### LINEEAR ALGEBRAIC METHODS

Linear algebraic methods

### Oddtown

In order to cut down the number of committees a town of *n* people has instituted the following rules:

- (a) Each club shall have an odd number of members.
- (b) Each pair of clubs shall share an even number of members.

### Theorem

With these rules, there are at most n clubs.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト …

æ

**Proof** Suppose that the clubs are  $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_m \subseteq [n]$ .

Let  $\mathbf{v}_i = (\mathbf{v}_{i,1}, \mathbf{v}_{i,2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{i,n})$  denote the incidence vector of  $C_i$  for  $1 \le i \le m$  i.e.  $\mathbf{v}_{i,j} = 1$  iff  $j \in C_i$ . We treat these vectors as being over the two element field  $\mathbb{F}_2$ .

We claim that  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_m$  are linearly independent and the theorem will follow.

The rules imply that (i)  $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i = 1$  and (ii)  $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j = 0$  for  $1 \le i \ne j \le m$ . (Remember that we are working over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ .)

Linear algebraic methods

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ● ○ ○ ○

Suppose then that

$$c_1\mathbf{v}_1+c_2\mathbf{v}_2+\cdots+c_m\mathbf{v}_m=0.$$

We show that  $c_1 = c_2 = \cdots = c_m = 0$ .

Indeed, we have

$$0 = \mathbf{v}_j \cdot (c_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + c_2 \mathbf{v}_2 + \dots + c_m \mathbf{v}_m)$$
  
=  $c_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_j + c_2 \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_j + \dots + c_m \mathbf{v}_m \cdot \mathbf{v}_j$   
=  $c_j$ ,

for j = 1, 2, ..., m.

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆臣 > ◆臣 > ─臣 ─のへで

## Point sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with only two distances

Let  $A = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Suppose that the pair-wise distance between elements of A only take two values. How large can A be?

Denote the maximum size of A by m(n).



**Proof** For the lower bound we let  $A = \{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j : 1 \le i < j \le n\}$  where  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is the *i*th coordinate vector.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

## Point sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with only two distances

There are only two distances between elements of A viz.  $2^{1/2}$  and 2.

 $|A| = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ , but it lies in the (n-1)-dimensional space  $x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n = 2$ .

For the upper bound, assume that the two distances in *A* are  $d_1, d_2$ . Then consider the multivariate polynomial with 2n variables,

$$F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}||^2 - d_1^2)(||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}||^2 - d_2^2).$$

Thus our two-distance condition can be expressed:

$$F(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j) = \begin{cases} (d_1 d_2)^2 & i = j \\ 0 & i \neq j \end{cases}$$

・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト … ヨ

## Point sets in **R**<sup>n</sup> with only two distances

Next let

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}_i)$$
 for  $i = 1, 2, ..., m$ .

We claim that  $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that for some  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_m$ 

 $\lambda_1 f_1(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_2 f_2(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + \lambda_m f_m(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

But if  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a}_j$  then  $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  and  $f_j(\mathbf{x}) = (d_1 d_2)^2 \neq 0$ .

It follows that  $\lambda_i f_i(\mathbf{a}_i) = 0$  and the independence claim follows.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ● ○ ○ ○

### Point sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with only two distances

On the other hand, all polynomials  $f_i$  can be expressed as linear combinations of the following:

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n x_k^2\right)^2, \left(\sum_{k=1}^n x_k^2\right) x_j, x_i x_j, x_i, 1.$$

The number of polynomials listed is

1 + n + n(n+1)/2 + n + 1 = (n+1)(n+4)/2.

Thus the  $f_i$  belong to a space of dimension at most (n+1)(n+4)/2.

П

▲圖 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ …

# Decomposing $K_n$ into bipartite subgraphs

### Here we show

### Theorem

If  $G_k$ , k = 1, 2, ..., m is a collection of complete bipartite graphs with vertex partitions  $A_k$ ,  $B_k$ , such that every edge of  $K_n$  is in exactly one subgraph, then  $m \ge n - 1$ . (Note that  $A_k \cap B_k = \emptyset$ here.)

**Proof** This is tight since we can take  $A_k = \{k\}, B_k = \{k+1, \dots, n\}$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ .

Define  $n \times n$  matrices  $M_k$  where  $M_k(i,j) = 1$  if  $i \in A_k, j \in B_k$ and  $M_k(i,j) = 0$  otherwise.

Let  $S = M_1 + M_2 + \dots + M_m$ . Then  $S + S^T = J_n - I_n$  where  $I_n$  is the identity matrix and  $J_n$  is the all ones matrix.

