

# CD-INDEPENDENT SUBSETS IN MEET-DISTRIBUTIVE LATTICES

GÁBOR CZÉDLI

ABSTRACT. A subset  $X$  of a finite lattice  $L$  is CD-independent, if the meet of any two incomparable elements of  $X$  equals 0. In 2009, Czédli, Hartmann and Schmidt proved that any two maximal CD-independent subsets of a finite distributive lattice have the same number of elements. In this paper, we prove that if  $L$  is a finite meet-distributive lattice, then the size of every CD-independent subset of  $L$  is at most the number of atoms of  $L$  plus the length of  $L$ . If, in addition, there is no three-element antichain of meet-irreducible elements, then we give a recursive description of maximal CD-independent subsets. Finally, an application of CD-independent subsets to counting islands is given.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND THE MAIN RESULT

All lattices in the present paper are assumed to be finite, even if this is not repeated all the times. For  $u \neq 0$  in a (finite) lattice  $L$ , let  $u_*$  denote the meet of all lower covers of  $u$ . If the interval  $[u_*, u]$  is a distributive lattice for every  $u \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , then  $L$  is *meet-distributive*. This concept goes back to Dilworth [18] but there are more than a dozen equivalent definitions. In fact, meet-distributivity or its dual is one of the most often rediscovered concepts in Lattice Theory; see Adaricheva [1], Adaricheva, Gorbunov and Tumanov [3], Monjardet [30], and Caspard and Monjardet [7]; see also Czédli [9, Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2] and Adaricheva and Czédli [2] for recent surveys.

As usual, a finite lattice  $L$  is *lower semimodular* if whenever  $a, b \in L$  such that  $a$  is covered by  $a \vee b$ , in notation  $a \prec a \vee b$ , then  $a \wedge b \prec b$ . Equivalently, if the implication  $a \prec b \Rightarrow a \wedge c \preceq b \wedge c$  holds for all  $a, b, c \in L$ . We will often use the fact, without further reference, that finite meet-distributive lattices are lower semimodular; see Dilworth [18] and Monjardet [7], or see also the dual of Czédli [9, Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2] for an overview.

An element of  $L$  is *meet-irreducible* if it has exactly one cover. The set of meet-irreducible elements of  $L$  is denoted by  $\text{Mi}(L)$ . The set  $\text{Ji}(L)$  of *join-irreducible* elements is defined dually. Following Grätzer and Knapp [22] and, in the present form, Czédli and Schmidt [15],  $L$  is *dually slim* if  $\text{Mi}(L)$  contains no three-element antichain. Due to Czédli [10], and to the dual of results in Czédli and Grätzer [11]

---

*Date:* July 3, 2013.

*1991 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06C10.

*Key words and phrases.* CD-independent subset, laminar system, meet-distributive lattice, convex geometry of circles, number of islands.

This research was supported by the European Union and co-funded by the European Social Fund under the project “Telemedicine-focused research activities on the field of Mathematics, Informatics and Medical sciences” of project number “TÁMOP-4.2.2.A-11/1/KONV-2012-0073”, and by NFSR of Hungary (OTKA), grant number K83219.

and Czédli and Schmidt [15], [16], and [17], dually slim lower semimodular lattices are understood quite well.

For a lattice  $L$ , let  $\text{Atoms}(L)$  and  $\text{length}(L)$  stand for the set of atoms of  $L$  and the length of  $L$ , respectively. Since we deal with lower semimodular, finite lattices,  $\text{length}(L)$  equals the size of any maximal chain minus 1. Following Czédli, Hartmann and Schmidt [12], a subset  $X$  of a lattice  $L$  is *CD-independent* if for any  $x, y \in X$  such that  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable (in notation,  $x \parallel y$ ), we have  $x \wedge y = 0$ . In other words, if any two elements of  $X$  are either Comparable or Disjoint; this is where the acronym CD comes. The main result of [12] is the following:

**Proposition 1.1** ([12]). *Let  $L$ ,  $X$ , and  $C$  be a finite, lower semimodular lattice, a maximal CD-independent subset of  $L$ , and a maximal chain of  $L$ , respectively. Then the following assertions hold.*

- $C \cup \text{Atoms}(L)$  is a maximal CD-independent subset of  $L$ .
- If, in addition,  $L$  is distributive, then  $|X| = |C \cup \text{Atoms}(L)|$ , that is, the size of every maximal CD-independent subset is  $\text{length}(L) + |\text{Atoms}(L)|$ .

