Szigetek

K. Horváth Eszter

Szeged, 2010. április 27.

Definition/1

Grid, neighbourhood relation





Definition/2

We call a rectangle/triangle an *island*, if for the cell t, if we denote its height by a_t, then for each cell $\hat{t}$ neighbouring with a cell of the rectange/triangle T, the inequality $a_{\hat{t}} < min\{a_t : t \in T\}$ holds.





History/1

Coding theory

S. Földes and N. M. Singhi: On instantaneous codes, J. of Combinatorics, Information and System Sci., 31 (2006), 317-326.

History/1

Coding theory

S. Földes and N. M. Singhi: On instantaneous codes, J. of Combinatorics, Information and System Sci., 31 (2006), 317-326.

History/2

Rectangular islands

G. Czédli: The number of rectangular islands by means of distributive lattices, European Journal of Combinatorics 30 (2009), 208-215.

The maximum number of rectangular islands in a $m \times n$ rectangular board on square grid:

$$f(m,n) = [\frac{mn+m+n-1}{2}].$$



History/2

Rectangular islands

G. Czédli: The number of rectangular islands by means of distributive lattices, European Journal of Combinatorics 30 (2009), 208-215.

The maximum number of rectangular islands in a $m \times n$ rectangular board on square grid:

$$f(m,n) = [\frac{mn+m+n-1}{2}].$$



History/2

Rectangular islands

G. Czédli: The number of rectangular islands by means of distributive lattices, European Journal of Combinatorics 30 (2009), 208-215.

The maximum number of rectangular islands in a $m \times n$ rectangular board on square grid:

$$f(m,n) = [\frac{mn+m+n-1}{2}].$$



History/3

Rectangular islands in higher dimensions

G. Pluhár: The number of brick islands by means of distributive lattices, Acta Sci. Math., to appear.

History/3

Rectangular islands in higher dimensions

G. Pluhár: The number of brick islands by means of distributive lattices, Acta Sci. Math., to appear.

History/4

Triangular islands

E. K. Horváth, Z. Németh and G. Pluhár: The number of triangular islands on a triangular grid, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, 58 (2009), 25–34.
Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

For the maximum number of triangular islands in an equilateral rectangle of side length n, $\frac{n^2+3n}{5} \leq f(n) \leq \frac{3n^2+9n+2}{14}$ holds.



History/4

Triangular islands

E. K. Horváth, Z. Németh and G. Pluhár: The number of triangular islands on a triangular grid, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, 58 (2009), 25–34.
Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

For the maximum number of triangular islands in an equilateral rectangle of side length n, $\frac{n^2+3n}{5} \leq f(n) \leq \frac{3n^2+9n+2}{14}$ holds.



History/4

Triangular islands

E. K. Horváth, Z. Németh and G. Pluhár: The number of triangular islands on a triangular grid, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, 58 (2009), 25–34.
Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

For the maximum number of triangular islands in an equilateral rectangle of side length n, $\frac{n^2+3n}{5} \leq f(n) \leq \frac{3n^2+9n+2}{14}$ holds.



History/5

Square islands (also in higher dimensions)

E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Z. Németh, Cs. Szabó: The number of square islands on a rectangular sea, Acta Sci. Math., to appear. Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

$$\frac{1}{3}(rs - 2r - 2s) \leq f(r,s) \leq \frac{1}{3}(rs - 1)$$



History/5

Square islands (also in higher dimensions)

E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Z. Németh, Cs. Szabó: The number of square islands on a rectangular sea, Acta Sci. Math., to appear. Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

$$\frac{1}{3}(rs - 2r - 2s) \leq f(r,s) \leq \frac{1}{3}(rs - 1)$$



History/5

Square islands (also in higher dimensions)

E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Z. Németh, Cs. Szabó: The number of square islands on a rectangular sea, Acta Sci. Math., to appear. Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

$$\frac{1}{3}(rs - 2r - 2s) \leq f(r,s) \leq \frac{1}{3}(rs - 1)$$



History/5

Square islands (also in higher dimensions)

E. K. Horváth, G. Horváth, Z. Németh, Cs. Szabó: The number of square islands on a rectangular sea, Acta Sci. Math., to appear. Available at http://www.math.u-szeged.hu/~horvath

$$\frac{1}{3}(rs - 2r - 2s) \leq f(r,s) \leq \frac{1}{3}(rs - 1)$$



Proving methods/1

LATTICE THEORETICAL METHOD

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

Any two weak bases of a finite distributive lattice have the same number of elements.

Proving methods/1

LATTICE THEORETICAL METHOD

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

Any two weak bases of a finite distributive lattice have the same number of elements.

Proving methods/1

LATTICE THEORETICAL METHOD

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

Any two weak bases of a finite distributive lattice have the same number of elements.

Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD





Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD





Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD

Lemma 2 (folklore)

(i) Let T be a binary tree with ℓ leaves. Then the number of vertices of T depends only on ℓ, moreover $|V| = 2\ell - 1$.

(ii) Let T be a rooted tree such that any non-leaf node has at least 2 sons. Let ℓ be the number of leaves in T. Then $|V| \leq 2\ell - 1$.

We have $4s + 2d \leq (n+1)(m+1)$.
The number of leaves of $T(\mathcal{I})$ is $\ell = s + d$. Hence by Lemma 2 the number of islands is

$$|V| - d \leq (2\ell - 1) - d = 2s + d - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(m+1) - 1.$$

.

Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD

Lemma 2 (folklore)

(i) Let T be a binary tree with ℓ leaves. Then the number of vertices of T depends only on ℓ, moreover $|V| = 2\ell - 1$.

(ii) Let T be a rooted tree such that any non-leaf node has at least 2 sons. Let ℓ be the number of leaves in T. Then $|V| \leq 2\ell - 1$.

We have $4s + 2d \leq (n+1)(m+1)$.
The number of leaves of $T(\mathcal{I})$ is $\ell = s + d$. Hence by Lemma 2 the number of islands is

$$|V| - d \leq (2\ell - 1) - d = 2s + d - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(m+1) - 1.$$

.

Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD

Lemma 2 (folklore)

(i) Let T be a binary tree with ℓ leaves. Then the number of vertices of T depends only on ℓ, moreover $|V| = 2\ell - 1$.

(ii) Let T be a rooted tree such that any non-leaf node has at least 2 sons. Let ℓ be the number of leaves in T. Then $|V| \leq 2\ell - 1$.

We have $4s + 2d \leq (n+1)(m+1)$.
The number of leaves of $T(\mathcal{I})$ is $\ell = s + d$. Hence by Lemma 2 the number of islands is

$$|V| - d \leq (2\ell - 1) - d = 2s + d - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(m+1) - 1.$$

.

Proving methods/2

TREE-GRAPH METHOD

Lemma 2 (folklore)

(i) Let T be a binary tree with ℓ leaves. Then the number of vertices of T depends only on ℓ, moreover $|V| = 2\ell - 1$.

(ii) Let T be a rooted tree such that any non-leaf node has at least 2 sons. Let ℓ be the number of leaves in T. Then $|V| \leq 2\ell - 1$.

We have $4s + 2d \leq (n+1)(m+1)$.
The number of leaves of $T(\mathcal{I})$ is $\ell = s + d$. Hence by Lemma 2 the number of islands is

$$|V| - d \leq (2\ell - 1) - d = 2s + d - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(m+1) - 1.$$

.

Proving methods/3

ELEMENTARY METHOD

We define

$$\mu(R) = \mu(u, v) := (u+1)(v+1).$$

Now

$$f(m,n) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} f(R) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{(u+1)(v+1)}{2} \right] - 1 \right)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{\mu(u,v)}{2} \right] - 1 \right) \leq 1 - |max\mathcal{I}| + \left[\frac{\mu(\mathbb{C})}{2} \right].$$

If $|max\mathcal{I}| \geq 2$, then the proof is ready. Case $|max\mathcal{I}| = 1$ is an easy excersise.

Proving methods/3

ELEMENTARY METHOD

We define

$$\mu(R) = \mu(u, v) := (u + 1)(v + 1).$$

Now

$$f(m, n) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} f(R) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{(u+1)(v+1)}{2} \right] - 1 \right)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{\mu(u, v)}{2} \right] - 1 \right) \leq 1 - |max\mathcal{I}| + \left[\frac{\mu(\mathrm{C})}{2} \right].$$

If $|max\mathcal{I}| \geq 2$, then the proof is ready. Case $|max\mathcal{I}| = 1$ is an easy excersise.

Proving methods/3

ELEMENTARY METHOD

We define

$$\mu(R) = \mu(u, v) := (u + 1)(v + 1).$$

Now

$$f(m, n) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} f(R) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{(u+1)(v+1)}{2} \right] - 1 \right)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{\mu(u, v)}{2} \right] - 1 \right) \leq 1 - |max\mathcal{I}| + \left[\frac{\mu(\mathrm{C})}{2} \right].$$

If $|max\mathcal{I}| \geq 2$, then the proof is ready. Case $|max\mathcal{I}| = 1$ is an easy excersise.

Proving methods/3

ELEMENTARY METHOD

We define

$$\mu(R) = \mu(u, v) := (u + 1)(v + 1).$$

Now

$$f(m, n) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} f(R) = 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{(u+1)(v+1)}{2} \right] - 1 \right)$$

$$= 1 + \sum_{R \in max\mathcal{I}} \left(\left[\frac{\mu(u, v)}{2} \right] - 1 \right) \leq 1 - |max\mathcal{I}| + \left[\frac{\mu(\mathrm{C})}{2} \right].$$

If $|max\mathcal{I}| \geq 2$, then the proof is ready. Case $|max\mathcal{I}| = 1$ is an easy excersise.

