

A constructive proof of the Bollobás-Varopoulos theorem

Dylanger S. Pittman

400 Dowman Drive, Atlanta

Abstract

The Bollobás-Varopoulos theorem is an analogue of Hall's matching theorem on non-atomic measure spaces. Here we prove a finite version with a completely constructive proof.

Keywords: combinatorics, measure theory, discrete math, graph theory

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

In 1972, Bella Bollobás and Nicholas Varopoulos [1] proved an analogue to Hall's matching theorem using a short clever argument that involves characteristic function methods similar to those introduced in [2]. Here, we reprove a finite version of the same theorem, with a fully constructive method. Here is our result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (Ω, S, ν) be a finite non-atomic measure and A a measurable set in S with $\nu(A) > 0$ and subsets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n and let $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n > 0$.*

Then there are disjoint subsets $B_k \subseteq A_k$ with $\nu(B_k) = m_k$ for all $k \in [n]$ if and only if

$$\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

Email address: dpittm2@emory.edu (Dylanger S. Pittman)

2. Background and lemmas

2.1. Notation and non-atomic measures

We use the following standard notation for the rest of the write up: 2^Q is the power set of a set Q , $|Q|$ denotes the cardinality of a set Q , $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ are the natural numbers.

It would be beneficial to use to restate some of the key theorems and definitions that we use.

Let (Ω, S, ν) be a σ -finite measure. Then an *atom* of ν is a set $A \in S$ with $\nu(A) > 0$ such that for all $C \in S$ with $C \subset A$, either $\nu(C) = 0$ or $\nu(C) = \nu(A)$. By σ -finiteness, we have $\nu(A) < \infty$. (Ω, S, ν) or ν is called *non-atomic* if it has no atoms. Equivalently, (Ω, S, ν) or ν is called *non-atomic* if for any measurable set A with $\nu(A) > 0$ there exists a measurable subset B of A such that $\nu(A) > \nu(B) > 0$.

The following corollary is a consequence of Proposition A.1 in [3]. This is coincidentally the theorem proved first by Waclaw Sierpiński, see [4].

Corollary 2.1. *Let (Ω, S, ν) be a non-atomic finite measure with $\nu(\Omega) > 0$. Then if A is a measurable set in S with $\nu(A) > 0$, then for any real number c with $\nu(A) \geq c \geq 0$ there exists a measurable subset B of A such that $\nu(B) = c$.*

We also have another corollary following from Proposition A.2 in [3].

Corollary 2.2. *Let (Ω, S, ν) be a finite non-atomic measure and A a measurable set in S with $\nu(A) > 0$. Let r_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$ be numbers with $r_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i = \nu(A)$. Then A can be decomposed as a union of disjoint sets $R_i \in S$ with $\nu(R_i) = r_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

2.2. Generalizations of Hall's matching theorem

In addition to Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2, we also need to use Hall's matching theorem, see ([5], theorem 2.1.2 in [6]). Hall's theorem itself will not be covered in this write-up as there is a lot of literature already in existence, not to mention

it would require me writing a few pages of elementary graph theory to cover the requisite background to make the statement of the theorem understandable.

The following corollary is a generalization of Hall's matching theorem. It is in fact Exercise 2.9 on p.54 in [6] and it is proven with a clever application of Hall's matching theorem.

Corollary 2.3. *Let A be a finite set with subsets A_1, \dots, A_n , and let $d_1, \dots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq A_k$, with $|D_k| = d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if*

$$\left| \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right| \geq \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

The above claim is a generalization of Hall's matching theorem because if we set $d_i = 1$ for all $i \in [n]$, then it would be an equivalent statement. If we consider the case where each point has the same weight of $\xi > 0$, then we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4. *Let A be a finite set with subsets A_1, \dots, A_n and let $d_1, \dots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a real $\xi > 0$, let $(A, 2^A, \eta)$ be a discrete measure defined as $\eta(X) = \xi|X|$ for all $X \in 2^A$.*

Then there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq A_k$, with $\eta(D_k) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\eta\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i\right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

If $\xi = 1$, then will obtain Corollary 2.3. So, the above Corollary 2.4 is a generalization of Corollary 2.3.

If we replace weighted discrete points with disjoint subsets with the same measure and apply that to Corollary 2.4, we obtain the next corollary.

