Forbidden Families of Configurations

Richard Anstee, UBC, Vancouver

Joint work with Christina Koch University of South Carolina Feb 21, 2013

3 ×

I have worked with a number of coauthors in this area: Farzin Barekat, Laura Dunwoody, Ron Ferguson, Balin Fleming, Zoltan Füredi, Jerry Griggs, Nima Kamoosi, Steven Karp, Peter Keevash, Christina Koch, Connor Meehan, U.S.R. Murty, Miguel Raggi and Attila Sali but there are works of other authors (some much older, some recent) impinging on this problem as well. For example, the definition of *VC*-dimension uses a forbidden configuration. A survey article is now available at the Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, Dynamic Survey 20.



Christina Koch

・ロ・・(四・・)を注・・(注・・)注

Consider the following family of subsets of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$: $\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}\}$ The incidence matrix A of the family \mathcal{A} of subsets of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ is:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition We say that a matrix A is *simple* if it is a (0,1)-matrix with no repeated columns.

Definition We define ||A|| to be the number of columns in *A*. ||A|| = 6 = |A|

- 4 周 ト 4 日 ト 4 日 ト - 日

Definition Given a matrix F, we say that A has F as a *configuration* (denoted $F \prec A$) if there is a submatrix of A which is a row and column permutation of F.

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \prec \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

-

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

æ

Definition Given a matrix F, we say that A has F as a *configuration* (denoted $F \prec A$) if there is a submatrix of A which is a row and column permutation of F.

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \prec \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

-

Definitions

 $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t\}$ Avoid $(m, \mathcal{F}) = \{A : A \text{ m-rowed simple, } F \not\prec A \text{ for all } F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ forb $(m, \mathcal{F}) = \max_A \{ ||A|| : A \in \text{Avoid}(m, \mathcal{F}) \}$

Some Main Results

Definition Let K_k denote the $k \times 2^k$ simple matrix of all possible columns on k rows.

Theorem (Sauer 72, Perles and Shelah 72, Vapnik and Chervonenkis 71)

forb
$$(m, \mathbf{K}_k) = \binom{m}{k-1} + \binom{m}{k-2} + \cdots + \binom{m}{0}$$
 which is $\Theta(m^{k-1})$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

æ

Some Main Results

Definition Let K_k denote the $k \times 2^k$ simple matrix of all possible columns on k rows.

Theorem (Sauer 72, Perles and Shelah 72, Vapnik and Chervonenkis 71)

forb
$$(m, \mathbf{K}_k) = \binom{m}{k-1} + \binom{m}{k-2} + \cdots + \binom{m}{0}$$
 which is $\Theta(m^{k-1})$.

When a matrix A has a copy of K_k on some k-set of rows S, then we say that A shatters S. The results of Vapnik and Chervonenkis were for application in Applied Probability, in *Learning Theory*. One defines A to have VC-dimension k if k is the maximum cardinality of a shattered set in A. There are further applications; the last CanaDAM and the last SIAM Conference on Discrete Mathematics had plenary talks containing applications.

• Imp + I

Theorem (Sauer 72, Perles and Shelah 72, Vapnik and Chervonenkis 71)

forb
$$(m, K_k) = \binom{m}{k-1} + \binom{m}{k-2} + \cdots + \binom{m}{0}$$
 which is $\Theta(m^{k-1})$.

Corollary Let F be a $k \times \ell$ simple matrix. Then forb $(m, F) = O(m^{k-1})$. **Theorem** (Füredi 83). Let F be a $k \times \ell$ matrix. Then forb $(m, F) = O(m^k)$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Theorem (Sauer 72, Perles and Shelah 72, Vapnik and Chervonenkis 71)

forb
$$(m, K_k) = \binom{m}{k-1} + \binom{m}{k-2} + \cdots + \binom{m}{0}$$
 which is $\Theta(m^{k-1})$.