History/6

Some exact formulas

Peninsulas (semi islands) (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
$p(m,n) = f(m,n) = [(mn + m + n - 1)/2]$.

Cylindric board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_1(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}]$.

Cylindric board, cylindric and rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_2(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}] + [\frac{(m-1)}{2}]$.

Torus board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $m, n \geq 2$, then $t(m,n) = [\frac{mn}{2}]$.

History/6

Some exact formulas

Peninsulas (semi islands) (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
$p(m,n) = f(m,n) = [(mn + m + n - 1)/2]$.

Cylindric board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_1(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}]$.

Cylindric board, cylindric and rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_2(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}] + [\frac{(m-1)}{2}]$.

Torus board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $m, n \geq 2$, then $t(m,n) = [\frac{mn}{2}]$.

History/6

Some exact formulas

Peninsulas (semi islands) (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
$p(m,n) = f(m,n) = [(mn+m+n-1)/2]$.

Cylindric board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_1(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}]$.

Cylindric board, cylindric and rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_2(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}] + [\frac{(m-1)}{2}]$.

Torus board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $m, n \geq 2$, then $t(m,n) = [\frac{mn}{2}]$.

History/6

Some exact formulas

Peninsulas (semi islands) (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
$p(m,n) = f(m,n) = [(mn + m + n - 1)/2]$.

Cylindric board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_1(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}]$.

Cylindric board, cylindric and rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $n \geq 2$, then $h_2(m,n) = [\frac{(m+1)n}{2}] + [\frac{(m-1)}{2}]$.

Torus board, rectangular islands (J. Barát, P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth):
If $m, n \geq 2$, then $t(m,n) = [\frac{mn}{2}]$.

History/7

Further results on rectangular islands

Zs. Lengvárszky: The minimum cardinality of maximal systems of rectangular islands, European Journal of Combinatorics, **30** (2009), 216-219.

History/7

Further results on rectangular islands

Zs. Lengvárszky: The minimum cardinality of maximal systems of rectangular islands, European Journal of Combinatorics, **30** (2009), 216-219.

History/8

The board consists of all vertices of a hypercube, i.e. the elements of a Boolean algebra $BA = \{0,1\}^n$.

We consider two cells neighbouring if their Hamming distance is 1.

We denote the maximum number of islands in $BA = \{0,1\}^n$ by $b(n)$.

Island formula for Boolean algebras (P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth)
$b(n) = 1 + 2^{n-1}$.

History/8

The board consists of all vertices of a hypercube, i.e. the elements of a Boolean algebra $BA = \{0,1\}^n$.

We consider two cells neighbouring if their Hamming distance is 1.

We denote the maximum number of islands in $BA = \{0,1\}^n$ by $b(n)$.

Island formula for Boolean algebras (P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth)
$b(n) = 1 + 2^{n-1}$.

History/8

The board consists of all vertices of a hypercube, i.e. the elements of a Boolean algebra $BA = \{0,1\}^n$.

We consider two cells neighbouring if their Hamming distance is 1.

We denote the maximum number of islands in $BA = \{0,1\}^n$ by $b(n)$.

Island formula for Boolean algebras (P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth)
$b(n) = 1 + 2^{n-1}$.

History/8

The board consists of all vertices of a hypercube, i.e. the elements of a Boolean algebra $BA = \{0,1\}^n$.

We consider two cells neighbouring if their Hamming distance is 1.

We denote the maximum number of islands in $BA = \{0,1\}^n$ by $b(n)$.

Island formula for Boolean algebras (P. Hajnal, E.K. Horváth)
$b(n) = 1 + 2^{n-1}$.

Rectangular height functions/1

Joint work with Branimir Šešelja and Andreja Tepavčević

A *height function* h is a mapping from $\{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ to $\mathbb{N}$, $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$.

The co-domain of the height function is the lattice $(\mathbb{N}, \leq)$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers under the usual ordering $\leq$ and suprema and infima are max and min, respectively.

For every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, the *cut of the height function*, i.e. the *p-cut* of h is an ordinary relation h_p on $\{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ defined by

$$(x, y) \in h_p \text{ if and only if } h(x, y) \geq p.$$

Rectangular height functions/1

Joint work with Branimir Šešelja and Andreja Tepavčević

A *height function* h is a mapping from $\{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ to $\mathbb{N}$, $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$.

The co-domain of the height function is the lattice $(\mathbb{N}, \leq)$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers under the usual ordering $\leq$ and suprema and infima are max and min, respectively.

