

# A NOTE ON THE DIAMOND SATURATION PROBLEM

MARIA-ROMINA IVAN

## Abstract

For a given fixed poset  $\mathcal{P}$  we say that a family of subsets of  $[n]$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -saturated if it does not contain an induced copy of  $\mathcal{P}$ , but whenever we add to it a new set, an induced copy of  $\mathcal{P}$  is formed. The size of the smallest such family is denoted by  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{P})$ .


For the diamond poset  $\mathcal{D}_2$  (the two-dimensional Boolean lattice), Martin, Smith and Walker proved that  $\sqrt{n} \leq \text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \leq n + 1$ . In this paper we prove that  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \geq (4 - o(1))\sqrt{n}$ .

## 1 Introduction

We say that a poset  $(\mathcal{Q}, \preceq')$  contains an *induced copy* of a poset  $(\mathcal{P}, \preceq)$  if there exist an injective function  $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $(\mathcal{P}, \preceq)$  and  $(f(\mathcal{P}), \preceq')$  are isomorphic. In this paper we will only consider posets consisting of subsets of  $[n]$  with the partial order given by inclusion. For a fixed poset  $\mathcal{P}$  we call a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$   *$\mathcal{P}$ -saturated* if  $\mathcal{F}$  does not contain an induced copy of  $\mathcal{P}$ , but for every subset  $S$  of  $[n]$  such that  $S \notin \mathcal{F}$ , the family  $\mathcal{F} \cup S$  does contain such a copy. We denote by  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{P})$  the size of the smallest  $\mathcal{P}$ -saturated family of subsets of  $[n]$ . In general we refer to  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{P})$  as the *induced saturation number* of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Saturation for posets was introduced by Gerbner and Patkós [2], although this was not for *induced* saturation. We refer the reader to the work of Morrison, Noel and Scott [5] for more results. We also remark that considerable efforts have been made on related extremal problems in poset theory, such as the recent work of Keszegh, Lemons, Martin, Pálvölgyi and Patkós [3].

The diamond poset, which we denote by  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , is the 4 point poset with one minimal element, one maximal element and two incomparable elements as shown in the picture below. Equivalently,  $\mathcal{D}_2$  is the two-dimensional Boolean lattice.



The Hasse diagram of the poset  $\mathcal{D}_2$

Despite the simplicity of the diamond poset, the question of its induced saturation number is still open. The most recent bounds are  $\sqrt{n} \leq \text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \leq n + 1$  proved by Martin, Smith and Walker [4]. Ferrara, Kay, Kramer, Martin, Reiniger, Smith and Sullivan [1] conjectured that  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) = \Theta(n)$ .

In this paper we prove that  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \geq (4 - o(1))\sqrt{n}$ , thus improving the constant factor. Most importantly, our proof explores in depth what it means for a diamond-saturated family to be

of size  $c\sqrt{n}$  for a constant  $c$ . Surprisingly, such a structure is very rich in properties and yet, as far as we can see, there is no indication that such a family cannot exist. This suggests that perhaps the induced saturation number for the diamond is not of linear growth.

## 2 Singletons analysis

The following lemma shows the importance of minimal elements in a  $\mathcal{D}_2$ -saturated family  $\mathcal{F}$ . Ferrara, Kay, Kramer, Martin, Reiniger, Smith and Sullivan [1] proved that if  $\mathcal{F}$  contains the empty set (or the full set  $[n]$ ), then  $|\mathcal{F}| > n$ . This fact will be used repeatedly throughout the proof.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\mathcal{D}_2$ -saturated family. Let  $S$  be a minimal element of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq |S|$ .*

*Proof.* If  $S$  is the empty set, then the statement is trivially true.

Now we assume  $S \neq \emptyset$ , and for each element  $i$  of  $S$  we will find an element of  $\mathcal{F}$  that contains all elements of  $S$  except  $i$ . This will give us  $|S|$  elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ , as desired.

More precisely, by the minimality of  $S$  we have that  $S - \{i\} \notin \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore, since  $\mathcal{F}$  is diamond-saturated,  $S - \{i\}$  will have to form a diamond when added to the family. We obtain three sets  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that they form a diamond together with  $S - \{i\}$ . By the minimality again we can only have  $S - \{i\}$  the minimal element of the diamond. Let  $A$  be the maximal element of the diamond.

