t(n-t)$ edges between them with some colour i satisfying $e_i \geq t(n-t)$. The size of such a standard colouring step is t .
- A simple colouring step is a standard colouring step of size 1.

We are interested in colourings of K_n that can be obtained entirely from standard colouring steps.

Definition 4.2. Given a complete graph K_n and a sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i \geq \binom{n}{2}$, we say K_n has a standard colouring (with respect to (e_1, \dots, e_k)) if it has an edge colouring that can be obtained from a sequence of standard colouring steps. More formally, K_n has a standard colouring if it has an edge colouring that can be obtained using the following stepwise algorithm, where we view each set S_ℓ as a multiset.

- Initialise by setting $S_0 = \{K_n\}$ and $e_{0,j} = e_j$ for all $j \in [k]$
- For $\ell \geq 0$, if $S_\ell = \{K_1, \dots, K_1\}$, terminate.
Otherwise, pick some $K_m \in S_\ell$ with $m \geq 2$, some $i \in [k]$ and some $1 \leq t \leq \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$, such that $t(m-t) \leq e_{\ell,i}$.
- Set $S_{\ell+1} = (S_\ell \setminus \{K_m\}) \cup \{K_t, K_{m-t}\}$, $e_{\ell+1,i} = e_{\ell,i} - t(m-t)$ and $e_{\ell+1,j} = e_{\ell,j}$ for all $j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}$. Note that this corresponds to a standard colouring step on K_m of size t using colour i .
- Repeat the second and third step.

Similarly, we say K_n has a simple colouring if it has an edge colouring that can be obtained from a sequence of simple colouring steps.

We first prove a lemma that explains why we are interested in standard colouring steps and standard colourings.

Lemma 4.3. *Every standard colouring of K_n is rainbow cycle-free, and therefore rainbow H -free for all graphs H with degeneracy 2.*

Proof. For every $3 \leq k \leq n$, let C be an arbitrary cycle of length k in K_n . Let $\ell \geq 1$ be the smallest index such that vertices in C do not all belong to the same complete graph in S_ℓ . By minimality, they all belong to the same complete graph in $S_{\ell-1}$, say K_m , that was split into two complete graphs K_t and K_{m-t} by a standard colouring step in the ℓ -th iteration of the algorithm. From definition, all edges between K_t and K_{m-t} have the same colour. Since at least two edges on C go between K_t and K_{m-t} , C is not rainbow. \square

Assume now that the algorithm starts with a complete graph K_n and an n -good sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) . Then throughout the algorithm, there is a relation between the sizes of the complete graphs in S_ℓ and the $e_{\ell,j}$'s.

Lemma 4.4. *For every $\ell \geq 0$, if $S_\ell = \{K_{m_1}, \dots, K_{m_r}\}$, then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^r \binom{m_j}{2} = \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j}.$$

Proof. We use induction on ℓ . The case $\ell = 0$ follows from the assumption that $(e_1, \dots, e_k) = (e_{0,1}, \dots, e_{0,k})$ is n -good. Suppose this is true for some $\ell \geq 0$, and without loss of generality assume that the $(\ell + 1)$ -th standard colouring step is splitting K_{m_1} into K_t and K_{m_1-t} and colouring the $t(m_1 - t)$ edges with colour 1. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{t}{2} + \binom{m_1-t}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^r \binom{m_j}{2} &= \binom{t}{2} + \binom{m_1-t}{2} - \binom{m_1}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j} \\ &= -t(m_1-t) + e_{\ell,1} + \sum_{j=2}^k e_{\ell,j} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell+1,j}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

This relation can also be proved by noting that edges that remained to be coloured after ℓ iterations are exactly those within the complete graphs in S_ℓ .

Using this, we can prove that a simple colouring step can always be performed during the algorithm under a mild size condition.

Lemma 4.5. *For every $\ell \geq 0$, if $S_\ell = \{K_{m_1}, \dots, K_{m_r}\}$ and $m_1 \geq 2k$, then a simple colouring step can be performed on K_{m_1} .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j} = \sum_{j=1}^r \binom{m_j}{2} \geq \binom{m_1}{2}.$$

So there exists $i \in [k]$ such that $e_{\ell,i} \geq \frac{1}{k} \binom{m_1}{2} \geq m_1 - 1$. Hence, we can perform a simple colouring step on K_{m_1} using colour i . \square

To obtain result analogous to Lemma 4.5 below size $2k$, we need the following important concept of cushion.

