MA 724 Homework 2, Comments and some solutions.

## CHAPTER 0, PROBLEM 3

I graded this out of 4 points each for the 4 different things you had to prove.

**Dimension.** Since  $\Pi_{d-1}$  is contained in the hyperplane  $\left\{ \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^d = \binom{d+1}{2} \right\}$ , its dimension is at most d-1. We will show that there are d linearly independent vertices of  $\Pi_{d-1}$  These will then be affinely independent, so that their affine span has at least dimension d-1. This is trivial for d=1, so assume d>1. Take the vertices in the permutohedron whose last coordinate is d. These are obtained from the vertices of  $\Pi_{d-2}$  by adjoining a new last coordinate d. By induction, there are d-1 linearly independent vertices of  $\Pi_{d-2}$ , and when we adjoin a new last coordinate d, we obtain d-1 linearly independent vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , all of which are vertices of  $\Pi_{d-1}$ . Each of these new vectors has  $x_1 + \cdots + x_{d-1} = \binom{d}{2}$  and  $x_d = d$ , so they are contained in the linear subspace of points satisfying  $x_1 + \cdots + x_{d-1} - \frac{d-1}{2}x_d = 0$ . It's now easy to find a vertex of  $\Pi_{d-1}$  not contained in this subspace, for example, the point  $\vec{x}$  with  $x_1 = n$ ,  $x_2 = n-1$ , etc., which has  $x_1 + \cdots + x_{d-1} - \frac{d-1}{2}x_d = \left[\binom{d+1}{2} - 1\right] - \frac{d-1}{2} = \frac{d^2-1}{2}$ , which is nonzero for d > 1.

Comment: Many of you did this by showing that the vertex for the identity permutation, and all its d-1 neighbors, constitute a linearly (and thus affinely) independent set. That's a fine way to do it, but notice that it's much easier to subtract the coordinates of the identity permutation from all of them, and show that the d-1 neighbors are linearly independent. Also, notice that if you want to show that all d vectors form an independent set, it's much easier to use *column* operations in this case.

**Facets.** We will show that the facets are in bijection with the nonempty proper subsets of [d]. Given such a subset, the corresponding inequality is  $\sum_{i \in S} x_i \ge {\binom{|S|+1}{2}}$ . All vertices of  $\Pi_{d-1}$  (and thus all points of  $\Pi_{d-1}$  satisfy this inequality, because the smallest that  $\sum_{i \in S}$  can be is  $1 + 2 + \cdots + |S| = {\binom{|S|+1}{2}}$ . This is attained for all vertices having the values 1 through |S| in their coordinates indexed by indices in S. The convex hull of these vertices is a (d-2)-polytope isomorphic to  $\Pi_{|S|-1} \times \Pi_{d-|S|-1}$ , so these inequalities define facets. It only remains to show that there are no other facets.

The facet defined by S contains the vertex  $\vec{x}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1\\ 2\\ \vdots\\ d \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $S = \{1, \ldots, i\}$  for some *i* with

 $1 \leq i < n$ . If  $S = \{1, \ldots, i\}$  and  $S' = \{1, \ldots, j\}$  with i < j, then the intersection of the facets defined by S and S' contains all vertices with the values 1 through i appearing as the first through ith coordinates, and i + 1 through j appearing as the (i + 1)st through jth coordinates. Arguing similarly, we see that the intersection of all of these facets containing  $\vec{x}_0$ , except the facet defined by  $\{1, \ldots, i\}$ , has exactly two vertices:  $\vec{x}_0$  and the point  $\vec{x}_i$  whose ith coordinate is i + 1, whose (i + 1)st coordinate is i, and whose jth coordinate is j for  $j \notin \{i, i + 1\}$  (as asserted in Ziegler). Consider the polyhedron P defined only by the facet-defining inequalities for facets, defined by subsets, containing  $\vec{x}_0$ . Then P contains  $\Pi_{d-1}$ , and P is  $\vec{x}_0 + \text{cone}(\{\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_0 : i \in [d]\})$ . If there are any additional facets containing  $\vec{x}_0$  besides those defined by subsets, then these facets define a polyhedron P' strictly smaller than P. This P' is  $\vec{x}_0 + \text{cone}(Y)$  for some set of vectors that cannot contain  $\{\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_0 : i \in [d]\}$ , since P' is strictly smaller than P. In particular, some  $\vec{x}_i$  is not in  $\Pi_{d-1}$  and this contradiction shows that the only facets containing  $\vec{x}_0$  are those defined by subsets. By the symmetry of permuting coordinates, we conclude that all facets of P are defined by subsets as above.

