

# RAINBOW STACKINGS OF RANDOM EDGE-COLORINGS

NOGA ALON, COLIN DEFANT, AND NOAH KRAVITZ

ABSTRACT. A *rainbow stacking* of  $r$ -edge-colorings  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  of the complete graph on  $n$  vertices is a way of superimposing  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  so that no edges of the same color are superimposed on each other. We determine a sharp threshold for  $r$  (as a function of  $m$  and  $n$ ) governing the existence and nonexistence of rainbow stackings of random  $r$ -edge-colorings  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION




FIGURE 1. A rainbow stacking  $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_4^3$  of 3 edge-colorings of  $K_4$ , where there are  $r = 3$  total colors. The permutations in the tuple  $\pi$  are (in one-line notation)  $\pi_1 = 1234$ ,  $\pi_2 = 2431$ , and  $\pi_3 = 1243$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  denote the symmetric group of permutations of the set  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $K_n$  denote the complete graph with vertex set  $[n]$  and edge set  $\binom{[n]}{2}$ . Consider a set  $\mathcal{C}_r$  of  $r$  colors, and let  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m: \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  be edge-colorings of  $K_n$ . A *rainbow stacking* of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  is a tuple  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m) \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  such that for each edge  $e \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ , the colors

$$\chi_1(\sigma_1^{-1}(e)), \dots, \chi_m(\sigma_m^{-1}(e))$$

are all distinct (where  $\sigma_k^{-1}(\{i, j\}) := \{\sigma_k^{-1}(i), \sigma_k^{-1}(j)\}$ ). Less formally, a rainbow stacking is a way of stacking copies of  $K_n$  with the colorings  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  on top of each other so that no edge is stacked above another edge of the same color (see Figure 1).

We are interested in the existence of rainbow stackings, especially when  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m: \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  are independent uniformly random colorings. When  $m$  is fixed and  $n$  is growing, we wish to determine which values of  $r$  (in terms of  $n$ ) guarantee the existence or nonexistence of rainbow

stackings. In what follows, the phrase *with high probability* always means *with probability tending to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$* . Our main theorem determines a sharp threshold that governs whether rainbow stackings exist with high probability or do not exist with high probability.

**1.1. Motivation.** The main motivation for the rainbow stacking problem comes from the active research area of *graph-packing* (see, e.g., [7, 13] and the references therein), in which one says that graphs  $G_1, G_2$  on the same number of vertices have a *packing* if there is a bijection from the vertex set of  $G_1$  to the vertex set of  $G_2$  that does not map any edge of  $G_1$  to any edge of  $G_2$ . A well known result of Sauer and Spencer [13] gives a sufficient condition, in terms of the maximum degrees of  $G_1, G_2$ , for the existence of a packing. Our rainbow stacking problem can be interpreted as a natural multi-color analogue of the packing problem.

We naturally encountered the packing problem in our previous work on friends-and-strangers graphs, where packings correspond to isolated vertices in a friends-and-strangers graph. The rainbow stacking problem for a pair of graphs plays an analogous role in a certain multi-color generalization of friends-and-strangers graphs. The study of friends-and-strangers graphs for random graphs has turned out to be quite rich (see [2, 9]), and this provided our initial motivation for looking at rainbow stackings of random edge-colorings.

The problem of rainbow stackings for a pair of graphs includes several notorious problems about combinatorial designs. In particular, if we identify the vertex sets of our two graphs with equal-sized subsets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^k$  and color each edge  $(a, b)$  by the sum  $a + b$ , then the existence of a rainbow stacking is equivalent to the existence of a bijection  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  such that the quantities  $a + \varphi(a)$  (for  $a \in A$ ) are all distinct. For further discussion of this problem in relation to transversals in Latin squares (going back to work of Euler) and the Hall–Paige Conjecture, see the paper of Müyesser and Pokrovskiy [11] and the references therein, as well as the brief discussion in the last section of the present paper.

**1.2. Main result.** Using the first-moment method, one can quickly find an upper bound on  $r$  that guarantees the nonexistence of a rainbow stacking with high probability, as follows. Let  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m : \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  be independent uniformly random edge-colorings. For each  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$ , let  $Z_\sigma$  be the indicator function for the event that  $\sigma$  is a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ , and let  $Z := \sum_{\sigma} Z_\sigma$  be the total number of rainbow stackings of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ . Note that  $Z$  is always a multiple of  $n!$ ; indeed, if  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$  is a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ , then so is each tuple of the form  $(\tau\sigma_1, \dots, \tau\sigma_m)$  for  $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . For each  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$ , the expectation of  $Z_\sigma$  is exactly

$$E_{n,m,r} := \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{r}\right)^{\binom{n}{2}}.$$

Consequently,

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z] = n!^m E_{n,m,r} \leq n!^m \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} e^{-i/r} \right)^{\binom{n}{2}} = n! \exp \left( (m-1) \log(n!) - \binom{m}{2} \binom{n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{r} \right).$$

