

# Tight bounds on the maximum size of a set of permutations with bounded VC-dimension \*

Josef Cibulka<sup>1</sup>, Jan Kynčl<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Applied Mathematics,  
Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,  
Malostranské nám. 25, 118 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic;  
cibulka@kam.mff.cuni.cz

<sup>2</sup> Department of Applied Mathematics and Institute for Theoretical Computer Science,  
Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,  
Malostranské nám. 25, 118 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic;  
kyncl@kam.mff.cuni.cz

## Abstract

The *VC-dimension* of a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$ -permutations is the largest integer  $k$  such that the set of restrictions of the permutations in  $\mathcal{P}$  on some  $k$ -tuple of positions is the set of all  $k!$  permutation patterns. Let  $r_k(n)$  be the maximum size of a set of  $n$ -permutations with VC-dimension  $k$ . Raz showed that  $r_2(n)$  grows exponentially in  $n$ . We show that  $r_3(n) = 2^{\Theta(n \log \alpha(n))}$  and for every  $t \geq 1$ , we have  $r_{2t+2}(n) = 2^{\Theta(n\alpha(n)^t)}$  and  $r_{2t+3}(n) = 2^{O(n\alpha(n)^t \log \alpha(n))}$ .

We also study the maximum number  $p_k(n)$  of 1-entries in an  $n \times n$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with no  $(k + 1)$ -tuple of columns containing all  $(k + 1)$ -permutation matrices. We determine that, for example,  $p_3(n) = \Theta(n\alpha(n))$  and  $p_{2t+2}(n) = n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \pm O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})}$  for every  $t \geq 1$ .

We also show that for every positive  $s$  there is a slowly growing function  $\zeta_s(n)$  (for example  $\zeta_{2t+3}(n) = 2^{O(\alpha^t(n))}$  for every  $t \geq 1$ ) satisfying the following. For all positive integers  $n$  and  $B$  and every  $n \times n$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $M$  with  $\zeta_s(n)Bn$  1-entries, the rows of  $M$  can be partitioned into  $s$  intervals so that at least  $B$  columns contain at least  $B$  1-entries in each of the intervals.

**Keywords.** permutation pattern, VC-dimension, Davenport–Schinzel sequence, set of permutations, inverse Ackermann function

---

\*This is the authors' version of a work that was accepted for publication in Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A.

An extended abstract of this paper appeared in Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA12), SIAM, 2012, pp. 1113-1122.

Research was supported by the project CE-ITI (GACR P2020/12/G061) of the Czech Science Foundation, by project no. 52410 of the Grant Agency of Charles University and by the grant SVV-2012-265313 (Discrete Methods and Algorithms). Josef Cibulka was also supported by the Czech Science Foundation under the contract no. 201/09/H057.

# 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a set system on  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We say that a set  $K \subset [n]$  is *shattered* by  $\mathcal{T}$  if every subset of  $K$  appears as an intersection of  $K$  and some set from  $\mathcal{T}$ . The *Vapnik–Chervonenkis dimension* (*VC-dimension*) of  $\mathcal{T}$  is the size of the largest set shattered by  $\mathcal{T}$ . Sauer’s lemma gives the exact value of the maximum size of a set system on  $[n]$  with VC-dimension  $k$ , which is a polynomial in  $n$  of degree  $k$ . More on the VC-dimension and its history can be found for example in [16].

Motivated by the so-called acyclic linear orders problem, Raz [23] defined the VC-dimension of a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of permutations: Let  $S_n$  be the set of all  $n$ -permutations, that is, permutations of  $[n]$ . The *restriction of  $\pi \in S_n$  to the  $k$ -tuple  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$  of positions* (where  $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k \leq n$ ) is the  $k$ -permutation  $\pi'$  satisfying  $\forall i, j : \pi'(i) < \pi'(j) \Leftrightarrow \pi(a_i) < \pi(a_j)$ . The  $k$ -tuple of positions  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  is *shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$*  if each  $k$ -permutation appears as a restriction of some  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$  to  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ . The *VC-dimension of  $\mathcal{P}$*  is the size of the largest set of positions shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $r_k(n)$  be the size of the largest set of  $n$ -permutations with VC-dimension  $k$ .

Raz [23] proved that  $r_2(n) \leq C^n$  for some constant  $C$  and asked whether an exponential upper bound on  $r_k(n)$  can also be found for every  $k \geq 3$ .

An  $n$ -permutation  $\pi$  *avoids* a  $k$ -permutation  $\rho$  if none of the restrictions of  $\pi$  to a  $k$ -tuple of positions is  $\rho$ . Clearly, the set of permutations avoiding  $\rho \in S_k$  has VC-dimension smaller than  $k$ . Thus, Raz’s question generalizes the Stanley–Wilf conjecture which states that the number of  $n$ -permutations that avoid an arbitrary fixed permutation  $\rho$  grows exponentially in  $n$ . The conjecture was settled by Marcus and Tardos [15] using a result of Klazar [12].

We show in Section 2 that the size of a set of  $n$ -permutations with VC-dimension  $k$  cannot be much larger than exponential in  $n$ . The result has an application in enumerating simple complete topological graphs [14]. Let  $\alpha(n)$  be the inverse of the Ackermann function; see Section 2.2 for its definition.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The sizes of sets of permutations with bounded VC-dimension satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} r_3(n) &\leq \alpha(n)^{(4+o(1))n}, \\ r_4(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot (2\alpha(n) + 3 \log_2(\alpha(n)) + O(1))}, \\ r_{2t+2}(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot ((2/t!) \alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1}))} \quad \text{for every } t \geq 2 \text{ and} \\ r_{2t+3}(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot ((2/t!) \alpha(n)^t \log_2(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t))} \quad \text{for every } t \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we give a negative answer to Raz’s question in Section 3.

**Theorem 1.2.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} r_3(n) &\geq (\alpha(n)/2 - O(1))^n \quad \text{and} \\ r_{2t+3}(n) &\geq r_{2t+2}(n) \geq 2^{n \cdot ((1/t!) \alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1}))} \quad \text{for every } t \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

An  *$n$ -permutation matrix* is an  $n \times n$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with exactly one 1-entry in every row and every column. Permutations and permutation matrices are in a one-to-one

correspondence that assigns to a permutation  $\pi$  a permutation matrix  $A_\pi$  with  $A_\pi(i, j) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \pi(j) = i$ .

An  $m \times n$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $B$  *contains* a  $k \times l$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $S$  if  $B$  has a  $k \times l$  submatrix  $T$  that can be obtained from  $S$  by changing some (possibly none) 0-entries to 1-entries. Otherwise  $B$  *avoids*  $S$ . Thus, a permutation  $\pi$  avoids  $\rho$  if and only if  $A_\pi$  avoids  $A_\rho$ . Füredi and Hajnal [7] studied the following problems from the extremal theory of  $(0, 1)$ -matrices. Given a matrix  $S$  (the *forbidden matrix*), what is the maximum number  $\text{ex}_S(n)$  of 1-entries in an  $n \times n$  matrix that avoids  $S$ ? This area is closely related to Turán problems on graphs and to Davenport–Schinzel sequences. Functions  $\text{ex}_S$  or their asymptotics have been determined for some matrices  $S$  [7, 20, 25] and these results have found applications mostly in discrete geometry [2, 5, 6, 18] and also in the analysis of algorithms [19]. The Füredi–Hajnal conjecture states that  $\text{ex}_P(n)$  is linear in  $n$  whenever  $P$  is a permutation matrix. Marcus and Tardos proved this conjecture by a surprisingly simple argument [15]. This implied the relatively long standing Stanley–Wilf conjecture by Klazar’s reduction [12]. An improved reduction yielding the upper bound  $2^{O(k \log k)n}$  on the size of a set of  $n$ -permutations with a forbidden  $k$ -permutation was found by the first author [3].

We modify the question of Füredi and Hajnal and study the maximal number  $p_k(n)$  of 1-entries in an  $n \times n$  matrix such that no  $(k + 1)$ -tuple of columns contains all  $(k + 1)$ -permutation matrices. It can be easily shown that  $p_2(n) = 4n - 4$ . Indeed, consider an  $n \times n$  matrix with at least  $4n - 3$  1-entries. Remove the highest and the lowest 1-entry in every column. Then the first and the last row of the resulting matrix contain no 1-entry and thus one of the rows contains three 1-entries. The three columns of the original matrix containing these 1-entries contain every 3-permutation matrix. The lower bound  $4n - 4$  can be achieved for example by filling the two top rows and some two columns with 1’s.

**Theorem 1.3.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} 2n\alpha(n) - O(n) &\leq p_3(n) \leq O(n\alpha(n)), \\ p_{2t+2}(n) &= n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \pm O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} \quad \text{for every } t \geq 1 \text{ and} \\ n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} &\leq p_{2t+3}(n) \leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \log_2(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} \quad \text{for every } t \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bounds from Theorem 1.3 are proven as Corollary 2.4 in Section 2.1 and the lower bounds as Corollary 3.7 in Section 3.2.

