

Lower bounds on the minimal dispersion of point sets via cover-free families

M. Trödler*, J. Volec† and J. Vybíral‡

April 2, 2025

Abstract

We elaborate on the intimate connection between the largest volume of an empty axis-parallel box in a set of n points from $[0, 1]^d$ and cover-free families from the extremal set theory. This connection was discovered in a recent paper of the authors. In this work, we apply a very recent result of Michel and Scott to obtain a whole range of new lower bounds on the number of points needed so that the largest volume of such a box is bounded by a given ε . Surprisingly, it turns out that for each of the new bounds, there is a choice of the parameters d and ε such that the bound outperforms the others.

1 Introduction

Let $X \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a (finite) set of points. There are several ways of how to measure whether the points of X are well spread. One way, which has

The work of the first and the third author has been supported by the grant P202/23/04720S of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic. The work of the second author has been supported by the grant 23-06815M of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic.

*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Trojanova 13, 12000 Prague, Czech Republic. E-mail: trodlmat@fjfi.cvut.cz

†Department of Theoretical Computer Science, Faculty of Information Technology, Czech Technical University in Prague, Thákurova 9, Prague, 160 00, Czech Republic. E-mail: jan@ucw.cz

‡Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and Physical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Trojanova 13, 12000 Prague, Czech Republic. E-mail: jan.vybiral@fjfi.cvut.cz

recently attracted the attention of many researchers, is the so-called *dispersion*. The dispersion of X is the volume of the largest axis-parallel box in $[0, 1]^d$ that contains no point of X , i.e.,

$$\text{disp}(X) := \sup_{B: B \cap X = \emptyset} |B|. \quad (1)$$

Here, the supremum is taken over all the boxes $B = \prod_{i=1}^d (a_i, b_i)$, where $0 \leq a_i < b_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in [d]$, and $|B|$ stands for the (Lebesgue) volume of B . The study of this notion goes back to [13, 22] and [23].

A very natural extremal problem is to determine the smallest possible dispersion for a given number of points in $[0, 1]^d$. For fixed integers d and n , we denote the minimum dispersion of an n -point set $X \subseteq [0, 1]^d$ by

$$\text{disp}^*(n, d) := \inf_{\substack{X \subseteq [0, 1]^d \\ |X| = n}} \text{disp}(X). \quad (2)$$

It is sometimes convenient to study this problem in the inverse setting: given an integer d and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, how many points do we need to place into the d -dimensional unit cube (and how?) so that their dispersion is at most ε ? The extremal problem is reflected by the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} N(\varepsilon, d) &:= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{disp}^*(n, d) \leq \varepsilon\} \\ &= \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \exists X \subset [0, 1]^d \text{ with } |X| = n \text{ and } \text{disp}(X) \leq \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As mentioned above, a number of upper and lower bounds on the quantities $\text{disp}^*(n, d)$ and $N(\varepsilon, d)$ have been established. The elementary lower bound $\text{disp}^*(n, d) \geq \frac{1}{n+1}$ was improved in [7] to $\text{disp}^*(n, d) \geq \frac{5}{4(n+5)}$. As the next step, for $d \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, it was shown in [2] that

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{\log_2 d}{8\varepsilon}, \quad (4)$$

which seems to be the first lower bound on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ that grows with d .

A further improvement was obtained by Bukh and Chao [6], who proved

$$\text{disp}^*(n, d) \geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \frac{2d}{n} \left(1 - \frac{4d}{n^{1/d}}\right). \quad (5)$$

This can be translated into the following lower bound on the inverse problem:

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \frac{d}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon \leq (8d)^{-d}. \quad (6)$$

The bounds (5) and (6) are nearly optimal when d is fixed, and we study the limiting behavior for n (or $1/\varepsilon$) tending to infinity. However, note that (5) yields (6) only for very small values of ε .

