

# DIMENSION BOUNDS OF CLASSES OF INTERVAL ORDERS

CSABA BIRÓ AND SIDA WAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we discuss the dimension of interval orders having a representation using  $n$  different interval lengths, and the dimension of interval orders which has a representation using length in  $[1, r]$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper by Keller, Trenk, and Young [3], the authors proved that the dimension of interval orders that have a representation with interval lengths 0 and 1 have dimension at most 3. At the end of their paper, they proposed two problems. (1) Find a good bound on the dimension of interval orders whose representation uses intervals of length  $r$  and  $s$ , where  $r, s > 0$ . (2) Find a good bound on the dimension of interval orders that have a representation using at most  $r$  different lengths.

Let  $f(r)$  denote the best bound in problem (2). In [3], the authors gave a simple upper bound  $f(r) \leq 3r + \binom{r}{2}$ . We provide a better bound; we also noticed that the bound is related to not just the number of lengths but also the relation between the lengths, hence it's natural to discuss the dimension of interval orders that have a representation with interval lengths in a certain range.

In this paper, we use the function “lg” to denote the logarithm of base 2.

## 2. BACKGROUND

A partially ordered set (or poset) is a pair  $(X, P)$  where  $X$  is a set and  $P$  is a reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive binary relation on  $X$ . We will use  $\mathbf{P}$  to denote the pair  $(X, P)$ . We use  $x < y$  in  $P$  to denote  $(x, y) \in P$ ,  $x \parallel y$  when  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable in  $P$ . For a subset  $Y$  of the ground set  $X$ , we denote the restriction of  $P$  to  $Y$  by  $P(Y)$ ; the poset  $\mathbf{Q} = (Y, P(Y))$  is a subposet of  $\mathbf{P}$ .

A linear order  $L$  on  $X$  is called linear extension of  $P$  if  $P \subseteq L$ . We denote the dual of  $L$  by  $L^d$ . A family of linear extensions  $\mathcal{R}$  on  $X$  is called a realizer of  $P$  if  $\cap \mathcal{R} = P$ ; in other words, for all  $x, y$  in  $X$ , we have  $x < y$  in  $P$  if and only if  $x < y$  in  $L$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{R}$ . The dimension of a poset  $\mathbf{P}$  is the minimum cardinality of a realizer of  $P$ , denoted by  $\dim(\mathbf{P})$ .

A poset  $(X, P)$  is an interval order if for each  $x \in X$ , an interval  $[l_x, r_x]$  can be assigned to  $x$ , such that for  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x < y$  in  $P$  if and only if  $r_x < l_y$ . We call the assignment of a collection of intervals to all the vertices in the ground set of  $\mathbf{P}$  an interval representation of  $\mathbf{P}$ . Fishburn [2] showed that a poset is an interval order if and only if it does not contain  $S_2 = \mathbf{2} + \mathbf{2}$  as a subposet.

An interval order is a semi-order if it has an interval representation in which all intervals have the same length. Usually, we use unit length for the intervals, so semiorders can be called unit interval orders. Scott and Suppes [7] proved that

an interval order  $\mathbf{P}$  is a semiorder if and only if  $\mathbf{P}$  does not contain a  $\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1}$  as a subposet.

### 3. TWIN-FREE AND DISTINGUISHING REPRESENTATIONS

Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be an interval order, and fix a representation for  $\mathbf{P}$ . Let  $x, y \in X$  be such that the same interval is assigned to both. We call  $x$  and  $y$  a twin (of points). If a representation does not have any twins, we call it twin-free. A representation of an interval order is distinguishing, if every real number occurs at most once as an endpoint of an interval of the representation, i.e. no two intervals share an endpoint. A distinguishing representation is of course twin-free.

Let  $\mathbf{P} = (X, P)$  be a poset, and  $x, y \in X$ . We say  $x, y$  have duplicated holdings, if  $\{z \in X : z > x\} = \{z \in X : z > y\}$  and  $\{z \in X : z < x\} = \{z \in X : z < y\}$ ; in other words the upsets and the downsets of  $x$  and  $y$  are the same. If  $\mathbf{P}$  is an interval order with a representation in which  $x$  and  $y$  are twins, then they have duplicated holdings. So if an interval order has no duplicated holdings, then every representation is twin-free.

