

---

# On Polynomial Methods in Combinatorics

---

Conrad Crowley  
118316041

Supervisor: Dr. Marco Vitturi  
Second Reader: Dr. Andrei Mustata

Final Year Project 2022



# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1 The Kakeya Problem in Finite Fields</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background . . . . .	3
1.2 Introduction to Finite Fields . . . . .	3
1.3 Combinatorial attempts at the proof . . . . .	3
1.3.1 Bush Argument . . . . .	4
1.3.2 Hair Brush Argument . . . . .	4
1.4 Dvir's Proof . . . . .	5
<b>2 The Joints Problem</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Background . . . . .	8
2.2 Solution of the Joints Problem . . . . .	9
<b>3 Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Background . . . . .	11
3.2 The Trivial Bound . . . . .	11
3.3 Examples . . . . .	13
3.4 Ham Sandwich Theorems . . . . .	14
3.5 Proof of the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem . . . . .	16
<b>4 Counting Circle Tangencies</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 Trivial Bounds . . . . .	19
4.2 Lifting of circles to $\mathbb{R}^3$ . . . . .	20
4.3 Ellenberg-Solymosi-Zahl's Proof of Theorem 4.1.2 . . . . .	21
4.4 Proof via Polynomial Partitioning for Varieties . . . . .	23
<b>5 The Polynomial Method in Additive Combinatorics</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1 Combinatorial Nullstellensatz . . . . .	26
5.2 Cauchy-Davenport Theorem . . . . .	27
<b>References</b>	<b>28</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	An example of a Kakeya set (shaded) in $\mathbb{F}_3^2$ . . . . .	3
2.1	A $N \times N$ layer of our grid. . . . .	8

# Chapter 1

## The Kakeya Problem in Finite Fields

Before we can discuss the Kakeya problem in finite fields, and its rather surprising resolution, we ought to first discuss the origin and history of the problem. Work on the Kakeya problem can be traced back to the Russian mathematician Abram Besicovitch in 1917. While working on a problem in Riemann integration, Besicovitch reduced it to the question of the existence of planar sets of measure zero which contain a line segment in every direction. In 1920, Besicovitch constructed such a set and published in a Russian Journal.

However, 1917 was a turbulent year as it marked the end of the Russian Empire and the start of the Russian civil war. Due to this and the ensuing blockade of Russian ports there was scarce communication with the outside world. Thus Besicovitch could not have known of a Japanese mathematician Kakeya who asked also in 1917 a related question: What is the smallest area of a convex set within which one can rotate a needle by 180 degrees in the plane? Julius Pal answered this question in 1921 with the equilateral triangle. The more interesting problem without the convexity condition remained open. In 1924, after leaving the newly formed Soviet Union for Copenhagen, Besicovitch discovered this problem and by modifying his previous construction produced a solution in 1925. This led to the more general questions being asked about Kakeya sets in higher dimensions.

**Definition 1.0.1** (Kakeya Set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ). A Kakeya set is a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  that contains a unit segment in every direction.

Besicovitch's construction showed that these sets can have arbitrarily small measures, even attaining zero, in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Further, a straightforward construction produces these measure zero sets in dimensions  $> 2$ .

The natural question then arises, what is the dimension of such sets? There are many notions of dimensions that can be investigated, but we restrict ourselves to the Minkowski and Hausdorff dimensions.

**Definition 1.0.2** (Minkowski Dimension). Given a set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , define  $N(\varepsilon)$  to be the

number of boxes of side length  $\varepsilon$  required to cover the set. The Minkowski Dimension of the set  $S$  is then defined as:

$$\dim_M(S) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log(N(\varepsilon))}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}.$$

If this limit does not exist, one can still define the upper and lower Minkowski dimensions,  $\dim_{M_{\text{upper}}}$  and  $\dim_{M_{\text{lower}}}$ , by taking the limit superior and limit inferior respectively.

**Definition 1.0.3** (Hausdorff Dimension). We define the  $d$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of a set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  as:

$$\mathcal{H}^d(S) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_i r_i^d : \text{there is a countable cover of } S \text{ by balls with radii } 0 < r_i < r \right\}$$

Then we can define the Hausdorff dimension of the set  $S$  to be:

$$\dim_H(S) = \inf\{d \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^d(S) = 0\}.$$

These dimensions are related by the following inequality when they are all defined:

$$\dim_H \leq \dim_{M_{\text{lower}}} \leq \dim_{M_{\text{upper}}}.$$

In 1971, Davies produced a solution for the 2 dimensional case, proving that although the measure of a Kakeya set can be arbitrarily small, it must have Hausdorff (and hence Minkowski) dimension of 2.[1] This resulted in the following conjectures:

**Conjecture 1** (Kakeya Conjecture for the Minkowski Dimension). Let  $A$  be a Kakeya set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $\dim_M(A) = n$ .

**Conjecture 2** (Kakeya Conjecture for the Hausdorff Dimension). Let  $A$  be a Kakeya set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $\dim_H(A) = n$ .

## Notation

We introduce some convenient notation here. We write that  $A \lesssim_n B$  to mean that there exists some constant  $C(n)$  which depends on  $n$  such that  $A \leq C(n)B$ . Further, we write that  $A \sim_n B$  if  $A \lesssim_n B$  and  $B \lesssim_n A$ .

We write  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  to represent the space of polynomials in  $n$  variables with coefficients in  $\mathbb{K}$  and degree at most  $D$ .

The indicator function  $\mathbb{1}$  is defined on logical statements  $X$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{1}[X] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X \text{ is true,} \\ 0 & \text{if } X \text{ is false.} \end{cases}$$

Wolff  
finite  
fields

For any function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  let us denote the zero set of  $f$  by  $Z(f) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) = 0\}$ .

## 1.1 Background

Analogous to the Euclidean case, we define lines in  $\mathbb{F}_p^n$  as the set:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{x + ty : x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n, t \in \mathbb{F}_p\}$$

A Kakeya set in  $\mathbb{F}_p^n$  is a set that contains a line in every direction.




Figure 1.1: An example of a Kakeya set (shaded) in  $\mathbb{F}_3^2$ .

## 1.2 Introduction to Finite Fields

**Definition 1.2.1** (Finite Field). A finite field,  $\mathbb{F}$ , is a finite set that forms a field. That is, it is closed under addition, subtraction, multiplication, and non-zero division. The number of elements of a finite field,  $|\mathbb{F}|$ , is called the order of the finite field.

A finite field of order  $q$  exists if and only if  $q = p^k$  for some prime  $p$  and integer  $k$ .

**Lemma 1.2.1.** *Each element  $X$  in a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$  satisfies the identity:*

$$X^{|\mathbb{F}|} - X = 0$$

*identically in  $\mathbb{F}$ .*

This lemma follows immediately from Fermat's Little Theorem.

## 1.3 Combinatorial attempts at the proof

We fix a finite field  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_{p^k}$ .

more  
needed  
here

this sec-  
tion  
sucks,  
rewrite!

### 1.3.1 Bush Argument

Bourgain produced one of the first non-trivial estimates of the dimension in 1991.[2] We present the finite field analogue of his argument here.[3]

**Theorem 1.3.1** (Bush Argument). *If  $l_1, \dots, l_M$  are lines in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , then the number of points in their union is at least*

$$\frac{1}{2}M^{1/2}|\mathbb{F}|$$

*In particular, if  $A$  is a Kakeya set, then we have:*

$$|A| \gtrsim |\mathbb{F}|^{\frac{n+1}{2}}$$

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be the union of the lines  $l_1, \dots, l_M$ . Each of these lines contains  $|\mathbb{F}|$  points of  $X$ , so we have  $|\mathbb{F}|M$  points to distribute over  $X$ . By the pigeonhole principle, there is a point  $x \in X$  which lies in at least  $|\mathbb{F}|M|X|^{-1}$  of the lines  $l_i$ .

