The Probabilistic Method

exercise solutions by

Marcel K. Goh

17 February 2022

Note. A star indicates a starred problem in the text; these are supposed to be harder. I have decided to put my work here even when I haven't solved the problem yet, so that when I come back later I can see what I've tried. I won't put the black square \blacksquare until I think the proof is actually done. Also I wrote log everywhere to mean \log_e even though the text uses ln.

1. The Basic Method

Exercise 1.1. Prove that if there is a real p, with $0 \le p \le 1$ such that

$$\binom{n}{k} p^{\binom{k}{2}} + \binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} < 1,$$

then the Ramsey number r(k,t) satisfies r(k,t) > n. Using this, show that

$$r(4,t) \ge \Omega(t^{3/2}/(\log t)^{3/2}).$$

Proof. We follow the proof of Proposition 1.1.1 in the book. We consider a random graph on n vertices, where each edge is present with probability p. Let K be the event that there is a clique of size k in the graph, and let I be the event that there is an independent set of size t in the graph. By the union bound,

$$\mathbf{P}\{K \cup I\} \le \mathbf{P}\{K\} + \mathbf{P}\{I\} \le \sum_{|S|=k} p^{\binom{k}{2}} + \sum_{|S|=t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} = \binom{n}{k} p^{\binom{k}{2}} + \binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} < 1.$$

This means that $\mathbf{P}\{\neg K \cap \neg I\} > 0$ and since the sample space is finite, there exists a graph on n vertices with no clique of size k and no independent set of size t and therefore r(k,t) > n.

Next we show that $r(4,t) > (t/(e\log t))^{3/2}$ for large enough t. Note that

$$\binom{n}{4} p^{\binom{k}{2}} + \binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} \leq n^4 p^6 + \frac{e^t n^t}{t^t} (1-p)^{t^2/4},$$

by the inequalities

$$\frac{n^k}{k^k} \le \binom{n}{k} \le \frac{e^k n^k}{k^k}.$$

Setting $n = t^{3/2}/(e \log t)^{3/2}$, we have

$$n^{4}p^{6} + \frac{e^{t}n^{t}}{t^{t}}(1-p)^{t^{2}/4} = \left(\frac{tp}{e\log t}\right)^{6} + \frac{e^{t}t^{3t/2}}{t^{t}e^{3t/2}(\log t)^{3t/2}}(1-p)^{t^{2}/4}$$

$$= \left(\frac{tp}{e\log t}\right)^{6} + \frac{t^{t/2}}{e^{t/2}(\log t)^{3t/2}}(1-p)^{t^{2}/4}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{tp}{e\log t}\right)^{6} + \left(\frac{t(1-p)^{t/2}}{e(\log t)^{3}}\right)^{t/2}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{tp}{e\log t}\right)^{6} + \left(\frac{t}{e^{pt/2+1}(\log t)^{3}}\right)^{t/2},$$

where in the last line we used the inequality $1 - p \le e^{-p}$. Choosing $p = 2 \log t/t$, we simply need t large enough such that

$$\left(\frac{t}{e^{\log t + 1}(\log t)^3}\right)^{t/2} = \left(\frac{1}{e(\log t)^3}\right)^{t/2} < 1 - \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^6,$$

which can be done since the left-hand side goes to 0.

Exercise 1.2. Suppose $n \ge 4$ and let H be an n-uniform hypergraph with at most $4^{n-1}/3^n$ edges. Prove that there is a colouring of the vertices of H by 4 colours so that in every edge all 4 colours are represented.

