

Singularity of $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrices and asymptotics of the number of threshold functions

Anwar A. Irmatov

Abstract

Two results concerning the number of threshold functions $P(2, n)$ and the probability $\mathbb{P}_n$ that a random $n \times n$ Bernoulli matrix is singular are established. We introduce a supermodular function $\eta_n^\star : 2_{fin}^{\mathbf{RP}^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, defined on finite subsets of $\mathbf{RP}^n$, that allows us to obtain a lower bound for $P(2, n)$ in terms of $\mathbb{P}_{n+1}$. This, together with L. Schläfli's famous upper bound, give us asymptotics

$$P(2, n) \sim 2 \binom{2^n - 1}{n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, the validity of the long-standing conjecture concerning $\mathbb{P}_n$ is proved:

$$\mathbb{P}_n \sim (n-1)^2 2^{1-n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Keywords. Threshold function, Bernoulli matrices, Möbius function, supermodular function, combinatorial flag.

1 Introduction.

Definition 1 *A function $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ is called a threshold function, if there exist real numbers $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$, such that*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n + \alpha_0 \geq 0.$$

This research has been partially supported by RFBR grant 18-01-00398 A

Denote by $P(2, n)$ the number of threshold functions.

Let us note that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \text{sign}\langle \bar{\alpha}, (1, \bar{x}) \rangle,$$

where $(1, \bar{x}) = (1, x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. This observation allows us to correspond a threshold function its $(n+1)$ -weight vector $\bar{\alpha}$ as a point in the dual space $(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})^* = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

Let $A^\perp$ be a finite arrangement of hyperplanes all passing through the zero in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ (central arrangement) and denote by $A = \{w_1, \dots, w_T\}$ the set of their normal vectors. For any $w \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus \mathbf{0}$, we consider the linear space $\langle w \rangle$, generated by w , as a point of the projective space $\mathbf{RP}^n$. By definition, two hyperplane arrangements $A_1 = \{w_1^1, \dots, w_T^1\}$ and $A_2 = \{w_1^2, \dots, w_S^2\}$ are equal, $A_1^\perp \equiv A_2^\perp$, iff subsets $\langle A_1 \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle w_1^1 \rangle, \dots, \langle w_T^1 \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ and $\langle A_2 \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle w_1^2 \rangle, \dots, \langle w_S^2 \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ coincide, $\langle A_1 \rangle = \langle A_2 \rangle$.

It is shown in the paper [23], that $P(2, n)$ can be expressed by the number $C(\langle E_n \rangle)$ of disjoint chambers, obtained as compliment in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ to the arrangement of 2^n hyperplanes all passing through the origin with the normal vectors from the set

$$E_n = \{(1, b_1, \dots, b_n) \mid b_i \in \{\pm 1\}, i = 1, \dots, n\}. \quad (1)$$

The upper bound of the number $C(\langle H \rangle)$ for any central arrangement of hyperplanes with a set H of normal vectors was established by L. Schläfli in [18]. For the case $H = E_n$, we have the following upper bound:

$$P(2, n) = C(\langle E_n \rangle) \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{2^n - 1}{i}. \quad (2)$$

It should be noted, that in the early 60s of the 20th century the upper bound (2) was obtained by several authors [3], [12], [22]. The detailed information of contribution of above mentioned authors can also be found in [4].

One of the first lower bound of $P(2, n)$ was established by S. Muroga in [16]:

$$P(2, n) \geq 2^{0.33048n^2}. \quad (3)$$

S. Yajima and T. Ibaraki in [24] improved the order of the logarithm of the lower bound (3) upto $n^2/2$:

$$P(2, n) \geq 2^{n(n-1)/2+8} \quad \text{for } n \geq 6. \quad (4)$$

Further significant improvements of the bound (4) were obtained basing on the paper [17] of A. M. Odlyzko. In the paper [26], it was noted that from the papers [17], [25] follows:

$$C(E) = P(2, n) \geq 2^{n^2 - 10n^2 / \ln n + O(n \ln n)}. \quad (5)$$

Taking into account the upper bound (2) and inequality (5), it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_2 P(2, n)}{n^2} = 1. \quad (6)$$

In the paper [9], it was suggested an original geometric construction that, in combination with the result from the paper [17], improved the inequality (5) to:

$$P(2, n) \geq 2^{n^2(1 - \frac{7}{\ln n})} \cdot P\left(2, \left\lfloor \frac{7(n-1)}{\log_2(n-1)} \right\rfloor\right). \quad (7)$$

The generalization of the inequality (7) for the number of threshold k -logic functions was obtained in [11]. Asymptotics of logarithm of the number of polynomial threshold functions has been recently obtained in [1].

In parallel to finding the asymptotics of the number of threshold functions, studies were conducted to find the asymptotics of the number of singular $\{\pm 1\}$ (or $\{0, 1\}$) $n \times n$ -matrices.

Let $M_n = (a_{ij})$ be a random $n \times n$ $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrix, whose entries are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) Bernoulli random variables:

$$\Pr(a_{ij} = 1) = \Pr(a_{ij} = -1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Many researchers have devoted considerable attention to the old problem of finding the probability

$$\mathbb{P}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(\det M_n = 0)$$

that a random Bernoulli $n \times n$ $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrix M_n is singular.

In 1963, J. Komlós [14] proved P. Erdős' conjecture that the probability that a random Bernoulli $n \times n$ $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix is singular approaches 0 as n tends to infinity. It is also true for random Bernoulli $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrices:

$$\mathbb{P}_n = o_n(1). \quad (8)$$

In 1977, J. Komlos [15] improved his result by proving that

$$\mathbb{P}_n < O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (9)$$

The proof of (9) is based on the lemma usually referred to as the Littlewood-Offord lemma, which was proved by P. Erdős ([6]).

In 1995, J. Kahn, J. Komlós, and E. Szemerédi established in [13] for the first time an exponential decay of the upper bound of the singularity probability of random Bernoulli matrices:

$$\mathbb{P}_n \leq (1 - \varepsilon + o_n(1))^n, \quad \text{where } \varepsilon = 0.001. \quad (10)$$

In [19], T. Tao and V. Vu improved the result (10) for $\varepsilon = 0.06191$, and then in [20], they sharpened their technique to prove (10) for $\varepsilon = 0.25$:

$$\mathbb{P}_n \leq \left(\frac{3}{4} + o_n(1)\right)^n. \quad (11)$$

In 2009, Tao-Vu's result (11) was further improved by J. Bourgain, V. H. Vu, and P. M. Wood (see [2]). They proved that

$$\mathbb{P}_n \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + o_n(1)\right)^n. \quad (12)$$

In 2018, K. Tikhomirov finally obtained in [21] that

$$\mathbb{P}_n = \left(\frac{1}{2} + o_n(1)\right)^n. \quad (13)$$

In this paper, we prove the validity of the long standing conjecture (see [15], [17], [13]) that dominant sources of singularity are the cases when a matrix M_n contains two identical (or opposite) rows or two identical (or opposite) columns.

Theorem 6 *Asymptotics of the probability that a random Bernoulli matrix is singular is $(n-1)^2 2^{1-n}$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_n \sim (n-1)^2 2^{1-n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We also obtain a new lower bound for the number of threshold functions

$$P(2, n) \geq 2 \left[1 - \frac{n^2}{2^n} (1 + o_n(1)) \right] \binom{2^n - 1}{n}. \quad (14)$$

Combining the lower bound (14) with the upper bound (2), we get

Theorem 7 *Asymptotics of the number of threshold functions is equal to $2 \binom{2^n - 1}{n}$:*

$$P(2, n) \sim 2 \binom{2^n - 1}{n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

2 Function $\eta^\star$ and its properties.

As we mentioned in the previous section, any central hyperplane arrangement $H^\perp$ with the set of normal vectors $H = \{w_1, \dots, w_T\} \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus \mathbf{0}$, we can identify with the subset $\langle H \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle w_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle w_T \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ of the n -dimensional projective space. We define a partially ordered set (poset) L^H in the following way. By definition, any subspace of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ generated by some (possibly empty) subset of H is an element of the poset L^H . An element $s \in L^H$ is less than an element $t \in L^H$ iff the subspace t contains the subspace s . For any poset P , we can define a *simplicial complex* Δ_P in the following way. The set of vertices of Δ_P coincides with the set of elements P and a set of vertices of P defines a simplex of Δ_P iff this set forms a chain in P . Let us denote by Δ_{L^H} the simplicial complex of the poset

$$(0_{L^H}, 1_{L^H}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z \in L^H \mid 0_{L^H} < z < 1_{L^H}\},$$

where 0_{L^H} and 1_{L^H} are the elements of the poset L^H corresponding to the zero subspace of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and the subspace $\text{span} \langle w_1, \dots, w_T \rangle$, respectively. Without loss of generality, we can assume that

$$\dim \langle H \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim \text{span} \langle w_1, \dots, w_T \rangle = n + 1,$$

i.e.,

$$\text{span } \langle w_1, \dots, w_T \rangle = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}.$$

It has been shown in [25] that the number $C(\langle H \rangle)$ of $(n+1)$ -dimensional regions into which $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is divided by hyperplanes from the set $H^\perp$ can be found by the formula:

$$C(\langle H \rangle) = \sum_{t \in L^H} |\mu(0_{L^H}, t)|, \quad (15)$$

where $\mu(s, t)$ is Möbius function of the poset L^H . Möbius function of partially ordered set in Zaslavsky's formula (15) for calculation of the number of chambers $C(\langle H \rangle)$ can be interpreted by tools of algebraic topology in the following way. First, we introduce a simplicial complex K^H . The set of vertices of K^H coincides with the set $\langle H \rangle$. A subset $\{\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_s} \rangle\}$ of $\langle H \rangle$ forms a simplex of K^H iff

$$\text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_s} \rangle \neq \text{span } \langle w_1, \dots, w_T \rangle = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}.$$

Taking into account the results of the papers [7], [8], it is possible to show (see [10]) that the absolute value of the Möbius function $|\mu(0_{L^H}, u)|$ is equal to the dimension of the reduced homology group of the complex $K^{H \cap u}$ with coefficients in an arbitrary field $\mathbf{F}$:

$$|\mu(0_{L^H}, u)| = \text{rank } \tilde{H}_{\dim u - 2}(K^{H \cap u}; \mathbf{F}). \quad (16)$$

Here, the set $\langle H \rangle \cap u$ consists of all elements $\langle H \rangle$ belonging to the subspace $u \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and is considered as a subset of $\mathbf{R}^{\dim u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u$.