Note that it is also possible to define the concept of CD-independent subsets of posets, see Horváth and Radeleczki [26], but the present paper is restricted to lattices. In view of further results in [12], we cannot expect that the second part of this proposition extends to a significantly larger class of lattices. However, replacing distributivity by meet-distributivity, which is a weaker assumption, the theorem below still exhibits some property of CD-independent subsets. For a poset  $H$ , let  $\max(H)$  stand for the set of maximal elements of  $H$ . If  $u \in L$ , then the principal ideal  $\{x \in L : x \leq u\}$  is denoted by  $\downarrow u$ . Our main goal is to prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $L$  be a finite, meet-distributive lattice, and let  $X$  be a maximal CD-independent subset of  $L$ . Then the following assertions hold.*

- (i)  $|X| \leq \text{length}(L) + |\text{Atoms}(L)|$ .
- (ii) *If, in addition,  $L$  is dually slim or  $L$  is distributive, then*
  - $|\max(X \setminus \{1\})| \leq 2$ , and
  - for each  $u \in \max(X \setminus \{1\})$ ,  $X \cap \downarrow u$  is a maximal CD-independent subset in  $\downarrow u$ .

**Remark 1.3.** The condition on  $L$  in Part ii is redundant even in the nondistributive case since, by the dual of Czédli, Ozsvárt, and B. Udvari [14], meet-distributivity is equivalent to lower semimodularity for a dually slim lattices.

**Remark 1.4.** By Proposition 1.1,  $C \cup \text{Atoms}(L)$  is always a maximal CD-independent set, provided  $L$  is meet-distributive. Hence the upper bound in Part (i) is sharp.

**Remark 1.5.** Part (ii) leads easily to the following recursive description of maximal CD-independent subsets in dually slim lower semimodular lattices: a subset  $X$  of such a lattice  $L$  is a maximal CD-independent subset if and only if one of the following two possibilities holds:

- $X = X_0 \cup \{1\}$ , where  $a_0 = \bigvee X_0$  is a coatom of  $L$ ,  $X_0$  is a maximal CD-independent subset of  $\downarrow a_0$ , and  $\text{Atoms}(L) = \text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_0)$ ;
- $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{1\}$ , where  $a_1 = \bigvee X_1$  and  $a_2 = \bigvee X_2$  are pseudocomplements of each other,  $X_i$  is a maximal CD-independent subset of  $\downarrow a_i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and  $\text{Atoms}(L) = \text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_1) \cup \text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_2)$ .

## 2. CIRCLES AND THE PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

Before proving Theorem 1.2, we recall some results from Czédli [10]. Note that this will be the first application of [10]. As usual, a *circle* in the plane is a set  $\{(x, y) : (x - u)^2 + (y - v)^2 = r^2\}$  where  $u, v, r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $r \geq 0$ . Let  $F$  be a finite set of circles in the plane. A subset  $Y$  of  $F$  is *closed* if whenever  $C \in F$  and  $C$  is in the convex hull of  $\bigcup\{D : D \in Y\}$ , then  $C \in Y$ . Less formally (but not quite precisely), if  $Y$  is closed with respect to the usual convex hull operation restricted to  $F$ . Let  $\text{Lat}(F)$  denote the set of closed subsets of  $F$ . With respect to inclusion,  $\text{Lat}(F)$  is a lattice, and  $\emptyset, F \in \text{Lat}(F)$ . We call  $\text{Lat}(F)$  a *lattice of circles*. If the centers of the circles in  $F$  are on the same line, then  $F$  is *collinear*. In the collinear case, we always assume that the line containing the centers is the  $x$  axis. A collinear set  $F$  of circles is *separated* if no point of the  $x$  axis belongs to more than one member of  $F$ . For example, if we disregard the dotted arcs, then  $F$  depicted in Figure 1 is a separated collinear set of circles.




FIGURE 1. A separated concave set of collinear circles

Next, let  $F$  be a separated collinear set of circles. For  $C \in F$ ,  $C$  is of the form  $\{(x, y) : (x - u)^2 + y^2 = r^2\}$ , where  $0 \leq r \in \mathbb{R}$ . The points  $\text{LPt}(C) = \langle u - r, 0 \rangle$  and  $\text{RPt}(C) = \langle u + r, 0 \rangle$  are the *leftmost point* and the *rightmost point* of  $C$ , respectively. For  $A, B \in F$ , let

$$\text{HInt}_F(A, B) = \{C \in F : \text{LPt}(A) \leq C \text{ and } \text{RPt}(C) \leq \text{RPt}(B)\};$$

it is called the *horizontal interval* determined by  $A$  and  $B$ . For example, in Figure 1,  $\text{HInt}_F(A_1, B_1)$  consists of the light grey circles while  $\text{HInt}_F(A_i, B_i)$  from the dark grey ones. We say that  $F$  is a *concave set* of collinear circles if for all  $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in F$ , the conjunction of  $\text{LPt}(C_1) \leq \text{LPt}(C_2)$  and  $\text{RPt}(C_2) \leq \text{RPt}(C_3)$  implies that the smallest closed subset of  $F$  that contains  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  also contains  $C_2$ . In Figure 1, the circles determined by dotted arcs do not belong to  $F$ ; their purpose is to indicate what concavity means. (Of course, the dotted line need not be a circular arc in general.)