Corollary 2.5. *Given a real $\xi > 0$, let (Ω, S, ν) be a finite measure and $A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_\ell\}$ be a finite collection of disjoint measurable sets in S where $\nu(A_i) = \xi$. Also let $d_1, \dots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \subseteq A$.*

Then there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq \alpha_k$, with $\nu(\bigcup_{D \in D_k} D) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\nu\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \left(\bigcup_{B \in \alpha_i} B\right)\right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

Proof. Let $(A, 2^A, \eta)$ be a discrete measure defined as $\eta(X) = \xi|X|$ for all $X \in 2^A$. Then by Corollary 2.4, there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq \alpha_k$, with $\eta(D_k) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\eta\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i\right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

Since $\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i$ is a finite collection of disjoint measurable sets, then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i\right) &= \eta\left(\bigcup_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \{B\}\right) \\ &= \sum_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \eta(\{B\}) \\ &= \sum_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \nu(B) \\ &= \nu\left(\bigcup_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} B\right) \\ &= \nu\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \left(\bigcup_{B \in \alpha_i} B\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

It also good to mention that Corollary 2.5 is a generalization of Corollary 2.4. As 2.5 deals with disjoint sets with measure, while 2.4 exclusively deals with the case where each set is a single point.

3. Main Result

Now to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. If such B_k 's exist, then for all I , $\nu\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i\right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i$.

Conversely, let Q be a nonempty subset of $[n]$, then we can define

$$S_Q = \left(\bigcap_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{i \notin Q} A_i \right).$$

Note that if P is also a nonempty subset of $[n]$ and $Q \neq P$, then $S_Q \cap S_P = \emptyset$.

It would also be helpful to note that

$$A_k = \bigcup_{Q \in \{P \in 2^{[n]} \mid k \in P\}} S_Q$$

and

$$\bigcup_{i \in [n]} A_i = \bigcup_{Q \in 2^{[n]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}} S_Q.$$

Assume $\xi > 0$. Then by Corollary 2.1, for each nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ there exists a subset of S_Q of measure $\xi \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(S_Q)}{\xi} \right\rfloor$; let this subset be denoted as $E_{Q,\xi}$.

Then by Corollary 2.2, $E_{Q,\xi}$ can be partitioned into $\left\lfloor \frac{\nu(S_Q)}{\xi} \right\rfloor$ subsets of measure ξ . We can now define a set

$$A_{k,\xi} = \bigcup_{Q \in \{P \in 2^{[n]} \mid k \in P\}} E_{Q,\xi}.$$

Now consider the number $\left\lfloor \frac{m_k}{\xi} \right\rfloor$, we are given m_k by the theorem statement, which by Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2 is the maximum number of disjoint subsets of measure ξ for a set of measure m_k and define $d_{k,\xi} = \left\lfloor \frac{m_k}{\xi} \right\rfloor - 2^{n+1}$. We want $d_{k,\xi}$ to be positive integers, so note that if $0 < \xi \leq \frac{m_k}{2^{n+1} + 1}$, then $d_{k,\xi} > 0$.

Observe that given a nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i,\xi} \right) \right| &= \left| \nu \left(\bigcup_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} S_P \right) - \nu \left(\bigcup_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} E_{P,\xi} \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} \nu(S_P) - \sum_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} \nu(E_{P,\xi}) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} [\nu(S_P) - \nu(E_{P,\xi})] \right| \\
&< \left| \sum_{P \in \{T \in 2^{[n]} \mid T \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}} \xi \right| = \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus as $\xi \rightarrow 0$, $\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i,\xi} \right) \rightarrow \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right)$.

Also note that

$$\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \geq \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i,\xi} \right).$$

We use $d_{k,\xi}$ because if we are given a nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ then by the work we did previously, $\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i,\xi} \right) > \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|})$.

Since the theorem hypothesis states that $\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in Q} m_i$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) &\geq \left(\sum_{i \in Q} m_i \right) - \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \\
&\geq \xi \left(\sum_{i \in Q} \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right) - \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \\
&\geq \xi \left(\sum_{i \in Q} \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right) - 2^{n+1}\xi \\
&\geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} \left(\left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor - 2^{n+1} \right) = \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i,\xi}.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, for sufficiently small ξ ,

$$\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i,\xi} \right) > \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi(2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i,\xi} > 0.$$

Therefore for all $I \subseteq [n]$ and a sufficiently small ξ we have

$$\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,\xi} \right) > \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_{i,\xi} > 0.$$

Therefore by Corollary 2.5, for sufficiently small ξ there exists disjoint subsets $B_{k,\xi} \subseteq A_{k,\xi}$ such that $\nu(B_{k,\xi}) = \xi d_{k,\xi}$ for all $k \in [n]$.