It follows from the definition of Möbius function that

$$\sum_{0_{L^H} \leq u < 1_{L^H}} |\mu(0_{L^H}, u)| \geq \left| - \sum_{0_{L^H} \leq u < 1_{L^H}} \mu(0_{L^H}, u) \right| = |\mu(0_{L^H}, 1_{L^H})|.$$

Hence,

$$C(\langle H \rangle) = |\mu(0_{L^H}, 1_{L^H})| + \sum_{0_{L^H} \leq u < 1_{L^H}} |\mu(0_{L^H}, u)| \geq 2|\mu(0_{L^H}, 1_{L^H})|. \quad (17)$$

From (16) and (17), we have:

$$C(\langle H \rangle) \geq 2 \text{rank } H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F}). \quad (18)$$

As a consequence of (18) for the case $H = E_n$, we have:

$$P(2, n) = C(\langle E_n \rangle) \geq 2 \operatorname{rank} H_{n-1} (K^{E_n}; \mathbf{F}). \quad (19)$$

Let us fix an arbitrary order on the set $\langle H \rangle$:

$$\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n, \quad |\langle H \rangle| = T, \quad \langle w_i \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi(i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq T. \quad (20)$$

Let us denote by $\langle H \rangle^{\times s}$, $s = 1, \dots, T$, the set of ordered collections $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_s} \rangle)$ of different s elements from $\langle H \rangle$ and let $\langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s} \subset \langle H \rangle^{\times s}$ and $\langle H \rangle_{=0}^{\times s} \subset \langle H \rangle^{\times s}$ be the subsets

$$\langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_s} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle^{\times s} \mid \dim \operatorname{span} \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_s} \rangle = s\}. \quad (21)$$

$$\langle H \rangle_{=0}^{\times s} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_s} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle^{\times s} \mid \dim \operatorname{span} \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_s} \rangle < s\}. \quad (22)$$

Definition 2 We say that an ordered collection of different elements $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle^{\times n}$ satisfies to $\eta_n^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$ condition iff the following requirements are fulfilled:

1. $2 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n \leq T$;
2. $\forall l, \quad 1 \leq l \leq n$, the element $\langle w_{i_l} \rangle$ is minimal in order π among all points from the set $\langle H \rangle \cap \operatorname{span} \langle \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle \rangle$.

It follows from the definition 2 that if a collection $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle)$ satisfies to $\eta_n^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$ condition, then for all $l = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\dim \operatorname{span} \langle w_{i_l}, \dots, w_{i_n} \rangle = n - l + 1,$$

i.e.,

$$(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n},$$

and

$$\operatorname{span} \langle w_1, w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_n} \rangle = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}. \quad (23)$$

Denote by $B^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$ the set

$$B^\pi(\langle H \rangle) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n} \mid W \text{ satisfies to } \eta_n^\pi(\langle H \rangle) \text{ condition}\}. \quad (24)$$

The theorem 7 of [10] is also true for any finite subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$. It asserts that the number of collections $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle)$ satisfying to $\eta_n^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$

condition is equal to the $rank\ H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F})$. Hence, the number of collection satisfying to $\eta_n^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$ condition doesn't depend on the order π on the set $\langle H \rangle$. Let us denote this number by $\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle)$. Thus on the set $2_{fin}^{\mathbf{RP}^n}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbf{RP}^n$, the function $\eta_n^\star : 2_{fin}^{\mathbf{RP}^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies to the formula:

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle) = rank\ H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F}), \quad \langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n. \quad (25)$$

Proposition 1 $\eta_n^\star$ is a supermodular function on $2_{fin}^{\mathbf{RP}^n}$.

Proof. It is necessary to demonstrate that for any finite subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$, $|\langle H \rangle| = T$, and any two different elements $\langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle \in \mathbf{RP}^n \setminus \langle H \rangle$ the following inequality

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) - \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle) \leq \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle\}) - \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle v \rangle\}) \quad (26)$$

is fulfilled.

For any order $\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle$, we define orders $\pi^{u,v} : [T+2] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle\}$, $\pi^u : [T+1] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}$, and $\pi^v : [T+1] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle v \rangle\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{u,v}(i) &= \pi^u(i) = \pi^v(i) = \pi(i), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, T; \\ \pi^{u,v}(T+1) &= \langle u \rangle, \quad \pi^{u,v}(T+2) = \langle v \rangle; \\ \pi^u(T+1) &= \langle u \rangle, \quad \pi^v(T+1) = \langle v \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Then the expression in the left part of the inequality (26) equals to the number of collections $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle)$ satisfying to $\eta_n^{\pi^u}(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$ condition. Due to (27), these collections also satisfy to $\eta_n^{\pi^{u,v}}(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle\})$ condition. The expression in the right side of the inequality (26) equals to cardinality of the set consisting of collections of the form $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle)$ and $(\langle w_{j_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{j_{n-2}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle)$ satisfying to $\eta_n^{\pi^{u,v}}(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle, \langle v \rangle\})$ condition. Hence, the inequality (26) is proved.

Q.E.D.

Denote by $P_{R^{n+1}}^{\langle w \rangle}$ the orthogonal projector along the linear subspace $\langle w \rangle \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ onto its n -dimensional orthogonal compliment $\langle w \rangle^\perp \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, and denote by $v^{\perp w}$ the image of a vector $v \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$:

$$v^{\perp w} \stackrel{def}{=} P_{R^{n+1}}^{\langle w \rangle}(v). \quad (28)$$

For $\langle H \rangle = \{\langle w_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle w_T \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ and $\langle w \rangle \notin \langle H \rangle$, we denote by $\langle H \rangle^{\perp w}$ the set:

$$\langle H \rangle^{\perp w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{R^{n+1}}^{(w)}(\langle H \rangle) = \{\langle w_1^{\perp w} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_T^{\perp w} \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^{n-1}. \quad (29)$$

Theorem 1 *For any finite subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ and element $\langle u \rangle \in \mathbf{RP}^n \setminus \langle H \rangle$, we have:*

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) = \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle) + \eta_{n-1}^\star(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u}). \quad (30)$$

Proof. Let $\pi : [T+1] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}$ be an order on $\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ such that $\pi(T+1) = \langle u \rangle$. For any $\langle w^{\perp u} \rangle \in \langle H \rangle^{\perp u}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} T^\pi(w^{\perp u}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [T] \mid \langle w_i^{\perp u} \rangle = \langle w^{\perp u} \rangle\} \\ m(w^{\perp u}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \{i \in T^\pi(w^{\perp u})\} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

For $\langle x^{\perp u} \rangle, \langle y^{\perp u} \rangle \in \langle H \rangle^{\perp u}$, we say that

$$\langle x^{\perp u} \rangle <_{\pi_{u^\perp}} \langle y^{\perp u} \rangle \quad \text{iff} \quad m(x^{\perp u}) < m(y^{\perp u}). \quad (32)$$

Let $|\langle H \rangle^{\perp u}| = T'$. Then we define the order $\pi|_{u^\perp} : [T'] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle^{\perp u}$ as the unique map preserving the linear orders:

$$i < j \quad \text{iff} \quad \pi|_{u^\perp}(i) <_{\pi_{u^\perp}} \pi|_{u^\perp}(j). \quad (33)$$

In the proof of the Proposition 1, we have shown that the cardinality of the set

$$\begin{aligned} B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \\ &= \left\{ W \in B^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) \mid W = (W', \langle u \rangle), W' \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(n-1)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is equal to the number $\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) - \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle)$:

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) - \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle) = |B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})|. \quad (34)$$

For any $W = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle) \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$, we assert that

$$W^{\perp u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle w_{i_1}^{\perp u} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp u} \rangle) \in B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u}). \quad (35)$$

First of all, we note that for $W \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$, we have

$$i_l = m(i_l) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m(w_i^{\perp u}), \quad \forall l = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (36)$$

Indeed, if the condition (36) is not fulfilled for some $l, 1 \leq l \leq n-1$, then $i_l > m(i_l)$. Taking into account that

$$w_i^{\perp u} = w_i - \beta_i u, \quad \beta_i = \frac{(w_i, u)}{(u, u)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (37)$$

we have

$$\langle w_{m(i_l)} \rangle \in \text{span} \langle \langle w_{i_l} \rangle, \langle u \rangle \rangle \subset \text{span} \langle \langle w_{i_l} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{n-1} \rangle, \langle u \rangle \rangle. \quad (38)$$

The inclusion (38) contradicts to our choice $W \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$.

Now consider the case when the condition (35) is not fulfilled, i.e., there exist $l, k, 1 \leq l \leq n-1$, and $k < i_l$ such that

$$\langle w_k^{\perp u} \rangle \in \text{span} \langle \langle w_{i_l}^{\perp u} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp u} \rangle \rangle.$$

Hence, there exist $\alpha_l, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$w_k^{\perp u} = \alpha_l w_{i_l}^{\perp u} + \dots + \alpha_{n-1} w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp u}. \quad (39)$$

From (37) and (39) we have

$$w_k = \alpha_l w_{i_l} + \dots + \alpha_{n-1} w_{i_{n-1}} - (\alpha_l \beta_{i_l} + \dots + \alpha_{n-1} \beta_{i_{n-1}} - \beta_k) u. \quad (40)$$

The last equation means that $\langle w_k \rangle \in \text{span} \langle \langle w_{i_l} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle \rangle$, i.e., contradicts to our requirement $W \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$.

