

PROJECTIVE AND EXTERNAL SATURATION PROBLEM FOR POSETS

DÖMÖTÖR PÁLVÖLGYI AND BALÁZS PATKÓS

ABSTRACT. We introduce two variants of the poset saturation problem. For a poset P and the Boolean lattice \mathcal{B}_n , a family \mathcal{F} of sets, not necessarily from \mathcal{B}_n , is *projective P -saturated* if (i) it does not contain any strong copies of P , (ii) for any $G \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$, the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$ contains a strong copy of P , and (iii) for any two different $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $F \cap [n] \neq F' \cap [n]$. Ordinary strongly P -saturated families, i.e., subfamilies \mathcal{F} required to be from \mathcal{B}_n satisfying (i) and (ii), automatically satisfy (iii) as they lie within \mathcal{B}_n . We study what phenomena are valid both for the ordinary saturation number $\text{sat}^*(n, P)$ and the projective saturation number $\text{psat}(n, P)$, the size of the smallest projective P -saturated family.

Note that the projective saturation number might differ for a poset and its dual. We also introduce an even more relaxed and symmetric version of poset saturation, *external saturation*. We conjecture that all finite posets have bounded external saturation number, and prove this in some special cases.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this short note, we add several new notions and some related results to the growing literature of poset saturation problems. $\mathcal{B}_n = (2^{[n]}, \subseteq)$ denotes the Boolean poset of dimension n .

We say that a family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$ is a *weak copy* of a poset P if there exists a bijective poset-homomorphism from P to \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{G} is a *strong copy* of P if there exists a poset-isomorphism between P and \mathcal{G} . A family that does not contain a weak / strong copy of P is called *weak / strong P -free*. The extremal numbers $La(n, P)$ and $La^*(n, P)$ denote the maximum number of sets in a weak / strong P -free family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$. In the past four decades, there have been a huge interest in determining (the asymptotics of) these parameters. For a survey, see [7] or [6, Chapter 7].

The first instance of the corresponding saturation problem was introduced in [5], and the general problem was formalized in [3]: Let $\text{sat}(n, P)$ / $\text{sat}^*(n, P)$ denote the minimum size of a weak / strong P -free family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$ such that $\{G\} \cup \mathcal{F}$ contains a weak / strong copy of P for any $G \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$. So far research has mainly focused on the cases when P is an antichain [1, 2, 3], a chain [5, 12], from a special subclass of posets [3], or sporadic particular

DP was partially supported by the ERC Advanced Grant “ERMiD” and by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and by the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP-22-5 and by the Thematic Excellence Program TKP2021-NKTA-62 of the National Research, Development and Innovation Office.

Patkós’s research is partially supported by NKFIH grants SNN 129364 and FK 132060.

posets [3, 8, 9, 11]. A general dichotomy phenomenon was stated first in [10]: For any poset P , $\text{sat}^*(n, P)$ is either bounded by a constant or grows at least as a logarithmic function of n . This was recently improved as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (Freschi, Sharifzadeh, Spiga, Treglown [4]). *For any poset P , either there exists a constant c_P^* such that $\text{sat}^*(n, P) \leq c_P^*$ holds for all n or we have $\text{sat}^*(n, P) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$.*

In [10], it was shown that for any poset P we have $\text{sat}(n, P) \leq c_P$ for some constant c_P depending only on P and not on n .

1.1. Projective saturation. The constant upper bounds of [10] and Theorem 1.1 tell us that the “(size of the) underlying set might not matter.” This leads us to the idea to allow the saturated families \mathcal{F} to contain arbitrary sets, while keeping the aim that every $G \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$ should create a copy of the forbidden poset P . Will this change make strong saturation numbers constant, or will proofs become easier in this more general setting?

As $\text{sat}(n, P)$ is always bounded by a constant, from here on, all copies of any poset in this note are going to be strong copies unless otherwise stated. The formal definition is as follows. Note that N does not really play any role.

Definition 1.2. A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}_N$ is *projective P -saturated* for \mathcal{B}_n if

- (i) \mathcal{F} is P -free,
- (ii) for any $G \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$, the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$ contains a copy of P ,
- (iii) for any two different $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\pi(F) := F \cap [n] \neq F' \cap [n] = \pi(F')$.