Using a result of Edelman [19], see also [10, Lemma 3.5], one can translate some result of [10] to the language of Lattice Theory as follows.

**Proposition 2.1** ([10, Proposition 2.1, Theorem 2.2, and Lemma 3.1]).

- (A) If  $F$  is a finite set of circles in the plane, then  $\text{Lat}(F)$  is a meet-distributive lattice.
- (B) Dually slim, lower semimodular lattices are, up to isomorphism, characterized as lattices  $\text{Lat}(F)$  where  $F$  is a separated, concave set of collinear circles.
- (C) If  $F$  is a separated, concave set of collinear circles, then we have  $\text{Lat}(F) = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{\text{HInt}_F(A, B) : A, B \in F\}$ . Actually, for each  $X \in \text{Lat}(F)$  there are a unique  $A \in X$  and a unique  $B \in X$  such that  $X = \text{HInt}_F(A, B)$ .

Note that for  $|F| > 1$ , the  $\{\emptyset\}$  above is superfluous since  $\text{HInt}_F(A, B)$  can be empty. However, we need  $\{\emptyset\}$  if  $|F| = 1$ . Now, we prove our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* We prove Part (i) by induction on  $|L|$ . For  $|L| \leq 4$ ,  $L$  is distributive and (i) follows from Proposition 1.1.

Assume that  $|L| > 4$  and that Part (i) holds for all lattices of smaller size. Clearly,  $0, 1 \in X$ . Let  $k = |\max(X \setminus \{1\})|$  and  $X \setminus \{1\} = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ . If  $k = 1$ , then the maximality of  $X$  implies  $a_1 \prec 1$ , and the induction step from  $\downarrow a_1$  and  $X \setminus \{1\}$  to  $L$  and  $X$  is obvious. Therefore, we assume  $k \geq 2$ .

Observe that the maximality of  $X$  implies  $\text{Atoms}(L) \subseteq X$ . This gives  $\text{Atoms}(L) \subseteq \downarrow a_1 \cup \dots \cup \downarrow a_k$ , and we conclude  $\text{Atoms}(L) = \text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_k)$ . Here the union is disjoint since  $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$  is an antichain and  $X$  is CD-independent. Therefore,

$$(2.1) \quad |\text{Atoms}(L)| = |\text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_1)| + \dots + |\text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_k)|.$$

For  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ , we have  $\text{Ji}(\downarrow a_i) \cap \text{Ji}(\downarrow a_j) = \emptyset$  since  $a_i \wedge a_j = 0$ . On the other hand,  $\text{Ji}(\downarrow a_t) \subseteq \text{Ji}(L)$  for  $t = 1, \dots, k$ . Hence,  $|\text{Ji}(\downarrow a_1)| + \dots + |\text{Ji}(\downarrow a_k)| \leq |\text{Ji}(L)|$ . We know from Stern [33, Theorem 7.2.27], who attributes it to Avann [4] and [5], that  $|\text{Ji}(K)| = \text{length}(K)$  for every meet-distributive lattice; see also the dual of Czédli [9, Proposition 2.1(iii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (v)] for more historical comments. Clearly, the  $\downarrow a_i$  are meet-distributive. Thus the previous inequality turns into

$$(2.2) \quad \text{length}(\downarrow a_1) + \dots + \text{length}(\downarrow a_k) \leq \text{length}(L).$$

Next, for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $X_i = X \cap \downarrow a_i$ . Since  $X_i$  is clearly a CD-independent subset of  $\downarrow a_i$ , the induction hypothesis gives

$$(2.3) \quad |X_i| \leq |\text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_i)| + \text{length}(\downarrow a_i) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Now, using the previous formulas,  $X_i \cap X_j = \{0\}$  for  $i \neq j$ , and  $k \geq 2$ , we can compute as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k |X_i \setminus \{0\}| \stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k (|\text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_i)| + \text{length}(\downarrow a_i) - 1) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\text{Atoms}(\downarrow a_i)| + \sum_{i=1}^k \text{length}(\downarrow a_i) \stackrel{(2.1), (2.2)}{\leq} |\text{Atoms}(L)| + \text{length}(L). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction step and proves Part (i).

