

# Part III – Combinatorics (Ongoing course, rough)

Based on lectures by Professor I. B. Leader

Notes taken by Bhavik Mehta

Michaelmas 2018

## Contents

<b>0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Set systems</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Chains and antichains . . . . .	4
1.2	Shadows . . . . .	8
1.2.1	Two total orderings on $X^{(r)}$ . . . . .	8
1.3	Compressions . . . . .	9
1.4	Intersecting families . . . . .	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Isoperimetric inequalities</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1	Concentration of measure . . . . .	20
2.2	Edge-isoperimetric inequalities . . . . .	22
2.3	Inequalities in the grid . . . . .	25
2.4	Edge-isoperimetric inequalities in the grid . . . . .	28
<b>3</b>	<b>Projections</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>30</b>

## 0 Introduction

*Lecture 1* Combinatorics tends to have problems which are easy to state and hard to prove. One of the reasons for this is that it is often unclear where to start - for instance in linear algebra we can often start by picking a basis. Proofs tend to have the property that they seem to take thousands of years to come up with, and a single line to write down. In this course, we learn some techniques which make problems sounding very hard become very easy.

We start with set systems, which builds on the idea of subsets and containment. Next, we study isoperimetric inequalities. In the continuous case, in the plane, a typical problem is to find the maximum area one can enclose with a fixed perimeter, which is solved by a circle. Similarly, a soap bubble will minimise its surface area for a fixed volume. Here, in the discrete case, we will try to understand ‘how tightly’ we can pack subsets. Finally, we look at continuous projections. For instance, given a subset of space, suppose we know the  $z$ -coordinate of all points is between 0 and 1, and the projection to the  $xy$ -plane has area  $A$ , we know the total volume is bounded by  $A$ . We generalise this result into higher dimensions and the box result, which has applications in combinatorics.

While all examinable proofs will be included in lectures, relevant books for this course are:

1. *Combinatorics*, Bollobás, C.U.P., 1996. This matches chapter 1 excellently and parts of chapter 2. It is a gentle read and includes other developments in combinatorics.
2. *Combinatorics of finite sets*, Anderson, O.U.P., 1987. It is a simple and clear study on chapter 1.

# 1 Set systems


**Definition** (Set system). Let  $X$  be a set. A **set system** on  $X$  (or **family of subsets** of  $X$ ) is a family  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ .

For instance, we write  $X^{(r)} = \{A \subseteq X \mid |A| = r\}$ , so  $X^{(r)}$  is a **set system** on  $X$ . Unless otherwise stated,


$$X = [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

e.g.  $|X^{(r)}| = \binom{n}{r}$ . Thus  $[4]^{(2)} = \{12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 34\}$ , so  $|[4]^{(2)}| = 6$ .


Often, we make  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  into a graph, called  $Q_n$ , by joining  $A$  to  $B$  if  $|A \triangle B| = 1$ , i.e. if  $A = B \cup \{i\}$  for some  $i \notin B$  (or vice versa). For instance, here is a picture of  $Q_3$ :



As we know, the picture gets ‘thicker’ in the middle. But, for odd  $n$ , is it not clear where exactly the middle is, so in the odd case we have two equally sized large blobs in the middle.



If we identify a set  $A \subseteq X$  with a 0-1 sequence of length  $n$ , e.g.  $134 \longleftrightarrow 1011000 \dots 0$ , via  $A \longleftrightarrow 1_A$  or  $\chi_A$ , the characteristic function, then  $Q_3$  looks like



**Definition** (Hypercube).  $Q_n$  is often called the **hypercube** or **discrete cube** or  **$n$ -cube**.

It is important to keep *both* these pictures in mind: for induction the cube image is more instructive, but when thinking about layers the earlier image is more helpful.


## 1.1 Chains and antichains

**Definition** (Chain). A family  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a **chain** if  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have  $A \subseteq B$  or  $B \subseteq A$ .

**Definition** (Antichain). A family  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is an **antichain** if  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $A \neq B \Rightarrow A \not\subseteq B$ .

**Example.** For instance,  $\{12, 125, 123589\}$  is an **chain**, and  $\{1, 467, 2456\}$  is an **antichain**.

In this course, we ask questions like, how large can a **chain** be? We can achieve  $|\mathcal{A}| = n+1$ , e.g.  $\{\emptyset, 1, 12, 123, \dots, [n]\}$ . It is easy to visualise this by picking ‘one per level’:



We cannot exceed  $n + 1$ , since a chain must meet each ‘level’  $X^{(r)}$  ( $0 \leq r \leq n$ ) in at most one place.

How large can an **antichain** be? We could achieve  $|\mathcal{A}| = n$ , e.g.  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$  (and this is maximal). Indeed, we could take  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(r)}$  for any  $r$ , so we can achieve  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ . Can we beat this? Aim: Prove this is the winner.


Inspired by ‘each **chain** meets each level  $X^{(r)}$  in at most one place’ for chains, we try to decompose  $Q_n$  into chains to find large **antichains**.

**Theorem 1.1** (Sperner’s Lemma). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  be an **antichain**. Then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ .

*Proof.* It is sufficient to partition  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  into  $\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$  **chains**. For this, it is sufficient to show

- (i)  $\forall r < \frac{n}{2}$ , there is a matching from  $X^{(r)}$  to  $X^{(r+1)}$
- (ii)  $\forall r > \frac{n}{2}$ , there is a matching from  $X^{(r)}$  to  $X^{(r-1)}$ .


Then put these matchings together to form chains, each passing through  $X^{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}$ , so there are  $\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$  of them. (Recall we have a **natural graph structure** on  $Q_n$ )



By taking complements, it is sufficient to prove (i).

Consider the subgraph of  $Q_n$  spanned by  $X^{(r)} \cup X^{(r+1)}$ . It is bipartite. For any  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ , we have that

- The number of edges from  $\mathcal{B}$  to  $\Gamma(\mathcal{B})$  is  $|\mathcal{B}|(n-r)$  (each point in  $X^{(r)}$  has degree  $n-r$ ).
- The number of edges from  $\mathcal{B}$  to  $\Gamma(\mathcal{B})$  is at most  $|\Gamma(\mathcal{B})|(r+1)$  (each point in  $X^{(r+1)}$  has degree  $r+1$ ).



Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(\mathcal{B})| &\geq |\mathcal{B}| \frac{n-r}{r+1} \\ &\geq |\mathcal{B}| \end{aligned}$$

as  $r < \frac{n}{2}$ . Hence by Hall's theorem, there is a matching.  $\square$

**Remark.** Recall  $\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$  was achievable, for example  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}$ . This proof says nothing about extremal cases - which **antichains** have size  $\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ ?

Aim: For  $\mathcal{A}$  an antichain,


$$\sum_{r=0}^n \frac{|\mathcal{A} \cap X^{(r)}|}{\binom{n}{r}} \leq 1.$$

This trivially implies **Sperner's Lemma**.

**Definition** (Shadow). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ , for some  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . The **shadow** or **corner shadow** of  $\mathcal{A}$  is

$$\partial \mathcal{A} \equiv \partial^- \mathcal{A} := \{A - \{i\} \mid A \in \mathcal{A}, i \in A\}$$

so  $\partial \mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r-1)}$ .



For example, if  $\mathcal{A} = \{123, 124, 134, 135\} \subseteq X^{(3)}$ , then

$$\partial \mathcal{A} = \{12, 13, 23, 24, 34, 15, 35\} \subseteq X^{(2)}.$$

**Lemma 1.2** (Local LYM). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq n$ . Then

$$\frac{|\partial \mathcal{A}|}{\binom{n}{r-1}} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{\binom{n}{r}}.$$

‘The fraction of the layer occupied increases when we take the **shadow**’.