Proof. Let each vertex of H be independently given one of the four colours uniformly at random. (If H is infinite, it does not matter what colour we give to vertices that do not appear in any edge, so it suffices to consider H finite, which makes the sample space finite.) Given some edge e of H with n vertices, there are 4^n total ways that e may be coloured, and for each of the four colours, 3^n total ways that e may be coloured using only the other three colours. Let K(e) denote the event that e does not contain all four colours. By the inclusion-exclusion principle,

$$\mathbf{P}\{K(e)\} = 4 \cdot 3^n - 6 \cdot 2^n + 4$$

Since $6 \cdot 2^n \ge 96 > 4$, the probability that a given edge *does not* contain all four colours is (much) less than $3^n/4^{n-1}$. By the union bound,

$$\mathbf{P}\Big\{\bigcup_{e \in E(H)} K(e)\Big\} \le \sum_{e \in E(H)} \mathbf{P}\big\{K(e)\big\} < \frac{4^{n-1}}{3^n} \cdot \frac{3^n}{4^{n-1}} = 1.$$

Since the sample space is finite this implies that there is some colouring of the vertices of H in which every edge has all four colours. \blacksquare

*Exercise 1.3. Prove that for two independent, identically distributed real random variables X and Y,

$$P\{|X - Y| \le 2\} \le 3P\{|X - Y| \le 1\}.$$

Proof. [Not done. Need to use independence somehow. I think by symmetry it is enough to show that $\mathbf{P}\{1 < X - Y \le 2\} \le \mathbf{P}\{|X - Y| \le 1\}$ or $\mathbf{P}\{X - Y > 1 \mid |X - Y| \le 2\} \le 1/3$. In the second expression, X and Y are no longer independent.]

*Exercise 1.4. Let G = (V, E) be a graph with n vertices and minimum degree $\delta > 10$. Prove that there is a partition of V into two disjoint subsets A and B so that $|A| \leq O((n \log n)/\delta)$, and each vertex of B has at least one neighbour in A and at least one neighbour in B.

Proof. We follow the construction of the dominating set from the proof of Theorem 1.2.2, since the required A here is a dominating set with some extra conditions. Let p be chosen later and let X be a random set of vertices obtained by independently selecting each $v \in V$ with probability p. Then as in the proof from the textbook, we let Y be the set of all $v \in V \setminus X$ that have no neighbours in X. At this point $X \cup Y$ is a dominating set, but we are not yet done constructing A, since there may still be elements in $V \setminus (X \cup Y)$ all of whose neighbours belong to $X \cup Y$. Let $Z \subseteq V \setminus (X \cup Y)$ denote all of these elements. For any given $v \in V$, we have $\mathbf{P}\{v \in X\} = p$ and

$$\mathbf{P}\{v \in Y\} = (1-p)^{\deg(v)+1} \le (1-p)^{\delta+1} \le e^{-p(\delta+1)},$$

since for $v \in Y$ we need v itself as well as all deg(v) of its neighbours to not be in X. Lastly,

$$\mathbf{P}\{v \in Z\} = (1-p) \prod_{w \in N(v)} (p + (1-p)^{\deg(w)+1}) \le (1-p) (p + (1-p)^{\delta+1})^{\delta} \le (1-p) (p + e^{-p(\delta+1)})^{\delta}.$$

Now we compute

$$\mathbf{E}\{|A|\} = \sum_{v \in V} v \in \{X \cup Y \cup Z\}$$

$$\leq n(p + e^{-p(\delta+1)} + (1-p)(p + e^{-p(\delta+1)})^{\delta}).$$

Since $p + e^{-p(\delta+1)} < 1$, we can remove the δ from its exponent for the looser but simpler bound

$$\mathbf{E}\{|A|\} \le np + ne^{-p(\delta+1)} + np - np^2 + ne^{-p(\delta+1)} - npe^{-p(\delta+1)}$$

= $(2-p)(np + ne^{-p(\delta+1)}).$

Setting $p = \log(\delta + 1)/(\delta + 1)$ just as in the dominating set proof, we have

$$e^{-p(\delta+1)} = \frac{1}{\delta+1}$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}\big\{|A|\big\} \le \bigg(2 - \frac{\log(\delta+1)}{\delta+1}\bigg) \bigg(n\frac{\log(\delta+1)}{\delta+1} + \frac{n}{\delta+1}\bigg) = 2n\frac{\log(\delta+1)}{\delta+1} + o\bigg(\frac{n\log\delta}{\delta}\bigg),$$

which has the required asymptotics. It remains to choose an A with |A| at least this average.

