

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## **European Journal of Combinatorics**

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

### Cutting convex curves



European Journal of Combinatorics

### Andreas F. Holmsen<sup>a</sup>, János Kincses<sup>b</sup>, Edgardo Roldán-Pensado<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, Daejeon, South Korea

<sup>b</sup> University of Szeged, Bolyai Institute Aradi vértanúk tere 1., H-6720 Szeged, Hungary

<sup>c</sup> Instituto de Matemáticas, UNAM campus Juriquilla, Querétaro, Mexico

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 27 January 2016 Accepted 30 April 2016 Available online 27 May 2016

#### ABSTRACT

We show that for any two convex curves  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  parametrized by [0, 1] with opposite orientations, there exists a hyperplane H with the following property: For any  $t \in [0, 1]$  the points  $C_1(t)$  and  $C_2(t)$  are never in the same open half space bounded by H. This will be deduced from a more general result on equipartitions of ordered point sets by hyperplanes.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

In [3] the following interesting theorem is proved: If  $A_1, A_2, ..., A_n$  and  $B_1, B_2, ..., B_n$  are the vertices of two convex polygons in the plane ordered cyclically with opposite orientation, then there exists a line that intersects each of the line segments  $A_iB_i$ .

This result can be derived from a continuous version of the problem which has an elementary topological argument (which is what they do in [3]). The natural problem which is raised in [3] is to try to generalize this result to higher dimensions, and some partial results are proven for convex polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  (but with some limitations).

Here we will give a generalization of this theorem to arbitrary dimensions. Our proof is essentially different from the one given in [3] and uses notions from oriented matroid theory together with a basic fixed-point theorem.

A convex curve in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is a continuous mapping  $C: [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$  which intersects every hyperplane at most *d* times, meaning  $|\{t \in [0, 1] : C(t) \in H\}| \le d$  for any hyperplane  $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . The name comes

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2016.04.011

0195-6698/© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*E-mail addresses:* andreash@kaist.edu (A.F. Holmsen), kincses@math.u-szeged.hu (J. Kincses), e.roldan@im.unam.mx (E. Roldán-Pensado).

from the fact that in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  a convex curve corresponds to a connected subset of the boundary of a convex body. A typical example of a convex curve in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is the so-called *moment curve*,

$$\left\{ \left(t, t^2, \dots, t^d\right) : t \in [0, 1] \right\},\$$

which has numerous applications in discrete and computational geometry. For instance, the convex hull of n > d distinct points on the moment curve in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is a cyclic *d*-polytope [7], which is arguably the most useful example of a neighborly polytope.

An important feature of a convex curve in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is the fact that for any  $0 \le t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d \le 1$ , the determinant

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} C(t_0) & C(t_1) & \cdots & C(t_d) \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(1)

does not vanish, which is in fact a defining property of convex curves [5]. (In the case of a *closed* convex curve, e.g. C(0) = C(1), we naturally require that  $t_d < 1$ .) This implies that the determinant (1) has the same sign for all choices  $0 \le t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_d \le 1$ , and therefore we may define the *orientation* of a convex curve *C* to be *positive* or *negative* according to the sign of the determinant (1).

In this note we report the following interesting property concerning pairs of convex curves.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be convex curves in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with opposite orientations. There exists a hyperplane *H* such that the points  $C_1(t)$  and  $C_2(t)$  are never contained in the same open half space bounded by *H*.

For d = 2 this is the main result shown in [3]. Somewhat surprisingly, the convexity plays a rather minor role. Theorem 1.1 will be deduced from a more general result concerning point sets, stated below as Theorem 2.1.

#### 2. Order-types

Let *A* be a set of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which affinely spans  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The *order-type* of *A* is the set of signs of the determinants

 $\det \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_d \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ (2)

indexed by the (d + 1)-tuples  $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_d) \in A^{d+1}$  with distinct entries. Notice that the condition that *A* affinely spans  $\mathbb{R}^d$  guarantees the existence of at least one (d+1)-tuple such that the determinant (2) is non-zero. Usually, the notion of order-type is used with finite sets of points, however we will allow the possibility of *A* being infinite.

The order-type defines an equivalence relation on sets of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , in which two sets *A* and *B* are equivalent if there exists a bijection  $\gamma : A \to B$  with

$$\operatorname{sgn}\operatorname{det}\begin{bmatrix}a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_d\\1 & 1 & \cdots & 1\end{bmatrix} = \operatorname{sgn}\operatorname{det}\begin{bmatrix}\gamma(a_0) & \gamma(a_1) & \cdots & \gamma(a_d)\\1 & 1 & \cdots & 1\end{bmatrix}$$
(3)

for all (d + 1)-tuples  $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_d)$  with distinct entries (see e.g. [2]).

To the other extreme, we say that the sets A and B have opposite order-types if

$$\operatorname{sgn}\operatorname{det}\begin{bmatrix}a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_d\\1 & 1 & \cdots & 1\end{bmatrix} = -\operatorname{sgn}\operatorname{det}\begin{bmatrix}\gamma(a_0) & \gamma(a_1) & \cdots & \gamma(a_d)\\1 & 1 & \cdots & 1\end{bmatrix}$$

is satisfied instead of (3). In this case we say that  $\gamma$  is order-type reversing.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let A and B be point sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which affinely span  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . If  $\gamma : A \to B$  is an order-type reversing bijection, then there exists a hyperplane which intersects all the segments ab with  $b = \gamma(a)$ .

**Remark 2.2.** The condition on the affine span of the point sets could be weakened, but this would involve refining the notion of the order-type (since all the determinants (2) would vanish) and the statement of Theorem 2.1 would become more technical.

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4653213

Download Persian Version:

## https://daneshyari.com/article/4653213

Daneshyari.com