

On k -modal subsequences

Zijian Xu*

Abstract

A k -modal sequence is a sequence of real numbers that can be partitioned into $k + 1$ (possibly empty) monotone sections such that adjacent sections have opposite monotonicities. For every positive integer k , we prove that any sequence of n pairwise distinct real numbers contains a k -modal subsequence of length at least $\sqrt{(2k + 1)(n - \frac{1}{4})} - \frac{k}{2}$, which is tight in a strong sense. This confirms an old conjecture of F.R.K. Chung (*J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 29(3):267–279, 1980).

1 Introduction

Given a sequence of real numbers, does there exist a long subsequence under some fixed structure \mathcal{S} ? This kind of Ramsey-style problems have attracted lots of attention over the years. Probably the first result of such a problem (in which $\mathcal{S} = \text{“monotonicity”}$) is the well-known Erdős–Szekeres theorem [7]. It asserts that every sequence of length n contains a monotone subsequence of length at least $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$, a tight lower bound. Moreover, this monotone subsequence of a sequence problem can be naturally extended to analogy problem concerning the convex subset of a point set. Indeed, the convex subset problem was initiated in [7], and was reiterated in [3, 9, 17, 18, 10, 12] since then. This direction of study culminated in the result that any $2^{n+o(n)}$ points in \mathbb{R}^2 contain n points in convex position, a breakthrough by Suk [16]. Other studies are around the case $\mathcal{S} = \text{“higher order monotonicity”}$ ([6, 11]) and the case $\mathcal{S} = \text{“convexity together with an empty upper region”}$ ([19, 20]). There are also recent results on monotone subarrays ([1, 4]).

Through out this paper, k stands for some nonnegative integer. We work on the aforementioned problem in which $\mathcal{S} = \text{“piecewise monotonicity”}$. To be specific, a *generic sequence of length n* is a sequence of distinct $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, and a *k -modal subsequence of length t* of a generic sequence is a subsequence b_1, \dots, b_t of a_1, \dots, a_n such that there exist $1 = i_0 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq i_{k+1} = t$ with

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871. 2200010770@stu.pku.edu.cn.

- $b_{i_j} < b_{i_{j+1}} < \dots < b_{i_{j+1}}$ if j is odd and $b_{i_j} > b_{i_{j+1}} > \dots > b_{i_{j+1}}$ if j is even, or
- $b_{i_j} > b_{i_{j+1}} > \dots > b_{i_{j+1}}$ if j is odd and $b_{i_j} < b_{i_{j+1}} < \dots < b_{i_{j+1}}$ if j is even.

In particular, a unimodal subsequence refers to a 1-modal subsequence.

This definition can be viewed as a natural extension of the Erdős–Szekerés monotone subsequence problem. By definition, a monotone subsequence is a 0-modal subsequence. Let $\rho(n; k)$ be the largest integer such that any generic sequence of length n contains a k -modal subsequence of length $\rho(n; k)$. The Erdős–Szekerés theorem asserts that $\rho(n; 0) = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$. Chung [2] resolved the unimodal case by proving $\rho(n; 1) = \lceil \sqrt{3n - \frac{3}{4}} - \frac{1}{2} \rceil$. A related probabilistic problem was studied by Steele [15].

Chung [2] also mentioned that $\rho(n; k) \leq \sqrt{(2k+1)n}$, and conjectured that this is asymptotically tight when k is fixed and n goes to infinity. By studying k -modal subsequences which are increasing from the beginning to the first modal, Gong et al. [8] established $\rho(n; k) \geq \sqrt{2kn}$. In this paper, we resolve Chung’s longstanding conjecture by proving the following pair of theorems:

Theorem 1. *For any integers $k \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$, we have $\rho(n; k) \geq \lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)(n - \frac{1}{4})} - \frac{k}{2} \rceil$.*

Theorem 2. *For any integers $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 10k^3$, we have $\rho(n; k) \leq \lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)(n - \frac{1}{4})} - \frac{k}{2} \rceil + 1$.*

The $n \geq 10k^3$ threshold in Theorem 2 is not optimal, but one cannot expect the same bound for small n . Indeed, it is obvious from the definition that $\rho(n; k) = n$ when $n \leq k$. Also, it might very well be possible to remove the error term “+1” in Theorem 2 through a more careful analysis of our explicit construction, but we decide not to put into that level of effort.

In the cases when $k = 0$ or 1, Theorem 1 is best possible as it matches the aforementioned values $\rho(n; 0)$ and $\rho(n; 1)$. For larger k , Theorem 2 shows that Theorem 1 is tight up to a small additive constant, which confirms Chung’s conjectured $\rho(n; k) = (1 + o(1))\sqrt{(2k+1)n}$ in a strong sense.

Probably the most famous proof of the lower bound $\rho(n; 0) \geq \sqrt{n}$ is done by the labeling trick introduced by Seidenberg [13], where each term a_i of $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is associated with the label

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ y_i \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \text{the length of the longest increasing subsequence ending at } a_i \\ \text{the length of the longest decreasing subsequence ending at } a_i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the lower bound follows immediately by observing that the labels are pairwise distinct. The lower bounds on $\rho(n; 1)$ due to Chung and $\rho(n; k)$ due to Gong et al. are also established by more sophisticated labeling arguments. A main novelty of this work is that our proof of Theorem 1 does

not utilize any kind of labeling. Inspired by the notable theorem due to Dilworth [5], we shall prove Theorem 1 by analyzing the underlying poset structures behind k -modal subsequences. It might be of independent interest to figure out a proof of Theorem 1 via some kind of labels.

Instead of proving Theorems 1 and 2 directly, we consider the geometric generalization, which turns out to be easier to work with. For every point $p = (a, b)$ on the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 , denote $x(p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a$ and $y(p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b$. For any pair of points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we introduce two partial orders:

- The “northeast” one \prec_{NE} satisfies $p \prec_{\text{NE}} q$ if and only if $x(p) < x(q)$ and $y(p) < y(q)$.
- The “southeast” one \prec_{SE} satisfies $p \prec_{\text{SE}} q$ if and only if $x(p) < x(q)$ and $y(p) > y(q)$.

Among finite subsets of \mathbb{R}^2 , an *increasing path* is a chain under \prec_{NE} , a *decreasing path* is a chain under \prec_{SE} , and a *monotone path* is either an increasing path or a decreasing path. The number of points in a monotone path is referred to as its *length*. For instance, the empty set \emptyset is a monotone path of length 0, and the set $\{(1, 5), (2, 4), (8, \pi)\}$ is a decreasing path of length 3.

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a finite point set. We call S *generic* if $x(p) \neq x(q)$ and $y(p) \neq y(q)$ for any pair of distinct points $p, q \in S$. The i -th point of S refers to the element of S with the i -th smallest x -coordinate. A $(k+1)$ -partition of S is a $(k+1)$ -tuple (S_0, \dots, S_k) with $S = S_0 \cup \dots \cup S_k$ such that $\max_{p \in S_i} x(p) < \min_{q \in S_j} x(q)$ whenever $0 \leq i < j \leq k$. Here each S_i ($0 \leq i \leq k$) is possibly empty, and we apply the conventions $\max_{p \in \emptyset} x(p) = -\infty$, $\min_{q \in \emptyset} x(q) = +\infty$.

