

# Proof of an entropy conjecture of Leighton and Moitra

Hüseyin Acan <sup>\*†</sup>                      Pat Devlin <sup>\*‡</sup>  
 huseyin.acan@rutgers.edu              prd41@math.rutgers.edu  
 Jeff Kahn <sup>\*†</sup>  
 jkahn@math.rutgers.edu

## Abstract

We prove the following conjecture of Leighton and Moitra. Let  $T$  be a tournament on  $[n]$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  the set of permutations of  $[n]$ . For an arc  $uv$  of  $T$ , let  $A_{uv} = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \sigma(u) < \sigma(v)\}$ .

**Theorem.** For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\mathbb{P}$  is a probability distribution on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(A_{uv}) > 1/2 + \varepsilon$  for every arc  $uv$  of  $T$ , then the binary entropy of  $\mathbb{P}$  is at most  $(1 - \vartheta_\varepsilon) \log_2 n!$  for some (fixed) positive  $\vartheta_\varepsilon$ .

When  $T$  is transitive the theorem is due to Leighton and Moitra; for this case we give a short proof with a better  $\vartheta_\varepsilon$ .

## 1 Introduction

In what follows we use  $\log$  for  $\log_2$  and  $H(\cdot)$  for binary entropy. The purpose of this note is to prove the following natural statement, which was conjectured by Tom Leighton and Ankur Moitra [6] (and told to the third author by Moitra in 2008).

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $T$  be a tournament on  $[n]$  and  $\sigma$  a random (not necessarily uniform) permutation of  $[n]$  satisfying:*

$$\text{for each arc } uv \text{ of } T, \quad \mathbb{P}(\sigma(u) < \sigma(v)) > 1/2 + \varepsilon. \quad (1)$$

---

AMS 2010 subject classification: 05C20, 05D40, 94A17, 06A07

Key words and phrases: entropy, permutations, tournaments, regularity

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University

<sup>†</sup>Supported by National Science Foundation Fellowship (Award No. 1502650).

<sup>‡</sup>Supported by NSF grant DMS1501962.

Then

$$H(\sigma) \leq (1 - \vartheta) \log n!, \tag{2}$$

where  $\vartheta > 0$  depends only on  $\varepsilon$ .

(We will usually think of permutations as bijections  $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ ). The original motivation for Leighton and Moitra came mostly from questions about sorting partially ordered sets; see [6] for more on this.

For the special case of *transitive*  $T$ , Theorem 1 was proved in [6] with  $\vartheta_\varepsilon = C\varepsilon^4$ . Note that for a *typical* (a.k.a. *random*)  $T$ , the conjecture’s hypothesis is unachievable, since, as shown long ago by Erdős and Moon [2], no  $\sigma$  agrees with  $T$  on more than a  $(1/2 + o(1))$ -fraction of its arcs. In fact, it seems natural to expect that transitive tournaments are the *worst* instances, being the ones for which the hypothesized agreement is easiest to achieve. From this standpoint, what we do here may be considered somewhat unsatisfactory, as our  $\vartheta$ ’s are quite a bit worse than those in [6]. For transitive  $T$  it’s easy to see [6, Claim 4.14] that one can’t take  $\vartheta$  greater than  $2\varepsilon$ , which seems likely to be close to the truth. We make some progress on this, giving a surprisingly simple proof of the following improvement of [6].

**Theorem 2.** *For  $T, \mathbb{P}, \sigma$  as Theorem 1 with  $T$  transitive,*

$$H(\sigma) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)n \log n.$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 3 following brief preliminaries in Section 2. The underlying idea is similar to that of [6], which in turn was based on the beautiful tournament ranking bound of W. Fernandez de la Vega [1]; see Section 3 (end of “Sketch”) for an indication of the relation to [6]. Theorem 2 is proved in Section 4.

## 2 Preliminaries

*Usage*

In what follows we assume  $n$  is large enough to support our arguments and pretend all large numbers are integers.