These set of lines  $l_i$  through  $x$  is called the bush of  $x$ . These lines are disjoint except at  $x$ , and their union lies in  $X$ . So we have:

$$(|\mathbb{F}| - 1)|\mathbb{F}|M|X|^{-1} \leq |X|.$$

Rearranging we get:

$$\frac{1}{2}|\mathbb{F}|M^{1/2} \leq |X|$$

A Kakeya set  $A \subset \mathbb{F}^n$  contains at least  $|\mathbb{F}|^{n-1}$  lines. Setting  $M = |\mathbb{F}|^{n-1}$  yields:

$$\frac{1}{2}|\mathbb{F}||\mathbb{F}|^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sim |\mathbb{F}|^{\frac{n-1+2}{2}} = |\mathbb{F}|^{\frac{n+1}{2}} \lesssim |A|.$$

□

### 1.3.2 Hair Brush Argument

Due to Wolff. [4]

**Theorem 1.3.2** (Hair Brush Argument). *Suppose  $l_1, \dots, l_M$  are lines in  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , and that at most  $|\mathbb{F}| + 1$  of the lines lie in any plane. Then their union has cardinality at least*

$$\frac{1}{3}|\mathbb{F}|^{3/2}M^{1/2}.$$

*In particular, if  $A$  is a Kakeya set, then we have:*

$$|A| \gtrsim |\mathbb{F}|^{\frac{n+2}{2}}$$

*Proof.* Let  $X = \cup_i l_i$ . If  $l_i$  is a line in  $A$ , then the hairbrush with stem  $l_i$  is defined to be the set of lines  $l_j$  which intersect  $l_i$ . An average point of  $X$  lies in  $|\mathbb{F}|M|X|^{-1}$  lines  $l_i$ .

Im not sure what to expand on here - we could contradict by saying if this wasn't the case but that seems verbose

If each point of  $X$  was about average, then each hairbrush would contain  $\gtrsim |\mathbb{F}|^2 M |X|^{-1}$  lines. We claim that there is always at least one hairbrush with  $\geq (1/2) |\mathbb{F}|^2 M |X|^{-1}$  lines.  $\square$

Finish  
this  
proof

## 1.4 Dvir's Proof

In finite fields Kakeya's conjecture is as follows:

**Theorem 1.4.1** (Kakeya Conjecture in Finite Fields). *If  $A \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$  contains a translate of every line, then  $|A| \gtrsim_n p^n$ .*

We shall prove this theorem via 3 surprisingly simple lemmas. This formulation of Dvir's proof is due to Gowers.[5]

**Lemma 1.4.2** (Parameter Counting). *Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a (not necessarily finite) field. If  $A \subset \mathbb{K}^n$  and  $|A| < \binom{n+D}{n}$ , there exists a non-zero polynomial  $P(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of degree  $D$  that vanishes on  $A$ .*

*Proof.* We first show the dimension of  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  is  $\binom{D+n}{n}$ . A basis for  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  is given by monomials of the form  $x_1^{D_1} \dots x_n^{D_n}$ , where  $\sum_i D_i \leq D$ , hence we just need to count the number of monomials.

We can map a monomial  $x_1^{D_1} \dots x_n^{D_n}$  to a string of  $D$   $\star$ 's and  $n$   $|$ 's as follows. Begin with  $D_1$   $\star$ 's, then place one  $|$ . We put now  $D_2$   $\star$ 's, and place a second  $|$ . We continue until we have placed  $D_n$   $\star$ 's followed by an  $n^{\text{th}}$   $|$ . Finally we place  $D - \sum_i D_i$   $\star$ 's. This is a bijective map between the monomials in  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  and all the strings of  $D$   $\star$ 's and  $n$   $|$ 's. To count the strings, fix the  $n$   $|$ 's. Now we have  $n+1$  bins to distribute our  $D$   $\star$ 's. Therefore we have by the stars and bars theorem:

$$\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n) = \binom{n+1+D-1}{n+1-1} = \binom{n+D}{n}.$$

Let now  $p_1, \dots, p_{|A|}$  be the points of  $A$ . We consider the evaluation map  $E : \text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^{|A|}$  defined by:

$$E(Q) = (Q(p_1), \dots, Q(p_{|A|})).$$

This map is clearly linear. Its kernel  $\ker E$  is exactly the set of polynomials in  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  that vanish on  $A$ . By assumption, the dimension of  $\text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  is greater than  $|A|$ , so the dimension of the domain of  $E$  is greater than the codomain of  $E$ . By the rank-nullity theorem, we conclude  $E$  must have a non-trivial kernel. Thus there exists a non-zero polynomial  $P \in \text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{K}^n)$  that vanishes on  $A$ .  $\square$

Note that if  $D = |\mathbb{F}| - 1$ , and  $|A| \leq \binom{|\mathbb{F}|+n-1}{|\mathbb{F}|-1} = \binom{|\mathbb{F}|+n-1}{n}$  we have a polynomial of degree  $|\mathbb{F}| - 1$  that vanishes on  $A$ . Since  $\frac{|\mathbb{F}|^n}{n!} < \binom{|\mathbb{F}|+n-1}{n}$ , we can definitely find such a polynomial when  $|A| \leq \frac{|\mathbb{F}|^n}{n!}$ .



**Lemma 1.4.3.** *Suppose  $A \subset \mathbb{F}^n$  contains a line in every direction, and suppose that there exists a non-zero polynomial  $P$  with degree  $D < |\mathbb{F}|$  that vanishes on  $A$ . Then there exists a non-zero degree  $D$  polynomial  $\bar{P}$  that vanishes everywhere on  $\mathbb{F}^n$ .*

*Proof.* Choose a line in  $A$ , say  $\ell = \{x + tz : t \in \mathbb{F}\}$  with  $x \in \mathbb{F}^n$  and  $z \in \mathbb{F}^n/\mathbb{F}^\times$ . Now we consider the restriction of our polynomial  $P$  to the line  $\ell$ ,  $P|_\ell$ . Recall  $P$  is a sum of monomials, and we use multi-index notation here with  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ ,  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and  $|\alpha| = \sum \alpha_i$ .  $P$  can be written as:

$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq D} c_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

Now  $P|_\ell$  can be written:

$$P|_\ell = P(x + tz) = Q_{x,z}(t) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq D} c_\alpha \prod_i (x_i + tz_i)^{\alpha_i}.$$

We now wish to examine the degree  $D$  term of  $Q$ , which is achieved by picking the  $tz_i$  terms from each bracket in the product above. This gives the degree  $D$  component of  $Q$ ,  $Q_{x,z,D}$ , which has the form:

$$Q_{x,z,D} = t^D Q_D(z) = t^D \sum_{|\alpha|=D} c_\alpha \prod_i z_i^{\alpha_i}.$$

Now if  $P|_\ell$  vanishes everywhere on  $\ell$ , since its dependence on  $t$  is given by a polynomial of degree less than  $|\mathbb{F}|$ , all its coefficients must be zero. This is clear from the factor theorem, as we could write the roots of  $P|_\ell$  as  $(t - k_1)(t - k_2) \dots (t - k_{|\mathbb{F}|})$ , but this contradicts the fact  $P$  is of degree  $D < |\mathbb{F}|$ .

Notice that  $Q_{x,z,D}$  no longer depends on  $x$ , but on  $z$  alone. In particular  $Q_D(z) = 0$ , but  $z$  was an arbitrary element of  $\mathbb{F}^n/\mathbb{F}^\times$ , and  $Q_D(z)$  also vanishes at zero, so it vanishes everywhere. Thus we can pick  $\bar{P} = Q_D$ , and we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.4.4.** *Let  $P$  be a non-zero polynomial on  $\mathbb{F}^n$  with degree less than  $|\mathbb{F}|$ . Then  $P$  does not vanish everywhere.*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$ , a non-zero polynomial that vanishes everywhere has  $|\mathbb{F}|$  roots, so must be at least of degree  $|\mathbb{F}|$ . Let us assume that the statement holds in  $\mathbb{F}^{n-1}$ , we now prove it must also hold for  $\mathbb{F}^n$ .

We let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be coordinates on  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , and we write  $P$  in the form:

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^{|\mathbb{F}|-1} P_j(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) x_n^j.$$

Each  $P_j$  are polynomials in  $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}$  of degree less than  $|\mathbb{F}|$ . Fix  $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}$ , and let  $x_n$  vary. Now we have a polynomial in  $x_n$  of degree less than  $|\mathbb{F}|$  that vanishes for all  $x_n \in \mathbb{F}$ . By the base case this must be the zero polynomial. So each  $P_j(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0$

for all  $j$  and for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^{n-1}$ . Now by induction on  $n$ , each  $P_j$  is the zero polynomial. Then  $P$  is the zero polynomial as well. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.1.* Assume  $A \subset \mathbb{F}^n$  is a Kakeya set, and that  $|A| \leq \frac{|\mathbb{F}|^n}{n!}$ . Then by 1.4.2 we can find a non-zero polynomial, say  $P$ , that vanishes on  $A$ . Now by 1.4.3 there exists a non-zero polynomial  $\bar{P}$  that vanishes everywhere on  $\mathbb{F}^n$ , and has degree less than  $|\mathbb{F}|$ . Finally 1.4.4 says that such a  $\bar{P}$  is necessarily the zero polynomial, a contradiction. We conclude that  $|A| > \frac{|\mathbb{F}|^n}{n!}$ , or in other words:

$$|A| \gtrsim_n |\mathbb{F}|^n.$$

□

## Chapter 2

# The Joints Problem

### 2.1 Background

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a set of distinct lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A joint of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a point which lies in three non-coplanar lines of  $\mathcal{L}$ . The joints problem consists of setting a sharp lower bound on the maximal number of joints that can be formed from a configuration of  $L$  distinct lines. We denote this quantity  $J(L)$ . In other words  $J(L)$  is the supremum over all configurations of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in the number of joints.