*Proof.* Counting from above, there are  $r|\mathcal{A}|$  edges  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\partial \mathcal{A}$ . Counting from below, the number of edges  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\partial \mathcal{A}$  is at most  $(n-r+1)|\partial \mathcal{A}|$ , so

$$\frac{|\partial \mathcal{A}|}{|\mathcal{A}|} \geq \frac{r}{n-r+1}.$$

But

$$\frac{\binom{n}{r-1}}{\binom{n}{r}} = \frac{r}{n-r+1}.$$

$\square$

When do we get equality in **Local LYM**? We'd need  $(A - \{i\}) \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{A} \ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}, i \in A, j \notin A$ . Hence  $\mathcal{A} = X^r$  or  $\emptyset$ .

The LYM in **Local LYM** stands for 'Lubell–Yamamoto–Meshalkin'. We can use **Local LYM** to prove:

**Theorem 1.3** (LYM). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  be an **antichain**. Then

$$\sum_{r=0}^n \frac{|\mathcal{A} \cap X^{(r)}|}{\binom{n}{r}} \leq 1.$$


*Proof 1: 'Bubble down with Local LYM'.* Write  $\mathcal{A}_r = \mathcal{A} \cap X^{(r)}$ . We have  $\frac{|\mathcal{A}_n|}{\binom{n}{n}} \leq 1$ . Also,  $\partial\mathcal{A}_n$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{n-1}$  are distinct since  $\mathcal{A}$  was an **antichain**, so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\partial\mathcal{A}_n|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-1}|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} &= \frac{|\partial\mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{n-1}|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{|\mathcal{A}_n|}{\binom{n}{n}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-1}|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} &\leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

by **Local LYM**.

Also,  $\partial(\partial\mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{n-1})$  is disjoint from  $\mathcal{A}_{n-2}$ , again since  $\mathcal{A}$  is an antichain so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\partial(\partial\mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{n-1})|}{\binom{n}{n-2}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-2}|}{\binom{n}{n-2}} &\leq 1, \\ \Rightarrow \frac{|\partial(\partial\mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{n-1})|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-2}|}{\binom{n}{n-2}} &\leq 1, \\ \Rightarrow \frac{|\mathcal{A}_n|}{\binom{n}{n}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-1}|}{\binom{n}{n-1}} + \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{n-2}|}{\binom{n}{n-2}} &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$



Keep going, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_n}{\binom{n}{n}} + \frac{\mathcal{A}_{n-1}}{\binom{n}{n-1}} + \cdots + \frac{\mathcal{A}_0}{\binom{n}{0}} \leq 1. \quad \square$$

When do we get equality in [LYM](#)? We must have had equality in each use of [Local LYM](#). So the first (greatest)  $r$  with  $\mathcal{A}_r \neq \emptyset$  must have  $\mathcal{A}_r = X^{(r)}$  thus  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(r)}$ . Hence equality in [Sperner's Lemma](#)  $\iff \mathcal{A} = X^{(\frac{n}{2})}$  for  $n$  even and  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}$  or  $X^{(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil)}$  for  $n$  odd.

Lecture 3

*Proof 2.* Choose uniformly at random a maximal [chain](#)  $\mathcal{C}$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{C}_n$ ) with  $|\mathcal{C}_i| = i \ \forall i$ . For a given [r-set](#)  $A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{C}) &= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{r}} && \text{(all } r\text{-sets are equally likely)} \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_r \text{ meets } \mathcal{C}) &= \frac{|\mathcal{A}_r|}{\binom{n}{r}} && \text{(events are disjoint)} \\ \implies \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} \text{ meets } \mathcal{C}) &= \sum_{r=0}^n \frac{|\mathcal{A}_r|}{\binom{n}{r}}. \\ &\implies \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{|\mathcal{A}_i|}{\binom{n}{i}} \leq 1. && \square \end{aligned}$$

**Remark.** Equivalently, the number of maximal chains is  $n!$ , and the number containing a given  $r$ -set is  $r!(n-r)!$ , so  $\sum |\mathcal{A}_r| r!(n-r)! \leq n!$ .

## 1.2 Shadows

For  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ , we know  $|\partial \mathcal{A}| \geq |\mathcal{A}| \frac{r}{n-r+1}$  - but equality is rare (only for  $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$  or  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(r)}$ ).

Given  $|\mathcal{A}|$ , how should we choose  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  to minimise  $|\partial \mathcal{A}|$ ? (Ultimately, we are asking ‘how tightly can we pack some  $r$ -sets?’) If  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k}{r}$ , it is believable that we’d take  $\mathcal{A} = [k]^{(r)}$  - giving  $\partial \mathcal{A} = [k]^{(r-1)}$ . What if  $\binom{k}{r} < |\mathcal{A}| < \binom{k+1}{r}$ ? Believable that we’d take  $[k]^{(r)}$  and some other  $r$ -sets from  $[k+1]^{(r)}$ . For instance, if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(3)}$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{7}{3} + \binom{4}{2}$ , we’d take  $\mathcal{A} = [7]^{(3)} \cup \{A \cup \{8\} \mid A \in [4]^{(2)}\}$

### 1.2.1 Two total orderings on $X^{(r)}$

Given  $A, B \in X^{(r)}$ , say  $A = a_1 \cdots a_r$ ,  $B = b_1 \cdots b_r$ .

**Definition** (Lexicographic order). Say  $A < B$  in the **lexicographic order** or **lex order** if for some  $i$  we have  $a_i < b_i$  and  $a_j = b_j \ \forall j < i$ .

Equivalently,  $a_i < b_i$ , where  $i = \min \{j \mid a_j \neq b_j\}$ . ‘Use small numbers’, dictionary order.

**Example.**

- The [lex order](#) on  $[4]^{(2)}$  is

12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 34.



- The lex order on  $[6]^{(3)}$  is

123, 124, 125, 126, 134, 135, 136, 145, 146, 156,  
234, 235, 236, 245, 246, 256, 345, 346, 356, 456.

**Definition** (Colexicographic order). Say  $A < B$  in the **colexicographic order** or **colex order** if for some  $i$  have  $a_i < b_i$  and  $a_j = b_j \forall j > i$ .

Equivalently,  $a_i < b_i$  where  $i = \max \{ j \mid a_j \neq b_j \}$ . ‘Avoid large numbers’. Equivalently,  $A < B$  if  $\sum_{i \in A} 2^i < \sum_{i \in B} 2^i$ .

**Example.**

- Colex on  $[4]^{(2)}$  is

12, 13, 23, 14, 24, 34

- Colex on  $[6]^{(3)}$  is

123, 124, 134, 234, 125, 135, 235, 145, 245, 345,  
126, 136, 236, 146, 246, 346, 156, 256, 356, 456.

Note: In **colex**,  $[k]^{(r)}$  is an initial segment of  $[k+1]^{(r+1)}$ , so we could view colex as an enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}^{(r)}$  (but this is false for **lex**).

**Aim.** Initial segments of **colex** minimise  $\partial$ , i.e. if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  and  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  is the first  $|\mathcal{A}|$   $r$ -sets in **colex**, then  $|\partial \mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial \mathcal{C}|$ .

This is known as the Kruskal-Katona theorem. In particular,

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k}{r} \implies |\partial \mathcal{A}| \geq \binom{k}{r-1}.$$

### 1.3 Compressions

Idea: We want to ‘replace’  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  with some  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq X^{(r)}$  such that

- (i)  $|\mathcal{A}'| = |\mathcal{A}|$
- (ii)  $|\partial \mathcal{A}'| \leq |\partial \mathcal{A}|$
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}'$  ‘looks more like  $\mathcal{C}$ ’ than  $\mathcal{A}$  did.

Ideally, we’d compress  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'' \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  where either  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$  or  $\mathcal{B}$  is so similar to  $\mathcal{C}$  that we can see directly that  $|\partial \mathcal{B}| \geq |\partial \mathcal{C}|$ .