Thus we can define the map

$$\psi_u^\pi : B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}) \rightarrow B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u})$$

by the rule

$$\psi_u^\pi(W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W^{\perp u} \quad (41)$$

We assert that ψ_u^π is injective. If we assume the opposite, then there exist $W_1, W_2 \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})$, $W_1 \neq W_2$, $W_1 = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle)$, $W_2 = (\langle w_{j_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{j_{n-1}} \rangle, \langle u \rangle)$ such that

$$\psi_u^\pi(W_1) = (\langle w_{i_1}^{\perp u} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp u} \rangle) = (\langle w_{j_1}^{\perp u} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{j_{n-1}}^{\perp u} \rangle) = \psi_u^\pi(W_2). \quad (42)$$

Let l , $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, be the maximal number such that $w_{i_l} \neq w_{j_l}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $i_l < j_l$. It follows from (36) that $m(i_l) = i_l < j_l = m(j_l)$. Then

$$\langle w_{i_l}^{\perp u} \rangle = \langle w_{m(i_l)}^{\perp u} \rangle <_{\pi^{u\perp}} \langle w_{m(j_l)}^{\perp u} \rangle = \langle w_{j_l}^{\perp u} \rangle. \quad (43)$$

The inequality (43) contradicts to our assumption (42) that $\langle w_{i_l}^{\perp u} \rangle = \langle w_{j_l}^{\perp u} \rangle$, $l = 1, \dots, n-1$.

We assert that ψ_u^π is surjective. Let $X^{\perp u} = (\langle x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle x_{n-1} \rangle) \in B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u})$. Let us put

$$(\psi_u^\pi)^{-1}(X^\perp) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle w_{m(x_1)} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{m(x_{n-1})} \rangle, \langle u \rangle). \quad (44)$$

It is necessary to demonstrate that

$$(\psi_u^\pi)^{-1}(X^\perp) \in B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\}). \quad (45)$$

If we assume that the inclusion (45) isn't true, then there exist l, k , $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, and $k < m(x_l)$ such that

$$\langle w_k \rangle \in \text{span}(\langle w_{m(x_l)} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{m(x_{n-1})} \rangle, \langle u \rangle).$$

Hence,

$$\langle w_k^{\perp u} \rangle \in \text{span}(\langle w_{m(x_l)}^{\perp u} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{m(x_{n-1})}^{\perp u} \rangle). \quad (46)$$

Since $k < m(x_l)$, then

$$m(w_k^{\perp u}) < m(x_l) < \dots < m(x_{n-1}). \quad (47)$$

From inclusion (46) and inequalities (47) we get a contradiction to $X^{\perp u} \in B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u})$.

Thus we have demonstrated that

$$|B_u^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle u \rangle\})| = |B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u})|. \quad (48)$$

Since

$$\eta_{n-1}^\star(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u}) = |B^{\pi|_{u^\perp}}(\langle H \rangle^{\perp u})|, \quad (49)$$

our Theorem follows from the equalities (34), (48), and (49).

Q.E.D.

For any finite subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ and element $\langle w \rangle \in \mathbf{RP}^n$, we denote by $\binom{\langle H \rangle}{\eta_n^\star}^{\langle w \rangle}$ the following sum:

$$\binom{\langle H \rangle}{\eta_n^\star}^{\langle w \rangle} \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\{\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle\} \subset \langle H \rangle} \eta_n^\star(\{\langle w \rangle, \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle\}). \quad (50)$$

Theorem 2 For any $n \geq 1$, finite subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$, and element $\langle w \rangle \in \mathbf{RP}^n$, we have:

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}) \leq \binom{\langle H \rangle}{\eta_n^\star}^{\langle w \rangle}. \quad (51)$$

Proof. Let $\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}$ be an order on $\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$, $T = |\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}|$, such that $\pi(1) = \langle w \rangle$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n^\star(\{\langle w \rangle, \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle\}) &= 1 \Leftrightarrow \\ \Leftrightarrow \text{span } \langle w, w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_n} \rangle &= \mathbf{R}^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from definition 2 that if a collection $(\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in B^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\})$, then (see (23))

$$\text{span } \langle w_1, w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_n} \rangle = \text{span } \langle w, w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_n} \rangle = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}.$$

Now the Theorem follows from the equality $\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}) = |B^\pi(\langle H \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\})|$.

Q.E.D.

3 A formula for $\eta_n^\star$ in terms of combinatorial flags on a central hyperplane arrangement.

For any $W = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}$ and $l = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$q_l^W \stackrel{def}{=} |L_l(W) \cap \langle H \rangle| \stackrel{def}{=} |\text{span } \langle \langle w_{i_{n-l+1}} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle \rangle \cap \langle H \rangle|. \quad (52)$$

Definition 3 For any $W \in \langle H \rangle^{\times n}$, the ordered set of numbers

$$W(\langle H \rangle) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (q_n^W, q_{n-1}^W, \dots, q_1^W) \quad (53)$$

is called a combinatorial flag on $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ of the ordered set W .

If $W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}$, then $W(\langle H \rangle)$ is called a full combinatorial flag of W .

For the sake of simplicity, we will use the following notation:

$$W[H] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} q_n^W \cdot q_{n-1}^W \cdots q_1^W. \quad (54)$$

To define the set $B^\pi(\langle H \rangle)$ (see (24)), we fixed an order $\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ (see (20)) that allowed us to compare elements of $\langle H \rangle$:

$$\langle w_i \rangle <_\pi \langle w_j \rangle \iff i < j.$$

We denote by Γ the set of all orders on the set $\langle H \rangle$. Then any order on $\langle H \rangle$ can be defined as composition

$$[T] \xrightarrow{\gamma} [T] \xrightarrow{\pi} H$$

of a permutation $\gamma : [T] \rightarrow [T]$ with π , and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_i \rangle <_\gamma \langle w_j \rangle &\iff (\pi\gamma)^{-1}(\langle w_i \rangle) < (\pi\gamma)^{-1}(\langle w_j \rangle) \iff \\ &\iff \gamma^{-1}(i) < \gamma^{-1}(j). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Thus Γ can be identified with the symmetric group $Sym([T])$, and any permutation $\sigma : [T] \rightarrow [T]$ defines the basis of the homology group $H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F})$, considered as a vector space over a fixed field $\mathbf{F}$, say $\mathbb{Z}_2$, as the subset of collections of n elements from $\langle H \rangle$

$$B^{\pi \circ \sigma}(\langle H \rangle) \subset \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s}$$

obeying to $\eta_n^{\pi \circ \sigma}(\langle H \rangle)$ condition.

Theorem 3 For any probability distribution $p = (p_1, \dots, p_T)$ on a subset $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$, $\text{span } \langle H \rangle = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, the following equality is true:

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle) = \sum_{W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}} \frac{1 - p_{i_1} - p_{i_2} - \dots - p_{i_{q_n^W}}}{W[H]}. \quad (56)$$

Here, the indices used in the numerator correspond to elements from

$$L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle = \left\{ \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{q_n^W}} \rangle \right\}.$$

Proof. We define the probability distribution $\tilde{p}$ on the set $\Gamma \cong \text{Sym}([T])$ by the formula:

$$\tilde{p}(\gamma) = p_{\gamma(1)} \frac{1}{(T-1)!}, \quad \gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]).$$

For any collection $W = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in H_{\neq 0}^{\times n}$, we define the random function $I_W : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by the formula:

$$I_W(\gamma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } W \text{ satisfies to } \eta_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle) \text{ condition;} \\ 0, & \text{in all other cases.} \end{cases}$$

Let

$$I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}} I_W : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}.$$

Then for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$I(\gamma) = \mathbf{const} = |B^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle)| = \text{rank } H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F}) = \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle).$$

Hence, the expectation of I is equal to $\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[I] = \eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle). \quad (57)$$

Additivity of expectation reduces the problem of calculation $\mathbb{E}[I]$ to counting the probability $\mathbf{Pr}(I_W = 1)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[I] = \sum_{W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}} \mathbb{E}[I_W] = \sum_{W \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}} \mathbf{Pr}(I_W = 1). \quad (58)$$

Further we calculate the number of permutations γ such that $I_W(\gamma) = 1$. Since $\langle w_{\gamma(1)} \rangle \notin L_n(W)$, then q_n^W elements from $L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ can be located in any places except the first one, i.e., $\gamma^{-1}(j) \neq 1$ for any $j \in [T]$ such that $\langle w_j \rangle \in L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$. The arrangement of the remaining elements from $\langle H \rangle \setminus \{\langle w_{\gamma(1)} \rangle \cup \{L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle\}\}$ does not affect the fulfillment of $\eta_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle)$ condition. By $\eta_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle)$ condition, the element $\langle w_{i_1} \rangle$ has to be in the first place among the selected q_n^W positions for arrangement of the set $L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$, while q_{n-1}^W elements from $L_{n-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ can be located in any of the remained $q_n^W - 1$ places. The arrangement of the elements from $\{L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle\} \setminus \{\langle w_{i_1} \rangle \cup \{L_{n-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle\}\}$ in $q_n^W - q_{n-1}^W - 1$ places, left after choosing

$q_{n-1}^W + 1$ places for arrangement of the set $L_{n-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ and $\langle w_{i_1} \rangle$, doesn't affect the fulfillment of $\eta_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle)$ condition. Continuing the same way, we get that in the first place among q_l^W positions selected for the elements from $L_l(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ has to be located the element $\langle w_{i_{n-l+1}} \rangle$, while q_{l-1}^W elements from $L_{l-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ can be located in any of the remained $q_l^W - 1$ places, and the positions of the elements from $\{L_l(W) \cap \langle H \rangle\} \setminus \{\langle w_{i_{n-l+1}} \rangle \cup \{L_{l-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle\}\}$ in $q_l^W - q_{l-1}^W - 1$ places, left after choosing $q_{l-1}^W + 1$ places for arrangement of the set $L_{l-1}(W) \cap \langle H \rangle$ and $w_{i_{n-l+1}}$, doesn't affect the fulfillment of $\eta_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(\langle H \rangle)$ condition.