Suppose  $B \neq S$  and  $C \neq S$ . If  $i \in B$  and  $i \in C$ , then we observe that  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$  and  $S$  form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ , contradiction. Thus we can assume, without loss of generality, that  $i \notin B$ . So we have  $S - \{i\} \subset B$  and  $i \notin B$ , as claimed.

If on the other hand  $C = S$ , then  $B$  and  $S$  are incomparable and  $S - \{i\} \subset B$ . So we again obtain that  $i \notin B$  and  $S - \{i\} \subset B$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$


**Theorem 2.** *For every  $c < 4$  there exists an  $n_0$  such that  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \geq c\sqrt{n}$  for any  $n \geq n_0$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that for some  $c < 4$  we have  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) \leq c\sqrt{n}$  for some arbitrarily large  $n$ .


Fix  $\mathcal{F}$  an arbitrary diamond-saturated family with with cardinality at most  $c\sqrt{n}$ . This immediately implies that  $\emptyset, [n] \notin \mathcal{F}$ . Fix  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  a minimal set with respect to inclusion. From Lemma 1 we know that  $|S| \leq c\sqrt{n}$ . Thus there exist  $n - c\sqrt{n}$  singletons such that  $i \notin S$ . For those singletons, at least  $n - 2c\sqrt{n}$  of the sets  $S \cup \{i\}$  are not in  $\mathcal{F}$ , by our initial assumption on the size of the family. A set  $S \cup \{i\}$  that is not in our family must form a diamond with 3 elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  by the saturation of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Assume  $S \cup \{i\}, A, B, C$  form a diamond where  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{F}$ .

We observe that  $S \cup \{i\}$  cannot be the maximal element of the diamond for more than  $c\sqrt{n}$  singletons since the middle elements of the diamond would have to contain  $i$  and be subsets of  $S \cup \{i\}$ . Say  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  are two middle elements for two different singletons. Then  $A_i \neq A_j$  as they differ in elements  $i$  and  $j$ .

For each singleton  $i$  for which  $S \cup \{i\}$  is the maximal element of the induced diamond, let  $V_i$  be its minimal element, as well as minimal with respect to this property. We observe that  $V_i$  are minimal elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  and that  $i \in V_i$  by the minimality of  $S$ . Moreover,  $V_i = S - K_i \cup \{i\}$  for some  $K_i \subseteq S$ . Also,  $S \cup \{i\}$  cannot be the minimal element of the diamond because then  $A, B, C, S$  would form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ , contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{F}$  is diamond free. Thus,  $S \cup \{i\}$  has to be one of the two incomparable elements of the induced diamond for at least  $n - 3c\sqrt{n}$  singletons. Therefore, for these singletons  $i$  we have the structure below, where  $A_i, B_i, S_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .




Moreover, we observe that by minimality either  $S = S_i$  or  $S_i - S = \{i\}$ . If  $S_i \neq S$  then there exists  $K_i \subseteq S$  such that  $S_i = S \cup \{i\} - K_i$ , and all such  $S_i$  are pairwise different because  $S_i$  is the only one containing  $i$ . Therefore there are at least  $n - 4c\sqrt{n}$   $i$  such that  $S_i = S$ . We will now focus on these singletons for which we have the following diamond, where  $B_i$  is of maximal cardinality with respect to this construction, and  $A_i$  of minimal cardinality, after choosing  $B_i$ .



We observe that since  $B_i$  and  $S \cup \{i\}$  are incomparable, but  $S \subset B_i$ , then we must have  $i \notin B_i$ .


**Claim A.** *If  $i \neq j$ , then  $B_i \cup \{i\} \neq B_j \cup \{j\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $B_i \cup \{i\} = B_j \cup \{j\}$ . If  $B_i$  and  $B_j$  are incomparable, then we get a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$  made from  $S, B_i, B_j, A_i$ .  $A_i$  is the maximal element because  $B_j \subset B_j \cup \{j\} = B_i \cup \{i\} \subseteq A_i$ . Therefore we must have, without loss of generality,  $B_i \subset B_j$ . They cannot be equal because they differ by at least  $i$  and  $j$ . In this case we have  $i \in B_j$ , thus  $S \cup \{i\} \subset B_j$  (they cannot be equal since  $B_j \in \mathcal{F}$ ). On the other hand we have that  $B_j \cup \{j\} \subseteq A_i$ , so  $|B_j| < |A_i|$ . We obtain the diamond below, which contradicts the minimality of  $A_i$  with respect to the construction and  $B_i$ .