The minimum size that a projective P -saturated family for \mathcal{B}_n can have is denoted by $\pi\text{sat}(n, P)$. By definition, we have $\pi\text{sat}(n, P) \leq \text{sat}^*(n, P)$.

Observe that if we omit the last condition of Definition 1.2, then the problem becomes a lot less interesting.


Proposition 1.3. *For any poset P , the saturation number satisfying only conditions (i) and (ii) of Definition 1.2 is $|P|$ or $|P| - 1$, depending on whether P contains a smallest element or not, provided that 2^n is at least this big.*

We will be interested in what statements on $\text{sat}^*(n, P)$ remain true for $\pi\text{sat}(n, P)$, and whether those that do, will need a new proof or not. Our first observation is that both the proof of the weaker dichotomy statement of [10] and that of Theorem 1.1 work word-by-word in this scenario.

Theorem 1.4. *For any poset P either there exists a constant $c_{\pi, P}$ such that $\pi\text{sat}^*(n, P) \leq c_{\pi, P}$ holds for all n or we have $\pi\text{sat}^*(n, P) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$.*

The interested reader can find the proof of Theorem 1.4 in Appendix A. On the other hand, we will show that the class of posets P for which $\pi\text{sat}(n, P)$ is constant is a *strict* superclass of those for which $\text{sat}^*(n, P)$ is constant.

We denote by A_k the k -element antichain, and by C_k the k -element chain. The fork \vee_k , the cherry \wedge_k , and the diamond D_k have point sets $\{a, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k\}$, $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k, c\}$, and

FIGURE 1. Hasse diagrams of \vee_k , \wedge_k and D_k

$\{a, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k, c\}$, respectively, with $a < b_i < c$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and the b_i 's forming an antichain (see Figure 1).

All of \wedge_k , \vee_k , and D_k have unbounded sat^* -value if $k \geq 2$. This was shown in [3] using the so-called *unique cover twin property* (UCTP). A poset P has UCTP if whenever q is the unique cover of p in z , then there exists an element $z \in P$, not equal to p , of which the only cover is also q . The next proposition shows that $\pi\text{sat}(n, P)$ can be bounded for posets with UCTP. For a poset P , we denote by kP the poset obtained by k pairwise incomparable copies of P . The unboundedness of $\text{sat}^*(n, 2C_2)$ (where $2C_2$ is the union of two incomparable chains on two elements each) was shown in [10].

Proposition 1.5.

- (i) For any $k \geq 2$, we have $\pi\text{sat}(n, \wedge_k), \pi\text{sat}(n, D_k) \leq 2k + 1$.
- (ii) We have $\pi\text{sat}(n, 2C_2) \leq 8$

On the other hand, we show that if $P = A_k$ for some $k \geq 2$, then there does not exist any projective A_k -saturated family that is not simply A_k -saturated.

Proposition 1.6. For any $k \geq 1$, if \mathcal{F} is projective A_{k+1} -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n , then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$. In particular, $\pi\text{sat}(n, A_{k+1}) = \text{sat}^*(n, A_{k+1})$.

Although the UCTP proof of [3] does not remain valid in the context of $\pi\text{sat}(n, P)$, with some extra work, however, one can save the argument for \vee_k . The next proposition, together with Proposition 1.5, shows that another phenomenon of sat^* does not hold for πsat : if P^D is the dual of P obtained by reversing all relations of P , then by taking complements of P -saturated families, it is clear that $\text{sat}^*(n, P) = \text{sat}^*(n, P^D)$ holds for all P , but we can have $\pi\text{sat}^*(n, P) \neq \pi\text{sat}^*(n, P^D)$.

Proposition 1.7. For any n , we have $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee) = \text{sat}^*(n, \vee) = n + 1$.

For any $k \geq 2$, we have $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee_k) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$.

1.2. External saturation. As $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee) \neq \pi\text{sat}(n, \wedge)$, it is natural to attempt to find a more symmetric variant of projective saturation, for example, by fixing some $AB_n = \{A \cup B : B \in \mathcal{B}_n\}$ for some $A \subset \{n + 1, \dots, N\}$, and requiring saturation only in AB_n . Again, N does not really play any role.