Given a nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ we have that $\sum_{i \in Q} m_i \geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i,\xi}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i \in Q} m_i - \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i,\xi} \right| &= \left| \sum_{i \in Q} (m_i - \xi d_{i,\xi}) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i \in Q} \left(m_i - \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor + \xi 2^{n+1} \right) \right| \\ &= 2^{n+1} \xi |Q| + \left| \sum_{i \in Q} \left(m_i - \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Keep in mind that $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} m_i - |\xi| \leq \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \leq \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} m_i + |\xi|$. Therefore $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor = m_i$.

Thus as $\xi \rightarrow 0$ we have that $\nu(B_{k,\xi}) = \xi d_{k,\xi} \rightarrow m_k$ for all $k \in [n]$ and

$$\nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,\xi} \right) > \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_{i,\xi} \longrightarrow \nu \left(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

Given a sufficiently small $\xi > 0$, let us define $\xi_i = \frac{\xi}{2^i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. So for each $k \in [n]$ we can now create a sequence $\{\nu(B_{k,\xi_i})\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$. Since this sequence is monotonically increasing, by our previous work and Corollary 2.1 for every $k \in [n]$ there exists a sequence of sets

$$B_{k,\xi_0} \subseteq B_{k,\xi_1} \subseteq B_{k,\xi_2} \subseteq \dots$$

such that for every $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$: $B_{k,\xi_i} \subseteq A_k$, $\nu(B_{k,\xi_i}) = \xi_i d_{k,\xi_i}$, and $B_{k,\xi_i} \cap B_{k',\xi_i} = \emptyset$ when $k \neq k'$. Let us define

$$B_{k,0} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} B_{k,\xi_i}.$$

By our previous work, we know that $m_k = \nu(B_{k,0})$. We now need to prove two more things:

1. there exists a set $B_k \subseteq B_{k,0}$ such that $B_k \subseteq A_k$ and $\nu(B_k) = \nu(B_{k,0})$
2. there exists sets $B_{k_1} \subseteq B_{k_1,0}$ and $B_{k_2} \subseteq B_{k_2,0}$ where $B_{k_1} \cap B_{k_2} = \emptyset$, $\nu(B_{k_1}) = \nu(B_{k_1,0})$ and $\nu(B_{k_2}) = \nu(B_{k_2,0})$ when $k_1 \neq k_2$.

If $B_{k,0}$ is not a subset of A_k then $B_{k,0} \cap A_k^c \neq \emptyset$. If $\nu(B_{k,0} \cap A_k^c) > 0$, then there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $\nu(B_{k,\xi_\alpha} \cap A_k^c) > 0$, which contradicts $B_{k,\xi_\alpha} \subseteq A_k$. Therefore $\nu(B_{k,0} \cap A_k^c) = 0$. Thus there exists a set of measure zero N_k such that $\nu(B_{k,0} \setminus N_k) = m_k$ and $B_{k,0} \setminus N_k \subseteq A_k$.

Similarly if we are given distinct $k_1, k_2 \in [n]$ and $B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0} \neq \emptyset$, then if $\nu(B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0}) > 0$, then there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $\nu(B_{k_1,\xi_\alpha} \cap B_{k_2,\xi_\alpha}) > 0$. This contradicts $B_{k_1,\xi_\alpha} \cap B_{k_2,\xi_\alpha} = \emptyset$, thus $\nu(B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0}) = 0$. Thus there exists sets of measure zero E_{k_1} and E_{k_2} such that $(B_{k,0} \setminus E_{k_1}) \cap (B_{k',0} \setminus E_{k_2}) = \emptyset$ if $k_1 \neq k_2$.

So there exists disjoint sets $B_k \subseteq A_k$ such that $\nu(B_k) = m_k$ for all $k \in [n]$. Our proof is complete. □

Acknowledgements

The author conjectured the main result before knowing that it had a connection with graph theory. He would like to thank Professor Hao Huang for pointing out its combinatorial connection and Professor Shanshuang Yang for his proofreading and verification.

References

- [1] B. Bollobás, N. Varopoulos, Representation of systems of measurable sets, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 44 (1972) 323–325.

- [2] N. Varopoulos, Sur un probleme d'interpolation, O.B. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A 274 (1972) 1539–1542.
- [3] R. M. Dudley, R. Norvaiša, Appendix: Nonatomic Measure Spaces, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2011, pp. 645–648.
- [4] W. Sierpiński, Sur les fonctions d'ensemble additives et continues, Fundamenta Mathematicae 3 (1922) 240–246.
- [5] P. Hall, On representatives of subsets, J. London Math. Soc. 10 (1) (1935) 26–36.
- [6] R. Diestel, Graph Theory, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2010.