Corollary Let F be a $k \times \ell$ simple matrix. Then forb $(m, F) = O(m^{k-1})$. **Theorem** (Füredi 83). Let F be a $k \times \ell$ matrix. Then forb $(m, F) = O(m^k)$. **Problem** Given F, can we predict the behaviour of forb(m, F)?

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Let C_k denote the $k \times k$ vertex-edge incidence matrix of the cycle of length k.

e.g.
$$C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let C_k denote the $k \times k$ vertex-edge incidence matrix of the cycle of length k.

e.g.
$$C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

.

< □→ < 注→ < 注→ □ 注

Matrices in Avoid $(m, \{C_3, C_5, C_7, ...\})$ are called Balanced Matrices. **Theorem** $forb(m, \{C_3, C_5, C_7, ...\}) = forb(m, C_3)$ Let C_k denote the $k \times k$ vertex-edge incidence matrix of the cycle of length k.

e.g.
$$C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Matrices in Avoid $(m, \{C_3, C_5, C_7, \ldots\})$ are called Balanced Matrices. **Theorem** $forb(m, \{C_3, C_5, C_7, \ldots\}) = forb(m, C_3)$

Matrices in Avoid $(m, \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, ...\})$ are called Totally Balanced Matrices. Theorem $forb(m, \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, ...\}) = forb(m, C_3)$ The inequality $forb(m, \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, \ldots\}) \leq forb(m, C_3)$ is quite easy.

Lemma If $\mathcal{F}' \subset \mathcal{F}$ then $\textit{forb}(m, \mathcal{F}) \leq \textit{forb}(m, \mathcal{F}')$.

Obviously the potential difficulty in obtaining equality is a construction but in my Ph.D. thesis I had shown that any $m \times forb(m, C_3)$ simple matrix is in fact totally balanced. Thus we have

 $forb(m, \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, \ldots\}) = forb(m, C_3).$

・吊り イヨト イヨト ニヨ

The building blocks of our product constructions are I, I^c and T:

$$I_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad I_4^c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad T_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

白 ト く ヨ ト く ヨ ト

Definition Given an $m_1 \times n_1$ matrix A and a $m_2 \times n_2$ matrix B we define the product $A \times B$ as the $(m_1 + m_2) \times (n_1 n_2)$ matrix consisting of all $n_1 n_2$ possible columns formed from placing a column of A on top of a column of B. If A, B are simple, then $A \times B$ is simple. (A, Griggs, Sali 97)

Given p simple matrices A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_p , each of size $m/p \times m/p$, the p-fold product $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_p$ is a simple matrix of size $m \times (m^p/p^p)$ i.e. $\Theta(m^p)$ columns.

(4月) (4日) (4日) 日

Definition Given an $m_1 \times n_1$ matrix A and a $m_2 \times n_2$ matrix B we define the product $A \times B$ as the $(m_1 + m_2) \times (n_1 n_2)$ matrix consisting of all $n_1 n_2$ possible columns formed from placing a column of A on top of a column of B. If A, B are simple, then $A \times B$ is simple. (A, Griggs, Sali 97)

Given p simple matrices A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_p , each of size $m/p \times m/p$, the p-fold product $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_p$ is a simple matrix of size $m \times (m^p/p^p)$ i.e. $\Theta(m^p)$ columns.

(4月) (4日) (4日) 日

Definition Let x(F) denote the largest p such that there is a p-fold product which does not contain F as a configuration where the p-fold product is $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_p$ where each $A_i \in \{I_{m/p}, I_{m/p}^c, T_{m/p}\}.$

向下 イヨト イヨト

3

Definition Let x(F) denote the largest p such that there is a p-fold product which does not contain F as a configuration where the p-fold product is $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_p$ where each $A_i \in \{I_{m/p}, I_{m/p}^c, T_{m/p}\}.$

Conjecture (A, Sali 05) *forb*(m, F) *is* $\Theta(m^{\times(F)})$.