Definition 4.6. *For $\ell \geq 0$, if $S_\ell = \{K_{m_1}, \dots, K_{m_r}\}$, then we say the cushion we have for K_{m_1} is $\sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j} - \binom{m_1}{2} = \sum_{j=2}^r \binom{m_j}{2}$, and we say that this cushion is provided by K_{m_2}, \dots, K_{m_r} .*

Lemma 4.7. *For all $m \geq 2$, suppose $K_m \in S_\ell$ and the cushion we have for K_m is at least $\min\{\frac{1}{2}(k^2 - k), km\}$. Then $m - 1$ consecutive simple colouring steps can be performed on K_m to produce a simple colouring.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for each $0 \leq t \leq m - 2$, it is possible to perform a simple colouring step on K_{m-t} . Indeed, performing simple colouring steps on K_m, \dots, K_{m-t+1} colours $\sum_{j=1}^t (m - j) = \frac{1}{2}t(2m - t - 1)$ edges in total.

If the cushion we have is at least $\frac{1}{2}(k^2 - k)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell+t,j} &= \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j} - \frac{1}{2}t(2m - t - 1) \\ &\geq \binom{m}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(k^2 - k) - \frac{1}{2}t(2m - t - 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(m^2 - m + k^2 - k - 2mt + t^2 + t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(t - m + k)(t - m + k + 1) + k(m - t - 1) \\ &\geq k(m - t - 1). \end{aligned}$$

If instead the cushion we have is at least km , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell+t,j} &= \sum_{j=1}^k e_{\ell,j} - \frac{1}{2}t(2m - t - 1) \\ &\geq \binom{m}{2} + km - \frac{1}{2}t(2m - t - 1) \\ &= \binom{m-t}{2} + km \\ &\geq km \geq k(m - t - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in both cases there exists a colour i with $e_{\ell+t,i} \geq m - t - 1$. So we can perform a simple colouring step on K_{m-t} using colour i , as required. \square

We remark that a weaker version of this lemma in the case when $m = 2k$ was proved by Feffer, Fu and Yan in [4] using a much more complicated method.

We prove one final lemma before proving Theorem 1.9. This lemma allow us to perform several consecutive standard colouring steps of the same size, which will be useful for creating cushion.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $n, m, t, k \geq 1$ and $e_1, \dots, e_k \geq 0$ be integers satisfying $n > tm$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i > tn(m+k)$. Then we can perform m consecutive standard colouring steps of size t on K_n .*

Proof. For each $j \in [m]$, the j -th size t standard colouring step splits $K_{n-(j-1)t}$ into K_t and K_{n-jt} , and colour the $t(n-jt)$ edges between them using one of the k colours. Since $t(n-jt) \leq tn$, colour i can be used to perform a size t standard colouring step at least $\lfloor \frac{e_i}{tn} \rfloor$ times for each $i \in [k]$. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \lfloor \frac{e_i}{tn} \rfloor \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e_i}{tn} - k > m + k - k = m,$$

it is possible to perform m such steps. □

We now sketch the upper bound proof in Theorem 1.9, which proceeds in three stages:

- Stage 1: We perform k consecutive standard colouring steps of size $r = \Theta\left(\frac{k^{0.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}\right)$ using Lemma 4.8. Let \mathcal{R} be the set of k complete graphs K_r split off in these steps. These complete graphs in \mathcal{R} will provide a small but still significant amount of cushion.
- Stage 2: We perform several standard colouring steps of larger size, so that the set \mathcal{C} of complete graphs split off in this stage provide a big cushion of at least $\frac{1}{2}k^2$.
- Stage 3: By Lemma 4.5, we can reduce the size of the largest remaining complete graph down to K_{2k} . Using the cushion provided by \mathcal{C} and Lemma 4.7, we can find a simple colouring for this K_{2k} . Then, we use Lemma 4.7 again and the cushion provided by \mathcal{R} to find simple colourings for each complete graph in \mathcal{C} . Finally, we show that the cushion provided by \mathcal{R} is enough for us to find simple colourings for the complete graphs in \mathcal{R} itself as well.

The idea of this proof is already present implicitly in the upper bound proof in [4] but with \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{R} being the same set, which turns out to be less than optimal.