Next, we prove Part (ii). Its second part is obvious. If  $L$  is distributive, then the first paragraph in the proof of the Main Theorem of Czédli, Hartmann and Schmidt [12] explicitly says that  $k = |\max(X \setminus \{1\})|$  is at most 2. Therefore, we assume that  $L$  is dually slim. By Proposition 2.1, we also assume that  $L = \text{Lat}(F)$  for a finite, separated, concave set of collinear circles. Note the rule  $Y_1 \wedge Y_2 = Y_1 \cap Y_2$ , for  $Y_1, Y_2 \in F$ . Let  $\max(X \setminus \{1\}) = \{D_1, \dots, D_k\}$ .

For the sake of contradiction, suppose  $k \geq 3$ . By Proposition 2.1(C), there exist unique  $A_j$  and  $B_j$  in  $F$ , not necessarily distinct, such that we have  $\{A_j, B_j\} \subseteq D_j = \text{HInt}_F(A_j, B_j)$ , for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . For example, in Figure 1, where the label of a circle is always below its center,  $D_1$  consists of the light grey circles while  $D_i$  from the dark grey ones. Since  $\text{LPt}(A_j) \leq \text{RPt}(A_j)$ ,  $\text{LPt}(B_j) \leq \text{RPt}(B_j)$ , and  $A_j, B_j \in D_j = \text{HInt}_F(A_j, B_j)$ , we obtain

$$(2.4) \quad \text{LPt}(A_j) \leq \text{RPt}(A_j) \leq \text{RPt}(B_j) \text{ and } \text{LPt}(A_j) \leq \text{LPt}(B_j) \leq \text{RPt}(B_j),$$

for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . However, note that either  $\text{LPt}(B_j) \leq \text{RPt}(A_j)$ , or  $\text{LPt}(B_j) > \text{RPt}(A_j)$  can occur.

We assert that, for  $i \neq j$ ,  $\text{LPt}(A_i) \neq \text{LPt}(A_j)$  and  $\text{RPt}(B_i) \neq \text{RPt}(B_j)$ . By left-right symmetry, it suffices to deal with  $\text{LPt}(A_i)$  and  $\text{LPt}(A_j)$ . Aiming for a contradiction, suppose  $\text{LPt}(A_i) = \text{LPt}(A_j)$ . If  $\text{RPt}(A_i) \leq \text{RPt}(A_j)$ , then

$$\text{LPt}(A_j) \leq \text{LPt}(A_i) \text{ and } \text{RPt}(A_i) \leq \text{RPt}(A_j) \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \text{RPt}(B_j)$$

gives  $A_i \in D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Otherwise, if  $\text{RPt}(A_i) > \text{RPt}(A_j)$ , we similarly obtain  $A_j \in D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$ , a contradiction again. Thus the  $\text{LPt}(A_i)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , are pairwise distinct, and so are the  $\text{RPt}(B_i)$ . Using that  $F$  is separated, we can choose the indices such that

$$(2.5) \quad \text{LPt}(A_1) < \text{LPt}(A_2) < \dots < \text{LPt}(A_k).$$

For the sake of contradiction, suppose  $\text{RPt}(B_i) \geq \text{RPt}(B_j)$  for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ . In this case,

$$\text{LPt}(A_i) \stackrel{(2.5)}{<} \text{LPt}(A_j) \text{ and } \text{RPt}(A_j) \stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \text{RPt}(B_j) \leq \text{RPt}(B_i)$$

gives  $A_j \in D_i \cap D_j$ , a contradiction. This shows that we have

$$(2.6) \quad \text{RPt}(B_1) < \text{RPt}(B_2) < \dots < \text{RPt}(B_k).$$

Next, (2.4), (2.5), (2.6), and  $k \geq 3$  easily imply  $D_1 \vee D_2 \subseteq \text{HInt}_F(A_1, B_2)$ ,  $B_2 \notin D_1$ ,  $A_1 \notin D_2$ , and  $B_k \notin \text{HInt}_F(A_1, B_2)$ . Hence,  $D_1 \vee D_2$  is neither the largest element of  $\text{Lat}(F)$ , nor  $D_1$ , nor  $D_2$ . Therefore,  $X$  is a proper subset of  $X' = X \cup \{D_1 \vee D_2\}$ . To obtain the desired contradiction, it suffices to prove that  $X'$  is CD-independent. It suffices to show that  $(D_1 \vee D_2) \wedge D_i = 0$  for  $i \leq 3$  since  $X$  is CD-independent. Hence, for  $i \geq 3$ , it is sufficient to prove  $\text{HInt}_F(A_1, B_2) \cap \text{HInt}_F(A_i, B_i) = \emptyset$ . Suppose for contradiction that a circle  $C \in F$  belongs to this intersection. This gives

$$\text{LPt}(A_2) \stackrel{(2.5)}{<} \text{LPt}(A_i) \leq \text{LPt}(C) \text{ and } \text{RPt}(C) \leq \text{RPt}(B_2),$$

implying  $C \in \text{HInt}_F(A_2, B_2) \cap \text{HInt}_F(A_i, B_i) = D_2 \cap D_i = \emptyset$ . This is a contradiction proving that  $X'$  is CD-independent. However, this is impossible since  $X$  was a maximal CD-independent subset of  $\text{Lat}(F)$ . Thus, we have proved Part (ii).  $\square$