**Simple.** Since we know what the facets are, we notice that the facet defined by S contains the vertex labeled by the identity permutation if and only if  $S = \{1, \ldots, i\}$  for some i with  $1 \le i < n$ . There are exactly d - 1 facets containing that vertex, and all vertices are symmetric by the symmetry of permuting coordinates, so  $\Pi_{d-1}$  is simple.

Zonotope. One way to do this is on p. 200 of Ziegler. We'll show another, less slick way.

We'll project the cube  $[0,1]^{\binom{d}{2}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\binom{d}{2}}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and show that the image is  $\Pi_{d-1}$ . Label the standard unit basis vectors for  $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{d}{2}}$  as  $\vec{e}_{ij}$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq d$  and define a linear map  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{\binom{d}{2}} \to \mathbb{R}^d$  by sending  $e_{ij}$  to  $e_i - e_j$ . Define an affine map  $\bar{\varphi}$  sending  $\vec{x}$  to  $\varphi(x) + \vec{x}_0$ . To show that the image of the cube under  $\bar{\varphi}$  is  $\Pi_{d-1}$ , we need to show two things: First, we'll show that every vertex of  $\Pi_{d-1}$  is the image of some vertex of the cube under  $\bar{\varphi}$ . That implies that  $\Pi_{d-1}$  is contained in the image. Then we'll show that each vertex of the cube projects into  $\Pi_{d-1}$ , by showing that the projections satisfy all of the facet-defining inequalities. That implies that the image is contained in  $\Pi_{d-1}$ .

**Proposition 1.** If  $\vec{x}$  is a vertex of  $\Pi_{d-1}$ , then there exists a vertex  $\vec{v}$  of  $[0,1]^{\binom{d}{2}}$  such that  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) = \vec{x}$ . Specifically,  $\vec{v}$  is the vector in  $\{0,1\}^{\binom{d}{2}}$  whose ij-coordinate is 1 if and only if  $x_i > x_j$ .

*Proof.* We argue by induction on the number of inversions of the permutation whose one-line notation is  $x_1 \cdots x_n$ . If there are no inversions, then  $\vec{x} = \vec{x}_0 = \bar{\varphi}(\vec{0})$ . Otherwise, there exists some  $k \in [d-1]$  such that k precedes k+1 in  $x_1 \cdots x_n$ . Let  $\vec{x}'$  be the vector obtained by replacing k by k+1 and k+1 by k in the coordinates of  $\vec{x}$ . By induction, the vector  $\vec{v}'$  in  $\{0,1\}^{\binom{d}{2}}$  whose ij-coordinate is 1 if and only if  $x'_i > x'_j$  has  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}') = \vec{x}'$ . Now  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) = \bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}') + e_i - e_j = \vec{x}$ , where i is the position of k+1 in  $\vec{x}$  and j is the position of k in  $\vec{x}$ .

**Proposition 2.** If  $\vec{v}$  is a vertex of  $[0,1]^{\binom{d}{2}}$ , then  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) \in \Pi_{d-1}$ .

*Proof.* First, we show that  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v})$  satisfies the facet-defining inequalities for facets containing  $\vec{x}_0$ , as described above. This amount to showing that, for each  $i \in [d-1]$ , the sum of the first *i* coordinates of  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v})$  is at least  $\binom{i+1}{2}$ . We argue by induction on the number of 1's among the coordinates of  $\vec{v}$ . If there are no 1's, then  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) = \vec{x}_0$ , which satisfies the inequalities (with equality, in fact). Otherwise, suppose the *ij*-coordinate of  $\vec{v}$  is 1 for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq d$ , and let  $\vec{v}'$  be  $\vec{v} - \vec{e}_{ij}$ , the vector obtained by changing that 1 to 0. Then  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}') = \bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) - \vec{e}_i + \vec{e}_j$ , so for any  $k \in [d-1]$ , the sum of the first k coordinates of  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}')$  is at least as big as the sum of the first k coordinates of  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}')$ . By induction, the inequalities hold for  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}')$ , so the inequality holds for  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v})$  as well.

To see that the other inequalities hold, make the same inductive argument with the following modifications: Instead of  $\vec{x}_0$ , take any vertex  $\vec{x}$  of  $\Pi_{d-1}$ . Let  $\vec{v}$  be the vector in  $[0,1]^{\binom{d}{2}}$  such that  $\bar{\varphi}(\vec{v}) = \vec{x}$ , which exists by the previous proposition. Let  $\vec{w}$  be any other vector in  $[0,1]^{\binom{d}{2}}$ . Instead of doing induction on the number of zeros in  $\vec{w}$ , do induction on the number of positions where  $\vec{w}$  differs from  $\vec{v}$ . When  $\vec{v}$  and  $\vec{w}$  differ at some position ij, either subtract or add  $\vec{e}_{ij}$  to make  $\vec{w}$  closer to  $\vec{v}$ . Instead of considering the first k positions, consider the positions where the coordinates of  $\vec{v}$  are 1 through k.