Finally, we can prove Theorem 1.9.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. The lower bound follows directly from Corollary 3.2, so we just need to prove the upper bound. The proof proceeds in 3 stages. Assume k is sufficiently large and set

$$\beta = 5000000, \quad n = \left\lfloor \frac{\beta k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor.$$

Let (e_1, \dots, e_k) be any n -good sequence, and write $e = \binom{n}{2}$. Initialise the colouring algorithm by setting $e_{0,j} = e_j$ for all $j \in [k]$ and $S_0 = \{K_n\}$.

Stage 1: The Small Cushion Steps

Set $r = \left\lfloor \frac{\beta k^{0.5}}{30(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor$. Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^k e_{0,j} = e = \binom{n}{2} > \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{3 \log k} \geq 10krn > rn(k+k),$$

we may perform k consecutive standard colouring steps of size r on K_n using Lemma 4.8. Let \mathcal{R} be this collection of k complete graphs of size r . Note that we have coloured at most $k r n \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} < 0.1e$ edges. Therefore, at the end of this stage, we have $\sum_{j=1}^k e_{k,j} \geq 0.9e$.

Stage 2: The Big Cushion Steps

Let $J_1 = \left\{ j \in [k] \mid e_{k,j} \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \right\}$. Since

$$|J_1| \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \leq \sum_{j \in J_1} e_{k,j} \leq e,$$

it follows that $|J_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25}$. We split into two cases.

Case 1. $\sum_{j \in J_1} e_{k,j} \geq 0.1e$.

Set $c = \left\lfloor \frac{k^{0.75}}{(\log k)^{0.75}} \right\rfloor$. Since

$$\sum_{j \in J_1} e_{k,j} \geq 0.1e \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} \geq cn \cdot \frac{\beta k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25}}{30} > cn (\lceil k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \rceil + |J_1|),$$

we can perform $\lceil k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \rceil$ consecutive simple colouring steps of size c using only the colours in J_1 by Lemma 4.8. Let \mathcal{C} be this collection of $\lceil k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \rceil$ complete graphs of size c . Observe that complete graphs in \mathcal{C} create a cushion of

$$k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \binom{c}{2} \geq \frac{k^{2.25}}{3 (\log k)^{1.25}} \gg k^2,$$

which is enough for us to apply Lemma 4.7 later on. At this point, the set of complete graphs yet to be coloured consists of the complete graphs in \mathcal{R} coming from Stage 1, the complete graphs in \mathcal{C} coming from Stage 2 and one other large complete graph of size $n - rk - c \lceil k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \rceil \gg 2k$.

Case 2. $\sum_{j \in J_1} e_{k,j} < 0.1e$.

Let $J_2 = \left\{ j \in [k] \mid e_{k,j} \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} \right\}$, then $\sum_{j \in J_2} e_{k,j} \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} \leq 0.1e$. Let $J_3 = [k] \setminus (J_1 \cup J_2)$.

Without loss of generality, assume $J_3 = [\ell]$. Then $\frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} < e_{k,j} < \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}}$ for all $j \in J_3 = [\ell]$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} e_{k,j} = \sum_{j=1}^k e_{k,j} - \sum_{j \in J_1} e_{k,j} - \sum_{j \in J_2} e_{k,j} \geq 0.9e - 0.1e - 0.1e = 0.7e.$$

For each $j \in J_1 \cup J_2$, use colour j to perform as many simple colouring steps as possible to the largest remaining complete graph. Suppose a total of $N - k$ simple colouring steps are performed. Then for each $j \in J_1 \cup J_2$, we have $e_{N,j} < n$, as otherwise we could perform another simple colouring step using colour j . Let K_{x_0} be the largest complete graph in S_N . Then S_N consists of K_{x_0} , k complete graphs K_r coming from Stage 1, and many K_1 from the simple colouring steps above. Therefore, by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\binom{x_0}{2} + k \binom{r}{2} = \sum_{j \in J_1 \cup J_2} e_{N,j} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} e_{N,j} \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} e_{N,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} e_{k,j} \geq 0.7e.$$

Since $k \binom{r}{2} \ll e$, it follows that $0.5x_0^2 \geq \binom{x_0}{2} \geq 0.66e \geq 0.32 \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{\log k}$, and thus $x_0 \geq \frac{4\beta k^{1.5}}{5(\log k)^{0.5}}$.

Now consider the following process.