Let  $S$  and  $T$  be sequences. We say that  $S$  *contains* a pattern  $T$  if  $S$  contains a subsequence  $T'$  isomorphic to  $T$ , that is,  $T$  can be obtained from  $T'$  by a one-to-one renaming of the symbols. A sequence  $S$  over an alphabet  $\Gamma$  is a *Davenport–Schinzel sequence of order  $s$*  (a  $\text{DS}(s)$ -sequence for short) if no symbol appears on two consecutive positions and  $S$  does not contain the pattern  $abab\dots$  of length  $s + 2$ . These sequences were introduced by Davenport and Schinzel [4] and found numerous applications in computational and combinatorial geometry. More can be found in the book of Sharir and Agarwal [24]. Let  $\lambda_s(n)$  be the maximum length of a Davenport–Schinzel sequence over  $n$  symbols. The following are the current best bounds on  $\lambda_s(n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
2n\alpha(n) - O(n) &\leq \lambda_3(n) \leq 2n\alpha(n) + O\left(n\sqrt{\alpha(n)}\right), \\
n \cdot 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} &\leq \lambda_{2t+2}(n) \leq n \cdot 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1 \text{ and} \\
n \cdot 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} &\leq \lambda_{2t+3}(n) \leq n \cdot 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t \log_2 \alpha(n) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The upper bound on  $\lambda_3$  is by Klazar [11], the lower bounds on  $\lambda_s$  for  $s > 3$  are by Agarwal, Sharir and Shor [1] and all the other bounds were proved by Nivasch [17].

Pettie [22] recently announced the following improved bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega(n\alpha(n)2^{\alpha(n)}) &\leq \lambda_5(n) \leq O(n\alpha^2(n)2^{\alpha(n)}) \quad \text{and} \\
\lambda_{2t+3}(n) &\leq n \cdot 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t(1+o(1))} \quad \text{for } t \geq 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Our proofs are based on several results on Davenport–Schinzel sequences as well as on sequences with other forbidden patterns. The results on sequences that we use are mentioned in more detail in Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1, where they are transformed into claims about matrices with forbidden patterns.

An  $s$ -partition of the rows of an  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  is a partition of the interval of integers  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  into  $s$  intervals  $\{1 = m_1, \dots, m_2 - 1\}$ ,  $\{m_2, \dots, m_3 - 1\}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\{m_s, \dots, m = m_{s+1} - 1\}$ . A matrix  $M$  contains a  $B$ -fat  $(r, s)$ -formation if there exists an  $s$ -partition of the rows and an  $r$ -tuple of columns each of which has  $B$  1-entries in each interval of rows. Note that the order of the columns in the matrix is not important for this notion. See Fig. 1 for an example of a 1-fat  $(3, 4)$ -formation. In Section 2.2, we prove the following lemma, which gives an upper bound on the number of 1-entries an  $n \times n$  matrix can have and still not contain any  $B$ -fat  $(B, s)$ -formation. It is used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 2.3, analogously to the use of Raz’s Technical Lemma [23].

**Lemma 1.4.** *For all positive integers  $s, n$  and  $B$ , an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $\zeta_s(n)Bn$  1-entries contains a  $B$ -fat  $(B, s)$ -formation, where  $\zeta_s(n)$  are functions of the form*

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_2(n) &= O(1), \quad \zeta_3(n) = O(\alpha(n)), \quad \zeta_4(n) = O(\alpha(n)^2), \quad \zeta_5(n) = O(\alpha(n)2^{\alpha(n)}), \\
\zeta_{2t+3}(n) &= 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} \quad \text{for } t \geq 2 \text{ and} \\
\zeta_{2t+4}(n) &= 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t \log(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

More generally, for all positive integers  $m, n, s$  and  $B$ , an  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $\zeta_s(m)Bn$  1-entries contains a  $B$ -fat  $(\lfloor nB/m \rfloor, s)$ -formation.

The proof of the lemma is based on a proof of the upper bound on the number of symbols in the so-called formation-free sequences (see definition in Section 2.1) from Nivasch’s paper [17].

By an argument similar to the proof of  $p_2(n) \leq 4n - 4$  above, it is easy to verify that every  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $3n$  1-entries contains a 1-fat  $(\lceil n/m \rceil, 3)$ -formation. A similar result for 2-fat formations would slightly improve the upper bounds on  $r_3(n)$  and  $r_4(n)$ .

**Problem 1.1.** *Does there exist a constant  $c$  such that for every  $m$  and  $n$ , every  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $cn$  1-entries contains a 2-fat  $(\lfloor n/m \rfloor, 3)$ -formation?*

All logarithms in this paper are in base 2.

## 2 Upper bounds

### 2.1 Numbers of 1-entries in matrices

A sequence  $S$  of length  $l$  over an alphabet  $\Gamma$  is a function  $S : [l] \rightarrow \Gamma$ . An  $(r, s)$ -formation is a sequence formed by  $s$  concatenated permutations of the same  $r$ -tuple of symbols. The permutations in a formation are its *troops*. A sequence  $S = (a_1, \dots, a_l)$  is  $r$ -sparse if  $a_i \neq a_j$  whenever  $0 < |i - j| < r$ . An  $(r, s)$ -formation-free sequence is a sequence that is  $r$ -sparse and contains no  $(r, s)$ -formation as a subsequence. Let  $F_{r,s}(n)$  be the maximum length of an  $(r, s)$ -formation-free sequence over  $n$  symbols. Formation-free sequences were first studied by Klazar [10].

To be able to use results on sequences for matrices, we use the *matrix*→*sequence transcription* MST (our name) defined by Pettie [20] who improved an earlier transcription by Füredi and Hajnal [7]. The letters of the sequence correspond to the columns of the matrix. The matrix is transcribed row by row from top to bottom. Let  $\text{Seq}_{i-1}$  be the sequence created from the first  $i - 1$  rows. We consider the set  $C_i$  of letters corresponding to the columns having a 1-entry in the row  $i$ . The letters in  $C_i$  are ordered in the order of the last appearance in  $\text{Seq}_{i-1}$ ; the one that appeared last in  $\text{Seq}_{i-1}$  is first and so on. The letters that did not appear in  $\text{Seq}_{i-1}$  are ordered arbitrarily and placed after those that did appear. The ordered sequence  $C_i$  is then appended to  $\text{Seq}_{i-1}$ . The length of the resulting sequence  $\text{MST}(M) = \text{Seq}_m$  is equal to the number of 1-entries in  $M$  and the size of the alphabet is  $n$ . Note that the previous papers ([7, 20]) transcribe the matrices column by column instead of row by row.

A *block* in a sequence is a contiguous subsequence containing only distinct symbols. Note that  $\text{MST}(M)$  can be decomposed into  $m$  or fewer blocks.

A set  $S$  of  $rs$  1-entries forms an  $(r, s)$ -formation in  $M$  if there exists an  $s$ -partition of the rows and an  $r$ -tuple of columns each of which has a 1-entry of  $S$  in every interval of rows of the partition. See Fig. 1. In this and all other figures, circles and full circles represent the 1-entries and empty space represents the 0-entries. A matrix  $M$  is  $(r, s)$ -formation-free if it contains no  $(r, s)$ -formation.




Figure 1: A  $(3, 4)$ -formation on columns  $j_1, j_2$  and  $j_3$ . Full circles represent the 1-entries of the formation. Empty circles represent 1-entries outside of this formation.

**Lemma 2.1.** *A  $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $M$  contains an  $(r, s)$ -formation if and only if  $\text{MST}(M)$  contains an  $(r, s)$ -formation.*

*Proof.* Observe that an  $(r, s)$ -formation in a matrix  $M$  implies an  $(r, s)$ -formation in  $\text{MST}(M)$ .

The proof of the other direction is more complicated, because symbols of one block of  $\text{MST}(M)$  may be present in two troops of the  $(r, s)$ -formation in  $\text{MST}(M)$ . To overcome this complication, we consider such an  $(r, s)$ -formation in  $\text{MST}(M)$ , whose each troop ends earliest possible. Assume that the  $i$ -th troop ends with an occurrence of a symbol  $a$  in the  $j$ -th block of  $\text{MST}(M)$  and that the  $(i + 1)$ -st troop begins with  $b$  from the  $j$ -th block. Since  $a$  precedes  $b$  in the  $j$ -th block, we know, by the definition of  $\text{MST}(M)$ , that  $a$  appears somewhere between the occurrences of  $b$  and  $a$  of the  $i$ -th troop. Therefore, the  $i$ -th troop could end earlier, contradicting the selection of the  $(r, s)$ -formation.  $\square$

Nivasch gives the following upper bound on the maximum length  $F_{r,s}(n)$  of an  $(r, s)$ -formation-free sequence on  $n$  symbols:

**Theorem 2.2.** ([17, Theorem 1.3]) *For every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$F_{r,4}(n) \leq O(n\alpha(n)).$$

*For every  $r$  and every  $s \geq 5$ , letting  $t := \lfloor (s - 3)/2 \rfloor$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{r,s}(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \log(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} && \text{when } s \text{ is even and} \\ F_{r,s}(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} && \text{when } s \text{ is odd.} \end{aligned}$$

Let  $p'_k(n)$  be the maximum number of 1-entries in an  $(k + 1, k + 1)$ -formation-free  $n \times n$  matrix. Theorem 2.2 implies the following upper bounds on  $p'_k(n)$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *We have*

$$p'_3(n) \leq O(n\alpha(n)).$$

*For every fixed  $k \geq 4$ , letting  $t := \lfloor (k - 2)/2 \rfloor$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} p'_k(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \log(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} && \text{when } k \text{ is odd and} \\ p'_k(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} && \text{when } k \text{ is even.} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Take a  $(k + 1, k + 1)$ -formation-free matrix  $M$ . Then  $\text{MST}(M)$  does not contain any  $(k + 1, k + 1)$ -formation by Lemma 2.1.