As usual  $G[X]$  is the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $X$ ; we use  $G[X, Y]$  for the bipartite subgraph induced (in the obvious sense) by disjoint  $X$  and  $Y$ . For a digraph  $D$ ,  $D[X]$  and  $D[X, Y]$  are used analogously. For both graphs and digraphs, we use  $|\cdot|$  for number of edges (or arcs).

Also as usual, the *density* of a pair  $(X, Y)$  of disjoint subsets of  $V(G)$  is  $d(X, Y) = d_G(X, Y) = |G[X, Y]|/(|X||Y|)$ , and we extend this to bipartite digraphs  $D$  in which

$$\text{at most one of } D \cap (X \times Y), D \cap (Y \times X) \text{ is nonempty.} \quad (3)$$

For a digraph  $D$ ,  $D^r$  is the digraph gotten from  $D$  by reversing its arcs.

Write  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  for the set of permutations of  $[n]$ . For  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , we use  $T_\sigma$  for the corresponding (transitive) tournament on  $[n]$  (that is,  $uv \in T_\sigma$  iff  $\sigma(u) < \sigma(v)$ ) and for a digraph  $D$  (on  $[n]$ ) define

$$\text{fit}(\sigma, D) = |D \cap T_\sigma| - |D^r \cap T_\sigma|$$

(e.g. when  $D$  is a tournament, this is a measure of the quality of  $\sigma$  as a ranking of  $D$ ).

#### *Regularity*

Here we need just Szemerédi's basic notion [7] of a regular pair and a very weak version (Lemma 3) of his Regularity Lemma. As usual a bipartite graph  $H$  on disjoint  $X \cup Y$  is  $\delta$ -regular if

$$|d_H(X', Y') - d_H(X, Y)| < \delta$$

whenever  $X' \subseteq X$ ,  $Y' \subseteq Y$ ,  $|X'| > \delta|X|$  and  $|Y'| > \delta|Y|$ , and we extend this in the obvious way to the situation in (3). It is easy to see that if a bigraph  $H$  is  $\delta$ -regular then its bipartite complement is as well; this implies that for a tournament  $T$  on  $[n]$  and  $X, Y$  disjoint subsets of  $[n]$ ,

$$T \cap (X \times Y) \text{ is } \delta\text{-regular if and only if } T \cap (Y \times X) \text{ is.} \quad (4)$$

The following statement should perhaps be considered folklore, though similar results were proved by János Komlós, circa 1991 (see [5, Sec. 7.3]).

**Lemma 3.** *For each  $\delta > 0$  there is a  $\beta > 2^{-\delta^{-O(1)}}$  such that for any bigraph  $H$  on  $X \cup Y$  with  $|X|, |Y| \geq n$ , there is a  $\delta$ -regular pair  $(X', Y')$  with  $X' \subseteq X, Y' \subseteq Y$  and each of  $|X'|, |Y'|$  at least  $\beta n$ .*

**Corollary 4.** *For each  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\beta$  as in Lemma 3 and digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , there is a partition  $L \cup R \cup W$  of  $V$  such that  $E \cap (L \times R)$  is  $\delta$ -regular and  $\min\{|L|, |R|\} \geq \beta|V|/2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X \cup Y$  be an (arbitrary) equipartition of  $V$  and apply Lemma 3 to the undirected graph  $H$  underlying the digraph  $G \cap (X \times Y)$ .  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1

We now assume that  $\sigma$  drawn from the probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  satisfies (1) and try to show (2) (with  $\vartheta$  TBA). We use  $\mathbb{E}$  for expectation w.r.t.  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mu$  for uniform distribution on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ .

*Sketch and connection with [6]*

We will produce  $S_1, \dots, S_m \subseteq T$  with  $S_i \subseteq L_i \times R_i$  for some disjoint  $L_i, R_i \subseteq [n]$ , satisfying:

- (i) with  $\|S_i\| := \min\{|L_i|, |R_i|\}$ ,  $\sum \|S_i\| = \Omega(n \log n)$  (where the implied constant depends on  $\varepsilon$ );
- (ii) each  $S_i$  is  $\delta$ -regular (with  $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon$  TBA);
- (iii) for all  $i < j$ , either  $(L_i \cup R_i) \cap (L_j \cup R_j) = \emptyset$  or  $L_j \cup R_j$  is contained in one of  $L_i, R_i$  (note this implies the  $S_i$ 's are disjoint).