A generic $P \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a k -modal path if P admits a $(k+1)$ -partition (P_0, \dots, P_k) such that

- for $i = 0, \dots, k$, each section P_i is a monotone path, and
- for $i = 1, \dots, k$, the monotonicity of P_{i-1}, P_i are opposite.

For a k -modal path P , we distinguish two possible classes of it:

- If P_0, P_2, \dots are increasing paths and P_1, P_3, \dots are decreasing paths, then P is a $(+k)$ -path.
- If P_0, P_2, \dots are decreasing paths and P_1, P_3, \dots are increasing paths, then P is a $(-k)$ -path.

Note that the two classes are not disjoint as each section P_i might have size at most 1. The *length* of a k -modal path refers to its cardinality as a finite set.

By considering the generic point set $\{(i, a_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ generated by a generic sequence $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$, and the generic sequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ induced by a generic point set $\{(x_i, y_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, it is easily seen that Theorems 1 and 2 are equivalent to Theorems 3 and 4 below, respectively.

Theorem 3. *If nonempty $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is generic, then S contains a k -modal path subset P of length*

$$|P| \geq \left\lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)\left(|S| - \frac{1}{4}\right)} - \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil.$$

Theorem 4. *Given integers $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 10k^3$. There exists an n -point generic $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that*

$$|P| \leq \left\lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)\left(|S| - \frac{1}{4}\right)} - \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil + 1$$

holds for the length of any k -modal path subset P of S .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Sections 2 and 3 (also Appendix A) are devoted to the proof of Theorem 3. In Section 2, we introduce *fine coverings*, the main tool in our proof of Theorem 3. We also prove Theorem 3 in Section 2 assuming a key property (Theorem 7) of fine coverings, and then establish Theorem 7 in Section 3 (the proof of a technical lemma is postponed to Appendix A). Finally, we present our constructive proof of Theorem 4 in Section 4.

2 Modal paths and fine coverings

Observe that antichains with respect to “ \prec_{NE} ” are exactly chains with respect to “ \prec_{SE} ”, and vice versa. We thus deduce from Dilworth’s theorem (see [5]) the following result.

Lemma 5. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a generic point set. Then the maximum length of increasing paths of S is equal to the minimum number of decreasing paths needed to cover S .*

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be generic. A *fine covering* of S by $(+k)$ -paths is a multiset \mathcal{C} of $(+k)$ -paths such that the i -th sections of all k -modal paths in \mathcal{C} form a partition of S for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. The *size* of \mathcal{C} is the cardinality of \mathcal{C} as a multiset, denoted by $|\mathcal{C}|$. Such a covering will be abbreviated as a $(+k)$ -*covering*. The reason we think of \mathcal{C} as a multiset is that two $(+k)$ -paths in \mathcal{C} may be the same as a set but admit different partitions into sections. For instance, if $S = P = Q = \{(1, 1), (2, 2)\}$ with $P_0 = \emptyset$, $P_1 = S$ and $Q_0 = S$, $Q_1 = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{C} = \{P, Q\}$ is a $(+1)$ -covering of S . We also define $(-k)$ -*coverings*, fine coverings by $(-k)$ -paths, in a similar way.

For any generic point set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we introduce the following definitions:

- Denote by $M_+(S), M_-(S)$ the maximum length of $(+k)$ - and $(-k)$ -paths of S , respectively.
- Denote by $m_+(S), m_-(S)$ the minimum size of $(+k)$ - and $(-k)$ -coverings of S , respectively.

Proposition 6. *Let S be a generic point set with $|S| = n$. Then we have*

- $m_+(S) \leq M_+(S) + k$ and $m_-(S) \leq M_-(S) + k$ if k is odd, and
- $m_+(S) \leq M_-(S) + k$ and $m_-(S) \leq M_+(S) + k$ if k is even.

Proof. We are going to construct a generic point set and apply Lemma 5. Without loss of generality, we assume that $S \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)$ and $|x(p) - x(q)| \geq k + 1$ for any pair of distinct points $p, q \in S$.

We inductively define generic point sets S_0, \dots, S_k as follows: Set $S_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, assume S_{i-1} is defined and set $S_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r_i(S_{i-1})$. Here r_i , a composition of the reflection over the line $y = i$ and the shifting under the vector $(1, 0)$, sends (x, y) to $(x + 1, 2i - y)$. The trajectory of each point of S induces a natural bijection $\tau_i: S_0 \rightarrow S_i$. Indeed, the i -th point of S_0 is mapped to the i -th point of S_i under τ_i . Figure 1 illustrates this process, in which $|S| = 5$ and $k = 3$.




Figure 1: An evolution from S_0 to S_3 .

Let $\tilde{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=0}^k S_i$. Obviously, \tilde{S} is generic. We introduce a map g such that

$$\{\text{decreasing paths of } \tilde{S}\} \xrightarrow{g} \{k\text{-modal paths of } S\}.$$

To be specific, for any decreasing path $P \subseteq \tilde{S}$, we define $g(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=0}^k (\tau_i^{-1}(P \cap S_i)) \subseteq S$ (note that τ_0 is the identity map on S_0 and $\tau(U) = \{\tau(u) : u \in U\}$). Moreover, as a k -modal path, the i -th section of $g(P)$ is $\tau_{k-i}^{-1}(P \cap S_{k-i})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. Observe that $g(P)$ is a $(+k)$ -path when k is odd, and $g(P)$ is a $(-k)$ -path when k is even. (Also, $|g(P)| = |P|$ because the trajectory $\{p, \tau_1(p), \dots, \tau_k(p)\}$ is an increasing path for any $p \in P$, but we shall not use this property.)

For any increasing path P of \tilde{S} , similar to the definition of g , we associate with it a $(+k)$ -path $T_P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=0}^k (\tau_i^{-1}(P \cap S_i))$, whose i -th section is given by $\tau_i^{-1}(P \cap S_i)$. Notice that T_P is always a $(+k)$ -rather than a $(-k)$ -path because its 0-th section $\tau_0^{-1}(P \cap S_0) = P \cap S_0$ is increasing.

We claim that $|T_P| \geq |P| - k$. To see this, it suffices to show for $i = 1, \dots, k$ that

$$\left| \tau_i^{-1}(P \cap S_i) \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} (\tau_j^{-1}(P \cap S_j)) \right) \right| \leq 1.$$

Indeed, this is true because the intersection happens only possibly at the last point of $\tau_i^{-1}(P \cap S_i)$ and the first point of $\bigcup_{j=0}^{i-1} (\tau_j^{-1}(P \cap S_j))$. Thus, the claim holds.

Since the length of each $(+k)$ -path of S is upper bounded by $M_+(S)$, the claimed $|T_P| \geq |P| - k$ implies that any increasing path on \tilde{S} is of length at most $M_+(S) + k$. We thus obtain from Lemma 5 the existence of \mathcal{F} , a covering of \tilde{S} by $M_+(S) + k$ many (possibly empty) decreasing paths. Assume further that each point of S is covered exactly once in \mathcal{F} . Then g induces a covering $\mathcal{F}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(\mathcal{F})$ of S by $M_+(S) + k$ many $(\pm k)$ -paths (“ \pm ” depends on the parity of k). So, $M_+(S) + k \geq m_{\pm}(S)$.