### 3. EXAMPLES AND COMMENTS

The proof of Part (ii) of Theorem 1.2 was based on Proposition 2.1. Clearly, there exists a purely lattice theoretical proof of Part (ii) since, in the worst case, we can import several parts from the proof of Proposition 2.1, given in Czédli [10]. However, the present approach based on circles is more economic.

The examples given in this section show that the assumptions stipulated in Theorem 1.2 are relevant. In fact, we do not see any straightforward way of reasonable generalizations. Note that it was already proved in Czédli, Hartmann and Schmidt [12] that distributivity in Proposition 1.1 cannot be replaced by a weaker lattice identity.

**Example 3.1.** In Figure 2,  $L$  is a dually slim, meet-distributive lattice with  $\text{length}(L) + |\text{Atoms}(L)| = 7$ . The black-filled elements form a maximal CD-independent subset of size 6. This shows that in Part (i) of Theorem 1.2, the inequality can be proper even if  $L$  is dually slim.




FIGURE 2. A maximal CD-independent set




FIGURE 3. An atomistic example

A lattice is *atomistic* if each of its element is the join of some atoms. The following example indicates that atomicity would not improve Theorem 1.2(i).

**Example 3.2.** Let  $L = \text{Lat}(F)$ , where  $F$  consists of the circles depicted in Figure 3. The dotted lines indicate how these nine circles are positioned. Clearly,  $L$  is an atomistic lattice, and it is meet-distributive by Proposition 2.1(A). Since  $\text{Atoms}(L) = \{\{x\} : x \in F\}$ ,  $|\text{Atoms}(L)| = 9$ . By an already mentioned result of Avann [4] and [5], see also Stern [33, Theorem 7.2.27],  $\text{length}(L) = |\text{Atoms}(L)|$ . For  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , let  $A_i = \{x_i, z_i\}$  and  $B_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$ ; these subsets of  $F$  belong to  $L$ . Note that  $B_1, B_2$ , and  $B_3$  consist of the black-filled circles, the grey-filled circles, and the empty circles, respectively. It is straightforward to verify that  $X = \text{Atoms}(L) \cup \{\emptyset, F, A_1, B_1, A_2, B_2, A_3, B_3\}$  is a maximal CD-independent subset of  $L$ . Since  $|X| = 17$  and  $\text{length}(L) + |\text{Atoms}(L)| = 18$ , we do not have equality in Part (i) of Theorem 1.2.

#### 4. AN APPLICATION TO THE THEORY ISLANDS

The concept of islands appeared first in Czédli [8]. For definition, let  $m$  and  $n$  be natural numbers, and consider an  $m$ -by- $n$  *rectangular board*, denoted by  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ . It consists of little unite squares called cells, which are arranged in  $m$  columns and  $n$  rows. For example,  $\text{Board}(8, 8)$  is the chess-board. Let  $h: \text{Board}(m, n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a map, called *height function*. A nonempty set  $H$  of cells forming a rectangle is called a (*cellular*) *rectangular island* with respect to  $h$  if the minimum height of  $H$  is greater than the height of any cell around the perimeter of  $H$ . Let us emphasize that the empty set is never a cellular rectangle. This concept was motivated by Foldes and Singhi [21], where cellular rectangular islands on  $\text{Board}(n, 1)$  played a key role in characterizing maximal instantaneous codes. The number of cellular rectangular islands of the system  $\langle \text{Board}(m, n), h \rangle$  depends

on the height function but it takes its maximum for some  $h$ . This maximum value, denoted by  $f(m, n)$ , is determined by the following result.

**Proposition 4.1** ([8]). *For  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f(m, n) = \lfloor (mn + m + n - 1)/2 \rfloor$ .*

This result was soon followed by many related ones, due to Barát, Foldes, E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Lengvárszky, Németh, Pach, Pluhár, Pongrácz, Šešelja, Szabó, and Tepavčević. The results of these authors, written alone or in various groups, range from triangular boards to the continuous case and from lattice theory to combinatorics, see [6], [20], [23], [24], [25], [27], [28], [29], [31], [32], and some further papers not referenced here. Since [20] and [23] give good overviews on islands, we do not go into further details. However, we mention the following feature of this research field. At the beginning, in [8] and also in [25] and [32], a lattice theoretical result of Czédli, Huhn, and Schmidt [13] on weakly independent sets played the main role in proofs. Soon afterward, simpler approaches were discovered in [6], and Lattice Theory was more or less neglected.