□

We deduce from Claim A and the assumption on the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  that for at least  $n - 5c\sqrt{n}$  singletons  $i$ ,  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  is not in the family. Therefore, by saturation, it has to form a diamond with 3 different elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $X_i, Y_i, N_i$  be three such elements. We notice that  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  cannot be the minimal element because then  $B_i, X_i, Y_i, N_i$  would form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ . It also cannot be the maximal element of the diamond because  $B_i \cup \{i\} \subset A_i$ , thus  $A_i, X_i, Y_i, N_i$  will again form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ . We conclude that  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  has to be one of the two incomparable elements as shown in the picture below. We choose  $N_i$  of minimal cardinality with respect to this configuration.




**Claim B.**  $B_i$  and  $N_i$  are incomparable.

*Proof.* Suppose they are comparable. There are three cases:

1.  $N_i \subset B_i$ .

In this case, if  $B_i$  and  $Y_i$  were incomparable, then we would have the diamond  $X_i, B_i, N_i, Y_i$  inside  $\mathcal{F}$ . Therefore  $B_i$  and  $Y_i$  are comparable and the only option is  $B_i \subset Y_i$  as  $B_i \cup \{i\} \parallel Y_i$ . This also implies that  $i \notin Y_i$ . Finally we have  $S \subset B_i \subset Y_i$ ,  $S \cup \{i\} \subset B_i \cup \{i\} \subset X_i$ , and  $S \cup \{i\} \parallel Y_i$  since  $i \notin Y_i$  and clearly  $|S \cup \{i\}| \leq |B_i| < |Y_i|$ . This means that we have the diamond below, which contradicts the maximality of  $B_i$ .



2.  $N_i = B_i$ .

This case reduces to the previous case since now we already know  $B_i \subset Y_i$ .

3.  $B_i \subset N_i$ .

This case is impossible by cardinality since  $N_i \subset B_i \cup \{i\}$ , thus  $|B_i| < |N_i| < |B_i \cup \{i\}| = |B_i| + 1$ , contradiction.

□

An immediate consequence of Claim B is that  $S$  and  $N_i$  are incomparable. If they were not, then  $S \subset N_i$  would form the diamond  $X_i, B_i, N_i, S$  in  $\mathcal{F}$ , contradiction. Lastly,  $S$  cannot be equal to  $N_i$  since  $S \subset B_i$ , but  $B_i$  and  $N_i$  are incomparable.

We also remark that by maximality we have that any two distinct  $N_i$  are incomparable, and that  $i \in N_i$ . The second remark follows from the fact that  $N_i \parallel B_i$  but  $N_i \subset B_i \cup \{i\}$ .

The following claim will be very useful for the construction and consequent modification of a certain bipartite graph at the end of the section.


**Claim C.** *If  $i \neq j$  then we cannot have both  $N_i = N_j$  and  $B_i = B_j$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $N_i = N_j$ . Then by previous remark we have that  $i \in N_i$  and consequently  $i \in N_j$ . Also  $N_j \subset B_j \cup \{j\}$ , thus  $i \in B_j$ . On the other hand  $i \notin B_i$ , hence  $B_i \neq B_j$  which finishes the claim. □

The next claim is of potential interest towards proving more than the result in this paper, and it further illustrates how constraining and rich in properties the structure studied in this proof is.

**Claim D.** *If  $B_i \neq B_j$ , then  $A_i \neq A_j$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A_i = A_j$ . We cannot have  $B_i \parallel B_j$  because otherwise  $A_i = A_j, B_i, B_j, S$  would form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume  $B_i \subset B_j$  and we have the following diagram.



If  $S \cup \{i\}$  is not comparable to  $B_j$ , then the diamond formed by these two,  $A_{i,j}$  and  $S$  would contradict the maximality of  $B_i$ . Hence we need to have  $S \cup \{i\}$  and  $B_j$  comparable, and by cardinality, the only possibility is  $S \cup \{i\} \subset B_j$ .

But now we have the diamond formed by  $S, B_i, S \cup \{i\}, B_j$  which contradicts the minimality of  $A_i$  with respect to  $B_i$ . Therefore  $A_i \neq A_j$ .  $\square$

We have already seen previously that  $B_i \cup \{i\} \neq B_j \cup \{j\}$  for  $i \neq j$ . Thus we have at least  $n - 5c\sqrt{n}$  such sets. Each of them has a corresponding set  $N_i$ , although the  $N_i$ 's can sometimes coincide for different  $i$ 's. We build the following bipartite graph:  $\mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{N}$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  consists of the sets  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  consists of the corresponding sets  $N_i$ . The only edges are the ones joining  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  to  $N_i$ . We observe that each vertex in  $\mathcal{B}$  has degree 1, thus we have at least  $n - 5c\sqrt{n}$  edges.