Suppose k is odd. Then \mathcal{F}' gives a $(+k)$ -covering of S with $|\mathcal{F}'| \leq M_+(S) + k$. This implies that $m_+(S) \leq M_+(S) + k$. Let σ be the reflection over the line $y = \frac{1}{2}$ in the plane. By applying the same arguments to $\sigma(S)$ we deduce that $m_-(S) \leq M_-(S) + k$. The case when k is even can be proved similarly, and the proof of Proposition 6 is complete. \square

For any generic point set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, write $m(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{m_+(S), m_-(S)\}$. In other words, there are

- a $(+k)$ -covering of S by at most $m(S)$ many $(+k)$ -paths, and
- a $(-k)$ -covering of S by at most $m(S)$ many $(-k)$ -paths.

Theorem 7. *For any generic S , we have $m(S) \geq \sqrt{(2k+1)(|S| - \frac{1}{4})} + \frac{k}{2}$.*

Proof of Theorem 3 assuming Theorem 7. Let P be a k -modal path of S whose length is maximized. Then Proposition 6 and Theorem 7 implies that $|P| \geq m(S) - k \geq \sqrt{(2k+1)(|S| - \frac{1}{4})} - \frac{k}{2}$. Since $|P|$ takes integer values, we conclude that $|P| \geq \left\lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)(|S| - \frac{1}{4})} - \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil$. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 7

The definition of $m(S)$ implies that there exists a $(+k)$ -covering \mathcal{C}_+ and a $(-k)$ -covering \mathcal{C}_- of S with $|\mathcal{C}_+| \leq m(S)$ and $|\mathcal{C}_-| \leq m(S)$. One extra assumption on $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ will be imposed later.

Recall that every k -modal path admits some $(k+1)$ -partition in which each section is of some fixed monotonicity. Throughout this section, whenever we mention a k -modal path \bullet , we implicitly assume that \bullet has the $(k+1)$ -partition $\bullet_0 \cup \dots \cup \bullet_k$. The reason we write \bullet rather than P here is that \bullet could be P, Q, R, L with possible superscripts later in the text.

Assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ does not contain the empty k -modal path. Due to the existence of a k -modal path that is both a $(+k)$ - and a $(-k)$ -path (such as a k -point generic set), we denote by $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ the union of multisets (which implies that $|\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-| = |\mathcal{C}_+| + |\mathcal{C}_-|$).

For each $P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$, define a map $\mathbf{N}_P: P \setminus P_k \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ such that:

- If $p \in P_i$ and $P \in \mathcal{C}_+$, then $\mathbf{N}_P(p)$ is the unique $Q \in \mathcal{C}_-$ satisfying $p \in Q_{i+1}$.
- If $p \in P_i$ and $P \in \mathcal{C}_-$, then $\mathbf{N}_P(p)$ is the unique $Q \in \mathcal{C}_+$ satisfying $p \in Q_{i+1}$.

We remark that the uniqueness follows from the definition of fine coverings.

Write $s(P)$ as the first point of P , and denote by $i(P)$ the unique index i such that $s(P) \in P_i$. Define $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_- : i(P) < k\}$. Let $\varphi: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ be the map given by $\varphi(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{N}_P(s(P))$.

We claim that the action of φ is acyclic. Formally, there exists no $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and k -modal path P such that the ℓ -th iteration $\varphi^{(\ell)}(P) = P$. To see this, write $Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi(P)$. Then $s(P) \in Q$, and hence $x(s(Q)) \leq x(s(P))$ with $x(s(Q)) = x(s(P))$ implying $s(Q) = s(P)$ and so $i(Q) = i(P) + 1$. Thus,

$$\left(x(s(Q)), -i(Q)\right) \prec \left(x(s(P)), -i(P)\right),$$

where “ \prec ” stands for the canonical lexicographical order on \mathbb{Z}^2 . This verifies the claim.

Let $\varphi^{(t)}$ be the t -th iteration of φ , where $\varphi^{(1)} = \varphi$ and $\varphi^{(0)}$ is the identity. For each $P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$, we define its *depth* $d(P)$ as follows: If $P \in (\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-) \setminus \mathcal{D}$, then $d(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$. Otherwise, when $P \in \mathcal{D}$, set $d(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ell$ be the unique positive integer such that $\varphi^{(\ell-1)}(P) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\varphi^{(\ell)}(P) \in (\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-) \setminus \mathcal{D}$. It is worth mentioning that ℓ exists because the action of φ is acyclic (the previous claim).

Observation 8. *For any $P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$, if $d(P) < k$, then $P_0 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. It follows from the definitions of φ and d that $i(P) = k$ when $d(P) = 0$. Then it is easy to show (via induction on j) that $i(P) \geq k - j$ when $d(P) = j$, for any nonnegative integer j . \square

We remark that the converse of Observation 8 does not hold, as $d(P) \geq k$ does not necessarily imply that $P_0 \neq \emptyset$. Notice that the $\mathbf{N}_P, \mathcal{D}, \varphi, d$ defined in this section all depend on $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$.

Lemma 9. *We can choose $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ appropriately so that φ is injective.*

The proof is subtle and is included in Appendix A. Thanks to Lemma 9, we may assume that φ is injective. This is the extra assumption on $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ that we claimed at the beginning of the section.

Since φ is injective, the action of φ results in a finite number of disjoint chain-like orbits. Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r$ be all such orbits containing at least $k + 1$ elements (k -modal paths). For each of these orbits \mathcal{O} , assume $\mathcal{O} = \{P^0, P^1, \dots, P^t\}$ with $t \geq k$ and $d(P^i) = i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, t$. That is,

$$P^0 = \varphi(P^1) = \dots = \varphi^{(t)}(P^t) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(P^0) \in (\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-) \setminus \mathcal{D}.$$

Associate with \mathcal{O} the modal path $P^{\mathcal{O}}$ whose $(i - k)$ -th section is given by P_0^{i-k} ($i = k, k + 1, \dots, t$). Indeed, $P^{\mathcal{O}}$ is a $(t - k)$ -modal path, and we define $P^{\mathcal{O}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$ when $k > t$. To see that the associated $P^{\mathcal{O}}$ is well-defined, we must verify for all $k \leq i \leq t$ that the monotonicity of P_0^i, P_0^{i+1} are opposite, and for all $k \leq i < j \leq t$ that $\max x(P_0^i) < \min x(P_0^j)$. Notice that we need to consider not only the consecutive pairs because each P_0^ℓ could possibly be empty. From $\varphi(P^{\ell+1}) = P^\ell$ we deduce that

- $\min x(P_0^j) \geq x(s(P^j)) \geq x(s(P^{j-1})) \geq \dots \geq x(s(P^{i+1})) \geq \max x(P_0^i)$, and
- $(P^i, P^{i+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_+ \times \mathcal{C}_-$ or $\mathcal{C}_- \times \mathcal{C}_+$, so P_0^i, P_0^{i+1} are of opposite monotonicity.