By giving a new proof for Proposition 4.1 based on CD-independence, the goal of this section is to demonstrate that Lattice Theory is still competitive with other approaches. Note that this task was suggested by Horváth [23, Problem 9.1]. We only need Proposition 1.1 for this purpose.

Being a square, each cell has exactly four vertices. For a (cellular) rectangular subset  $X$  of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ , let  $\text{Grid}(X)$  denote the set of vertices of the cells of  $X$ . We call  $\text{Grid}(X)$  the *point rectangle* associated with the *cellular rectangle*  $X$ . We call  $\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))$  the *grid* associated with  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ . In general, a grid of type  $\langle m, n \rangle$  is a set congruent to the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, m\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  of points in the plane. For a set  $\mathcal{H}$  of cellular rectangular subsets of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ , we let  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H}) = \{\text{Grid}(X) : X \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . The idea of working with grids rather than boards goes back to E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Németh, and Cs. Szabó [24]. First of all, we rephrase the following statement, which were used practically by all previous approaches dealing with (finitely many) islands. The collection of all subsets of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  is denoted by  $\text{PowSet}(\text{Board}(m, n))$ .

**Lemma 4.2** ([8, Lemma 2]). *For an arbitrary set  $\mathcal{H}$  of cellular rectangles of the board  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  is the collection of all cellular rectangular islands of  $\langle \text{Board}(m, n), h \rangle$  for an appropriate height function  $h$  if and only if  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H})$  is a CD-independent subset of the powerset lattice  $\langle \text{PowSet}(\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))), \subseteq \rangle$  and  $\text{Board}(m, n) \in \mathcal{H}$ .*

Note that some authors, including Pach, Pluhár, Pongrácz, and Szabó [31], call CD-independent subsets as *laminar systems*.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* We do not deal with  $f(m, n) \geq \lfloor (mn + m + n - 1)/2 \rfloor$  since this inequality is proved by an easy construction without any tool, see [8].

For brevity, let  $G = \text{PowSet}(\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n)))$ . By Proposition 1.1, each maximal CD-independent set of  $\langle G, \subseteq \rangle$  is of size  $2 \cdot \text{length}(G) = 2 \cdot |\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))| = 2 \cdot (m + 1)(n + 1)$ . With the notation  $\hat{n} = n + 1$  and  $\hat{m} = m + 1$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad \text{each maximal CD-independent subset of } G \text{ is of size } 2\hat{m}\hat{n}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the collection of all cellular rectangular islands of  $\langle \text{Board}(m, n), h \rangle$ , and denote  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H})$  by  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $|\mathcal{T}|$  by  $t$ . Since  $|\mathcal{H}| = |\mathcal{T}| = t$ , it suffices to show the inequality in

$$(4.2) \quad t \leq \lfloor \hat{m}\hat{n}/2 \rfloor - 1 = \lfloor (mn + m + n - 1)/2 \rfloor.$$



We know from Lemma 4.2 that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a CD-independent subset of  $G$ . Since the cellular rectangles of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  are nonempty by definition, each member of  $\mathcal{T}$  consist of at least four points. Therefore the set

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{T} \cup \{0_G\} \cup \text{Atoms}(G) = \mathcal{T} \cup \{X : X \subseteq \text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n)) \text{ and } |X| \leq 1\}$$

is also CD-independent, and it is of size  $t + 1 + \widehat{m}\widehat{n}$ .

A subset  $X$  of  $\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))$  will be called *bizarre* if  $|X| \geq 2$  and there is no rectangle  $Y$  of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  with  $X = \text{Grid}(Y)$ . We claim that there exist a set  $\mathcal{B}$  of bizarre subsets of  $\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))$  such that

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{B} \text{ is CD-independent in } G \text{ and } |\mathcal{B}| \geq \begin{cases} t + 1 & \text{if } 2 \mid \widehat{m}\widehat{n} \\ t + 2 & \text{if } 2 \nmid \widehat{m}\widehat{n} \end{cases}.$$

Note that the validity of (4.3) will complete the proof as follows. First, let  $\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  be odd. Since  $|\mathcal{W}| = t + 1 + \widehat{m}\widehat{n}$ , (4.1) and (4.3) yield  $t + 1 + \widehat{m}\widehat{n} + t + 2 \leq |\mathcal{W}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq 2\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$ , which clearly implies (4.2). For  $\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  even, we conclude (4.2) from  $t + 1 + \widehat{m}\widehat{n} + t + 1 \leq |\mathcal{W}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq 2\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  even faster.

