

An Application of Density Ramsey Theory to Transversal Theory

T. C. Brown

Citation data: T.C. Brown, *An application of density Ramsey theory to transversal theory*, Bogazici University J. **10** (1983), 41–46.

Abstract

We apply results of [1] and [2] to obtain certain sufficient conditions (which involve arbitrarily small “density”) for the existence of a “ k -transversal” of t s -block partitions of a set X . Along the way, some questions arise of possible independent interest.

1 Introduction and definitions

In this note we prove the two theorems stated below. Section 2 contains some necessary preliminaries, Section 3 contains the proofs, and Section 4 contains some remarks and related questions.

Definition 1. Let X be a set, and let P_1, \dots, P_t be s -block partitions of X . Then P_1, \dots, P_t *separate* the points of X if for every pair of elements x, y of X , $x \neq y$, x and y belong to different blocks of at least one of the partitions P_i .

Definition 2. If $P = (P(1), \dots, P(s))$ is an (ordered) s -block partition of the set X , a *transversal* of P is a set T of s elements of X , one element from each of the blocks $P(i)$, $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Definition 3. Let P_1, \dots, P_t be s -block partitions of a set X . a k -*transversal* of P_1, \dots, P_t is an s -element subset T of X with the following two properties. 1) For each i , $1 \leq i \leq t$, T is either a transversal of P_i or is contained in a single block of P_i . 2) For at least k distinct values of i , T is a transversal of P_i .

Definition 4. For $s \geq 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $k \geq 1$, $P(s, \varepsilon, k)$ denotes the smallest positive integer (if one exists!) with the following property. If $t \geq P(s, \varepsilon, k)$ and P_1, \dots, P_t are s -block partitions of a set X which separates the points of X , and $|X| \geq \varepsilon s^t$, then there exists a k -transversal of P_1, \dots, P_t .

Theorem 1. $P(2, \varepsilon, k)$ and $P(3, \varepsilon, k)$ exist for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $k \geq 1$.

Theorem 2. Let $s \geq 2$ be fixed. If $P(s, \varepsilon, 1)$ exists for all $\varepsilon > 0$ then $P(s, \varepsilon, k)$ exists for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $k \geq 1$.

2 Preliminaries and further definitions

Let $s \geq 2$ and $t \geq 1$ be given, let $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$ and let A^t be the t -fold cartesian product $A^t = \{a_1 \dots a_t : a_i \in A, 1 \leq i \leq t\}$.

Let P_1, \dots, P_t be s -block partitions of a set X which separate the points of X . Order the blocks of each partition P_i in an arbitrary way, say

$$P_i = (P(i, 1), \dots, P(i, s)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq t.$$

Define the mapping g from X into A^t by setting, for each element x of X ,

$$g(x) = a_1 \dots a_t, \quad \text{where } x \in P(1, a_1) \cap \dots \cap P(t, a_t).$$

Note that g is injective, since P_1, \dots, P_t separate the points of X .

Definition 5. Let $s \geq 2$, let $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$, and let k, t be positive integers with $t \geq k$. Consider any $s \times t$ matrix (a_{ij}) , $1 \leq i \leq s$, $1 \leq j \leq t$, which has the property that each column of this matrix is either constant (perhaps different constants for different columns) or is some permutation of the elements of A (perhaps different permutations for different columns), and such that *at least* k of the columns are non-constant. Then the s rows of such a matrix, regarded as elements of A^t , form a k -complementary set in A^t .

(This definition, and the mapping g above, is essentially due to Judith Q. Longyear [8].)

Remark. Let P_1, \dots, P_t be s -block partitions of a set X which separate the points of X , and let $Y = g(X)$. It follows from the definition of g that there exists a k -transversal of P_1, \dots, P_t if and only if Y contains a k -complementary set.

3 Proofs

In view of the preceding Remark, $P(s, \varepsilon, k)$ (Definition 4) is the smallest positive integer (if one exists) with the following property.