Let  $A_i = \{\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i) > \varepsilon |S_i|\}$  and  $Q = \{\sum \{\|S_i\| : A_i \text{ occurs}\} = \Omega(n \log n)\}$ . The main points are then:

- (a)  $\mathbb{P}(Q)$  is bounded below by a positive function of  $\varepsilon$ . (This is just (i) together with a couple applications of Markov's Inequality.)
- (b) Regularity of  $S_i$  implies  $\mu(A_i) \leq \exp[-\Omega(\|S_i\|)]$ .
- (c) Under (iii), for any  $I \subseteq [m]$ ,

$$\mu(\cap_{i \in I} A_i) < \exp[-\sum_{i \in I} \Omega(\|S_i\|)]$$

- (a weak version of independence of the  $A_i$ 's under  $\mu$ ).

And these points easily combine to give (2) (see (6) and (8)).

For the transitive case in [6] most of this argument is unnecessary; in particular, regularity disappears and there is a natural *decomposition* of  $T$  into  $S_i$ 's: Supposing  $T = \{ab : a < b\}$  and (for simplicity)  $n = 2^k$ , we may take the  $S_i$ 's to be the sets  $L_i \times R_i$  with  $(L_i, R_i)$  running over pairs

$$([(2s-2)2^{-j}n+1, (2s-1)2^{-j}n], [(2s-1)2^{-j}n+1, 2s2^{-j}n]), \quad (5)$$

with  $j \in [k]$  and  $s \in [2^{j-1}]$ . (As mentioned earlier, this decomposition of the (identity) permutation  $(1, \dots, n)$  also provides the framework for [1].)

After some translation, our argument (really, a fairly small subset thereof) then specializes to essentially what's done in [6].  $\square$

Set  $\delta = .03\varepsilon$  and let  $\beta$  be half the  $\beta$  of Lemma 3 and Corollary 4. We use the corollary to find a rooted tree  $\mathcal{T}$  each of whose internal nodes has degree (number of children) 2 or 3, together with disjoint subsets  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m$  of (the arc set of)  $T$ , corresponding to the internal nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$ . The nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  will be subsets of  $[n]$  (so the *size*,  $|U|$ , of a node  $U$  is its size as a set).

To construct  $\mathcal{T}$ , start with root  $V_1 = [n]$  and repeat the following for  $k = 1, \dots$  until each unprocessed node has size less than (say)  $t := \sqrt{n}$ . Let  $V_k$  be an unprocessed node of size at least  $t$  and apply Corollary 4 to  $T[V_k]$  to produce a partition  $V_k = L_k \cup R_k \cup W_k$ , with  $|L_k|, |R_k| > \beta|V_k|$  and  $S_k := T \cap (L_k \times R_k)$   $\delta$ -regular of density at least  $1/2$ . (Note (4) says we can reverse the roles of  $L_k$  and  $R_k$  if the density of  $T \cap (L_k \times R_k)$  is less than  $1/2$ .) Add  $L_k, R_k, W_k$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  as the children of  $V_k$  and mark  $V_k$  "processed." (Note the  $V_k$ 's are the *internal* nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$ ; nodes of size less than  $t$  are not processed and are automatically leaves. Note also that there is no restriction on  $|W_k|$  and that, for  $k > 1$ ,  $V_k$  is equal to one of  $L_i, R_i, W_i$  for some  $i < k$ .)

Let  $m$  be the number of internal nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  (the final tree). Note that the leaves of  $\mathcal{T}$  have size at most  $t$  and that the  $S_i$ 's satisfy (ii) and (iii) of the proof sketch; that they also satisfy (i) is shown by the next lemma.

