

Lecture 8-9

Lecturer: Mark Braverman

Scribe: Joseph Perla\*

# 1 Shearer's Lemma

Today we shall learn about Shearer's Lemma, which is a generalization of the subadditivity of entropy.

**Lemma 1** (Shearer's Lemma). *Let  $X = X_1, \dots, X_n$  be any random variables. If  $S$  is any distribution on subsets of  $\{1 \dots n\}$ , such for every  $i$ ,  $\Pr[i \in S] \geq \mu$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[H(X_S)] \geq \mu \cdot H(X)$ .*

(As an aside, we give a simple proof due to Jaikumar Radhakrishnan.)

**Proof** For  $T = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  with  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_T) &= H(X_{i_1}) + H(X_{i_2}|X_{i_1}) + \dots + H(X_{i_k}|X_{i_{k-1}}, \dots, X_{i_1}) \\ &\geq H(X_{i_1}|X_{<i_1}) + H(X_{i_2}|X_{<i_2}) + \dots + H(X_{i_k}|X_{<i_k}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used chain rule in the equality, and used the fact that entropy is only smaller if we condition on more variables, for the inequality.

Thus, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_S [H(X_S)] &\geq \mathbb{E}_S \left[ \sum_{i \in S} H(X_i|X_{<i}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \Pr[i \in S] \cdot H(X_i|X_{<i}) \quad \text{whenever } i \text{ is not in } S, \text{ this term contributes } 0 \\ &\geq \mu \sum_{i \in [n]} H(X_i|X_{<i}) \\ &= \mu \cdot H(X) \end{aligned}$$

■

# 2 Applications

Now, let's start counting the number of cliques within a graph. We start with a simple example. Suppose  $G = (V, E)$  is an undirected graph,  $t$  is the number of triangles and  $\ell$  is the number of edges.

**Proposition 2.**  $t \leq (2\ell)^{3/2}/6$

**Proof** The proof is very similar to that of the triangles and vee problem we have seen. Let  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  be uniformly random vertices forming a triangle. Then  $H(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \log(6t)$ , since each triangle can be written in 6 ways.

Let  $S$  be a uniformly random subset of coordinates  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  of size 2. Then for all  $i$ ,  $\Pr[i \in S] = 2/3$ . By Shearer's Lemma,

$$\mathbb{E}_S [H(X_S)] \geq \frac{2}{3} \log(6t),$$

---

\*Based in part on lecture notes by Anup Rao and Jijiang Yan.

so there exists  $T \subset [1, 2, 3]$ ,  $|T| = 2$ , for which  $H(X_T) \geq \frac{2}{3} \log(6t)$ . On the other hand  $X_T$  is supported on edges of the graph, so  $\log(2\ell) \geq H(X_T)$ . This gives  $2\ell \geq (6t)^{2/3}$ , proving the bound. ■

It is easy to see using a similar proof that if  $a < b$  and  $n_a$  is the number of cliques of size  $a$  and  $n_b$  is the number of cliques of size  $b$ , then  $(b! \cdot n_b)^a \leq (a! \cdot n_a)^b$ . Can we say something about arbitrary subgraphs (besides cliques)? It turns out that we can completely characterize the relationship between the number of subgraphs to the number of edges!

## 2.1 Counting Embeddings of Graphs

$N(T, \ell)$  is the maximum number of homomorphisms a graph  $T$  can have in a graph with  $\ell$  edges.

Look at  $N(K_k, \ell)$ .

$$(b!n_b)^2 \leq (2\ell)^b$$

$$n_b \leq (2\ell)^{\frac{b}{2}}/b!$$

$$N(K_k, \ell) \leq (2\ell)^{\frac{b}{2}}$$

The last equation is tight for a complete graph. But what is  $N(T, \ell)$  in general?

Look at  $T$ , a 5-star (one node with edges to 5 nodes around it). For this  $T$ ,  $\ell$ -star leads to at most  $\ell^5$  embeddings and  $\sqrt{2\ell}$  clique leads to  $\sqrt{2\ell}^5$  embeddings. The number has to do with the structure of  $T$ .