Lecture 4

Use the idea that ‘**colex** prefers 1 to 2’ to inspire:

**Definition** ( $ij$ -compression). For  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , the  $ij$ -**compression**  $C_{ij}$  defined by: for  $A \subseteq X$ ,

$$C_{ij}(A) = \begin{cases} A - \{j\} \cup \{i\} & \text{if } j \in A, i \notin A \\ A & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and for  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(X)$ ,

$$C_{i,j}(\mathcal{A}) = \{ C_{ij}(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{A} \} \cup \{ A \in \mathcal{A} \mid C_{ij}(A) \in \mathcal{A} \}.$$

Say  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $ij$ -**compressed** if  $C_{ij}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$ .

**Example.** If  $\mathcal{A} = \{123, 134, 234, 235, 247\}$ , then

$$C_{12}(\mathcal{A}) = \{123, 134, 234, 135, 147\}.$$

So  $|C_{ij}(\mathcal{A})| = |\mathcal{A}|$ .

**Proposition 1.4.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ ,  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ . Then

$$|\partial C_{ij}(\mathcal{A})| \leq |\partial \mathcal{A}|.$$

*Proof.* Write  $\mathcal{A}'$  for  $C_{ij}(\mathcal{A})$ . We'll show that if  $B \in \partial \mathcal{A}' - \partial \mathcal{A}$  then  $i \in B, j \notin B$  and  $B \cup \{j\} - \{i\} \in \partial \mathcal{A} - \partial \mathcal{A}'$ , then done, since this gives an injection.

We have  $B \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{A}'$ , for some  $x \notin B$ , and  $B \cup \{x\} \notin \mathcal{A}$  (as  $B \notin \partial \mathcal{A}$ ). Hence  $i \in B \cup \{x\}$ ,  $j \notin B \cup \{x\}$  and  $(B \cup \{x\}) \cup \{j\} - \{i\} \in \mathcal{A}$ . Note that  $x \neq i$ , else  $B \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{A}$ , contradicting  $B \notin \partial \mathcal{A}$ . Certainly  $B \cup \{j\} - \{i\} \in \partial \mathcal{A}$ .

**Claim:**  $B \cup \{j\} - \{i\} \notin \partial \mathcal{A}'$ .

**Proof of claim:** Suppose  $(B \cup \{j\} - \{i\}) \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{A}'$ . We cannot have  $y = i$ , else  $B \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{A}'$ , whence  $B \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{A}$  as  $j \in B \cup \{j\}$ , a contradiction.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} j &\in (B \cup \{j\} - \{i\}) \cup \{y\} \\ i &\notin (B \cup \{j\} - \{i\}) \cup \{y\} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$(B \cup \{j\} - \{i\}) \cup y \in \mathcal{A}$$

and  $B \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{A}$  (definition of  $C_{ij}$ ), contradicting the assumption that  $B \in \partial \mathcal{A}' - \partial \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** We actually showed

$$\partial C_{ij}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq C_{ij}(\partial \mathcal{A}).$$

**Definition** (Left-compressed). Say  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  is **left-compressed** if  $C_{ij}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A} \forall i < j$ .

**Proposition 1.5.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ . Then  $\exists$  **left-compressed**  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  with  $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}|$  and  $|\partial \mathcal{B}| \leq |\partial \mathcal{A}|$

*Proof.* Among all  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  with  $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}|$  and  $|\partial \mathcal{B}| \leq |\partial \mathcal{A}|$ , choose one with  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in A} x$  minimal. Then  $\mathcal{B}$  left-compressed, as if  $C_{ij}(\mathcal{B}) \neq \mathcal{B}$  we contradict minimality.  $\square$

**Remark.** Or apply a  $C_{ij}$ , then another, and so on - this must terminate. In fact, can apply each  $C_{ij}$  at most once, if you chose a sensible order.

Certainly initial segments of **colex** are **left-compressed**. The converse is false - e.g.  $\mathcal{A} = \{123, 124, 125, 126, 127\}$ .

'Coxlex prefers 23 to 14' inspires:

**Definition** ( $UV$ -compression). For  $U, V \subseteq X$  with  $|U| = |V|$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ , the  $UV$ -compression  $C_{UV}$  is defined by For  $A \subseteq X$ ,

$$\begin{cases} A \cup U - V & \text{if } V \subseteq A, U \cap A = \emptyset \\ A & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$ ,

$$C_{UV}(\mathcal{A}) = \{C_{UV}(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid C_{UV}(A) \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

Say  $\mathcal{A}$  is  **$UV$ -compressed** if  $C_{UV}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$ .

**Example.** If  $\mathcal{A} = \{123, 134, 235, 145, 146, 157\}$  then

$$C_{23,14}(\mathcal{A}) = \{123, 134, 235, 145, 236, 157\}.$$

Note that  $|C_{UV}(\mathcal{A})| = |\mathcal{A}|$ .

Sadly,  $C_{UV}$  need not decrease  $\partial$  - e.g.  $\mathcal{A} = \{146, 467\}$  has  $|\partial\mathcal{A}| = 5$ , but  $C_{23,14}(\mathcal{A}) = \{236, 467\}$  has  $|\partial C_{23,14}(\mathcal{A})| = 6$ .  $C_{23,14}$  moved some things a long way. However:

**Proposition 1.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  and  $U, V \subseteq X$  with  $|U| = |V|$  and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . Suppose  $\forall x \in U \exists y \in V$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $(U - x, V - y)$ -compressed. Then  $|\partial C_{UV}(\mathcal{A})| \leq |\partial\mathcal{A}|$ .

*Lecture 5 Proof.* Write  $\mathcal{A}'$  for  $C_{UV}(\mathcal{A})$ . Given  $B \in \partial\mathcal{A}' - \partial\mathcal{A}$ , we'll show that  $U \subseteq B$ ,  $V \cap B = \emptyset$ , and  $B \cup V - U \in \partial\mathcal{A} - \partial\mathcal{A}'$  (then done).

We have  $B \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{A}'$  for some  $x \in B$ , with  $B \cup \{x\} \notin \mathcal{A}$ . So  $U \subseteq B \cup \{x\}$ ,  $V \cap (B \cup \{x\}) = \emptyset$ , and  $(B \cup \{x\}) \cup V - U \in \mathcal{A}$ . Thus certainly  $V \cap B = \emptyset$ .

If  $x \in U$ : We have  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $(U - x, V - y)$ -compressed for some  $y \in V$ . So from  $(B \cup \{x\}) \cup V - U \in \mathcal{A}$ , we obtain  $B \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{A}$ , contradicting  $B \notin \partial\mathcal{A}$ . Hence  $x \notin U$ , and so  $U \subseteq B$ .

Also,  $B \cup V - U \in \partial\mathcal{A}$  (as  $(B \cup \{x\}) \cup V - U \in \mathcal{A}$ ). Suppose  $B \cup V - U \in \partial\mathcal{A}'$ . Then  $(B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\} \in \mathcal{A}'$  for some  $w$ .

If  $w \notin U$ : Then  $V \subseteq (B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\}$  and  $U \cap ((B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\}) = \emptyset$ , so from  $(B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\} \in \mathcal{A}'$  we can conclude that both  $(B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $B \cup \{w\} \in \mathcal{A}$ , contradicting  $B \notin \partial\mathcal{A}$ .

If  $w \in U$ : We know  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $(U - w, V - z)$ -compressed for some  $z \in V$ . So from  $(B \cup V - U) \cup \{w\} \in \mathcal{A}$  (as it is in  $\mathcal{A}'$  and contains  $V$ , so could not have moved). We deduce  $B \cup \{z\} \in \mathcal{A}$ , contradicting  $B \notin \partial\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** Actually showed  $\partial C_{UV}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq C_{UV}(\partial\mathcal{A})$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Kruskal-Katona theorem). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  (for  $1 \leq r \leq n$ ) and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the initial segment of **colex** on  $X^{(r)}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ . Then  $|\partial\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial\mathcal{C}|$ . In particular, if  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k}{r}$  then  $|\partial\mathcal{A}| \geq \binom{k}{r-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$\Gamma = \{(U, V) \mid U, V \subseteq X, |U| = |V| > 0, U \cap V = \emptyset, \max U < \max V\}.$$

Define a sequence of **set systems**  $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \dots$  in  $X^{(r)}$  as follows. Put  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$ .