▲□ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ □ ● ● ● ●

### Decomposing $K_n$ into bipartite subgraphs

We show next that  $rank(S) \ge n - 1$  and then the theorem follows from

 $rank(S) \leq rank(M_1) + rank(M_2) + \cdots + rank(M_m) \leq m.$ 

Suppose then that  $rank(S) \le n - 2$  so that there exists a non-zero solution  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$  to the system of equations

$$S\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, \ \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

But then,  $J_n \mathbf{x} = 0$  and  $S^T \mathbf{x} = -\mathbf{x}$  and  $-|\mathbf{x}|^2 = -\mathbf{x}^T S^T \mathbf{x} = 0$ , contradiction.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

# Nonuniform Fisher Inequality

### Theorem

Let  $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_m$  be distinct subsets of [n] such that for every  $i \neq j$  we have  $|C_i \cap C_j| = s$  where  $1 \leq s < n$ . Then  $m \leq n$ .

**Proof** If  $|C_1| = s$  then  $C_i \supset C_1, i = 2, 3, ..., m$  and the sets  $C_i \setminus C_1$  are pairwise disjoint for  $i \ge 2$ .

It follows in this case that  $m \leq 1 + n - s \leq n$ .

Assume from now on that  $c_i = |C_i| - s > 0$  for  $i \in [m]$ .

<ロ> <問> <問> < E> < E> < E> < E

Let *M* be the  $m \times n 0/1$  matrix where M(i, j) = 1 iff  $j \in C_i$ .

Let

$$A = MM^T = sJ + D$$

where *J* is the  $m \times m$  all 1's matrix and *D* is the diagonal matrix, where  $D(i, i) = c_i$ .

We show that A and hence M has rank m, implying that  $m \le n$  as claimed.

We will in fact show that  $\mathbf{x}^T A \mathbf{x} > 0$  for all  $0 \neq \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . This means that  $A \mathbf{x} \neq 0$  when  $\mathbf{x} \neq 0$ .

# Nonuniform Fisher Inequality

If  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_m)^T$  then

$$\mathbf{x}^T A \mathbf{x} = s(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_m)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m c_i x_i^2 > 0.$$

Linear algebraic methods

ヘロト 人間 とくほとく ほとう

## Lighting problem

Let G = (V, E) be an arbitrary graph. Suppose that each vertex contains a light bulb and  $\ell(v) = 1$  indicates that the light bulb on v is on and  $\ell(v) = 0$  indicates that it is off.

Suppose that for  $v \in V$ , the transformation T(v) flips the values at v and all of its neighbors. I.e. T(v) switches on a neighboring light bulb if it is off and turns it off if it is on.

Suppose that initially,  $\ell(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V$ , i.e. all light bulbs are off. We show that there exists a set  $S \subseteq V$  such that applying  $T(v), v \in S$  in any order makes  $\ell(v) = 1$  for  $v \in V$ .

・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・

## Lighting problem

Observe first that applying T(v) and then T(w) achieves the same effect as applying T(w) and then T(v) i.e. the order of application of the transformations does not matter. (The value of  $\ell(u)$  is flipped by the two transformations iff it is adjacent to exactly one of  $\{v, w\}$ .)

Let *A* be the 0-1 adjacency matrix of *G* i.e. let A(v, w) = 1 iff  $w \in N(v)$ . In addition put A(v, v) = 1 for  $v \in V$ .

The set of transformations corresponding to *S* will turn on all of the lights iff  $A1_S = 1_V$  where  $1_S$  is the 0-1 vector indexed by *V* such that there is a 1 in component *v* iff  $v \in S$ .

ヘロン 人間 とくほ とくほ とう

Our claim amounts to saying that there exists *S* such that  $A1_S = 1_V$  where calculations are done in the binary field.

If there is no such  $\mathbf{1}_S$  then basic linear algebra theory tells us that there exists x such that  $x^T A = 0$  and  $x^T \mathbf{1}_V \neq 0$ .

Since *A* is symmetric, this means that Ax = 0 as well. Let  $x = 1_S$ . Then *S* has the following properties:

- (a)  $|S \cap N(v)|$  is odd for all  $v \in V$ . This is a consequence of Ax = 0.
- **(a)** |S| is odd. This is a consequence of  $x^T \mathbf{1}_V \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

▲圖 → ▲ 国 → ▲ 国 → □

Now consider the sub-graph of *G* induced by *S*.

Every vertex has odd degree by (a). But in any graph, the number of odd vertices is even. Contradiction.

・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

æ