Regarding upper bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$, a series of recent papers [18, 26, 31] have shown that

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \leq \frac{C \log d \cdot \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (7)$$

In [29] we have shown that this bound is nearly optimal for ε being large:

Theorem 1 ([29]). *There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that for any integer $d \geq 2$ and any real $\varepsilon \in \left(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{d}}, \frac{1}{4}\right)$, it holds that*

$$N(\varepsilon, d) > \frac{c \log d}{\varepsilon^2 \cdot \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}. \quad (8)$$

On one hand, (8) matches (7) up to a polylogarithmic factor in $1/\varepsilon$. On the other hand, (8) holds only for ε of the order at least $1/\sqrt{d}$. Some further bounds for different regimes of ε and d were obtained in [4, 18, 19, 20, 24], and the dispersion of certain specific sets was studied also in [5, 12, 15, 16, 17, 28, 30].

The aim of this work is to establish lower bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ that are valid when $\varepsilon < 1/\sqrt{d}$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2. *Fix a positive integer k . There exists a constant c_k such that if d is a positive integer satisfying $d \geq d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} + k$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 2^{-k-2})$, then the following is true.*

- (i) *If $\varepsilon \geq d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$ then $N(\varepsilon, d) \geq c_k \cdot \varepsilon^{-\frac{k+1}{k}}$.*
- (ii) *If $\varepsilon < d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$ then $N(\varepsilon, d) \geq c_k \cdot d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} \varepsilon^{-1}$.*

The proof of part (i) of Theorem 2 is given in Section 2 and the second part of Theorem 2 is demonstrated in Section 3. We postpone the comparison of the bounds given in Theorem 2 to other bounds available in the literature to Section 4.

1.1 Notation

For a finite set X , we denote its size by $|X|$. With a slight abuse of notation, we also write $|A|$ for $A \subseteq [0, 1]^d$ to denote the Lebesgue measure of A . It

will be, however, always clear from the context whether the argument of $|\cdot|$ is a finite set or not.

For a positive integer d , we denote by $[d]$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Additionally, for a non-negative integer k , we write $\binom{[d]}{k}$ to denote the collection of all the k -element subsets of $[d]$. Given a point $x \in [0, 1]^d$ and an integer $i \in [d]$, we denote by $(x)_i$ the i -th coordinate of x .

2 Part (i) of Theorem 2 and cover-free families

We utilize a strong connection between lower bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ and a certain problem in extremal set theory. The following is a generalization of the notion of an r -cover-free family, a crucial notion in the proof of (8) in [29].

Definition 1. *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of subsets of a ground set X . We say that \mathcal{F} is (k, r) -cover-free if no intersection of any k sets of \mathcal{F} is contained in the union of any other r sets from \mathcal{F} , i.e., if for all $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $B_1, \dots, B_r \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ it holds that*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \not\subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^r B_j.$$

Let $C(k, r, d)$ be the smallest size of the ground set such that a d -element (k, r) -cover-free family exists, i.e.,

$$C(k, r, d) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \exists (k, r)\text{-cover-free family } \mathcal{F}_n \text{ on } [n] \text{ with } |\mathcal{F}_n| = d\}.$$

Note that the case $k = 1$ corresponds to r -cover-free families introduced in 1964 by Kautz and Singleton [14] and then intensively studied since the 1980s in various contexts [1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 25, 27]. The following very recent result of Michel and Scott [21] plays a crucial role for us.

Theorem 3 ([21, Lemma 2.2]). *If k, s, t and d are positive integers satisfying $d \geq k + t$, then $C(k, s + t, d) \geq \frac{1}{2k^k} \cdot \min\{d^k, s(k + t)^k\}$.*

The connection between lower bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ and cover-free families was first discovered in [29]. Our approach here is similar, but more elaborate and more flexible. We define a very specific set of axis-parallel boxes of volume at least ε , which allows us to translate the bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ from below to the existence of (k, r) -cover-free families. The role of k in this reduction will be such that we obtain a whole range of new lower bounds, each valid only for ε that is appropriately bounded from below.