In other words, we predict our product constructions with the three building blocks $\{I, I^c, T\}$ determine the asymptotically best constructions.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Definition Let x(F) denote the largest p such that there is a p-fold product which does not contain F as a configuration where the p-fold product is $A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_p$ where each $A_i \in \{I_{m/p}, I_{m/p}^c, T_{m/p}\}.$

Conjecture (A, Sali 05) *forb*(m, F) *is* $\Theta(m^{\times(F)})$.

In other words, we predict our product constructions with the three building blocks $\{I, I^c, T\}$ determine the asymptotically best constructions.

The conjecture has been verified for $k \times \ell F$ where k = 2 (A, Griggs, Sali 97) and k = 3 (A, Sali 05) and $\ell = 2$ (A, Keevash 06) and for k-rowed F with bounds $\Theta(m^{k-1})$ or $\Theta(m^k)$ plus other cases.

Definition ex(m, H) is the maximum number of edges in a (simple) graph G on m vertices that has no subgraph H.

 $A \in \operatorname{Avoid}(m, \mathbf{1}_3)$ will be a matrix with up to m + 1 columns of sum 0 or sum 1 plus columns of sum 2 which can be viewed as the vertex-edge incidence matrix of a graph. Assume p = |V(H)| and q = |E(H)|. Let I(H) denote the $p \times q$

vertex-edge incidence matrix associated with H.

Theorem forb $(m, \{1_3, I(H)\}) = m + 1 + ex(m, H)$. In this talk $I(C_4) = C_4$. (Also $C_4 = I_2 \times I_2$)

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Definition ex(m, H) is the maximum number of edges in a (simple) graph G on m vertices that has no subgraph H.

 $A \in \operatorname{Avoid}(m, \mathbf{1}_3)$ will be a matrix with up to m + 1 columns of sum 0 or sum 1 plus columns of sum 2 which can be viewed as the vertex-edge incidence matrix of a graph. Assume p = |V(H)| and q = |E(H)|. Let I(H) denote the $p \times q$ vertex-edge incidence matrix associated with H. **Theorem** forb $(m, \{\mathbf{1}_3, I(H)\}) = m + 1 + \exp(m, H)$. In this talk $I(C_4) = C_4$. (Also $C_4 = I_2 \times I_2$)

Theorem forb $(m, \{\mathbf{1}_3, C_4\}) = m + 1 + \exp(m, C_4)$ which is $\Theta(m^{3/2})$.

Theorem forb $(m, \{\mathbf{1}_3, C_6\}) = m + 1 + \exp(m, C_6)$ which is $\Theta(m^{4/3})$.

▲圖 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶

Theorem (Balogh and Bollobás) Let k be given. Then there is a constant c_k so that $forb(m, \{I_k, I_k^c, T_k\}) = c_k$.

We note that there is no obvious product construction.

Note that $c_k \ge \binom{2k-2}{k-1}$ by taking all columns of column sum at most k-1 that arise from the k-1-fold product $T_{k-1} \times T_{k-1} \times \cdots \times T_{k-1}$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_\ell\}$. Lemma Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} have the property that for every G_i , there is some F_j with $F_j \prec G_i$. Then $forb(m, \mathcal{F}) \leq forb(m, \mathcal{G})$.

(4月) (4日) (4日)

3

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_\ell\}$. Lemma Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} have the property that for every G_i , there is some F_j with $F_j \prec G_i$. Then $forb(m, \mathcal{F}) \leq forb(m, \mathcal{G})$.

Theorem Let \mathcal{F} be given. Then either there is a constant c with forb $(m, \mathcal{F}) = c$ or forb (m, \mathcal{F}) is $\Omega(m)$. **Proof:** We start using $\mathcal{G} = \{I_p, I_p^c, T_p\}$ with p suitably large. Either we have the property that there is some $F_r \prec I_p$, and some $F_s \prec I_p^c$ and some $F_t \prec T_p$ in which case forb $(m, \mathcal{F}) \leq forb(m, \{I_p, I_p^c, T_p\}) = O(1)$ or

without loss of generality we have $F_j \not\prec I_p$ for all j and hence $I_m \in Avoid(m, \mathcal{F})$ and so $forb(m, \mathcal{F})$ is $\Omega(m)$.