We prove (4.3) by induction on  $mn$ . A bizarre subset of  $\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))$  is *straight* if all of its points lie on the same vertical or horizontal line. We will only use straight bizarre sets.

Assume that  $\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  is even, and let  $U_1, \dots, U_k$  be the list of maximal elements of  $\mathcal{H} \setminus \text{Board}(m, n)$ . First, assume  $k = 1$ . Clearly, at least one of the four sides of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  is *separated* from  $U_1$  in the sense that no cell on this side belongs to  $U_1$ . Note that  $|\mathcal{H} \cap \downarrow U_1| = t - 1$ , where  $\downarrow U_1 = \{X \in G : X \subseteq U_1\}$  denotes the principal ideal of  $G$  generated by  $U_1$ . By the induction hypothesis, applied to the subboard  $U_1$ , we can add at least  $(t - 1) + 1$  straight bizarre subsets of  $\text{Grid}(U_1)$  to  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H} \setminus \{\text{Board}(m, n)\})$  to obtain a CD-independent subset of  $\text{Grid}(\text{Board}(m, n))$ . Two neighboring points on the separate side form a straight bizarre set, which we still can add without losing its CD-independence. The set  $\mathcal{B}$  of all these bizarre sets is of size at least  $(t - 1) + 1 + 1 = t + 1$ , as desired.

Second, assume  $k \geq 2$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $t_i = |\mathcal{H} \cap \downarrow U_i|$ . Clearly,  $t = t_1 + \dots + t_k + 1$ . By the induction hypothesis, we can add at least  $t_i + 1$  straight bizarre subsets of  $\text{Grid}(U_i)$  to  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H} \cap \downarrow U_i)$  without spoiling its CD-independence. Since the bizarre subsets we add to  $\text{Grid}(\mathcal{H} \cap \downarrow U_i)$  are disjoint from  $\text{Grid}(U_j)$  for  $j \neq i$ , we can add all these bizarre subsets simultaneously to  $\mathcal{W}$  without hurting its CD-independence. This way, the set  $\mathcal{B}$  of all straight bizarre subsets we add is at least

$$(4.4) \quad (t_1 + 1) + \dots + (t_k + 1) = t + (k - 1) \geq t + 1.$$

Hence, (4.3) holds in this case.

Next, we assume that  $\widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  is odd. The treatment of this case is more or less the same as that for  $2 \mid \widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  but we have to find an appropriate  $\mathcal{B}$  of size at least  $t + 2$ . That is, we have to find an extra straight bizarre subset. Hence, it will suffice to compare this case to the case of  $2 \mid \widehat{m}\widehat{n}$  wherever it is possible. Observe that  $1 \leq m < \widehat{m}$  and  $2 \nmid \widehat{m}$  gives  $\widehat{m} \geq 3$ , and we also have  $\widehat{n} \geq 3$ . Therefore, if  $k = 1$ , then we can find two comparable straight bizarre subsets of the separated side rather than just one, and  $|\mathcal{B}| \geq t + 2$  follows as previously. If  $k \geq 3$ , then  $|\mathcal{B}| \geq t + 2$  comes from (4.4).

Therefore, we are left with the case  $k = 2$  such that no side of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  is separated from both  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . The situation, up to rotation by ninety degree,



$$\text{Board}(m, n) = \text{Board}(8, 4)$$




FIGURE 4. The case of  $k = 2$  and  $2 \nmid \widehat{m}\widehat{n}$

is depicted in Figure 4. By the maximality of  $\mathcal{H}$ , there is no cellular rectangular subset of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$  that includes  $U_i$  and is disjoint from  $U_{3-i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . It follows that three sides of  $U_i$  lie on appropriate sides of  $\text{Board}(m, n)$ , and the distance between  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  is 1. Let  $U_i$  be an  $m_i$ -by- $n$  board for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Since  $\widehat{m} = m + 1$  is odd and  $m = m_1 + m_2 + 1$ , one of  $\widehat{m}_1 = m_1 + 1$  and  $\widehat{m}_2 = m_2 + 1$  is odd, and the other is even. Let, say,  $\widehat{m}_1$  be odd. Since  $\widehat{m}_1 n$  is odd, the induction hypothesis allows us to achieve  $t_1 + 2$  instead of  $t_1 + 1$  in (4.4), and  $|\mathcal{B}| \geq t + 2$  follows again.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** Since we only used straight bizarre sets in the proof above, there is a hope that this method works for other sorts of boards and islands.