We shall begin by examining an example based on a grid, with the hopes of gaining better intuition about the problem and formulating a conjecture.

**Example 2.1.** Consider an  $N \times N \times N$  regular grid of integer coordinates. We shall give a collection of lines such that each point of this grid is a joint for the collection. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the collection of all lines parallel to any of the Cartesian axes that intersect this a point in this grid. For each horizontal  $N \times N$  layer, there are  $N + N = 2N$  lines that intersect our grid. There are  $N$  layers, so we obtain  $2N^2$  distinct lines in this manner. Finally we need to account for the  $N^2$  lines perpendicular to the  $N \times N$  layers. This leaves us with  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3N^2$  lines forming  $N^3$  joints. The number of joints is thus  $\sim |\mathcal{L}|^{3/2}$ .




Figure 2.1: A  $N \times N$  layer of our grid.

We can extend this example to higher dimensional grids easily.

**Example 2.2.** If we have an  $\underbrace{N \times \cdots \times N}_{n \text{ Dimensions}}$  regular grid of integer coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we can

construct an example by a straightforward extension of the above example. Each additional dimension increases the number of lines by a factor of  $N$ , this can be seen by considering each new dimension as a layering of the previous set along the new axis. Thus we can see that  $\sim N^{n-1}$  lines form  $N^n$  joints in this manner. So the number of joints is  $\sim |\mathcal{L}|^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ .

It turns out that the examples illustrated above provide asymptotically maximal configurations, that is, disregarding the best constant  $C$  such that  $J(L) \leq CL^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$ .

## 2.2 Solution of the Joints Problem

This solution was first produced by Guth-Katz for the three-dimensional case,[6] and later extended to the general case by Quilodr  n,[7] and independently at the same time by Kaplan-Sharir-Shustin.[8]

**Theorem 2.2.1.** *Any  $L$  lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  determine  $\lesssim_n L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}$  joints.*

We begin with the fundamental lemma to this proof.

**Lemma 2.2.2.** *If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a set of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that determines  $J$  joints, then one of the lines contains at most  $nJ^{\frac{1}{n}}$  joints.*

*Proof.* Let  $P$  denote the lowest degree non-zero polynomial that vanishes at every joint of  $\mathcal{L}$ . By parameter counting, Lemma 1.4.2, the degree of  $P$  is at most  $nJ^{\frac{1}{n}}$ . (To see this, set  $D = \lfloor nJ^{\frac{1}{n}} \rfloor$  and then  $J < \binom{D+n}{n}$ .)

We proceed by contradiction. Assume every line contains more than  $nJ^{\frac{1}{n}}$  joints. Now  $P$  must vanish on every line in  $\mathcal{L}$  as the degree of  $P$  is less than the number of joints it must interpolate.

We now examine the gradient of  $P$  at each joint in  $\mathcal{L}$ . We will need a fact about gradients for this, which we will encapsulate in the following lemma for clarity.

**Lemma 2.2.3.** *If  $x$  is a joint of  $\mathcal{L}$ , and if a smooth function  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  vanishes on the lines of  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $\nabla F$  vanishes at  $x$ .*

*Proof.* The joint  $x$  is contained in  $n$  non-coplanar lines  $l_1, \dots, l_n$ , in directions  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$  respectively. Now consider the directional derivative for a particular  $v_i$ :

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_i} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\overbrace{F(x + tv_i)}^{F \equiv 0 \text{ on a line in } \mathcal{L}} - \overbrace{F(x)}^{F \equiv 0 \text{ on joints}}}{t} = \frac{0}{t} = 0.$$

Notice that  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_i} = \langle \nabla F, v_i \rangle$ , so since we have this for each  $v_i$ , and the set of  $v_i$ 's form a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we have that  $\nabla F(x) = 0$ .  $\square$

So we see that the partial derivatives of  $P$  vanish at each joint. The derivatives are polynomials of smaller degree than  $P$  and since  $P$  was assumed to be the minimal degree non-zero polynomial that vanishes at each joint, each derivative of  $P$  is identically zero.

This implies  $P$  must be constant, which implies that there does not exist such a minimal degree polynomial, a contradiction.  $\square$

Finally we can prove the main result.

*Proof.* Lemma 2.2.2 tells us that if we remove a line from our collection, we are removing at most  $nJ(L)^{\frac{1}{n}}$  joints. By repeating this process, we get the chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(L) &\leq J(L-1) + n(J(L))^{\frac{1}{n}} \\
 &\leq J(L-2) + 2 \left[ n(J(L))^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] \\
 &\leq J(L-3) + 3 \left[ n(J(L))^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] \\
 &\vdots \\
 &\leq L \left[ n(J(L))^{\frac{1}{n}} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(L) &\leq L \left[ n(J(L))^{\frac{1}{n}} \right] \\
 J(L)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} &\lesssim_n L \\
 J(L) &\lesssim_n L^{\frac{n}{n-1}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## Chapter 3

# Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem

In this chapter we will study the application of the polynomial method to incidence geometry by proving a fundamental theorem in the field. Incidence geometry is the study of possible intersection patterns of simple geometric objects, such as lines or low degree curves. We have already seen an incidence problem in the previous chapter on the Joints problem. By developing the powerful tool of polynomial partitioning we shall see the key role that the topology of  $\mathbb{R}$  can play in such problems, in contrast to the trivial topology of finite fields.

### 3.1 Background

The Szemerédi-Trotter theorem is a fundamental theorem to the field of incidence geometry, originally proved by an involved cell decomposition argument of Szemerédi and Trotter and later given a shorter proof using crossing numbers by Székely.

**Theorem 3.1.1** (Szemerédi-Trotter). *Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a finite set of points and let  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a finite set of lines. We define*

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) = \{(p, \ell) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{L} \mid p \in \ell\}$$

*to be the set of incidences between  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

*Then:*

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \lesssim (|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{L}|)^{2/3} + |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{L}|$$

### 3.2 The Trivial Bound

In planar geometry, we have the following dual statements: two points determine a line and every pair of lines intersect in at most one point. Using this we can prove the following bounds on  $I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})$ :

**Theorem 3.2.1** (Trivial Bounds). *For a set of points  $\mathcal{S}$  and lines  $\mathcal{L}$  we have*

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \leq |\mathcal{S}|^2 + |\mathcal{L}|.$$

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \leq |\mathcal{L}|^2 + |\mathcal{S}|.$$

*Proof.* To see this, count the lines that have at most one point in  $\mathcal{S}$  on them. These contribute at most  $|\mathcal{L}|$  incidences. Every other line has at least two points in  $\mathcal{S}$ . The total number of incidences on these lines is at most  $|\mathcal{S}|^2$  as otherwise there would exist a  $p \in \mathcal{S}$  that lies on over  $|\mathcal{S}|$  lines, and each of these lines would have an additional point on it. This would imply there are more than  $|\mathcal{S}|$  points, a contradiction.

Interchanging the roles of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  achieves the other bound. □

does it?

**Theorem 3.2.2** (Second Trivial Incidence Bound).

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \lesssim |\mathcal{S}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\mathcal{L}|$$

and

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \lesssim |\mathcal{L}| \cdot |\mathcal{S}|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\mathcal{S}|.$$

*Proof.* We now bound the number of incidences.

$$\begin{aligned} |I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})|^2 &= \left( \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{1}[p \in \ell] \right)^2 \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}| \cdot \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \left( \sum_{p \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{1}[p \in \ell] \right)^2 \quad (\text{Cauchy-Schwarz on } \ell) \\ &= |\mathcal{L}| \cdot \sum_{p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{1}[p_1 \in \ell] \mathbb{1}[p_2 \in \ell] \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}| \cdot (|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| + |\mathcal{S}|^2) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}|^2 + 2|\mathcal{L}| \cdot |\mathcal{S}|^2 \quad (\text{Using Theorem 3.2.1}) \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \lesssim |\mathcal{S}| \cdot |\mathcal{L}|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\mathcal{L}|.$$

Repeating the above proof interchanging the roles  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{L}$  achieves the other bound. □

extra  
step  
needed  
here -  
split up  
sum and  
do triple  
thing

### 3.3 Examples

We can not improve beyond our second trivial bounds in a finite field  $\mathbb{F}^2$ .