We shall write $R^i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P^{\mathcal{O}_i}$ ($i = 1, \dots, r$) for brevity. Let $t_i + 1 \geq k + 1$ be the number of k -modal paths in the orbit \mathcal{O}_i . Set $\ell_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t_i - k + 1$, and so R^i is an $(\ell_i - 1)$ -modal path.

Observation 10. *The sections of R^i consists of all 0-th sections of $P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ with $d(P) \geq k$.*

Proof. This is straightforward from our definition of $P^{\mathcal{O}}$. □

Observation 11. $kr + (\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_r) \leq 2m(S)$.

Proof. From the definition of ℓ_i we obtain $k + \ell_i = t_i + 1 = |\mathcal{O}_i|$. As disjoint orbits, $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_r$ form a partition of some submultiset of the multiset $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$. It follows that

$$kr + (\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_r) = \sum_{i=1}^r (k + \ell_i) = \sum_{i=1}^r |\mathcal{O}_i| \leq |\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-| = |\mathcal{C}_+| + |\mathcal{C}_-| \leq 2m(S). \quad \square$$

For $i = 1, \dots, r$, we say that R^i is a *+-path* if R^i is a $(+(\ell_i - 1))$ -path, and R^i is a *--path* if it is a $(-(\ell_i - 1))$ -path. This \pm -path classification will be referred to as the *sign* of R^i . Call

- the sections of even indices of *+-paths* and of odd indices of *--paths* *increasing sections*, and
- the sections of odd indices of *+-paths* and of even indices of *--paths* *decreasing sections*.

Let \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{D} be the multisets of all increasing and decreasing sections of R^1, \dots, R^r , respectively.

Recall that a $(+0)$ -covering of S is a fine covering of S by increasing paths, and a (-0) -covering of S is a fine covering of S by decreasing paths.

Proposition 12. *The set \mathcal{I} is a $(+0)$ -covering of S , and the set \mathcal{D} is a (-0) -covering of S .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{C}_+ is a $(+k)$ -covering of S , the collection of all 0-th sections of k -modal paths in \mathcal{C}_+ forms a $(+0)$ -covering of S . It then suffices to verify that \mathcal{I} consists of all nonempty 0-th sections of $P \in \mathcal{C}_+$ and a bunch of empty sets. Indeed, from Observation 10 we deduce that \mathcal{I} consists of all nonempty 0-th sections of $P \in \mathcal{C}_+$ with $d(P) \geq k$, and Observation 8 tells us that every $P \in \mathcal{C}_+$ with $d(P) < k$ has an empty 0-th section. We thus conclude that \mathcal{I} forms a $(+0)$ -covering of S . Similarly, the set \mathcal{D} forms a (-0) -covering of S . \square

Let $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_+ : 1 \leq i < j \leq r\}$. We associate with each $p \in S$ a pair $\chi(p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (i, j) \in K$ such that p is the intersection of an increasing section and a decreasing section of R^i and R^j . The existence of R^i, R^j follows from Proposition 12. Since we assumed $i < j$, we do not specify which section is from R^i and which is from R^j . For $(i, j) \in K$, write $S_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{p \in S : \chi(p) = (i, j)\}$. Obviously, as (i, j) goes through K , the sets $S_{i,j}$ form a partition of S . Define

$$\ell(i, j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j}{2} \rfloor & \text{if } R^i \text{ and } R^j \text{ are of opposite signs,} \\ \lfloor \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 1}{2} \rfloor & \text{if } R^i \text{ and } R^j \text{ are of the same sign.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 13. *For each $(i, j) \in K$, we have $|S_{i,j}| \leq \ell(i, j)$.*

Proof. Let $p \in S_{i,j}$ and assume that u, v are the unique pair of indices such that $p = R_u^i \cap R_v^j$. We claim that the parity of $u + v$ depends only on (i, j) . Indeed, from the definition we deduce that

$$(u + v) \bmod 2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } R^i \text{ and } R^j \text{ are of opposite signs,} \\ 1 & \text{if } R^i \text{ and } R^j \text{ are of the same sign.} \end{cases}$$

Let $p' \in S_{i,j}$ be a point other than p and assume $p' = R_{u'}^i \cap R_{v'}^j$. We claim that $u + v \neq u' + v'$. To see this, we argue indirectly. Suppose $u + v = u' + v'$ and $(u', v') = (u + w, v - w)$. Due to their opposite monotonicity, R_u^i and R_v^j intersect in at most one point, and so $w \neq 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $w > 0$. This implies the following estimate on x -coordinates:

$$x(p') \leq \max x(R_{v'}^j) < \min x(R_v^j) \leq x(p) \leq \max x(R_u^i) < \min x(R_{u'}^i) \leq x(p'),$$

which is an obvious contradiction. The claim is thus proved.

Since R^i is an $(\ell_i - 1)$ -modal path and R^j is an $(\ell_j - 1)$ -modal path, by combining the analysis above we see that $|S_{i,j}|$ is upper bounded by either the total number of odds or the total number of evens among $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell_i + \ell_j - 2\}$, depending on the signs of R^i, R^j . The proof is done. \square

It is worth mentioning that our analysis in Proposition 13 is quite delicate. Indeed, we cannot prove it simply by establishing $|S_{i,j}| \leq \min\{\ell_i, \ell_j\} \leq \ell(i, j)$ as $|S_{i,j}| \leq \min\{\ell_i, \ell_j\}$ does not hold in general. Also, the crude bound $|S_{i,j}| \leq \max\{\ell_i, \ell_j\}$ is not enough for our proof of Theorem 7.

Proposition 14. *We have*

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in K} \ell(i, j) \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in K} \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 1}{2} + \frac{r}{4}.$$

Proof. Partition $[r] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, r\}$ into index sets A, B, C, D such that

$$\begin{aligned} A &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [r] : R^i \text{ is a } +\text{-path and } \ell_i \text{ is odd}\}, \\ B &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [r] : R^i \text{ is a } +\text{-path and } \ell_i \text{ is even}\}, \\ C &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [r] : R^i \text{ is a } --\text{-path and } \ell_i \text{ is odd}\}, \\ D &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [r] : R^i \text{ is a } --\text{-path and } \ell_i \text{ is even}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $(i, j) \in K$, we define $\lambda(i, j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \ell_i + \ell_j - 2\ell(i, j)$. We claim that $\lambda(i, j)$ is determined by the parts of $[r]$ that i and j are from, respectively. Here we only go through one of the cases, and the other cases are similar. To be specific, we show that $i, j \in A$ implies $\lambda(i, j) = 2$. In this case,

$$\ell(i, j) \stackrel{(*)}{=} \left\lfloor \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \stackrel{(**)}{=} \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 2}{2} \implies \lambda(i, j) = \ell_i + \ell_j - 2\ell(i, j) = 2,$$

where at $(*)$ we applied that R^i, R^j are of the same sign, and at $(**)$ we used that ℓ_i, ℓ_j are odd. By working through every other case, we have the table below of values of $\lambda(i, j)$ in all $4 \times 4 = 16$ cases, where the rows and columns stand for the parts that i and j belong to, respectively.