For every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, the *cut of the height function*, i.e. the *p-cut* of h is an ordinary relation h_p on $\{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ defined by

$$(x, y) \in h_p \text{ if and only if } h(x, y) \geq p.$$

Rectangular height functions/2

We say that two rectangles $\{\alpha, ..., \beta\} \times \{\gamma, ..., \delta\}$ and $\{\alpha_1, ..., \beta_1\} \times \{\gamma_1, ..., \delta_1\}$ are *distant* if they are disjoint and for every two cells, namely (a, b) from the first rectangle and (c, d) from the second, we have $(a - c)^2 + (b - d)^2 \geq 4$.

The height function h is called *rectangular* if for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, every nonempty p-cut of h is a union of distant rectangles.

Rectangular height functions/2

We say that two rectangles $\{\alpha, ..., \beta\} \times \{\gamma, ..., \delta\}$ and $\{\alpha_1, ..., \beta_1\} \times \{\gamma_1, ..., \delta_1\}$ are *distant* if they are disjoint and for every two cells, namely (a, b) from the first rectangle and (c, d) from the second, we have $(a - c)^2 + (b - d)^2 \geq 4$.

The height function h is called *rectangular* if for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$, every nonempty p-cut of h is a union of distant rectangles.

Rectangular height functions/3

5	5	3	5	5
4	4	2	4	4
2	2	1	2	2

$\Gamma_1 = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \times \{1,2,3\}$,
$\Gamma_2 = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \times \{1,2,3\} \setminus \{(3,1)\}$,
$\Gamma_3 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,3),(3,3),(4,2),\ (4,3),(5,2),(5,3)\}$,
$\Gamma_4 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,3),(4,2),(4,3),(5,2),(5,3)\}$ and
$\Gamma_5 = \{(1,3),(2,3),(4,3),(5,3)\}$

Rectangular height functions/3

5	5	3	5	5
4	4	2	4	4
2	2	1	2	2

$\Gamma_1 = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \times \{1,2,3\}$,
$\Gamma_2 = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \times \{1,2,3\} \setminus \{(3,1)\}$,
$\Gamma_3 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,3),(3,3),(4,2),\ (4,3),(5,2),(5,3)\}$,
$\Gamma_4 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,3),(4,2),(4,3),(5,2),(5,3)\}$ and
$\Gamma_5 = \{(1,3),(2,3),(4,3),(5,3)\}$

Rectangular height functions/4
CHARACTERIZATION THEOREM

Theorem 1

A height function $h_{\mathbb{N}} : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ is rectangular if and only if for all (α, γ), $(\beta, \delta) \in \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ either

- these are not neighboring cells and there is a cell (μ, ν) between (α, γ) and (β, δ) such that $h_{\mathbb{N}}(\mu, \nu) < \min\{h_{\mathbb{N}}(\alpha, \gamma), h_{\mathbb{N}}(\beta, \delta)\}$, or
- for all $(\mu, \nu) \in [\min\{\alpha, \beta\}, \max\{\alpha, \beta\}] \times [\min\{\gamma, \delta\}, \max\{\gamma, \delta\}]$,

$$h_{\mathbb{N}}(\mu, \nu) \geq \min\{h_{\mathbb{N}}(\alpha, \gamma), h_{\mathbb{N}}(\beta, \delta)\}.$$

Rectangular height functions/4
CHARACTERIZATION THEOREM

Theorem 1

A height function $h_{\mathbb{N}} : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ is rectangular if and only if for all (α, γ), $(\beta, \delta) \in \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ either

- these are not neighboring cells and there is a cell (μ, ν) between (α, γ) and (β, δ) such that $h_{\mathbb{N}}(\mu, \nu) < \min\{h_{\mathbb{N}}(\alpha, \gamma), h_{\mathbb{N}}(\beta, \delta)\}$, or
- for all $(\mu, \nu) \in [\min\{\alpha, \beta\}, \max\{\alpha, \beta\}] \times [\min\{\gamma, \delta\}, \max\{\gamma, \delta\}]$,

$$h_{\mathbb{N}}(\mu, \nu) \geq \min\{h_{\mathbb{N}}(\alpha, \gamma), h_{\mathbb{N}}(\beta, \delta)\}.$$

Rectangular height functions/5

Theorem 2

For every height function $h : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N}$, there is a rectangular height function $h^* : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N}$, such that $\mathcal{I}_{rect}(h) = \mathcal{I}_{rect}(h^*)$.



Rectangular height functions/6
CONSTRUCTING ALGORITHM

1. FOR $i = t$ TO 0
2. FOR $y = 1$ TO n
3. FOR $x = 1$ TO m
4. IF $h(x, y) = a_i$ THEN
5. j:= i
6. WHILE there is no island of h which is a subset of h_{a_j} that contains (x, y) DO j:=j-1
7. ENDWHILE
8. Let $h^*(x, y) := a_j$.
9. ENDIF
10. NEXT x
11. NEXT y
12. NEXT i
13. END.