Fix the dimension d . For all positive integers k and ℓ with $k + \ell \leq d$ and every $u \in (0, 1)$, we define a collection of boxes that have some k sides equal to $(0, u)$ and some other ℓ sides equal to $(u, 1)$. Specifically, for a given set $K \subseteq [d]$ with $|K| = k$ and $L \subseteq [d] \setminus K$ with $|L| = \ell$, let $B^{K,L} \subseteq [0, 1]^d$ be defined as

$$B_u^{K,L} := I_1 \times I_2 \times \cdots \times I_d, \quad \text{where } \begin{cases} I_i = (0, u) & \text{for } i \in K, \\ I_i = (u, 1) & \text{for } i \in L, \\ I_i = (0, 1) & \text{for } i \in [d] \setminus (K \cup L). \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{B}(d, k, \ell, u) := \left\{ B_u^{K,L} \subseteq [0, 1]^d : K \in \binom{[d]}{k}, L \in \binom{[d] \setminus K}{\ell} \right\}$. We choose ℓ and u based on the values of k and ε to ensure that the boxes in $\mathcal{B}(d, k, \ell, u)$ have volume at least ε .

Lemma 1. *Let k and d be positive integers, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 2^{-k-2})$, and set $u := (4\varepsilon)^{1/k}$. If $d \geq k + \lfloor \frac{1}{u} \rfloor$, then $|B| > \varepsilon$ for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(d, k, \lfloor \frac{1}{u} \rfloor, u)$.*

Proof. Observe that the bound on ε ensures that $u \in (0, 1/2)$. Therefore, it holds that $(1 - u)^{\frac{1}{u}} > \frac{1}{4}$ by convexity of 2^{-2u} in this interval. In particular,

$$|B| = u^k \cdot (1 - u)^{\lfloor \frac{1}{u} \rfloor} \geq 4\varepsilon \cdot (1 - u)^{\frac{1}{u}} > \varepsilon,$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Let us now describe how we assign to a point set $X \subset [0, 1]^d$ a certain family of subsets of $[d]$. Given $u \in (0, 1)$ and $j \in [d]$, we define

$$F_j^u := \{x \in X : (x)_j < u\}.$$

The connection between minimal dispersion and extremal set theory, which plays the central role in our proof of Part (i) of Theorem 2, is the following.

Lemma 2. *Let d be a positive integer, $u \in (0, 1)$, k and ℓ positive integers with $d \geq k + \ell$, and $X \subset [0, 1]^d$. If X intersects every box in $\mathcal{B}(d, k, \ell, u)$ then the family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1^u, F_2^u, \dots, F_d^u\}$ is (k, ℓ) -cover-free.*

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exist two index sets $K \in \binom{[d]}{k}$ and $L \in \binom{[d] \setminus K}{\ell}$ such that

$$\bigcap_{i \in K} F_i^u \subseteq \bigcup_{j \in L} F_j^u.$$

There must, however, exist a point $x \in X \cap B_u^{K,L}$. Since $(x)_i < u$ for all $i \in K$, we get $x \in F_i^u$ for all $i \in K$ and hence $x \in \bigcap_{i \in K} F_i^u$. On the other hand, $(x)_j > u$ for all $j \in L$ and thus $x \notin \bigcup_{j \in L} F_j^u$. A contradiction. \square

Lemmas 1 and 2 yield a lower bound on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ in terms of $C(k, r, d)$.

Corollary 4. *If k is a positive integer and $\varepsilon \in (0, 2^{-k-2})$ such that they satisfy $d \geq k + \lfloor (4\varepsilon)^{-1/k} \rfloor$, then $N(\varepsilon, d) \geq C(k, \lfloor (4\varepsilon)^{-1/k} \rfloor, d)$.*

Proof. Let $u := (4\varepsilon)^{1/k}$ and $\ell := \lfloor \frac{1}{u} \rfloor$. If $X \subset [0, 1]^d$ intersects all the axes-parallel boxes with volume larger than ε , then Lemma 1 yields that X intersects every box in $\mathcal{B}(d, k, \ell, u)$. By Lemma 2, the corresponding family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1^u, \dots, F_d^u\}$ is (k, ℓ) -cover-free. In particular, the ground set of \mathcal{F} , which is X , contains at least $C(k, \ell, d)$ points. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section — Part (i) of Theorem 2 — which we restate here for the sake of convenience.