One important property of two elements with duplicated holdings is that we may discard one of them without reducing the dimension (as long as the dimension is at least 2). We will use this property later by assuming that some poset, for which we are proving an upper bound for its dimension, has no duplicated holdings.

Since this paper studies interval orders for which the lengths of the intervals are not arbitrary, we introduce the following notations. Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ . An  $S$ -representation of a poset  $\mathbf{P}$  is an interval representation, in which every interval length is in  $S$ .

It is easy to see that every interval order has a distinguishing  $\mathbb{R}^+$ -representation. Things get less obvious with restrictions introduced. A simple example would be a  $\{0\}$ -representation of an antichain of size at least 2, which can not be made distinguishing, or even twin-free. We will prove that—essentially—this is the only problem case.

Following Fishburn and Graham [1], we will use the notation  $C(S)$  to denote the family of posets that have an  $S$ -representation. As a special case,  $C([\alpha, \beta])$  denotes the family of posets for which there is a representation with intervals of lengths between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (inclusive). We will use the shorthands  $C[\alpha, \beta] = C([\alpha, \beta])$ , and  $C(\alpha) = C([1, \alpha])$ .

The following observation is obvious due to the scalability of intervals in a representation.

**Observation 3.1.**  $C[\alpha, \beta] = C[m\alpha, m\beta]$ , for all  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ .

With these notations,  $C(\mathbb{R}^+)$  is the family of interval orders, and for  $s \neq 0$ ,  $C(\{s\}) = C(\{1\}) = C(1)$  is the family of semiorders.

Now we are ready to prove the theorem that shows that—in most cases—we can assume that a poset has a distinguishing representation.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ .*

- (1) *Every poset  $\mathbf{P} \in C(S)$  that has a twin-free free  $S$ -representation also has a distinguishing  $S$ -representation.*
- (2) *If  $0 \notin S$ , then every poset  $\mathbf{P} \in C(S)$  has a distinguishing  $S$ -representation.*

*Proof.* Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ , and let  $\mathbf{P} \in C(S)$ . Consider an  $S$ -representation of  $\mathbf{P}$ ; with a slight abuse of notation, the multiset of intervals in this representation will also be referred as  $\mathbf{P}$ . We will define two symmetric operations that we will perform repeatedly. These will be used to decrease the number of common endpoints of the intervals. After this, we enter a second phase, in which we remove twins, if possible.

**Left and right compression.** Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $L = \{x \in P : l_x < c\}$ , and let  $R = P - L$ . Define  $L' = \{[l_x + \epsilon, r_x + \epsilon] : x \in P\}$ . Let  $P' = L' \cup R$ , a multiset of intervals. The operation that creates  $P'$  from  $P$  is what we call “left compression” with parameters  $c$  and  $\epsilon$ .

We can similarly define right compressions. Let  $R = \{x \in P : r_x > c\}$ , and let  $L = P - R$ . Define  $R' = \{[l_x - \epsilon, r_x - \epsilon] : x \in P\}$ . Let  $P' = L \cup R'$  to define the operation of right compression.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be a poset (representation),  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \min\{|a - b| : a \text{ and } b \text{ are distinct endpoints}\}$ . Let  $\mathbf{P}'$  be the left (right) compression of  $\mathbf{P}$  with parameters  $c$  and  $\epsilon$ . Then  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $\mathbf{P}'$  represent isomorphic posets.*

*Proof of lemma.* We will do the proof for left compressions. The argument for right compressions is symmetric.

Notice that if  $a$  and  $b$  are two endpoints of intervals of  $\mathbf{P}$ , then their relation won't change, unless  $a = b$ . More precisely, if  $a < b$  in  $\mathbf{P}$  then the corresponding points in  $\mathbf{P}'$  will maintain this relation. Similarly for  $a > b$ .

So if  $x$  and  $y$  are two intervals in  $\mathbf{P}$  with no common endpoints, then their (poset) relation is maintained in  $\mathbf{P}'$ .

Now suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are intervals with some common endpoints. There are a few cases to consider.

If  $l_x = l_y$  then either  $x, y \in L$  or  $x, y \in R$ , so either both are shifted, or neither. Therefore  $x \parallel y$  both in  $\mathbf{P}$  and in  $\mathbf{P}'$ .