Denote by $N(\gamma(1) = i)$ the number of permutations γ with fixed value $\gamma(1) = i$ such that $\langle w_i \rangle \notin L_n(W)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} N(\gamma(1) = i) &= \binom{T-1}{q_n^W} (T-1-q_n^W)! \cdot \binom{q_n^W-1}{q_{n-1}^W} (q_n^W - q_{n-1}^W - 1)! \cdots \\ &\cdot \binom{q_l^W-1}{q_{l-1}^W} (q_l^W - q_{l-1}^W - 1)! \cdots \binom{q_2^W-1}{q_1^W} (q_2^W - q_1^W - 1)! = \\ &= \frac{(T-1)!}{q_n^W!} \cdot \frac{(q_n^W-1)!}{q_{n-1}^W!} \cdots \frac{(q_l^W-1)!}{q_{l-1}^W!} \cdots \frac{(q_2^W-1)!}{q_1^W!} = \frac{(T-1)!}{q_n^W q_{n-1}^W \cdots q_2^W q_1^W} = \\ &= \frac{(T-1)!}{W[H]} \quad (\text{since } q_1^W = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(I_W = 1) &= \sum_{i \in [T] \text{ s.t. } \langle w_i \rangle \notin L_n(W)} p_i \frac{1}{(T-1)!} \frac{(T-1)!}{W[H]} = \\ &= \frac{1 - p_{i_1} - \cdots - p_{i_{q_n^W}}}{W[H]}, \end{aligned}$$

where $L_n(W) \cap \langle H \rangle = \{\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{q_n^W}} \rangle\}$. Now the Theorem follows from (57) and (58).

Q.E.D.

Remark 1 Since the right side of equation of Theorem 3 is expressed by a polynomial of degree 1, then the Theorem 3 is true for any $p_i \in \mathbf{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, T$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^T p_i = 1$.

4 A lower bound for $\eta_*^\star$.

Next, we are going to get an upper bound for the rank $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F})$, where $\langle H \rangle = \{\langle w_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle w_T \rangle\} \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$, and K_{n-1}^H is the $(n-1)$ -skeleton of K^H . The nonzero part of the homology exact sequence of the pair (K^H, K_{n-1}^H) has the following form (see (11) of [10]):

$$0 \rightarrow H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F}) \rightarrow H_{n-1}(K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F}) \rightarrow H_{n-1}(K^H; \mathbf{F}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (59)$$

For any $\Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle_{=0}^{\times(n+1)}$, $i_1 < \dots < i_{n+1}$, let put

$$n(\Delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{t \in [n] \mid w_{i_t} \in \text{span} \langle w_{i_{t+1}}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle\}, \quad (60)$$

$$\Delta(H) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle w_p \rangle \in \langle H \rangle \mid \exists t \in [n] \text{ s.t. } p < i_{t+1}, \text{ and } w_p \in \text{span} \langle w_{i_{t+1}}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle\}, \quad (61)$$

$$t(\Delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{t \in n(\Delta)} t, \quad (62)$$

$$\langle w(\Delta) \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\langle w \rangle \in \Delta(H)} \langle w \rangle. \quad (63)$$

Let

$$C_n^\pi(H) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle_{=0}^{\times(n+1)} \mid i_1 < \dots < i_{n+1}, \langle w_{i_{t(\Delta)}} \rangle = \langle w(\Delta) \rangle\}, \quad (64)$$

It was shown in the paper [10] (see Lemma 5 and Lemma 6) that the set of homology classes of $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F})$ corresponded to the set of simplices $C_n^\pi(H)$ forms a basis of $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F})$. Hence, the cardinality $|C_n^\pi(H)|$ doesn't depend on the choice of order π on $\langle H \rangle$.

Let us fix any element $\langle w \rangle \in \langle H \rangle$. Since $|C_n^\pi(H)|$ doesn't depend on the choice of π , we can assume that $\langle w \rangle$ is the minimal element in π , i.e., $\pi(1) = \langle w \rangle$. Let put

$$D_n^\pi(H; w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Delta = (\langle w \rangle, \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_n} \rangle) \in \langle H \rangle_{=0}^{\times(n+1)} \mid 1 < i_1 < \dots < i_n\}. \quad (65)$$

It is clear that

$$D_n(H; w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |D_n^\pi(H; w)| \quad (66)$$

doesn't depend on the choice of π .

Remark 2 *From our definition, we have*

$$D_n(H; w) = \binom{T-1}{n} - \binom{\langle H \rangle}{\eta_n^\star}^{\langle w \rangle}. \quad (67)$$

The map $\widehat{t} : C_n^\pi(H) \rightarrow \langle H \rangle^{\times n}$ defined on $\Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in C_n^\pi(H)$ by the formula

$$\widehat{t}(\Delta) = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{t(\Delta)}-1} \rangle, \widehat{\langle w_{i_{t(\Delta)}} \rangle}, \langle w_{i_{t(\Delta)}+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle),$$

is a monomorphism. Note that for all Δ from the set

$$C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in C_n^\pi(H) \mid \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle = n, \text{ and } \langle w \rangle \notin \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle \}, \quad (68)$$

we have

$$\widehat{t}(\Delta) \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}.$$

Lemma 1 *The set of homology classes of $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ corresponded to the set of simplices $C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w) \cup D_n^\pi(H; w)$ generates $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.*

Proof. Since the set of homology classes corresponded to the set of simplices $C_n^\pi(H)$ forms a basis of $H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, it is sufficient to show that any simplex $\Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in C_n^\pi(H)$, such that

$$\dim \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle < n, \text{ and } \langle w \rangle \notin \{ \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle \},$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle &= n, \text{ and } \langle w \rangle \in \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle, \\ \text{but } \langle w \rangle &\notin \{ \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle \}, \end{aligned}$$

as a chain belongs to $\text{span} \langle C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w), D_n^\pi(H; w), \delta_{n+1}(C_{n+1}(K^H; \mathbb{Z}_2)) \rangle$. In both cases, we have

$$\Delta_{n+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle w \rangle, \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle) \in C_{n+1}(K^H; \mathbb{Z}_2),$$

and

$$\delta_{n+1}(\Delta_{n+1}) = \Delta + \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} (\langle w \rangle, \langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \widehat{\langle w_{i_k} \rangle}, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle).$$

Hence, $\Delta \in \text{span}\langle D_n^\pi(H; w), \delta_{n+1}(C_{n+1}(K^H; \mathbb{Z}_2)) \rangle$.

Q.E.D.

Corollary 1 *We have*

$$|C_n^\pi(H)| \leq |C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w)| + D_n(H; w). \quad (69)$$

We fix any $\langle w \rangle \in \langle H \rangle$, and for any $\langle u \rangle \in \langle H \rangle$, and order $\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle$, such that $\pi(1) = \langle w \rangle$, we put

$$\langle H_{<u}^\pi \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle h \rangle \in \langle H \rangle \mid \langle h \rangle <_\pi \langle u \rangle \}.$$

For any subset $\langle U \rangle = \{ \langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle \} \subset \langle H \rangle \setminus \langle w \rangle$, $0 \leq k \leq n$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle &<_\pi \dots <_\pi \langle u_{i_1} \rangle, \\ \dim \text{span}\langle U \rangle &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim \text{span}\langle u_{i_{n-k}}, \dots, u_{i_1} \rangle = n - k, \\ \text{and } \langle w \rangle &\notin \text{span}\langle U \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

we define the set $C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U) \subset \widehat{t}(C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w))$, where $\langle H_U^\pi \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle H_{<u_{i_{n-k}}}^\pi \rangle$, in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \gamma \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n} \mid \\ \exists \Delta = (\langle w_{j_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{j_{k+1}} \rangle, \langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle) &\in C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w) \text{ s.t. } \widehat{t}(\Delta) = \gamma \}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Remark 3 *Note that from the conditions $\Delta \in C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w)$ and $\dim \text{span}\langle U \rangle = n - k$, follows that $\langle w(\Delta) \rangle <_\pi \langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle <_\pi \dots <_\pi \langle u_{i_1} \rangle$.*

Definition 4 *Let a subset $\langle U \rangle \subset \langle H \rangle \setminus \langle w \rangle$ satisfy the conditions (70) and $\langle U_s^\pi \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle u_{i_s} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle \}$, $1 \leq s \leq n - k$. We say that $\langle U \rangle$ is a π -closed $(n - k)$ -subset of $\langle H \rangle$ iff*

$$\text{span}\langle U_s^\pi \rangle \cap \langle H_{U_s^\pi}^\pi \rangle = \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq s \leq n - k. \quad (72)$$

Definition 5 We say that $\langle U \rangle$ is a π -boundary $(n - k)$ -subset of $\langle H \rangle$ iff

$$\text{span}\langle U_s^\pi \rangle \cap \langle H_{U_s^\pi}^\pi \rangle = \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq s \leq n - k - 1, \quad (73)$$

$$\text{span}\langle U \rangle \cap \langle H_U^\pi \rangle \neq \emptyset. \quad (74)$$

Let $B(\langle H \rangle; n - k; \pi)$ denotes the set of all π -boundary $(n - k)$ -subsets of $\langle H \rangle$, $0 \leq k \leq n - 2$. Note that for $k = n - 1$, $B(\langle H \rangle; 1; \pi) = \emptyset$.