Definition 1.8. A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}_N$ is *external P -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n* if there exists $A \subseteq [n+1, N]$ such that

- (i) \mathcal{F} is P -free,
- (ii) for any $G \in A\mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$, the family $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$ contains a copy of P ,
- (iii) for any two different $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\pi(F) := F \cap [n] \neq F' \cap [n] = \pi(F')$.

The minimum size that an external P -saturated family for $A\mathcal{B}_n$ can have is denoted by $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P)$. Observe that if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_N$ is external P -saturated for $A\mathcal{B}_n$, then $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \{[N] \setminus F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is external P^D -saturated for $A'\mathcal{B}_n$, where $A' = [N] \setminus ([n] \cup A)$. Thus, we have $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P) \leq \min\{\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P), \mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P^D)\}$.

The proof of the dichotomy results Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4 remain valid for external saturation, but since surprisingly we do not have an example of P with unbounded external saturation number, we have the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.9. $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P) \leq C_P$ for every P for some C_P independent of n .

However, it is easy to see that the class of posets for which $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(P, n)$ is bounded by a constant is a strict superclass of those posets for which $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P)$ is a constant. This follows by considering \vee_k for which $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, \vee_k) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ by Proposition 1.7, but $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, \vee_k) \leq \mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, \wedge_k) \leq 2k + 1$ by Proposition 1.5. It is again not hard to see that there exist posets P for which both $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P)$ and $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P^D)$ are unbounded, but $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P)$ is bounded by a constant. The simplest such poset is the antichain A_k for any $k \geq 2$.

Proposition 1.10. $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, A_k) = k - 1$ for all k and n .

Proof. Let $N = n + 2$ and $A = \{n + 1\}$. Take any antichain \mathcal{X} with $k - 1$ elements from \mathcal{B}_n , and let $\mathcal{F} = \{F \cup \{n + 2\} \mid F \in \mathcal{X}\}$. This is clearly A_k -free, and it is also A_k -saturated for $A\mathcal{B}_n$, as each element of $A\mathcal{B}_n$ is incomparable to each element of \mathcal{F} . \square

Our final contribution is a class of height 2 posets for which we can prove Conjecture 1.9 by constructing external saturated families of constant size. It is easy to see that if the comparability graph of P contains an isolated vertex or an isolated edge, then $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P) = |P| - 1$ provided $2^n \geq |P| - 1$ (we do not need $h(P) = 2$ for this). Indeed, we can have $N = n + 2$, $A = \{n + 1\}$, then if $p \in P$ is an isolated vertex and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a copy of $P \setminus \{p\}$, then $\{G \cup \{n + 2\} : G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is external P -saturated for $A\mathcal{B}_n$. Similarly, if P has a C_2 -component, and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a copy of $P \setminus C_2$, then $\{\{n + 1\}\} \cup \{G \cup \{n + 2\} : G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is external P -saturated for $A\mathcal{B}_n$.

Let $P = P_1 \cup P_2$ be a height two poset with P_1 being the set of minimal elements of P and $P_2 = P \setminus P_1$ being the set of maximal, but not also minimal, elements. We say that a height 2 family $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathcal{B}_n$ is *almost saturated* if it is P -free and adding any $F \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{F}$ creates a weak copy of P that is almost strong, in the following sense. If F is on the top level of the copy, it might have extra containment relations with the members of \mathcal{F}_2 , while if F is on the bottom level, it might have extra containment relations with the members of \mathcal{F}_1 , but otherwise all containments are exactly the same as in P .

Proposition 1.11. *Suppose that for some height two, isolated C_2 -free poset P we have an almost saturated family $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$. Then $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, P) \leq 2|\mathcal{F}|$ for every n .*

This can be applied to $K_{s,t}$, the poset whose Hasse-diagram is a complete bipartite graph on $s + t$ vertices.

Corollary 1.12. $\mathbb{I}\text{sat}(n, K_{s,t}) \leq 4(s + t - 1)$ for all s, t, n .

We could also prove Conjecture 1.9 for some other specific posets, but we do not have any other interesting general result.

2. PROOFS

Proof of Proposition 1.3. If $2^n < |P|$, then $P \not\subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$, so $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}_n$ is saturated.

Otherwise, $|P| - 1$ is clearly a lower bound, as if \mathcal{F} consists of at most $|P| - 2$ sets, then $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$ cannot contain any copies of a poset of size $|P|$. Also, if P does not contain a smallest element, then the empty set does not help to create any copy of P , and thus it must be an additional element of any P -saturated family.