Now suppose  $l_x \neq l_y$ ; without loss of generality  $l_x < l_y$ . Also assume  $r_x = r_y$ . Then  $l_x + \epsilon < l_y$ , so  $x \parallel y$  both in  $\mathbf{P}$  and in  $\mathbf{P}'$ .

The remaining case is, without loss of generality,  $r_x = l_y$ . Then  $r_x + \epsilon < r_y$  (unless  $l_y = r_y = r_x$ , which was covered in the second case), so, again  $x \parallel y$  both in  $\mathbf{P}$  and in  $\mathbf{P}'$ .  $\square$

Now we return to the proof of the theorem. We will perform left and right compressions until no common endpoints remain except for twins. Let  $x, y$  be two intervals with a common endpoint, but  $x \neq y$ . Let  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \min\{|a - b| : a \text{ and } b \text{ are distinct endpoints}\}$ , as above.

- If  $l_x = l_y$  and  $r_x \neq r_y$ , perform a right compression with  $c = \min\{r_x, r_y\}$  and  $\epsilon$ .
- If  $r_x = r_y$  and  $l_x \neq l_y$ , perform a left compression with  $c = \max\{l_x, l_y\}$  and  $\epsilon$ .
- If  $l_x < r_x = l_y < r_y$  (or vice versa) either a left or a right shift will work with  $c = r_x = l_y$ .

Note that even though the definition of  $\epsilon$  looks the same in every step, the actual value will change as the representation changes. Indeed, it is easy to see that  $\epsilon$  is getting halved in every step.

If  $\mathbf{P}$  started with a twin-free representation, then we have arrived to a distinguishing representation, so part 1 is proven.

If  $\mathbf{P}$  had twins, those are still present at the representation. Let  $x$  and  $y$  be identical intervals of the representation, and let  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \min\{|a-b| : a \text{ and } b \text{ are distinct endpoints}\}$  again. If  $0 \notin S$ , then the length of  $x$  (and hence the length of  $y$ ) is positive. Note that this length is at least  $\epsilon$ . Move  $x$  by  $\epsilon$  to the right, that is, replace  $x$  with the interval  $[l_x + \epsilon, r_x + \epsilon]$ . The new representation will not have the  $x, y$  twin and represents the same poset. Repeat this until all twins disappear.  $\square$

#### 4. CHOICE FUNCTIONS

Let  $\mathbf{I}$  be a representation of an interval order  $(X, P)$ . Kierstead and Trotter [4] defined choice functions: a choice function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{I}$  is an injection  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $l_x \leq f(x) \leq r_x$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . For a given choice function  $f$ , define the linear order  $L(f)$  by setting  $x < y$  in  $L(f)$  if and only if  $f(x) < f(y)$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . It is easy to see that for each choice function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{I}$ ,  $L(f)$  is a linear extension of  $P$ . Indeed, for every  $x, y \in X$ ,  $x < y$  in  $P$ ,  $I_x$  always lies to the left of  $I_y$ , hence for any choice function  $f$ , we have  $f(x) < f(y)$ .

In [4], the following lemma is proven, which is specific to interval orders. We provide a different proof here, which hopefully provides some more insight.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $(X, P)$  be an interval order,  $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_s$  be a partition. Let  $L_i$  be a linear extension of  $P(X_i)$  where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . Then there exists a linear extension  $L$  of  $P$  such that  $L(X_i) = L_i$ .*

*Proof.* We will prove the lemma for  $s = 2$ ; the case of  $s > 2$  then follows by induction.

Let  $X_1, X_2, L_1, L_2$  be defined as in the lemma. Define the relation  $E = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup P$ , and the directed graph  $G = (X, E)$ . It is sufficient to show that  $G$  has no directed closed walk; indeed, if that is the case, the transitive closure  $T$  of  $G$  is an extension of the poset  $\mathbf{P}$ , and any linear extension  $L$  of  $T$  will satisfy the requirements of the conclusion of the lemma.

Suppose for a contradiction that  $G$  contains a directed closed walk. Since neither  $G[X_1]$  nor  $G[X_2]$  contains a directed closed walk, every directed closed walk in  $G$  must have both an  $X_1 X_2$  and an  $X_2 X_1$  edge. We will call these edges *cross-edges*. Let  $C$  be a directed closed walk in  $G$  with the minimum number of cross-edges.