- Start with the complete graph K_{x_0} .
- In the j -th step, if $x_{j-1} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$, we stop. Otherwise, perform a standard colouring step on $K_{x_{j-1}}$ of maximum possible size $c_j < \frac{1}{2}x_{j-1}$ to split $K_{x_{j-1}}$ into K_{x_j} and K_{c_j} , where $x_j = x_{j-1} - c_j$.

The maximality of c_j implies that

$$c_j x_j \leq e_{N+j-1,j} \quad \text{and} \quad (c_j + 1)(x_j - 1) > e_{N+j-1,j}.$$

From this, it follows that

$$e_{N+j,j} = e_{N+j-1,j} - c_j x_j < x_j - c_j - 1 \leq x_j - 1 < n,$$

and

$$\frac{e_{N+j-1,j}}{2x_j} \leq \frac{e_{N+j-1,j}}{x_j - 1} - 1 \leq c_j \leq \frac{e_{N+j-1,j}}{x_j}, \quad (\spadesuit)$$

where the first inequality holds because

$$e_{N+j-1,j} = e_{k,j} \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} > 2n \geq 2x_j.$$

Assume the process stop in step ℓ' . We claim that $x_{\ell'} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$. Indeed, this follows trivially if the process stops because $x_{j-1} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$ for some $j \in [\ell']$. If instead we performed all ℓ' standard colouring steps described above, then at the end we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k e_{N+\ell',j} = \sum_{j \in J_1 \cup J_2} e_{N,j} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} e_{N+j,j} < kn.$$

This implies that $x_{\ell'} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$, as required, because otherwise

$$\binom{x_{\ell'}}{2} > kn \geq \sum_{j=1}^k e_{N+\ell',j},$$

contradicting Lemma 4.4.

Since $x_0 \geq \frac{4\beta k^{1.5}}{5(\log k)^{0.5}}$, we have $\frac{x_0}{x_{\ell'}} \geq \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{0.25}}{5(\log k)^{0.25}}$. Moreover, we have

$$2k \ll \frac{\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}} \leq \frac{1}{2}x_{\ell'-1} \leq x_{\ell'} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}},$$

It follows that for $j \in [\ell']$, we have

$$c_j \leq \frac{e_{N+j-1,j}}{x_j} \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \frac{(\log k)^{0.25}}{\sqrt{\beta}k^{1.25}} \leq \frac{\beta^{1.5}k}{\log k}. \quad (\clubsuit)$$

Let \mathcal{C} be the collection $K_{c_1}, \dots, K_{c_{\ell'}}$ of small complete graphs split off in this process. The amount of cushions provided by \mathcal{C} is at least

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \binom{c_j}{2} \geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} c_j^2 \geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} c_j \frac{e_{N+j-1,j}}{2x_j} \quad \text{by } (\spadesuit)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} c_j \frac{e_{k,j}}{2x_j} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \frac{c_j}{x_j} && \text{by } e_{k,j} \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \int_{x=x_j}^{x_{j-1}} \frac{1}{x_j} dx && \text{by } c_j = x_{j-1} - x_j \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \int_{x=x_j}^{x_{j-1}} \frac{1}{x} dx \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \int_{x=x_{\ell'}}^{x_0} \frac{1}{x} dx \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \log \frac{x_0}{x_{\ell'}} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \log \frac{2\sqrt{\beta}k^{0.25}}{5(\log k)^{0.25}} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{720 \log k} (\log k - \log \log k) \gg k^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which is enough for us to apply Lemma 4.7 later on. At this point, the set of complete graphs left to be coloured consists of those in \mathcal{R} , those in \mathcal{C} and the complete graph $K_{x_{\ell'}}$ with $x_{\ell'} \gg 2k$.

Stage 3: Colour the Remaining Complete Graphs

In both cases, there is only one complete graph left with size at least $2k$. We can first use Lemma 4.5 to perform as many simple colouring steps on it as needed to reduce its size down to $2k$. Then we can use Lemma 4.7 to find a simple colouring for it, because the complete graphs in \mathcal{C} provide a cushion of at least $\frac{1}{2}k^2$.