*Exercise 1.5. Let G = (V, E) be a graph on $n \ge 10$ vertices and suppose that if we add to G any edge not in G, the number of copies of a complete graph on 10 vertices in it increases. Show that the number of edges of G is at least 8n - 36.

Proof. The figure 8n-36 in the conclusion obscures the fact that we should use Theorem 1.3.3. In fact,

$$8n - 36 = \frac{n^2 - n - n^2 + 17n - 72}{2} = \frac{n(n-1) - (n-8)(n-9)}{2} = \binom{n}{2} - \binom{n-8}{2}.$$

Let $F = V^{(2)} \setminus E = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_h\}$ be the set of non-edges in G. Since the addition of any non-edge causes the number of K_{10} subgraphs to increase, we know that for each A_i there exists a set X_i of size 8 and disjoint from A_i such that the subgraph induced on the vertices $A_i \cup X_i$ would be a K_{10} if A_i happened to be in E (which it isn't). Set $B_i = V \setminus (A_i \cup S_i)$. Clearly, $A_i \cap B_i = \emptyset$ for all i. Also, since $A_i \cup S_i$ is complete except for one missing edge A_i , for any $j \neq i$, we have $A_j \not\subseteq A_i \cup S_i$. This means that $A_j \cap B_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \neq i$. Hence $\{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i=1}^h$ is a (2, n-10)-system as defined in the chapter, and by Theorem 1.3.3, $|F| = h \leq {2+n-10 \choose 2}$. We conclude that $|E| \geq {n \choose 2} - {n-8 \choose 2}$.

Exercise 1.8. Let F be a finite collection of binary strings of finite lengths and assume no member of F is a prefix of another one. Let N_i denote the number of strings of length i in F. Prove that

$$\sum_{i \ge 1} \frac{N_i}{2_i} \le 1.$$

Proof. This inequality looks an awful bit like the LYM inequality, so our proof is informed by the proof of that statement. Let m be the maximum length of any string in F (such a maximum exists because F is finite). Let b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_m be a sequence of independent random variables with $\mathbf{P}\{b_i = 0\} = \mathbf{P}\{b_i = 1\} = 1/2$ for all $1 \le i \le m$. Consider the set of strings

$$C = \{b_1, b_1 b_2, \dots, b_1 b_2 \cdots b_m\}.$$

This is a random set, so we may study the random quantity $|C \cap F|$. Note that C contains exactly one bitstring of each length, and every string of length i has an equal chance of being in C, namely 2^{-i} . So

$$\mathbf{E}\{|C \cap F|\} = \sum_{s \in F} \mathbf{P}\{s \in C\} = \sum_{s \in F} 2^{-|s|} = \sum_{i \ge 1} \frac{N_i}{2^i},$$

where |s| is the length of the string s. In the last equality we simply grouped strings of the same length together. On the other hand, $|C \cap F|$ cannot possibly be greater than 1, since for any two members of C, one must be a prefix of the other. So $\mathbf{E}\{|C \cap F|\} \leq 1$ as well, and this observation completes the proof.

2. Linearity of Expectation

Exercise 2.1. Suppose $n \ge 2$ and let H = (V, E) be an n-uniform hypergraph with $|E| = 4^{n-1}$ edges. Show that there is a colouring of V by 4 colours so that no edge is monochromatic.

Proof. Let ϕ be a random function from V to [4], so that all 4^n possible colourings are equally likely. Let X be the number of monochromatic edges in H under this colouring; that is,

$$X = \sum_{e \in E} \mathbf{1}_{[e \text{ is monochromatic}]}.$$

The probability that a given edge $e = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is monochromatic is $1/4^{n-1}$, since $\phi(v_1)$ can be anything, but then $\phi(v_2)$ through to $\phi(v_n)$ each have a 1/4 chance of matching $\phi(v_1)$. So

$$\mathbf{E}\{X\} = \sum_{e \in E} \mathbf{P}\{e \text{ is monochromatic}\} = \frac{4^{n-1}}{4^{n-1}} = 1.$$

We can produce a colouring with 4^{n-1} monochromatic edges by setting $\phi(v) = 1$ for all $v \in V$, so $\mathbf{P}\{X > 1\} > 0$. Thus for $\mathbf{E}\{X\}$ to equal 1, we must also have $\mathbf{P}\{X < 1\} > 0$, and since X is nonnegative, this means that $\mathbf{P}\{X = 0\} > 0$ and there exists some colouring with no monochromatic edges.