Proposition 5. *Fix a positive integer k . If d is a positive integer satisfying $d \geq d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} + k$ and $\varepsilon \in \left[d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}, 2^{-k-2} \right)$, then*

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{1}{16ek^k(k+1)} \cdot \varepsilon^{-\frac{k+1}{k}}.$$

Proof. The case $k = 1$ follows from Theorem 1, so in the remaining we assume $k \geq 2$. First, observe that $k + \lfloor (4\varepsilon)^{-1/k} \rfloor \leq k + \varepsilon^{-1/k} \leq k + d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} \leq d$.

Next, let $\ell := \lfloor (4\varepsilon)^{-1/k} \rfloor$, and define

$$s := \left\lceil \frac{\ell + 1}{k + 1} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad t := \left\lfloor \frac{k \cdot \ell - 1}{k + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

Observe that this choice ensures that $s, t \geq 1$ and $s + t = \ell$. Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 yield that

$$\begin{aligned} N(\varepsilon, d) &\geq C(k, \ell, d) = C(k, s + t, d) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k^k} \cdot \min \left\{ d^k, \frac{\ell + 1}{k + 1} \cdot \left(k + \left\lfloor \frac{k \cdot \ell - 1}{k + 1} \right\rfloor \right)^k \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k^k} \cdot \min \left\{ d^k, \frac{(4\varepsilon)^{-1/k}}{k + 1} \left(\frac{k}{k + 1} (4\varepsilon)^{-1/k} \right)^k \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k^k} \cdot \min \left\{ d^k, \frac{1}{e(k + 1)} (4\varepsilon)^{-\frac{k+1}{k}} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k^k e(k + 1)} \cdot \min \left\{ d^k, (4\varepsilon)^{-\frac{k+1}{k}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Under the condition on ε , the minimum is attained by the second term, and since $4^{-\frac{k+1}{k}} \geq \frac{1}{8}$ for $k \geq 2$, the statement of the proposition follows. \square

3 Rescaling and Part (ii) of Theorem 2

We start with a rescaling-type observation analogous to [2, Lemma 1], which was stated for $\text{disp}^*(n, d)$.

Lemma 3. *If d and b are positive integers and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{b})$, then*

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq b \cdot N(b \cdot \varepsilon, d).$$

Proof. Let $\Omega := [0, 1]^d$ be the unit cube. For a positive integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an arbitrary box $A \subset \Omega$ we define in analogy to (2) the minimal dispersion relative to A as

$$\text{disp}^*(n, d, A) := \inf_{\substack{X \subset A \\ |X|=n}} \sup_{\substack{B: B \subset A \\ B \cap X = \emptyset}} |B|,$$

and, similarly to (3), its inverse function

$$N(\varepsilon, d, A) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{disp}^*(n, d, A) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (9)$$

Note that $N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega) = N(\varepsilon, d)$.

Next, we define $\Omega_i = (\frac{i-1}{b}, \frac{i}{b}) \times (0, 1) \times \cdots \times (0, 1) \subset \Omega$. Observe that, up to a set of zero measure, $(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_b)$ is a partition of Ω into b disjoint boxes of equal volume. By (9), we need at least $N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega_i)$ points to intersect every box of volume $\varepsilon > 0$ within Ω_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, b\}$. Therefore, for the entire cube, it holds

$$N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega) \geq N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega_1) + \cdots + N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega_b) = b \cdot N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega_1). \quad (10)$$

Finally, consider the mapping $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \rightarrow (b \cdot x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$. Clearly, it maps Ω_1 onto Ω , preserves the cardinality of subsets and transforms boxes in Ω_1 to boxes in Ω so that their volume enlarges exactly b -times. Therefore, $N(\varepsilon, d, \Omega_1) = N(b \cdot \varepsilon, d, b \cdot \Omega_1) = N(b \cdot \varepsilon, d, \Omega)$, which, together with (10), finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 3 serves as a tool for extending the validity of the lower bound in Part (i) of Theorem 2 to the regime of ε in Part (ii). Indeed, for the k -th bound of Part (ii), we apply the lemma to move in the range of parameters, where the k -th bound of Proposition 5 applies.