As we noted,  $C$  contains at least one  $X_1 X_2$  edge; let  $(a, b)$  be such an edge. Let  $(c, d)$  be the first  $X_2 X_1$  edge that follows  $(a, b)$  in  $C$ . Observe that  $c < d$ ,  $a < b$  in  $P$ , and  $b \leq c$  in  $L_2$ . If  $d = a$ , then  $c < d = a < b$  in  $P$ , which would contradict  $b \leq c$  in  $L_2$ . If  $d > a$  in  $L_1$ , then we could eliminate the path  $ab \dots cd$  in  $C$ , replacing it with the single-edge path  $ad$ , and thereby decreasing the number of cross-edges in  $C$ , contradicting the minimality of  $C$ . (See Figure 1.)

So we concluded that  $d < a$  in  $L_1$ , and recall that  $b \leq c$  in  $L_2$ . If  $b \leq c$  in  $P$ , then  $a < b \leq c < d$  would contradict  $d < a$  in  $L_1$ . (In particular,  $b \neq c$ .) Obviously,  $b \not\leq c$  in  $P$ , so  $b \parallel c$  in  $P$ . Similar argument shows that  $d \parallel a$  in  $P$ . Hence the set  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  induces a  $\mathbf{2} + \mathbf{2}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $(X, P)$  be a poset, and  $X = Y \cup Z$  be a partition of  $X$ . We say that  $Y$  is over  $Z$  in an linear extension  $L$  of  $P$  if  $y > z$  in  $L$  whenever  $y \in Y$ ,  $z \in Z$  and  $y \parallel z$  in  $P$ . Using choice functions, Kierstead and Trotter [4] provided a shorter proof of a lemma below due to Rabinovitch [5]. We will include the proof for completeness.




FIGURE 1. Minimal oriented cycles

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $(X, P)$  be an interval order, and  $X = X_1 \cup X_2$  be a partition of  $X$ , where  $\mathbf{P}_1 = (X_1, P(X_1))$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_2 = (X_2, P(X_2))$ . Then*

$$\dim(\mathbf{P}) \leq \max\{\dim(\mathbf{P}_1), \dim(\mathbf{P}_2)\} + 2.$$

*Proof.* Consider a distinguishing representation of  $(X, P)$ , and let  $t = \max\{\dim(\mathbf{P}_1), \dim(\mathbf{P}_2)\}$ . By Lemma 4.1, there exists a family  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $t$  linear extensions of  $P$ , such that the restriction of the linear extensions in  $\mathcal{R}$  to each  $X_i$  form a realizer of  $P_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then define two choice functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , where  $f_1(x) = l_x$ ,  $f_2(x) = r_x$  for every  $x \in X_1$ ;  $f_1(y) = r_y$ ,  $f_2(y) = l_y$  for every  $y \in X_2$ . Let  $L_1 = L(f_1)$ ,  $L_2 = L(f_2)$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{R} \cup \{L_1, L_2\}$  is a realizer of  $P$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{P} = (X, P)$  be an interval order with no duplicated holdings, let  $\mathbf{I}$  be a distinguishing representation of  $\mathbf{P}$ . If  $L$  is an arbitrary linear extension of  $P$ , then there exists a choice function  $f$  on  $\mathbf{I}$ , such that  $L(f) = L$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, label the ground set  $X$  by the linear extension  $L = x_1x_2, \dots, x_n$ . Let  $I$  be the function that maps each  $x \in X$  to a closed interval  $I_x$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . If  $I_x$  is an interval with a positive length, then let  $l_x$  be the left endpoint of  $I(x)$  and  $r_x$  be the right endpoint of  $I_x$ . Otherwise, we say  $I_x \in D$  if it is a zero length interval and let  $m_x$  denote the real value of  $I_x$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Meanwhile, let  $\epsilon$  be the smallest difference between any two endpoints in  $\mathbf{I}$ . Since  $\mathbf{I}$  is a distinguishing representation, we have  $\epsilon > 0$ . Without further due, let's find a choice function for  $\mathbf{I}$  that gives us  $L$ . For convenience, let  $f_i = f(x_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2 \dots n$ . First, define:

$$f_i = \begin{cases} m_{x_1}, & I_x \in D \\ l_{x_1} + \epsilon/2, & I_x \notin D \end{cases}$$