**Acknowledgment.** The author is indebted to Eszter K. Horváth for comments on the literature of islands.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Adaricheva, K.: Representing finite convex geometries by relatively convex sets. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, to appear; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.1539>
- [2] Adaricheva, K., Czédli, G.: Notes on the description of join-distributive lattices by permutations. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.3376>
- [3] Adaricheva, K., Gorbunov, V.A., Tumanov, V.I.: Join-semidistributive lattices and convex geometries. *Advances in Math.* **173**, 1–49 (2003)
- [4] Avann, S.P.: Application of the join-irreducible excess function to semimodular lattices. *Math. Annalen* **142**, 345–354 (1961)
- [5] Avann, S.P.: Increases in the join-excess function in a lattice. *Math. Ann.* **154**, 420–426 (1964)
- [6] J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth: Elementary proof techniques for the maximum number of islands. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, **32**, 276–281 (2011)
- [7] Caspard, N., Monjardet, B.: Some lattices of closure systems on a finite set. *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* **6**, 163–190 (2004)
- [8] G. Czédli: The number of rectangular islands by means of distributive lattices. *European Journal of Combinatorics* **30** (2009), 208–215
- [9] Czédli, G.: Coordinatization of join-distributive lattices. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.3517>, submitted to *Algebra Universalis*
- [10] Czédli, G.: Finite convex geometries of circles. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.3456>
- [11] Czédli, G., Grätzer, G.: Notes on planar semimodular lattices. VII. Resections of planar semimodular lattices. *Order*, to appear. DOI 10.1007/s11083-012-9281-1
- [12] G. Czédli, M. Hartmann and E.T. Schmidt: CD-independent subsets in distributive lattices. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, **74/1–2** (2009), 127–134.
- [13] G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices. *Algebra Universalis* **20**, 194–196 (1985)

- [14] G. Czédli, L. Ozsvárt and B. Udvari: How many ways can two composition series intersect? *Discrete Mathematics* **312**, 3523–3536 (2012)
- [15] Czédli, G., Schmidt, E.T.: The Jordan-Hölder theorem with uniqueness for groups and semimodular lattices. *Algebra Universalis* **66**, 69–79 (2011)
- [16] Czédli, G., Schmidt, E.T.: Slim semimodular lattices. I. A visual approach. *Order* **29**, 481–497 (2012)
- [17] Czédli, G., Schmidt, E.T.: Slim semimodular lattices. II. A description by patchwork systems. *Order*, Published online August 29, 2012, DOI: 10.1007/s11083-012-9271-3
- [18] Dilworth, R.P.: Lattices with unique irreducible decompositions. *Annals of Mathematics* (2) **41**, 771–777 (1940)
- [19] Edelman, P.H.: Meet-distributive lattices and the anti-exchange closure. *Algebra Universalis* **10**, 290–299 (1980)
- [20] S. Foldes, E.K. Horvth, S. Radeleczi, T. Waldhauser: A general framework for island systems. <http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath/>
- [21] S. Foldes and N. M. Singhi: On instantaneous codes. *J. of Combinatorics, Information and System Sci.* **31** (2006), 317–326
- [22] Grätzer, G., Knapp, E.: Notes on planar semimodular lattices. I. Construction. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **73**, 445–462 (2007)
- [23] E. K. Horváth: Islands: from coding theory to enumerative combinatorics and to lattice theory – overview and open problems. xxx
- [24] E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Z. Németh, Cs. Szabó: The number of square islands on a rectangular sea. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **76**, 35–48 (2010)
- [25] E. K. Horváth, Z. Németh, G. Pluhár: The number of triangular islands on a triangular grid. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica* **58**, 25–34 (2009)
- [26] E. K. Horváth and S. Radeleczi: Notes on CD-independent subsets. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **78**, 3–24 (2012)
- [27] E. K. Horváth, B. Šešelja, A. Tepavčević: Cardinality of height functions range in case of maximally many rectangular islands — computed by cuts. *Central European J. Math.* **11**(2), 296–307 (2013)
- [28] E. K. Horváth, B. Šešelja, A. Tepavčević: Cut approach to islands in rectangular fuzzy relations. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **161**, 3114–3126 (2010)
- [29] Zs. Lengvárszky: Notes on systems of triangular islands. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **75**, 369–376 (2009)
- [30] Monjardet, B.: A use for frequently rediscovering a concept. *Order* **1**, 415–417 (1985)
- [31] P. P. Pl Pach, G. Pluhár, A. Pongrácz, Cs. Szabó: The possible number of islands on the sea. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **375**, 8–13 (2011)
- [32] G. Pluhár: The number of brick islands by means of distributive lattices. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **75**, 3–11 (2009)
- [33] Stern, M.: *Semimodular Lattices. Theory and Applications*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **73**. Cambridge University Press (1999)

*E-mail address:* [czedli@math.u-szeged.hu](mailto:czedli@math.u-szeged.hu)

*URL:* <http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~czedli/>