Having defined  $\mathcal{A}_k$ , if  $\mathcal{A}_k$  is  $(U, V)$ -compressed  $\forall (U, V) \in \Gamma$  then stop the sequence with  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . If not, choose  $(U, V) \in \Gamma$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_k$  is not  $(U, V)$ -compressed with  $|U|$  minimal.

Set  $\mathcal{A}_{k+1} = C_{UV}(\mathcal{A}_k)$ . Note that  $\forall x \in U$  we have  $(U - \{x\}, V - \{y\}) \in \Gamma \cup \{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$  for  $y = \min V$ . So by **Proposition 1.6**,  $|\partial\mathcal{A}_{k+1}| \leq |\partial\mathcal{A}_k|$ . Continue.

The sequence must terminate, e.g. as  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{i \in A} 2^i$  is decreasing in  $\mathcal{A}$ . The final system  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_k$  satisfies  $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}|$  and  $|\partial\mathcal{B}| \leq |\partial\mathcal{A}|$ , and is  $(U, V)$ -compressed  $\forall (U, V) \in \Gamma$ .

**Claim:**  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$ .

**Proof of claim:** Suppose  $\mathcal{B}$  is not an initial segment of colex. Then  $\exists A < B$  in colex with  $A \notin \mathcal{B}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , but then  $U = A - B$  and  $V = B - A$  have  $(U, V) \in \Gamma$  and  $C_{UV}(B) = A$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark.**

1. Equivalently: If  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  with

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k_r}{r} + \binom{k_{r-1}}{r-1} + \cdots + \binom{k_s}{s},$$

where  $k_r > k_{r-1} > \cdots > k_s$  and  $s > 0$ , then

$$|\partial\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k_r}{r-1} + \binom{k_{r-1}}{r-2} + \cdots + \binom{k_s}{s-1}.$$

2. In the proof of the [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#), we used only [Proposition 1.6](#), not [Proposition 1.4](#) or [Proposition 1.5](#).
3. Uniqueness? Can check that if  $|\partial\mathcal{A}| = |\partial\mathcal{C}|$  and  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k}{r}$ , then  $\mathcal{A} = Y^{(r)}$ , for some  $k$ -set  $Y$  (i.e. uniqueness).

But, in general, it is not true that  $|\partial\mathcal{A}| = |\partial\mathcal{C}| \implies \mathcal{A}$  isomorphic to  $|\mathcal{C}|$  (where  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are **isomorphic** if  $\exists$  a permutation of  $X$  sending  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$ ).

**Definition** (Upper shadow). For  $A \subseteq X^{(r)}$  ( $0 \leq r \leq n-1$ ), the **upper shadow** of  $\mathcal{A}$  is

$$\partial^+\mathcal{A} = \{A \cup \{x\} \mid A \in \mathcal{A}, x \notin A\}.$$

Note also  $A < B$  in [colex](#)  $\iff A^c < B^c$  in [lex](#) with ground-set order reversed.

**Corollary 1.8.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  ( $0 \leq r \leq n-1$ ) and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the initial segment of [lex](#) with  $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ . Then  $|\partial^+\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial^+\mathcal{C}|$ .

*Proof.* Take complements. □

Also, the [shadow](#) of an initial segment of [colex](#) (in  $X^{(r)}$ ) is again an initial segment of [colex](#) in  $X^{(r-1)}$ . Indeed, if

$$\mathcal{C} = \{A \in X^{(r)} \mid A \leq a_1 a_2 \dots a_r\}$$

then

$$\partial\mathcal{C} = \{B \in X^{(r-1)} \mid B \leq a_2 \dots a_r\}.$$

**Corollary 1.9.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  and let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  be the initial segment of [colex](#) with  $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ . Then  $|\partial^t\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial^t\mathcal{C}| \forall 1 \leq t \leq r$ . In particular, if  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{k}{r}$  then  $|\partial^t\mathcal{A}| \geq \binom{k}{r-t}$ .

*Proof.* If  $|\partial^t\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial^t\mathcal{C}|$  then  $|\partial^{t+1}\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial^{t+1}\mathcal{C}|$  by [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#). □

## 1.4 Intersecting families

*Lecture 6* **Definition** (Intersecting). A family  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(X)$  is **intersecting** if  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset \forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ .


How large can  $|\mathcal{A}|$  be? Can achieve  $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^{n-1}$ , by taking, e.g.  $\mathcal{A} = \{A \subseteq X \mid 1 \in A\}$ .

**Proposition 1.10.** Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(X)$  be [intersecting](#). Then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$ .

*Proof.* For each  $A \subseteq X$ , can have  $\leq 1$  of  $A, A^c$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . □

Note: there are many examples with  $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^{n-1}$ , e.g. for  $n$  odd we can take

$$\left\{ A \subseteq X \mid |A| > \frac{n}{2} \right\}.$$



What if we insist  $A \subseteq X^{(r)}$ ?

If  $r > \frac{n}{2}$ , this is a silly question, as we can take  $\mathcal{A} = X^{(r)}$ . If  $r = \frac{n}{2}$ , the maximum is  $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{r}$  - just choose one of  $A, A^c$  for each  $A \in X^{(r)}$ . So assume  $r < \frac{n}{2}$ .

Taking

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ A \in X^{(r)} \mid 1 \in A \}$$

gives  $|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{n-1}{r-1} = \frac{r}{n} \binom{n}{r}$ . Could also try, e.g.

$$\mathcal{B} = \{ A \in X^{(r)} \mid |A \cap \{1, 2, 3\}| \geq 2 \}.$$

Try both on  $[8]^{(3)}$ :

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{7}{2} = 21$$

$$|\mathcal{B}| = 1 + \binom{3}{2} \binom{5}{1} = 16 < 21.$$

where the first term counts the number of  $|A \cap \{1, 2, 3\}| = 3$ , and the second term counts  $|A \cap \{1, 2, 3\}| = 2$ .

In fact, the size from  $\mathcal{A}$  is optimal:

**Theorem 1.11** (Erdős-Ko-Rado). Let  $r < \frac{n}{2}$ , and let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq X^{(r)}$  be [intersecting](#). Then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ .

*Proof 1:* ‘Bubble down with [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#)’. For  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , have  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ , i.e.  $A \not\subseteq B^c$ . Writing  $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$  for  $\{ A^c \mid A \in \mathcal{A} \} \subseteq X^{(n-r)}$ , this says that  $\partial^{n-2r} \bar{\mathcal{A}}$  is disjoint from  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Suppose  $|\mathcal{A}| > \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ . Then  $|\mathcal{A}^c| > \binom{n-1}{r-1} = \binom{n-1}{n-r}$ , so by [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#) (as given in [Corollary 1.9](#)), have  $|\partial^{n-2r} \bar{\mathcal{A}}| \geq \binom{n-1}{r}$ . But

$$\binom{n-1}{r-1} + \binom{n-1}{r} = \binom{n}{r}$$


i.e.

$$|\partial^{n-2r} \bar{\mathcal{A}}| + |\mathcal{A}| > |X^{(r)}|.$$

a contradiction. □

**Remark.** The numbers *had* to work, as we get equality for  $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in X^{(r)} \mid 1 \in A\}$ .

*Proof 2.* Consider a cyclic ordering of  $[n]$ , i.e. a bijection  $C : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ , e.g.



How many  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  are intervals (sets of  $r$  consecutive elements) in our ordering? Answer:  $\leq r$ . Indeed, suppose  $c_1 \dots c_r \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then, for each  $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ , at most one of the two intervals  $\dots c_{i-1} c_i$  and  $c_{i+1} c_{i+2} \dots$  can belong to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Also, a given  $r$ -set  $A$  is an interval in exactly  $nr!(n-r)!$  of the  $n!$  cyclic orderings. Hence  $|\mathcal{A}|nr!(n-r)! \leq n!r$ , i.e.

