

# Point-hyperplane incidence geometry and the log-rank conjecture

Noah Singer\*

Madhu Sudan†

May 3, 2021

## Abstract

We study the log-rank conjecture from the perspective of incidence geometry and present a reformulation as well as a strengthening. The reformulation involves point sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that are covered in many ways by constant sized sets of parallel hyperplanes. We show that the log-rank conjecture is equivalent to the implication that all such configurations contain a subspace that accounts for a large fraction of the incidences, in the sense of containing a large fraction of the points and being contained in a large fraction of the hyperplanes. In other words the log-rank conjecture is equivalent to asserting that the point-hyperplane incidence graph for such configurations has a large complete bipartite subgraph. The strengthening of the log-rank conjecture comes from relaxing the requirements that the set of hyperplanes be parallel.

Motivated by the connections above we revisit some well-studied questions in point-hyperplane incidence geometry and present some improvements. We give a simple probabilistic argument for the existence of complete bipartite subgraphs of density  $\Omega(\epsilon^{2d}/d)$  in any  $d$ -dimensional configuration with incidence density  $\epsilon$ , matching previously known results qualitatively. We also improve an upper-bound construction of Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07] yielding a configuration whose complete bipartite subgraphs are exponentially small and whose incidence density is  $\Omega(1/\sqrt{d})$ .

---

\*Harvard College. [noahsinger@college.harvard.edu](mailto:noahsinger@college.harvard.edu). Work supported by the Herchel Smith Fellowship.

†School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University. [madhu@cs.harvard.edu](mailto:madhu@cs.harvard.edu). Supported in part by a Simons Investigator Award and NSF Award CCF 1715187.

# 1 Introduction

In this work we present some questions in incidence geometry motivated by the “log-rank conjecture” in communication complexity. We also describe some mild progress on the incidence-geometric questions. We start with some background on communication complexity and incidence geometry.

## 1.1 Motivation: Communication complexity and the log-rank conjecture

The (*deterministic*) *communication complexity* of a (two-party) function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , as defined by Yao [Yao79], measures how much communication is needed for two cooperating parties, one knowing  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and the other knowing  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , to jointly determine  $f(x, y)$ . The (deterministic) communication complexity  $\text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f)$  is the minimum over all communication protocols that compute  $f(x, y)$  of the maximum communication over all pairs  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ .

Every function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  corresponds naturally to a Boolean matrix  $M_f$ , with rows indexed by  $\mathcal{X}$  and columns by  $\mathcal{Y}$ , where  $(M_f)_{x,y} = f(x, y)$ . Given a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we can define its *rank*  $\text{rank}(f)$  as the rank of  $M_f$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is a linear-algebraic measure of  $f$ 's complexity. This leads to a natural question: How is  $\text{rank}(f)$  connected to  $\text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f)$ ?

A *monochromatic rectangle* for a function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a pair  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$  such that  $f(a, b)$  is constant over all  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . A  $c$ -bit communication protocol partitions the space  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  into a disjoint union of at most  $2^c$  monochromatic rectangles. Since monochromatic rectangles correspond to rank-1 matrices,  $\log_2(\text{rank}(f)) \leq \text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f)$  [MS82]. The *log-rank conjecture* of Lovász and Saks [LS88] posits a converse up to a polynomial factor; that is:

**Conjecture 1.1** (Log-rank conjecture [LS88]). *For any function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,*

$$\text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f) \leq \text{polylog}(\text{rank}(f)).$$

This conjecture is a central open question in communication complexity. Currently, the best known bound for arbitrary  $f$  is due to Lovett [Lov16], who showed that

$$\text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f) \leq O\left(\sqrt{\text{rank}(f)} \log(\text{rank}(f))\right).$$

The log-rank conjecture asserts that every low rank Boolean matrix can be partitioned into a small number of monochromatic rectangles. An obviously necessary condition for this is the presence of a large monochromatic rectangle. A result due to Nisan and Wigderson [NW95] shows that this is in fact also a sufficient condition. Specifically, define the *size* of a rectangle  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  as  $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}|$ . Nisan and Wigderson established the following:

**Theorem 1.2** ([NW95], as articulated in [Lov16]). *Suppose that there exists some function  $\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that the following is true: For any Boolean function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,  $f$  contains a monochromatic rectangle of size at least  $|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| \cdot 2^{-\gamma(\text{rank}(f))}$ . Then for any Boolean function  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,*

$$\text{CC}_{\text{det}}(f) \leq O\left(\log^2(\text{rank}(f)) + \sum_{i=0}^{\log(\text{rank}(f))} \gamma\left(\frac{r}{2^i}\right)\right).$$

In particular, proving that the hypothesis of this theorem holds with  $\gamma(d) = \text{polylog}(d)$  would suffice to prove the log-rank conjecture (Conjecture 1.1).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This reduction is tight in a strong sense: A  $c$ -bit protocol for  $f$  partitions  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  into  $\leq 2^c$  monochromatic rectangles, one of which must have size at least  $|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| \cdot 2^{-c}$ .

## 1.2 Background: Incidence geometry

In this section, we give various definitions and notations that we will use throughout the rest of the paper. These will be linked with the log-rank conjecture in §2.

