Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Discrete Mathematics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/disc

Intermingled ascending wave *m*-sets

Aaron Robertson^a, Caitlin Cremin^{b,1}, Will Daniel^{b,1}, Quer Xiang^{b,1}

^a Department of Mathematics, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY, United States

^b Colgate University, Hamilton, NY, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 19 August 2014 Received in revised form 28 September 2015 Accepted 29 September 2015 Available online 11 November 2015

Keywords: m-sets Non-overlapping monochromatic sets Ramsey theory

ABSTRACT

Given a coloring of \mathbb{Z}^+ , we call a monochromatic set $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m\}$ an *m*-set. The diameter of *A* is $a_m - a_1$. Given two *m*-sets *A* and *B*, we say that they are non-overlapping if max(*A*) < min(*B*) or max(*B*) < min(*A*). The original study of non-overlapping *m*sets, done by Bialostocki, Erdős, and Lefmann, concerned non-decreasing diameters. We investigate an "intermingling" of certain subset diameters of non-overlapping *m*-sets. In particular, we show that, for every integer $m \ge 2$, the minimum integer n(m) such that every 2-coloring of [1, n(m)] admits two *m*-sets $\{a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m\}$ and $\{b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_m\}$ with $a_m < b_1$, such that $b_1 - a_1 \le b_2 - a_2 \le \cdots \le b_m - a_m$ is n(m) = 6m - 5. The *r*-coloring case is also investigated.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

This article falls under the general heading of Ramsey theory on the integers. In order to discuss some of the history, we first have need of some definitions and notation. Recall that a 2-coloring of a set *S* is a map $\chi : S \to T$, where |T| = 2. We will use $T = \{G, R\}$ (to stand for green and red).

Definition 1. Let $m \ge 2$ be an integer and consider an arbitrary 2-coloring χ of \mathbb{Z}^+ . We say that $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$ is an *m*-set if |A| = m and *A* is monochromatic under χ (i.e., $|\chi(A)| = 1$).

Definition 2. For $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m\}$ we call $a_m - a_1$ the *diameter of A* and write diam(*A*); we refer to the differences $a_{i+1} - a_i, 1 \le i \le m - 1$, as gaps.

Definition 3. For *A* and *B* both *m*-sets (possibly of different colors, but both monochromatic by definition), we say that $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m\}$ and $B = \{b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_m\}$ are *non-overlapping* if either $a_m < b_1$ or $b_m < a_1$. When we have $a_m < b_1$ we write A < B.

The research into *m*-sets with diameter restrictions was started by Bialostocki, Erdős, and Lefmann. In their paper [3] they proved, in particular, that for $m \ge 2$, the integer s = s(m) = 5m - 3 is the minimum integer such that every 2-coloring of [1, *s*] admits two *m*-sets *A* and *B* with $A \prec B$, such that diam(A) \le diam(B). They also provided the associated Ramsey-type number for three colors, while Bernstein, Grynkiewicz, and Yerger [2] provide a formula in the two color, three set situation, and Grynkiewicz [6] proved that 12m - 9 is the correct interval length for two colors for four *m*-sets with non-decreasing

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2015.09.029 0012-365X/© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.



Note





E-mail address: arobertson@colgate.edu (A. Robertson).

¹ This work was done as part of a capstone course in mathematics while these three authors were undergraduates at 34 Colgate University, under the directorship of the first author.

diameters. Bollobás, Erdős, and Jin [5] investigated the situation for strictly increasing diameters. If we insist that two *m*-sets have equal diameters, the answer is still unknown; Bialostocki and Wilson [4] conjecture that the correct interval length is 6m - 4. Schultz [8] investigated the minimal interval length for *r*-colorings that admit *m*-sets with $2 \cdot \text{diam}(A) \leq \text{diam}(B)$, finding exact values for r = 2, 3, 4.

Perhaps the closest diameter requirement to what we study in this article was done by Grynkiewicz and Sabar [7], in which they study pairs of non-overlapping *m*-sets that satisfy $b_j - a_j \ge b_1 - a_1$ for a fixed $j \in \{2, 3, ..., m\}$. Our requirement on the relationship between non-overlapping *m*-sets is examined in Section 2. There, not only do we require non-decreasing diameters, but also non-decreasing gaps between corresponding pairs of elements in each set. Specifically, for $A = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_m\}$ and $B = \{b_1, b_2, ..., b_m\}$ we require

$$b_1 - a_1 \le b_2 - a_2 \le \dots \le b_{m-1} - a_{m-1} \le b_m - a_m.$$
 (*)

Note that by considering only the first and last arguments above we have $b_1 - a_1 \le b_m - a_m$, which is equivalent to diam(A) \le diam(B). Also note that (*) is equivalent to the conditions $b_j - b_{j-1} \ge a_j - a_{j-1}$ for j = 2, 3, ..., m. Hence, this is also a refinement of what was studied by Grynkiewicz and Sabar [7].