Set

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m |V_i|;$$

this quantity will play a central role in what follows.

**Lemma 5.**  $\Lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}n \log_3 n$

*Proof.* This will follow easily from the next general (presumably known) observation, for which we assume  $\mathcal{T}$  is a tree satisfying:

- the nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  are subsets of  $S$ , an  $s$ -set which is also the root of  $\mathcal{T}$ ;
- the children of each internal node  $U$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  form a partition of  $U$  with at most  $b$  blocks;
- the leaves of  $\mathcal{T}$  are  $U_1, \dots, U_r$ , with  $|U_i| = u_i \leq t$  (any  $t$ ) and depth  $d_i$ .

**Lemma 6.** *With the setup above,  $\sum u_i d_i \geq s \log_b(s/t)$ .*

(Of course this is exact if  $\mathcal{T}$  is the complete  $b$ -ary tree of depth  $d$  and all leaves have size  $2^{-b}s$ ).

*Proof.* Recall that the *relative entropy* between probability distributions  $p$  and  $q$  on  $[r]$  is

$$D(p||q) = \sum p_i \log(q_i/p_i) \leq 0$$

(the inequality given by the concavity of the logarithm). We apply this with  $p_i = u_i/s$  and  $q_i$  the probability that the ordinary random walk down the tree ends at  $u_i$ . In particular  $q_i \geq b^{-d_i}$ , which, with nonpositivity of  $D(p||q)$  and the assumption  $u_i \leq t$ , gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum (u_i/s) d_i \log b &\geq \sum (u_i/s) \log(1/q_i) \\ &\geq \sum (u_i/s) \log(s/u_i) \geq \log(s/t). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows.  $\square$

This gives Lemma 5 since  $\sum |V_i| = \sum_U |U| d(U)$ , with  $U$  ranging over leaves of  $\mathcal{T}$  (and  $d(\cdot)$  again denoting depth).  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *The number  $m$  of internal nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  is less than  $n$ .*

*Proof.* A straightforward induction shows that the number of leaves of a rooted tree is  $1 + \sum (b(w) - 1)$ , where  $w$  ranges over internal nodes and  $b$  denotes number of children. The lemma follows since here the number of leaves is at most  $n$  (actually at most  $3\sqrt{n}$ ) and each  $d(w)$  is at least 2.  $\square$

Recalling that  $A_i = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \text{fit}(\sigma, S_i) \geq \varepsilon |S_i|\}$  and that  $\mathbb{E}$  refers to  $\mathbb{P}$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)] \geq 2\varepsilon |S_i|$ , which with

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)] \leq \mathbb{P}(A_i) |S_i| + (1 - \mathbb{P}(A_i)) \varepsilon |S_i| \leq (\mathbb{P}(A_i) + \varepsilon) |S_i|$$

gives  $\mathbb{P}(A_i) \geq \varepsilon$  (essentially Markov's Inequality applied to  $|S_i| - \text{fit}(\sigma, S_i)$ ).

Set  $\xi_i = |V_i| \mathbf{1}_{A_i}$  and  $\xi = \sum_i \xi_i$ , and let  $Q$  be the event  $\{\xi \geq \varepsilon \Lambda / 2\}$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i] = |V_i| \mathbb{P}(A_i) \geq \varepsilon |V_i|$ , implying  $\mathbb{E}[\xi] = \sum \mathbb{E}[\xi_i] \geq \varepsilon \Lambda$ , and (since  $\xi_i \leq |V_i|$ )  $\xi \leq \Lambda$ ; so using Markov's Inequality as above gives  $\mathbb{P}(Q) \geq \varepsilon / 2$ .

Thus, with  $\sigma$  chosen from  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  according to  $\mathbb{P}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma) &\leq 1 + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Q)) \log n! + \mathbb{P}(Q) \log |Q| \\ &= 1 + \log n! + \mathbb{P}(Q) \log \mu(Q) \leq 1 + \log n! + (\varepsilon / 2) \log \mu(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

(recall  $\mu$  is the uniform measure on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ ).