The sequence  $\text{MST}(M) = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  can be made  $(k + 1)$ -sparse by removing at most  $kn$  occurrences of symbols. Indeed, whenever two occurrences  $a_i, a_j$  (where  $i < j$ ) of the same symbol appear at distance at most  $k$ , then  $a_i$  is among the last  $k$  symbols preceding the block containing  $a_j$ . Thus, it suffices to take the blocks from left to right and in each of them remove the at most  $k$  symbols that appear as the last  $k$  symbols preceding the block. The resulting sequence is thus a  $(k + 1, k + 1)$ -formation-free sequence of length differing by  $O(n)$  from the number of 1-entries of  $M$ . The result then follows from Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

This proves the upper bounds in Theorem 1.3 by observing that a  $(k + 1)$ -tuple of columns with a  $(k + 1, k + 1)$ -formation contains every  $(k + 1)$ -permutation matrix.

**Corollary 2.4.** *For every fixed  $k \geq 3$  if we let  $t := \lfloor (k - 2)/2 \rfloor$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} p_3(n) &\leq O(n\alpha(n)), \\ p_k(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t \log(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t)} && \text{when } k \text{ is odd and greater than 3 and} \\ p_k(n) &\leq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} && \text{when } k \text{ is even.} \end{aligned}$$

## 2.2 Fat formations in matrices

A sequence  $S$  is an  $\text{AFF}_{r,s,k}(m)$ -sequence<sup>1</sup> if it contains no  $(r, s)$ -formation as a subsequence, can be decomposed into  $m$  or fewer blocks and each symbol of the sequence appears at least  $k$  times. Let  $\Pi'_{r,s,k}(m)$  be the maximum number of symbols in an  $\text{AFF}_{r,s,k}(m)$ -sequence.

Let  $\alpha_d(m)$  be the  $d$ th function in the *inverse Ackermann hierarchy*. That is,  $\alpha_1(m) = \lceil m/2 \rceil$ ,  $\alpha_d(1) = 0$  for  $d \geq 2$  and  $\alpha_d(m) = 1 + \alpha_d(\alpha_{d-1}(m))$  for  $m, d \geq 2$ . The *inverse Ackermann function* is defined as  $\alpha(m) := \min\{k : \alpha_k(m) \leq 3\}$ .

Nivasch defines a hierarchy of functions  $R_s(d)$ , which we shift by 1 in the index. That is, our  $R_s(d)$  is the original  $R_{s-1}(d)$ . We thus have the functions defined for  $s \geq 2$  and  $d \geq 2$ . The values are  $R_2(d) = 2$ ,  $R_3(d) = 3$ ,  $R_4(d) = 2d + 1$ ,  $R_s(2) = 2^{s-2} + 1$  and

$$R_s(d) = 2(R_{s-1}(d) - 1) + (R_{s-2}(d) - 1)(R_s(d-1) - 3) + 1 \quad \text{when } s \geq 5 \text{ and } d \geq 3.$$

For  $s \geq 5$ , if we let  $t = \lfloor (s-3)/2 \rfloor$ , then  $R_s(d) = 2^{(1/t)d^t \log(d) + O(d^t)}$  if  $s$  is even and  $R_s(d) = 2^{(1/t)d^t + O(d^{t-1})}$  when  $s$  is odd.

**Lemma 2.5.** ([17, Corollary 5.14]) *For every  $d \geq 2$ ,  $s \geq 3$ ,  $r \geq 2$ ,  $m$  and  $k$  satisfying  $m \geq k \geq R_s(d)$  we have*

$$\Pi'_{r,s,k}(m) \leq c'_s r m \alpha_d(m)^{s-3},$$

where  $c'_s$  is a constant depending only on  $s$ .

The linear dependence of the upper bound on  $r$  is not explicitly mentioned in [17], but can be revealed from the proof. In the base case, the dependence on  $r$  is linear (Lemmas 5.9 and 5.10 in [17]) and in Recurrences 5.11 and 5.13, the right-hand side can be rewritten as  $r$  times an expression not depending on  $r$ .

It was shown [13, 21] that doubling letters in the forbidden subsequence usually has small impact on the maximum length of a generalized DS-sequence (see the definition in [10]). Geneson [8] generalized the linear upper bound from the Füredi–Hajnal conjecture to forbidden double permutation matrices. We show a similar behavior of formation-free sequences and matrices. For  $s \geq 2$ , a set  $S$  of  $r(2s-2)$  1-entries forms a *doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation* in  $M$  if there exists an  $s$ -partition of the rows and an  $r$ -tuple of columns each of which has one 1-entry of  $S$  in the top and bottom interval of rows of the partition and two 1-entries in every other interval. A matrix  $M$  is *doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation-free* if it contains no doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation. A  $\text{DFF}_{r,s,k}(m)$ -matrix is a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation-free matrix with  $m$  rows and at least  $k$  1-entries in every column. Let  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(m)$  be the maximum number of columns in a  $\text{DFF}_{r,s,k}(m)$ -matrix.

In Corollary 2.12 we show an analogue of Lemma 2.5 for doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation-free matrices. The proof follows the structure of the proof of Corollary 5.14 in [17]. First, we show some simple bounds on  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(m)$ . The case  $d = 2$  of Corollary 2.12 is proved in Corollary 2.10 by Recurrence 2.9 and the remaining cases follow from Recurrence 2.11. Corollary 2.12 will give a sequence of upper bounds on  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(m)$ . Typically, the bounds are superlinear in  $m$  for  $r, s$  and  $k$  fixed and the subsequence of bounds applicable is limited by the values of  $s$  and  $k$ . As  $k$  grows (keeping  $r$  and  $s$  fixed) the best applicable

---

<sup>1</sup> AFF is an abbreviation for *almost-formation-free*.

bound gets closer and closer to linear. When one lets  $k$  be a suitable function of  $\alpha(m)$ , the bound becomes linear in  $m$ .

If  $m < k$ , no matrix with  $m$  rows can have  $k$  1's in every column.

**Observation 2.6.** *For every  $r, s, k, m$ , if  $m < k$ , then*

$$\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) = 0.$$

**Observation 2.7.** *For every  $r, s, k, m$ , if  $k < 2s - 2$ , then*

$$\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) = \infty.$$

Analogously to [17, Lemma 5.10], all the other values of  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(m)$  are finite.

**Observation 2.8.** *For every  $r \geq 2, s \geq 2$  and  $m \geq 2s - 2$*

$$\Delta_{r,s,2s-2}(m) \leq (r-1) \binom{m-s+1}{s-1} \leq rm^{s-1}.$$

*Proof.* If each column in an  $r$ -tuple of columns has the same position of the 2nd, 4th,  $\dots$ ,  $(2s-2)$ nd 1-entry, then the first  $2s-2$  1-entries from the columns form a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation.  $\square$

**Recurrence 2.9.** *For every  $r, k, m$  and  $s \geq 3$*

$$\Delta_{r,s,2k+1}(2m) \leq 2\Delta_{r,s,2k+1}(m) + 2\Delta_{r,s-1,k}(m).$$

*Proof.* As in the proof of [17, Recurrence 5.11], we cut the rows of a  $\text{DFF}_{r,s,2k+1}(2m)$ -matrix into the upper  $m$  rows and the lower  $m$  rows. The *local columns* are those with all 1-entries in the same half of rows. There are at most  $2\Delta_{r,s,2k+1}(m)$  local columns. Columns that are not local are *global*. Consider the submatrix  $M'_1$  formed by the upper half of rows of global columns with at least half of their 1's in the upper half of rows. Let  $M_1$  be the matrix created from  $M'_1$  by removing the lowest 1 in every column of  $M'_1$ . If  $M_1$  contains a doubled  $(r, s-1)$ -formation, then  $M$  contains a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation. Thus  $M_1$  has at most  $\Delta_{r,s-1,k}(m)$  columns. A symmetric argument can be applied on the global columns with at least half of their 1's in the lower half of rows.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.10.** *For every fixed  $s \geq 2$  and for all integers  $r, k, m$  satisfying  $k \geq 2^{s-1} + 2^{s-2} - 1$  we have*

$$\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) \leq \bar{c}_s r m \log(m)^{s-2},$$

where  $\bar{c}_s$  is a constant depending only on  $s$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on  $s$  and  $m$ . The base case of  $s = 2$  follows from Observation 2.8 and the cases with  $m < k$  from Observation 2.6. Recurrence 2.9 is used as the induction step.  $\square$

**Recurrence 2.11.** *For every nonnegative  $r, m, k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4$  and  $t$  satisfying  $m > t$ ,  $k_1 \geq k_2 + 1 \geq 2$  and  $k_4 \geq k_3 \geq 3$ , if we let  $k = 2k_1 + (k_2 + 1)(k_3 - 3) + (k_4 - k_3) + 1$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{r,s,k}(m) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) (\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + 2\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t) + \Delta_{r,s-2,k_2}(t)) + \\ &\quad + \Pi'_{r,s,k_3} \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) + \Delta_{r,s,k_4} \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) \quad \text{for } s \geq 4 \text{ and} \\ \Delta_{r,s,k}(m) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) (\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + 2\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t) + r - 1) + \\ &\quad + \Pi'_{r,s,k_3} \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) + \Delta_{r,s,k_4} \left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) \quad \text{for } s = 3. \end{aligned}$$



*Proof.* Consider a  $\text{DFE}_{r,s,k}(m)$ -matrix  $M$ . We partition the rows of  $M$  into  $b := \lceil m/t \rceil \leq m/t + 1$  layers  $L_1, \dots, L_b$  of at most  $t$  consecutive rows each.