If $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$, $t \geq P(s, \varepsilon, k)$, and Y is any subset of A^t with $|Y| > \varepsilon s^t$, then Y contains a k -complementary set.

To prove Theorem 1, we make use of the following known fact.

Fact. (Corollary to Theorem 1 in [2]). The proof of this fact requires the main result given in [1].) If F is either the 2-element field or the 3-element field, and $k \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$ are given, there exists an integer $n(|F|, \varepsilon, k)$ such that if $t \geq n(|F|, \varepsilon, k)$, V is a t -dimensional vector space over F and Y is any subset of V with $|Y| > \varepsilon |V|$, then Y contains a k -dimensional affine subspace (translate of a k -dimensional vector subspace) of V .

Note that any k -dimensional affine subspace of V contains a 1-dimensional affine subspace in which there are at least k nonconstant coordinates. (Here we are viewing V as F^t .)

Now let $s = 2$ or $s = 3$, let $k \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, let $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$, and let $t \geq n(|A|, \varepsilon, k)$. Let Y be any subset of A^t with $|Y| > \varepsilon s^t = \varepsilon |A^t|$. Then identifying A with the s -element field F , and identifying A^t with

the t -dimensional vector space V over F , it follows from the Fact above and the following remark that Y contains a 1-dimensional affine subspace with at least k non-constant coordinates, that is, Y contains a k -complementary set.

This shows that $P(s, \varepsilon, k) \leq n(|A|, \varepsilon, k)$ (for $s = 2$ or $s = 3$), and completes the proof of Theorem 1.

The proof of Theorem 2 is obtained by a slight modification of the proof of Theorem 1 in [2]. For the sake of completeness we give the modified argument here.

Lemma. *Let $s \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$ be fixed, and assume that $P(s, \varepsilon, 1)$ exist for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for each positive integer r , the existence of $P(s, 1/(r+1), k)$ implies the existence of $P(s, 1/r, k+1)$.*

Proof. Let $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$, let $no = P(s, 1/(r+1), k)$, and let e be the number of distinct k -complementary sets in A^{no} . Let $\varepsilon' = 1/(er^2)$, and let $nl = P(s, \varepsilon', 1)$. We now claim that $P(s, 1/r, k+1) \leq no + nl$.

To see this, let Y be any subset of A^{no+nl} with $|Y| > 1/r \cdot s^{no+nl}$. We need to show that Y contains a $(k+1)$ -complementary set.

For each $z \in A^{nl}$, let W_z denote the set $A^{no} \times \{z\}$. Then

$$A^{no+nl} = \cup \{W_z : z \in A^{nl}\}.$$

Note that if $|Y \cap W_z| > 1/(r+1) \cdot s^{no}$, then by the definition of no , Y must contain a k -complementary set.

Let u denote the number of elements z in A^{nl} such that $|Y \cap W_z| \leq 1/(r+1) \cdot s^{no}$.

Then we have

$$1/r \cdot s^{no+nl} < |Y| = \sum |Y \cap W_z| \leq u/(r+1) \cdot s^{no} + (s^{nl} - u) \cdot s^{no},$$

hence $u(1 - 1/(r+1)) < s^{nl}(1 - 1/r)$, $u < s^{nl}(1 - 1/r^2)$, $s^{nl}/r^2 < s^{nl} - u$.

Therefore there are

$$d = s^{nl} - u > s^{nl}/r^2$$

elements z in A^{nl} such that

$$|Y \cap W_z| > 1/(r+1) \cdot s^{no},$$

and each of these sets $Y \cap W_z$ contains a k -complementary set

$$U_z \times \{z\},$$

where U_z is a k -complementary set contained in A^{no} .

Since there are only e distinct k -complementary sets in A^{no} , at least d/e of the sets $U_z \times \{z\}$ must have the form $U \times \{z\}$ for a fixed k -complementary set U in A^{no} . Let these be

$$U \times \{z_1\}, \dots, U \times \{z_h\},$$

where $h \geq d/e$.