Let

$$\mathcal{J} = \{I \subseteq [m] : \sum_{i \in I} |V_i| \geq \varepsilon \Lambda / 2\}$$

and, for  $I \in \mathcal{J}$ , let  $A_I = \cap_{i \in I} A_i$ . Set

$$b = \varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^3 / 33 \quad (7)$$

(see (12) for the reason for the choice of  $b$ ). We will show, for each  $I \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

$$\mu(A_I) \leq e^{-b\varepsilon\Lambda/2}, \quad (8)$$

which implies

$$\log \mu(Q) = \log \mu(\cup_{I \in \mathcal{J}} A_I) \leq \log |\mathcal{J}| - (b\varepsilon\Lambda \log e)/2 \leq n - (b\varepsilon\Lambda \log e)/2,$$

the second inequality following from  $|\mathcal{J}| \leq 2^m$  together with Lemma 7. With  $c = \varepsilon^3 \delta \beta^3 / 150 < (b\varepsilon \log_3 e)/4$ , this bounds (for large  $n$ ) the r.h.s. of (6) by

$$(1 - \varepsilon c/2) \log n!,$$

which proves Theorem 1 with  $\vartheta = \varepsilon^4 \delta \beta^3 / 300 = \exp[-\varepsilon^{-O(1)}]$ .  $\square$

The rest of our discussion is devoted to the proof of (8). For a digraph  $D \subseteq L \times R$  with  $L, R$  disjoint subsets of  $V$ , say a pair  $(X, Y)$  of disjoint subsets of  $[n]$  with  $|X| = |L|$ ,  $|Y| = |R|$  is *safe* for  $D$  if

$$\text{fit}(\tau, D) < \varepsilon |L| |R| / 4 \quad (9)$$

for every bijection  $\tau : L \cup R \rightarrow X \cup Y$  with  $\tau(L) = X$  (where  $\text{fit}(\tau, D)$  has the obvious meaning). We also say  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  is *safe* for  $D$  if  $(\sigma(L), \sigma(R))$  is. Note that since  $S_i$  has density at least  $1/2$  in  $L_i \times R_i$ , the  $\sigma$ 's in  $A_i$  are unsafe for  $S_i$ .

**Lemma 8.** *Assume the above setup with  $|L| + |R| = l$  and  $|L| = \gamma l$ , and set  $\lambda = 2\delta$  and  $\zeta = \varepsilon \delta \gamma (1 - \gamma) / 4$ . Let  $I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_r$  be the natural partition of  $X \cup Y$  into intervals of size  $\lambda$ . If  $D$  is  $\delta$ -regular and*

$$|X \cap I_j| = (\gamma \lambda \pm \zeta) l \quad \forall j \in [r], \quad (10)$$

then  $(X, Y)$  is safe for  $D$ .

(Of course an *interval* of  $Z = \{i_1 < \dots < i_u\}$  is one of the sets  $\{i_s, \dots, i_{s+t}\}$ .)

*Proof.* For  $\tau$  as in the line after (9), let  $L_j = L \cap \tau^{-1}(I_j)$  and  $R_j = R \cap \tau^{-1}(I_j)$  ( $j \in [r]$ ). Then

$$|\text{fit}(\tau, D)| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} ||D \cap (L_i \times R_j)| - |D \cap (L_j \times R_i)|| + \gamma(1 - \gamma)\lambda l^2. \quad (11)$$

Here the last term is an upper bound on the contribution of pairs contained in the  $I_j$ 's: if  $|L_j| = \gamma_j |I_j| = \gamma_j \lambda l$  (so  $|R_j| = (1 - \gamma_j) \lambda l$  and  $\sum \gamma_j = \gamma / \lambda$ ), then

$$\sum \gamma_j (1 - \gamma_j) \leq \sum \gamma_j - (\sum \gamma_j)^2 / r = (\gamma - \gamma^2) / \lambda$$

gives

$$\sum |L_j| |R_j| = \sum \gamma_j (1 - \gamma_j) \lambda^2 l^2 \leq \gamma (1 - \gamma) \lambda l^2.$$

