

KAIST
2021 MAS575 Combinatorics
Homework

Jeongwoo Park

University: KAIST

Department: Mathematical Sciences

Student ID: 20190262

March 30, 2021

Contents

1 HW 2.1	2
2 HW 2.2	3
3 HW 2.3	4
4 HW 2.4	5
5 HW 2.5	6

HW 2.1

Let $\mathbf{a}_j \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ (respectively, \mathbf{b}_j) be the \mathbb{F}_p -coefficient characteristic vector of A_j (respectively, B_j) for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. If we define n -variable polynomials

$$f_j(x_\bullet) := \sum_{l \in L} (x_\bullet \cdot \mathbf{b}_j - \bar{l})$$

then we have an invertible lower triangular matrix $(f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} \in U_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$, because

$$f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}) = \begin{cases} \sum_l (\overline{|A_j \cap B_j|} - \bar{l}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times & j = j' \\ \sum_l (\overline{|A_{j'} \cap B_j|} - \bar{l}) = 0 & j > j' \end{cases}$$

holds. Let's consider induced polynomials $\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_i]_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ which obtained by changing x_i^2 to x_i for each term of the polynomial $f_j(x_\bullet)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, as in the lecture. Then, it is clear that $(f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'})) = (\bar{f}_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))$ is invertible, in particular, the set of polynomials $\{\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ is \mathbb{F}_p -linearly independent. Since every term of $\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet)$ is square-free, and $\deg \bar{f}_j(x_\bullet) \leq |L| = s$ holds, so we can deduce that $\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet) \in \langle x_\bullet^{\alpha_\bullet} \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_\infty \leq 1}$. By linear algebra, we can obtain that

$$m = \left| \{f_j(x_\bullet)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m} \right| \leq \dim \langle x_\bullet^{\alpha_\bullet} \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_\infty \leq 1} = \sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i}$$

This completes the proof. □

HW 2.2

We can label $\mathcal{F} = \{A_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ to be $|A_1| \leq \dots \leq |A_m|$ holds. Let $\mathbf{a}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the \mathbb{R} -coefficient characteristic vector of A_j , and we define n -variable polynomials

$$f_j(x_\bullet) := \sum_{l \in L; l < |\mathbf{a}_j|_1} (x_\bullet \cdot \mathbf{a}_j - l)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Then, we have an invertible upper triangular matrix $(f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} \in U_n(\mathbb{R})$, because

$$f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{l < |\mathbf{a}_{j'}|_1} (|\mathbf{a}_{j'}|_1 - l) \in \mathbb{R}^\times & j = j' \\ \sum_{l < |\mathbf{a}_{j'}|_1} (|A_{j'} \cap A_j| - l) = 0 & j > j' \end{cases}$$

Also, we consider polynomials

$$g_I(x_\bullet) := \left(\prod_{i=1}^r (|x_\bullet|_1 - k_i) \right) \cdot \prod_{i \in I} x_i$$

for all $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ satisfying $|I| \leq s - r$. Let's consider an indexing $\{I\}_{|I| \leq s-r} = \{I_\bullet\}$ such that $|I_1| \leq |I_2| \leq \dots$. Then, the matrix $(g_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')}$ is invertible upper triangular matrix where χ is the characteristic function, since

$$g_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}) \begin{cases} \in \mathbb{R}^\times & j = j' \text{ because } k_i > s - r \text{ for all } i. \\ = 0 & j > j' \text{ because } \prod_{i \in I_j} \chi_{I_{j'}}(i) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Also, we have $g_{I_j}(\mathbf{a}_{j'}) = 0$, hence the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} (f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (f_j(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \\ (g_{I_j}(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (g_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (f_j(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \\ 0 & (g_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \end{bmatrix}$$

is an invertible upper triangular matrix. In particular, the set of polynomials $\{f_j(x_\bullet), g_I(x_\bullet)\}_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ |I| \leq s-r}}$ is \mathbb{R} -linearly independent.

Now, let $\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet)$ (respectively, $\bar{g}_I(x_\bullet)$) be the reduction of $f_j(x_\bullet)$ (respectively, $g_I(x_\bullet)$) as in the

Problem 1. Then, we have the same invertible upper triangular matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\bar{f}_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (\bar{f}_j(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \\ (\bar{g}_{I_j}(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (\bar{g}_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (f_j(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (f_j(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \\ (g_{I_j}(\mathbf{a}_{j'}))_{(j,j')} & (g_{I_j}(\chi_{I_{j'}}))_{(j,j')} \end{bmatrix}$$