Let $Y' = \{z_1, \dots, z_h\}$. Then Y' is a subset of A^{nl} with

$$|Y'| = h \geq d/e > s^{nl}/(er^2) = \varepsilon' \cdot s^{nl}.$$

Therefore Y' contains a 1-complementary set. Re-numbering if necessary, let this 1-complementary set be z_1, \dots, z_s .

We now have that Y contains $U \times \{z_1\}, \dots, U \times \{z_s\}$, where U is a k -complementary set in A^{no} and $\{z_1, \dots, z_s\}$ is a 1-complementary set in A^{nl} . If $U = \{w_1, \dots, w_s\}$, then Y contains the $(k+1)$ -complementary set

$$w_1 \times z_1, \dots, w_s \times z_s.$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

Theorem 2 now follows from the Lemma by induction on k . Indeed, the hypothesis of Theorem 2 is the case $k = 1$. For the induction step, if $P(s, \varepsilon, k)$ exists for all $\varepsilon > 0$ then it exists for all $\varepsilon = 1/(r+1)$, $r \geq 1$, hence by the Lemma $P(s, 1/r, k+1)$ exists for all $r \geq 1$, hence $P(s, \varepsilon, k+1)$ exists for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

4 Remarks and questions

A *combinatorial line* T in A^t (where $A = \{1, \dots, s\}$) is a 1-complementary set of a very special type. When the t -tuples of T are regarded as the rows of an $s \times t$ matrix, then each column of this matrix is either constant or is a *single fixed* permutation of the elements of A .

The celebrated Hales-Jewett theorem [7] states that if s, r are given there exists a smallest positive integer $HJ(s, r)$ such that if $A = \{1, \dots, s\}, t \geq HJ(s, r)$, and A^t is r -colored (that is, a mapping $c : A^t \mapsto \{1, \dots, r\}$ is given) then there exists a combinatorial line T in A^t which is monochromatic (that is, the mapping c restricted to T is constant.)

The only known upper bounds for the function $HJ(s, r)$ are extremely large, to say the least. (See [3–6] for elegant proofs, generalizations and applications of the Hales-Jewett theorem, and for further discussion of these bounds. See also the numerous references in the excellent survey article [3].)

Let $f(s, r)$ denote the smallest positive integer such that if $A = \{1, \dots, s\}, t \geq f(s, r)$, and A^t is r -colored then there exists a 1-complementary set in A^t which is monochromatic. Perhaps a “reasonable” (primitive recursive?!) upper bound can found for the function $f(s, r)$.

One could also ask for bounds on the function $f(s, r, k)$, the smallest positive integer such that if $A = \{1, \dots, s\}, t \geq f(s, r, k)$, and A^t is r -colored, there exists a k -complementary set in A^t which is monochromatic.

References

- [1] T.C. Brown and J.P. Buhler, *A density version of a geometric Ramsey theorem*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **25** (1982), 20–34.
- [2] ———, *Lines imply spaces in density Ramsey theory*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **36** (1984), 214–220.

- [3] W. Deuber and B. Voigt, *Der satz von van der waerden über arithmetische progressionen*, Jber. d. Dt. Math.-Verein. **85** (1983), 66–85.
- [4] Ron L. Graham, *Rudiments of ramsey theory*, Regional conference series in Math., vol. 45, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1981.
- [5] Ronald L. Graham and Bruce L. Rothschild, *Ramsey's theorem for n-parameter sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **159** (1971), 257–292.
- [6] Ronald L. Graham, Bruce L. Rothschild, and Joel H. Spencer, *Ramsey theory*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1980.
- [7] Alfred W. Hales and Robert I. Jewett, *Regularity and positional games*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1963), 222–239.
- [8] J.Q. Longyear, *Common transversals in partitioning families*, Discrete Math. **17** (1977), 327–329.