If there is a function  $\omega : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(n) = \infty$  and

$$r \leq \frac{m \binom{n}{2}}{2 \log(n!)} - \frac{\omega(n)}{(\log n)^2},$$

then

$$m \binom{n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{r} - 2 \log(n!) \rightarrow \infty,$$

so  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = o_m(n!)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case, since the value of  $Z$  is always a nonnegative integer multiple of  $n!$ , Markov's Inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] = \mathbb{P}[Z \geq n!] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z]/n! = o_m(1),$$

so with high probability, there are no rainbow stackings of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ . This establishes the first half of the following theorem; the proof of the second half is the main work of this paper.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix an integer  $m \geq 2$  and a function  $\omega: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(n) = \infty$ . For each  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m: \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  be independent uniformly random  $r$ -edge-colorings. If  $r = r(n) \geq 1$  satisfies*

$$(2) \quad r \leq \frac{m \binom{n}{2}}{2 \log(n!)} - \frac{\omega(n)}{(\log n)^2},$$

*then with high probability, there does not exist a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ . If*

$$(3) \quad r \geq \frac{m \binom{n}{2}}{2 \log(n!)} + \frac{2m-1}{3} + \frac{m}{2 \log n} + \frac{\omega(n)}{(\log n)^2},$$

*then with high probability, there exists a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ .*

## 2. EXISTENCE OF RAINBOW STACKINGS

We will use the second-moment method to prove the second statement of [Theorem 1.1](#). We already computed the first moment of  $Z$  in [Section 1](#). The second moment of  $Z$  is

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m} Z_\sigma \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m} \mathbb{E}[Z_\sigma Z_\tau].$$

For each  $k \in [m]$ , define the new coloring  $\chi'_k: \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  by  $\chi'_k(e) := \chi_k(\sigma_k^{-1}(e))$ . Now,  $Z_\sigma Z_\tau$  is the indicator function of the event that for each  $e \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ , the colors

$$\chi'_1(e), \dots, \chi'_m(e)$$

are all distinct and the colors

$$\chi'_1(\sigma_1 \tau_1^{-1}(e)), \dots, \chi'_m(\sigma_m \tau_m^{-1}(e))$$

are all distinct. Hence,  $Z_\sigma Z_\tau$  has the same distribution as  $Z_{\mathbf{id}} Z_{(\sigma_1 \tau_1^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_m \tau_m^{-1})}$ , where we write  $\mathbf{id} = (\text{id}, \dots, \text{id})$  for the tuple in  $\mathfrak{S}_n^m$  whose components are all equal to the identity permutation  $\text{id} \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] = n!^m \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m} \mathbb{E}[Z_{\mathbf{id}} Z_\pi].$$

We derive an explicit formula for each  $[Z_{\mathbf{id}} Z_\pi]$  as follows.

For each  $e \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ , let  $\beta_1(e), \dots, \beta_m(e)$  be  $m$  copies of  $e$ . Consider the  $m$ -partite graph  $G_\pi$  with vertex set  $V(G_\pi) = \{\beta_k(e) : e \in \binom{[n]}{2}, k \in [m]\}$  in which  $\beta_k(e)$  is adjacent to  $\beta_{k'}(e')$  if and only if  $k \neq k'$  and either  $e = e'$  or  $\pi_k(e) = \pi_{k'}(e')$ . The random edge-colorings  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  naturally induce a random vertex-coloring of  $G_\pi$ , where  $\beta_k(e)$  is assigned the color  $\chi_k(e)$ . Observe that  $\mathbf{id}$  and  $\pi$  are both rainbow stackings of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$  if and only if the induced vertex-coloring of  $G_\pi$  is proper. For example, if  $\pi$  and  $\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3$  are as depicted in [Figure 1](#), then  $G_\pi$  and its induced coloring are shown in [Figure 2](#). Although  $\pi$  is a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3$ , the identity tuple  $\mathbf{id}$  is not; this is why there are pink edges in [Figure 2](#) whose endpoints have the same color.

The quantity  $\mathbb{E}[Z_{\mathbf{id}} Z_\pi]$  is equal to  $r^{-m} \binom{n}{2} N_\pi$ , where  $N_\pi$  is the number of proper  $r$ -vertex-colorings of  $G_\pi$ . Hence, we will study how  $N_\pi$  depends on  $\pi$ .

The graph  $G_\pi$  has  $m \binom{n}{2}$  vertices and

$$2 \binom{m}{2} \binom{n}{2} - \left| \left\{ (k, k', e) \in [m] \times [m] \times \binom{[n]}{2} : k < k' \text{ and } \pi_k(e) = \pi_{k'}(e) \right\} \right|$$




FIGURE 2. The graph  $G_\pi$ , where  $\pi = (1234, 2431, 1243)$  is as depicted in Figure 1. Edges of  $G_\pi$  of the form  $\{\beta_k(e), \beta_{k'}(e)\}$  are drawn in **thin pink**, while those of the form  $\{\beta_k(e), \beta_{k'}(e')\}$  with  $\pi_k(e) = \pi_{k'}(e')$  are drawn in **thick navy**. Edges of the form  $\{\beta_k(e), \beta_{k'}(e)\}$  with  $\pi_k(e) = \pi_{k'}(e)$  are drawn with **both colors**. The vertex-coloring of  $G_\pi$  is induced by the edge-colorings  $\chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3$  in Figure 1.