On the other hand, regularity and (10) (which implies  $|L_i| > \delta |L|$  ( $= \delta \gamma l$ ) since  $\gamma \lambda - \zeta > \gamma \delta$ , and similarly  $|R_i| > \delta |R|$ ) give, for all  $i \neq j$ ,

$$|D \cap (L_i \times R_j)| = (d \pm \delta) |L_i| |R_j|,$$

where  $d$  is the density of  $D$ . Combining this with (10) bounds each of the summands in (11) by

$$\begin{aligned} & [(d + \delta)(\gamma \lambda + \zeta)((1 - \gamma) \lambda + \zeta) - (d - \delta)(\gamma \lambda - \zeta)((1 - \gamma) \lambda - \zeta)] l^2 \\ & = 2[\lambda \zeta d + \delta(\gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda^2 + \zeta^2)] l^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the r.h.s. of (11) by

$$\left\{ 2 \binom{r}{2} [\lambda \zeta d + \delta(\gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda^2 + \zeta^2)] + \gamma(1 - \gamma) \lambda \right\} l^2 < \varepsilon \gamma (1 - \gamma) l^2 / 4.$$

(The main term on the l.h.s. is the one with  $\lambda \zeta d$ , which, since  $r^{-1} = \lambda = 2\delta$ , is less than half the r.h.s. The second and third terms are much smaller (the second since  $\delta$  is much smaller than  $\varepsilon$ .)  $\square$

**Corollary 9.** *For  $D$  and parameters as in Lemma 8, and  $\sigma$  uniform from  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ ,*

$$\Pr(\sigma \text{ is unsafe for } D) < 2r \exp[-2\zeta^2 l / \lambda].$$

*Proof.* Let  $(X, Y) = (\sigma(L), \sigma(R))$ . Once we've chosen  $X \cup Y$  (determining  $I_1, \dots, I_r$ ),  $2 \exp[-2\zeta^2 l / \lambda]$  is the usual Hoeffding bound [3, Eq. (2.3)] on the probability that  $X$  violates (10) for a given  $j$ . (The bound may be more familiar when elements of  $X \cup Y$  are in  $X$  independently, but also applies to the *hypergeometric* r.v.  $|X \cap I_j|$ ; see e.g. [4, Thm. 2.10 and (2.12)].)  $\square$

*Proof of (8).* Let

$$B_i = \{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n : \sigma \text{ is unsafe for } S_i\}$$

and  $B_I = \cap_{i \in I} B_i$ . Then  $A_i \subseteq B_i$  (as noted above) and (therefore)  $A_I \subseteq B_I$ . Moreover—perhaps the central point—the  $B_i$ 's are independent, since  $B_i$  depends only on the relative positions of  $\sigma(L_i)$  and  $\sigma(R_i)$  within  $\sigma(V_i)$ .



On the other hand, Corollary 9, applied with  $D = S_i$  (so  $L = L_i$ ,  $R = R_i$ ,  $l = |L_i| + |R_i|$  and  $\gamma = |L_i|/l \in (\beta, 1 - \beta)$ ) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(B_i) &< 2r \exp[-2\zeta^2 l/\lambda] < 2r \exp[-\varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^2 l/64] \\ &< 2r \exp[-\varepsilon^2 \delta \beta^3 |V_i|/32] < e^{-b|V_i|}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

(Recall  $b$  was defined in (7); since we assume  $|V_i|$  is large ( $|V_i| > t = \sqrt{n}$ ), the choice leaves a little room to absorb the  $2r$ .) And of course (12) and the independence of the  $B_i$ 's give (8).  $\square$

## 4 Back to the transitive case

Theorem 2 is an easy consequence of the next observation.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $\mathbf{Y}$  a random  $m$ -subset of  $[2m]$  satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}|\{(a, b) : a < b, a \in [2m] \setminus \mathbf{Y}, b \in \mathbf{Y}\}| > (\tfrac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)m^2. \quad (13)$$