A column is

- *local* in layer  $L_i$  if all its 1's appear in layer  $L_i$ ,
- *top-concentrated* in layer  $L_i$  if it has at least  $k_1 + 1$  1's in layer  $L_i$  and at least one 1-entry below  $L_i$ ,
- *bottom-concentrated* in layer  $L_i$  if it has at least  $k_1 + 1$  1's in layer  $L_i$  and at least one 1-entry above  $L_i$ ,
- *middle-concentrated* in layer  $L_i$  if it has at least  $k_2 + 2$  1's in layer  $L_i$  and at least one 1-entry above and one below layer  $L_i$ ,
- *doubly-scattered* if it has at least two 1's in at least  $k_3$  layers,
- *scattered* if it has a 1-entry in at least  $k_4$  layers.

These categories are analogous to those used by Nivasch [17], except that we added the category of doubly-scattered columns. This allows us to use  $\Pi'$  instead of  $\Delta$  in one summand of the recurrence. As one of the consequences, when  $s \geq 6$ , the upper bound on the maximum number of 1's in a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation-free  $n \times n$  matrix in Lemma 1.4 is similar to the best known upper bound on  $F_{r,s}(n)$ , although it is closer to  $F_{r,s+1}(n)$  when  $s = 3$ .

Every column falls into one of these categories. If a column is in none of them, then its number of 1's is maximized when it has  $k_1$  1's in its top and bottom nonzero layers,  $k_2 + 1$  1's in some other  $k_3 - 3$  layers and a single 1 in some additional  $k_4 - k_3$  layers. Thus it contains only at most  $2k_1 + (k_2 + 1)(k_3 - 3) + (k_4 - k_3) \leq k - 1$  1-entries.

For each layer  $L_i$ , the number of columns local in  $L_i$  is at most  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(t)$ . For every fixed  $i$  we consider the columns that are top-concentrated in  $L_i$  and let  $M'_i$  be the submatrix of  $M$  defined by these columns and the rows of  $L_i$ . Let  $M_i$  be obtained from  $M'_i$  by removing the lowest 1-entry from every column. If  $M_i$  contains a doubled  $(r, s - 1)$ -formation, then  $M$  contains a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation. Thus there are at most  $\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t)$  columns top-concentrated in  $L_i$ . Similarly, there are at most  $\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t)$  columns bottom-concentrated in  $L_i$ . For  $s \geq 4$ , there are at most  $\Delta_{r,s-2,k_2}(t)$  columns middle-concentrated in  $L_i$ . For  $s = 3$ , there are at most  $r - 1$  columns middle concentrated in  $L_i$ , because an  $r$ -tuple of columns with two 1's in layer  $L_i$  and at least one 1 above and one below contains a doubled  $(r, 3)$ -formation.

To bound the number of doubly-scattered columns, we *contract* each layer into a single row. That is, we write 1 for every column containing at least two 1's in the layer and 0 otherwise. If there is an  $(r, s)$ -formation on the contracted doubly-scattered columns, then  $M$  contains a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation. Thus, by Lemma 2.1, there are at most  $\Pi'_{r,s,k_3}(\lceil m/t \rceil)$  doubly-scattered columns. By a similar argument, the number of scattered columns is at most  $\Delta_{r,s,k_4}(\lceil m/t \rceil)$ . The only difference is that while contracting, we write 1 for the columns containing at least one 1 in the layer.  $\square$

Similarly to Nivasch's functions  $R_s(d)$ , we define a hierarchy of functions  $D_s(d)$ , where  $s \geq 1$  and  $d \geq 2$ , as follows:  $D_1(d) = 0$ ,  $D_2(d) = 2$ ,  $D_s(2) = 2^{s-1} + 2^{s-2} - 1$  and when  $s, d \geq 3$

$$D_s(d) = 2D_{s-1}(d) + (D_{s-2}(d) + 1)(R_s(d-1) - 3) + D_s(d-1) - R_s(d-1) + 1.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_3(d) &= 2d + 1, & D_4(d) &\leq O(d^2), & D_5(d) &\leq O(d2^d), \\ D_{2t+3}(d) &\leq 2^{(1/t!)d^t + O(d^{t-1})} & \text{for } t \geq 2 & \text{and} & D_{2t+4}(d) &\leq 2^{(1/t!)d^t \log(d) + O(d^t)} & \text{for } t \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 2.12.** *For every  $d \geq 2$ ,  $s \geq 2$ ,  $r \geq 2$ ,  $m$  and  $k$  satisfying  $m \geq k \geq D_s(d)$  we have*

$$\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) \leq c_s r m \alpha_d(m)^{s-2},$$

where  $c_s$  is a constant depending only on  $s$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on  $d, s$  and  $m$  similarly to the proof of [17, Corollary 4.12]. In the case  $s = 2$ , we apply Observation 2.8 and so the lemma holds with  $c_2 = 1$ . For every  $s \geq 3$  let  $m_0(s)$  be a constant such that

$$m \geq 1 + (6s)^s \lceil \log_2(m) \rceil^{s^2} \quad \text{for every } m \geq m_0(s).$$

Let  $\widehat{c}_1 = \widehat{c}_2 = 1$  and for  $s \geq 3$  we define  $\widehat{c}_s$  in the order of increasing  $s$  as

$$\widehat{c}_s := \max\{c'_s, \bar{c}_s, 9\widehat{c}_{s-1}, 9\widehat{c}_{s-2}, m_0(s)^{s-1}\},$$

where  $\bar{c}_s$  is the constant from Corollary 2.10 and  $c'_s$  is the constant from Lemma 2.5. For every  $s \geq 3$  and  $d \geq 2$ , we define a function  $\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}$  by  $\bar{\alpha}_{2,s}(m) = \lceil \log(m) \rceil$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m) = 1$  if  $m \leq m_0(s)$  and

$$\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m) = 1 + \bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(6s\bar{\alpha}_{d-1,s}(m)^{s-2}) \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Then  $\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)$  is well defined and differs by at most an additive constant (depending on  $s$ ) from the values of the  $d$ th inverse Ackermann function  $\alpha_d(m)$  for all  $s, d$  and  $m$  (this can be shown similarly to [17, Appendix C]). The functions also satisfy  $\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m) \geq \bar{\alpha}_{d,s-1}(m)$ . It is thus enough to prove

$$\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) \leq \widehat{c}_s r m \bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-2}.$$

The case  $d = 2$  follows from Corollary 2.10. The cases  $m \leq m_0(s)$  follow from Observation 2.8. Now  $s \geq 3$ ,  $d \geq 3$  and  $m > m_0(s)$ . We apply Recurrence 2.11 with:

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= D_{s-1}(d), & k_2 &= D_{s-2}(d), & k_3 &= R_s(d-1), \\ k_4 &= D_s(d-1), & k &= D_s(d) & \text{and} & t = 6s\bar{\alpha}_{d-1,s}(m)^{s-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t) + \Delta_{r,s-2,k_2}(t) &\leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}t\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} && \text{when } s \geq 4, \\
2\Delta_{r,s-1,k_1}(t) + r - 1 &\leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}t\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} && \text{when } s = 3, \\
\Delta_{r,s,k_4}\left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) &\leq \widehat{c}_s r \frac{2m}{t} \bar{\alpha}_{d-1,s}(m)^{s-2} \leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3s} \leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{9}m\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} && \text{for } s \geq 3
\end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 2.5,

$$\Pi'_{r,s,k_3}\left(1 + \frac{m}{t}\right) \leq rs\widehat{c}_s\frac{2m}{t}\bar{\alpha}_{d-1,s}(m)^{s-3} \leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}m \leq r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}m\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3}.$$

Substituting into Recurrence 2.11 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) &\leq \frac{m}{t}\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + \Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + (m+t)r\frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} + \frac{4\widehat{c}_s}{9}rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} \\
&\leq \frac{m}{t}\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + \frac{7\widehat{c}_s}{9}rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} + \Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + \frac{\widehat{c}_s}{3}rt\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Observation 2.8,  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) \leq rt^{s-1} \leq r(6s\bar{\alpha}_{d-1,s}(m)^{s-2})^{s-1}$ , which is at most  $rm$ , because  $m \geq m_0(s)$ . So  $\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) \leq \widehat{c}_s rm/9$ . Similarly  $t\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} \leq m/3$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{r,s,k}(m) &\leq \frac{m}{t}\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + \frac{7\widehat{c}_s}{9}rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} + \frac{\widehat{c}_s}{9}rm + \frac{\widehat{c}_s}{9}rm \\
&\leq \frac{m}{t}\Delta_{r,s,k}(t) + \widehat{c}_s rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} \\
&\leq \frac{m}{t}\widehat{c}_s rt\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(t)^{s-2} + \widehat{c}_s rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3} && \text{by the induction hypothesis} \\
&\leq m\widehat{c}_s r \cdot ((\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m) - 1)^{s-2} + \bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-3}) \\
&\leq \widehat{c}_s rm\bar{\alpha}_{d,s}(m)^{s-2}. && \square
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\beta_s(m) := D_s(\alpha(m))$ .