Exercise 2.7. Let \mathcal{F} be a family of subsets of $[n] = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ and suppose there are no $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $A \subseteq B$. Let $\sigma \in S_n$ be a random permutation of the elements of [n] and consider the random variable

$$X = |\{i : \{\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \dots, \sigma(i)\} \in \mathcal{F}\}|.$$

By considering the expectation of X, prove that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

Proof. This is the proof that I said Exercise 1.8 reminded me of. Let $S_i = {\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(i)}$ and let

$$C = \{\emptyset, S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}.$$

If there are i < j such that S_i and S_j are both in \mathcal{F} , then \mathcal{F} violates the condition that there are no $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ with $A \subseteq B$. So $X \le 1$. On the other hand, C contains exactly one set of size i for each $0 \le i \le n$ and the probability that S_i is a given element of $X^{(i)}$ is the same. So letting N_i be the number of sets of size i in \mathcal{F} , we have

$$1 \geq \mathbf{E}\{X\} = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{F}} \binom{n}{|A|}^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^n N_i \binom{n}{i}^{-1} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}},$$

where the last inequality holds because $\binom{n}{k}$ is maximised when $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and because the sum of the N_i is $|\mathcal{F}|$.

3. Alterations

Exercise 3.1. As shown in Section 3.1, the Ramsey number R(k,k) satisfies

$$R(k,k) > n - \binom{n}{k} 2^{1 - \binom{k}{2}}$$

for every integer n. Conclude that

$$R(k,k) \ge (1 - o(1)) \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2}.$$

Proof. We set $n = (k-1)2^{k/2}/e$ in the above, to get the bound

$$R(k,k) > \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2} - \frac{1}{e} 2^{k/2} - \binom{(k-1)2^{k/2}/e}{k} 2^{1-\binom{k}{2}}.$$

Now we apply the inequality $\binom{n}{k} \leq e^k n^k / k^k$, which yields

$$\begin{split} R(k,k) &> \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2} - \frac{1}{e} 2^{k/2} - \frac{e^k (k-1)^k 2^{k^2/2} / e^k}{k^k} 2^{1-k^2/2+k/2} \\ &= \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2} - \frac{1}{e} 2^{k/2} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^k 2^{1+k/2}. \end{split}$$

Since $(1-1/k)^k \to 1/e$ as $k \to \infty$,

$$R(k,k) > \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2} \bigg(1 - \frac{1}{k} - \frac{2e(1-1/k)^k}{k} \bigg) = \frac{k}{e} 2^{k/2} \big(1 - o(1) \big). \quad \blacksquare$$

Exercise 3.3. Prove that every 3-uniform hypergraph with n vertices and $m \ge n/3$ edges contains an independent set (i.e., a set of vertices containing no edges) of size at least

$$\frac{2n^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3}\sqrt{m}}.$$

Proof. We mirror the proof of Theorem 3.2.1. Let $(X \cap \mathcal{F})$ be a 3-uniform hypergraph with |X| = n and $|\mathcal{F}| = m \ge n/3$. Let $S \subseteq X$ be a random subset obtained by independently putting each $x \in X$ in S with probability p, to be chosen later. Of course, $\mathbf{E}\{|X|\} = np$. What is the expected number of edges contained in S? Well, each edge $\{x, y, z\} \in \mathcal{F}$ has probability p^3 of being contained in S, so we expect mp^3 edges in the subgraph induced by S. If Y is the set of these edges, we now want to choose p to minimise the quantity $\mathbf{E}\{|X|-|Y|\} = np - mp^3$. The derivative is $n-3mp^2$ so we ought to set $p = \sqrt{n/3m}$, obtaining

$$\mathbf{E}\{|X| - |Y|\} = \frac{n^{3/2} - m\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{3m}}.$$

Since $m \geq n/3$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\big\{|X|-|Y|\big\} \geq \frac{n^{3/2}}{\sqrt{3m}} - \frac{n^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3m}} = \frac{2n^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{3m}}.$$

This means there exists some set $S \subseteq X$ with the number of vertices minus the number of edges at least $2n^{3/2}/(3\sqrt{3m})$. Removing one vertex from each edge, we arrive at an independent set of vertices S' with cardinality at least this quantity.