On the other hand, fix a minimal element $p \in P$ and a copy $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}_N$ of $P \setminus \{p\}$ such that $\emptyset \neq F \subset \{n + 1, \dots, N\}$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, i.e., $\pi(F) = \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$ but $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$. Also fix a bijection $f : P \setminus \{p\} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. Then $\mathcal{G} := \{f(q) : p \not\leq q\} \cup \{[n] \cup f(q) : p \leq q\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ P -saturates any $H \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{G}$ with H playing the role of p for any H . For example, if $P = \wedge$, then we can take $\mathcal{F} = \{\{n + 1\}, \{n + 1, n + 2\}\}$, and $\mathcal{G} = \{\{n + 1\}, [n + 2], \emptyset\}$. Moreover, if P has a smallest element, then even $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ will P -saturate — note that in this case all elements of \mathcal{G} contain $[n]$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.5. The same construction works for D_k and \wedge_k , proving (1). Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{n,k} := \{\emptyset, [n + k - 1], [2k - 2] \cup \{n + k\}\} \cup \{\{i, n + i\}, \{k - 1 + i, n + k\} : i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1\}.$$

Observe that $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ consists of 2 incomparable \wedge_{k-1} posets, plus the \emptyset , so it is \wedge_k - and thus D_k -free. Furthermore, if $F \in \mathcal{B}_n \setminus (\{\emptyset\} \cup \{\{i\} : i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1\})$, then $F, [n + k - 1], \{\{i, n + i\} : i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1\}$ form a copy of \wedge_k (and together with \emptyset a copy of D_k). Finally, $\{j\}, [2k - 2] \cup \{n + k\}, \{\{k - 1 + i, n + k\} : i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1\}$ form a copy of \wedge_k (together with \emptyset a copy of D_k) for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. So $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ is indeed projective \wedge_k - and D_k -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n .

To prove (2), we can take the following projective $2C_2$ -saturated family of size 8:

$$\emptyset, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, n + 1\}, \{1, 2, 3, n + 1\}, [n] \setminus \{2\}, [n + 1] \setminus \{1\}.$$

It can be verified with a similar simple case analysis, which we omit here, that this family is indeed projective $2C_2$ -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n . \square

Proof of Proposition 1.6. Suppose that there exists a family \mathcal{F} that is projective A_{k+1} -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n such that $F \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{B}_n$. Let us pick F such that $|F|$ is minimal over all $F' \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{B}_n$. As \mathcal{F} is A_{k+1} -free, one can partition \mathcal{F} into k many chains $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{C_1^1 \subset C_2^1 \subset \dots \subset C_{i_j}^1\}, \mathcal{C}_2, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$,

and assume that F is the j th set in \mathcal{C}_1 . Then by the minimality of $|F|$, we have $C_{j-1}^1 \in \mathcal{B}_n$, and as $\pi(A) \neq \pi(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, we must have $C_{j-1}^1 \subsetneq \pi(F)$. Also, $\pi(F) \notin \mathcal{F}$ as $F \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{B}_n$. But then $\pi(F)$ can be added to \mathcal{C}_1 and so $\mathcal{F} \cup \{\pi(F)\}$ is still a union of k chains and thus A_{k+1} -free. This contradiction finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.7. For the upper bound, observe that for any $k \leq n$ we have $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee_k) \leq \text{sat}^*(n, \vee_k) \leq n + 1$ shown by the family $\binom{[n]}{\geq n-1} = \{F \subseteq [n] : |F| \geq n - 1\}$.

The beginning of the proof of both lower bounds is the same. Let \mathcal{F} be a projective \vee_k -saturated family for \mathcal{B}_n . We write $\mathcal{F}^{in} = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{B}_n$ and $\mathcal{F}^{out} = \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{B}_n$. We start with a claim that states that every pair $A \in \mathcal{F}^{in}, B \in \mathcal{F}^{out}$ is incomparable. Clearly, we cannot have $B \subseteq A$.

Claim 2.1. There does not exist any pair $A \in \mathcal{F}^{in}, B \in \mathcal{F}^{out}$ with $A \subseteq B$.