Lemma 2 The set $\widehat{t}(C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w)) \subset \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}$ can be expressed as disjoint union of $C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U)$ as follows:

$$\widehat{t}(C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w)) = \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-2} \bigsqcup_{\langle U \rangle \in B(\langle H \rangle; n-k; \pi)} C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U). \quad (75)$$

Proof. Let us assume that there exists $\gamma \in C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U) \cap C_{n-l}^\pi(H_V^\pi; V) \subset \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times n}$ for some two different π -boundary subsets $\langle U \rangle$ and $\langle V \rangle$. Then

$$\widehat{t}^{-1}(\gamma) = \Delta = (\langle w_{j_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{j_{k+1}} \rangle, \langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle) = (\langle w_{r_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{r_{l+1}} \rangle, \langle v_{i_{n-l}} \rangle, \dots, \langle v_{i_1} \rangle).$$

Since $\langle U \rangle$ and $\langle V \rangle$ are different, then $k \neq l$. Let $k < l$. Then $\langle V \rangle \subset \langle U \rangle$, $\langle v_{i_1} \rangle = \langle u_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle v_{i_{n-l}} \rangle = \langle u_{i_{n-l}} \rangle$. Since $\langle U \rangle$ and $\langle V \rangle$ are π -boundary subsets, then

$$\emptyset \neq \text{span}\langle V \rangle \cap \langle H_V^\pi \rangle = \text{span}\langle U_{n-l}^\pi \rangle \cap \langle H_{U_{n-l}^\pi}^\pi \rangle = \emptyset.$$

This contradicts to our assumption. Hence, for any two different π -boundary subsets $\langle U \rangle$ and $\langle V \rangle$, we have

$$C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U) \cap C_{n-l}^\pi(H_V^\pi; V) = \emptyset.$$

For any $\Delta \in C_{n;\neq 0}^\pi(H; w)$, $\Delta = (\langle w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle)$, let

$$M(\Delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{t \in [n] \mid \text{span}\langle w_{i_{t+1}}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle \cap \langle H_{< w_{i_{t+1}}}^\pi \rangle \neq \emptyset\},$$

and

$$m(\Delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{t \in M(\Delta)} t.$$

Then the set $\langle U(\Delta) \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle w_{i_{m(\Delta)+1}} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n+1}} \rangle\}$ is a π -boundary $(n - m(\Delta) + 1)$ -subset. Since $t(\Delta) \leq m(\Delta)$, then

$$\widehat{t}(\Delta) \in C_{n-m(\Delta)+1}^\pi(H_{U(\Delta)}^\pi; U(\Delta)).$$

Q.E.D.

Let denote by $\langle H; w \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s}$ the set

$$\langle H; w \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s} \stackrel{def}{=} \{U \in \langle H \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s} \mid w \notin \text{span}\langle U \rangle\}. \quad (76)$$

Theorem 4 *Let $\langle H \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ be a finite subset, $|\langle H \rangle| = T$. Then for any $\langle w \rangle \in \langle H \rangle$, the following inequality is true*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank } H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F}) &\leq \frac{1}{(T-1)!} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \sum_{U \in \langle H; w \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(n-k)}} \frac{1}{q_{n-k-1}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \\ &\times \sum_{d=k+3}^{T-q_{n-k-1}^U} \frac{(T-d)!(T-q_{n-k}^U-1)!}{(T-q_{n-k-1}^U-d)!} \cdot A_{n-k}(U; d) \binom{d-2}{k} + D_n(H; w), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n-k}(U; d) &\stackrel{def}{=} \left[\binom{T-q_{n-k-1}^U-2}{q_{n-k}^U - q_{n-k-1}^U - 1} - \binom{T-q_{n-k-1}^U-d}{q_{n-k}^U - q_{n-k-1}^U - 1} \right] \times \\ &\times (q_{n-k}^U - q_{n-k-1}^U - 1)!. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let denote by Γ the set of all orders on the set $\langle H \rangle$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}(1) = \langle w \rangle$, $\forall \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$. For a fixed order π (see (20)) such that $\pi(1) = \langle w \rangle$, any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ can be expressed as composition

$$\tilde{\gamma} = \pi \circ \gamma : [T] \rightarrow [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle$$

π with a permutation $\gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1) \subset \text{Sym}([T])$ such that $\gamma(1) = 1$. Let p be the uniform probability distribution on $\Gamma \cong \text{Sym}([T]; 1)$:

$$p(\gamma) = \frac{1}{(T-1)!}, \quad \gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1).$$

For any collection $U = (\langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle) \in H_{\neq 0}^{\times(n-k)}$ such that $\langle w \rangle \notin \text{span}\langle U \rangle$, we define the random function $I_{n-k}^U : \text{Sym}([T]; 1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by the

formula:

$$I_{n-k}^U(\gamma) \stackrel{def}{=} \begin{cases} \binom{(\pi \circ \gamma)^{-1}(\langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle) - 2}{k}, & \text{if } U \in B(\langle H \rangle; n-k; \pi \circ \gamma); \\ 0 & \text{in all other cases.} \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

From definition (71) follows that for any $(n-k)$ -subset $\langle U \rangle \subset \langle H \rangle \setminus \langle w \rangle$ and order $\pi : [T] \rightarrow \langle H \rangle$ satisfying to (70), we have:

$$|C_{n-k}^\pi(H_U^\pi; U)| < \binom{|H_U^\pi|}{k}. \quad (79)$$

Let

$$I_{n-k} \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{U \in \langle H; w \notin \rangle^{\times(n-k)}_{\neq 0}} I_{n-k}^U : \text{Sym}([T]; 1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}. \quad (80)$$

Then from Corollary 1, (79), and Lemma 2 for any $\gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1)$, we have

$$\text{rank } H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F}) = |C_n^{\pi \circ \gamma}(H)| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} I_{n-k}(\gamma) + D_n(H; w). \quad (81)$$

Hence, the inequality (81) holds if we change the right hand side of (81) by its expectation:

$$\text{rank } H_n(K^H, K_{n-1}^H; \mathbf{F}) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[I_{n-k}] + D_n(H; w). \quad (82)$$

Let $U = (\langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle) \in H_{\neq 0}^{\times(n-k)}$ such that $\langle w \rangle \notin \text{span} \langle U \rangle$ and $q_{n-k}^U > q_{n-k-1}^U + 1$. We don't need to consider the case $q_{n-k}^U = q_{n-k-1}^U + 1$, because for any $\gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1)$ such U cannot be a $\pi \circ \gamma$ -boundary subset of $\langle H \rangle$.

Let us calculate the number of permutations $\gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1)$ such that

$$I_{n-k}^U(\gamma) = \binom{d-2}{k}, \quad (83)$$

for some d , $k+3 \leq d \leq T - q_{n-k-1}^U$. From (78), we have

$$(\pi \circ \gamma)^{-1}(\langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle) = d.$$

From the condition (73) follows that positions of elements from $L_{n-k-1}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle$ in the order $\pi \circ \gamma$ have to be chosen from the set $[d+1, T] = [d+1, d+2, \dots, T]$, and if they are fixed, we have $A_{n-k}(U; d)$ possibilities for arrangement of elements from the set

$$\{L_{n-k}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle\} \setminus \{\{\langle u_{n-k} \rangle \cup L_{n-k-1}(U)\} \cap \langle H \rangle\}$$

to fulfill the $\pi \circ \gamma$ -boundary condition (74). The arrangement of the remaining elements from

$$\langle H \rangle \setminus \{\{\langle w \rangle \cup L_{n-k}(U)\} \cap \langle H \rangle\}$$

will not affect the fact that U is a $\pi \circ \gamma$ -boundary subset of $\langle H \rangle$. Since the collection $U_{n-k-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle u_{i_{n-k-1}} \rangle, \dots, \langle u_{i_1} \rangle)$ has to be a $\pi \circ \gamma$ -closed subset of $\langle H \rangle$, then the element $\langle u_{i_{n-k-1}} \rangle$ has to be in the first place among any q_{n-k-1}^U positions selected from the set $[d+1, T]$ for arrangement of the set $L_{n-k-1}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle$, while q_{n-k-2}^U elements from $L_{n-k-2}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle$ can be located in any of the remained $q_{n-k-1}^U - 1$ places. The arrangement of the elements from

$$\{L_{n-k-1}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle\} \setminus \{\{\langle u_{i_{n-k-1}} \rangle \cup L_{n-k-2}(U)\} \cap \langle H \rangle\}$$

in $q_{n-k-1}^U - q_{n-k-2}^U - 1$ places, left after choosing $q_{n-k-2}^U + 1$ places for arrangement of the set $L_{n-k-2}(U) \cap \langle H \rangle$ and $\langle u_{i_{n-k-1}} \rangle$, doesn't affect the fulfillment of $\pi \circ \gamma$ -closeness condition for U_{n-k-1} .

Continuing the same way, we get that the number $N(U; d)$ of permutations $\gamma \in \text{Sym}([T]; 1)$, such that $(\pi \circ \gamma)^{-1}(\langle u_{i_{n-k}} \rangle) = d$ and U is a $\pi \circ \gamma$ -boundary subset of $\langle H \rangle$, is

$$\begin{aligned} N(U; d) &= (T - q_{n-k}^U - 1)! A_{n-k}(U; d) \binom{T-d}{q_{n-k-1}^U} \times \\ &\times \binom{q_{n-k-1}^U - 1}{q_{n-k-2}^U} (q_{n-k-1}^U - q_{n-k-2}^U - 1)! \times \dots \times \binom{q_l^U - 1}{q_{l-1}^U} (q_l^U - q_{l-1}^U - 1)! \times \\ &\dots \times \binom{q_2^U - 1}{q_1^U} (q_2^U - q_1^U - 1)! = \frac{(T - q_{n-k}^U - 1)! A_{n-k}(U; d) (T-d)!}{(T - q_{n-k-1}^U - d)!} \frac{1}{q_{n-k-1}^U q_{n-k-2}^U \dots q_1^U}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_{n-k}^U] &= \frac{1}{(T-1)!} \frac{1}{q_{n-k-1}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \\ &\times \sum_{d=k+3}^{T-q_{n-k-1}^U} \frac{(T-d)!(T-q_{n-k}^U-1)!}{(T-q_{n-k-1}^U-d)!} A_{n-k}(U; d) \binom{d-2}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

The Theorem follows from (82), (84), and additivity of expectation.