- 4 周 ト 4 日 ト 4 日 ト - 日

A pair of Configurations with quadratic bounds

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

e.g. $F_2(1,2,2,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \notin I \times I^c.$

- < ≣ →

æ

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

e.g. $F_2(1,2,2,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \notin I \times I^c$.
 $I_{m/2} \times I_{m/2}^c$ is an $m \times m^2/4$ simple matrix avoiding $F_2(1,2,2,1)$, so forb $(m, F_2(1,2,2,1))$ is $\Omega(m^2)$.
(A, Ferguson, Sali 01 forb $(m, F_2(1,2,2,1)) = \lfloor \frac{m^2}{4} \rfloor + \binom{m}{1} + \binom{m}{0}$)

- < ≣ →

æ

A pair of Configurations with quadratic bounds

_

-

프 🖌 🛪 프 🕨

A pair of Configurations with quadratic bounds

向ト・モート

→ 注→ 注

By considering the construction $I \times I^c$ that avoids $F_2(1,2,2,1)$ and the construction $T \times T$ that avoids I_3 , we note that we have only linear obvious constructions that avoid both $F_2(1,2,2,1)$ and I_3 . We are led to the following: **Theorem** forb $(m, \{I_3, F_2(1,2,2,1)\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

More is true:

Theorem forb $(m, \{2 \cdot I_3, F_2(1, 2, 2, 1)\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

伺下 イヨト イヨト

By considering the construction $I \times I^c$ that avoids $F_2(1,2,2,1)$ and the construction $T \times T$ that avoids I_3 , we note that we have only linear obvious constructions that avoid both $F_2(1,2,2,1)$ and I_3 . We are led to the following:

Theorem forb $(m, \{I_3, F_2(1, 2, 2, 1)\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

More is true:

Theorem forb $(m, \{2 \cdot I_3, F_2(1, 2, 2, 1)\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

We are unable to extend this to the following although it seems to be true.

Conjecture forb $(m, \{t \cdot I_3, F_2(1, t, t, 1)\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト ……

This idea was shown to hold for all pairs of the minimal quadratically bounded configurations.

▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶

3

Let $A \in Avoid(m, \mathcal{F})$. Decompose A as follows by deleting row r and collecting any repeated columns in C_r :

$$A = \begin{array}{cccc} \operatorname{row} r & \left[\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ B_r & & C_r & C_r & & D_r \end{array} \right].$$

Now $[B_r C_r D_r] \in Avoid(m-1, \mathcal{F})$ and so $||[B_r C_r D_r]|| \leq forb(m-1, \mathcal{F})$. Also $C_r \in Avoid(m-1, \mathcal{F}')$ where \mathcal{F}' is the (minimal) set of configurations F' such that there is a configuration $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \prec F' \times [0 \ 1]$. We are ready for induction using $forb(m, \mathcal{F}) \leq forb(m-1, \mathcal{F}) + forb(m-1, \mathcal{F}')$

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Using our very standard induction one can prove the following. **Theorem** Let k be given. Then $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

Proof: We apply the standard induction noting that $C_r \in Avoid(m, \{I_k, I_k^c, T_k\})$ and so $||C_r||$ is O(1) and so by induction $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$. We note that $I_m \in Avoid(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Using our very standard induction one can prove the following. **Theorem** Let k be given. Then $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