λ	A	B	C	D
A	2	1	0	1
B	1	2	1	0
C	0	1	2	1
D	1	0	1	2

Notice that $|A| + |B| + |C| + |D| = r$. From the definition of K , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |K| &= \binom{|A|}{2} + \binom{|B|}{2} + \binom{|C|}{2} + \binom{|D|}{2} + |A||B| + |B||C| + |C||D| + |D||A| + |A||C| + |B||D| \\ &= \frac{|A|^2 + |B|^2 + |C|^2 + |D|^2 - r}{2} + |A||B| + |B||C| + |C||D| + |D||A| + |A||C| + |B||D|. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(i,j) \in K} \lambda(i,j) &= \frac{|A|^2 + |B|^2 + |C|^2 + |D|^2 - r}{2} \cdot 2 + (|A||B| + |B||C| + |C||D| + |D||A|) \cdot 1 \\
&= |K| + \left(\frac{|A|^2 + |B|^2 + |C|^2 + |D|^2 - r}{2} - (|A||C| + |B||D|) \right) \\
&= |K| + \frac{(|A| - |C|)^2 + (|B| - |D|)^2 - r}{2} \geq |K| - \frac{r}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Thus, from the definition of λ and (1) we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{(i,j) \in K} \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 1}{2} + \frac{r}{4} \right) - \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in K} \ell(i,j) \right) = \sum_{(i,j) \in K} \frac{\lambda(i,j)}{2} + \frac{\frac{r}{2} - |K|}{2} \geq 0. \quad \square$$

Finally, we are in a position to prove Theorem 7. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2k+1)|S| &= (2k+1) \cdot \sum_{(i,j) \in K} |S_{i,j}| \\
&\leq (2k+1) \cdot \sum_{(i,j) \in K} \ell(i,j) && \text{by Proposition 13} \\
&\leq (2k+1) \cdot \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in K} \frac{\ell_i + \ell_j - 1}{2} + \frac{r}{4} \right) && \text{by Proposition 14} \\
&= (2k+1) \cdot \left(\frac{r-1}{2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \ell_i - \frac{r}{2} \right) + \frac{r}{4} \right) \\
&\leq (2k+1) \cdot \left(\frac{r-1}{2} \cdot \left(2m(S) - \left(k + \frac{1}{2} \right) r \right) + \frac{r}{4} \right) && \text{by Observation 11.}
\end{aligned}$$

Take the substitution $r' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (k + \frac{1}{2})r$, and so $r = \frac{2r'}{2k+1}$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2k+1)|S| &\leq (2k+1) \cdot \frac{r-1}{2} \cdot (2m(S) - r') + \frac{r'}{2} \\
&= \left(r' - \frac{2k+1}{2} \right) \cdot (2m(S) - r') + \frac{r'}{2} \\
&= -(2k+1)m(S) + r' \cdot (2m(S) + k + 1 - r') \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} -(2k+1)m(S) + \left(\frac{2m(S) + k + 1}{2} \right)^2 \\
&= \left(m(S) - \frac{k}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{2k+1}{4},
\end{aligned}$$

where at the step marked with (*) we applied the AM-GM inequality. By rearranging the inequality and taking square roots on both sides, we obtain $m(S) \geq \sqrt{(2k+1)(|S| - \frac{1}{4})} + \frac{k}{2}$.

4 Generic sets without long k -modal paths

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4. We begin by constructing a family of generic sets $U^{s,t} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ containing only short k -modal paths. Then we can prove Theorem 4 by carefully choosing s, t as functions of n , and delete a small number of points from $U^{s,t}$ to obtain the desired set S . It is worth mentioning that our construction is partly inspired by the previous work [8].

Assume s, t are positive integers. Let P^1, \dots, P^{s+2t} be decreasing paths of lengths

$$\underbrace{t, t+1, \dots, 2t-1}_t, \quad \underbrace{2t, \dots, 2t}_s, \quad \underbrace{2t-1, \dots, t+1, t}_t$$

satisfying $p_i \prec_{\text{NE}} p_j$ for any $p_i \in P_i, p_j \in P_j$ with $i < j$. Take $U^{s,t} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P^1 \cup \dots \cup P^{s+2t}$. Then

$$|U^{s,t}| = 2(t + (t+1) + \dots + (2t-1)) + s \cdot 2t = t(2s + 3t - 1).$$

For instance, Figure 2 illustrates a possible configuration of $U^{3,2}$.




Figure 2: One possible drawing of $U^{3,2}$.

The following upper bound on the length of any k -modal path subset of $U^{s,t}$ is crucial.

Proposition 15. *Suppose $Q \subseteq U^{s,t}$ is a k -modal path. Then $|Q| \leq (k+2)t + s - \frac{k}{2}$.*

To prove Proposition 15, we need some preparations. Suppose a, b are the first and the last point of Q , respectively. Find α and β such that $a \in P^\alpha$ and $b \in P^\beta$. Define $Q^\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q \cap P^\alpha$, $Q^\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q \cap P^\beta$ and $Q^\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q \cap P^\gamma$ ($\gamma = \alpha + 1, \dots, \beta - 1$). Call an index $\gamma \in \Gamma^Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha + 1, \dots, \beta - 1\}$ as Q -rich if $|Q \cap P^\gamma| \geq 2$, and Q -poor if $|Q \cap P^\gamma| \leq 1$. Consider the partition $\Gamma^Q = \Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q \cup \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q$, where

$$\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\gamma \in \Gamma^Q : \gamma \text{ is } Q\text{-rich}\}, \quad \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\gamma \in \Gamma^Q : \gamma \text{ is } Q\text{-poor}\}.$$

Observation 16. *If Q is a $(+k)$ -path, then $|\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$; if Q is a $(-k)$ -path, then $|\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| \leq \lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \rfloor$.*

Proof. The cardinality $|\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q|$ is upper bounded by the number of indices $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ such that Q_i is a decreasing section with $|Q_i| \geq 2$. Then the observation follows from counting such sections when Q is a $(+k)$ - or $(-k)$ -path and k is even or odd, respectively. \square

We say that α is *bad* if the beginning section Q_0 of Q is increasing and $|Q^\alpha| > 1$. We say that β is *bad* if the ending section Q_k of Q is increasing and $|Q^\beta| > 1$.

Lemma 17. *Denote by $[E]$ the indicator function of the event E . Then we have*

$$|\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - [\alpha \text{ is bad}] - [\beta \text{ is bad}].$$

Proof. Observe that $Q_1 \subseteq P^\alpha$ if α is bad and $Q_{k-1} \subseteq P^\beta$ if β is bad. We see that there are at most $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - [\alpha \text{ is bad}] - [\beta \text{ is bad}]$ decreasing sections of Q possibly lying in the union $P^{\alpha+1} \cup \dots \cup P^{\beta-1}$. It follows that $|\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - [\alpha \text{ is bad}] - [\beta \text{ is bad}]$. \square

Proof of Proposition 15. We prove by a casework on the sign of Q and the parity of k . The strategy is to deal with Q^α , Q^β , $Q^\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q \cap P^\gamma$ ($\gamma = \alpha + 1, \dots, \beta - 1$) separately. Observe that

$$|Q^\alpha| \leq |P^\alpha| \leq \min\{\alpha + t - 1, 2t\}, \quad |Q^\beta| \leq |P^\beta| \leq \min\{s + 3t - \beta, 2t\}.$$

We shall use one of the estimates on Q^α and one of the estimates on Q^β at each of the (\spadesuit) steps.