4. The Second Moment

Exercise 4.1. Let X be a random variable taking integral nonnegative values, let $\mathbf{E}\{X^2\}$ denote the expectation of its square, and let $\mathbf{V}\{X\}$ denote its variance. Prove that

$$\mathbf{P}\{X=0\} \le \frac{\mathbf{V}\{X\}}{\mathbf{E}\{X^2\}}.$$

Proof. Since X is integer and nonnegative, we have $\mathbf{P}\{X=0\}=1-\mathbf{P}\{X\geq 1\}$ and since $\mathbf{V}\{X\}=\mathbf{E}\{X^2\}-\mathbf{E}\{X\}^2$, to get our result it suffices to show that

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\} \ge \frac{\mathbf{E}\{X\}^2}{\mathbf{E}\{X^2\}}.$$

We start by noting that

$$\mathbf{E}\{X\} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \, \mathbf{P}\{X = k\} = \mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k \, \mathbf{P}\{X = k\}}{\mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\}} = \mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\} \, \mathbf{E}\{X \, | \, X \ge 1\}.$$

Since the function $x \mapsto x^2$ is convex, we have, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbf{E}\{X\}^2 = \mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\}^2 \, \mathbf{E}\{X \, | \, X \ge 1\}^2 \le \mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\}^2 \, \mathbf{E}\{X^2 \, | \, X \ge 1\} = \mathbf{P}\{X \ge 1\} \, \mathbf{E}\{X^2\}.$$

Dividing both sides by $\mathbf{E}\{X^2\}$ gives us what we want.

Exercise 4.4. Let X be a random variable with expectation $\mathbf{E}\{X\} = 0$ and variance $\mathbf{V}\{X\} = \sigma^2$. Prove that for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \ge \lambda\} \le \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + \lambda^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$. Note that if $X \ge \lambda$, then X is also positive so in particular, for any a > 0, X + a and $\lambda + a$ are both positive. This implies that $(X + a)^2 \ge (\lambda + a)^2$. Note that since $\mathbf{V}\{X\} = \mathbf{E}\{X^2\} - \mathbf{E}\{X\}^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\mathbf{E}\{X\} = 0$, we have $\mathbf{E}\{X^2\} = \sigma^2$, which in turn implies that

$$\mathbf{E}\big\{(X+a)^2\big\} = \mathbf{E}\{X^2\} + 2a\,\mathbf{E}\{X\} + \mathbf{E}\{a^2\} = \sigma^2 + a^2.$$

Now we take the infimum over all a > 0 and apply Markov's inequality to get

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \ge \lambda\} \le \inf_{a>0} \mathbf{P}\{(X+a)^2 \ge (\lambda+a)^2\} \le \inf_{a>0} \frac{\sigma^2 + a^2}{(\lambda+a)^2}.$$

We now optimise over a > 0. We have

$$\frac{d}{da}\frac{\sigma^2 + a^2}{(\lambda + a)^2} = \frac{(\lambda + a)^2 2a - (\sigma^2 + a^2)2(\lambda + a)}{(\lambda + a)^4},$$

which is zero when $a = \sigma^2/\lambda > 0$. Plugging in this value of a gives

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \ge \lambda\} \le \frac{\sigma^2 + \sigma^4/\lambda^2}{(\lambda + \sigma^2/\lambda)^2} = \frac{\sigma^2(\lambda + \sigma^2/\lambda)}{\lambda(\lambda + \sigma^2/\lambda)^2} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + \lambda^2},$$

exactly what we need.