If  $x_1$  is a zero length interval in  $\mathbf{I}$ , then  $f_1 = m_{x_1} \in [l_x, r_x]$ , for  $l_{x_1} = m_{x_1} = r_{x_1}$  in this case. Otherwise, if  $x_1 \notin D$ ,  $l_{x_1} + \epsilon/2 < l_{x_1} + \epsilon < r_{x_1}$  by our definition. Then, for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ , define:

$$f_i = \begin{cases} m_{x_i}, & I_{x_i} \in D \\ \max\{f(i-1) + \epsilon/2^i, l_{x_i} + \epsilon/2^i\}, & I_{x_i} \notin D \end{cases}$$

We shall check if  $f_i \in [l_{x_i}, r_{x_i}]$  for every  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . We call  $f_i$  to be good if  $f_i \in [l_{x_i}, r_{x_i}]$ . We have already shown that  $f_1$  is good. We will proceed by




FIGURE 2.

induction. Let's first show that  $f(2)$  is good. If one or both of  $I_{x_1}$  and  $I_{x_2}$  are zero length intervals, it's clear that  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are good. Assume that they are both intervals with positive length. If  $x_2 > x_1$  in  $P$ , then  $f_2 = l_{x_2} + \epsilon/4 < l_{x_2} + \epsilon \leq r_{x_2}$ ,  $f_2$  is good. Otherwise, if  $x_1 \parallel x_2$  in  $P$ , there are 2 cases, either  $l_{x_1} < l_{x_2} < r_{x_1}$  or  $l_{x_2} < l_{x_1} < r_{x_2}$ . In the first case,  $l_{x_2} > l_{x_1} + \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/4$ , hence  $f_2 = l_{x_2} + \epsilon/4$ ,  $f_2$  is good. In the second case  $f_2 = f_1 + \epsilon/4 = l_{x_1} + \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/4 < l_{x_1} + \epsilon < r_{x_2}$ , hence  $f_2$  is also good. Now, assume  $f_i$ 's are good for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ , ( $0 < k \leq n$ ), need to show that  $f_k$  is also good. If  $I_{x_{k-1}}$  is a zero length interval, either  $x_{k-1} < x_k$  or  $x_{k-1} \parallel x_k$  in  $P$ , it's clear that  $f_k$  is good. Let's assume  $I_{x_{k-1}}$  has positive length. If after we take the maximum we obtained  $f_k = l_{x_n} + \epsilon/2^n$ , then  $f_k$  is good. The case we need to check is the one that  $f_k = f_{k-1} + \epsilon/2^k > l_{x_k} + \epsilon/2^k$  and meanwhile  $f_{k-1} + \epsilon/2^k$  is not in  $[l_{x_k}, r_{x_k}]$ , i.e.  $f_{k-1} + \epsilon/2^k > r_{x_k}$ . But we will show that this is impossible. Since for  $f_{k-1}$  there exists a interval  $I_{x_s}$ ,  $0 < s < k-1$  (see Figure 2), such that  $f_{k-1} < l_{x_s} + \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2^2 + \dots < l_{x_s} + \epsilon$ . And we have  $x_s < x_{k-1} < x_k$  in  $L$ , hence  $x_k \parallel x_s$ . Then  $f(x_{k-1}) - \epsilon < l(x_s) < r(x_k) < f_{x_{k-1}}$ , notice that  $r(x_k) = m(x_k)$  if  $x_k$  is a zero length interval, but both case give us  $r(x_k) - l(x_s) < \epsilon$  which is a contradiction. Hence  $f_k$  is good, we have  $f_i \in [l_{x_i}, r_{x_i}]$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . For the rest of the proof, it's easy to see that  $f_i \geq f_{i-1} + \epsilon/2^{i-1} > f_{i-1}$ , hence  $L(f) = L$ . □

## 5. DIMENSION OF INTERVAL ORDERS USING TWO LENGTHS

In [3], the following theorem is proven.