edges. For each  $k < k'$ , we have

$$\left| \left\{ e \in \binom{[n]}{2} : \pi_k(e) = \pi_{k'}(e) \right\} \right| = \binom{f_{k,k'}(\pi)}{2} + t_{k,k'}(\pi),$$

where  $f_{k,k'}(\pi)$  and  $t_{k,k'}(\pi)$  denote the number of fixed points and the number of 2-cycles (respectively) of  $\pi_k^{-1}\pi_{k'}$  (viewed as a permutation of  $[n]$ ). Define the weight

$$\text{wt}(\pi) := \sum_{1 \leq k < k' \leq m} \text{wt}_{k,k'}(\pi),$$

where

$$\text{wt}_{k,k'}(\pi) := \binom{f_{k,k'}(\pi)}{2} + t_{k,k'}(\pi).$$

Then the number of edges of  $G_\pi$  is

$$2 \binom{m}{2} \binom{n}{2} - \text{wt}(\pi).$$

The following lemma provides an upper bound on  $N_\pi$  in terms of the weight  $\text{wt}(\pi)$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer. If  $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  and  $r = r(n)$  satisfies  $n^2/r^3 = o(1)$ , then*

$$N_\pi \leq (1 + o_m(1)) r^{m \binom{n}{2}} E_{n,m,r}^2 e^{\text{wt}(\pi)/(r-(2m-1)/3)}.$$

*Proof.* We use the entropy method. Let  $\chi : V(G_\pi) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  be a uniformly random proper  $r$ -coloring. Then the entropy of  $\chi$  is

$$H(\chi) = \log(N_\pi),$$

where  $H(\cdot)$  denotes the base- $e$  entropy function. Let  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$  be a permutation. We will reveal the values of  $\chi$  on the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(1)}(e)$ , then the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(2)}(e)$ , and so on until the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(m)}(e)$ . For each stage, let  $\chi_{<k}^\sigma$  denote the partial coloring on the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(e)$  for  $k' < k$  and  $e \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ . Then the chain rule and the subadditivity of entropy give that

$$H(\chi) \leq \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{e \in \binom{[n]}{2}} H(\chi(\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e)) \mid \chi_{<k}^\sigma).$$

We will estimate the summands appearing on the right-hand side of this inequality individually.

For each color  $c \in \mathcal{C}_r$ , each vertex  $\beta_\ell(e)$ , and each partial proper coloring  $\chi'$  of the other vertices of  $G_\pi$ , we have

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{P}[\chi(\beta_\ell(e)) = c \mid \chi \text{ and } \chi' \text{ agree wherever } \chi' \text{ is defined}] \leq 1/(r - 2m + 2).$$

Indeed, because  $\beta_\ell(e)$  has at most  $2m - 2$  neighbors, there are at most  $2m - 2$  forbidden values of  $\chi(\beta_\ell(e))$ ; since the remaining colors are equally likely, each one occurs with probability at most  $1/(r - 2m + 2)$ .

Now, consider a single permutation  $\sigma$  and a single vertex  $\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e)$ . Let  $y = y_k^\sigma(e)$  be such that  $2(k - 1) - y$  is the number of distinct colors already assigned by  $\chi$  to the neighbors of  $\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e)$  that are of the form  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(e')$  with  $k' < k$ . Then there are at most  $r - 2(k - 1) + y$  possibilities for  $\chi(\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e))$ , and the entropy of  $\chi(\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e))$  conditioned on this partial coloring is at most

$$\log(r - 2(k - 1) + y) = \log(r - 2(k - 1)) + \log\left(1 + \frac{y}{r - 2(k - 1)}\right) \leq \log(r - 2(k - 1)) + \frac{y}{r - 2(k - 1)}.$$

Summing over all of the possibilities for the partial coloring  $\chi_{<k}^\sigma$ , we find that

$$(5) \quad H(\chi(\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e)) \mid \chi_{<k}^\sigma) \leq \log(r - 2(k - 1)) + \mathbb{E}[y] \frac{1}{r - 2(k - 1)}.$$

The next task is estimating  $\mathbb{E}[y]$ .

For each triple  $(\ell, \ell', e)$  with  $\ell < \ell'$  and  $e \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ , let

$$x(\ell, \ell', e) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \pi_\ell(e) = \pi_{\ell'}(e); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We record for future reference the identity

$$(6) \quad \sum_{\ell < \ell'} \sum_{e \in \binom{[n]}{2}} x(\ell, \ell', e) = \text{wt}(\pi).$$