Proposition 6. *Fix a positive integer k . If d is a positive integer satisfying $d \geq d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} + k$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}})$, then*

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{1}{64ek^k(k+1)} \cdot \frac{d^{\frac{k}{k+1}}}{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Set $b := \left\lceil d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}} \cdot \varepsilon^{-1} \right\rceil$. Note that this choice ensures that

$$d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}} \leq b\varepsilon \leq d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}} + \varepsilon \leq 2d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}.$$

Therefore, Lemma 3 and Proposition 5 readily yield that

$$\begin{aligned} N(\varepsilon, d) &\geq b \cdot N(b \cdot \varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{1}{16ek^k(k+1)} \cdot d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}} \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot (b\varepsilon)^{-\frac{k+1}{k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{64ek^k(k+1)} \cdot \frac{d^{\frac{k}{k+1}}}{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

and this finishes the proof. \square

4 Conclusion

Let us discuss the relation of Theorem 2 to the lower (and upper) bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$ available in the literature.

We start with $k = 1$. Due to the restriction $\varepsilon \geq d^{-1/2}$, we always have $\frac{\log(d)}{\log(1/\varepsilon)} \geq 2$ and the bound in Part (i) of Theorem 2 is inferior to (8) by logarithmic factors. Part (ii) of Theorem 2 for $k = 1$ states that

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \geq C \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon} \tag{11}$$

and it clearly outperforms (possibly up to multiplicative constants) the lower bound of [2], cf. (4). On the other hand, (6) is stronger, but note that the validity of (6) was restricted to extremely small ε 's. In contrast, (11) holds for $\varepsilon = O(d^{-1/2})$. Finally, let us note that [6, Theorem 2] shows that

$$N(\varepsilon, d) \leq \frac{cd^2 \log(d)}{\varepsilon}.$$

When increasing the value of k , Theorem 2 yields a whole series of lower bounds on $N(\varepsilon, d)$, conveniently indexed by k . The bounds are relevant when d is sufficiently large. Specifically, if $d = (k+1)^2$ then it is easy to check that $k + d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} \leq d$ and, by the monotonicity of the function $d \rightarrow d - d^{\frac{k}{k+1}}$, Theorem 2 applies whenever $d \geq (k+1)^2$. To simplify the discussion, we neglect the factors depending only on k (which we did not try to optimize), and we also assume that d is sufficiently large. We observe, that the lower

bound from Part (ii) of Theorem 2 approaches (6) as k tends to infinity. However, the interval where ε must lie in gets smaller when k increases.

Finally, let us discuss the interplay between the lower bounds of Theorem 2 for different values of k . Again, we neglect the factors c_k , which were not optimized. Observe that, for a fixed k , we get a lower bound that changes its nature at $\varepsilon = d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$. And, for a fixed $k = k_0$, this bound is better than the bounds for other values of k if $d^{-k_0} \leq \varepsilon < d^{-(k_0-1)}$, i.e., when the value $d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$ lies in this interval.

Therefore, for d large enough, we get the best lower bound from Theorem 2 in the following way:

1. Choose the integer k such that $\varepsilon \in [d^{-k}, d^{-(k-1)})$.
2. If $\varepsilon \geq d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$ then $N(\varepsilon, d) \geq c_k \cdot \varepsilon^{-\frac{k}{k+1}}$ by Part (i) for k .
3. Otherwise $\varepsilon < d^{-\frac{k^2}{k+1}}$, thus $N(\varepsilon, d) \geq c_k \cdot d^{\frac{k}{k+1}} \varepsilon^{-1}$ by Part (ii) for k .

References

- [1] A. Z. Abdi and N. H. Bshouty, *Lower bounds for cover-free families*, Electron. J. Comb. 23(2), Paper 2.45 (2016)
- [2] C. Aistleitner, A. Hinrichs, and D. Rudolf, *On the size of the largest empty box amidst a point set*, Discrete Appl. Math. 230 (2017), 146–150
- [3] N. Alon and V. Asodi, *Learning a hidden subgraph*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. 18 (2005), 697–712
- [4] A. Arman and A. E. Litvak, *Minimal dispersion on the cube and the torus*, J. Compl. 85 (2024), 101883
- [5] S. Breneis and A. Hinrichs, *Fibonacci lattices have minimal dispersion on the two-dimensional torus*, in: Dmitriy Bilyk, Josef Dick, Friedrich Pillichshammer (Eds.), Discrepancy Theory, De Gruyter, 2020, pp. 117–132
- [6] B. Bukh and T. Chao, *Empty axis-parallel boxes*, Int. Math. Res. Notices 18 (2022), 13811–13828
- [7] A. Dumitrescu and M. Jiang, *On the largest empty axis-parallel box amidst n points*, Algorithmica 66 (2013), 225–248