**Example 3.1** (Finite Fields). *Consider the set of points  $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{F}^2$  and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of all lines in  $\mathbb{F}^2$ . Every line contains exactly  $|\mathbb{F}|$  many points of  $\mathcal{S}$ , so we have  $|\mathbb{F}|^3$  incidences. So both sides of the second trivial bound are comparable:*

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) = |\mathbb{F}|^3 \sim (|\mathbb{F}|^2)(|\mathbb{F}|^2)^{1/2} + |\mathbb{F}|^2.$$

In contrast, the following examples seem to be the best possible over  $\mathbb{R}$ . We will later prove that these are the tight case of the Szemerédi–Trotter Theorem. We define a line in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as follows:

$$\ell_{m,c} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y = mx + c\}.$$

**Example 3.2.** *Consider the following collections in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid a \in [1, N], b \in [1, 2N^2]\} \\ \mathcal{L} &= \{\ell_{m,c} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid m, c \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in [1, N], c \in [1, N^2]\} \end{aligned}$$

*The collection  $\mathcal{S}$  contains  $2N^3$  points and  $\mathcal{L}$  contains  $N^3$  lines. Every line in  $\mathcal{L}$  contains  $N$  points in  $\mathcal{S}$  as for each  $x \in [1, N]$  the  $y$ -coordinate of  $\ell_{m,c}$ ,  $mx + c$ , gives a different integer in  $[1, 2N^2]$ . Hence there are  $N^4$  incidences. Both sides of the Szemerédi–Trotter inequality are comparable as*

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) = N^4 \sim (N^3)^{\frac{2}{3}}(N^3)^{\frac{2}{3}} \sim |\mathcal{S}|^{2/3}|\mathcal{L}|^{2/3}$$

diagram?

**Example 3.3.** *Let  $N \gg 1$  be a large even integer and let  $1 < R \ll N$  be another integer. Consider the collections in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid (a, b) \in [-N/2, N/2] \times [-N/2, N/2]\} \\ \mathcal{L} &= \{\ell \mid \ell \text{ contains between } R \text{ and } 2R \text{ points of } \mathcal{S}\} \end{aligned}$$

*We begin by estimating how many lines pass through a given point of the regular grid  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  and  $p \in \mathcal{S}$ . The closest point  $p' \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $p \neq p'$  and  $p' \in \ell$  must lie in a square centred at  $p$  of side length  $\sim N/R$ . This follows from the fact that there are at least  $R$  points of  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\ell$  and hence the projections of these points to the axes can be separated by at most  $\sim N/R$ . Taking each possible combination of these we can conclude that there are  $\lesssim N^2/R^2$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  through a given point  $p$ .*

check  
here

*We now claim that there are  $\gtrsim N^2/R^2$  distinct such lines. We need only consider the points in the upper right quadrant of  $\mathcal{S}$  as the problem is symmetrical. Further, we restrict ourselves to considering lines with slopes  $m$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{2} < m < 2$ . For such a line to contain  $R$  points of  $\mathcal{S}$  we require  $m = \frac{l}{k} \in \mathbb{Q}$  with  $\gcd(l, k) = 1$  and  $l, k \in [\frac{N}{2R}, \frac{N}{R}]$ .*



There are  $\gtrsim N^2/R^2$  pairs, as the proportion of pairs that share a factor of 2 is  $\frac{1}{2}^2$  and the proportion of pairs that share a factor of 3 is  $\frac{1}{3}^2$ , and in general the proportion that shares a factor of  $k$  is  $\frac{1}{k}^2$ . We have that  $\sum_{k>1} \frac{1}{k}^2 < \frac{2}{3} < 1$  and hence there are  $\gtrsim N^2/R^2$  distinct lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  through each point. Taking account of what we have shown:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}| &\sim N^2 \\ |\mathcal{L}| &\sim |\mathcal{S}| \frac{N^2}{R^2} \frac{1}{R} \sim \frac{N^4}{R^3} \\ |I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| &\sim |\mathcal{S}| \frac{N^2}{R^2} \sim \frac{N^4}{R^2} \end{aligned}$$

we can see that both sides of the Szemerédi-Trotter inequality are comparable:

$$|I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})| \sim \frac{N^4}{R^2} \sim (N^2)^{\frac{2}{3}} \left( \frac{N^4}{R^3} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \sim |\mathcal{S}|^{\frac{2}{3}} |\mathcal{L}|^{\frac{2}{3}}$$

add diagram (!)

### 3.4 Ham Sandwich Theorems

The above examples suggest that the topology of  $\mathbb{R}$  plays a key role in this incidence problem. We shall now introduce the method of polynomial partitioning, which can be seen as the topological analogy to the vanishing lemma we used in the previous chapters.

Let  $\mathbb{S}^n$  denote the unit  $n$ -sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.1** (Borsuk-Ulam). *A map  $\phi$  is said to be antipodal if it obeys  $\phi(-x) = -\phi(x)$  for all  $x$  in its domain. Suppose  $\phi : \mathbb{S}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is a continuous antipodal mapping. Then the image of  $\phi$  contains 0.*

The proof of this result is long and beyond the scope of this paper. We refer interested readers to a beautiful geometric proof in chapter 2 of Matousek's book *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem*. [9]

Let us now define some useful notation going forward.

**Definition 3.4.1** (Bisection of a Set). A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to bisect an open set  $U$  with volume  $\text{Vol}(U) < \infty$  if:

$$\text{Vol}\{x \in U \mid f(x) > 0\} = \text{Vol}\{x \in U \mid f(x) < 0\} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Vol}(U).$$

Analogously, a function  $f$  is said to bisect a finite set  $S$  if both:

$$|\{x \in S \mid f(x) > 0\}| \leq \frac{|S|}{2}$$

and

$$|\{x \in S \mid f(x) < 0\}| \leq \frac{|S|}{2}.$$

**Theorem 3.4.2** (General Ham Sandwich Theorem). *Let  $V$  be a finite dimensional vector space of continuous functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for any non-zero function  $f$ ,  $Z(f)$  has zero Lebesgue measure. Let  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_N \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be finite volume open sets with  $N < \dim V$ .*

*Then there exists a non-zero function  $f \in V$  that bisects each  $U_i$ .*

*Proof.* Define the functions  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^N$ ,  $\phi_i : V \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi_i(f) = \text{Vol}(\{x \in U_i \mid f(x) > 0\}) - \text{Vol}(\{x \in U_i \mid f(x) < 0\})$$

Since  $Z(f)$  has measure zero, it is easy to see that  $\phi_i(f) = 0$  if and only if  $f$  bisects  $U_i$ . Notice also that  $\phi_i(-f) = -\phi_i(f)$ , hence  $\phi_i$  is antipodal.

We now show each  $\phi_i$  is continuous. It is enough to show that if  $U$  is a finite volume open set, then the measure of  $\{x \in U \mid f(x) > 0\}$  depends continuously on  $f \in V \setminus \{0\}$ .

Suppose  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in  $V$  for some  $f, f_n \in V \setminus \{0\}$ .  $f_n$  converges to  $f$  in the topology of  $V$ , so it follows it must converge pointwise. Pick any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By Egorov's theorem, we can find a subset  $E \subset U$  so that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly pointwise on  $U \setminus E$ , and  $m(E) < \varepsilon$ . By hypothesis,  $m(Z(f)) = 0$  and  $m(U) < \infty$ . Since the Lebesgue measure is continuous we can choose  $\delta$  such that  $m(\{x \in U \mid |f(x)| < \delta\}) < \varepsilon$ .

Now we choose  $n$  sufficiently large that  $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \delta$  on  $U \setminus E$ . Then we have

$$|m(\{x \in U \mid f_n(x) > 0\}) - m(\{x \in U \mid f(x) > 0\})| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary each  $\phi_i$  is continuous.