Proof. Suppose there are such A and B , and consider such a pair that minimizes $|\pi(B)|$ over all such pairs. As $B \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\pi(B) \notin \mathcal{F}$, so there exist $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\pi(B), F_1, \dots, F_k$ form a copy of \vee_k . If $\pi(B)$ is the root of this copy, then A, F_1, \dots, F_k form a copy of \vee_k in \mathcal{F} —a contradiction. If $\pi(B)$ is not the root but, say, F_1 is, then the only way how B, F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k would not form a copy of \vee_k is $F_i \subset B$ for some $2 \leq i \leq k$. But then $F_i \notin \mathcal{B}_n$ would contradict the choice of B , while $F_i \in \mathcal{B}_n$ would mean $F_i \subset \pi(B)$ contradicting that $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k, \pi(B)$ form a copy of \vee_k with F_1 being the root, as then F_i and $\pi(B)$ should be incomparable. \square

Claim 2.1 implies that if $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{in}$ and thus $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \text{sat}^*(n, \vee_k)$.

Claim 2.2. The set $[n]$ belongs to \mathcal{F} .

Proof. Suppose not. Then $[n], F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k$ is a copy of \vee_k for some $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}$. If $[n]$ is the root, then $\pi(F_i) = [n]$ for all i —a contradiction as $k \geq 2$. If, say, F_1 is the root, then $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}^{in}$ as $F_1 \subseteq [n]$, while for all other i we must have $F_i \in \mathcal{F}^{out}$ as $[n]$ and F_i must be incomparable. But then $F \subset F_i$ contradicts Claim 2.1. \square

Next, we prove $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee_k) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$. As in [3], it is enough to prove that for any $x, y \in [n]$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $|F \cap \{x, y\}| = 1$. We borrow ideas from [3, Lemma 8]. Suppose towards a contradiction that for some $x, y \in [n]$, we have that for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ the size of $F \cap \{x, y\}$ is either 0 or 2. We will show that then $F \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, which would contradict Claim 2.2. So let us fix a minimum size S such that $S_{x,y} := S \cup \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Observe first that whenever $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is incomparable to $S_x := S \cup \{x\}$, then so are F and $S_{x,y}$. Indeed, if $|F \cap \{x, y\}| = 0$, then the incomparability of F and S_x yields the existence of an element $z \in F \setminus S_{x,y}$ and thus F and $S_{x,y}$ are incomparable. If $F \supset \{x, y\}$, then by choice of S , we have $|F| \geq |S_{x,y}|$, and thus the only possibility for comparability is $F \supset S_{x,y} \supset S_x$, which contradicts the incomparability of F and S_x .

As $F \cap \{x, y\}$ has size 0 or 2 for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we know that $S_x \notin \mathcal{F}$, and thus there exists $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\{S_x\} \cup \mathcal{F}'$ is a copy of \vee_k . We claim that if $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ covers S_x in the poset structure of $\{S_x\} \cup \mathcal{F}'$, then F covers $S_{x,y}$ in the poset structure of $\{S_{x,y}\} \cup \mathcal{F}'$. Indeed, the only problem could be when S_x is the root of the copy $\{S_x\} \cup \mathcal{F}'$ of \vee_k . So all $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ contains

x and thus y . As they are incomparable, they all must properly contain $S_{x,y}$. These statements and the previous paragraph imply that $\{S_{x,y}\} \cup \mathcal{F}'$ is a copy of \vee_k , which contradicts the \vee_k -free property of \mathcal{F} .

Next, we prove the lower bound $\pi\text{sat}(n, \vee) \geq n + 1$. Consider the family $\pi(\mathcal{F}^{\text{out}}) = \{\pi(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{out}}\}$ and the downset \mathcal{D} generated by $\pi(\mathcal{F}^{\text{out}})$, i.e., $\mathcal{D} = \{G : \exists F \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{out}} \text{ such that } G \subseteq \pi(F)\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ by Claim 2.1. So $\mathcal{F}^{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{U} := \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Also, for any $G \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{F}$, in the copy G, F, F' of \vee , we must have $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{in}}$. Indeed, by the definition of \mathcal{U} , G is only comparable to sets in \mathcal{F}^{in} , and Claim 2.1 ensures that then both F, F' must belong to \mathcal{F}^{in} .