Q.E.D.

Taking into account the inequality (19) and definition (25), we return to elaborating of $\eta_n^\star(\langle H \rangle)$ for $\langle H \rangle = \langle E_n \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^n$ (see (1)).

We define $\delta_{n,k}$, $k = 1, \dots, n+1$, as

$$\delta_{n,k} \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{|\langle E_n \rangle^{\times k} \setminus \langle E_n \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}|}{|\langle E_n \rangle^{\times k}|}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n+1. \quad (85)$$

We choose subspaces

$$V_k \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}, \quad \dim V_k = k, \quad k = 1, \dots, n+1,$$

such that the orthogonal projectors

$$\begin{aligned} P_k : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} &= V_k^\perp \oplus V_k \rightarrow V_k^\perp \oplus V_k = \mathbf{R}^{n+1}, \\ P_k(v) &= v_2, \quad \forall v = v_1 + v_2 \in V_k^\perp \oplus V_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, n+1, \end{aligned}$$

satisfy the following conditions:

for any k linear independent vectors $w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_k} \in E_n$, the vectors

$$w_{i_s}^k \stackrel{def}{=} P_k(w_{i_s}), \quad s = 1, \dots, k,$$

are linear independent as well.

Let $E_{n,k}$ denote the set

$$E_{n,k} \stackrel{def}{=} P_k(E_n). \quad (86)$$

For $W^{k+1} = (\langle w_{i_1}^{k+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_k}^{k+1} \rangle) \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}$, we use the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned}
L(W^{k+1}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{span } \langle w_{i_1}^{k+1}, \dots, w_{i_k}^{k+1} \rangle \subset V_{k+1} = \mathbf{R}^{k+1}; \\
q_k^{W^{k+1}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |L(W^{k+1}) \cap E_{n,k+1}|; \\
E_{n,k+1}^m &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ W^{k+1} \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k} \mid q_k^{W^{k+1}} = k + m \right\}; \\
\gamma_{k+1}^m &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{|E_{n,k+1}^m|}{|\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}|}; \\
B_{k+1} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (\langle w_{i_1}^{k+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{k+1}}^{k+1} \rangle) \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times(k+1)} \setminus \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k+1)} \mid \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\langle w_{i_1}^{k+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_k}^{k+1} \rangle) \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k} \right\}; \\
\epsilon_{k+1} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{|B_{k+1}|}{|\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times(k+1)}|}.
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Note that

$$\delta_{n,s} = \frac{|\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times s} \setminus \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times s}|}{|\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times s}|}, \quad s = 1, \dots, k+1. \tag{88}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times(k+1)} \setminus \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k+1)} &= \\
&= \left\{ \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times(k+1)} \setminus \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k+1)} \setminus B_{k+1} \right\} \cup B_{k+1},
\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\delta_{n,k+1} = \delta_{n,k} + \epsilon_{k+1}. \tag{89}$$

From definition (87) we have

$$|B_{k+1}| = \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} |E_{n,k+1}^m| m, \tag{90}$$

$$|E_{n,k+1}^m| = \gamma_{k+1}^m |\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}|, \tag{91}$$

and from (88)

$$|\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}| = (1 - \delta_{n,k}) |\langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle^{\times k}|. \tag{92}$$

Hence, from (90), (91), (92) we get

$$\epsilon_{k+1} = (1 - \delta_{n,k}) \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{m}{2^n - k}. \quad (93)$$

Definition 6 We say that a vector $w \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is in general position to the sets $E_n = P_{n+1}(E_n), P_n(E_n), \dots, P_2(E_n)$ iff for any $k, k = 2, \dots, n+1$, and vectors $w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{k-1}} \in E_n \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, the vector $w^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_k(w)$ doesn't belong to the linear span of vectors $w_{i_1}^k, \dots, w_{i_{k-1}}^k$:

$$w^k \notin \text{span}\langle w_{i_1}^k, \dots, w_{i_{k-1}}^k \rangle.$$

Next, we are going to apply the Theorem 4 to the sets

$$\langle Z_k \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle E_{n,k} \rangle \cup \langle w^k \rangle \subset \mathbf{RP}^{k-1}, \quad k = 2, \dots, n+1,$$

where $w \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is in general position to the sets $P_k(E_n), k = 2, \dots, n+1$. We express the right hand side of the inequality (77) as the sum of four summands

$$\text{rank } H_{k-1} \left(K^{Z_k}, K_{k-2}^{Z_k}; \mathbf{F} \right) \leq S_0^k + S_{\leq}^k + S_{>}^k + D_{k-1}(Z_k; w^k), \quad (94)$$

where

$$S_0^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2^n)!} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \quad (95)$$

$$\times \sum_{d=3}^{2^n+1-q_{k-2}^U} \frac{(2^n+1-d)!(2^n-q_{k-1}^U)!}{(2^n+1-q_{k-2}^U-d)!} \cdot A_{k-1}(U; d);$$

$$S_{\leq}^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{(2^n)!} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \quad (96)$$

$$\times \sum_{d=t+3}^{q_{k-t-2}^U} \frac{(2^n+1-d)!(2^n-q_{k-t-1}^U)!}{(2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U-d)!} \cdot A_{k-t-1}(U; d) \binom{d-2}{t};$$

$$S_{>}^k \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{(2^n)!} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \quad (97)$$

$$\sum_{d=\max(q_{k-t-2}^U+3; t+3)}^{2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U} \frac{(2^n+1-d)!(2^n-q_{k-t-1}^U)!}{(2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U-d)!} \cdot A_{k-t-1}(U; d) \binom{d-2}{t},$$

where

$$A_{k-t-1}(U; d) \stackrel{def}{=} \left[\binom{2^n - q_{k-t-2}^U - 1}{q_{k-t-1}^U - q_{k-t-2}^U - 1} - \binom{2^n - q_{k-t-2}^U - d + 1}{q_{k-t-1}^U - q_{k-t-2}^U - 1} \right] \times \\ \times (q_{k-t-1}^U - q_{k-t-2}^U - 1)!.$$

Lemma 3 *For sufficiently large n , the following inequality holds:*

$$S_{>}^k + S_{\leq}^k \leq \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^2}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-3}{2^n} \binom{2^n}{k-1}. \quad (98)$$

Proof. From (97) and the inequality $q_{k-t-2}^U \geq k - t - 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{>}^k &\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \not\in \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=\max(q_{k-t-2}^U+3; t+3)}^{2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U} \frac{(2^n - d + 1) \cdots (2^n - d - q_{k-t-2}^U + 2)}{(2^n - 1) \cdot (2^n - q_{k-t-2}^U)} \binom{d-2}{t} \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \not\in \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=\max(q_{k-t-2}^U+3; t+3)}^{2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U} (1 - \alpha_d)^{q_{k-t-2}^U} \alpha_d^t \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \not\in \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=\max(q_{k-t-2}^U+3; t+3)}^{2^n+1-q_{k-t-2}^U} (1 - \alpha_d)^{k-t-2} \alpha_d^t.
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Here $\alpha_d = \frac{d-2}{2^n-1}$.

From (96) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\leq}^k &\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=t+3}^{q_{k-t-2}^U+2} \frac{(2^n - q_{k-t-2}^U - 1) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-t-2}^U - (d-2))}{(2^n - 1) \cdot (2^n - (d-2))} \binom{d-2}{t} \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=t+3}^{q_{k-t-2}^U+2} \left(1 - \frac{q_{k-t-2}^U}{2^n - 1}\right)^{d-2} \alpha_d^t \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \times \\
&\times \sum_{d=t+3}^{q_{k-t-2}^U+2} (1 - \alpha_d)^{k-t-2} \alpha_d^t.
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

The last inequality in (100) follows from the inequality

$$\left(1 - \frac{q}{2^n - 1}\right)^{(2^n - 1)x} \leq (1 - x)^{k-t-2}$$

that holds for $x \in [0, \frac{q}{2^n - 1}]$ and $q \geq k - t - 2$.

From (99) and (100) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{>}^k + S_{\leq}^k &\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \sum_{d=2}^{2^{n+1}} (1 - \alpha_d)^{k-t-2} \alpha_d^t \times \\
&\quad \times \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-t-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \leq \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t=1}^{k-3} \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - t)}{t!} \left(\frac{\Gamma(k-t-1)\Gamma(t+1)}{\Gamma(k)} + \frac{n^2}{12(2^n - 1)^2} \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \frac{1}{(k-t-2)!} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-t-1)}} 1 \leq \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^2}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-3}{2^n} \binom{2^n}{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the formula 853.21 from [5] that holds for $t \geq 1$:

$$\int_0^1 (1-x)^{k-t-2} x^t dx = \frac{\Gamma(k-t-1)\Gamma(t+1)}{\Gamma(k)} = \frac{(k-t-2)!t!}{(k-1)!}$$

and the midpoint rule for sum estimation by integral.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 4 *For any $n \geq 64$, the following inequality holds:*

$$S_0^k \leq \left(\frac{1}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) + (\delta_{n,k} - \delta_{n,k-1}) \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{2^n} \right) \right) \binom{2^n}{k-1}. \quad (101)$$

Proof. From (95) we have

$$S_0^k \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}} \frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} (J(U, k; >) + J(U, k; \leq)), \quad (102)$$

where

$$J(U, k; >) \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{d=q_{k-2}^U+3}^{2^n+1-q_{k-2}^U} \frac{(2^n - d + 1) \cdots (2^n - d - q_{k-2}^U + 2)}{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-2}^U)}, \quad (103)$$

and

$$J(U, k; \leq) \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{d=3}^{q_{k-2}^U+2} \left(\frac{(2^n - q_{k-2}^U - 1) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-2}^U - (d-2))}{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - (d-2))} - \frac{(2^n - q_{k-1}^U) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-1}^U - (d-3))}{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - (d-2))} \right). \quad (104)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} J(U, k; >) &\leq \frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} \sum_{d=q_{k-2}^U+3}^{2^n+1-q_{k-2}^U} (1 - \alpha_d)^{q_{k-2}^U} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(k-2)!} \frac{k-2}{q_{k-2}^U} \left(\frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U + 1} + \frac{(q_{k-2}^U)^2}{24(2^n - 1)^2} \right) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left(1 + \frac{n^2 q_{k-2}^U}{(2^n - 1)^2} \right) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Here $\alpha_d = \frac{d-2}{2^n-1}$.