We now combine each  $\phi_i$  into the map  $\phi : V \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ . Since  $\dim V > N$ , select a subspace  $U < V$  such that  $\dim U = N + 1$ . Now choose an isomorphism of  $U$  with  $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ , and think of  $\mathbb{S}^N$  as a subset of  $U$ . Now the map  $\phi : \mathbb{S}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is antipodal and continuous. By the Borsuk-Ulam theorem, there exists an  $f \in \mathbb{S}^N \subset V \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\phi(f) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.2.1** (Finite Ham Sandwich Theorem). *Let  $S_1, \dots, S_N$  be finite sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $D$  be such that  $N < \binom{D+n}{n}$ . Then there exists a non-zero  $P \in \text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that bisects each  $S_i$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $\delta > 0$ , define  $U_{i,\delta}$  to be the union of  $\delta$ -balls centred at the points of  $S_i$ . By Theorem 3.4.2, we can find a non-zero  $P_\delta$  with degree less than  $D$  that bisects each  $U_{i,\delta}$ . By rescaling we can assume  $P_\delta \in \mathbb{S}^N \subset \text{Poly}_D(\mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\mathbb{S}^N$  compact, we can find a sequence  $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$  so that  $P_{\delta_m}$  converges to  $P$  in  $\mathbb{S}^N$ . Since the coefficients of  $P_{\delta_m}$  converge to  $P$ ,  $P_{\delta_m}$  converges to  $P$  uniformly on compact sets.

We claim  $P$  bisects each  $S_i$ . By contradiction, suppose  $P > 0$  on more than half the points of  $S_i$ , say on the points of  $S_i^+$ . Choosing  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small, we can assume  $P > 0$  on the  $\varepsilon$ -ball around each point of  $S_i^+$ . Further, we can choose  $\varepsilon$  such that each  $\varepsilon$ -ball is disjoint. Since  $P_{\delta_m}$  converges uniformly, we can find  $m$  sufficiently large such that  $P_{\delta_m} > 0$  on the  $\varepsilon$ -ball around each point of  $S_i^+$ . By making  $m$  large, we can also arrange that  $\delta_m < \varepsilon$ . Thus  $P_{\delta_m} > 0$  on more than half the points of  $U_{i,\delta_m}$ .  $\square$

is this  
just  
cnty  
of every-  
thing?  
- ask  
marco

abusing  
nota-  
tion,  
also the  
norm is  
11?

**Theorem 3.4.3** (Polynomial Partitioning). *For any  $n$  there exists a constant  $c(n)$  such that if  $S$  is a finite subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $D$  is any degree, then there exists a polynomial  $P$  of degree  $D$  such that  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$  is a disjoint union of  $\lesssim D^n$  open sets  $O_i$  each containing  $\lesssim_n |S|D^{-n}$  points.*

*Proof.* The main idea of this proof is the repeated application of the Finite Ham Sandwich Theorem. We begin by finding a polynomial  $P_1$  of degree 1 that bisects  $S$ . This partitions  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P_1)$  into two disjoint open sets according to the sign of  $P_1$ ,  $P_1^+$  and  $P_1^-$ , each containing at most  $|S|/2$  points. We then bisect both of these sets using another polynomial  $P_2$ . There are four sign conditions on  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , these being the four possible intersections of the sets  $P_1^\pm$  and  $P_2^\pm$ , and the subset for each sign condition contains at most  $|S|/4$  points of  $S$ . Continuing this process to define polynomials  $P_3, P_4, \dots$ , where the polynomial  $P_j$  simultaneously bisects  $2^{j-1}$  finite sets. By the Finite Ham Sandwich Theorem, each  $P_j$  can have a degree  $\lesssim 2^{j/n}$ . Repeating this procedure  $J$  times, and defining  $P = \prod_{i=1}^J P_i$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$  is the disjoint union of  $2^J$  open sets each containing  $\leq |S|2^{-J}$  points of  $S$ . Now we choose  $D$  such that  $\deg(P) < D$  which is equivalent to  $\sum_{j=0}^J c(n)2^{j/n} \leq D$ . But  $\sum_{j=0}^J 2^{j/n}$  is a geometric series so we can find  $\deg(P) < D$  for  $D \leq c(n)2^{J/n}$ . The number of points in each  $O_i$  is  $\leq |S|2^{-J} \leq c(n)|S|D^{-n}$   $\square$

There is a crucial point to note about polynomial partitioning. The above theorem does not guarantee anything about the distribution of points between  $Z(P)$  and its complement. This is made most clear looking at the extremal examples. If all points line in the complement of  $Z(P)$  then we have an optimal equidistribution of points, and can often use trivial bounds in a divide-and-conquer style argument. On the otherhand, in the case all points are contained in  $Z(P)$  we have many points in an algebraic surface of controlled degree, so we can try and use tools from algebraic geometry. Generally, there will be some points in both  $Z(P)$  and its complement, which we need to deal with separately.

### 3.5 Proof of the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem

We now can prove the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem using polynomial partitioning.

*Proof of the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem.* Let  $|\mathcal{S}| = S$  and  $|\mathcal{L}| = L$ . We need only consider the case  $S^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq L \leq S^2$ , as otherwise the proof follows immediately from the lemma above. Let  $D$  be a degree to be chosen later. By Theorem 3.4.3, there exists a polynomial  $P$  of degree  $D$  such that  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus Z(P)$  splits into  $D^2$  components each having  $\lesssim SD^{-2}$  points. Let  $O_{i \in \Pi}$  denote these components and let  $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S} \cap O_i$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_i$  denote the lines that intersect the

interior of each  $O_i$  respectively. We define the following pairs of complimentary sets:

$$\mathcal{S}_c = \{x \in \mathcal{S} \mid x \notin Z(p)\}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_z = \{x \in \mathcal{S} \mid x \in Z(p)\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_c = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \mid \ell \not\subset Z(p)\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_z = \{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \mid \ell \subset Z(p)\}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_c \cup \mathcal{S}_z$ ,  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_c \cup \mathcal{L}_z$ . We can now write our total line-point incidences as the following sum

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) = I(\mathcal{S}_c, \mathcal{L}) + I(\mathcal{S}_z, \mathcal{L}_z) + I(\mathcal{S}_z, \mathcal{L}_c).$$

If a line  $\ell$  is not contained entirely in  $Z(P)$  then it can intersect  $P$  at most  $D$  times, so each line intersects at most  $D + 1$  cells. Hence  $\sum_{i \in \Pi} L_i \leq (D + 1)L$ . We begin by examining the  $I(\mathcal{S}_c, \mathcal{L})$  term:

check equality?

$$I(\mathcal{S}_c, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{i \in \Pi} I(\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$$

Using our trivial bound in each cell:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i \in \Pi} \mathcal{S}_i^2 + \sum_{i \in \Pi} \mathcal{L}_i \\ &\lesssim LD + SD^{-2} \sum_{i \in \Pi} S_i \\ &\leq LD + S^2 D^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

The number of lines in  $\mathcal{L}_z$  is at most  $D$ . So we have by our trivial bounds:

$$I(\mathcal{S}_z, \mathcal{L}_z) \leq S + D^2.$$

Each line in  $\mathcal{L}_c$  has at most  $D$  intersection points with  $Z(P)$  so it has at most  $D$  incidences with  $\mathcal{S}_z$ . Hence:

$$I(\mathcal{S}_z, \mathcal{L}_c) \leq LD.$$

Together we have now

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) \lesssim LD + S^2 D^{-2} + S + D^2.$$

We optimise  $LD + S^2 D^{-2}$  by choosing  $D$  such that both terms comparable and hence  $D \sim S^{\frac{2}{3}} L^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ . From our restriction  $S^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq L \leq S^2$  we have  $S^{\frac{2}{3}} L^{-\frac{1}{3}} \geq 1$  and  $D^2 \sim S^{\frac{4}{3}} L^{-\frac{2}{3}} \leq S$ , so we achieve

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) \lesssim (SL)^{2/3} + S.$$

Considering the regime where  $L > S^2$  and applying the trivial bound yields the full

Szemerédi-Trotter inequality:

$$I(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}) \lesssim (SL)^{2/3} + S + L.$$

□

There are two key things to note about the above proof. First, the key role that the topology of  $\mathbb{R}$  plays. Topology is used in the proof of polynomial partitioning as it relies on the Borsuk Ulam theorem. It is a worthwhile heuristic to develop that polynomial partitioning may be useful for incidence problems where the best examples in a finite field (which is only equipped with the trivial topology) do not coincide with the best known examples over the reals. Secondly, the above proof illustrates the surprising power of polynomial partitioning. We are able to use very trivial bounds in each cell to achieve a tight overall bound.

consider  
adding  
a digres-  
sion on  
ST

## Chapter 4

# Counting Circle Tangencies

Here we shall discuss the problem of counting the number of tangencies in a suitably non-degenerate collection of circles. We say two circles are tangent if their intersection contains a single point. The set of unordered pairs of circles in a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  which are mutually tangent are called the tangencies of the collection and is denoted  $\tau(\mathcal{C})$ .