The remainder of the proof is a slight modification of that in [3] showing $\text{sat}^*(n, \vee) = n + 1$, which we include here for completeness. Our goal is to define an injection $f : \binom{[n]}{n-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \setminus \{[n]\}$. If we manage to do so, then Claim 2.2 ensures $|\mathcal{F}| \geq n + 1$. If for some $G \in \binom{[n]}{n-1}$ there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\pi(F) = G$ (in particular, if $G \in \mathcal{F}$), then we let $f(G) = F$. Otherwise, there exist $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{in}}$ that form a copy of \vee with G . As $[n]$ is the only one set in \mathcal{F}^{in} that contains G , G cannot be the root of this copy, so we can assume that the root is F . Let us pick F, F' such that $|F'|$ is minimal. We let $f(G) = F$.

To show that f is an injection, denote by x the element for which $G = [n] \setminus \{x\}$. Following [3], we show that $F' = F \cup \{x\}$. As $F' \not\subseteq G$, we have $x \in F'$. Define $F'_{-x} = F' \setminus \{x\}$. Suppose for contradiction that $F \neq F'_{-x}$. It is clear that $F \subseteq F'_{-x}$, as $x \notin F \subsetneq F'$. By the minimality of F' , then $F'_{-x} \notin \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is projective \vee -saturated, $\mathcal{F} \cup \{F'_{-x}\}$ contains a copy of \vee . As $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F \subsetneq F'_{-x}$, in this copy F'_{-x} cannot be the smallest element, or we could replace it with F , contradicting that \mathcal{F} is \vee -free. So we have some $H \subsetneq F'_{-x}$ and $H' \not\subseteq F'_{-x}$ in \mathcal{F} such that $H \subsetneq H'$. As F', H, H' cannot form a \vee , we have $H' \subsetneq F'$. Since $H' \not\subseteq F'_{-x}$ but $H' \subset F' = F'_{-x} \cup \{x\}$, we can conclude that $x \in H'$ and thus $H' \not\subseteq G$. But $H \subset F'_{-x} \subset G$, so G, H, H' form a \vee , contradicting the minimality of $|F'|$. Thus, $F' = F \cup \{x\}$. In other words, if $F = f([n] \setminus \{x\})$ for some x , then $F \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

To finish the proof of the injectivity of f , assume for a contradiction that $f([n] \setminus \{x\}) = F = f([n] \setminus \{y\})$. But then $F, F \cup \{x\}, F \cup \{y\}$ form a \vee , contradiction. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.11. Let $N = n + 3$, and set $A = \{n + 3\}$. Our external P -saturated family \mathcal{G} will consist of four parts, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}'_1 \cup \mathcal{G}'_2 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$, defined as follows, using the shorthand $\mathcal{F} + A = \{F \cup A \mid F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

$$\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1,$$

$$\mathcal{G}'_1 = \mathcal{F}_1 + \{n + 1\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}'_2 = \mathcal{F}_2 + \{n + 1, n + 2\},$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2 + \{n + 1, n + 2, n + 3\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{G} \cap AB_n = \emptyset$, that the relations among \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}'_1 form $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ isolated C_2 's, while the relations among \mathcal{G}_2 and \mathcal{G}'_2 form $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ isolated C_2 's, and the relations among \mathcal{G}_1^* and \mathcal{G}_2^* are the same as among \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 , where \mathcal{G}_i^* is either \mathcal{G}_i or \mathcal{G}'_i .

First, we show that \mathcal{G} is P -free. Suppose for contradiction that it contains a $g(P)$ copy of P . If for some $F \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cap g(P)$ we have $F \cup \{n+1\} \in \mathcal{G}'_1 \cap g(P)$, then these would form an isolated C_2 in $g(P)$, as they are comparable to the same sets of \mathcal{G}_2 and \mathcal{G}'_2 , and P has only two levels. But this is impossible as P is C_2 -free. Otherwise, we can suppose that $g(P) \cap \mathcal{G}'_i = \emptyset$, as we can replace each set with a respective one from \mathcal{G}_i . Thus, $g(P) \subset \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$, but \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 have the same relations as \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 , and \mathcal{F} is P -free. Therefore, $g(P)$ cannot be a copy of P .