**Theorem 5.1.** *If  $\mathbf{P}$  is an interval order that has representation such that every interval is of length 0 or 1, then  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) \leq 3$ .*

In [3], the authors defined two disjoint sets of incomparable pairs neither of which contains a alternating cycle, hence there exist linear extensions that reverse all the incomparable pairs in each of the sets. The remaining incomparable pairs can be reversed in one extra linear extension. Here we provide a shorter proof using a choice function, which gives the three linear extensions that realize the interval order directly.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be a twin-free interval order, and let  $\mathbf{I}$  be a distinguishing representation of  $\mathbf{P}$  which only consist of length 0 and 1 intervals. Let poset  $\mathbf{U} = (U, \mathbf{P}_U)$  be the subposet of  $\mathbf{P}$  consisting all the points represented by intervals of length 1 in  $\mathbf{I}$ , and  $\mathbf{D}$  be the subposet of  $\mathbf{P}$  consisting all the points represented by intervals of length 0 in  $I$ . Let  $D$  be the ground set of  $\mathbf{D}$ . For each element  $x \in D$ , use  $R_x$  to denote the unique real number in the interval representing  $x$ . Partition  $U$  into antichains  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_t$  by taking the minimal elements successively. It is easy to see that  $x < y$  in  $P$  for every  $x \in A_i, y \in A_{i+2}$ . Let  $A_{\text{odd}} = \{x \in U : x \in A_i \text{ for some } i \in [t] \text{ with } i \text{ odd}\}$ , and  $A_{\text{even}} = U - A_{\text{odd}}$ .

Let  $f_1, f_2$  be choice functions on  $\mathbf{I}$ , defined as follows.

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} l_x, & x \in A_{\text{odd}} \\ r_x, & x \in A_{\text{even}} \\ R_x, & x \in D \end{cases}$$

$$f_2(x) = \begin{cases} r_x, & x \in A_{\text{odd}} \\ l_x, & x \in A_{\text{even}} \\ R_x, & x \in D \end{cases}$$

Then, let  $L_1 = L(f_1), L_2 = L(f_2)$ , hence  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are both linear extensions of  $P$ . It is clear that each incomparable pair  $\{x, y\}$ , where  $x \in A_{\text{odd}}, y \in A_{\text{even}}$ , is reversed in the two linear extensions, as well as the incomparable pairs  $\{x, y\}$ , for which  $x \in U, y \in D$ . the only incomparable pairs need to be reversed are the ones that both of the points are in the same  $A_i$ , we can reverse all of them in:

$$L_3 = L_1^d(A_1) < L_1^d(A_2) < \dots < L_1^d(A_t).$$

Hence,  $\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$  is a realizer of  $\mathbf{P}$ . □

## 6. DIMENSION OF INTERVAL ORDERS WITH REPRESENTATION USING MULTIPLE POSITIVE LENGTHS

Let  $r, s > 0$ . Recall that  $C(\{r, s\})$  denotes the class of interval orders that have a representation, in which every interval is of length  $r$  or  $s$ . Rabinovitch [6] proved that the dimension of a semiorder is at most 3. Here, we prove the following bound on the dimension of posets in  $C(\{r, s\})$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{P} \in C(\{r, s\})$ . Then  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) \leq 5$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{P} \in C(\{r, s\})$ , and consider a representation of  $\mathbf{P}$ . We can partition  $\mathbf{P}$  into the union of 2 semiorders,  $\mathbf{S}_r$  and  $\mathbf{S}_s$ , which consist of intervals of length only  $r$  and  $s$ , respectively. Since the dimension of a semiorder is at most 3, apply Lemma 4.2 to conclude

$$\dim(P) \leq \max\{\dim(S_r), \dim(S_s)\} \leq 5.$$

□

Let  $f(r)$  be the maximum dimension of interval orders having a representation consisting of intervals of at most  $r$  different positive lengths. By partitioning the interval orders into the union of  $r$  different semiorders, then using similar techniques, we have the following bound for  $f(r)$ .

**Proposition 6.2.**  $f(r) \leq \lceil \lg r \rceil + 3$ .

If these bounds are tight is not known. Even for Proposition 6.1, the existence of an interval order in the class  $C(\{r, s\})$  of dimension 4 remains open.

## 7. DIMENSION OF INTERVAL ORDERS IN $C(\alpha)$

Recall that  $C(\alpha)$  is the family of posets that have a representation with intervals of lengths between 1 and  $\alpha$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{P} = (X, P)$  be a interval order with a representation such that each interval is of length 1 except for one interval, which is of length between 0 and 2 (inclusive). Then  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) \leq 3$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  has no duplicated holdings. By Theorem 3.2, it has a distinguishing representation; fix one of these. Let  $x_0$  be the interval whose length is not 1. Let  $m_0$  be the midpoint of  $x_0$ , and let  $A_0$  be the set of intervals that contain  $m_0$ . (See Figure 3.)