- If Q is a $(+k)$ -path and k is even, then it follows from the facts $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\beta \leq s + 2t$ that $\beta - \alpha - 1 \leq s + 2t - 2$. So, from Lemma 17 we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |Q| &= |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| \leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t - 1) \cdot |\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| + |\Gamma^Q| \\ &\leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t - 1) \cdot \left(\frac{k}{2} - [|Q^\alpha| > 1] - [|Q^\beta| > 1] \right) + (\beta - \alpha - 1) \\ &\stackrel{(\spadesuit)}{\leq} 1 + 1 + (2t - 1) \cdot \frac{k}{2} + (s + 2t - 2) = (k + 2)t + s - \frac{k}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

- If Q is a $(-k)$ -path and k is even, then from Observation 16 we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |Q| &= |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| \leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t - 1) \cdot |\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| + |\Gamma^Q| \\ &\stackrel{(\spadesuit)}{\leq} (\alpha + t - 1) + (s + 3t - \beta) + (2t - 1) \cdot \frac{k-2}{2} + (\beta - \alpha - 1) = (k + 2)t + s - \frac{k}{2} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

- If Q is a $(+k)$ -path and k is odd, then from Lemma 17 and the fact $\alpha \geq 1$ we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q| &= |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| \leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t-1) \cdot |\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| + |\Gamma^Q| \\
&\leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t-1) \cdot \left(\frac{k-1}{2} - [|\alpha| > 1]\right) + (\beta - \alpha - 1) \\
&\stackrel{(\spadesuit)}{\leq} 1 + (s + 3t - \beta) + \frac{k-1}{2} \cdot (2t-1) + (\beta - 1 - 1) = (k+2)t + s - \frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

- If Q is a $(-k)$ -path and k is odd, then from Lemma 17 and the fact $\beta \leq s + 2t$ we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q| &= |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{poor}}^Q} |Q^\gamma| \leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t-1) \cdot |\Gamma_{\text{rich}}^Q| + |\Gamma^Q| \\
&\leq |Q^\alpha| + |Q^\beta| + (2t-1) \cdot \left(\frac{k-1}{2} - [|\beta| > 1]\right) + (\beta - \alpha - 1) \\
&\stackrel{(\spadesuit)}{\leq} (\alpha + t - 1) + 1 + \frac{k-1}{2} \cdot (2t-1) + (s + 2t - \alpha - 1) = (k+2)t + s - \frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By combining all four cases above, we conclude that $|Q| \leq (k+2)t + s - \frac{k}{2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. For given integers $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 10k^3$, we choose parameters

$$x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\lceil \sqrt{(2k+1)\left(n - \frac{1}{4}\right)} - \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil, \quad y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x + 1 + \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil, \quad t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\langle \frac{y}{2k+1} \right\rangle, \quad s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y - (k+2)t,$$

where $\langle \alpha \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$ denotes the closest integer to α . For any generic $T \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, denote by $M(T)$ the maximum length of a k -modal path subset of T . Write $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U^{s,t}$ for brevity.

We first show that $M(U) \leq x + 1$. Indeed, it follows from Proposition 15 that

$$M(U) \leq (k+2)t + s - \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil = y - \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil = x + 1.$$

We then show that $|U| \geq n$. From the definition we deduce that $\frac{y-k}{2k+1} \leq t \leq \frac{y+k}{2k+1}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
|U| &= t(2s + 3t - 1) = t(2y - (2k+1)t + 1) = -(2k+1)\left(t - \frac{y-\frac{1}{2}}{2k+1}\right)^2 + \frac{(y-\frac{1}{2})^2}{2k+1} \\
&\geq -(2k+1)\left(\frac{k+\frac{1}{2}}{2k+1}\right)^2 + \frac{(y-\frac{1}{2})^2}{2k+1} = \frac{(y-\frac{1}{2})^2}{2k+1} - \frac{2k+1}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|U| \geq n \iff \frac{(y-\frac{1}{2})^2}{2k+1} - \frac{2k+1}{4} \geq n \iff (2y-1)^2 \geq 4(2k+1)n + (2k+1)^2.$$

By $x \geq \sqrt{(2k+1)\left(n - \frac{1}{4}\right)} - \frac{k}{2}$ and $y \geq x + 1 + \frac{k}{2}$ we have $2y-1 \geq \sqrt{(2k+1)(4n-1)} + 1$, and so

$$(2y-1)^2 = \left(\sqrt{(2k+1)(4n-1)} + 1\right)^2 \geq 4(2k+1)n + (2k+1)^2,$$

thanks to the assumption $n \geq 10k^3$. This implies that $|U| \geq n$.

Finally, since $|U| \geq n$, we fix choose an arbitrary n -point subset of U as S . It follows that

$$M(S) \leq M(U) \leq x + 1 = \left\lceil \sqrt{(2k + 1)(n - \frac{1}{4}) - \frac{k}{2}} \right\rceil + 1.$$

So, the set S constructed above satisfies Theorem 4, and the proof is complete. \square

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Zichao Dong for suggesting this problem, for talking with me the previous work [8] (the undergraduate research was supervised by Boris Bukh and Zichao Dong), and for many helpful discussions. I would also like to thank Professor Chunwei Song for providing valuable suggestions on improving the writing of this paper.

References

- [1] M. Bucić, B. Sudakov, and T. Tran. Erdős-Szekeres theorem for multidimensional arrays. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 25(8):2927–2947, 2023.
- [2] F. R. K. Chung. On unimodal subsequences. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 29(3):267–279, 1980.
- [3] F. R. K. Chung and R. L. Graham. Forced convex n -gons in the plane. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 19(3):367–371, 1998. Dedicated to the memory of Paul Erdős.
- [4] R. A. Çiçeksiz, Z. Jin, E. Rätty, and I. Tomon. Exponential Erdős-Szekeres theorem for matrices. arXiv:2305.07003v1.
- [5] R. P. Dilworth. A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 51:161–166, 1950.
- [6] M. Eliáš and J. Matoušek. Higher-order Erdős-Szekeres theorems. *Adv. Math.*, 244:1–15, 2013.
- [7] P. Erdős and G. Szekeres. A combinatorial problem in geometry. *Compositio mathematica*, 2:463–470, 1935.
- [8] C. Gong, E. Gu, Z. Yang, and Z. Yu. Zigzag subsequences. *Carnegie Mellon Undergraduate Research Program*, unpublished manuscript, 2022.