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{(n-1)!}{(r-1)!(n-r)!} = \binom{n-1}{r-1}. \quad \square$$

**Remark.**


1. Equivalently, we are double-counting the edges in the bipartite graph, vertex classes  $\mathcal{A}$  and all cyclic orderings, in which  $A$  is joined to  $C$  if  $A$  is an interval in  $C$ .
2. This method is called **averaging**, or Katona's method.

Equality in [Erdős-Ko-Rado](#)? Can check equality holds  $\iff \mathcal{A} = \{A \in X^{(r)} \mid i \in A\}$  for some  $i$ . This follows (proof 1) from equality case of [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#), or (proof 2) by considering changing the cyclic ordering bit by bit.

## 2 Isoperimetric inequalities

*Lecture 7* ‘How tightly can we pack a subset of given size in a space?’ We are familiar with this kind of inequality in the continuous sense:


- Among subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of given area, the disc has smallest perimeter.
- Among subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  of given volume, the sphere has smallest surface area.
- Among subsets of  $S^2$  of given area, the cap has smallest perimeter.



**Definition** (Boundary). For a set  $A$  of vertices in a graph  $G$ , the **boundary** is

$$b(A) = \{x \in V(G) \mid x \notin A, xy \in E \text{ for some } y \in A\}.$$

For example, in the picture, if  $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then  $b(A) = \{4, 5\}$ .



**Definition** (Isoperimetric inequality). An **isoperimetric inequality** on  $G$  is an inequality of the form


$$|b(A)| \geq f(|A|) \quad \forall A \subseteq V(G).$$

**Definition** (Neighbourhood). Equivalently, minimise the **neighbourhood** of  $A$ :


$$N(A) = A \cup b(A) = \{x \in G \mid d(x, A) \leq 1\}$$

where  $d$  denotes the usual graph distance.

A natural guess to minimise **neighbourhood** is often  $B(x, r) = \{y \in G \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$ . What happens in  $Q_n$ ? For example, try  $|A| = 4$  in  $Q_3$ :



$$|b(A)| = 3$$



$$|b(A)| = 4$$

Guess: ‘Balls are best’, i.e.

$$\text{if } |A| = |X^{(\leq r)}|, \text{ then } |N(A)| \geq |X^{(\leq r+1)}|$$

(where  $X^{(\leq r)}$  is shorthand for  $X^{(0)} \cup \dots \cup X^{(r)}$ ).

But what if  $|A|$  is strictly between  $\sum_{i=0}^r \binom{n}{i}$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^{r+1} \binom{n}{i}$ ? Guess: Take  $A = X^{(\leq r)} \cup B$ , for some  $B \subseteq X^{(r+1)}$  (called a ‘Hamming Ball’). If we knew this, then

$$N(A) = X^{(\leq r+1)} \cup \partial^+ B,$$

so by [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#) we’d take  $B$  to be an initial segment of [lex](#).

**Definition** (Simplicial order). Define the **simplicial order** on  $Q_n$  by  $x < y$  if either  $|x| < |y|$  or  $|x| = |y|$  and  $x < y$  in [lex](#).


The slogan for the [simplicial order](#) is ‘Go up in levels, and use [lex](#) inside a level.’

**Aim.** Initial segments of [simplicial order](#) are best for minimising  $N(A)$ .

**Definition** (Sections). Given  $A \subseteq Q_n$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the  $i$ -**sections** are the [set systems](#)  $A_+^{(i)}, A_-^{(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X - i)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_-^{(i)} &= \{x \in A \mid i \notin x\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X - \{i\}) \\ A_+^{(i)} &= \{x - \{i\} \mid x \in A, i \in x\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X - \{i\}). \end{aligned}$$


Note  $\mathcal{P}(X - \{i\})$  is [isomorphic](#) to  $Q_{n-1}$ .



**Definition** (Compression). Define the  $i$ -**compression**  $C_i(A)$  of  $A$  by giving its  $i$ -**sections**.

- $C_i(A)_+^{(i)}$  is the initial segment of  $Q_{n-1}$  of size  $|A_+^{(i)}|$
- $C_i(A)_-^{(i)}$  is the initial segment of  $Q_{n-1}$  of size  $|A_-^{(i)}|$





Certainly  $|C_i(A)| = |A|$ . Also,  $C_i(A)$  ‘looks more like’ an initial segment of [simplicial](#) than  $A$  did.

Say  $A$  is  $i$ -**compressed** if  $C_i(A) = A$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (Harper’s theorem). Let  $A \subseteq Q_n$ , and let  $C$  be the initial segment of [simplicial](#) order with  $|C| = |A|$ . Then  $|N(A)| \geq |N(C)|$ . In particular, if

$$|A| \geq \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{n}{i}$$

then

$$|N(A)| \geq \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} \binom{n}{i}.$$

**Remark.**

1. If we know  $A$  is a [Hamming ball](#), then done by [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#).
2. [Harper’s theorem](#)  $\Rightarrow$  [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#): Given  $B \subseteq X^{(r)}$ , apply [Harper’s theorem](#) to  $A = B \cup X^{(\leq r-1)}$

*Proof.* Induction on  $n$ .  $n = 1$  works. Given  $A \subseteq Q_n$  for  $n > 1$ , fix  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

**Claim:**  $|N(C_i(A))| \leq |N(A)|$ .

**Proof of claim:** Write  $B = C_i(A)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} |N(A)| &= |A_+ \cup N(A_-)| + |A_- \cup N(A_+)| \\ |N(B)| &= |B_+ \cup N(B_-)| + |B_- \cup N(B_+)| \end{aligned}$$

where the first term is ‘downstairs’, and the second term is ‘upstairs’. Now,  $|B_+| = |A_+|$  and  $|N(B_-)| \leq |N(A_-)|$  by induction.

But  $N(B_-)$  is an initial segment of [simplicial](#) on  $Q_{n-1}$  as is  $B_+$ . So  $N(B_-)$  and  $B_+$  are nested (in some direction). Hence

$$|B_+ \cup N(B_-)| \leq |A_+ \cup N(A_-)|$$

and similarly

$$|B_- \cup N(B_+)| \leq |A_- \cup N(A_+)|$$

Thus  $|N(B)| \leq |N(A)|$ . ■

Lecture 8 Among all  $B \subseteq Q_n$  with  $|B| = |A|$  and  $|N(B)| \leq |N(A)|$ , choose one with

$$\sum_{x \in B} f(x)$$

minimal, where  $f(x)$  = the position of  $x$  in the [simplicial order](#) on  $Q_n$ . Then  $B$  is  $i$ -compressed  $\forall i$ . Must such a  $B$  be an initial segment of simplicial? Unfortunately, no - e.g.  $B = \{\emptyset, 1, 2, 12\} \subseteq Q_3$ .


However,

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $B \subseteq Q_n$  be  $i$ -compressed  $\forall i$  but not an initial segment of simplicial order. Then if  $n$  is odd, say  $n = 2k + 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= X^{(\leq k)} - \{\text{last } k\text{-set}\} \cup \{\text{first } k+1\text{-set}\} \\ &= X^{(\leq k)} - \{(k+2) \dots (2k+1)\} \cup \{12 \dots k(k+1)\} \end{aligned}$$

while if  $n$  is even, say  $n = 2k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= X^{(\leq k-1)} \cup \{x \in X^{(k)} \mid 1 \in x\} - \{\text{last } k\text{-set with } 1\} \cup \{\text{first } k\text{-set without } 1\} \\ &= X^{(\leq k-1)} \cup \{x \in X^{(k)} \mid 1 \in x\} - \{1(k+2) \dots (2k)\} \cup \{234 \dots k(k+1)\} \end{aligned}$$



Once we have proved this, we are done, as in each case  $|N(B)| \geq |N(C)|$ .