## CHAPTER 0, PROBLEM 9

This was really 2 separate parts, so I graded it out of 8 (4 each).

The "show bijectively" question could be straight out of MA 524, although I think that without Gale's evenness criterion for context, it would have been harder to understand what was being asked. There are many nice ways to do this.

**Proposition 3.** The number of subsets  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that S is a disjoint union of k pairs of the form  $\{i, i+1\}$  is  $\binom{n-k}{k}$ .

*Proof.* Here is a bijection  $\eta$  from such subsets S to sequences of dots and rectangles with exactly k rectangles and n - 2k dots: Write the numbers  $1, \ldots, n$  on a horizontal line. For each pair  $\{i, i + 1\}$  in S, draw a rectangle around i and i + 1 and erase the numbers i and i + 1. Then replace each remaining number with a dot. The resulting sequence is  $\eta(S)$ . (For example, for n = 9 and  $S = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8\}$ , we would write  $\bullet \square \square \bullet \square \bullet$ .

The inverse map  $\theta$  is as follows. Given a sequence T of dots and rectangles, starting from the left, write the numbers  $1, \ldots, n$ , one number replacing each dot and two numbers inside each rectangle. Then  $\theta(T)$  is the set of numbers occurring inside rectangles.

Sequences of dots and rectangles with exactly k rectangles and n-2k dots are counted by  $\binom{n-k}{k}$  because for each of the n-k positions in the sequence, we choose exactly k of them to be filled with rectangles.  $\Box$ 

Now, we can count facets of the cyclic polytope  $C_d(n)$ . These are subsets that satisfy Gale's evenness criterion.

**Proposition 4.** The number of facets of  $C_d(n)$  is  $\frac{n}{n-k} \binom{n-k}{k}$  if d = 2k or  $2\binom{n-k-1}{k}$  if d = 2k+1.

*Proof.* The vertices of  $C_d(n)$  are  $\{\vec{x}(t_1), \ldots, \vec{x}(t_n)\}$  with  $t_1 < \cdots < t_n$ . The facets of  $C_d(n)$  are the convex hulls of sets  $\{\vec{x}(t_i) : i \in S\}$  for sets S satisfying Gale's evenness criterion. (We will call such sets "Gale-even sets" in this proof.) A Gale-even set S is not necessarily a disjoint union of pairs of the form  $\{i, i + 1\}$ . Instead it is a disjoint union of sets  $\{i, i + 1\}$  and possibly a set  $\{1\}$  and/or a set  $\{n\}$ .

If d = 2k, then Gale-even sets come in two kinds: Either S is a disjoint union of k subsets  $\{i, i+1\}$  of [n] or S is a disjoint union of  $\{1, n\}$  and k - 1 subsets  $\{i, i+1\}$  of  $\{2, \ldots, n-1\}$ . By Proposition 3, the first kind of subset is counted by  $\binom{n-k}{k}$  and the second kind of subset is counted by  $\binom{n-1-k}{k-1} = \binom{n-1-k}{k-1}$ . The total number of Gale-even sets is

$$\binom{n-k}{k} + \binom{n-1-k}{k-1} = \binom{n-k}{k} + \frac{(n-k-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-2k)!} = \binom{n-k}{k} + \frac{k}{n-k} \cdot \frac{(n-k)!}{k!(n-2k)!} = \frac{n}{n-k} \binom{n-k}{k}.$$

If d = 2k - 1, then Gale-even sets again come in two kinds. This time, either S is a disjoint union of the set  $\{1\}$  with k subsets  $\{i, i + 1\}$  of  $\{2, \ldots, n\}$  or S is a disjoint union of  $\{n\}$  with k subsets  $\{i, i + 1\}$  of  $\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ . Proposition 3 implies that each kind of set is counted by  $\binom{n-1-k}{k}$ , for a total of  $2\binom{n-k-1}{k}$ .  $\Box$ 

It is straightforward to go from Proposition 4 to the formula in the book using floors and ceilings, but I don't think that is an improvement. What is nice about the formula with floors and ceilings is that it is a huge hint for how you prove Proposition 4, by breaking up the count as a sum of two particular binomial coefficients and referring to Proposition 3.

For the estimates, I guess we could think hard about approximating binomial coefficients, but I just put them into Maple:  $C_{10}(20) = 4004 \approx 4 \cdot 10^3$ ,  $C_{10}(100) = 60990020 \approx 6 \cdot 10^7$ , and  $C_{50}(100) = 70118062854865191504 \approx 7 \cdot 10^{19}$ .