It remains to colour the complete graphs in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{R} . First we find a simple colouring for each of those in \mathcal{C} . Recall that, for every $K_s \in \mathcal{C}$,

- If we are in Case 1, then $s = c = \left\lfloor \frac{k^{0.75}}{(\log k)^{0.75}} \right\rfloor$,
- If we are in Case 2, then $s = c_j \leq \frac{\beta^{1.5}k}{\log k}$ for some $j \in [\ell']$ by (

Note that the k complete graphs of size r in \mathcal{R} together provide a cushion of at least

$$k \binom{r}{2} \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{2000 \log k} \geq ks$$

for K_s . Hence, by Lemma 4.7 we can find a simple colouring for K_s .

Finally, we prove that we can colour all k complete graphs of size r in \mathcal{R} . We do this by showing that it is always possible to perform a simple colouring step on the largest remaining complete graphs in \mathcal{R} . Indeed, suppose the largest remaining complete graph has size $2 \leq t \leq r$, then the other $k-1$ complete graphs all have size at least $t-1$. Hence by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k e_{L,j} \geq (k-1) \binom{t-1}{2} + \binom{t}{2} \geq (k-1)(t-2) + (t-1) = k(t-2) + 1.$$

So there exists some $i \in [k]$ with $e_{L,i} \geq t - 1$, which we can use to perform a simple colouring step on K_t . As this is true for every t , we can repeat and colour all complete graphs in \mathcal{R} . This completes a standard colouring of K_n with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) . By Lemma 4.3, this colouring is rainbow H -free, which completes the proof. \square

5 Triangle

In this section, we resolve the question posed by Gyarfas et al. in [6] by proving Theorem 1.2. Recall that rainbow K_3 -free colourings are also known as Gallai colourings, and $g(K_3, k) = g(k)$. As we have proved the upper bound in Section 4, it suffices to prove the lower bound here. Note that Theorem 1.2 also shows that the upper bound in Theorem 1.9 is tight up to the choice of constant in the case when $H = K_3$.

We will use the following fundamental decomposition theorem of Gallai colourings.

Theorem 5.1 ([4]). *Suppose we have a Gallai k -colouring of K_n . Then there exist at most two colours, which we call base colours, and a decomposition of K_n into $m \geq 2$ vertex disjoint complete graphs K_{n_1}, \dots, K_{n_m} , such that for each $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, there exists a base colour with all edges between $V(K_{n_i})$ and $V(K_{n_j})$ having this colour. Moreover, each base colour is used to colour at least $n - 1$ edges between these smaller complete graphs.*

Now we can prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Theorem 1.9, we only need to show $g(H, k) = \Omega(k^{1.5}/(\log k)^{0.5})$. The proof consists of 3 steps.

Step 1: Construct the sequence and describe a splitting process

Consider the colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) on n vertices given by $e_1 = \dots = e_c = a + 1$, $e_{c+1} = \dots = e_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} = a$ and $e_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1} = \dots = e_k = b$, where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{10}, \quad n = \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor, \quad b = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad a = \left\lfloor \frac{\binom{n}{2} - b \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \right\rfloor, \quad c = \binom{n}{2} - b \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor - a \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

It is easy to verify that (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k) is an n -good sequence. We will show that for sufficiently large k , there is no Gallai colouring of K_n with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) .

Suppose for a contradiction that there is such a Gallai colouring, then we can perform the following stepwise splitting process by repeatedly applying Theorem 5.1:

- Initialise with $K_{x_0} = K_n$.
- For each $i \geq 0$, if $x_i \leq b + 1$, we stop. Otherwise, by Theorem 5.1, we can find a decomposition of K_{x_i} using at most two base colours into $m \geq 2$ vertex disjoint complete graphs K_{y_1}, \dots, K_{y_m} , where $y_1 \geq \dots \geq y_m$.
- Let $t_{i+1} = y_m$ and $x_{i+1} = x_i - t_{i+1}$. Split K_{x_i} into K_{y_m} and $K_{x_{i+1}}$, with the latter being the union of $K_{y_1}, \dots, K_{y_{m-1}}$. Note that by Theorem 5.1, every edge between $V(K_{x_{i+1}})$ and $V(K_{y_m})$ is coloured with a base colour.
- Repeat the second and third step.

Hence, we can find a nested sequence of complete graphs $K_{x_0} \supset K_{x_1} \supset \dots \supset K_{x_\ell}$, where $n = x_0 > x_1 > \dots > x_{\ell-1} \geq b + 2 > x_\ell$. Moreover, by the last part of Theorem 5.1, in each iteration of the process above, the base colour chosen must be used to colour at least $b + 1$ edges. Hence colours $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1, \dots, k$ will never be picked as base colours in this process.