*Proof.* We have  $x \notin B, y \in B$  for some  $x, y$  with  $x < y$  in simplicial. We cannot have  $i \in x, i \in y$  (as  $B$  is  $i$ -compressed), and cannot have  $i \notin x, i \notin y$  (as  $B$  is  $i$ -compressed).

So, for each  $i$ ,  $i$  belongs to exactly one of  $x, y$ . Thus  $y = x^c$ .

Hence for each  $y \in B$ , at most one  $x < y$  has  $x \notin B$  (namely  $y^c$ ) and for each  $x \notin B$ , at most  $y > x$  has  $y \in B$  (namely  $x^c$ ).

Hence  $B = \{z \mid z \leq y\} - \{x\}$  where  $x$  is the immediate predecessor of  $y$  and  $x = y^c$ . But then  $x = \text{last } k\text{-set}$  (if  $n = 2k + 1$ ) or the last  $k$ -set containing 1 (if  $n = 2k$ ) by definition of simplicial ordering. □

□

**Remark.**

1. Can also prove [Harper's theorem](#) by *UV-compressions*.
2. Can also use these 'codimension 1' compressions to prove [Kruskal-Katona theorem](#).

**Definition** (Neighbourhood). For  $A \subseteq Q_i$ , the  $t$ -**neighbourhood** of  $A$  is

$$A_{(t)} := N^t(A) = \{x \in Q_n \mid d(x, A) \leq t\}.$$

**Corollary 2.3.** Let  $A \subseteq Q_n$  with  $|A| = |X^{(\leq r)}|$ . Then, for  $1 \leq t \leq n - r$ , have

$$|A_{(t)}| \geq |X^{(\leq r+t)}|$$

*Proof.* [Harper's theorem](#) and induction. □

To get a feel for what [Corollary 2.3](#) is saying, we'll need some estimates for things like  $\sum_{i=0}^r \binom{n}{i}$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** Let  $0 \leq \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ , then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)n \rfloor} \binom{n}{i} < \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{(-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2})} 2^n$$

(an exponentially small fraction of  $2^n$  for  $\epsilon$  fixed).

Roughly we are going around  $\epsilon\sqrt{n}$  standard deviations from the mean.

*Proof.* For  $i \leq (\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon)n$ :

$$\frac{\binom{n}{i-1}}{\binom{n}{i}} = \frac{i}{n-i+1} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} = 1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \leq 1 - 2\epsilon.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)n \rfloor} \binom{n}{i} \leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \binom{n}{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)n \rfloor}$$

as a geometric progression. Similarly, replacing  $\epsilon$  with  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)n \rfloor} &\leq (1-\epsilon)^{\epsilon \frac{n}{2}-1} \binom{n}{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{2})n \rfloor} \\ &\leq 2(1-\epsilon)^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} 2^n \\ &\leq 2e^{-\epsilon \cdot \frac{n}{2}} 2^n, \end{aligned}$$

using  $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$  in the final step. Thus

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)n \rfloor} \binom{n}{i} \leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon} 2e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}} \cdot 2^n.$$

□

Lecture 9 **Theorem 2.5.** Let  $A \subseteq Q_n$  with  $\frac{|A|}{2^n} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ . Then

$$\frac{|A_{(\epsilon n)}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}.$$

‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ -sized sets have exponentially large  $\epsilon n$ -neighbourhoods’

*Proof.* Enough to show that if  $\epsilon n$  an integer, then

$$\frac{|A_{(\epsilon n)}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}.$$

We have

$$|A| \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} - 1 \rceil} \binom{n}{i}$$

So by [Harper's theorem](#), we have

$$|A_{(\epsilon n)}| \geq \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil n(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon) - 1 \rceil} \binom{n}{i}$$

i.e.,

$$|A_{(\epsilon n)}|^c \leq \sum_{i=\lceil n(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon) \rceil}^n \binom{n}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) \rfloor} \binom{n}{i} \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}} \cdot 2^n. \quad \square$$

## 2.1 Concentration of measure

**Definition** (Lipschitz). Say  $f : Q_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is **Lipschitz** if  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq 1$  for all  $x, y \in Q_n$  adjacent.

**Definition** (Median). Say  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  is a **median** or **Lévy mean** of  $f$  if

$$|\{x \mid f(x) \leq M\}|, |\{x \mid f(x) \geq M\}| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^n.$$

Now ready to show ‘every well-behaved function on  $Q_n$  is roughly constant nearly everywhere’.

**Theorem 2.6.** Let  $f : Q_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be [Lipschitz](#) with [median](#)  $M$ , and  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ . Then

$$\frac{|\{x \mid |f(x) - M| \leq \epsilon n\}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{4}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A = \{x \mid f(x) \leq M\}$ . Then  $\frac{|A|}{2^n} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , so

$$\frac{|A_{\epsilon n}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}.$$

But  $x \in A_{(\epsilon n)} \implies f(x) \leq M + \epsilon n$  (as  $f$  is [Lipschitz](#)), so

$$\frac{|\{x \mid f(x) \leq M + \epsilon n\}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{|\{x \mid f(x) \leq M - \epsilon n\}|}{2^n} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{n}{2}}$$

and intersect these. □

**Remark.** This is the ‘**concentration of measure** phenomenon’.

Let  $G$  be a graph of diameter  $D$  (recall the diameter is  $\max \{d(x, y) \mid x, y \in G\}$ ). Let

$$\alpha(G, \epsilon) = \max \left\{ 1 - \frac{|A_{(\epsilon D)}|}{|G|} \mid A \subseteq G, \frac{|A|}{|G|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

So  $\alpha(G, \epsilon)$  *small* says ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ -sized sets have big  $\epsilon D$ -neighbourhoods.’


**Definition** (Lévy family). Say a sequence of graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots$  is a **Lévy family** if  $\alpha(G_n, \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (for each fixed  $\epsilon$ ).

Thus [Theorem 2.5](#) says  $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, \dots$  forms a **Lévy family** and even a **normal** Lévy family, meaning  $\alpha(G_n, \epsilon)$  exponentially small in  $n$  (for each fixed  $\epsilon$ ), so have concentration of measure as in ([Theorem 2.6](#)) for any **Lévy family**.

Many natural families of graphs form **Lévy families**, e.g. symmetric group  $S_n$  - made into a graph by joining  $x, y$  if  $xy^{-1}$  is a transposition.


Similarly, we can define  $\alpha(X, \epsilon)$  for  $X$  any metric measure space (of finite diameter and finite measure) - so again have concentration of measure for any **Lévy family**.

**Example.** Take the sphere  $S^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .




To show ‘ $\frac{1}{2}$ -sized sets have big  $\epsilon$ -neighbourhoods’, we need two ingredients:


- 1) An isoperimetric inequality: if  $A \subseteq S^n$  and  $C \subseteq S^n$  is the circular cap with  $|C| = |A|$ , then  $|A_{(\epsilon)}| \geq |C_{(\epsilon)}|$ .



Compression is ‘stamp on your set’, i.e. we always move a point above the equator to corresponding point below the equator, called 2-point symmetrisation.



2) An estimate: Let  $C$  be the circular cap with  $|C| = \frac{1}{2}$ , i.e. angle  $= \frac{\pi}{2}$ .



Then  $C_{(\epsilon)}$  is the circular cap of angle  $\frac{\pi}{2} + \epsilon$ . But the remaining volume is proportional to  $\int_{\epsilon}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\cos \theta)^n d\theta$ , which  $\rightarrow 0$  (exponentially fast) as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Lecture 10

We deduced concentration of measure from isoperimetric inequalities. Conversely,

**Proposition 2.7.** Let  $G$  be a graph such that for any Lipschitz function  $G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with median  $M$ , we have


$$\frac{|\{x \in G \mid |f(x) - M| \leq t\}|}{|G|} \geq 1 - \alpha$$

for some given  $t, \alpha$ . Then for  $A \subseteq G$  with  $\frac{|A|}{|G|} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $\frac{|A_{(t)}|}{|G|} \geq 1 - \alpha$ .