Takeya  
proof  
with a  
twist

is this  
stupid?

### 4.1 Trivial Bounds

**Theorem 4.1.1** (Trivial Bound). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an arbitrary finite collection of circles. Then the number of tangencies  $|\tau(\mathcal{C})|$  is bounded as follows:*

$$|\tau(\mathcal{C})| \leq |\mathcal{C}|^2.$$

Stated for arbitrary collections of circles the problem is not particularly interesting as the above bound turns out to be asymptotically tight.

**Example 4.1.** *Denote a circle centred at  $(x, y)$  with radius  $r$  as  $\gamma(x, y, r)$ . Consider the following collection of  $N + 1$  circles:*

notation

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= \gamma(0, 0, 1) \\ C_1 &= \gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ C_2 &= \gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &\vdots \\ C_N &= \gamma\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^N}, 0, \frac{1}{2^N}\right) \end{aligned}$$

*Each circle in our collection  $\mathcal{C} = \cup_{0 \leq i \leq N} C_i$  is tangent to  $N$  other circles at the point  $(1, 0)$ . Hence  $|\tau(\mathcal{C})| \sim N^2 \sim |\mathcal{C}|^2$ .*

diagram

Instead we shall look at collections of circles that satisfy a single non-degeneracy condition. We consider collections of circles such that no three are mutually tangent at a common point. The best known examples leverage our tight Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem examples:

**Example 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}$  be collections of  $N$  points and  $N$  lines respectively such that the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem's bound is tight. In particular, they determine  $\sim N^{4/3}$  point line incidences. Let  $C_1$  denote the collection of unit circles centred at the points of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $C_2$  denote the collection of lines obtained by translating each line  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$  one unit in the  $\ell^\perp$  direction. If  $(p, \ell) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{L}$  is a point-line incidence from our original collection, then the corresponding circle-line pair will be tangent. Performing an inversion transform about a point that does not lie in any of the circles or lines, our collection  $\mathcal{C} = C_1 \cup C_2$  becomes a collection of  $2N$  circles that determine  $N^{4/3}$  tangencies.*

We shall now present a bound from a recent paper of Ellenberg-Solymosi-Zahl which uses the polynomial method.[10]

**Theorem 4.1.2.** *Given a finite collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $N$  circles in the plane such that no three are tangent at a common point, then the number of tangencies  $|\tau(\mathcal{C})|$  obeys:*

$$|\tau(\mathcal{C})| \lesssim N^{3/2}$$

It is not obvious how to apply the polynomial method in the current formulation. We will perform a lifting of our circles into algebraic curves  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , preserving tangencies between circles in the plane as intersections between their lifted curves in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . This transforms the problem from a tangency problem to an incidence problem, and reduces the required degree of polynomial needed to interpolate. In general Lemma 1.4.3 tells us that if we are to interpolate a set of  $M$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by a polynomial  $P$ , the degree of  $P$  is of order  $\deg P \sim M^{1/d}$ , so increasing the dimension of the problem yields a more controlled degree of the polynomial required.

wrong lemma?

## 4.2 Lifting of circles to $\mathbb{R}^3$

We shall now discuss this lifting in detail. Let  $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a circle in the plane of radius  $r_\gamma$  centred at  $(x_\gamma, y_\gamma)$ . We define the lifting transform of the circle as:

$$\beta(\gamma) = \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid (x - x_\gamma)^2 + (y - y_\gamma)^2 = r_\gamma^2, \ z = -\frac{x - x_\gamma}{y - y_\gamma} \right\}.$$

Clearly  $\beta$  is an algebraic curve, so now we shall examine the correspondence between mutually tangent circles. Notice that  $z$  is defined as the slope of the tangent line at the point  $(x, y) \in \gamma$ .

**Lemma 4.2.1.** *Let  $\beta$  be the transform defined as above. Then two circles  $\gamma, \gamma' \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  are tangent if and only if  $\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma'$  are tangent, then there exists a point  $(x, y) \in \gamma \cap \gamma'$  so the first two coordinates of  $\beta(\gamma)$  and  $\beta(\gamma')$  agree. Further, at a point of tangency we have that the slope of the tangent lines coincide for  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma'$ , so the final coordinate is also equal. Hence  $\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \neq \emptyset$ .

In the other direction, assume there exists some  $(x, y, z) \in \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma')$ . Clearly  $(x, y) \in \gamma \cap \gamma'$ , and again the slope of the tangent lines at this point are equal, hence we conclude  $\gamma$  is tangent to  $\gamma'$ .  $\square$

satisfactory?

This one-to-one correspondence between tangencies in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and incidences in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is the key idea behind the proof. For those more algebraically inclined, what we are doing here is equivalent to looking at the tangent bundles of our circle in the projective space, hence we are preserving intersections.

We will need a Bezout-type result which bounds the number of intersections between curves with no common components.

dangerous  
comment  
when  
Andrei  
is  
second  
reader

**Lemma 4.2.2** (Bezout's Theorem for Plane Algebraic Curves). *Let  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  be the zero sets of two polynomials over  $\mathbb{R}[X, Y]$  and suppose  $\deg Z_1 > \deg Z_2$ . Then one of the following holds:*

$$|\{x \mid x \in Z_1 \cap Z_2\}| \leq \deg Z_1 \deg Z_2$$

$$\text{or } Z_2 \subset Z_1$$

### 4.3 Ellenberg-Solymosi-Zahl's Proof of Theorem 4.1.2

In this proof, we will need to ensure our tangencies are sufficiently uniformly distributed among our circles. We can refine our collection such that this is the case by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.1** (Uniform Refinement). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of  $N$  circles and suppose that  $\tau(\mathcal{C}) \gtrsim N^\alpha$ . Then we can refine our collection to a collection  $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$  such that every circle in  $\mathcal{C}'$  is tangent to  $\gtrsim N^{\alpha-1}$  other circles in  $\mathcal{C}'$  and  $\tau(\mathcal{C}') \gtrsim N^\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tau(\mathcal{C})$  be the set of tangencies of the circles in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}$ . Take a circle  $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0$  such that  $|\{(\gamma, \gamma') \mid (\gamma, \gamma') \in \tau(\mathcal{C}_0)\}| < c_1 N^{1/2}$  and discard it. We label our new refined collection as  $\mathcal{C}_1$ . From this collection, again take a circle  $\gamma$  such that  $|\{(\gamma, \gamma') \mid (\gamma, \gamma') \in \tau(\mathcal{C}_1)\}| < c_1 N^{1/2}$  and discard it.

After repeating this process  $M$  times until there are no more circles that satisfy our criteria, at each step removing a circle that contributes only a small number of tangencies, we attain a collection  $\mathcal{C}_M$ . We claim that  $\tau(\mathcal{C}_M) \gtrsim N^\alpha$ , and that  $\mathcal{C}_M \neq \emptyset$ .



For the first claim, observe that at each step  $i$  we are reducing  $\tau(\mathcal{C}_i)$  by at most  $c_1 N^{\alpha-1}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(\mathcal{C}_M)| &\geq |\tau(\mathcal{C}_0)| - M c_1 N^{\alpha-1} \\ &> c_0 N^\alpha - M c_1 N^{\alpha-1} \\ &> c_0 N^\alpha - c_1 N^\alpha \\ |\tau(\mathcal{C}_M)| &> \frac{c_0}{2} N^\alpha. \quad (\text{by choosing } c_1 = c_0/2) \end{aligned}$$

We must now check that we have not removed every circle from our collection. We have the trivial inequality  $|\tau(\mathcal{C}_M)| \leq |\mathcal{C}_M|^2$ . Combining this with the result above, we attain  $|\mathcal{C}_M| \gtrsim |N|^{\alpha/2}$ .  $\square$

disagree with correction here?

In a similar fashion to our arguments in the Keakeya problem we will be arguing by contradiction, however here we will be arguing that if the zero set of a polynomial contains too many of a certain first type of object, it must contain many more of a second kind of object.

write coherent sentence

We can now prove the main theorem.