We assert that for any $U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}$ for $n \geq 64$, the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} J(U, k; \leq) \leq \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{(k-1)!}. \quad (106)$$

For $U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}$ such that $q_{k-1}^U \geq n^3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)} \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} J(U, k; \leq) \leq \\ & \leq \frac{1}{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)} \frac{1}{q_{k-2}^U} \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{(k-3)!} \cdot q_{k-2}^U \leq \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

$$(q_{k-1}^U \geq n^3)$$

$$\leq \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{(k-1)!}.$$

For $U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}$ such that $q_{k-1}^U < n^3$, it can be proven by mathematical induction that for any d , $3 \leq d \leq q_{k-2}^U + 2$, and $n \geq 64$ (for $n \geq 64$, we have $n^{10} < 2^n - 1$), the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(2^n - q_{k-2}^U - 1) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-2}^U - (d-2))}{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - (d-2))} - \\ & - \frac{(2^n - q_{k-1}^U) \cdots (2^n - q_{k-1}^U - (d-3))}{(2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - (d-2))} \leq \frac{d-2}{n (q_{k-2}^U)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

Hence, for $U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}$ such that $q_{k-1}^U < n^3$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)} \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{q_{k-2}^U \cdots q_1^U} J(U, k; \leq) \leq \\ & \leq 1 \cdot \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{(k-2)!} \frac{1}{n (q_{k-2}^U)^2} \sum_{d=3}^{q_{k-2}^U + 2} (d-2) \leq \frac{q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)}{(k-1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

The assertion (106) follows from (107) and (109).

It follows from (102), (105), and (106) that for any $n \geq 64$, the following inequality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_0^k &\leq \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right)}{(k-1)!} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}} 1 + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}} (q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)).
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

Taking into account (89), we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{U \in \langle Z_k; w^k \notin \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times(k-1)}} (q_{k-1}^U - (k-1)) = \frac{1}{2^n} |B_k| = \\
&= \frac{\epsilon_k}{2^n} 2^n (2^n - 1) \cdots (2^n - k + 1) = (\delta_{n,k} - \delta_{n,k-1}) \binom{2^n - 1}{k-1} (k-1)!.
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

The Lemma follows from (110) and (111).

Q.E.D.

Theorem 5 *For any $n \geq 64$, the following inequality holds for $k = 1, \dots, n$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_k^\star(\langle Z_{k+1} \rangle) &\geq \left[1 - \delta_{n,k} - \frac{k-1}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) - \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] \binom{2^n}{k} = \\
&= \left(\frac{\langle E_n \rangle}{\eta_k^\star} \right)^{\langle w \rangle} - \left[\frac{k-1}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] \binom{2^n}{k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

Proof. From the exact sequence (59), we get:

$$\eta_k^\star(\langle Z_{k+1} \rangle) = \binom{2^n}{k} - \text{rank } H_k \left(K^{Z_{k+1}}, K_{k-1}^{Z_{k+1}}; \mathbf{F} \right). \tag{113}$$

From inequality (94), Lemma 3, and Lemma 4, for any $n \geq 64$, we get for $k = 1, \dots, n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank } H_k \left(K^{Z_{k+1}}, K_{k-1}^{Z_{k+1}}; \mathbf{F} \right) &\leq \\ &\leq \left[\delta_{n,k} + \frac{k-1}{2^n} \left(1 + o \left(\frac{n^3}{2^n} \right) \right) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] \binom{2^n}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

The Theorem follows from (113), (114), and Remark 2.

Q.E.D.

5 Asymptotics of the number of singular $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrices.

Lemma 5 For $n \geq 64$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k} \leq \frac{k-1}{2^n} \left(1 + o \left(\frac{n^3}{2^n} \right) \right). \quad (115)$$

Proof. We define the probability distribution $p : \langle Z_{k+1} \rangle = \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle \cup \{ \langle w^{k+1} \rangle \} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by the rule:

$$p(\langle w^{k+1} \rangle) = 1, \quad p(\langle w_i^{k+1} \rangle) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2^n.$$

Then from Theorem 3 we have

$$\eta_k^\star(\langle Z_{k+1} \rangle) = \sum_{W^{k+1} \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}} \frac{1}{W^{k+1}[E_{n,k+1}]}. \quad (116)$$

For any permutation $\sigma \in \text{Sym}[k]$, we define the map $\sigma^* : \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k} \rightarrow \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(W^{k+1}) &= W_\sigma^{k+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\langle w_{i_{\sigma(1)}}^{k+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{\sigma(k)}}^{k+1} \rangle) \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}, \\ \forall W^{k+1} &= (\langle w_{i_1}^{k+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_k}^{k+1} \rangle) \in \langle E_{n,k+1} \rangle_{\neq 0}^{\times k}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for the symmetrization of a combinatorial flag, defined by the formula

$$\text{Sym}(W^{k+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}[k]} \frac{1}{W_{\sigma}^{k+1}[E_{n,k+1}]},$$

for $W^{k+1} \in E_{n,k+1}^m$, we have

$$\text{Sym}(W^{k+1}) \leq \frac{k}{k+m}. \quad (117)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{W^{k+1} \in E_{n,k+1}^m} \frac{1}{W^{k+1}[E_{n,k+1}]} &\leq \gamma_{k+1}^m (1 - \delta_{n,k}) \frac{k}{k+m} \binom{2^n}{k} \quad \text{and} \\ \eta_k^{\star}(\langle Z_{k+1} \rangle) &\leq (1 - \delta_{n,k}) \binom{2^n}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{k}{k+m}. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

Combining (118) with inequality (112), for $n \geq 64$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \delta_{n,k}) \binom{2^n}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{k}{k+m} &\geq \eta_k^{\star}(\langle Z_{k+1} \rangle) \geq \\ &\geq \left[1 - \delta_{n,k} - \frac{k-1}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) - \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] \binom{2^n}{k}, \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{n,k}} \left[\left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-1}{2^n} + \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] &\geq \\ &\geq 1 - \gamma_{k+1}^0 - \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{k}{k+m}. \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

Taking into account the identity

$$1 - \gamma_{k+1}^0 = \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m,$$

the inequality (120) may be expressed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{n,k}} \left[\left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-1}{2^n} + \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] &\geq \\ &\geq \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{m}{k+m}. \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, the inequality

$$\frac{m}{k+m} \geq \frac{2m}{2^n - k} \quad (122)$$

is fulfilled for all m , $1 \leq m \leq 2^{k-1} - k$.

For $k = n$, the inequality (122) is true for all $m \leq 2^{n-1} - \frac{3}{2}n$. It follows from Littlewood-Offord lemma in the form proven by P. Erdős [6] that for $n \geq 4$,

$$\gamma_{n+1}^m = 0, \quad \forall m, \text{ such that } 2^{n-1} - \frac{3}{2}n < m < 2^{n-1} - n. \quad (123)$$

From (121), (122), (123), (89), and (93), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - \delta_{n,k}} \left[\left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-1}{2^n} + \left(1 - \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}) \right] &\geq \\ &\geq \sum_{m=1}^{2^{k-1}-k} \gamma_{k+1}^m \frac{2m}{2^n - k} = \frac{2(\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k})}{1 - \delta_{n,k}} \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

Hence,

$$\left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \frac{k-1}{2^n} \geq \left(1 + \frac{k}{2^n} \right) (\delta_{n,k+1} - \delta_{n,k}). \quad (125)$$

The inequality (115) of Lemma 5 follows from (125).

Q.E.D.

For ease of use of established terminology, we formulate an estimate for the cardinality of the set of singular $\{\pm 1\}$ -matrices in terms of the probability $\mathbb{P}_n$ of singularity of random Bernoulli matrices. Also, we can identify $\langle E_n \rangle$ with E_n .

Theorem 6 For $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_n \sim \frac{(n-1)^2}{2^{n-1}}. \quad (126)$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{n+1} = \frac{\left| \left[\{E_n\}^{n+1} \setminus [E_n]^{\times(n+1)} \right] \cup \left[[E_n]^{\times(n+1)} \setminus [E_n]_{\neq 0}^{\times(n+1)} \right] \right|}{2^{n(n+1)}}, \text{ i.e.,} \quad (127)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{n+1} = \frac{|\{E_n\}^{n+1} \setminus [E_n]^{\times(n+1)}|}{2^{n(n+1)}} + \delta_{n,n+1} \frac{|[E_n]^{\times(n+1)}|}{2^{n(n+1)}},$$

where $\{E_n\}^{n+1} = \underbrace{E_n \times \cdots \times E_n}_{n+1}$.