**Corollary 2.13.** *An  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $\beta_s(m)$  1-entries in every column contains a doubled  $(\lfloor (n-1)/(mc'_s) \rfloor, s)$ -formation, where  $c'_s$  is a constant depending only on  $s$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $c'_s = c_s 3^{s-3}$ , where  $c_s$  is the constant from Corollary 2.12 and let  $r = \lfloor (n-1)/(mc'_s) \rfloor$ . If  $M$  did not contain a doubled  $(r, s)$ -formation, its number of columns would be, by Corollary 2.12 with  $d = \alpha(m)$ , at most

$$c_s rm\alpha_{\alpha(m)}(m)^{s-3} \leq rmc_s 3^{s-3} = \lfloor (n-1)/(mc'_s) \rfloor mc'_s < n. \quad \square$$

A set  $S$  of  $Brs$  1-entries forms a  $B$ -fat  $(r, s)$ -formation in  $M$  if there exists an  $s$ -partition of the rows and an  $r$ -tuple of columns each of which has  $B$  1-entries of  $S$  in each interval. A matrix  $M$  is  $B$ -fat  $(r, s)$ -formation-free if it contains no  $B$ -fat  $(r, s)$ -formation.

We now prove a more precise version of Lemma 1.4.

**Lemma 2.14.** *For all positive integers  $m, n, s$  and  $B$ , an  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  with at least  $2(\beta_s(m) + 2)Bn$  1-entries contains a  $B$ -fat  $(\lfloor nB/(mc_s) \rfloor, s)$ -formation, where  $c_s$  is a constant depending only on  $s$ .*

*Proof.* We transform the given matrix  $M$  to a matrix  $\overline{M}$  with the same number of 1-entries in every column using the idea from the proof of Lemma 4.1 from [17]. Let  $v(q)$  be the number of 1-entries in a column  $q$  of  $M$ . In every column  $q$ , we split the 1-entries into chunks of consecutive  $(\beta_s(m) + 2)B$  1's. The last less than  $(\beta_s(m) + 2)B$  1's are discarded. Each of the chunks gets its own column with 1-entries in the rows where the 1-entries of the chunk lie. These columns form the matrix  $\overline{M}$ . Note that the order in which the columns are placed to  $\overline{M}$  is not important. Because we discarded at most  $(\beta_s(m) + 2)Bn$  1's and every column of  $\overline{M}$  has exactly  $(\beta_s(m) + 2)B$  1's,  $\overline{M}$  has at least  $n$  columns. Observe that for every  $r$  and  $s$  if  $\overline{M}$  contains a  $B$ -fat  $(r, s)$ -formation, then so does  $M$ .

We consider only the first  $n$  columns of  $\overline{M}$ . We also remove at most  $B - 1$  rows so as to have the number of rows divisible by  $B$ . We still have at least  $(\beta_s(m) + 1)B$  1's in every column. In each column  $q$ , we select a set  $S$  of 1's such that none of them is among the first or the last  $B - 1$  1's of the column  $q$  and there are at least  $B - 1$  1's between every two 1's of  $S$ . We take  $S$  of size  $\beta_s(m)$  and remove all the other 1's in  $q$ . The rows of  $\overline{M}$  are now grouped into intervals of rows  $\{iB + 1, \dots, (i + 1)B\}$ . By the choice of  $S$ , every column contains at most one 1-entry in every interval. We obtain  $\overline{\overline{M}}$  by contracting each of the intervals of rows into a single row.

The matrix  $\overline{\overline{M}}$  has  $\lfloor m/B \rfloor$  rows and  $n$  columns, each of them having  $\beta_s(m)$  1's. It thus contains a doubled  $(\lfloor (n-1)B/(mc'_s) \rfloor, s)$ -formation by Corollary 2.13. By the choice of  $S$ , this implies that  $\overline{\overline{M}}$  and consequently  $M$  contain a  $B$ -fat  $(\lfloor (n-1)B/(mc'_s) \rfloor, s)$ -formation.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.4.* Let  $\zeta_s(m) = 2(\beta_s(m) + 2) \max\{1, c_s\}$ , where  $c_s$  is the constant from Lemma 2.14. Let  $M$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix with at least  $\zeta_s(m)Bn$  1-entries. By Lemma 2.14,  $M$  contains a  $B$ -fat  $(\lfloor nB/m \rfloor, s)$ -formation.  $\square$

## 2.3 Sets of permutations with bounded VC-dimension

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. It will be more convenient for the proof to substitute the permutations by their corresponding permutation matrices. That is, we have a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$ -permutation matrices and for every  $(k + 1)$ -tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_{k+1})$  of columns, there is a forbidden  $(k + 1)$ -permutation matrix  $S_{a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}}$ .

Let  $M_{\mathcal{P}}$  be a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with 1-entries on the positions where at least one matrix from  $\mathcal{P}$  has a 1-entry. Let  $|M|$  denote the number of 1-entries in a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $M$  and let  $v(\mathcal{P}) = v(M_{\mathcal{P}}) = |M_{\mathcal{P}}|/n$ . Similarly to Raz's proof of the exponential upper bound on  $r_2(n)$  [23], we will remove matrices from  $\mathcal{P}$  until we decrease  $v(\mathcal{P})$  below some threshold  $T(n)$ . When  $v(\mathcal{P}) \leq T(n)$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}| \leq T(n)^n$  since the number of permutation matrices contained in  $M_{\mathcal{P}}$  is bounded from above by the maximum of a product of  $n$  numbers with sum  $v(\mathcal{P})n$ .

Let  $\gamma_k(n) = 2(k + 1)! \zeta_{k+1}(n)$ , where  $\zeta_{k+1}(n)$  is the function from Lemma 1.4.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a set of  $n$ -permutation matrices with VC-dimension  $k$  such that  $v(\mathcal{P}) \geq 2\gamma_k(n)$ . Then there is a set  $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$  satisfying*

$$v(\mathcal{P}') \leq v(\mathcal{P}) - \frac{v(\mathcal{P})^2}{\gamma_k^2(n)n}$$

$$|\mathcal{P}'| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}|}{2v(\mathcal{P})^k}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $B := \lfloor v(\mathcal{P})/\zeta_{k+1}(n) \rfloor$ . By Lemma 1.4, the matrix  $M_{\mathcal{P}}$  contains a  $B$ -fat  $(B, k+1)$ -formation. Let  $C$  be the set of the  $B$  columns of the formation and let  $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{k+1}\}$  be the intervals of rows of the formation.

Consider some  $t$ -tuple  $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_t\}$  of columns from  $C$ , where  $t \leq k+1$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}_Q$  be the set of all injective functions  $I : Q \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  assigning the intervals  $R_j$  to the columns  $q_i$ . We say that a permutation matrix  $P$  obeys  $I \in \mathcal{I}_Q$  if for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ , the 1-entry of  $P$  in the column  $q_i$  lies in some row of  $I(q_i)$ . For each  $I \in \mathcal{I}_Q$  let  $\mathcal{P}_I$  be the set of matrices  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  that obey  $I$ . The  $t$ -tuple  $Q$  of columns is said to be *criss-crossed* if

$$\forall I \in \mathcal{I}_Q : |\mathcal{P}_I| \geq |\mathcal{P}|/v(\mathcal{P})^t.$$

Suppose that some  $(k+1)$ -tuple of columns from  $C$  is criss-crossed. Then every  $(k+1)$ -permutation appears as a restriction of some matrix from  $\mathcal{P}$  on the criss-crossed  $(k+1)$ -tuple of columns. Hence the VC-dimension of  $\mathcal{P}$  is at least  $k+1$ .