Rectangular height functions/7
LATTICE-VALUED REPRESENTATION

Theorem 3
Let $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a rectangular height function. Then there is a lattice L and an L-valued mapping Φ, such that the cuts of Φ are precisely all islands of h.

Rectangular height functions/8

Let $h : \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \times \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a height function.

4	9	8	7	1	5
3	8	8	7	1	4
2	7	7	7	1	5
1	2	2	2	1	6
	1	2	3	4	5

Rectangular height functions/9

h is a rectangular height function. Its islands are:

$I_1 = \{(1,4)\}$,
$I_2 = \{(1,3),(1,4),(2,3),(2,4)\}$,
$I_3 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(1,4),(2,2),(2,3),(2,4),(3,2),(3,3),(3,4)\}$,
$I_4 = \{(5,1)\}$,
$I_5 = \{(5,1),(5,2)\}$,
$I_6 = \{(5,4)\}$,
$I_7 = \{(5,1),(5,2),(5,3),(5,4)\}$,
$I_8 = \{(1,2),(1,3),(1,4),(2,2),(2,3),$
$(2,4),(3,2),(3,3),(3,4),(1,1),(2,1),(3,1)\}$,
$I_9 = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \times \{1,2,3,4\}$.

Rectangular height functions/10

Its cut relations are:

$h_{10} = \emptyset$
$h_9 = I_1$ (one-element island)
$h_8 = I_2$ (four-element square island)
$h_7 = I_3$ (nine-element square island)
$h_6 = I_3 \cup I_4$ (this cut is a disjoint union of two islands)
$h_5 = I_3 \cup I_5 \cup I_6$ (union of three islands)
$h_4 = I_3 \cup I_7$ (union of two islands)
$h_2 = I_7 \cup I_8$ (union of two islands)
$h_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \times \{1, 2, 3, 4\} = I_9$ (the whole domain)

Rectangular height functions/11



$$L = (\mathcal{I}_0(\Gamma), \supseteq)$$

Rectangular height functions/12

Theorem 4
For every rectangular height function

$$h^* : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N},$$

there is a rectangular height function

$$h^{**} : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N},$$

such that $\mathcal{I}_{rect}(h^*) = \mathcal{I}_{rect}(h^{**})$ and in h^{**} every island appears exactly in one cut.

If a rectangular height function h^{**} has the property that each island appears exactly in one cut, then we call it *standard rectangular height function.*

Rectangular height functions/12

Theorem 4
For every rectangular height function

$$h^* : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N},$$

there is a rectangular height function

$$h^{**} : \{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., m\} \to \mathbb{N},$$

such that $\mathcal{I}_{rect}(h^*) = \mathcal{I}_{rect}(h^{**})$ and in h^{**} every island appears exactly in one cut.

If a rectangular height function h^{**} has the property that each island appears exactly in one cut, then we call it *standard rectangular height function.*

Rectangular height functions/13

We denote by $\Lambda_{max}(m, n)$ the maximum number of different nonempty p-cuts of a standard rectangular height function on the rectangular table of size $m \times n$.

Theorem 5 $\Lambda_{max}(m, n) = m + n - 1$.

Rectangular height functions/13

We denote by $\Lambda_{max}(m, n)$ the maximum number of different nonempty p-cuts of a standard rectangular height function on the rectangular table of size $m \times n$.

Theorem 5 $\Lambda_{max}(m, n) = m + n - 1$.

Rectangular height functions/14



The maximum number of different nonempty p-cuts of a standard rectangular height function is equal to the minimum cardinality of maximal systems of islands.

Rectangular height functions/15

Lemma 1
If $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 3$ and a height function $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ has maximally many islands, then it has exactly two maximal islands.

Lemma 2
If $m \geq 3$ or $n \geq 3$, then for any odd number $t = 2k + 1$ with $1 \leq t \leq max\{m - 2, n - 2\}$, there is a standard rectangular height function $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ having the maximum number of islands f(m,n), such that one of the side-lengths of one of the maximal islands is equal to t.
(Remark: The statement is not true for even side-lengths, one can construct counterexample easily!)

Rectangular height functions/15

Lemma 1
If $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 3$ and a height function $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ has maximally many islands, then it has exactly two maximal islands.

Lemma 2
If $m \geq 3$ or $n \geq 3$, then for any odd number $t = 2k + 1$ with $1 \leq t \leq max\{m - 2, n - 2\}$, there is a standard rectangular height function $h : \{1, 2, ..., m\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ having the maximum number of islands f(m,n), such that one of the side-lengths of one of the maximal islands is equal to t.
(Remark: The statement is not true for even side-lengths, one can construct counterexample easily!)