Let  $U_0 = \{x \in X : l_x > m_0\}$ , and let  $D_0 = \{x \in X : r_x < m_0\}$ . Let  $A_1$  be the set of minimal elements of  $U_0$ , and let  $U_i = U_{i-1} - A_i$ , where  $A_i$  is the set of minimal elements of  $U_{i-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Similarly, let  $B_1$  be the set of maximal elements of  $D_0$ , and let  $D_i = D_{i-1} - B_i$ , where  $B_i$  is the set of maximal elements of  $D_{i-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ . Hence we have a partition  $P_1$  of  $\mathbf{P}$ :  $B_s \cup \dots \cup B_1 \cup A_0 \cup A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_k$ .

For any elements  $x$  and  $y$ , where  $x \in A_0$ ,  $y \in A_2$ , we have  $x < y$  in  $P$ . Indeed, if  $y$  is in  $A_2$ , there must be an element  $w$  in  $A_1$ , such that,  $m_0 < l_w < r_w < l_y$ . Since  $w$  has length 1, we have  $l_y > m_0 + 1$ . And given that  $x_0$  has length between 0 and 2 inclusive with midpoint  $m_0$ , we have  $r_x \leq m_0 + 1 < l_y$ . By symmetry, it can be proved that  $x < y$  for every  $x \in B_2$ ,  $y \in A_0$ . In addition, from the property of semiorders,  $x < y$  for every  $x \in A_i$ ,  $y \in A_{i+2}$ , and for every  $x \in B_{j+2}$ ,  $y \in B_j$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 2$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, s - 2$ . Finally, for every  $x \in B_1$ ,  $y \in A_1$ , clearly  $x < y$  since  $r_x < m_0 < l_y$ .

Hence if we relabel the partition  $P_1$  from left to right to be  $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_n$ , we have  $x < y$  for every  $x \in A_i$ ,  $y \in A_{i+2}$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 2$ . Meanwhile each  $S_i$  is an antichain. Then, apply a similar method as the one in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Let  $f_1, f_2$  be choice functions on  $\mathbf{I}$ , which define as follows:

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} l_x, & x \in S_{\text{odd}} \\ r_x, & x \in S_{\text{even}} \end{cases}$$

$$f_2(x) = \begin{cases} r_x, & x \in S_{\text{odd}} \\ l_x, & x \in S_{\text{even}} \end{cases}$$

Let  $L_1 = L(f_1)$ ,  $L_2 = L(f_2)$ , and let  $L_3 = L_1^d(A_1) < L_1^d(A_2) < \dots < L_1^d(A_t)$ . Clearly  $\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$  is a realizer of  $\mathbf{P}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{P} \in C(2)$ . Then  $\dim(\mathbf{P}) \leq 4$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{P} \in C(2)$ , where  $\mathbf{P} = (X, P)$ . Fix a distinguishing representation of  $\mathbf{P}$ . We will think of the elements of  $\mathbf{P}$  as intervals, and we will use the notation  $l_x, r_x$  to denote the left and right endpoints of  $x$  in  $X$ , respectively.

We again apply the technique of partitioning the poset by successively removing minimal elements. To be precise, we let  $A_1$  be the set of minimal elements of  $X$ , and let  $P_1 = P(X - A_1)$ . We define  $A_i$  recursively as follows: assuming that  $A_{i-1}$






FIGURE 3.

and  $P_{i-1}$  is defined, we let  $A_i$  be the set of minimal elements of  $X_{i-1}$ , and we let  $X_i = X_{i-1} - A_i$ .

We will show that for all  $i$ ,  $A_i < A_{i+3}$ ; that is, whenever  $x \in A_i$  and  $y \in A_{i+3}$ , we have  $x < y$ .

Let  $i$  be a positive integer, and let  $x \in A_i$ ,  $y \in A_{i+3}$ . Since  $x \not\leq y$ , we just have to prove that  $x$  and  $y$  can not be incomparable. There exists  $z_2 \in A_{i+2}$  such that  $z_2 < y$ ; and so on,  $z_1 \in A_{i+1}$  with  $z_1 < z_2$ , and  $z_0 \in A_i$  with  $z_0 < z_1$ .