Consequently, there is some  $t$  such that  $0 \leq t \leq k$  and the largest criss-crossed set  $Q$  of columns from  $C$  has size  $t$ . This means that for every column  $u$  outside  $Q$ , we can find an injective function  $J_u \in \mathcal{I}_{Q \cup \{u\}}$  such that  $|\mathcal{P}_{J_u}| < |\mathcal{P}|/v(\mathcal{P})^{t+1}$ . On the other hand, if we restrict  $J_u$  on  $Q$ , the resulting function  $I_u := J_u \upharpoonright Q$  satisfies  $|\mathcal{P}_{I_u}| \geq |\mathcal{P}|/v(\mathcal{P})^t$ . To each choice of  $u \in C \setminus Q$ , we assign the function  $I_u \in \mathcal{I}_Q$  and the interval  $J_u(u)$  of rows. Some function  $I \in \mathcal{I}_Q$  was then assigned to at least  $(|C| - k)/|\mathcal{I}_Q|$  columns. Because  $B \geq 4(k+1)!$ , we have

$$\frac{|C| - k}{|\mathcal{I}_Q|} \geq \frac{B - k}{(k+1)!} \geq \frac{v(\mathcal{P})}{2\zeta_{k+1}(n)(k+1)!} \geq \frac{v(\mathcal{P})}{\gamma_k(n)}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{T}_I$  be the set of some  $\lceil v(\mathcal{P})/\gamma_k(n) \rceil$  columns that were assigned the function  $I$ . Because  $v(\mathcal{P}) \geq 2\gamma_k(n)$ , we have

$$\frac{v(\mathcal{P})}{\gamma_k(n)} \leq |\mathcal{T}_I| \leq \frac{2v(\mathcal{P})}{\gamma_k(n)} \leq \frac{v(\mathcal{P})}{2}. \quad (2.1)$$

For each column  $q_i \in Q$ , we remove from  $M$  all 1-entries in the column  $q_i$  except those that lie in the rows of  $I(q_i)$ . This reduces the number of permutation matrices, but there are still at least  $|\mathcal{P}|/v(\mathcal{P})^t$  of them. Then we remove from  $M$  the 1-entries in each column  $u \in \mathcal{T}_I$  that lie in the set of rows  $J_u(u)$ . See Fig. 2. Thus we removed at least  $B$  1-entries from each of these columns. The removed 1-entries of each of these columns decreased the number of permutation matrices by at most  $|\mathcal{P}_{J_u}| \leq |\mathcal{P}|/v(\mathcal{P})^{t+1}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}$  be the set of permutation matrices containing none of the removed




Figure 2: A criss-crossed set  $Q$  of 3 columns and a set  $\mathcal{T}_I$  of columns  $\{u_1, \dots, u_5\}$ , where  $I(q_1) = R_4$ ,  $I(q_2) = R_1$ ,  $I(q_3) = R_2$ ,  $J_{u_1}(u_1) = J_{u_2}(u_2) = R_3$  and  $J_{u_3}(u_3) = J_{u_4}(u_4) = J_{u_5}(u_5) = R_5$ . The 1-entries from the crossed rectangles are removed.

1-entries. Using the bounds from Equation (2.1), we obtain

$$|M_{\mathcal{P}'}| \leq |M_{\mathcal{P}}| - B|\mathcal{T}_I| \leq nv(\mathcal{P}) - \frac{v(\mathcal{P})^2}{\gamma_k^2(n)},$$

$$|\mathcal{P}'| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}|}{v(\mathcal{P})^t} - \frac{|\mathcal{P}||\mathcal{T}_I|}{v(\mathcal{P})^{t+1}} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}|}{2v(\mathcal{P})^t} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}|}{2v(\mathcal{P})^k}. \quad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a set of permutation matrices with VC-dimension  $k$ . We will bound its size by iteratively applying Lemma 2.15. Let  $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}$  and for  $j \geq 1$  let  $\mathcal{P}_j$  be the  $\mathcal{P}'$  given by the lemma applied on  $\mathcal{P}_{j-1}$ .

The iterations are further grouped into phases. Let  $\phi_0 := 0$ . Phase  $i$  ends after the first iteration  $\phi_i$  after which  $v(\mathcal{P}_{\phi_i}) \leq v(\mathcal{P}_{\phi_{i-1}})/2$ . Let  $v_i := v(\mathcal{P}_{\phi_i})$ . Then an iteration of phase  $i$  is applied on a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of permutations satisfying

$$\frac{v_{i-1}}{2} \leq v(\mathcal{P}) \leq v_{i-1} \quad (2.2)$$

Further, let

$$T := \gamma_k^2(n) \log(\gamma_k(n)). \quad (2.3)$$

We end after the first phase  $l$  satisfying  $v_l \leq 2T$ . We thus have

$$|\mathcal{P}_{\phi_l}| \leq (2T)^n. \quad (2.4)$$

For every  $i \geq 1$  we have

$$v_{l-i} \geq 2^i T. \quad (2.5)$$

We now count the number of iterations in phase  $i$ . By Lemma 2.15 and ((2.2)), each of these iterations decreases  $v(\mathcal{P})$  by at least  $v_{i-1}^2/(4\gamma_k^2(n)n)$ . Therefore the phase ends after at most  $\lceil 2\gamma_k^2(n)n/v_{i-1} \rceil \leq 3\gamma_k^2(n)n/v_{i-1}$  iterations. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_{i-1}}| &\leq |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_i}| \cdot (2v_{i-1}^k)^{3\gamma_k^2(n)n/v_{i-1}} && \text{by Lemma 2.15 and (2.2)} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_i}| \cdot 2^{(1+k \log v_{i-1})3\gamma_k^2(n)n/v_{i-1}} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_i}| \cdot 2^{6k\gamma_k^2(n)n \log v_{i-1}/v_{i-1}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{P}| = |\mathcal{P}_0| &\leq |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_l}| \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} 2^{6k\gamma_k^2(n)n \log v_i/v_i} \\
&\leq |\mathcal{P}_{\phi_l}| 2^{6k\gamma_k^2(n)n \sum_{i=1}^l \log(2^{iT})/(2^{iT})} \quad \text{by (2.5) and since } \frac{\log(x)}{x} \text{ is decreasing on } [2T, \infty) \\
&\leq (2T)^n \cdot 2^{6k\gamma_k^2(n)n(2+\log T)/T} \quad \text{by (2.4)} \\
&\leq (2\gamma_k^2(n) \log(\gamma_k(n)))^n \cdot 2^{30kn} \quad \text{by (2.3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\gamma_k(n) \in O(\zeta_{k+1}(n))$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
r_3(n) &\leq (O(\alpha(n)^4 \log(\alpha(n))))^n, \\
r_4(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot (2\alpha(n) + 3 \log(\alpha(n)) + O(1))}, \\
r_{2t+2}(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot ((2/t!) \alpha(n)^t + O(\alpha(n)^{t-1}))} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1 \text{ and} \\
r_{2t+3}(n) &\leq 2^{n \cdot ((2/t!) \alpha(n)^t \log(\alpha(n)) + O(\alpha(n)^t))} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark.** Let an  $n$ -function be a total function  $f : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ . We say that a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $n$ -functions has *VC-dimension with respect to permutations* (abbreviated as *pVC-dimension*)  $k$  if  $k$  is the largest integer such that the set of restrictions of the functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  to some  $k$ -tuple of elements from  $[n]$  contains all  $k$ -permutations. Let  $r'_k(n)$  be the size of the largest set of  $n$ -functions with pVC-dimension  $k$ . Observe that the proofs of this section never use the fact that the matrices in  $\mathcal{P}$  have exactly one 1-entry in every row. Thus the upper bound from Theorem 1.1 also holds with  $r'_k(n)$  in place of  $r_k(n)$ .

## 3 Lower bounds

### 3.1 Matrices from sequences

Let  $DS_s$  be the  $s \times 2$  matrix with 1-entry in the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column exactly when  $i + j$  is odd. For example

$$DS_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad DS_5 = \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}.$$

Based on a construction of Davenport–Schinzel sequences of order 3 and length  $\Omega(n\alpha(n))$  by Hart and Sharir [9], Füredi and Hajnal [7] constructed  $n \times n$   $DS_4$ -avoiding matrices  $A_n$  with  $\Omega(n\alpha(n))$  1-entries. We will use a different construction of  $DS(s)$ -sequences of orders  $s = 3$  and all even  $s \geq 4$  by Nivasch [17] that together with the following transcription will provide us with  $DS_{s+1}$ -avoiding matrices with the additional property of having the same number of 1-entries in every column.

Let  $S$  be a sequence over  $n$  symbols that can be partitioned into  $m$  blocks. Recall that each block contains only distinct symbols. We number the symbols  $1, \dots, n$  in the increasing order of their first appearance. The *sequence  $\rightarrow$  matrix transcription* of  $S$ ,  $SMT(S)$ , is the  $m \times n$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with a 1-entry in the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column exactly if the  $i$ th block in the sequence contains the symbol  $j$ .

**Observation 3.1.** ([7]) *If  $S$  is a sequence avoiding the alternating pattern  $aba\dots$  of length  $s + 2$ , then  $\text{SMT}(S)$  avoids  $DS_{s+1}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\text{SMT}(S)$  contains  $DS_{s+1}$ , then  $S$  contains the alternating sequence  $ba\dots$  of length  $s + 1$  for some  $a < b$ . By the numbering of the symbols, the symbol  $a$  appears before the first occurrence of  $b$ , therefore  $S$  contains  $aba\dots$  of length  $s + 2$  and thus  $S$  is not a  $DS(s)$ -sequence.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For every  $n$  there exists an  $n \times n$   $DS_4$ -avoiding matrix  $M_n$  with at least  $2\alpha(n) - O(1)$  1-entries in every column.*

*Proof.* Let  $A_d(x)$  be the  $d$ th function of the Ackermann hierarchy. We refer the reader to Nivasch's paper [17] for the definition. Let  $A(x) = A_x(3)$  be the Ackermann function.

In Section 6 of [17], Nivasch constructs for every  $d, m \geq 1$  an  $ababa$ -free sequence  $Z_d(m)$ . We use the sequences  $Z'_d = Z_d(8d + 4)$  which have the following properties:

- Each symbol appears exactly  $2d + 1$  times.
- The sequence can be decomposed into blocks of average length at least  $4d + 2$  (by [17, Lemma 6.2]).
- The number  $N_d$  of symbols of the sequence is at most  $A_d(8d + 4 + c)$  (by [17, Lemma 6.2]), where  $c$  is an absolute constant.