The neighbors of  $\beta_{\sigma(k)}(e)$  already colored by  $\chi_{<k}^\sigma$  are the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(e)$  and  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(\pi_{\sigma(k')}^{-1}\pi_{\sigma(k)}(e))$  for  $k' < k$ . Counting collisions, we find that the number of such vertices is

$$2(k-1) - \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e).$$

The vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(e)$  for  $k' < k$  form a clique in  $G_\pi$ ; likewise, the vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(\pi_{\sigma(k')}^{-1}\pi_{\sigma(k)}(e))$  for  $k' < k$  form a clique in  $G_\pi$ . So the pairs of such vertices receiving the same color form a matching, and the number of such pairs is at least  $y - \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e)$ . Each pair of vertices  $\beta_{\sigma(k')}(e), \beta_{\sigma(k')}(\pi_{\sigma(k')}^{-1}\pi_{\sigma(k)}(e))$ , for  $k', k'' < k$ , receives the same color with probability at most  $1/(r-2m+2)$  by (4), so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[y] &\leq \frac{(k-1 - \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e))^2}{r-2m+2} + \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e) \\ &\leq \frac{(k-1)(k-1 - \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e))}{r-2m+2} + \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e) \\ &= \frac{(k-1)^2}{r-2m+2} + \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{r-2m+2}\right) \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e) \\ &= \frac{(k-1)^2}{r-2m+2} + \left(\frac{r-2(k-1)}{r-k+1} + O_m(1/r^2)\right) \sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (5), summing over  $k$  and  $e$ , and averaging over  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$  gives that

$$(7) \quad H(\chi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{e \in \binom{[n]}{2}} (\Omega_k + \Psi_{k,e}^\sigma + O_m(1/r^3)),$$

where

$$\Omega_k = \log(r-2(k-1)) + \frac{(k-1)^2}{(r-2m+2)(r-2(k-1))} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{k,e}^\sigma = \frac{\sum_{k' < k} x(\sigma(k), \sigma(k'), e)}{r-k+1}.$$

We compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_k &= \log(r-2(k-1)) + \frac{(k-1)^2/r}{r-2(k-1)} + O_m(1/r^3) \\ &= \log(r-2(k-1)) + \log\left(1 + \frac{(k-1)^2/r}{r-2(k-1)}\right) + O_m(1/r^3) \\ &= \log(r-2(k-1)) + (k-1)^2/r + O_m(1/r^3) \\ &= \log r + 2\log(1 - (k-1)/r) + O_m(1/r^3); \end{aligned}$$

the crucial point is the identity  $r-2(k-1) + (k-1)^2/r = r(1 - (k-1)/r)^2$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{e \in \binom{[n]}{2}} \Omega_k &= m \binom{n}{2} \log r + 2 \binom{n}{2} \sum_{k=1}^m \log(1 - (k-1)/r) + O_m(n^2/r^3) \\ &= m \binom{n}{2} \log r + 2 \log(E_{n,m,r}) + o_m(1). \end{aligned}$$

Next, using (6), the formula for the sum of the first  $m - 1$  squares, and the hypothesis that  $n^2/r^3 = o(1)$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{e \in \binom{[m]}{2}} \Psi_{k,e}^\sigma &= \sum_{\ell < \ell'} \sum_e x(\ell, \ell', e) \mathbb{E}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \frac{1}{r - \max\{\sigma^{-1}(\ell), \sigma^{-1}(\ell')\} + 1} \\
&= \text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \mathbb{E}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \frac{1}{r - \max\{\sigma^{-1}(1), \sigma^{-1}(2)\} + 1} \\
&= \text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{(j-1)/\binom{m}{2}}{r-j+1} \\
&= \text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \left( \frac{1}{r} + \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{(j-1)^2/\binom{m}{2}}{r^2} + O_m(1/r^3) \right) \\
&= \text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \left( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{2m-1}{3r^2} \right) + O_m(n^2/r^3) \\
&= \frac{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})}{r - (2m-1)/3} + o_m(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these bounds back into (7), we conclude that

$$N_{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \leq (1 + o_m(1)) r^{m\binom{n}{2}} E_{n,m,r}^2 e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/(r-(2m-1)/3)},$$

as desired.  $\square$

For convenience, let

$$\hat{r} := r - (2m - 1)/3.$$

If  $r$  satisfies (3), then it follows immediately from Lemma 2.1 that

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_{\text{id}} Z_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}] \leq (1 + o_m(1)) E_{n,m,r}^2 e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\hat{r}}$$

for each  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$ , so

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \leq (1 + o_m(1)) E_{n,m,r}^2 n!^m \sum_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m} e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\hat{r}}.$$

Our goal is to obtain an upper bound on the sum on the right-hand side of (9). The following proposition captures the central estimate of the proof.

**Proposition 2.2.** *If  $r$  satisfies (3), then*

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m} e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\hat{r}} = n!^m (1 + o(1)).$$

Proposition 2.2 tells us that if  $r$  satisfies (3), then

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] = (1 + o_m(1)) (E_{n,m,r} n!^m)^2 = (1 + o_m(1)) \mathbb{E}[Z]^2$$

(using (1) for the second equality), so  $\text{Var}(Z) = o_m(\mathbb{E}[Z])$ . Then Chebyshev's Inequality gives that

$$\mathbb{P}[Z = 0] = o_m(1),$$

which proves the second part of Theorem 1.1. Thus, the remainder of this section will be devoted to proving Proposition 2.2. Assume in what follows that  $r$  satisfies (3) or, equivalently, that

$$(10) \quad \hat{r} \geq \frac{m\binom{n}{2}}{2 \log(n!)} + \frac{m}{2 \log n} + \frac{\omega(n)}{(\log n)^2}.$$

Each of the  $n!^m$  summands on the left-hand side of the equation in [Proposition 2.2](#) is at least 1, so we must show that very few summands can be significantly larger than 1. To accomplish this, we will split the sum according to the values of  $f_{k,k'}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  and  $t_{k,k'}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ .

Let  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  be the sequence obtained by listing the pairs  $(k, k') \in [m] \times [m]$  with  $k < k'$  in decreasing order of  $\text{wt}_{k,k'}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  (breaking ties arbitrarily). Now, let us construct a subsequence  $\vec{p}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = (p_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, p_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}))$  of  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  recursively as follows. Let  $p_1(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  be the first pair in  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ . For  $2 \leq i \leq m-1$ , let  $p_i(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  be the first pair in  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  such that  $p_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \notin \{p_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, p_{i-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi})\}$  and the (undirected) graph on the vertex set  $[m]$  with the edge set  $\{p_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, p_i(\boldsymbol{\pi})\}$  is acyclic (where we are identifying the ordered pair  $(k, k')$  with the unordered pair  $\{k, k'\}$ ). In other words,  $\vec{p}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  is the lexicographically first subsequence of  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  whose entries form the edges of a spanning tree of the complete graph on  $[m]$ . Notice that  $\vec{p}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  depends only on  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ , not on  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ .

Writing  $p_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = (k_\ell, k'_\ell)$ , we can use standard rearrangement inequalities to find that

$$\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \ell \left[ \binom{f_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi})}{2} + t_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \right],$$

where  $f_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) := f_{k_\ell, k'_\ell}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  and  $t_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) := t_{k_\ell, k'_\ell}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ . Note that the number of permutations in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  with  $f$  fixed points and  $t$  2-cycles is at most

$$\binom{n}{f} \binom{n-f}{2t} (2t-1)!! (n-f-2t)! = \frac{n!}{f!2^t t!}.$$

Given a sequence  $L$  and tuples  $(f_1, \dots, f_{m-1})$  and  $(t_1, \dots, t_{m-1})$ , the number of tuples  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  satisfying  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = L$  and  $f_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = f_\ell$  and  $t_\ell(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = t_\ell$  for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$  is at most

$$n!^m \prod_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{f_\ell! 2^{t_\ell} t_\ell!};$$

here, we are crucially using the fact that the entries of  $\vec{p}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  form the edge set of an acyclic graph.

Let  $\Upsilon$  denote the set of tuples  $(f_1, \dots, f_{m-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1})$  of integers satisfying the following conditions:

- $0 \leq f_1, \dots, f_{m-1} \leq n$ ;
- $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_{m-1} \leq n/2$ ;
- $\binom{f_1}{2} + t_1 \geq \dots \geq \binom{f_{m-1}}{2} + t_{m-1}$ .

Let

$$\Upsilon_{\leq} := \{(f_1, \dots, f_{m-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}) \in \Upsilon : \binom{f_1}{2} + t_1 \leq \binom{\log n}{2}\}$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\geq} := \{(f_1, \dots, f_{m-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}) \in \Upsilon : \binom{f_1}{2} + t_1 \geq \binom{\log n}{2}\}.$$

(We remark that in these definitions, the particular choice of  $\binom{\log n}{2}$  for the cutoff is not important.) For each  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$ , the tuple  $(f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, f_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}), t_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, t_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}))$  belongs to  $\Upsilon_{\leq}$  or  $\Upsilon_{\geq}$ . The tuples  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  with  $(f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, f_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}), t_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, t_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi})) \in \Upsilon_{\leq}$  will end up contributing the main term of  $n!^m(1 + o(1))$  in [Proposition 2.2](#), while the other tuples will end up contributing only to the  $o(n!^m)$  error term.

Let us begin with  $\Upsilon_{\leq}$ . If  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  is such that  $(f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, f_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}), t_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, t_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi})) \in \Upsilon_{\leq}$ , then

$$\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \binom{m}{2} \binom{\log n}{2}.$$

Since there are at most  $n!^m$  such tuples  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ , the sum of  $e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\hat{r}}$  over these tuples is at most

$$n!^m \exp\left(\binom{m}{2} \binom{\log n}{2} \frac{1}{\hat{r}}\right) \leq n!^m \exp(O_m((\log n)^3/n)) = n!^m(1 + o(1)),$$

where we have used [\(3\)](#).



We now turn to  $\Upsilon_{\geq}$ . Since there are at most  $\binom{m}{2}!$  possibilities for the sequence  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ , the sum of  $e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\widehat{r}}$  over all tuples  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  corresponding to a given tuple  $T = (f_1, \dots, f_{m-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}) \in \Upsilon_{\geq}$  is at most  $\binom{m}{2}! n!^m X(T)$ , where

$$(11) \quad X(T) := \prod_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \left( \frac{1}{f_{\ell}! 2^{t_{\ell}} t_{\ell}!} \exp \left( \left[ \binom{f_{\ell}}{2} + t_{\ell} \right] \frac{\ell}{\widehat{r}} \right) \right).$$

We wish to find a uniform upper bound on  $X(T)$  as  $T$  ranges over the elements of  $\Upsilon_{\geq}$ .