Based on our refinement, we make the following definition.

Definition 4. Let $r \ge 2$ be an integer. Define n(m; r) to be the minimum integer n such that every r-coloring of [1, n] admits two non-overlapping m-sets $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m\} \prec \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_m\}$ with $b_1 - a_1 \le b_2 - a_2 \le \cdots \le b_m - a_m$.

The main result is in Section 2; namely, n(m; 2) = 6m - 5. In Section 3 we investigate n(m; r) and end with some open questions.

Remark. We refer to sets that satisfy (*) as *intermingled ascending wave m-sets*. A set $S = \{s_1, s_2, ...\}$ is called an *ascending wave* if $s_{j+1} - s_j \ge s_j - s_{j-1}$ for j = 2, 3, ... (see [1]). In other words, successive gaps between adjacent elements of *S* are non-decreasing (which has been labeled in the literature as "ascending" instead of the more appropriate "non-descending"). We are intermingling the sets by considering $b_j - a_j$ and requiring that these "intermingled gaps" be non-decreasing.

Notation. Throughout the paper, unless otherwise stated, we will use $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m\}$ and $B = \{b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_m\}$, sometimes without explicitly stating so. Since we will be dealing strictly with the positive integers, we use the notation $[i, j] = \{i, i + 1, \dots, j\}$ for positive integers i < j. For all of our 2-colorings, we use green and red for the colors and denote these colors by *G* and *R*, respectively.

2. Intermingled ascending wave *m*-sets using two colors

We prove that n(m) = 6m - 5 in the standard way: by providing matching lower and upper bounds for n(m). We start with the lower bound.

Lemma 5. For $m \ge 2$, we have $n(m) \ge 6m - 5$.

Proof. Consider the following 2-coloring $\gamma : [1, 6m - 6] \rightarrow \{G, R\}$ defined by

$$\underbrace{RGRG\ldots GR}_{2m-1} \underbrace{GGRRGGRR\ldots GGR}_{4m-5}$$

We will show that γ does not admit two *m*-sets $A \prec B$ that satisfy (*).

Consider the case when $A \subseteq [1, 2m]$. Then we have $a_j - a_{j-1} = 2$ for all $j \in [2, m]$. Hence, we must have $B \subseteq [2m + 1, 6m - 6]$ with $b_j - b_{j-1} \ge 2$. Thus, *B* contains at most one element from each of the following 2m - 2 monochromatic sets: $\{2m + 1\}, [2m + 2, 2m + 3], \dots, [4m - 7, 4m - 6], \{4m - 5\}$. Each color appears in exactly m - 1 of these sets. Hence, *B* cannot have *m* elements.

Next, consider the case when $A \not\subseteq [1, 2m]$. In this situation, A may contain gaps of size 1. Let there be exactly j elements of A that are in [2m, 6m - 6], where $j \ge 2$. This gives us $a_m \ge 2m + 2j - 3$ so that $b_1 \ge 2m + 2j - 2$. Turning our attention to B, we see that the m - j gaps defined by the first m - j + 1 elements of B must have average gap size at least 4 since the corresponding gaps defined by the first m - j + 1 elements of A are necessarily greater than 1. Hence, we have $b_{m-j+1} \ge b_1 + 4(m - j) \ge (2m + 2j - 2) + 4(m - j) = 6m - 2j - 2$ as we can only use at most one element from any four consecutive elements with color pattern *GCRR* or *RRGG*. There are at most 2j - 4 elements larger than b_{m-j+1} , of which at most j - 2 are the same color as $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{m-j+1}$. However, we require j - 1 more elements in order for B to contain m total elements.

In both cases, under γ we do not have *m*-sets $A \prec B$ that satisfy (*). Hence, we conclude that n(m) > 6m - 6.

We now move on to our main result.

Theorem 6. For $m \ge 2$, let n = n(m) be the minimal integer such that every 2-coloring of [1, n] admits m-sets $A \prec B$ that satisfy $b_{j+1} - a_{j+1} \ge b_j - a_j$ for $1 \le j \le m - 1$. Then n(m) = 6m - 5.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4646653

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/4646653

Daneshyari.com