Step 2: Lower bound on the number of edges coloured with base colours

We claim that $t_{i+1} \leq \frac{4(a+1)}{x_i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$. Indeed, every edge between the complete graphs $V(K_{x_{i+1}})$ and $V(K_{y_m})$ must be coloured with a base colour. However, the at most 2 base colours together can be used to colour at most $2(a+1)$ edges. This implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}x_i t_{i+1} \leq (x_i - t_{i+1})t_{i+1} = x_{i+1}y_m \leq 2(a+1),$$

where we used $t_{i+1} = y_m \leq \frac{1}{2}x_i$. Thus, $t_{i+1} \leq \frac{4(a+1)}{x_i}$, as claimed.

We can now give a lower bound on the number of edges coloured with base colours in this splitting process. This number is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i(x_{i-1} - t_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} (x_{i-1} - t_i) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} \left(x_{i-1} - \frac{4(a+1)}{x_{i-1}} \right) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} \left(x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{x=x_{\ell}}^{x_0} \left(x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{x=b+1}^n \left(x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \frac{n^2 - (b+1)^2}{2} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b+1} \\ &\geq \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that only the first $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$ colours can be used as base colours in this process.

Step 3: Not enough edges can be coloured with the first $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$ colours

The total number of edges that can be coloured with the first $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$ colours is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil} e_i = \binom{n}{2} - b \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{n^2}{2} - b^2.$$

So we will have a contradiction if

$$\frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} > \frac{n^2}{2} - b^2.$$

Note that for sufficiently large k we have

$$\begin{aligned} b^2 &= \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor^2 \geq \left(\frac{k-1}{2} \right)^2 \geq \frac{k^2}{5}, \\ 4(a+1) &\leq 5a \leq 5 \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil} \leq \frac{5n^2}{k} \leq \frac{5\alpha^2 k^2}{\log k}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\log \frac{n}{b} \leq \log \left(\frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \frac{3}{k} \right) = \log \left(\frac{3\alpha k^{0.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right) = \frac{1}{2}(\log k - \log \log k) + \log(3\alpha) \leq \log k.$$

Putting these together and using $\alpha = \frac{1}{10}$, we get

$$\left(\frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} \right) - \left(\frac{n^2}{2} - b^2 \right) = \frac{b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} \geq \frac{k^2}{15} - \frac{k^2}{20} > 0,$$

as required. This proves that if k is sufficiently large, then there is no Gallai colouring with colour distribution sequence (e_1, \dots, e_k) . Therefore, $g(k) \geq \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}$. \square

References

- [1] J. de Oliveira Bastos, F. S. Benevides and J. Han. The number of Gallai k -colorings of complete graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 144 (2020), 1-13.
- [2] J. de Oliveira Bastos, F. S. Benevides, G. O. Mota and I. Sau. Counting Gallai 3-colorings of complete graphs, *Discrete Mathematics*, 342.9 (2019), 2618-2631.
- [3] J. Balogh and L. Li. The typical structure of Gallai colorings and their extremal graphs, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 33.4 (2019), 2416-2443.
- [4] J. Feffer, Y. Fu and J. Yan. Remarks on the distribution of colors in Gallai colorings, *Discrete Mathematics*, 343.10 (2020), 111996.
- [5] T. Gallai. Transitiv orientierbare Graphen, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 18 (1967), 25-66.
- [6] A. Gyárfás, D. Pálvölgyi, B. Patkós and M. Wales. Distribution of colors in Gallai colorings, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 86 (2020), 103087.
- [7] A. Gyárfás, G. N. Sárközy, A. Sebő and S. Selkow. Ramsey-type results for Gallai colorings, *Journal of Graph Theory*, 64.3 (2010), 233-243.
- [8] A. Gyárfás and G. Simonyi. Edge colorings of complete graphs without tricolored triangles, *Journal of Graph Theory*, 46.3 (2004), 211-216.
- [9] C. Magnant and I. Schiermeyer. Gallai-Ramsey number for K_5 , *Journal of Graph Theory*, 101.3 (2022), 455-492.
- [10] A. Frieze and M. Krivelevich. On rainbow trees and cycles, *The electronic journal of combinatorics*, 15 (2008), R59.