We first require a technical lemma. Define  $g, h: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by  $g(x) = \frac{x(x-1)}{2}$  and  $h(x) = \frac{1+\sqrt{1+8x}}{2}$  so that  $g(h(x)) = x$ . Let  $\Gamma$  denote the gamma function.

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $t$  and  $K$  are integers such that  $0 \leq t \leq K$ , then*

$$\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1) 2^{t!} \geq \Gamma(h(K) + 1).$$

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that  $\Gamma(h(K - (t-1)) + 1) 2^{t-1} (t-1)! \leq \Gamma(h(K-t) + 1) 2^{t!}$  whenever  $1 \leq t \leq K$ . The identity  $g(h(x)) = x$  implies that  $h'(x) = \frac{1}{g'(h(x))} = \frac{2}{2h(x)-1}$ . Because  $h''(x) < 0$  for all  $x > 1$ , we have

$$(12) \quad h(x+1) \leq h(x) + h'(x) = h(x) + \frac{2}{2h(x)-1}.$$

It is routine to verify that

$$(13) \quad \frac{\Gamma(z)}{\Gamma(z + \frac{2}{2z-1})} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for every real number  $z \geq 2$ . Assume  $1 \leq t \leq K$ . Since  $h(K-t) + 1 \geq h(0) + 1 = 2$ , we can set  $x = K-t$  in (12) and set  $z = h(K-t) + 1$  in (13) to find that

$$\frac{\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1)}{\Gamma(h(K-t+1) + 1)} \geq \frac{\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1)}{\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1 + \frac{2}{2h(K-t)-1})} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1) 2^{t!}}{\Gamma(h(K - (t-1)) + 1) 2^{t-1} (t-1)!} = 2t \frac{\Gamma(h(K-t) + 1)}{\Gamma(h(K-t+1) + 1)} \geq t \geq 1,$$

as desired.  $\square$

An immediate consequence of Lemma 2.3 is that for each integer  $K \geq 0$ , the maximum value of

$$\frac{1}{f! 2^{t!}} \exp \left( \left[ \binom{f}{2} + t \right] \frac{\ell}{\widehat{r}} \right),$$

over all  $f, t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying  $\binom{f}{2} + t = K$ , is at most

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(h(K) + 1)} \exp \left( \binom{h(K)}{2} \frac{\ell}{\widehat{r}} \right).$$

Applying this estimate to each multiplicand in the definition of  $X(T)$ , we find that

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \max_{T \in \Upsilon_{\geq}} X(T) &\leq \max_{\substack{n \geq f_1 \geq \dots \geq f_{m-1} \geq 0, \\ f_1 \geq \log n}} \prod_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(f_{\ell} + 1)} \exp \left( \binom{f_{\ell}}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{\widehat{r}} \right) \\ &= \max_{f_1 \in [\log n, n]} \exp(\varphi_{1/\widehat{r}}(f_1)) \max_{f_2 \in [0, f_1]} \exp(\varphi_{2/\widehat{r}}(f_2)) \cdots \max_{f_{m-1} \in [0, f_{m-2}]} \exp(\varphi_{(m-1)/\widehat{r}}(f_{m-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where the  $f_{\ell}$ 's run over intervals of real numbers and we have set

$$\varphi_q(f) := -\log \Gamma(f+1) + q \binom{f}{2}.$$

We will now study the behavior of the functions  $\varphi_q$ .

Since the logarithm of the gamma function is convex (by the Bohr–Mollerup Theorem; see, e.g., [4]) and the function  $f \mapsto \binom{f}{2}$  is concave, the function  $\varphi_q$  is also concave for all  $q \geq 0$ . In particular, the maximum value of  $\varphi_q$  on an interval is always assumed at one of the endpoints of the interval. So the maximum over  $f_{m-1}$  is achieved when either  $f_{m-1} = 0$  or  $f_{m-1} = f_{m-2}$ . In the former case, we simply remove this term (since  $\varphi_q(0) = 0$  for all  $q$ ). In the latter case, we “incorporate” the  $f_{m-1}$  term into the preceding  $f_{m-2}$  term by noting that

$$\varphi_{(m-2)/\widehat{r}}(f_{m-2}) + \varphi_{(m-1)/\widehat{r}}(f_{m-2}) = 2\varphi_{(m-3/2)/\widehat{r}}(f_{m-2}).$$

We then obtain the same dichotomy for the maximum over  $f_{m-2}$ , and we continue in this manner until we reach  $f_1$ , where the maximum occurs when either  $f_1 = n$  or  $f_1 = \log n$ . Thus, there is some  $1 \leq s \leq m-1$  such that

$$\max_{T \in \Upsilon_{\geq}} X(T) \leq \max \left\{ \exp \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(\log n) \right), \exp \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(n) \right) \right\}.$$