Next, suppose that we add some $G = F \cup A \in A\mathcal{B}_n$ to \mathcal{G} . Consider an $f(P)$ weak but almost strong copy of P that $F \in \mathcal{B}_n$ creates when we add it to \mathcal{F} . We will show how to turn this into a $g(P)$ strong copy of P for \mathcal{G} . Without loss of generality, assume that F is on the top level of $f(P)$. Then G will also be on the top level. For all other top level sets in $f(P)$, add $\{n+1, n+2\}$ to them, obtaining sets from \mathcal{G}'_2 . The bottom level of $f(P)$ remains unchanged, those sets are from \mathcal{G}_1 . This finishes the description of $g(P)$.

As the containment relations among \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}'_2 are the same as the relations among \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . The containment relations of G and \mathcal{G}_1 are also the same as the relations among F and \mathcal{F}_1 . Finally, there are no containments between G and \mathcal{G}_2 . Thus, $g(P)$ is indeed a strong copy of P , as $f(P)$ was an almost strong copy. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.12. If $s = t = 1$, the statement is trivial.

Otherwise, we can choose $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 &= \{\{1\}, \dots, \{s+t-1\}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{[n] \setminus \{1\}, \dots, [n] \setminus \{s+t-1\}\}.^1 \end{aligned}$$

By the pigeonhole principle, $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$ is $K_{s,t}$ -free.

Adding any $F \in \mathcal{B}_n$ to \mathcal{F} will create an almost strong copy of $K_{s,t}$. Indeed, if $|F \cap [s+t-1]| \geq s$, then F contains some s sets of \mathcal{F}_1 , which are further contained in some $t-1$ sets of \mathcal{F}_2 , while if $|F \cap [s+t-1]| \leq s-1$, then F is contained in some t sets of \mathcal{F}_2 , which further contain some $s-1$ sets of \mathcal{F}_1 . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Bastide, P., Groenland, C., Jacob, H., Johnston, T. (2022). Exact antichain saturation numbers via a generalisation of a result of Lehman-Ron. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.07391.
- [2] Đanković, I., Ivan, M. R. (2023). Saturation for Small Antichains. The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics 30(1), P1-3.
- [3] Ferrara, M., Kay, B., Kramer, L., Martin, R. R., Reiniger, B., Smith, H. C., Sullivan, E. (2017) The saturation number of induced subposets of the Boolean lattice. Discrete Mathematics, 340(10), 2479-2487.
- [4] Freschi, A., Piga, S., Sharifzadeh, M., Treglown, A. (2022). The induced saturation problem for posets. arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.03974.
- [5] Gerbner, D., Keszegh, B., Lemons, N., Palmer, C., Pálvölgyi, D., Patkós, B., Saturating Sperner families, Graphs and Combinatorics 29 (5), 1355-1364
- [6] Gerbner, D., Patkós, B. (2018). *Extremal finite set theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

¹This is not the best family for weak saturation; in [10] it was shown that $\text{sat}(n, K_{s,t}) \leq 2(s+t-1) - 2$.

- [7] Griggs, J. R., Li, W. T. (2016). Progress on poset-free families of subsets. In Recent trends in combinatorics, 317–338. Springer, Cham.
- [8] Ivan, M. R. (2020). Saturation for the butterfly poset. *Mathematika*, 66(3), 806-817.
- [9] Ivan, M. R. (2022). Minimal Diamond-Saturated Families. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 3(2), 81.
- [10] Keszegh, B., Lemons, N., Martin, R. R., Pálvölgyi, D., Patkós, B. (2021). Induced and non-induced poset saturation problems. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 184, 105497.
- [11] Martin, R. R., Smith, H. C., Walker, S. (2019). Improved bounds for induced poset saturation. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 27(2), P2-31.
- [12] Morrison, N., Noel, J. A., Scott, A. (2014). On Saturated k -Sperner Systems. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 21(3), P3-22.

APPENDIX A.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. As we mentioned, the proof follows word-by-word that in [4]. Suppose first that for every $i \in n$ and every \mathcal{F} that is projective P -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n , there exist $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \setminus F' = \{i\}$. Then, clearly, $|\mathcal{F}|(|\mathcal{F}| - 1) \geq n$ and thus $|\mathcal{F}| > \sqrt{n}$.