*Proof.* Given an arbitrary collection of circles  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\gtrsim N^{3/2}$  tangencies, Lemma 4.3.1 with  $\alpha = \frac{3}{2}$  allows us to reduce to a collection  $\Gamma$  where each circle is tangent to  $\gtrsim N^{1/2}$  other circles using the previous lemma. After applying a small rotation, we can assume that the tangent line at each point of tangency does not point vertically in the  $y$ -direction. Let  $\beta(\Gamma) = \{\beta(\gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ , where  $\beta$  is the lifting transform defined earlier, Recall from Lemma 4.2.1 that two circles  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are tangent if and only if  $\beta(\gamma_1) \cap \beta(\gamma_2) \neq \emptyset$ .

Suppose  $(x, y, z) \in \beta(\gamma_1) \cap \beta(\gamma_2)$  for some  $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$ . Then

$$(0, 0, 1) \in \text{span} \left( T_{(x,y,z)}\beta(\gamma_1), T_{(x,y,z)}\beta(\gamma_2) \right).$$

In other words, at the intersection of  $\beta(\gamma_1)$  and  $\beta(\gamma_2)$  their tangent vectors span a vertical subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . We can establish this by examining a parameterisation of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  in the neighbourhood of  $(x, y)$ . Define  $f_i(t)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $(t+x, f_i(t))$  is a parameterisation of  $\gamma_i$  in the neighbourhood of  $(x, y)$  for all  $t$  in a small neighbourhood of 0. In particular  $f_i(0) = y$ . Since  $\gamma_1$  is tangent to  $\gamma_2$  at  $(x, y)$ ,  $\frac{df_1}{dt}(0) = \frac{df_2}{dt}(0)$ . Since  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are distinct quadratic curves,  $\frac{d^2f_1}{dt^2}(0) \neq \frac{d^2f_2}{dt^2}(0)$ . In the neighbourhood of  $(x, y, z)$ ,  $\beta(\gamma_i)$  is parametrised by  $\left(t, f_i(t), \frac{df_i}{dt}(t)\right)$  as the slope of the tangent to the circle is given by  $\frac{df_i}{dt}(t)$ . It follows that the tangent vector  $\left(1, \frac{df_i}{dt}(0), \frac{d^2f_i}{dt^2}(0)\right)$  generates the vertical space  $T_{(x,y,z)}\beta(\gamma_i)$ . Thus

this was intuitive, not anymore :(

$$\begin{aligned} (0, 0, 1) &\in \text{span} \left( \left(1, \frac{df_1}{dt}(0), \frac{d^2f_1}{dt^2}(0)\right) - \left(1, \frac{df_2}{dt}(0), \frac{d^2f_2}{dt^2}(0)\right) \right) \\ &\subset \text{span} \left( T_{(x,y,z)}\beta(\gamma_1), T_{(x,y,z)}\beta(\gamma_2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

I'm not convinced in this explan.

We will now interpolate all points of intersection with a minimal polynomial of suitably low degree, and show that if this contains too many intersections it must also contain the curves. Then due to the tangent vector spanning the  $z$ -axis we will be able to achieve a contradiction.

Let  $P \in \mathbb{R}[x, y, z]$  be a non-zero polynomial of minimal degree that vanishes on all intersections between the curves in  $\beta(\Gamma)$ . This polynomial interpolates  $\sim N^{3/2}$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , so by Lemma 1.4.3 the degree of  $P$  is  $\lesssim (N^{3/2})^{\frac{1}{3}} = N^{1/2}$ .

wrong  
lemma?

Due to our refinement each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  is tangent to  $\gtrsim N^{1/2}$  circles and each of these tangencies occur at a distinct point by our non-degeneracy condition. Hence we have that  $P$  vanishes at  $\gtrsim N^{1/2}$  points on each curve in  $\beta(\Gamma)$ . By Bézout's theorem we have that  $P$  vanishes on all curves in  $\beta(\Gamma)$  as:

$$\deg(P) \deg(\beta(\gamma)) \lesssim \#\{P \cap \beta(\gamma)\}$$

for suitable choice of constants.

By our result above, if  $(x, y, z)$  is a point where two curves from  $\beta(\Gamma)$  intersect, then  $\partial_z P(x, y, z) = 0$ . Thus by the same Bezout argument  $\partial_z P$  is also a polynomial which vanishes on all curves in  $\beta(\Gamma)$ .

Since  $P$  was a non-zero polynomial of minimal degree that vanishes on all the curves in  $\beta(\Gamma)$ , we must conclude  $\partial_z P \equiv 0$ . By the minimality of  $P$  we must have that  $P(x, y, z) = Q(x, y)$  for some  $Q \in \mathbb{R}[x, y]$  with degree  $\lesssim N^{1/2}$ . But this implies that each of the  $N$  lifted circles in  $\beta(\Gamma)$  must also be contained in  $Z(Q)$ . This is a contradiction, as  $Q$  has degree  $\sim N^{1/2}$  whereas  $\cup \beta(\gamma)$  has degree  $2N$ . Thus  $\beta(\Gamma)$  has  $\lesssim N^{3/2}$  curve-curve incidences, so we can conclude that  $\Gamma$  has  $\lesssim N^{3/2}$  tangencies.  $\square$

worried  
about  
the  $\Gamma - \beta(\Gamma)$

## 4.4 Proof via Polynomial Partitioning for Varieties

In this section we shall present a new proof of Theorem 4.1.2. There are a few key differences between both methods of proof. In the following proof, it is no longer required to ensure the uniform distribution of tangent points among each circle in our collection, so we will not have to use Lemma 4.3.1. Secondly, we will partition  $\mathbb{R}^3$  using a polynomial of controlled degree and leverage our trivial bound in each cell. Slight care will be needed to deal with intersections with curves in the zero set. We begin by introducing the main tool for this proof, an extension of the polynomial partitioning theorem to algebraic varieties instead of just points (which are in some sense 0-dimensional varieties).

**Lemma 4.4.1** (Polynomial Partitioning for Algebraic Varieties). *Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a set of  $k$ -dimensional varieties in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For any positive integer  $D$  there exists a non-zero polynomial  $P$  of degree at most  $D$  such that each connected component of  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$  intersects  $\lesssim D^{k-n} |\Gamma|$  varieties  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ .*

We shall not prove this here. A proof of this can be found as Theorem 0.3 in the original paper of Guth presenting the result.[11]

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.2 by Polynomial Partitioning.* Relabel  $\mathcal{C}$  as  $\Gamma$  for convenience. Again, we perform the lifting transform  $\beta$  on each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . We have a collection of  $N$  1-dimensional varieties in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  upon which we shall use our polynomial partitioning lemma to find a polynomial  $P$  such that each cell of  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus Z(P)$  intersects  $\lesssim ND^{-2}$  varieties.  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus Z(P)$  partitions the space into  $D^3$  cells. Let us label the interior of each of these cells as  $\{\Omega_i \mid 0 \leq i \lesssim D^3\}$ , and further label the set of varieties in  $\Gamma$  that pass through a given cell  $\Omega_i$  as  $\Gamma_i$ .

We can now define the following complimentary sets based on whether the variety is contained entirely in  $Z(P)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \{\beta\gamma \mid \beta\gamma \not\subset Z(P)\} \\ C_2 &= \{\beta\gamma \mid \beta\gamma \subset Z(P)\} \end{aligned}$$

Notice here that  $\beta(\Gamma) = C_1 \cup C_2$ . Recalling the correspondence between incidences between our curves and tangencies of the circles, we define the following incidence sets and hence have the following expression for  $|\tau(\Gamma)|$ :

$$\begin{aligned} I(C_1, C_1) &= \{(\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma')) \mid \beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1, \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \neq \emptyset\} \\ I(C_1, C_2) &= \{(\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma')) \mid \beta(\gamma) \in C_1, \beta(\gamma') \in C_2, \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \neq \emptyset\} \\ I(C_2, C_2) &= \{(\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma')) \mid \beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_2, \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \neq \emptyset\} \\ |\tau(\Gamma)| &= |I(C_1, C_1)| + |I(C_1, C_2)| + |I(C_2, C_2)| \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed by calculating the cardinality each of these sets. The case for  $I(C_1, C_1)$  will use our trivial bound and bezout's theorem. Calculating for  $I(C_1, C_2)$  is again straight- forward by Bezout. The interesting case here is  $I(C_2, C_2)$ , where we will be forced to argue via a recursive style of argument.

no

We begin with the intersections that occur between varieties not entirely contained in the zero set:

$$\begin{aligned} I(C_1, C_1) &= \{(\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma')) \mid \beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1, \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus Z(P)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma')) \mid \beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1, \beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)\} \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |I(C_1, C_1)| &= \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus Z(P)] + \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)] \\ &= \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \sum_i \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in \Omega_i] + \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)] \\ &= \sum_i \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in \Gamma_i} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in \Omega_i] + \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)] \end{aligned}$$

Using our trivial bound and the fact that there are  $\lesssim ND^{-2}$  varieties intersecting a given cell we attain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_i \left( \frac{N}{D^2} \right)^2 + \sum_{\beta(\gamma), \beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)] \\ &= D^3 N^2 D^{-4} + \sum_{\beta(\gamma) \in C_1} \sum_{\beta(\gamma') \in C_1} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)] \end{aligned}$$

Fixing  $\beta(\gamma)$  we see that the latter sum must be  $\lesssim D$  by Bezout's lemma in conjunction with our non-degeneracy condition.