Then the sum of  $e^{\text{wt}(\boldsymbol{\pi})/\widehat{r}}$  over all  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n^m$  with  $(f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, f_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi}), t_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}), \dots, t_{m-1}(\boldsymbol{\pi})) \in \Upsilon_{\geq}$  is thus at most

$$\binom{m}{2}!(n^2/2)^{m-1}n!^m \max \left\{ \exp \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(\log n) \right), \exp \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(n) \right) \right\},$$

so to prove [Proposition 2.2](#), it suffices to show that

$$(m-1) \log(n^2/2) + \max \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(\log n), \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(n) \right\} \rightarrow -\infty$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We first check that

$$\begin{aligned} (m-1) \log(n^2/2) + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(\log n) &= (m-1) \log(n^2/2) - s \log(\Gamma(\log n + 1)) + \binom{s+1}{2} \binom{\log n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{r}} \\ &= -s \log n \log \log n + O_m(\log n) \end{aligned}$$

tends to  $-\infty$  (with room to spare in the asymptotic condition on  $\widehat{r}$  in (10)). We next consider

$$(15) \quad (m-1) \log(n^2/2) + \sum_{\ell=1}^s \varphi_{\ell/\widehat{r}}(n) = (m-1) \log(n^2/2) - s \log(n!) + \binom{s+1}{2} \binom{n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{r}}.$$

If  $s < m-1$ , then the right-hand side of (15) is  $-(1+o(1))s(1+(s+1)/m)n \log n$ , which certainly tends to  $-\infty$ . If  $s = m-1$ , then the right-hand side of (15) becomes

$$(m-1) \left[ \log(n^2/2) - \log(n!) + \frac{m}{2} \binom{n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{r}} \right],$$

which tends to  $-\infty$  by (10). This finishes the proof of [Proposition 2.2](#) and hence also of [Theorem 1.1](#).

### 3. FURTHER REMARKS

**3.1. Comments on the proof.** When  $m = 2$ , our proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) simplifies considerably but is still nontrivial. In this case, each graph  $G_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  is a disjoint union of edges (corresponding to edges fixed by  $\pi_1\pi_2^{-1}$ ) and even-length cycles. One can then bound  $N_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$  using the known formulas for the chromatic polynomials of cycles in lieu of [Lemma 2.1](#). Moreover, the proof of [Proposition 2.2](#) simplifies because the list  $L(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  consists of the single element  $(1, 2)$  and it is not necessary to extract the subsequence  $\vec{p}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ .

An examination of our proofs shows that [Theorem 1.1](#) continues to hold in the regime where  $m$  grows reasonably slowly with  $n$ . To optimize this dependence (which we have not attempted), one

should tweak some of the parameters appearing in our proof (for instance, the cutoff  $\binom{\log n}{2}$  in the definitions of  $\Upsilon_{\leq}$ ,  $\Upsilon_{\geq}$ ); we leave the details to the curious reader.

**3.2. Sharp thresholds.** [Theorem 1.1](#) shows that the existence problem for rainbow stackings exhibits a sharp threshold, in the sense that the transition from having no rainbow stackings with high probability to having rainbow stackings with high probability occurs within an interval of length roughly  $(2m - 1)/3$ . It is natural to ask if the transition is even sharper; in particular, we pose the following problem.

**Problem 3.1.** *Determine whether or not there exists a function  $r_0: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the following holds. For each  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m: \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_r$  be independent uniformly random  $r$ -edge-colorings. If  $r = r(n)$  satisfies  $r(n) < r_0(n)$ , then with high probability, there does not exist a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ . If  $r = r(n)$  satisfies  $r(n) > r_0(n)$ , then with high probability, there exists a rainbow stacking of  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m$ .*

In the past, the second-moment method has often been effective for obtaining analogous sharp results. A well-known example is the proof of the 2-point concentration of the independence number of the Erdős–Rényi random graph  $G(n, 1/2)$  (see, e.g., [\[3, 5, 8\]](#)). Since, however, the expected value of this quantity is only  $O(\log n)$ , such a sharp concentration is less dramatic than the sharp transition for rainbow stackings, where the critical value of  $r$  is on the order of  $n/\log n$ .

**3.3. Rainbow stackings of deterministic edge-colorings.** It seems interesting to find sufficient (deterministic) conditions for the existence of rainbow stackings, even when  $m = 2$ . Proper edge-colorings provide a natural starting point. We note that not every pair of proper edge-colorings has a rainbow stacking.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $n = 2^k - 2$  for some integer  $k \geq 2$ , then there is a pair of proper edge-colorings of  $K_n$  with no rainbow stackings.*

*Proof.* We provide an explicit construction of such a pair of colorings, based on a construction described in [\[1\]](#) (in the context of transversals in Latin squares). Let  $\mathbb{F}_2^k$  denote the elementary abelian 2-group of rank  $k$ . Let  $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$  be such that  $u_1 \neq v_1$ ,  $u_2 \neq v_2$ , and  $u_1 + v_1 = u_2 + v_2$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let us identify the set  $\mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_i, v_i\}$  with  $[n]$  arbitrarily and define the coloring  $\chi_i: \binom{\mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_i, v_i\}}{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$  by  $\chi_i(\{x, y\}) := x + y$ . It is clear that  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  are proper edge-colorings.