Rectangular height functions/16

We denote by $\Lambda_h^{cz}(m,n)$ the number of different nonempty cuts of a standard rectangular height function h in the case h has maximally many islands, i.e., when the number of islands is

$$f(m,n) = \left\lfloor \frac{mn+m+n-1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 6

Let $h : \{1,2,...,m\} \times \{1,2,...,n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a standard rectangular height function having maximally many islands $f(m,n)$. Then, $\Lambda_h^{cz}(m,n) \geq \lceil log_2(m+1) \rceil + \lceil log_2(n+1) \rceil - 1$.

Rectangular height functions/16

We denote by $\Lambda_h^{cz}(m,n)$ the number of different nonempty cuts of a standard rectangular height function h in the case h has maximally many islands, i.e., when the number of islands is

$$f(m,n) = \left\lfloor \frac{mn+m+n-1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 6

Let $h : \{1,2,...,m\} \times \{1,2,...,n\} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a standard rectangular height function having maximally many islands $f(m,n)$. Then, $\Lambda_h^{cz}(m,n) \geq \lceil log_2(m+1) \rceil + \lceil log_2(n+1) \rceil - 1$.

Islands and formal concepts

Neither every island is a formal concept, nor every formal concept is an island.

Let (C, D) be a formal concept of the context $\mathbb{K} := (A, B, I)$. Then, there are linear orderings $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$ on A and B, respectively, such that $C \times D$ is an island of $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$ if and only if there is an element $a \in A$ such that $a \notin C$ and $b \in B$ such that $b \notin D$, with $(a, b) \notin I$, $(a, y) \notin I$ for every $y \in D$ and $(x, b) \notin I$ for every $x \in C$.

If $A_1 \times B_1$ is an island of a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$, then (A_1, B_1) is a concept if and only if there is no $a \in A \setminus A_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $b \in B_1$ and there is no $b \in B \setminus B_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $a \in A_1$.

Let I be a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$. Then, every island in a relation I is a concept if and only if every $x \in A$ belongs to not more than one island and every $y \in B$ belongs to not more then one island.

Islands and formal concepts

Neither every island is a formal concept, nor every formal concept is an island.

Let (C, D) be a formal concept of the context $\mathbb{K} := (A, B, I)$. Then, there are linear orderings $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$ on A and B, respectively, such that $C \times D$ is an island of $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$ if and only if there is an element $a \in A$ such that $a \notin C$ and $b \in B$ such that $b \notin D$, with $(a, b) \notin I$, $(a, y) \notin I$ for every $y \in D$ and $(x, b) \notin I$ for every $x \in C$.

If $A_1 \times B_1$ is an island of a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$, then (A_1, B_1) is a concept if and only if there is no $a \in A \setminus A_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $b \in B_1$ and there is no $b \in B \setminus B_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $a \in A_1$.

Let I be a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$. Then, every island in a relation I is a concept if and only if every $x \in A$ belongs to not more than one island and every $y \in B$ belongs to not more then one island.

Islands and formal concepts

Neither every island is a formal concept, nor every formal concept is an island.

Let (C, D) be a formal concept of the context $\mathbb{K} := (A, B, I)$. Then, there are linear orderings $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$ on A and B, respectively, such that $C \times D$ is an island of $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$ if and only if there is an element $a \in A$ such that $a \notin C$ and $b \in B$ such that $b \notin D$, with $(a, b) \notin I$, $(a, y) \notin I$ for every $y \in D$ and $(x, b) \notin I$ for every $x \in C$.

If $A_1 \times B_1$ is an island of a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$, then (A_1, B_1) is a concept if and only if there is no $a \in A \setminus A_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $b \in B_1$ and there is no $b \in B \setminus B_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $a \in A_1$.

Let I be a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$. Then, every island in a relation I is a concept if and only if every $x \in A$ belongs to not more than one island and every $y \in B$ belongs to not more then one island.

Islands and formal concepts

Neither every island is a formal concept, nor every formal concept is an island.

Let (C, D) be a formal concept of the context $\mathbb{K} := (A, B, I)$. Then, there are linear orderings $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$ on A and B, respectively, such that $C \times D$ is an island of $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$ if and only if there is an element $a \in A$ such that $a \notin C$ and $b \in B$ such that $b \notin D$, with $(a, b) \notin I$, $(a, y) \notin I$ for every $y \in D$ and $(x, b) \notin I$ for every $x \in C$.

If $A_1 \times B_1$ is an island of a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$, then (A_1, B_1) is a concept if and only if there is no $a \in A \setminus A_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $b \in B_1$ and there is no $b \in B \setminus B_1$ such that $(a, b) \in I$ for all $a \in A_1$.