Again, the set $\{\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet), \bar{g}_I(x_\bullet)\}_{j,I}$ is linearly independent. Since each term of $\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet)$ and $\bar{g}_I(x_\bullet)$ is square-free, and by two inequalities $\deg \bar{f}_j(x_\bullet) \leq s$, $\deg \bar{g}_I(x_\bullet) \leq |I| + r \leq s$, we can obtain that $\bar{f}_j, \bar{g}_I \in \langle x_\bullet^{\alpha_\bullet} \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_\infty \leq 1}$. Therefore, the inequality

$$m + \sum_{i=0}^{s-r} \binom{n}{i} = \left| \{\bar{f}_j(x_\bullet), \bar{g}_I(x_\bullet)\}_{j,I} \right| \leq \dim \langle x_\bullet^{\alpha_\bullet} \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_\infty \leq 1} = \sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i}$$

holds, or equivalently,

$$m \leq \sum_{i=s-r+1}^s \binom{n}{i}$$

holds. This completes the proof. \square

HW 2.3

Let $A_i = \{i\}$ and $B_i = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}$. Then, this satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii). Also, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\binom{|A_i|+|B_i|}{|A_i|}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{i}$$

If we pick sufficiently large m , then we can obtain the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\binom{|A_i|+|B_i|}{|A_i|}} \geq n$$

and this completes the proof. □

HW 2.4

Let's write $\mathcal{F} = \{A_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$, and let $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the \mathbb{F}_2 -coefficient characteristic vector of A_i . Pick $i \in [1, m]$, then there are vectors $b_j \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ where $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that

1. Each coordinate-wise product $b_i b_{i'}$ is zero when $i \neq i'$, and the sum of all b_i 's is the vector consist of only 1 as coordinates.
2. For each i' , the equality $a_{i'} \cdot b_j = 1$ holds for all j if and only if $i' = i$ holds.

because of the coloring condition in the problem. By the symmetry, we can assume that the first coordinate of b_1 is 1. In this situation, we define $(n-1)$ -variable polynomial

$$f_i(x_\bullet) = \prod_{j=2}^k (x'_\bullet \cdot b_j)$$

over \mathbb{F}_2 , where x'_\bullet is the vector obtained by deleting the first entry of the vector x_\bullet . If $i' \neq i$, then the number of a non-zero entry of the coordinate-wise product $a_{i'} b_j$ is either 0 or 2 for some $j \geq 2$, by the pigeonhole principle. In the other word, the equality $f_i(a_{i'}) = \delta_{i,i'}$ holds, where $\delta_{\bullet,\bullet}$ denotes a Kronecker-delta function, i.e., the set $\{f_i(x_\bullet)\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ is \mathbb{F}_2 -linearly independent. Note that $f_i(x_\bullet)$ is homogeneous of degree $k-1$ only consist of square-free terms, so $f_i(x_\bullet) \in \langle x'^{\alpha_\bullet}_\bullet \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_1=k-1}$ holds. Hence, the inequality

$$m = \left| \{f_i(x_\bullet)\}_{1 \leq i \leq m} \right| \leq \dim \langle x'^{\alpha_\bullet}_\bullet \rangle_{|\alpha_\bullet|_1=k-1} = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$

holds, and this completes the proof. □

HW 2.5

Claim 5.1. Let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ be two k -uniform families over $[n]$. Then, the equality $\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)|) = \frac{|\mathcal{F}_1| \cdot |\mathcal{F}_2|}{\binom{n}{k}}$ holds, where the expectation is with respect to the uniform probability measure on the symmetric group $\text{Sym}(n)$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Easy calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)|) &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{F}_1, B \in \mathcal{F}_2} \Pr(A = \sigma(B)) \\ &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{F}_1, B \in \mathcal{F}_2} \frac{|\text{Sym}(n)_A|}{n!} \\ &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{F}_1, B \in \mathcal{F}_2} \frac{k!(n-k)!}{n!} \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{F}_1| \cdot |\mathcal{F}_2|}{\binom{n}{k}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Sym}(n)_A$ denotes the stabilizer of A , and this proves the claim. \square

We have to show that $\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)|) \leq 1$ if we set \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 as in the problem. It is enough to show that for each $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)$, the inequality $|\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)| \leq 1$ holds. If not, let A, B be two different sets in $\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)$ for some σ . Then, both $|A \cap B| \in L_1$ and $|A \cap B| = |\sigma^{-1}(A) \cap \sigma^{-1}(B)| \in L_2$ holds since $\sigma^{-1}(A), \sigma^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}_2$, but this contradicts to the assumption that the given two sets L_1 and L_2 are disjoint. Therefore, the inequality $|\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \sigma(\mathcal{F}_2)| \leq 1$ holds for every σ , and this completes the proof. \square