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim N^2 D^{-1} + \sum_{\beta(\gamma) \in C_1} D \\ &= N^2 D^{-1} + ND. \end{aligned}$$

The argument for  $I(C_1, C_2)$  is the similar to the above calculation, however there are now no intersections happening inside the cells by the definition of  $C_2$ . Fix  $\beta(\gamma)$  in:

$$I(C_1, C_2) = \sum_{\beta(\gamma) \in C_1} \sum_{\beta(\gamma') \in C_2} \mathbb{1}[\beta(\gamma) \cap \beta(\gamma') \in Z(P)]$$

not the  
same  
Bezout  
lemma

and again the second sum is  $\lesssim D$  due to Bezout and our non-degeneracy condition. Hence,

$$\lesssim \sum_{\beta(\gamma) \in C_1} D = ND.$$

□

## Chapter 5

# The Polynomial Method in Additive Combinatorics

So far our discussion has only centred around the usefulness of polynomial methods in geometric combinatorial problems. In this chapter we shall discuss applications to the exciting field of additive combinatorics, where in 1990 Alon provided perhaps the first example of the polynomial method in action.[12] We present Michalek's short, elementary, and direct proof of the combinatorial nullstellensatz.[13]

### 5.1 Combinatorial Nullstellensatz

**Theorem 5.1.1** (Combinatorial Nullstellensatz). *Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a (not necessarily finite) field, and let  $P(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{K}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be a polynomial in  $n$  variables with coefficients in  $\mathbb{K}$ . Suppose the coefficient of  $x_1^{k_1} x_2^{k_2} \dots x_n^{k_n}$  is non-zero and further suppose  $\deg P = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$ , where each  $k_i$  is a non-negative integer.*

*Then for any subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  of  $\mathbb{K}$  satisfying  $|A_i| > k_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  there exist  $a_1 \in A_1, \dots, a_n \in A_n$  such that  $P(a_1, \dots, a_n) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $\deg P = D$ . When  $D = 1$ ,  $P$  is simply a linear combination of  $n$  variables say  $P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = c_1 X_1 + \dots + c_n X_n$ . Without loss of generality assume  $x_1$  has a non-zero coefficient and consider the sets  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}\}$ . Suppose  $P$  at the point  $(a_{1,1}, a_{2,1}, \dots, a_{n,1})$  is zero. We can then determine  $c_1 = -\frac{c_2 a_{2,1} + c_3 a_{3,1} + \dots + c_n a_{n,1}}{a_{1,1}}$ . Now evaluating at  $(a_{1,2}, a_{2,1}, \dots, a_{n,1})$  we see that this is zero only when  $a_{1,1} = a_{1,2}$ , so our theorem holds.

Now let us assume the theorem holds for  $\deg P = D - 1$ , and prove for  $\deg P = D$ . Suppose that  $P$  satisfies the assumptions of the theorem but  $P(x) = 0$  for every  $x \in A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ . Without loss of generality  $k_1 > 0$ . Fixing  $a \in A_1$  we can write

$$P = (x_1 - a)Q + R \tag{†}$$

by the usual long division of polynomials. The degree of  $R$  in  $x_1$  must be strictly less

than  $\deg(x_1 - a)$ , so  $R$  does not contain any  $x_1$  terms. Thus it follows that  $Q$  must have a monomial with non-zero coefficient of the form  $x_1^{k_1-1}x_2^{k_2}\dots x_n^{k_n}$  and  $\deg(Q) = D - 1$ .

Take any  $x \in \{a\} \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$  and evaluate  $(\dagger)$ . Since  $P(x) = 0$  it follows that  $R(x) = 0$ , but  $R$  is independent of  $x_1$  so  $R$  must also vanish on  $A_1 \setminus \{a\} \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$ . Now take any  $x \in A_1 \setminus \{a\} \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$  and evaluate  $(\dagger)$ . Since  $(x_1 - a)$  is non-zero,  $Q(x) = 0$ . So  $Q$  vanishes on all  $x \in A_1 \setminus \{a\} \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$ , which contradicts the inductive hypothesis.  $\square$

## 5.2 Cauchy-Davenport Theorem

**Theorem 5.2.1** (Cauchy-Davenport Theorem). *Let  $A, B$  be non-empty subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  for some  $p$  prime. Define their sumset  $A + B$  as follows:*

$$A + B = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_p \mid x = a + b \text{ for some } a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

Then we have:

$$|A + B| \geq \min\{p, |A| + |B| - 1\}.$$

*Proof.* Let us tackle the two cases separately. First, assume that  $\min\{p, |A| + |B| - 1\} = p$ . Then if  $|A| + |B| > p$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  must intersect. For some  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_p$  denote the set  $\{g - x \mid x \in B, \} \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$  as  $g - B$ . Since  $|g - B| = |B|$ , we have that  $g - B$  and  $A$  must intersect as well. Thus there exists some  $a \in A, b \in B$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} g - b &= a \\ g &= a + b. \end{aligned}$$

Our choice of  $g$  was arbitrary, so it follows that  $A + B = \mathbb{Z}_p$  and hence  $|A + B| = p$ .

Now assume that  $\min\{p, |A| + |B| - 1\} = |A| + |B| - 1$ . Then if the theorem is false we have  $|A + B| \leq |A| + |B| - 2$ , so there exists some  $C \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$  such that  $A + B \subset C$  and  $|C| = |A| + |B| - 2$ . Now let us define a polynomial  $f(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[x, y]$  as:

$$f(x, y) = \prod_{c \in C} (x + y - c).$$

Since  $A + B \subset C$ ,  $f(a, b) = 0$  for all  $(a, b) \in A \times B$ . Further, the degree of  $f$  is  $\deg f = |C| = |A| + |B| - 2$ . We can now appeal to the combinatorial nullstellensatz to yield a contradiction. Let  $k_1 = |A| - 1$ , and  $k_2 = |B| - 1$ . Now  $\deg f = k_1 + k_2$ , and the coefficient of  $x^{k_1}y^{k_2}$  is  $\binom{|A|+|B|-2}{|A|-1}$  which is non-zero in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  as the numerator cannot contain a factor of  $p$  by assumption. Applying Theorem 5.1.1 we see that there must exist some  $(a, b) \in A \times B$  such that  $f(a, b) \neq 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Generalise this!

More explanation on  $\cap$  needed? PHP?

# References

- [1] Roy O Davies. Some remarks on the kakeya problem. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 69-3, pages 417–421. Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- [2] Jean Bourga'in. Besicovitch type maximal operators and applications to fourier analysis. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 1(2):147–187, 1991.
- [3] L. Guth. *Polynomial Methods in Combinatorics*. University Lecture Series. American Mathematical Society, 2016.
- [4] Thomas Wolff. An improved bound for kakeya type maximal functions. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 11(3):651–674, 1995.
- [5] Timothy Gowers. Topics in combinatorics - cambridge tripos lecture notes, 2020.
- [6] Larry Guth and Nets Hawk Katz. Algebraic methods in discrete analogs of the kakeya problem, 2008.
- [7] René Quilodrán. The joints problem in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , 2009.
- [8] Haim Kaplan, Micha Sharir, and Eugenio Shustin. On lines and joints, 2009.
- [9] Jiří Matoušek, Anders Björner, Günter M Ziegler, et al. *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry*. Springer, 2003.
- [10] Jordan S. Ellenberg, Jozsef Solymosi, and Joshua Zahl. New bounds on curve tangencies and orthogonalities, 2016.
- [11] Larry Guth. Polynomial partitioning for a set of varieties. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 159, pages 459–469. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [12] Noga Alon. Combinatorial nullstellensatz. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 8(1-2):7–29, 1999.
- [13] *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 117(9):821–823, Nov 2010.