

# Preliminary Observations on the Happy Ending Problem

Warren Jin

July 2023

## 1 Introduction and Literature Review

Given  $N$  points in the plane, we wish to check whether there must exist a convex polygon with  $n$  vertices. The lowest number of points required is denoted  $k(n)$ , such that  $\exists$  convex  $n$ -gon  $\forall N \geq k(n)$ . For simplicity, we can assume that no 3 points are collinear. This problem was posed by Erdős and Szekeres in this 1935 paper, where they conjectured that  $k(n) = 2^{n-2} + 1$  (which I will refer to as the ES conjecture).<sup>1</sup> They managed to prove that  $k(n) \geq 2^{n-2} + 1$  in a later paper.<sup>2</sup> A related problem is to find the infimum of the number of convex  $n$ -gons in a set of  $N$  points, which I will denote by  $f(N, n)$ . The case  $f(N, 4)$  was considered by Hu, Chen, and Zhu, who found exact values for  $N \leq 9$  and a lower bound for  $N > 9$ .<sup>3</sup> I present an alternative method to find the lower bound of  $f(N, 4)$  that coheres with Hu et al's finding on the growth rate of the function, and generalize it to any choice of  $n$ .

## 2 Some observations

For this article I will introduce some notation. Noting that if the power set of  $N$  points is taken to be a poset  $(P, \subseteq)$ , then every subset of the same number of points is pairwise incomparable. Thus, the number of elements on height  $H$  equals  $\binom{N}{H}$ . Evidently, the height of this poset is  $N$ . We can also see that  $P$  is a lattice, since the joins and meets for any two arbitrary elements are their union and intersection respectively, which are both elements of the power set.

Let  $x_i$  be an element of  $P$  with  $i$  elements. Define a function  $A : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $A(x)$  is the supremum of the possible areas enclosed by a cycle over the elements of  $x$ . We let  $A(x_1) = A(x_2) = 0$ . A cycle which gives this supremum does not have any edge crossings, because if the edges  $v_1v_2$  and  $v_3v_4$  crossed, then either  $v_1v_3$  and  $v_2v_4$  form a non-crossing cycle of larger area, or  $v_1v_4$  and

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.numdam.org/item/CM\\_1935\\_\\_2\\_\\_463\\_0.pdf](http://www.numdam.org/item/CM_1935__2__463_0.pdf)

<sup>2</sup>[https://www.renyi.hu/~p\\_erdos/1960-09.pdf](https://www.renyi.hu/~p_erdos/1960-09.pdf)

<sup>3</sup>[http://archive.ymsc.tsinghua.edu.cn/pacm\\_download/21/86-20100n\\_the\\_Minimum\\_Number\\_of\\_Convex\\_Quadrilaterals\\_in\\_Point\\_Sets\\_of\\_Given\\_Numbers\\_of\\_Points.pdf](http://archive.ymsc.tsinghua.edu.cn/pacm_download/21/86-20100n_the_Minimum_Number_of_Convex_Quadrilaterals_in_Point_Sets_of_Given_Numbers_of_Points.pdf)

$v_2v_3$  will achieve this. This process can be iterated as many times as necessary to obtain various cycles over  $x$ , from which it is possible to select one with the largest area.

Notice that for any polygon  $X$ , any other polygon with vertices chosen from  $X$  must also be convex and has a smaller area than  $X$  if and only if  $X$  is convex. We can then define a poset  $(Q, \geq)$  such that  $A(x) \in Q$  if  $x \in P$ . Clearly  $Q$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  and is thus a total order, but right now I am only interested in the relations in  $Q$  of corresponding comparable elements in  $P$ , which is to say that we only need to consider  $(A(x), A(y))$  for  $x \subseteq y$  or vice versa. By the observation above, consider a subposet of  $P$  formed by taking some element at height  $i$  and all the chains up to height  $i$  with this element as their join. The  $i$ -sided polygon corresponding to this element is convex if and only if the aforementioned subposet is isomorphic to the subposet of  $Q$  formed by applying  $A$  to every element. For an element  $x_i$  exhibiting these properties, we call it a convex element of  $P$ .

From this we have a restatement of the happy ending problem: given the posets  $P$  and  $Q$ , as well as the function  $A$ , which itself has many properties that are still unknown to me, we want to find an integer  $k(n)$  such that a convex element  $x_n$  must exist in  $P$  if the height of  $P \geq k(n)$ .

### 3 Lower bound for $f(N, n)$

Consider the poset  $P$  for a given power set of  $N$  elements. In general, we only consider cases where  $N \geq k(n)$ . Take the elements on the heights  $H = N, k(n)$ , and  $n$ . For each height, the number of elements would be  $\binom{1, N}{k(n)}$  and  $\binom{N}{n}$  respectively. The number of elements on  $H = k(n)$  that some element on  $H = n$  is a subset of is equal to the number of ways that one can choose another  $k(n) - n$  points out of  $N - n$  available ones.

Now consider the number of elements on  $H = n$  which must be convex. Since every  $k(n)$ -element subset must be comparable to a convex element on  $H = n$ , and every such element is comparable to exactly  $\binom{N-n}{k(n)-n}$  unique  $k(n)$ -element subsets, then minimally we would need

$$\left\lceil \binom{N}{k(n)} \div \binom{N-n}{k(n)-n} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{N!(k(n)-n)!}{k(n)!(N-n)!} \right\rceil$$

convex elements on  $H = n$  to satisfy the requirements.

By the result in the original paper where  $k(4) = 5$ , we have

$$f(N, 4) = \left\lceil \frac{N!}{120(N-4)!} \right\rceil$$

The growth rate of  $f(N, 4)$  by this calculation is given as such:

$$\frac{f(N, 4)}{f(N-1, 4)} \approx \frac{N}{N-4}$$

for large enough  $N$ . This is the same result found in Hu et al. However, this formula gives  $f(7, 4) = 7$ , which is worse than the actual bound  $f(7, 4) = 9$ . The disparity is due to the fact that the minimal number of convex elements required does not match the actual graph in the plane, as the additional point added from  $N$  to  $N + 1$  creates more convex elements than expected by our method. Additionally, the possible graphs of 7 points containing only 9 convex quadrilaterals must contain a convex pentagon.

Regardless of the actual value of  $f(N, 4)$ , the best bounds currently are  $O(N^4)$ . At  $H = 5$ , there are  $\binom{N}{5}$  elements, which is  $O(N^5)$ . Given that the number of  $(x_4, x_5)$  pairs in  $P$  is  $(N - 4)f(N, 4) = O(N^5)$ , it is not possible to use the pigeonhole principle alone to prove the happy ending problem for case  $n = 5$ . A similar argument applies for every  $n$ .

## 4 Some sketchy guesses

Assuming that  $k(n)$  and  $f(N, n)$  are accurately formulated:

1. For some set of  $k(n) - 1$  points which does not contain a convex polygon with  $n$  sides, the convex hull of the entire set is an  $n - 1$  sided polygon. This is a **very** sketchy guess.
2. For  $N \geq k(n)$ , a set of  $N$  points which does not contain a convex polygon with  $n$  sides contains more than  $f(N, n)$  convex  $n - 1$  sided polygons.
3.  $f(N, n)$  is  $O(N^n)$ .