*Proof.* The function  $f(x) = d(x, A)$  is Lipschitz and has 0 as a median (as  $|A| \geq \frac{1}{2}|G|$ ).  $\square$


## 2.2 Edge-isoperimetric inequalities

**Definition** (Edge boundary). For  $A \subseteq G$  ( $G$  a graph), the **edge-boundary** of  $A$  is  $\partial A = \{xy \in E(G) \mid x \in A, y \notin A\}$ .




In  $Q_n$  how should we choose  $A$  (with  $|A|$  given) to minimise  $|\partial A|$ ?

Take for example  $|A| = 4$  in  $Q_3$ :



$$|\partial A| = 6$$



$$|\partial A| = 4$$

This suggests that perhaps subcubes are best. But what if  $2^k < |A| < 2^{k+1}$ ? Maybe fill up all of  $Q_k$ , then add in subcubes.

**Definition** (Binary ordering). Say  $x < y$  in the **binary** ordering on  $Q_n$  if  $\max(x \triangle y) \in y$ .

Equivalently  $x < y$  if  $\sum_{i \in x} 2^i < \sum_{i \in y} 2^i$ : ‘go up in subcubes’.

**Aim.** Initial segments of **binary** are best (minimise) for  $\partial A$ . In particular,


$$|A| = 2^k \Rightarrow |\partial A| \geq 2^k(n - k).$$

**Definition** (Binary compression). For  $A \subseteq Q_n$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the  $i$ -**binary compression**  $B_i(A)$  is defined by giving its  $i$ -**sections**:

$$B_i(A)_+^{(i)} = \text{first } |A_+^{(i)}| \text{ elements of } \mathcal{P}(X - \{i\}) \text{ in } \text{binary}$$

$$B_i(A)_-^{(i)} = \text{first } |A_-^{(i)}| \text{ elements of } \mathcal{P}(X - \{i\}) \text{ in binary}$$

Note that  $|B_i(A)| = |A|$ . Say  $A$  is  $i$ -**binary compressed** if  $B_i(A) = A$ .



**Theorem 2.8** (Edge-isoperimetric inequality in the cube). Let  $A \subseteq Q_n$ , and let  $C$  be the initial segment of the **binary ordering** with  $|C| = |A|$ . Then  $|\partial A| \geq |\partial C|$ . In particular, if  $|A| = 2^k$  then  $|\partial A| \geq 2^k(n - k)$ .

**Remark.** Sometimes called the theorem of Harper, Lindsey, Bernstein and Hart.

*Proof.* Induction on  $n$ :  $n = 1$  is immediate. Given  $A \subseteq Q_n$  for  $n > 1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ : **Claim**  $|\partial B_i(A)| \leq |\partial A|$ .

**Proof of claim:** Write  $B$  for  $B_i(A)$ . We have


$$\begin{aligned} |\partial A| &= |\partial(A_-)| + |\partial(A_+)| + |A_i \triangle A_+| \\ |\partial B| &= |\partial(B_-)| + |\partial(B_+)| + |B_i \triangle B_+|. \end{aligned}$$

Now,  $|\partial(B_-)| \leq |\partial(A_-)|$  and  $|\partial(B_+)| \leq |\partial(A_+)|$  by induction. Also,  $|A_-| = |B_-|$ ,  $|A_+| = |B_+|$  and  $B_-, B_+$  nested (as both initial segments of **binary**). Whence  $|B_- \triangle B_+| \leq |A_i \triangle A_+|$ . Among all  $B \subseteq Q_n$  with  $|B| = |A|$  and  $|\partial B| \leq |\partial A|$ , choose one with

$$\sum_{x \in B} (\text{position of } x \text{ in binary order})$$

minimal, completing the claim. ■


Then  $B$  is  **$i$ -binary compressed**  $\forall i$  by claim. This  $B$  need not be an initial segment of binary, e.g.



However, claim: If  $B \subset Q_n$  is  $i$ -binary compressed  $\forall i$  but not an initial segment of binary, then

$$B = \mathcal{P}([n-1]) \cup \{n\} - \{123 \cdots (n-1)\}.$$

(Bottom half with last point removed, first point of top half added).



Then done, as clearly  $|\partial B| \geq |\partial C|$ .

**Proof of claim:** Have some  $x < y$  with  $x \notin B$  and  $y \in B$ . Then  $\forall i$ , cannot have  $i \notin x, y$  and cannot have  $i \in x, y$  as  $B_i(B) = B$ . So  $x = y^c$ . Thus for each  $y \in B$ , there is at most 1  $x < y$  with  $x \notin B$  (namely  $x^c$ ), and for each  $x \notin B$ , there is at most one  $y > x$  with  $y \in B$  (namely  $y^c$ ). Hence  $B = \{z \mid z \leq y\} - \{x\}$  where  $x$  is the immediate predecessor of  $y$  and  $x = y^c$ . Hence  $y = \{n\}$ . □




**Remark.** In the proofs of [Theorem 2.1](#) and [Theorem 2.8](#), vital that the extremal sets in dimension  $n - 1$  were nested, i.e. were the initial segments of some ordering.


*Lecture 11* **Definition** (Isoperimetric number). The **isoperimetric number** of a graph  $G$  is

$$i(G) := \left\{ \frac{|\partial A|}{|A|} \mid A \subseteq G, |A| \leq \frac{1}{2}|G| \right\}.$$


‘How small can the average out-degree be?’



**Corollary 2.9.**  $i(Q_n) = 1$ .




*Proof.* The set  $A = \mathcal{P}([n - 1])$  shows  $i(Q_n) \leq 1$ . To show  $i(Q_n) \geq 1$ , sufficient to show (by [Theorem 2.8](#)) that if  $C$  is an initial segment of binary with  $|C| \leq 2^{k-1}$  then  $|\partial C| \geq |C|$ .



But this is clear because  $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}([n - 1])$ . □



## 2.3 Inequalities in the grid

**Definition** (Grid). The **grid** is the graph on vertex-set  $[k]^n = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^n$  in which  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  joined to  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  if for some  $i$ , have  $|x_i - y_i| = 1$  and  $x_j = y_j \quad \forall j \neq i$  (‘ $\ell^1$ -distance’).



For  $k = 2$ , this is the discrete cube  $Q_n$ .

Do Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.8 have analogues in  $[k]^n$ ? What is the best vertex-boundary? Take  $[k]^2$  as an example:



This suggests that sets of the form  $\{x \mid |x| \leq r\}$  are best.


What about sizes in between? For given  $|x|$ , we'd 'keep  $x_1$  big'

**Definition** (Simplicial ordering). We define the on  $[k]^n$  by setting  $x < y$  if either  $|x| < |y|$  or  $|x| = |y|$  and  $x_i > y_i$ , where  $i = \min \{j \mid x_j \neq y_j\}$ . Note: for  $k = 2$  this agrees with our previous definition.

**Example.**

- On  $[3]^2$ , our ordering is

$$(1, 1), (2, 1), (1, 2), (3, 1), (2, 2), (1, 3), (3, 2), (2, 3), (3, 3).$$



- On  $[4]^3$ , we get

$$111, 211, 121, 112, 311, 221, 212, 131, 122, 113, 411, 321, \dots$$

**Aim.** Initial segments of simplicial minimise neighbourhood. In particular,

$$|A| = |\{x \mid |x| \leq r\}| \implies |N(A)| \geq |\{x \mid |x| \leq r+1\}|.$$

**Definition** (Sections). For  $A \subseteq [k]^n$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the  $i$ -sections of  $A$  are the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  (or  $A_1^{(i)}, \dots, A_k^{(i)}$ ) in  $[k]^{n-1}$  given by

$$A_t = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in [k]^{n-1} \mid (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \in A\} \quad \forall 1 \leq t \leq k$$

**Definition** ( $i$ -compression). The  $i$ -compression  $C_i(A) \subseteq [k]^n$  is defined by giving its  $i$ -sections:

$$C_i(A)_t = \text{first } |A_t| \text{ points in simplicial order on } [k]^{n-1}.$$

Certainly  $|C_i(A)| \leq |A|$ . Say  $A$  is  **$i$ -compressed** if  $C_i(A) = A$ .