- [8] K. Engel, *Interval packing and covering in the boolean lattice*, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 5 (1996), 373–384
- [9] P. Erdős, P. Frankl, and Z. Füredi, *Families of finite sets in which no set is covered by the union of two others*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 33 (1982), 158–166
- [10] P. Erdős, P. Frankl, and Z. Füredi, *Families of finite sets in which no set is covered by the union of r others*, *Israel J. Math.* 51 (1985), 75–89
- [11] Z. Füredi, *On r -cover-free families*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 73 (1996), 172–173
- [12] A. Hinrichs, D. Krieg, R. J. Kunsch, and D. Rudolf, *Expected dispersion of uniformly distributed points*, *J. Compl.* 61 (2020), 101483
- [13] E. Hlawka, *Abschätzung von trigonometrischen Summen mittels diophantischer Approximationen*, *Österreich. Akad. Wiss. Math.- Naturwiss. Kl. S.-B. II*, 185 (1976), 43–50
- [14] W. H. Kautz and R. C. Singleton, *Nonrandom binary superimposed codes*, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 10 (1964), 363–377
- [15] D. Krieg, *On the dispersion of sparse grids*, *J. Compl.* 45 (2018), 115–119
- [16] R. Kritzinger, *Dispersion of digital $(0, m, 2)$ -nets*, *Monatshefte Math.* 195 (1) (2021), 155–171
- [17] T. Lachmann and J. Wiart, *The area of empty axis-parallel boxes amidst 2-dimensional lattice points*, *J. Compl.* 76 (2023), 101724
- [18] A. E. Litvak, *A remark on the minimal dispersion*, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* 23 (2021), 2050060
- [19] A. E. Litvak and G. V. Livshyts, *New bounds on the minimal dispersion*, *J. Compl.* 72 (2022), 101648
- [20] K. MacKay, *Minimal dispersion of large volume boxes in the cube*, *J. Compl.* 72 (2022), 101650
- [21] L. Michel and A. Scott, *Lower bounds for graph reconstruction with maximal independent set queries*, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 1034 (2025), 115121

- [22] H. Niederreiter, *A quasi-Monte Carlo method for the approximate computation of the extreme values of a function*, In: P. Erdős, L. Alpár, G. Halász, A. Sárközy, (eds.), Birkhäuser Basel, Basel (1983), 523–529
- [23] G. Rote and R. F. Tichy, *Quasi-Monte Carlo methods and the dispersion of point sequences*, Math. Comput. Modelling 23 (1996), 9–23
- [24] D. Rudolf, *An upper bound of the minimal dispersion via delta covers*, Contemporary Computational Mathematics - A Celebration of the 80th Birthday of Ian Sloan, Springer-Verlag (2018), 1099–1108
- [25] M. Ruszinkó, *On the upper bound of the size of the r -cover-free families*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 66 (1994), 302–310
- [26] J. Sosnovec, *A note on the minimal dispersion of point sets in the unit cube*, Eur. J. Comb. 69 (2018), 255–259
- [27] D. R. Stinson, R. Wei, and L. Zhu, *Some new bounds for cover-free families*, J. Comb. Theory, Series A 90(1) (2000), 224–234
- [28] V. N. Temlyakov, *Smooth fixed volume discrepancy, dispersion, and related problems*, J. Approx. Theory 237 (2019), 113–134
- [29] M. Trödler, J. Volec, and J. Vybíral, *A tight lower bound on the minimal dispersion*. Eur. J. Combin. 120 (2024), 103945
- [30] M. Ullrich, *A note on the dispersion of admissible lattices*, Discrete Appl. Math. 257 (2019), 385–387
- [31] M. Ullrich and J. Vybíral, *An upper bound on the minimal dispersion*, J. Compl. 45 (2018), 120–126