Let I be a relation $I \subseteq (A, \leq_1) \times (B, \leq_2)$. Then, every island in a relation I is a concept if and only if every $x \in A$ belongs to not more than one island and every $y \in B$ belongs to not more then one island.

Distributive lattices

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

G. Czédli, M. Hartmann and E.T.Schmidt: CD-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen, 74/1-2 (2009), 127–134.

G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt: CDW-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 75 (2009), 49–53.

Distributive lattices

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

G. Czédli, M. Hartmann and E.T.Schmidt: CD-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen, 74/1-2 (2009), 127–134.

G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt: CDW-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 75 (2009), 49–53.

Distributive lattices

G. Czédli, A. P. Huhn and E. T. Schmidt: Weakly independent subsets in lattices, Algebra Universalis 20 (1985), 194-196.

G. Czédli, M. Hartmann and E.T.Schmidt: CD-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen, 74/1-2 (2009), 127–134.

G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt: CDW-independent subsets in distributive lattices, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 75 (2009), 49–53.

CD-independence in posets

Join work with Sándor Radeleczki

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $a, b \in P$. The elements a and b are called *disjoint,* and we write $a \perp b$, if

$\inf\{a, b\} = 0$, whenever $\mathbb{P}$ has a least element $0 \in P$,
a and b have no common lowerbound, whenever $\mathbb{P}$ is without 0.

Notice, that $a \perp b$ implies $x \perp y$ for all $x, y \in P$ with $x \leq a$ and $y \leq b$.
A nonempty set $X \subseteq P$ is called *CD-independent,* if for any $x, y \in X$ either $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$ or $x \perp y$ holds.

Maximal CD-independent sets (with respect to $\subseteq$) are called *CD-bases* in $\mathbb{P}$.

If $\mathbb{P}$ contains a least element 0 (a greatest element 1) and B is a CD-base, then obviously, $0 \in B$ ($1 \in B$).

Disjoint system

A nonempty set D of nonzero elements of P is called a *disjoint system* in $\mathbb{P}$, if $x \perp y$ holds for all $x, y \in D$, $x \neq y$.

If $\mathbb{P}$ is with 0-element, then $\{0\}$ is considered to be a disjoint system, too. Clearly, any disjoint system $D \subseteq P$ and any chain $C \subseteq P$ is a CD-independent set, and observe also, that D is a disjoint system, if and only if it is a CD-independent antichain in $\mathbb{P}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}(P)$ stand for the set of all disjoint systems of $\mathbb{P}$. Since the disjoint systems of $\mathbb{P}$ are also antichains, restricting $\leqslant$ to $\mathcal{D}(P)$, we obtain a poset $(\mathcal{D}(P), \leqslant)$. Clearly, if $\mathbb{P}$ has a least element 0, then $\{0\}$ itself is the least element of $(\mathcal{D}(P), \leqslant)$.

CD-bases

Proposition 1. *Any poset $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ hast at least one CD-base, and the set P is covered by the CD-bases of $\mathbb{P}$.*

We recall that any antichain $A = \{a_i \mid i \in I\}$ of a poset $\mathbb{P}$ determines a unique order-ideal $I(A)$ of $\mathbb{P}$, namely

$$I(A) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (a_i] = \{x \in P \mid x \leq a_i, \text{ for some } i \in I\},$$

where $(a]$ stands for the principal ideal of an element $a \in P$.

Proposition 2. *If B is a CD-base and $D \subseteq B$ is a disjoint system in the poset $(P, \leq)$, then $I(D) \cap B$ is also a CD-base in the subposet $(I(D), \leq)$.*

CD-bases and disjoint systems

Theorem 7. *Let $(P, \leq)$ be a finite poset and B a CD-base of it. Then the following assertions hold:*

(i) *There exists a maximal chain $D_1 \succ \ldots \succ D_n$ in $\mathcal{D}(P)$, such that $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} D_i$ and $n = \mid B \mid$.*

(ii) *For any maximal chain $D_1 \prec \ldots \prec D_m$ in $\mathcal{D}(P)$ the set $D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} D_i$ is a CD-base in $(P, \leq)$ with $\mid D \mid = m$.*

Graded posets

$\mathbb{P}$ is called *graded*, if all its maximal chains have the same cardinality.

Proposition 3. *Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a finite poset. Then the CD-bases of $\mathbb{P}$ have the same number of elements if and only if the poset $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is graded.*
Corollary 2. *Let $(P, \leq)$ be a finite poset and $(B, \leq)$ its subposet corresponding to a CD-base $B \subseteq P$. Then any maximal chain $\mathcal{C}$: $D_1 \prec \ldots \prec D_n$in $\mathcal{D}(B)$ is also a maximal chain in $\mathcal{D}(P)$.*

The complete disjoint systems of $\mathbb{P}$ form a principal filter $[A(P))$ in $\mathcal{D}(P)$. Their subposet $([A(P)), \leqslant)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{DC}(P)$.