**Theorem 2.10** (Vertex-isoperimetric inequality in the grid). Let  $A \subseteq [k]^n$  and let  $C$  be the initial segment of the simplicial roder on  $[k]^n$  with  $|C| = |A|$ . Then  $|N(A)| \geq |N(C)|$ . In particular, if  $|A| \geq |\{x \mid |x| \leq r\}|$  then  $|N(A)| \geq |\{x \mid |x| \leq r+1\}|$

*Proof.* Induction on  $n$ : For  $n = 1$ , if  $A \subseteq [k]^1$  with  $A \neq \emptyset, [k]^1$  then  $|N(A)| \geq |A| + 1 = |N(C)|$ , as required.

Given  $A \subseteq [k]^n$  (for  $n > 1$ ) and  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , **claim**  $|N(C_t(A))| \leq |N(A)|$ .

**Proof of claim:** For  $1 \leq t \leq k$ ,

$$N(A)_t = N(A_t) \cup A_{t-1} \cup A_{t+1}$$

(where  $A_0 = A_{k+1} = \emptyset$ ) and similarly

$$N(B)_t = N(B_t) \cup B_{t-1} \cup B_{t+1}.$$

Now,  $|B_{t-1}| = |A_{t-1}|$  and  $|B_{t+1}| = |A_{t+1}|$ . Also,  $|N(B_t)| \leq |N(A_t)|$  (induction).

But the sets  $B_{t-1}, B_{t+1}, N(B_t)$  are nested (as each is an initial segment), so  $|N(B)_t| \leq |N(A)_t|$ . This holds for each  $1 \leq t \leq k$ . ■

Among all  $B \subseteq [k]^n$  with  $|B| = |A|$  and  $|N(B)| \leq |N(A)|$ , choose one with minimal

$$\sum_{x \in B} (\text{position of } x \text{ in simplicial}).$$

Then  $B$  is  $i$ -compressed  $\forall i$  (else  $C_i(B)$  contradicts our discussion of  $B$ ).

Lecture 12

We want to show  $N(B) \geq N(C)$ .

- **Case 1:**  $n = 2$ .  $B$  is  $i$ -compressed  $\forall i$  if and only if  $B$  is a **down-set** (if  $x_i \leq y_i \forall i$  and  $y \in B$  then  $x \in B$ ). That is, ‘going down or left, we stay in  $B$ ’. Suppose  $B \neq C$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \min \{ |x| \mid x \notin B \} \\ s &= \max \{ |x| \mid x \in B \}. \end{aligned}$$

We must have  $r \leq s$ , since  $r > s \Rightarrow B = C$ , as  $B$  would be an exact ball.

If  $r = s$ , have

$$\{x : |x| \leq r-1\} \subseteq B \subseteq \{x \mid |x| \leq r\},$$

so clearly  $|N(B)| \geq |N(C)|$ .

If  $r < s$ , we cannot have  $\{x \mid |x| = r\}$  disjoint from  $B$  (as  $B$  is a down-set and  $\exists x \in B$  with  $|x| = s$ ). Similarly cannot have  $\{x \mid |x| = s\} \subseteq B$  (as  $B$  a down-set and  $\exists x \notin B, |x| = r$ ). So  $\exists x, x'$  on level  $r$  with  $x \notin B, x' \in B$  and  $x' = x \pm (e_1 - e_2)$ , and  $\exists y, y'$  on level  $s$  with  $y \in B, y' \notin B$  and  $y' = y \pm (e_1 - e_2)$ .

Now let  $B' = B \cup \{x\} - \{y\}$ . Then  $N(B') \leq N(B)$  (we lose  $\geq 1$  point from level  $s+1$  and gain  $\leq 1$  point from level  $r+1$ ), contradicting choice of  $B$ .

- **Case 2:**  $n \geq 3$ . If  $x \in B$  then must have  $x - e_n + e_i \in B$  (for any  $1 \leq i \leq n-1, x_n > 1, x_i \leq k$ ), because  $B$  is  $j$ -compressed, any  $j \neq n, i$  (as  $n \geq 3$ ). So  $N(B_t) \subseteq B_{t-1}$ . We had  $N(B)_t = N(B_t) \cup B_{t-1} \cup B_{t+1}$ , so  $N(B)_t = B_{t-1}$ . Thus

$$|N(B)| = |B_{k-1}| + |B_{k-2}| + \cdots + |B_1| + |N(B_1)| = |B| - |B_k| + |N(B_1)|$$

where  $B_1$  is in level 2, and  $N(B_1)$  is in level 1. Similarly,

$$|N(C)| = |C| - |C_k| + |N(C_1)|.$$

Thus it is sufficient to show that  $|B_k| \leq |C_k|$  and  $|B_1| \geq |C_1|$ . Focus on the former first: Define  $D \subseteq [k]^n$  by

$$\begin{aligned} D_k &= B_k \\ D_t &= N(D_{t+1}), \quad t = k-1, k-2, \dots, 1 \end{aligned}$$

Then  $D$  is an initial segment of simplicial, and  $D \subseteq B$ , so  $|D| \leq |B| = |C|$ , whence  $D \subseteq C$  (as  $D, C$  nested as initial segments of simplicial). Hence  $D_k \subseteq C_k$ .

Now aim to show  $|B_1| \geq |C_1|$ : Define  $E \subseteq [k]^n$  by

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= B_1 \\ E_t &= \{x \in [k]^{n-1} \mid N(\{x\}) \subseteq E_{t-1}\}, \quad t = 2, 3, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $E$  is an initial segment of simplicial and  $E \supset B$ , so  $|E| \geq |B| = |C|$ , whence  $E \supset C$  (as  $E, C$  nested). Hence  $E_1 \supset C_1$ . This completes the claim, and thus completes the induction.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.11.** Let  $A \subseteq [k]^n$  with  $|A| = |\{x \mid |x| \leq r\}|$ . Then  $|A_{(t)}| \geq |\{x \mid |x| \leq r+t\}|$ .

*Proof.* Induction on  $t$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** Can check from this that, for fixed  $k$ , the sequence  $[k]^1, [k]^2, [k]^3, \dots$  is a [normal Lévy family](#).

## 2.4 Edge-isoperimetric inequalities in the grid

We aim to minimise  $|\partial A|$  in  $[k]^m$ . For example, in  $[k]^2$ :

pictures

This suggests squares are best. But,

more pictures

so have ‘phase transitions’ at  $|A| = \frac{k^2}{4}$  and  $|A| = \frac{3k^2}{4}$ . The extremal sets are not nested! (So cannot compress,  $\nexists$  an ordering, etc.)

In  $[k]^3$ :

equation

Similarly in higher dimensions. This has been proved: ‘edge-isoperimetric inequality in the grid’.

Very few isoperimetric inequalities are known exactly or asymptotically.

### 3 Projections

## Index

- antichain, 4
- averaging, 14
- binary, 23
- boundary, 15
- chain, 4
- colexicographic order, 9
- compressed, 10
- $UV$ -compression, 10
- $ij$ -compression, 9
- concentration of measure, 21
- corner shadow, 6
- Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, 13
- family of subsets, 3
- grid, 25
- Hamming ball, 16
- hypercube, 4
- intersecting, 12
- isoperimetric inequality, 15
- isoperimetric number, 25
- Kruskal-Katona theorem, 11
- Lévy family, 21
- lexicographic order, 8
- Lipschitz, 20
- Local LYM, 6
- LYM, 7
- median, 20
- neighbourhood, 15
- section, 16
- set system, 3
- shadow, 6
- simplicial order, 16
- simplicial ordering, 26
- Sperner's Lemma, 5
- upper shadow, 12