Proof: We apply the standard induction noting that $C_r \in Avoid(m, \{I_k, I_k^c, T_k\})$ and so $||C_r||$ is O(1) and so by induction $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$. We note that $I_m \in Avoid(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$. **Conjecture** Let k, t be given. Then $forb(m, \{t \cdot I_k, t \cdot I_k^c, t \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Using our very standard induction one can prove the following. **Theorem** Let k be given. Then $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

Proof: We apply the standard induction noting that $C_r \in Avoid(m, \{I_k, I_k^c, T_k\})$ and so $||C_r||$ is O(1) and so by induction $forb(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$. We note that $I_m \in Avoid(m, \{2 \cdot I_k, 2 \cdot I_k^c, 2 \cdot T_k\})$. **Conjecture** Let k, t be given. Then $forb(m, \{t \cdot I_k, t \cdot I_k^c, t \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$.

Theorem forb $(m, \{t \cdot I_k, t \cdot I_k^c, t \cdot T_k\})$ is $\Theta(m)$ for k = 3, 4.

(4月) (4日) (4日)

Balogh Bollobás extended

Theorem (A, Meehan 12) Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, F_3\}$ be a family of *p*-rowed simple matrices with $p \ge k$ such that columns of $F_1|_{\{1,2,\dots,k\}}$ are contained in $[\mathbf{0}_k \ I_k]$, such that columns of $F_2|_{\{1,2,\dots,k\}}$ are contained in $[\mathbf{1}_k \ I_k^c]$ and such that columns of $F_3|_{\{1,2,\dots,k\}}$ are contained in $[\mathbf{0}_k \ T_k]$. Then $forb(m, \mathcal{F})$ is $O(m^{p-k})$.



・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

Theorem (A,Koch,Raggi,Sali 12) *forb*(m, { $T_2 \times T_2$, $I_2 \times I_2$ }) *is* $\Theta(m^{3/2})$.

$$T_2 \times T_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \ I_2 \times I_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

We showed initially that $forb(m, \{T_2 \times T_2, T_2 \times I_2, I_2 \times I_2\})$ is $\Theta(m^{3/2})$ but Christina Koch realized that we ought to be able to drop $T_2 \times I_2$ and we were able to redo the proof (which simplified slightly!).

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …



Miguel Raggi, Attila Sali

<ロ> (四) (四) (三) (三) (三) (三)

Induction

Let A be an $m \times forb(m, \mathcal{F})$ simple matrix with no configuration in $\mathcal{F} = \{T_2 \times T_2, I_2 \times I_2\}$. We can select a row r and reorder rows and columns to obtain

$$A = \begin{array}{cccc} \operatorname{row} r & \left[\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ B_r & C_r & C_r & D_r \end{array} \right].$$

∢ 문 ▶ - 문

Induction

Let A be an $m \times forb(m, \mathcal{F})$ simple matrix with no configuration in $\mathcal{F} = \{T_2 \times T_2, I_2 \times I_2\}$. We can select a row r and reorder rows and columns to obtain

$$A = \begin{array}{cccc} \operatorname{row} r \\ B_r \\ C_r \\ C_r \\ C_r \\ C_r \\ C_r \end{array} \right].$$

To show ||A|| is $O(m^{3/2})$ it would suffice to show $||C_r||$ is $O(m^{1/2})$ for some choice of r. Our proof shows that assuming $||C_r|| > 20m^{1/2}$ for all choices r results in a contradiction. In particular, associated with C_r is a set of rows S(r) with $S(r) \ge 5m^{1/2}$. We let $S(r) = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, \ldots\}$. After some work we show that $|S(r_i) \cap S(r_j)| \le 5$. Then we have $|S(r_1) \cup S(r_2) \cup S(r_3) \cup \cdots|$ $= |S(r_1)| + |S(r_2) \setminus S(r_1)| + |S(r_3) \setminus (S(r_1) \cup S(r_2))| + \cdots$ $= 5m^{1/2} + (5m^{1/2} - 5) + (5m^{1/2} - 10) + \cdots > m!!!$

伺い イヨン イヨン

3