Cardinality of the subset of matrices containing exactly two equal rows asymptotically plays the main role for estimation of $|\{E_n\}^{n+1} \setminus [E_n]^{\times(n+1)}|$, i.e.,

$$\frac{|\{E_n\}^{n+1} \setminus [E_n]^{\times(n+1)}|}{2^{n(n+1)}} = \frac{n(n+1)}{2^{n+1}}(1 + o_n(1)). \quad (128)$$

From Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{n,n+1} &\leq \delta_{n,n} + \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right)\right) \frac{n-1}{2^n} \leq \\ &\leq \delta_{n,n-1} + \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{n-2}{2^n} + \frac{n-1}{2^n}\right) \leq \dots \\ &\leq \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right)\right) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{k}{2^n} = \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right)\right) \frac{n(n-1)}{2^{n+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

We need to show that

$$\delta_{n,n+1} \geq \frac{n(n-1)}{2^{n+1}}(1 + o_n(1)). \quad (130)$$

Let $R_{n-1}^{n+1} \subset [E_{n-1}]^{\times(n+1)}$ be the subset of ordered collections $W = (w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}}) \in [E_{n-1}]^{\times(n+1)}$ such that the columns $\bar{1}, Y_2, \dots, Y_n$ of the

matrix $M(W)$ with rows $w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n+1}}$

$$M(W) = \begin{pmatrix} w_{i_1} \\ \vdots \\ w_{i_{n+1}} \end{pmatrix} = (\bar{1}, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)$$

are not collinear, i.e., $Y_i \neq \pm Y_j, \forall i \neq j$.

We can construct an ordered collection $W' \in [E_n]^{\times(n+1)}$ by placing a column $\pm Y_i, i = 2, \dots, n$, in one of n positions:

$$M(W') = (\bar{1}, Y_2, \dots, Y_i, \dots, \pm Y_i, \dots, Y_n).$$

Then the total number of $W' \in [E_n]^{\times(n+1)}$ such that the matrix $M(W')$ has exactly two equal up to sign columns is not less than

$$\frac{2(n-1)n}{2} |R_{n-1}^{n+1}| = n(n-1) |R_{n-1}^{n+1}|. \quad (131)$$

Since

$$\frac{|[E_{n-1}]^{\times(n+1)}|}{|[E_n]^{\times(n+1)}|} = \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}(1 + o_n(1)) \quad \text{and} \quad (132)$$

$$|[E_{n-1}]^{\times(n+1)}| = (1 + o_n(1)) |R_{n-1}^{n+1}|,$$

then (130) follows from (131) and (132). The Theorem follows from (127), (128), (129), and (130).

Q.E.D.

6 Asymptotics of the number of threshold functions.

In this section we use notations from the previous section.

Theorem 7 *Asymptotics of the number of threshold functions is equal to $2^{\binom{2^n-1}{n}}$:*

$$P(2, n) \sim 2^{\binom{2^n-1}{n}}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (133)$$

Proof. We write the inequality (112) of the Theorem 5 for $k = n$ taking into account the inequality (115) of Lemma 5:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta_n^\star(\langle E_n \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}) \geq \\
& \geq \left[1 - \delta_{n,n} - \frac{n-1}{2^{n-1}} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \right] \left[\binom{2^n-1}{n} + \binom{2^n-1}{n-1} \right] \geq \\
& \geq \left[1 - \frac{(n-1)^2}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \right] \binom{2^n-1}{n} + \\
& + \left[1 - \delta_{n,n} - \frac{n-1}{2^{n-1}} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \right] \binom{2^n-1}{n-1}. \tag{134}
\end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 1 we have:

$$\eta_n^\star(\langle E_n \rangle) = \eta_n^\star(\langle E_n \rangle \cup \{\langle w \rangle\}) - \eta_{n-1}^\star(\langle E_n \rangle^{\perp w}). \tag{135}$$

From Theorem 2 we have:

$$\eta_{n-1}^\star(\langle E_n \rangle^{\perp w}) \leq \binom{\langle E_n \setminus \{u\} \rangle^{\perp w}}{\eta_{n-1}^\star}^{\langle u^{\perp w} \rangle}, \tag{136}$$

where $u = \bar{1} \in E_n$.

A summand $\eta_{n-1}^\star(\{\langle u^{\perp w} \rangle, \langle w_{i_1}^{\perp w} \rangle, \dots, \langle w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp w} \rangle\})$ from the right side of (136) is equal to 1 iff

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{span } \langle u^{\perp w}, w_{i_1}^{\perp w}, \dots, w_{i_{n-1}}^{\perp w} \rangle = \langle w \rangle^\perp = \mathbf{R}^n, \text{ or} \\
& \dim \text{span } \langle u, w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_{n-1}} \rangle = n. \tag{137}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from symmetry of E_n , (137), and definition of $\delta_{n,n}$ that the right side of (136) is equal to $(1 - \delta_{n,n})\binom{2^n-1}{n-1}$ and

$$\eta_{n-1}^\star(\langle E_n \rangle^{\perp w}) \leq (1 - \delta_{n,n})\binom{2^n-1}{n-1}. \tag{138}$$

Taking into account (19), (25), (134), (135), and (138), we get a lower bound for $P(2, n)$:

$$P(2, n) \geq 2 \left[1 - \frac{n^2}{2^n} \left(1 + o\left(\frac{n^3}{2^n}\right) \right) \right] \binom{2^n-1}{n}. \tag{139}$$

The Theorem follows from the upper bound (2) and the lower bound (139).

Q.E.D.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Baldi and R. Vershinin, Polynomial Threshold Functions, Hyperplane Arrangements, and Random Tensors, *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 1(4) 2019, 699–729. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1257792>
- [2] J. Bourgain, V. H. Vu, P. M. Wood, On the singularity probability of discrete random matrices, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 258 (2010), 559–663. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2009.04.016>
- [3] S. H. Cameron, An Estimate of the Complexity Requisite in a Universal Decision Network. *Proceedings of 1960 Bionics Symposium*, Wright Air Development Division Technical Report 60-600, Dayton, Ohio, December, 1960, pp. 197-212
- [4] T. M. Cover, Geometrical and Statistical Properties of Systems of Linear Inequalities with Applications in Pattern Recognition, *IEEE Transactions on Electronic Computers*, 14(3) (1965), 326–334. DOI: 10.1109/PGEC.1965.264137
- [5] H. B. Dwight, Tables of integrals and other mathematical data, Fourth Edition, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1961
- [6] P. Erdős, On a lemma of Littlewood and Offord, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 54 (1945), 898–902. MR0014608
- [7] J. Folkman, The homology groups of a lattice, *J. Math. Mech.*, 15(4) (1966), 631–636. MR 32:5557
- [8] P. Hall, The Eulerian functions of a group, *Quart. J. Math.*, 7 (1936), 137–151. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/os-7.1.134>
- [9] A. A. Irmatov, On the number of threshold functions, *Discrete Math. Appl.*, 3(4) (1993), 429–432. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/dma-1993-0407>
- [10] A. A. Irmatov, Arrangement of Hyperplanes and the Number of Threshold Functions, *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 68 (2001), 211–226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012087813557>

- [11] A. A. Irmatov, Ž. D. Kovijanić, On the asymptotics of logarithm of the number of threshold K-logic functions, *Discrete Math. Appl.*, 8(4) (1998), 331–355. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/dma.1998.8.4.331>
- [12] R. D. Joseph, The number of orthants in n -space intersected by an s -dimensional subspace, *Tech Memo 8, Project PARA, Cornell Aeronautical Lab.*, Buffalo, N. Y., 1960.
- [13] J. Kahn, J. Komlós, and E. Szemerédi, On the probability that a random ± 1 -matrix is singular, *Journal of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 8, Num. 1, Jan. 1995, 223–240. MR1260107, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-1995-1260107-2>
- [14] J. Komlós, On the determinant of $(0,1)$ matrices, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 2 (1967), 7–21. MR0221962
- [15] J. Komlós, Manuscript (1977). In: *B. Bollobás (Ed.) “Random Graphs”, Academic Press, New York/London*, 1985, 347–350.
- [16] S. Muroga, Lower bounds of the number of threshold functions and a maximum weight, *IEEE Trans. on Electronic Comp.*, Vol. EC-14, Issue 2 (1965), 136–148. DOI: [10.1109/PGEC.1965.263958](https://doi.org/10.1109/PGEC.1965.263958)
- [17] A. M. Odlyzko, On subspaces spanned by random selection of ± 1 vectors, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 47 (1988), 124–133. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165\(88\)90046-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165(88)90046-5)
- [18] L. Schläfli, *Gesammelte Mathematische Abhandlungen I*, Verlag Birkhäuser, Springer Basel AG, 1950, 209–212.
- [19] T. Tao and V. Vu, On random ± 1 matrices: Singularity and Determinant, *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 28 (2006), No 1, 1–23. MR2187480
- [20] T. Tao and V. Vu, On the singularity of random Bernoulli matrices, *Journal of Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 20, Num. 3, July 2007, 603–628. MR2291914, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-07-00555-3>
- [21] K. Tikhomirov, Singularity of random Bernoulli matrices, *Annals of Math.*, Vol. 191 (2020), Issue 2, 593–634 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2020.191.2.6>

- [22] R. O. Winder, Single stage threshold logic, *Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design*, *AIEE Special Publications*, S-134, Sep. 1961, 321–322.
- [23] R. O. Winder, Partitions of N-space by hyperplanes, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 14(4) (1966), 811–818. DOI: 10.1109/FOCS.1961.29
- [24] S. Yajima and T. Ibaraki, A Lower Bound of the Number of Threshold Functions, *IEEE Trans. Electronic Comput.*, 14(6) (1965), 926–929. DOI: 10.1109/PGEC.1965.264090
- [25] T. Zaslavsky, Facing up to Arrangements: Face-count Formulas for Partitions of Space by Hyperplanes, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 154, Amer.Math.Soc., Providence, RI, 1975. MR 50:9603
- [26] Yu. A. Zuev, Asymptotics of the logarithm of the number of threshold functions of the algebra of logic, *Sov. Math., Dokl.*, 39 (1989), 512–513. Zbl 0693.94010

Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics, Lomonosov Moscow State University,
Moscow, Russian Federation

E-mail address: irmatov@intsys.msu.ru