- [9] D. Kleitman and L. Pachter. Finding convex sets among points in the plane. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 19(3):405–410, 1998. Dedicated to the memory of Paul Erdős.
- [10] H. N. Mojarrad and G. Vlachos. An improved upper bound for the Erdős-Szekeres conjecture. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 56(1):165–180, 2016.
- [11] G. Moshkovitz and A. Shapira. Ramsey theory, integer partitions and a new proof of the Erdős-Szekeres theorem. *Adv. Math.*, 262:1107–1129, 2014.
- [12] S. Norin and Y. Yuditsky. Erdős-Szekeres without induction. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 55(4):963–971, 2016.
- [13] A. Seidenberg. A simple proof of a theorem of Erdős and Szekeres. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 34:352, 1959.
- [14] R. P. Stanley. Longest alternating subsequences of permutations. *Michigan Math. J.*, 57:675–687, 2008.
- [15] J. M. Steele. Long unimodal subsequences: a problem of F. R. K. Chung. *Discrete Math.*, 33(2):223–225, 1981.
- [16] A. Suk. On the Erdős-Szekeres convex polygon problem. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 30(4):1047–1053, 2017.
- [17] G. Tóth and P. Valtr. Note on the Erdős-Szekeres theorem. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 19(3):457–459, 1998. Dedicated to the memory of Paul Erdős.
- [18] G. Tóth and P. Valtr. The Erdős-Szekeres theorem: upper bounds and related results. In *Combinatorial and computational geometry*, volume 52 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 557–568. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [19] P. Valtr. Open caps and cups in planar point sets. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 37(4):565–576, 2007.
- [20] J. Černý. A simple proof for open cups and caps. *European J. Combin.*, 29(1):218–226, 2008.

A Proof of Lemma 9

For any $P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$, let $\gamma(P) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the maximum index j such that \mathbf{N}_P sends the first through the j -th point of P to a same Q , which is $\varphi(P)$ by definition. Here we set $\gamma(P)$ to be 0 if $i(P) = k$. Write $\mathcal{H}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_- \\ d(P)=i}} \gamma(P)^2$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ and associate with $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ the infinite tuple

$$\mathcal{H} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1, \dots) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^{(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})}.$$

We claim that \mathcal{H} takes finitely many possible values. Indeed, from our assumption at the beginning of Section 3 we obtain $|\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-| \leq 2m(S)$. Also, we have $\gamma(P) \leq |S|$ and $d(P) \leq |\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-| \leq 2m(S)$ (because the action of φ is acyclic). It follows that \mathcal{H}_i is upper bounded by $2|S|^2 \cdot m(S)$.

Among all possible pairs of $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ with $\max\{|\mathcal{C}_+|, |\mathcal{C}_-|\} \leq m(S)$, we choose one so that \mathcal{H} is maximized under the canonical lexicographical order on $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^{(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})}$. Our aim is to establish that φ , associated with this choice of $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$, is injective. Notice that $\mathbf{N}_P, \mathcal{D}, \varphi, d, \gamma, \mathcal{H}$ depend on $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$.

Assume to the contrary that $P = \varphi(Q) = \varphi(R)$ for some $Q \neq R$. This implies that Q, R are of the same sign, for P and $\varphi(P)$ are always from different ones of $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$. That is, the monotonicity of Q_i and R_i are the same for each i . Keep in mind that even if $|Q_i| \leq 1$ for some i , we still endow a fixed monotonicity to Q_i as Q is from a certain one of \mathcal{C}_+ and \mathcal{C}_- .

Since $\varphi(Q) = \varphi(R)$ implies $d(Q) = d(R) = d$, we may choose Q and R so that d is minimized. Let q be the $\gamma(Q)$ -th point of Q and r be the $\gamma(R)$ -th point of R . Assume without loss of generality that $x(q) \geq x(r)$. We claim that $x(q) > x(r)$. If not, then $x(q) = x(r)$, and so $q = r = p$. Suppose $p \in P_{j+1}$. Then from $\varphi(Q) = \varphi(R) = P$ we deduce that $q \in Q_j, r \in R_j$. However, it follows from $\mathcal{C}_+, \mathcal{C}_-$ are fine coverings and Q, R are of the same sign that Q_j, R_j are disjoint, a contradiction.

Informally speaking, we are going to throw a couple of points of R into Q , and hence produce another pair of fine coverings $\mathcal{C}'_+, \mathcal{C}'_-$ with $\mathcal{H}' \succ \mathcal{H}$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose $A \subseteq R$ is the set of the 1-st through the $\gamma(R)$ -th point of R , and $B \subseteq Q$ is the set of the 1-st through the $\gamma(Q)$ -th point of Q . Observe from the definition of γ that $R_i \cap A \subseteq P_{i+1}$ and $Q_i \cap B \subseteq P_{i+1}$ hold for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. We obtain $\mathcal{C}'_+ \cup \mathcal{C}'_-$ from $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ by replacing Q, R with Q', R' and keep every other k -modal path intact, where for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$,

- the i -th sections of Q', R' are defined as $Q'_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_i \cup (R_i \cap A)$ and $R'_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_i \setminus A$, respectively.

Then $Q'_i \cup R'_i = Q_i \cup R_i$ as multisets. Obviously, R' is a k -modal path of the same sign as R .

We claim that Q' is a k -modal path of the same sign as Q . To see this, we need to show that

(Q1) Q'_i shares the same monotonicity with Q_i for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, and

(Q2) $\max_{p \in Q'_s} x(p) < \min_{p \in Q'_t} x(p)$ for any pair of indices s, t with $0 \leq s < t \leq k$.

For (Q1), since Q_i, R_i are of the same monotonicity with P_{i+1} , it suffices to show that Q'_i is monotone.

Choose index t such that $q \in Q_t$. We prove (Q1) through the following casework on i :

- If $i < t$, then $Q'_i = Q_i \cup (R_i \cap A) = (Q_i \cap B) \cup (R_i \cap A) \subseteq P_{i+1}$. To see the inclusion step, the definition of B implies that $N_Q(b) = P$ for every $b \in B$, and so $Q_i \cap B \subseteq P_{i+1}$. Similarly, we have $R_i \cap A \subseteq P_{i+1}$. Since P is a k -modal path, $Q'_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$ implies that Q'_i is monotone.
- If $i > t$, then from $x(q) > x(r)$ we deduce that $Q'_i = Q_i$, and so Q'_i is monotone.
- If $i = t$, then we consider $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in Q'_i : x(a) \leq x(q)\}$, $Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in Q'_i : x(a) \geq x(q)\}$ separately.

– By applying $x(q) > x(r)$ at (*), we may expand X into a union of two sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{a \in Q_i \cup (R_i \cap A) : x(a) \leq x(q)\} \\ &= \{a \in Q_i : x(a) \leq x(q)\} \cup \{a \in R_i \cap A : x(a) \leq x(q)\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \{a \in Q_i : x(a) \leq x(q)\} \cup \{a \in R_i : x(a) \leq x(r)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of γ tells that both sets above are contained in P_{i+1} , and so $X \subseteq P_{i+1}$.

– Again, from the fact $x(q) > x(r)$ we deduce that $Y \subseteq Q_i$.

So, $Q'_i = X \cup Y$ is monotone, thanks to Q_i, P_{i+1} are of the same monotonicity and $q \in X \cap Y$.

Recall the conventions $\max \emptyset = -\infty$ and $\min \emptyset = +\infty$. We will prove (Q2) by showing $x(b) < x(c)$ for any $(b, c) \in Q'_i \times Q'_j$ with $0 \leq i < j \leq k$ through the following casework on i, j :

- If $0 \leq i < j \leq t$, then we have shown $Q'_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$ in the proof of (Q1). Consider the first point a of Q'_j (there is nothing to prove if $Q'_j = \emptyset$). Then $x(a) \leq x(q)$. Recall that $Q'_j = Q_j \cup (R_j \cap A)$.
 - If $a \in Q_j$, then $a \in B$ thanks to $x(a) \leq x(q)$, and so $a \in P_{j+1}$.
 - If $a \in R_j \cap A$, then from $\varphi(R) = P$ we deduce that $a \in P_{j+1}$.