*Then  $H(\mathbf{Y}) < (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)2m$ .*

To get Theorem 2 from this, let  $T = \{ab : a < b\}$  and, for simplicity,  $n = 2^k$ , and decompose  $T = \bigcup (L_i \times R_i)$  as in (5). For each  $i$ , say with  $|L_i| (= |R_i|) = m_i$ , let  $\mathbf{Y}_i \subseteq [2m_i]$  consist of the indices of positions within  $\sigma(L_i \cup R_i)$  occupied by  $\sigma(R_i)$ ; that is, if  $\sigma(L_i \cup R_i) = \{j_1 < \dots < j_{2m_i}\}$ , then  $\mathbf{Y}_i = \{l : j_l \in \sigma(R_i)\}$ . Then Lemma 10 (its hypothesis provided by (1)) gives

$$H(\mathbf{Y}_i) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)2m_i;$$

so, since  $\sigma$  is determined by the  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ 's, we have

$$H(\sigma) \leq \sum H(\mathbf{Y}_i) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2/8) \sum (2m_i) = (1 - \varepsilon^2/8)n \log n. \quad \square$$

*Remark.* Note that the  $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$  of Theorem 2 is the best one can do without more fully exploiting (1) (that is, beyond (13) for the  $(L_i, R_i, Y_i)$ 's, which is all we are using).

*Proof of Lemma 10.* For  $a \in [2m]$ , set  $\mathbb{P}(a \in \mathbf{Y}) = 1/2 + \delta_a$ . Then

$$H(\mathbf{Y}) \leq \sum_a H(1/2 + \delta_a) \leq \sum_a (1 - 2\delta_a^2)$$

(where the 2 could actually be  $2 \log e$ ); so it is enough to show

$$\sum \delta_a^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 m/8.$$

For a given  $m$ -subset  $Y$  of  $[2m]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(Y) &:= |\{(a, b) : a < b, a \in [2m] \setminus Y, b \in Y\}| \\ &= \sum_{b \in Y} (b-1) - \binom{m}{2} = \sum_{b \in Y} b - \binom{m+1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(the first sum counts pairs  $(a, b)$  with  $a < b$  and  $b \in Y$ , and  $\binom{m}{2}$  is the number of such pairs with  $a$  also in  $Y$ ); so we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon\right)m^2 < \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta_b\right)b - \binom{m+1}{2} = \sum \delta_b b + m^2/2,$$

implying  $\sum \delta_b b > \varepsilon m^2$ . Combining this with  $2m \sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b \geq \sum \delta_b b$ , we have  $\sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b > \varepsilon m/2$  and then, using Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\sum \delta_b^2 \geq \sum_{\delta_b > 0} \delta_b^2 \geq \frac{1}{2m} (\varepsilon m/2)^2 = \varepsilon^2 m/8. \quad \square$$

## References

- [1] W. Fernandez de la Vega, On the maximal cardinality of a consistent set of arcs in a random tournament, *J. Comb. Th. Series B* (1983), 328-332.
- [2] P. Erdős and J. Moon, On sets of consistent arcs in a tournament, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **8** (1965), 269-271.
- [3] W. Hoeffding, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables, *J. Amer. Statistical Assoc.* **58** (1963), 13-30.
- [4] S. Janson, T. Łuczak and A. Ruciński, *Random Graphs*, Wiley, New York, 2000.
- [5] J. Komlós and M. Simonovits, Szemerédi's regularity lemma and its applications in graph theory, *Combinatorics, Paul Erdős is eighty, Vol. 2 (Keszthely, 1993)*, 295-352, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud. 2, János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 1996.
- [6] T. Leighton and A. Moitra, On Entropy and Extensions of Posets, manuscript 2011. <http://people.csail.mit.edu/moitra/docs/poset.pdf>.
- [7] E. Szemerédi, Regular Partitions of Graphs, pp. 399-401 in *Problèmes Combinatoires et Théorie des Graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976)*, Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), 1978.