Let  $M_d$  be the number of blocks of  $Z'_d$ . By counting the length of  $Z'_d$  in two ways,  $(2d + 1)N_d \geq (4d + 2)M_d$  and thus  $N_d \geq 2M_d$ . By the analysis before Equation (35) in [17], there is some  $d_0$  such that for  $d \geq d_0$  we have

$$N_d \leq A_d(8d + 4 + c) \leq A_d(A(d + 1)) = A(d + 2) \quad \text{and so} \\ \alpha(N_d) \leq d + 2.$$

Then  $\text{SMT}(Z'_d)$  is an  $M_d \times N_d$  matrix with  $2d + 1 \geq 2\alpha(N_d) - 3$  1-entries in every column. By Observation 3.1,  $\text{SMT}(Z'_d)$  avoids  $DS_4$ . We construct the matrix  $M_{N_d}$  by adding empty rows to  $\text{SMT}(Z'_d)$ .

For values  $n \geq N_{d_0}$  different from  $N_d$ , we proceed similarly to the method in Section 6 of [17]: We consider the largest  $N_d$  smaller than  $n$  and take  $\lceil n/N_d \rceil$  copies of  $\text{SMT}(Z'_d)$ . We place the copies into a single matrix so that each copy has its own set of consecutive rows and columns. After removing at most half of the columns, we obtain a matrix with exactly  $n$  columns and at most  $n$  rows. The matrix has at least  $2d + 1 \geq 2\alpha(N_{d+1}) - 5 \geq 2\alpha(n) - 5$  1-entries in every column. The construction of  $M_n$  is then finished by adding empty rows to obtain a square matrix.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *For every  $t \geq 1$  and  $n$  there exists an  $n \times n$   $DS_{2t+3}$ -avoiding matrix with at least  $2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})}$  1-entries in every column. In particular,*

$$\text{ex}_{DS_{2t+3}}(n) \geq n2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $s := 2t + 2$ . Since  $s$  is even and  $s \geq 4$ , we can use Nivasch's construction [17, Section 7] of  $DS(s)$ -sequences  $S_k^s(m)$  with parameters  $k, m \geq 2$ . Let  $\mu_s(k) := 2^{\binom{k}{s-2}/2}$ . We use the sequences  $S'_{s,k} = S_k^s(2\mu_s(k))$ , which have the following properties:



- Each symbol of  $S'_{s,k}$  appears exactly  $\mu_s(k)$  times (by [17, Equation (47)]).
- The sequence can be decomposed into blocks of length  $2\mu_s(k)$ .
- For every  $k \geq k_0(s)$ , where  $k_0(s)$  is a properly chosen constant, the number  $N_{s,k}$  of symbols of the sequence satisfies  $\alpha(N_{s,k}) \leq k + 3$  (by [17, Equations (50), (51)] and analysis similar to the one in the proof of Lemma 3.2).

Let  $M_{s,k}$  be the number of blocks of  $S'_{s,k}$ . It satisfies  $2M_{s,k} \leq N_{s,k}$ . The matrix  $\text{SMT}(S'_{s,k})$  is a  $DS_{s+1}$ -avoiding  $M_{s,k} \times N_{s,k}$  matrix with at least  $\mu_{s,k}$  1-entries in every column. For every  $n \geq N_{s,k_0(s)}$  we take the largest  $k$  such that  $n \geq N_{s,k}$  and proceed in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 with  $\text{SMT}(S'_{s,k})$  in the place of  $\text{SMT}(Z'_d)$ . We have

$$k \geq \alpha(N_{s,k+1}) - 4 \geq \alpha(n) - 4$$

and so the number of 1-entries in every column of the resulting matrix is

$$\mu_s(k) = 2^{\binom{k}{(s-2)/2}} = 2^{\binom{k}{t}} \geq 2^{(1/t)k^t - O(k^{t-1})} \geq 2^{(1/t)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})}. \quad \square$$

**Remark.** We could also use the construction of  $DS_4$ -avoiding matrices with  $\Omega(n\alpha(n))$  1-entries by Füredi and Hajnal [7]. The matrices do not have the same number of 1-entries in every column, but it can be shown that every column has at most constant multiple of the average number of 1-entries per column. This would be enough for our purposes. The base case of the inductive construction in [7] needs a small fix. The matrices  $M(s, 1)$  and  $M(1, s)$  do not satisfy conditions imposed on them. This can be fixed for example by taking  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  for  $M(s, 1)$  and the matrix with the leftmost column full of 1-entries and with no 1-entries in the other columns for  $M(1, s)$ .

### 3.2 Numbers of 1-entries in matrices

A matrix is  $k$ -full if some  $k$ -tuple of its columns contains every  $k$ -permutation matrix. The *fullness* of a matrix  $A$  is the largest  $k$  such that  $A$  is  $k$ -full. In this section we show a lower bound on the maximum number  $p_k(n)$  of 1-entries in an  $n \times n$  matrix with fullness  $k$ . This is achieved by showing that a  $k$ -full matrix contains the matrix  $DS_k$  and applying the results from Section 3.1. We prove a slightly stronger statement that will be used in the next section.

Let  $J_2 := (\bullet \bullet)$ . For an  $l$ -permutation matrix  $P$ , we define the  $J_2$ -expansion of  $P$ ,  $P^{J_2}$ , to be the  $2l \times 2l$  permutation matrix created by substituting every 1-entry of  $P$  by  $J_2$  and every 0-entry by a  $2 \times 2$  block full of 0-entries.

A pair of rows  $2i, 2i + 1$  of  $P^{J_2}$  will be called *contractible* if the 1-entry in row  $2i$  is to the left of the 1-entry in row  $2i + 1$ . That is, when  $\pi^{-1}(i) < \pi^{-1}(i + 1)$ , where  $\pi$  is the permutation corresponding to  $P$ . To *contract* a pair of rows means to replace them by a single row with 1-entries in the columns where at least one of the two original rows had a 1-entry.

Let an  $(n, m)$ -function be a total function  $f : [n] \rightarrow [m]$ . A *function matrix* is a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with exactly one 1-entry in every column. Assigning to a function  $f$  a function matrix  $G_f$  with  $G_f(i, j) = 1 \Leftrightarrow f(j) = i$  provides a bijection between  $(n, m)$ -functions and  $m \times n$  function matrices.

The set of  $J_2$ -expansion flattenings of  $P$  is the set  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2})$  of function matrices that can be obtained from  $P^{J_2}$  by contracting some pairs of contractible rows. Let  $\mathcal{P}_l$  be the set of  $l$ -permutation matrices and let

$$\Phi(l) := \{\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}) : P \in \mathcal{P}_l\}.$$

For example

$$\Phi(2) = \left\{ \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cc} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right) \right\}, \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cc} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right) \right\} \right\}.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *If an  $n \times 2l$  matrix  $A$  contains one matrix from  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2})$  for every  $l$ -permutation matrix  $P$ , then  $A$  contains an occurrence of  $DS_{2l}$  on columns  $\{2i - 1, 2i\}$  for some  $i \in [l]$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $l$ . The case  $l = 1$  is trivial since  $\Phi(1) = \{\{J_2\}\} = \{\{DS_2\}\}$ .

The  $i$ th pair of columns of  $A$  is the pair of columns  $\{2i - 1, 2i\}$ . For each  $i \leq l$  let  $h_i$  be the smallest number such that the  $i$ th pair of columns of  $A$  contains  $J_2$  on a subset of rows  $\{1 \dots h_i\}$ . Let  $t$  be the largest number satisfying  $\forall i \ h_i \leq h_t$ . Let  $A^{\setminus t}$  be the  $(n - h_t + 1) \times 2(l - 1)$  matrix obtained from  $A$  by removing the columns of the  $t$ th pair, removing the top  $h_t - 1$  rows and then changing all 1-entries among the first  $2(t - 1)$  entries in the first row to 0's. See Fig. 3




Figure 3: Induction step in the proof of Lemma 3.4. In this example  $t = 3$ .

