

# Comparable pairs in families of sets

Noga Alon, Shagnik Das, Roman Glebov, Benny Sudakov

## Definitions and results

Let  $A, B \subset [n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  be two different sets. We say that sets  $A, B$  are *comparable* if either  $A \subset B$  or  $B \subset A$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of subsets of  $[n]$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ . Denote by  $c(\mathcal{F})$  the number of comparable pairs in  $\mathcal{F}$  and define  $c(n, m)$  to be the maximum number of comparable pairs over all families of  $m$  subsets of  $[n]$ .

Clearly  $c(n, m) \leq \binom{m}{2}$  and equality holds only for  $m \leq n + 1$ . Again, little counting shows  $c(n, 2^n) = 3^n - 2^n \sim 2^{1.58n}$ .

Daykin and Frankl showed that there are "large" families where almost all pairs are comparable. More precisely, they proved that  $c(n, m) = (1 - o(1))\binom{m}{2}$  if and only if  $m = 2^{o(n)}$ . Their lower bound comes from the construction called *the tower of cubes*, which generalizes linearly ordered sets. A *subcube* of a hypercube  $2^{[n]}$  is, for some sets  $F_1 \subset F_2$ , a family of sets  $\mathcal{F} = \{F \subset [n] : F_1 \subseteq F \subseteq F_2\}$ . We call the number  $|F_2| - |F_1|$  the *dimension* of  $\mathcal{F}$ . For simplicity suppose that  $k \mid n$  and  $l = n/k$ . Let  $X_i = [il]$  for  $i \in [k]$ , and consider family

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \{F \subset [n] : X_{i-1} \subseteq F \subseteq X_i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} = \cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{F}_i.$$

Then  $|\mathcal{F}| = k2^{n/k} - k + 1$ ; moreover, any two sets from different subcubes are comparable, hence  $c(\mathcal{F}) \geq (1 - 1/k)\binom{m}{2}$ . When  $k = \omega(1)$ , then  $c(\mathcal{F}) = (1 - o(1))\binom{m}{2}$  as in the theorem of Daykin and Frankl.

Alon and Frankl proved that the towers of cubes are asymptotically optimal even when  $k$  is constant.

**Theorem 1** For every positive integer  $k$  there exists a positive  $\beta = \beta(k)$  such that if  $m = 2^{(1/(k+1)+\delta)n}$  for  $\delta > 0$ , then

$$c(n, m) < \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \binom{m}{2} + O\left(m^{2-\beta\delta^{k+1}}\right).$$

Case  $k = 1$  is of particular interest. Alon and Frankl proved that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of size  $m = 2^{(1/2+\delta)n}$  must have  $c(n, m) < 4m^{2-\delta^2/2} = o(m^2)$ , thus proving a conjecture of Daykin and Erdős. Erdős made a finer conjecture, asking whether  $m = \omega(2^{n/2})$  implies  $c(n, m) = o(m^2)$ . Alon and Frankl disproved this conjecture, exhibiting for any  $d \geq 1$  a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of size  $\Omega(n^d 2^{n/2})$  with  $c(\mathcal{F}) \geq 2^{-2d-1}\binom{m}{2}$ , and they conjectured that this construction is essentially the best possible.

**Conjecture 1** If  $m = n^{\omega(1)} 2^{n/2}$  then  $c(n, m) = o(m^2)$ .

## Proving a conjecture of Alon and Frankl

We prove a slightly more general result. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be two families of subsets of  $[n]$ , we write  $c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  for the number of pairs  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  with  $A \subset B$ .

**Theorem 2** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be two set families over  $[n]$  with  $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| = n^d 2^n$ . Then  $c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq 2^{-d/300} |\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|$ .

For the proof we need following lemmata.

**Lemma 1** For  $n \geq 2$  and  $d \in (0, 1]$ , let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be two families of subsets of  $[n]$  satisfying  $c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \geq 2^{-d/300} |\mathcal{A}| |\mathcal{B}|$ . Then  $|\mathcal{A}| |\mathcal{B}| < n^d 2^n$ .

**Lemma 2** For  $p, q \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 < \alpha < 1/300$  we have

$$(p(1-q))^{1-\alpha} + (pq)^{1-\alpha} + ((1-p)q)^{1-\alpha} \leq \left(2 + 2^{1-\frac{1}{300\alpha}}\right)^\alpha.$$

**Lemma 3** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of subsets of  $[n]$  and let  $p_i$  denote the fraction of sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  that contain  $i$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^{\sum_{i=1}^n H(p_i)},$$

where  $H(p) = -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p)$  is the binary entropy.

### Dense families

Here we describe the nature of large families  $\mathcal{F}$  maximizing  $c(\mathcal{F})$ . Since the sets  $\emptyset$  and  $[n]$  are contained in all possible comparable pairs, one can guess that families  $\mathcal{F}$  maximizing  $c(\mathcal{F})$  are concentrated close to the sets  $\emptyset$  and  $[n]$ . We show that it is the case for  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 2^{0.92n}$ .

Let  $0 \leq k \leq n/2$ , we define

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \{F \subset [n] : |F| \leq k\} \cup \{F \subset [n] : |F| \geq n - k\},$$

$$M_k = |\mathcal{H}_k| = 2 \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i}.$$

**Theorem 3** If  $M_{k-1} \leq m \leq M_k$  for some  $k$  with  $n/3 + \sqrt{2n \ln 2} \leq k \leq n/2$ , then every family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $m$  sets over  $[n]$  maximising the number of comparable pairs satisfies  $\mathcal{H}_{k-1} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_k$ .

The entropy bound  $2^{0.92n}$  comes from the estimate  $\sum_{i \leq pn} \binom{n}{i} \leq 2^{H(p)n}$ . The proof is based on switching sets between  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $2^{[n]} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 4** If  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{A \subseteq [r] : |A| \geq r/2 + \lambda\sqrt{r}\}$ , then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq e^{-2\lambda^2 2^r}$ .

**Lemma 5** Given integers  $n$  and  $s$  satisfying  $n/3 < s \leq n/2$ , the quantity

$$2^{n-t} + \sum_{j=0}^s \binom{t}{j}$$

is minimised over  $n-s \leq t \leq n$  when  $t = n-s$ .

The above theorem is enough to determine  $c(n, m)$  asymptotically, but we wish to determine the exact value of  $c(n, m)$ . That can be done for small values of  $m' = m - M_{k-1}$  by following proposition, but remains open for arbitrary  $m'$ . However, the exact result has some subtle complexities, since it contains as a special case the famous Kruskal-Katona Theorem.

**Proposition 1** Suppose  $n/3 + \sqrt{2n \ln 2} \leq k \leq n/2$  and  $m' = m - M_{k-1} \leq 2 \binom{n/2}{k}$ . Then  $c(n, m) = c(\mathcal{H}_{k-1} \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of  $\lfloor m'/2 \rfloor$   $k$ -subsets of  $[n/2]$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of  $\lceil m'/2 \rceil$   $(n-k)$ -sets containing  $[n/2]$ .