We will show that the colorings  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  do not admit a rainbow stacking. Consider a bijection  $\sigma: \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_1, v_1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_2, v_2\}$ . We claim that there are distinct elements  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}$  such that  $x + \sigma(x) = y + \sigma(y)$ . Indeed, if this were not the case, then the quantities  $z + \sigma(z)$  for  $z \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}$  would all be distinct. Then, since  $\sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_2^k} z = 0$ , the quantity  $\sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}} (z + \sigma(z))$  would be the sum of two distinct elements of  $\mathbb{F}_2^k$ , so it would be nonzero. At the same time, our choice of  $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2$  ensures that

$$\sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}} (z + \sigma(z)) = -(u_1 + v_1) - (u_2 + v_2) = 0.$$

This contradiction establishes the claim.

Take  $x, y$  as in the claim. The fact that  $\chi_1(\{x, y\}) = x + y = \sigma(x) + \sigma(y) = \chi_2(\sigma(\{x, y\}))$  shows that  $\sigma$  is not a rainbow stacking.  $\square$

We remark that the Cayley sum-graph construction in the proof of [Proposition 3.2](#) does not work when  $n$  is sufficiently large and  $n \neq 2^k - 2$ . Indeed, in this case, Müyesser and Pokrovskiy showed [\[11, Theorem 1.4\]](#) that for any  $n$ -element subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\mathbb{F}_2^k$ , there exists a bijection  $\sigma: A \rightarrow B$  such that the sums of the form  $a + \sigma(a)$  for  $a \in A$  are all distinct.

Motivated by these observations and by a conjecture of Ryser about the existence of transversals in Latin squares of odd order (see [\[10, 12\]](#)), we ask the following question.

**Question 3.3.** *For which positive integers  $n$  is it the case that every pair of proper edge-colorings of  $K_n$  admits a rainbow stacking? Is this the case for all odd  $n$ ?*

We have checked by computer that every pair of proper edge-colorings of  $K_n$  admits a rainbow stacking when  $n \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ . It seems that a general resolution of [Question 3.3](#) would be difficult; it may be easier to prove the existence of rainbow stackings under the additional hypothesis that each color appears a small number of times (e.g., at most  $n/100$  times).

**Remark 3.4.** As demonstrated by the example from [Proposition 3.2](#), it is already interesting to study the special case of [Question 3.3](#) in which the colorings are restricted to ones corresponding to Cayley sum-graphs of abelian groups. It seems natural to consider colorings corresponding to the same group, possibly with different subsets of elements. This is in analogy with the relationship between the Hall–Paige conjecture and possibly also the related question of Snevily—which corresponds to groups (see [\[11\]](#))—and the Ryser–Brualdi–Stein conjecture—which was almost completely solved by Montgomery in [\[10\]](#).

**3.4. Hypergraphs.** It could be interesting to extend our work to random edge-colorings of complete  $d$ -uniform hypergraphs for  $d > 2$ .<sup>1</sup>

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the anonymous referee for helpful comments. Noga Alon was supported by the NSF grant DMS-2154082. Colin Defant was supported by the NSF under grant 2201907 and by a Benjamin Peirce Fellowship at Harvard University. Noah Kravitz was supported in part by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant DGE-203965.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Akbari and A. Alipour, Transversals and multicolored matchings. *J. Combin. Des.*, **12** (2004), 325–332.
- [2] N. Alon, C. Defant and N. Kravitz, Typical and Extremal Aspects of Friends-and-Strangers Graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, **158** (2023), part 1, 3–42.
- [3] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method, Fourth Edition*. Wiley, 2016.
- [4] E. Artin, *The Gamma Function*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- [5] B. Bollobás and P. Erdős, Cliques in random graphs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **80** (1976), 419–427.
- [6] R. Gu. A note on rainbow stackings of random edge-colorings of hypergraphs. *Discrete Math.*, **348** (2025).
- [7] H. Kaul and B. Reiniger. A generalization of the graph packing theorems of Sauer–Spencer and Brandt. *Combinatorica*, **42** (2022), 1347–1356.
- [8] D. W. Matula, *The Largest Clique Size in a Random Graph*. Technical report, Southern Methodist University, 1976.
- [9] A. Milojević, Connectivity of old and new models of friends-and-strangers graphs, *Adv. Appl. Math.*, **155** (2024), Paper No. 102668, 53 pp.
- [10] R. Montgomery, A proof of the Ryser–Brualdi–Stein conjecture for large even  $n$ . *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.19779.
- [11] A. Műyesser and A. Pokrovskiy, A random Hall–Paige conjecture. *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.09666.
- [12] H. Ryser, Neuere probleme der kombinatorik. In *Vorträge über Kombinatorik*, Oberwolfach, 1967, 69–91.
- [13] N. Sauer and J. Spencer. Edge disjoint placement of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, **25** (1978), 295–302.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NJ 08544, USA AND SCHOOLS OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY, TEL AVIV 69978, ISRAEL  
*Email address:* `nalon@math.princeton.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138, USA  
*Email address:* `colindefant@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NJ 08540, USA  
*Email address:* `nkravitz@princeton.edu`

---

<sup>1</sup>Note added in revision: Motivated by our open problem, Gu [\[6\]](#) has recently obtained such an analogue of [Theorem 1.1](#).