Note that

$$l_y > r_{z_2} \geq l_{z_2} + 1 > r_{z_1} + 1 \geq l_{z_1} + 2 > r_{z_0} + 2.$$

Since  $z_0, x \in A_i$ , we have  $z_0 \parallel x$ , so  $l_x \leq r_{z_0}$ . From these we conclude that  $l_y > l_x + 2$ . If  $x \parallel y$ , then  $r_x \geq l_y$ , which would make the length of  $x$  more than 2. So we conclude  $x < y$ , as desired.

We define three linear extensions with choice functions that reverses most critical pairs. Let the choice functions  $f_0, f_1, f_2$  be defined by

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} r_x, & x \in A_j \text{ with } j \equiv i \pmod{3} \\ l_x, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  be the linear extensions defined by these choice functions.

If  $x \parallel y$ , and  $x \in A_i, y \in A_j$  with  $i \neq j$ , then  $l_x < l_y \leq r_x$ , which means that they will appear in both order in one of  $L_1, L_2, L_3$ . So we only need to reverse critical pairs that appear in a single  $A_i$ . This can be done with one extra linear extension:

$$L_4 = L_1^d(A_1) < L_1^d(A_2) < \dots < L_1^d(A_i).$$

□

It is open whether there is a poset in  $C(2)$  that is actually four-dimensional. It feels unlikely that the addition of all numbers between 1 and 2 as possible lengths would not increase the dimension from semiorders, but finding a four dimensional poset in  $C(2)$  has resisted our efforts.

Recall  $C[\alpha, \beta]$  denote the class of interval orders that can be represented with intervals of lengths in the range  $[\alpha, \beta]$ . Note that  $C(\alpha) = C[1, \alpha]$ . Use  $f(C[\alpha, \beta])$  to denote the least upper bound of the dimension of posets in the class  $C[\alpha, \beta]$ . We just proved that  $f(C[1, 2]) \leq 4$ .

**Theorem 7.3.** *For  $t \geq 2$ ,  $f(C(t)) = f(C[1, t]) \leq 2\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil + 4$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $n = 2^{\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil}$ . Since  $n \geq t$ , it is clear that  $f(C[1, t]) \leq f(C[1, n])$ . We will show by induction that  $f(C[1, n]) \leq 2\lceil \lg \lg n \rceil + 4 = 2\lg \lg n + 4$ .

For  $n = 2$ , the statement reduces to Theorem 7.2. Let  $n > 2$  be an integer. Note that in this case  $\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil \geq 1$ , so  $n \geq 4$  and a square. Let  $m = \sqrt{n} = 2^{\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil - 1}$ . If  $\mathbf{P} \in C[1, n]$ , then we can partition intervals of a representation of  $\mathbf{P}$  into “short” intervals of length at most  $m$ , and “long” intervals of length at least  $m$ . (Intervals of length  $m$ , if any, can be placed arbitrarily.) By Lemma 4.2, Observation 3.1, and the hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} f(C[1, n]) &\leq \max\{f(C[1, m]), f(C[m, n])\} + 2 = f(C[1, m]) + 2 \leq \\ &2(\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil - 1) + 4 + 2 = 2\lceil \lg \lg t \rceil + 4. \end{aligned}$$

□

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. C. Fishburn and R. L. Graham. Classes of interval graphs under expanding length restrictions. *J. Graph Theory*, 9(4):459–472, 1985.
- [2] Peter C. Fishburn. Intransitive indifference with unequal indifference intervals. *J. Mathematical Psychology*, 7:144–149, 1970.
- [3] Mitchel T. Keller, Ann N. Trenk, and Stephen J. Young. Dimension of restricted classes of interval orders. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.08294>, 2020.
- [4] H. A. Kierstead and W. T. Trotter. Interval orders and dimension. *Discrete Math.*, 213:179–188, 2000.
- [5] I. Rabinovitch. An upper bound on the dimension of interval orders. *J. Comb. Theory A* 25, pages 68–71, 1978.
- [6] I. Rabinovitch. The dimension of semiorders. *J. Comb. Theory A*, 25:50–61, 1987.
- [7] D. Scott and P. Suppers. Foundational aspects of theories of measurement. *J. Symb. Logic*, 23:113–128, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISVILLE, KY 40292, USA  
*Email address:* csaba.biro@louisville.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISVILLE, KY 40292, USA  
*Email address:* sida.wan@louisville.edu