For every  $P$  with the topmost 1-entry in column  $t$ ,  $A$  contains an occurrence of some  $F \in \mathcal{F}(P^{J_2})$ , that uses the two 1-entries of the topmost occurrence of  $J_2$  on the  $t$ th pair of columns. These occurrences induce an occurrence of some matrix from every set  $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(l - 1)$  in  $A^{\setminus t}$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $A^{\setminus t}$  contains  $DS_{2(l-1)}$  on some  $i$ th pair of columns. By the choice of  $t$ , this occurrence of  $DS_{2(l-1)}$  in  $A$  does not use any of the rows  $\{1 \dots h_i\}$ . Thus we obtain an occurrence of  $DS_{2l}$  in  $A$ .  $\square$

For an  $l$ -permutation matrix  $P$  and  $i \leq 2l + 1$  we define  $P^{J_2}(i)$  to be the  $(2l + 1)$ -permutation matrix that becomes  $P^{J_2}$  after removing the lowest row and column  $i$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i)$  is the set of function matrices that can be obtained from  $P^{J_2}(i)$  by contracting some pairs of contractible rows. For example

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}\right)^{J_2}, 4\right) = \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right) \right\}.$$

Let

$$\Phi(l, i) := \{\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i) : P \in \mathcal{P}_l\}.$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $A$  be an  $n \times (2l + 1)$  matrix and let  $A'$  be the matrix obtained from  $A$  by removing the last 1-entry from each column. If  $A'$  contains one matrix from  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i)$  for every  $l$ -permutation matrix  $P$  and every  $i \in [2l + 1]$ , then  $A$  contains  $DS_{2l+1}$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $i \leq 2l + 1$  let  $d_i$  be the row number of the lowest 1-entry in the  $i$ th column of  $A'$ . Let  $t$  be any of the rows satisfying  $\forall i \ d_i \geq d_t$ . Let  $A^t$  be the  $d_t \times 2l$  matrix obtained from  $A$  by removing the  $t$ th column and all rows below the  $d_t$ th row. Then  $A^t$  contains one matrix from every  $\mathcal{F} \in \Phi(l)$ , therefore by Lemma 3.4 the matrix  $A^t$  contains an occurrence of  $DS_{2l}$ . By the choice of  $t$ , the matrix  $A$  contains  $DS_{2l+1}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *For every  $k \geq 1$*

$$p_k(n) \geq \text{ex}_{DS_{k+1}}(n).$$

*Proof.* When  $k$  is even, the result follows from Lemma 3.5, since for every  $l$ -permutation matrix  $P$  and for every  $i \in [2l + 1]$ , the set  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i)$  contains some  $(2l + 1)$ -permutation matrix, namely the matrix without any row contractions. The result for  $k$  odd follows from Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

The row contractions did not play any role in the proof of Corollary 3.6, but they will play a role in Section 3.3 below.

**Corollary 3.7.** *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} p_3(n) &\geq 2n\alpha(n) - O(n), \\ p_k(n) &\geq n2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})} \quad \text{for } k \geq 4, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t := \lfloor (k - 2)/2 \rfloor$ .

*Proof.* The lower bound for  $k = 3$  is by Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.6 and from Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.6 when  $k$  is even and  $k > 3$ . When  $k$  is odd and  $k \geq 5$ , we use  $p_k(n) \geq p_{k-1}(n)$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 Sets of permutations

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Given  $k$  and  $n$ , we take the  $DS_{k+1}$ -avoiding  $n \times n$  matrix  $A_{k,n}$  from Lemma 3.2 if  $k = 3$  or from Lemma 3.3 if  $k \geq 4$  is even. Let  $\rho_k(n)$  be the number of 1-entries that  $A_{k,n}$  has in every column, that is  $\rho_2(n) = 2\alpha(n) - O(1)$  and for  $t \geq 1$   $\rho_{2t+2}(n) = 2^{(1/t!)\alpha(n)^t - O(\alpha(n)^{t-1})}$ .

From  $A_{k,n}$  we construct a set of  $\rho_k(n)^n$   $n \times n$  function matrices by choosing some 1-entry from each column. Then we remove all empty rows, which can make some originally different function matrices identical. However, the resulting set  $\mathcal{H}$  has size at least  $\rho_k(n)^n/2^n$  as there are at most  $2^n$  distinct ways to enlarge a function matrix by adding empty rows to a matrix with  $n$  rows.

The last step is inflating the rows of the function matrices in  $\mathcal{H}$  into diagonal matrices to obtain a set  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $n$ -permutation matrices. That is, for every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$ , we order the

1-entries primarily by the rows from top to bottom and secondarily from left to right. The permutation matrix  $Q$  will have 1-entries on those positions  $(i, j)$  such that  $H$  has its  $i$ th 1-entry in column  $j$ . The reverse process consists of contracting intervals of rows of a permutation matrix  $Q$  and we have at most  $2^n$  possibilities how to choose the intervals. Thus every permutation matrix can be created by expanding at most  $2^n$  different function matrices. The size of the set  $\mathcal{Q}$  is

$$|\mathcal{Q}| \geq \frac{\rho_k(n)^n}{2^n 2^n} = \left( \frac{\rho_k(n)}{4} \right)^n.$$

It remains to show that the VC-dimension of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is at most  $(k + 1)$ . We assume for contradiction that for some  $(k + 1)$ -tuple  $C$  of columns and every  $(k + 1)$ -permutation matrix  $R$  there exists  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  that contains  $R$  on  $C$ .

Consider some permutation matrix  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  and let  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  be the function matrix from which  $Q$  was created. The matrix  $H$  can thus be constructed from  $Q$  by contracting some intervals of rows such that the restriction of  $Q$  on each of these intervals of rows is a diagonal matrix. So the only change that these contractions can make on an occurrence of  $P^{J_2}$  in  $Q$  is that some pairs of its contractible rows can be contracted. Thus an occurrence of  $P^{J_2}$  in  $Q$  on the set  $C$  of columns can only be created from an occurrence of some  $F \in \mathcal{F}(P^{J_2})$  on  $C$  in  $H$  and in  $A_{k,n}$  as well. Similarly, an occurrence of  $P^{J_2}(i)$  on  $C$  in  $Q$  implies an occurrence of some matrix from  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i)$  on  $C$  in  $H$  and  $A_{k,n}$ . See Fig. 4.




Figure 4: Expansion of an occurrence of a matrix from  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2})$ .

Therefore for  $k \geq 4$  even, for every  $(k/2)$ -permutation matrix  $P$  and every  $i \in [k + 1]$ , some matrix from  $\mathcal{F}(P^{J_2}, i)$  occurs on  $C$  in  $A_{k,n}$ . Thus, by Lemma 3.5,  $A_{k,n}$  contains  $DS_{k+1}$ , a contradiction. Similarly if  $k = 3$ , we get a contradiction by Lemma 3.4.  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Seth Pettie for pointing us to a way to improve the result of Lemma 2.1. We also thank Ottfried Cheong, Martin Klazar and Pavel Valtr for inspiring discussions.

## References

- [1] P. K. Agarwal, M. Sharir and P. Shor, Sharp upper and lower bounds for the length of general Davenport-Schinzel sequences, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **52** (1989), 228–274.

- [2] D. Bienstock and E. Györi, An extremal problem on sparse 0-1 matrices, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **4**(1) (1991), 17–27.
- [3] J. Cibulka, On constants in the Füredi–Hajnal and the Stanley–Wilf conjecture, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **116**(2) (2009), 290–302.
- [4] H. Davenport and A. Schinzel, A combinatorial problem connected with differential equations, *American Journal of Mathematics* **87**(3) (1965), 684–694.
- [5] A. Efrat and M. Sharir, A near-linear algorithm for the planar segment-center problem, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **16**(3) (1996), 239–257.
- [6] Z. Füredi, The maximum number of unit distances in a convex  $n$ -gon, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **55**(2) (1990), 316–320.
- [7] Z. Füredi and P. Hajnal, Davenport–Schinzel theory of matrices., *Discrete Mathematics* **103**(3) (1992), 233–251.
- [8] J. T. Geneson, Extremal functions of forbidden double permutation matrices, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **116**(7) (2009), 1235–1244.
- [9] S. Hart and M. Sharir, Nonlinearity of Davenport–Schinzel sequences and of generalized path compression schemes, *Combinatorica* **6**(2) (1986), 151–178.
- [10] M. Klazar, A general upper bound in extremal theory of sequences, *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae* **33**(4) (1992), 737–746.
- [11] M. Klazar, On the maximum lengths of Davenport–Schinzel sequences, *Contemporary Trends in Discrete Mathematics, DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 49, AMS, Providence, RI (1999) 169–178.
- [12] M. Klazar, The Füredi–Hajnal Conjecture Implies the Stanley–Wilf Conjecture, *Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics, Moscow 2000*, Springer (2000) 250–255.
- [13] M. Klazar and P. Valtr, Generalized Davenport–Schinzel sequences, *Combinatorica* **14** (1994), 463–476.
- [14] J. Kynčl, Improved enumeration of simple topological graphs (in preparation).
- [15] A. Marcus and G. Tardos, Excluded permutation matrices and the Stanley–Wilf conjecture., *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **107**(1) (2004), 153–160.
- [16] J. Matoušek, *Lectures on Discrete Geometry*, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA (2002), ISBN 0387953744.
- [17] G. Nivasch, Improved bounds and new techniques for Davenport–Schinzel sequences and their generalizations, *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery* **57**(3) (2010), 1–44.
- [18] J. Pach and G. Tardos, Forbidden paths and cycles in ordered graphs and matrices, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **155** (2006), 359–380.

- [19] S. Pettie, Applications of forbidden 0-1 matrices to search tree and path compression-based data structures, *Proceedings 21st ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)* (2010) 1457–1467.
- [20] S. Pettie, Degrees of Nonlinearity in Forbidden 0-1 Matrix Problems, *Discrete Mathematics* **311** (2011), 2396–2410.
- [21] S. Pettie, Generalized Davenport-Schinzel Sequences and Their 0-1 Matrix Counterparts, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **118**(6) (2011), 1863–1895.
- [22] S. Pettie, Tightish Bounds on Davenport–Schinzel Sequences, arXiv:1204.1086v1 [cs.DM] (2012).
- [23] R. Raz, VC-Dimension of Sets of Permutations, *Combinatorica* **20**(2) (2000), 241–255.
- [24] M. Sharir and P. K. Agarwal, *Davenport–Schinzel Sequences and Their Geometric Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA (1995).
- [25] G. Tardos, On 0-1 matrices and small excluded submatrices, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **111**(2) (2005), 266–288.