### 2.1.1 Fractional Independent Set

To understand  $N(T, \ell)$  for an arbitrary graph  $T$ , we need to define two numbers associated with the graph  $T$ . The first is the *fractional independent set* number. A fractional independent set of  $T$  is a function  $\psi : V(T) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that for every edge,  $e = \{u, v\}$ ,  $\psi(u) + \psi(v) \leq 1$ . The size of the fractional independent set is  $\alpha(\psi) = \sum_{v \in V} \psi(v)$ . We write  $\alpha^*(T)$  to denote the size of the biggest fractional independent set. Note that  $\alpha^*(T)$  can be computed by a linear program, and the integer version of this program simply computes the size of the largest independent set.

This is a generalization of independent set. This continuous optimization is easier to solve than the discrete case.

The dual of this linear program measures a different quantity associated with  $T$ , namely the *fractional cover number*. Say that a mapping of the edges  $\phi : E(G) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a fractional cover if for every vertex  $v$ ,  $\sum_{v \in e} \phi(e) \geq 1$ , where the sum is taken over all edges  $e$  that contain  $v$ . The size of the fractional cover is  $\gamma(\phi) = \sum_e \phi(e)$ , and we denote by  $\gamma^*(T)$  the size of the smallest fractional cover. Then the linear programming duality theorem proves that  $\alpha^*(T) = \gamma^*(T)$ .

If  $T$  is a triangle, we have that  $\alpha^*(T) = 3/2$ , corresponding to the fractional independent set that weights every vertex with  $1/2$ . Similarly, if  $K$  is a  $k$ -clique,  $\alpha^*(K) = k/2$ . Indeed, the examples above are special cases of the following theorem, proved by Freidgut and Kahn (based on an earlier work of Alon).

**Theorem 3** ([1, 3]). *If  $T$  has  $m$  edges,  $(\ell/m)^{\alpha^*(T)} \leq N(T, \ell) \leq (2\ell)^{\alpha^*(T)}$ .*

**Proof** First we prove the upper bound. Let  $\sigma$  be a uniformly random embedding from  $T \rightarrow G$ , where  $G$  is a fixed graph with  $\ell$  edges. We shall use  $\sigma$  to define a distribution on the edges of  $T$  with high entropy. Let  $\phi$  be the fractional cover of size  $\alpha^*(T)$ , and let  $S$  be a random edge of  $T$ , such that for every edge  $e$ ,  $\Pr[S = e] = \phi(e)/\alpha^*(T)$ . Namely, we use the distribution given by  $\phi$  (after normalization). Now think of  $\sigma$

as being specified by the values of  $\sigma(v)$  for all vertices  $v$  of  $T$ . Then, since  $\phi$  is a fractional cover, we have that for every vertex  $v$ ,  $\Pr[v \in S] \geq \sum_{v \in e} \phi(e)/\alpha^*(T) \geq 1/\alpha^*(T)$ .

By Shearer's Lemma,  $\mathbb{E}_S[H(\sigma_S)] \geq H(\sigma)/\alpha^*(T)$ . On the other hand, for each edge  $e$ ,  $\sigma_e$  is supported on edges of  $G$ , so  $H(\sigma_e) \leq \log(2\ell)$ . Thus  $(2\ell)^{\alpha^*(T)} \geq N(T, \ell)$ .

Next we prove the lower bound (modulo rounding arguments). Let us construct  $G$  for which there are many embeddings of  $T$  into  $G$ . Let  $\psi$  be a fractional independent set that achieves  $\alpha^*(G)$ . We obtain  $G$  by replacing every vertex in  $T$  with an independent set of  $(\frac{\ell}{m})^{\psi(v)}$  vertices, and connecting every vertex in the independent set for  $u$  to every vertex in the independent set for  $v$  if and only if  $\{u, v\}$  is an edge of  $T$ . Every edge of  $T$  thus contributes  $(\frac{\ell}{m})^{\psi(u)+\psi(v)} \leq \ell/m$  edges to  $G$ , and so  $G$  has at most  $\ell$  edges. You can get a homomorphism from  $T$  to  $G$  by mapping any vertex  $v$  to a vertex in the independent set corresponding to  $v$ , so there are at least  $(\ell/m)^{\sum_v \psi(v)} = (\ell/m)^{\alpha^*(T)}$  such homomorphisms. ■

## 2.2 Intersecting Families of Graphs

Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of subsets of  $[n]$ . We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is *intersecting* if for every  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $|A \cap B| > 0$ .