We now modify the graph by replacing  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  with  $B_i$  for all  $i$ , and identifying the same repeating set with a single vertex – in other words, if  $B_i = B_j$  for two  $i \neq j$ , the vertex  $B_i \cup \{i\}$  and the vertex  $B_j \cup \{j\}$  will both be identified with the vertex  $B_i = B_j$ . Notice that no vertex in  $\mathcal{B}$  will be identified with any vertex in  $\mathcal{N}$  since all  $B_i$ 's contain  $S$ , while all  $N_i$ 's are incomparable to  $S$ .

If an edge were to contract, that would mean that for two different  $i$  and  $j$  we have  $N_i = N_j$  and  $B_i = B_j$ , which contradicts Claim C. Hence, the modified graph still has at least  $n - 5c\sqrt{n}$  edges.

Assume that  $|\mathcal{N}| = k$  and that  $d$  is the biggest degree in  $\mathcal{N}$ . Since the new graph is still bipartite we have that the number of edges is the sum of degrees in  $\mathcal{N}$  which is less or equal to  $kd$ . Thus we have that  $n - 5c\sqrt{n} \leq kd \Rightarrow d \geq \frac{n - 5c\sqrt{n}}{k}$ . This also tells us that the size of the modified  $\mathcal{B}$  is at least  $d \geq \frac{n - 5c\sqrt{n}}{k}$ .

Similarly, by looking at  $\mathcal{G} = \{A : \bar{A} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , where  $\bar{A}$  is the complement of  $A$  in  $[n]$ , we observe that this is also a diamond-saturated family of the same size as  $\mathcal{F}$ , where the minimal elements are the complements of the maximal elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We can do the same analysis as above by fixing  $T$  a minimal element of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We will construct a similar graph as the modified one explained previously.

Denote by  $M_i$  the minimal elements, the equivalent sets to the  $N_j$ , and by  $C_k$  the elements that contain  $T$ , equivalent sets to the  $B_l$ . Therefore  $\bar{M}_i \in \mathcal{F}$  are maximal elements in  $\mathcal{F}$ . On the other hand, any  $N_j$  is not a maximal element as it is contained in  $Y_j$  by construction. Similarly, any  $B_l$  is not a maximal element as it is contained in  $A_l$ . We conclude that no  $\bar{M}_i$  can be equal to any  $N_j$  or to any  $B_l$ . Moreover,  $B_l$  is neither a maximal nor a minimal element in  $\mathcal{F}$  since it is between  $S$  and  $A_i$ , thus no  $\bar{C}_k$  is a minimal or a maximal element either, which implies that no  $\bar{C}_k$  is equal to any  $N_j$ . We are left to prove that no  $\bar{C}_k$  is equal to any  $B_l$  in order to obtain two completely disjoint graphs in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Claim E.** *There exists a minimal element  $P$  and a maximal element  $R$ , with  $P, R \in \mathcal{F}$ , such that  $P$  and  $R$  are not comparable.*

*Proof.* We begin by noticing that all the  $N_i$  and  $S$  are minimal elements and  $i \in N$  for every  $i$  such that  $i \notin S$  and  $S - K_i \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{F}$  for any  $K_i \subseteq S$ . For the singletons  $i \notin S$  such that  $S - K_i \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$  for some  $K_i \subseteq S$ , we consider  $L_i \in \mathcal{F}$  to be the minimal element such that  $L_i \subseteq S - K_i \cup \{i\}$ . Because  $S$  is itself a minimal element, we need to have  $i \in L_i$ .

If every maximal element is comparable to every minimal element, then any maximal element must contain the union of all  $N_i$ ,  $L_i$  and  $S$  which is  $[n] - \mathcal{P}$ , where  $\mathcal{P} = \{i : i \notin S, S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .

Furthermore, if  $S \cup \{i\}$  and  $S \cup \{j\}$  are in  $\mathcal{F}$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $i, j \notin S$ , then we cannot have a maximal element  $T \in \mathcal{F}$  that contains the pair  $\{i, j\}$  since by assumption  $S \subset T$  and  $S, S \cup \{i\}, S \cup \{j\}$  and  $T$  will form a diamond in  $\mathcal{F}$ . This implies that no element of  $\mathcal{F}$  contains both  $i$  and  $j$ , in particular  $\{i, j\} \notin \mathcal{F}$ . Thus  $\{i, j\}$  will have to form a diamond with 3 elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  by saturation. However, since the empty set is not in the family,  $\{i, j\}$  cannot be the maximal element of the diamond, therefore it will be a subset of one of the three sets it form a diamond with, contradiction.