Since P is a k -modal path and $i + 1 < j + 1$, we obtain $x(b) < x(a) \leq x(c)$.

- For $t \leq i < j \leq k$, then we have shown $Q'_j = Q_j$ in the proof of (Q1). Consider the last point a of Q'_i (there is nothing to prove if $Q'_i = \emptyset$). Then $x(a) \geq x(q) > x(r)$, and so $a \notin A$, hence $a \notin R_j \cap A$. Thus, $a \in Q_i$. Since Q is a k -modal path and $i < j$, we obtain $x(b) \leq x(a) < x(c)$.
- If $0 \leq i < t < j \leq k$, then by considering $(\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}) = (i, t)$ with $0 < \tilde{i} < \tilde{j} \leq t$ and $(\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}) = (t, j)$ with $t \leq \tilde{i} < \tilde{j} \leq k$ in what we just proved, it follows that $x(b) < x(q) < x(c)$.

By combining the properties of Q' and R' proved above, we conclude that \mathcal{C}'_+ and \mathcal{C}'_- are a $(+k)$ - and a $(-k)$ -covering of S , respectively. Define $\mathbf{N}'_{P'}, \mathcal{D}', \varphi', d', \gamma', \mathcal{H}'$ with respect to \mathcal{C}'_+ and \mathcal{C}'_- in the same way as $\mathbf{N}_P, \mathcal{D}, \varphi, d, \gamma, \mathcal{H}$ with respect to \mathcal{C}_+ and \mathcal{C}_- . For any $L \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$, write $L' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q', R'$ when $L = Q, R$ (respectively) and $L' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L$ otherwise.

Proposition 18. *We have $\varphi'(L') = \varphi(L)'$ for all $L \in \mathcal{D}$ with $L \neq R$ and $\varphi(L) \neq R$.*

Proof. An important observation is that $\varphi(L) = \mathbf{N}_L(s(L))$ is uniquely determined by $(s(L), i(L))$ in $\mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$. Similarly, $\varphi'(L') = \mathbf{N}'_{L'}(s(L'))$ is uniquely determined by $(s(L'), i(L'))$ in $\mathcal{C}'_+ \cup \mathcal{C}'_-$.

- If $L = Q$, then $(s(L'), i(L')) = (s(Q'), i(Q')) \in \{(s(Q), i(Q)), (s(R), i(R))\}$ since Q' consists of Q and some part of R . It follows from $P = \varphi(R) = \varphi(Q) \notin \{Q, R\}$ that

$$\varphi'(Q') = \mathbf{N}'_{Q'}(s(Q')) \in \{\mathbf{N}_Q(s(Q)), \mathbf{N}_R(s(R))\} = \{\varphi(Q), \varphi(R)\} = \{P\} = \{P'\} = \{\varphi(Q)'\}.$$

- If $L \neq Q$, then from $L \neq R$ we deduce that $L' = L$, and hence $(s(L'), i(L')) = (s(L), i(L))$. Let $\varphi(L) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{P}$. Then $(\tilde{P})_i \subseteq (\tilde{P}')_i$, where the strict inclusion could happen only when $\tilde{P} = Q$. It follows that \tilde{P}' contains $s(L')$, and hence $\varphi'(L') = \tilde{P}' = \varphi(L)'$.

By combining the cases above, we conclude that the proposition holds. \square

Recall that $d(Q) = d(R) = d$. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, d$, write

$$\mathcal{L}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{L \in \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_- : d(L) = i\}, \quad \mathcal{L}'_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{L' \in \mathcal{C}'_+ \cup \mathcal{C}'_- : d'(L') = i\}.$$

Denote $\mathcal{L}_{\leq d} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=0}^d \mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{L}'_{\leq d} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i=0}^d \mathcal{L}'_i$. Then we have for every $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\leq d} \setminus \{Q, R\}$ that $L' = L$. We claim first for each $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\leq d}$ that $(d'(L'), \gamma'(L')) = (d(L), \gamma(L))$, and second that $d'(Q') = d$.

- Firstly, $\varphi^{(i)}(L) \neq R$ for $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\leq d} \setminus \{Q, R\}$ because otherwise the depth of L would be bigger than d . So, by Proposition 18, we see that $\varphi^{(i)}(L)' = \varphi^{(i)}(L')$, and hence $d'(L') = d(L)$. From $L = L'$ and $\varphi(L) = \varphi(L)'$ we obtain $\gamma'(L') = \gamma(L)$.

- Secondly, from $\varphi(Q) = P$ we deduce that $d(P) = d(Q) - 1$. Since Proposition 18 implies that $\varphi'(Q') = P'$, we obtain from the first claim that $d'(Q') = d'(P') + 1 = d(P) + 1 = d$.

We next show that $\gamma'(Q')^2 > \gamma(Q)^2 + \gamma(R)^2$. It suffices to prove $\gamma'(Q') \geq \gamma(Q) + \gamma(R)$. (In fact, the equality holds, but we shall not need this stronger fact.) Indeed, we are to show that every point of Q'_i which is to the left of q contributes to $\gamma'(Q')$. That is, $N'_{Q'}(s(Q')) = \dots = N'_{Q'}(q)$. Recall that Q, R are part of a fine covering and so $Q_i \cap R_i = \emptyset$. This will then imply that $\gamma'(Q') \geq \gamma(Q) + \gamma(R)$ as $x(r) < x(q)$ and every point of R that contributes to R are moved into Q' . Fix an index i and consider any point $a \in (Q_i \cap B) \cup (R_i \cap A) \subseteq Q'_i$ (hence a is to the left of q). Then $a \in P_{i+1} = P'_{i+1}$ and $N'_{Q'}(a) = P$. This implies that $N'_{Q'}(s(Q')) = \dots = N'_{Q'}(q) = P$, and so $\gamma'(Q') \geq \gamma(Q) + \gamma(R)$.

Finally, we are ready to prove $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{H}'_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ and $\mathcal{H}_d < \mathcal{H}'_d$. Indeed, for any $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\leq d} \setminus \{Q, R\}$, we have $d'(L') = d(L)$ and $\gamma'(L') = \gamma(L)$. Therefore, by $\gamma'(Q')^2 > \gamma(Q)^2 + \gamma(R)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_i &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_i} \gamma(L)^2 = \sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}'_d} \gamma'(L')^2 = \mathcal{H}'_i \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1), \\ \mathcal{H}_d &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_d} \gamma(L)^2 = \left(\sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_d \setminus \{Q, R\}} \gamma(L)^2 \right) + (\gamma(Q)^2 + \gamma(R)^2) \\ &< \left(\sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}'_d \setminus \{Q', R'\}} \gamma'(L')^2 \right) + \gamma'(Q')^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{L' \in \mathcal{L}'_d} \gamma'(L')^2 = \mathcal{H}'_d. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the desired contradiction $\mathcal{H}' \succ \mathcal{H}$. The proof of Lemma 9 is complete.