One example of a large intersecting family is the family of sets that contain 1. This family has size  $2^{n-1}$ , and this is as large as you can make such a family (because only one of  $A, A^c$  may belong to  $\mathcal{F}$ ):

**Claim 4.** *If  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting, then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^{n-1}$ .*

The proof is very simple: for every set  $A$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  can contain either  $A$  or its complement, but not both.

Next, let us call a family  $\mathcal{F}$  *k-intersecting* if for every  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $|A \cap B| \geq k$ . An obvious example of such a family is the family of sets that all contain  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ , which has size  $2^{n-k}$ . Can one do better?

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{A \subseteq [n] : |A| \geq n/2 + k/2\}$ . Then every two sets of  $\mathcal{F}$  intersect in at least  $k$  elements, but the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\sum_{i=\lceil n/2+k/2 \rceil}^n \binom{n}{i} \geq (2^n/2)(1 - O(k/\sqrt{n}))$ .

Next, let us try to place some structure on the intersections. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a family of graphs on the vertex set  $[n]$ . We say  $\mathcal{G}$  is *intersecting* if for any two graphs  $T, K \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $T \cap K$  has an edge. Then as before,  $\mathcal{G}$  is of size at most  $2^{\binom{n}{2}}/2$ , which can be achieved with the family of all graphs that contain a designated edge.

Things get interesting if we ask for the intersections to have some structure. Say that  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\nabla$ -*intersecting* if for every  $T, K \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $T \cap K$  contains a triangle. The trivial example gives a family of size  $2^{\binom{n}{2}}/8$ , but perhaps there is some clever way to get a  $\nabla$ -intersecting family that has size close to  $2^{\binom{n}{2}}/2$ , as in the examples above?

Chung, Frankl, Graham and Shearer showed that no such example exists:

**Theorem 5** ([2]). *If  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\nabla$ -intersecting, then  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq 2^{\binom{n}{2}}/4$ .*

**Proof** For any subset  $R \subseteq [n]$ , let  $G_R$  be the graph consisting of two disconnected cliques, one on  $R$  and the other on the complement of  $R$ . Write  $|G_R|$  for the number of edges in  $G_R$ . Then observe that since for every  $T, K \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $T \cap K$  contains a triangle, it must be the case that  $T \cap K \cap G_R$  contains an edge. Thus, the family of graphs  $\{T \cup G_R : T \in \mathcal{G}\}$  is intersecting, and so has size at most  $2^{|G_R|}/2$ .

Let us define  $S$  to be a uniformly random graph  $G_R$  obtained by picking a random subset  $R$  of size  $n/2$ . Observe that for any edge, by symmetry, the probability that the edge is included in  $G_R$  is  $|G_R|/\binom{n}{2}$ .

Let  $G$  be a uniformly random graph from  $\mathcal{G}$ . Consider what happens when we restrict  $G$  to the information about the edges in  $S$ . By Shearer's Lemma and the fact that  $G_S$  is supported on an intersecting family,

$$|G_R| - 1 \geq \mathbb{E}_S[H(G_S)] \geq \frac{|G_R|}{\binom{n}{2}} \log |\mathcal{G}|. \text{ Thus,}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\log |\mathcal{G}| &\leq \binom{n}{2} - \binom{n}{2} / |G_R| \\
&= \binom{n}{2} - \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{2^{\binom{n}{2}}} \\
&= \binom{n}{2} - \frac{n(n-1)}{2(n/2)(n/2-1)} \\
&= \binom{n}{2} - \frac{n-1}{n/2-1} \\
&\leq \binom{n}{2} - 2
\end{aligned}$$

■

## References

- [1] Noga Alon. On the number of subgraphs of prescribed type of graphs with a given number of edges. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 38:116–130, 1981.
- [2] Fan R. K. Chung, Ronald L. Graham, Peter Frankl, and James B. Shearer. Some intersection theorems for ordered sets and graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 43(1):23–37, 1986.
- [3] Ehud Friedgut and Jeff Kahn. On the number of copies of one hypergraph in another. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 105:251–256, 1998.