We conclude that  $|\mathcal{P}| \leq 1$ , thus the union of all the minimal sets is either  $[n]$  or  $[n] - \{i\}$  for some  $i \notin S$  and  $S \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . If the later is true, then take  $D$  to be the maximal element of  $\mathcal{F}$  that contains  $S \cup \{i\}$ .  $D$  will have to contain  $[n] - \{i\}$  too by our assumption, thus  $D = [n]$ . We see that in both cases we have to have  $[n] \in \mathcal{F}$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

To end the proof, we first pick a minimal element  $P$  and a maximal element  $R$  that are not comparable. We run the above argument once for  $\mathcal{F}$  with fixed minimal element  $P$  and once for  $\mathcal{G}$  with fixed minimal element  $\bar{R}$ . To simplify the notation we can assume without loss of generality that  $S = P$  and  $T = \bar{R}$ , hence assume that  $S$  and  $\bar{T}$  are not comparable. Now we notice that if  $B_l = \bar{C}_k$  for some  $l$  and  $k$ , then  $S \subset B_l = \bar{C}_k \subset \bar{T}$ , contradiction.

Notice that if we only look at the first graph, we already have that  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq k + \frac{n - 5c\sqrt{n}}{k} \geq 2\sqrt{n - 5c\sqrt{n}}$ . Therefore, since the two graphs are vertex-disjoint, we in fact obtain that  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 4\sqrt{n - 5c\sqrt{n}}$ , which is greater than  $c\sqrt{n}$  for  $n$  large enough, contradiction.  $\square$

### 3 Concluding remarks

The above proof explores the extremal behaviour of a diamond-saturated family where the square root bound appears as the minimal and maximal elements seem to be pushed closer together, yet spread through most of the layers of the hypercube – note that this is quite unlike the two canonical examples of diamond saturated families, namely a chain of size  $n + 1$  and the family of all singletons and the empty set. Indeed, consider the graphs constructed towards the end of the proof. They show that, under the condition that the diamond-saturated family  $\mathcal{F}$  is of square root order,  $\mathcal{F}$  must be in a way invariant under taking complements – for example, the antichains formed by the minimal and maximal elements have to roughly look the same and be of order  $\sqrt{n}$ .

It is clear from the proof that if the induced saturation number for the diamond is  $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ , then the size of the biggest antichain of a family of this size has to be of  $\sqrt{n}$  order. This can be seen by looking at the bipartite graph considered in the proof and the fact that one side, namely the  $N_i$ 's, was an antichain of size  $k$ . If  $k \ll \sqrt{n}$ , then we immediately get that  $|\mathcal{F}| \gg \sqrt{n}$  from the other side of the graph. By applying Dilworth's theorem, we get that  $\mathcal{F}$  can be decomposed into

roughly  $\sqrt{n}$  chains, whilst having the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  of the same order. This suggests a family of  $c'\sqrt{n}$  disjoint chains, each of constant size and, more importantly, positioned in such a way that there are no common interior gaps for all of them.

We believe that this is possible and that the above proof has some of the ingredients to construct such a diamond-saturated family, thus making us conjecture the following.

**Conjecture 3.**  $\text{sat}^*(n, \mathcal{D}_2) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ .

## References

- [1] M. Ferrara, B. Kay, L. Kramer, R. R. Martin, B. Reiniger, H. C. Smith, and E. T. Sullivan, *The saturation number of induced subposets of the boolean lattice*, *Discrete Mathematics* **340** (2017), 2479–2487.
- [2] D. Gerbner and B. Patkós, *Extremal finite set theory*, CRC Press, 2018.
- [3] B. Keszegh, N. Lemons, R. R. Martin, D. Pálvölgyi, and B. Patkós, *Induced and non-induced poset saturation problems*, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **184** (2021), 105497.
- [4] R. R. Martin, H. C. Smith, and S. Walker, *Improved bounds for induced poset saturation*, *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **27** (2020).
- [5] N. Morrison, J. A. Noel, and A. D. Scott, *On saturated  $k$ -Sperner systems*, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **21** (2014), P3.22.

Maria-Romina Ivan, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0WB, UK.

*Email address:* `mri25@dpms.cam.ac.uk`