Proposition 4. *Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a finite poset with 0. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*
(i) *The CD-bases of $\mathbb{P}$ have the same number of elements,*
(ii) *$\mathcal{D}(P)$ is graded.*
(iii) *$\mathcal{DC}(P)$ is graded.*

CD-bases in semilattices

Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \wedge)$ be a semilattice with 0. Now, for any $a, b \in P$ the relation $a \perp b$ means that $a \wedge b = 0$. Hence, a set $\{a_i \mid i \in I\}$ of nonzero elements is a disjoint system if and only if $a_i \wedge a_j = 0$, for all $i, j \in I$, $i \neq j$. A pair of elements $a, b \in P$ with a least upperbound $a \vee b$ in $\mathbb{P}$ is called a *distributive pair*, if $(c \wedge a) \vee (c \wedge b)$ there exists in $\mathbb{P}$ for any $c \in P$, and $c \wedge (a \vee b) = (c \wedge a) \vee (c \wedge b)$.

Theorem 8. *If $\mathbb{P} = (P, \wedge)$ is a semilattice with 0, then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is a semilattice with 0; if $D_1 \cup D_2$ is a CD-independent set for some $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}(P)$, then D_1, D_2 is a distributive pair in $\mathcal{D}(P)$. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a complete lattice, then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is a complete lattice, too.*

We say that $(P, \wedge)$ is *dp-distributive* (*distributive with respect to disjoint pairs*), if any $a, b \in P$ with $a \wedge b = 0$ is a distributive pair.

Corollary 2. *If $\mathbb{P} = (P, \wedge)$ is a semilattice with 0, then $\mathcal{D}(P)$ is a dp-distributive semilattice.*

CD-bases in posets with 0

Let $(P, \leq)$ be a poset and $A \subseteq P$. $(A, \leq)$ is called a *sublattice* of $(P, \leq)$, if $(A, \leq)$ is a lattice such that for any $a, b \in A$ the infimum and the supremum of $\{a, b\}$ is the same in the subposet $(A, \leq)$ and in $(P, \leq)$. If the relation $x \prec y$ in $(A, \leq)$, for some $x, y \in A$ implies $x \prec y$ in the poset $(P, \leq)$, then we say that $(A, \leq)$ is an *cover-preserving subposet* of $(P, \leq)$.

Proposition 5. *Let $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a poset with 0 and B a CD-base of it. Then $(\mathcal{D}(B), \leqslant)$ is a distributive cover-preserving sublattice of the poset $(\mathcal{D}(P), \leqslant)$. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a $\wedge$-semilattice, then for any $D \in \mathcal{D}(P)$ and $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ we have $(D_1 \vee D_2) \wedge D = (D_1 \wedge D) \vee (D_2 \wedge D)$.*

CD-bases in particular lattice classes /1

A lattice L with 0 is called *pseudocomplemented* if for each $x \in L$ there exists an element $x^* \in L$ such that for any $y \in L$, $y \wedge x = 0 \Leftrightarrow y \leq x^*$. It is known that an algebraic lattice L is pseudocomplemented if and only if it is 0-*distributive*, that is, for any $a, b, x \in L$, $x \wedge a = 0$ and $x \wedge b = 0$ imply $x \wedge (a \vee b) = 0$. We say that L is *weakly* 0-*distributive* if this implication holds under the assumption $a \wedge b = 0$.
We say that two elements $a, b \in L$ form a *modular pair* in the lattice L, and we write $(a, b)M$, if for any $x \in L$, $x \leq b$ implies $x \vee (a \wedge b) = (x \vee a) \wedge b$. a, b is called a *dual-modular pair* if for any $x \in L$, $x \geq b$ implies $x \wedge (a \vee b) = (x \wedge a) \vee b$. This is denoted by $(a, b)M^*$. Clearly, if a, b is a distributive pair, then $(a, b)M^*$ is satisfied.
We say that a lattice L satisfies condition M_0^*, if for all $a, b \in L$ with $a \wedge b = 0$, $(a, b)M^*$ holds.

Theorem 9. *Let L be a finite weakly 0-distributive lattice that satisfies condition M_0^*. Then the CD-bases of L have the same number of elements if and only L is graded.*

CD-bases in particular lattice classes /2

If $a \wedge b \neq 0$, then $(x \leq a \vee b$ and $x \wedge a = 0) \Longrightarrow x \leq b$, for any $a, b, x \in L$. $(\mathcal{I})$

Theorem 10. *Let L be a finite, weakly modular lattice satisfying condition $(\mathcal{I})$. Then the CD-bases of L have the same number of elements.*