So we can assume that there exists n_0 and a family \mathcal{F} that is projective P -saturated for \mathcal{B}_{n_0} such that $\{n_0\} \neq F \setminus F'$ for any $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$. Although in the definition of projective saturation, we required $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_N$ for some arbitrary large N , for convenience we assume that $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} F = [n_0] \cup A$, where A is disjoint with the set of integers. Then for any $n \geq n_0$, we define a bijection $f = f_n : 2^{A \cup [n_0]} \rightarrow 2^{A \cup [n]}$ that “blows up” n_0 into $n - n_0$ elements as

$$f(F) = \begin{cases} F & \text{if } n_0 \notin F, \\ F \cup [n_0 + 1, n] & \text{if } n_0 \in F, \end{cases}$$

and let $\mathcal{F}_n = \{f(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Clearly, $|\mathcal{F}_n| = |\mathcal{F}|$. So if we can prove that \mathcal{F}_n is projective P -saturated for \mathcal{B}_n , then $\pi\text{sat}(n, P) \leq \max\{\pi\text{sat}(m, P) : m \leq n_0\}$. By definition, the poset structure of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}_n are the same, so \mathcal{F}_n is P -free as so is \mathcal{F} .

We are left to prove that for any $G \in 2^{[n]} \setminus \mathcal{F}_n$ there exists a copy of P in $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$. We distinguish four cases.

CASE I. $G \subseteq [n_0 - 1]$

Then $f(G) = G$, and so $G \notin \mathcal{F}$ as otherwise it would also belong to \mathcal{F}_n . So $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G\}$ contains a copy \mathcal{G} of P and as f is a poset-isomorphism, $f[\mathcal{G}]$ is a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$.

CASE II. $G \supseteq [n_0, n]$

Then for $G^* := G \cap [n_0] \subset [n_0]$, we have $f(G^*) = G$ and thus $G^* \notin \mathcal{F}$, and so $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G^*\}$ contains a copy \mathcal{G} of P . But then $f[\mathcal{G}]$ is a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$.

CASE III. $n_0 \in G, \exists j \in [n_0 + 1, n] \setminus G$

We need the following claim.

Claim A.1. Either $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$ contains a copy of P or

(1) there exists $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $n_0 \in F_1 \subseteq G$,

and

(2) there exists $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $n_0 \notin F_2, G \cap [n_0 - 1] \subseteq F_2$.

Proof. Suppose first we do not have $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying (1). In particular, $G_1 := G \cap [n_0] \notin \mathcal{F}$, so $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G_1\}$ contains a copy \mathcal{G}_1 of P with $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Now the containment relation of G_1 and any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is the same as that of G and $f(F)$ unless F is a subset of $G_1 \subset G$ containing n_0 . So either we find F_1 with the required property, or $\{G\} \cup f[\mathcal{G}_1 \setminus \{G_1\}]$ is a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$.

Suppose next we do not have $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying (2). In particular, $G_2 := G \cap [n_0 - 1] \notin \mathcal{F}$, so $\mathcal{F} \cup \{G_2\}$ contains a copy \mathcal{G}_2 of P with $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Now the containment relation of G_2 and any $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is the same as that of G and $f(F)$ unless F is a superset of G_2 not containing n_0 . So either we find F_2 with the required property or $\{G\} \cup f[\mathcal{G}_2 \setminus \{G_2\}]$ is a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$. \square

As Claim A.1 implies either the existence of F_1, F_2 with $F_1 \setminus F_2 = \{n_0\}$ or a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$, we conclude to the latter as the assumption of Theorem 1.4 states that there are no such F_1, F_2 in \mathcal{F} .

CASE IV. $n_0 \notin G, \exists j \in [n_0 + 1, n] \cap G$

Consider $G^* := G \setminus \{j\} \cup \{n_0\}$. By CASE III, $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G^*\}$ contains a copy \mathcal{G}^* of P with $G \in \mathcal{G}^*$. All sets in \mathcal{F}_n are either disjoint to $[n_0, n]$, or contain $[n_0, n]$, so G and G^* have the same comparability to all sets in \mathcal{F}_n , therefore $\mathcal{G}^* \setminus \{G^*\} \cup \{G\}$ is a copy of P in $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \{G\}$. \square

ELTE EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY AND ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, BUDAPEST
Email address: dom@cs.elte.hu

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, BUDAPEST
Email address: patkos@renyi.hu