In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , a *hyperplane* is the locus of points  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  defined by an equation of the form  $\langle a, x \rangle = b$ , for some  $a \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . We refer to the vector  $a$  as the *normal vector* of  $h$  and  $b$  as its *offset* (denoted  $b(h)$ ); a hyperplane is *homogeneous* if it has offset zero. A pair of hyperplanes  $h, h'$  are *parallel* if for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  we have  $a = ca'$  (where  $h$  and  $h'$  are defined by  $\langle a, x \rangle = b$  and  $\langle a', x \rangle = b'$ , respectively).

A point  $p$  and a hyperplane  $h$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are *incident* if  $p$  lies on  $h$ ; we call the pair  $(p, h)$  an *incidence* (and say  $p$  is *incident to*  $h$  and vice versa). We refer to a collection  $\mathcal{P}$  of points together with a collection  $\mathcal{H}$  of hyperplanes (in the same ambient space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ) as a *configuration*. Configurations determine an *incidence graph*  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ , an (unweighted, undirected) bipartite graph defined as follows: The left vertices are the points  $\mathcal{P}$ , the right vertices are the hyperplanes  $\mathcal{H}$ , and the edge  $(p, h)$  is included iff  $p$  is incident to  $h$ . Following Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07], we denote by  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  the total number of incidences between  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  (equiv., the number of edges in  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ ) and by  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  the largest number of edges in any complete bipartite subgraph of  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ ; the reader may verify the equivalent characterization that

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) = \max_{S \text{ affine subspace } \subset \mathbb{R}^d} (|\{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \text{ lies on } S\}| \cdot |\{h \in \mathcal{H} : S \text{ lies on } h\}|).^2$$

Let  $|\mathcal{P}| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{H}| = m$ ; we refer to the ratios  $\frac{I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})}{mn}$  and  $\frac{\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})}{mn}$  as the *incidence* and *bipartite subgraph densities* of the configuration  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ , respectively.

## 1.3 Contributions

The rank of a matrix has a natural incidence-geometric interpretation: Given a matrix of rank  $d$  every row corresponds to a point in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and every column to a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and the entry of the matrix determines how much one needs to shift the hyperplane so that it contains the point. The hope that there is a large monochromatic rectangle in a matrix translates in this interpretation to the hope that there is a large bipartite subgraph in the point-hyperplane incidence graph, or equivalently that there is an affine subspace that is contained in many hyperplanes and contains many points. Moreover, the fact that the matrices under consideration are Boolean matrices implies that these point-hyperplane configurations have an unusually large density of incidences (specifically 50% of the point-hyperplane pairs are incident!). One could ask if simply the high density of incidences suffices to imply the existence of a large bipartite subgraph (of density  $2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$  in  $d$  dimensions). This is known to be false and a construction of Lovett [Lov16] is a counterexample.<sup>3</sup>

In view of this we ask what additional properties of the point-hyperplane configurations could potentially lead to the presence of a large bipartite subgraph. Building on unpublished work of Golovnev, Meka, Sudan and Velusamy [Gol+19], we note that Boolean matrices lead to configurations where the hyperplanes can be partitioned into *pairs* of parallel hyperplanes such that each pair *covers* the set of points. This leads to a easy reformulation of the log-rank conjecture (Conjecture 2.5). We extend this formulation to the notion of *parallel  $k$ -partitions* (see Definition 2.1) that allow the sets of hyperplanes to be partitioned into sets of size  $k$  for an arbitrary constant  $k$ . Informally our first theorem here is the  $k$ -parallel partitionable configurations have large bipartite

<sup>2</sup>The original motivation for the notation  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ :  $r$  refers to the quantity  $|\{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \text{ lies on } S\}|$  and  $s$  refers to the quantity  $|\{h \in \mathcal{H} : S \text{ lies on } h\}|$ ;  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  maximizes the product  $rs$  over all affine subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

<sup>3</sup>Though admittedly the authors were not aware of this at earlier stages of this writing [SS21]; see §5.

subgraphs in their incidence graphs if (and only) if the log-rank conjecture holds (see Theorem 2.11 for a quantitatively precise version). We note that the notion of parallel  $k$ -partitions also has a simple linear-algebraic analogue, which we refer to as  $k$ -listability: A matrix is  $k$ -listable if and only if every column has at most  $k$  distinct entries (though these sets may differ arbitrarily across columns). Hence by our theorem, in terms of  $k$ -listable matrices, the log-rank conjecture asserts that every  $k$ -listable matrix contains a large 1-listable submatrix (see Conjecture 2.7).

We believe that the *covering* aspect of the point-hyperplane incidences is a key element of the log-rank conjecture and posit an extension (which does not immediately seem to be equivalent to the log-rank conjecture, nor does it seem to have a simple linear-algebraic formulation). Specifically in Conjecture 2.8 we suggest that if a set of hyperplanes can be partitioned (in a not-necessarily-parallel way) into blocks of size at most  $k$  such that each covers a given set of points then the incidence graph corresponding to this configuration has a large bipartite subgraph.

Returning to the more basic question of the incidence density of a configuration versus the size of its largest bipartite subgraph, we present two results that improve the state of the art. Our first result here (Theorem 3.1) is a lower bound on the size of large bipartite subgraph in incidence graphs of constant density. Specifically in §3, we give a self-contained probabilistic argument that for  $\mathcal{P}$  a set of  $n$  points and  $\mathcal{H}$  a collection of  $m$  hyperplanes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for incidence density  $\epsilon = I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn$ , we must have  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega(mn \cdot \epsilon^{2d}/d)$ .<sup>4</sup> (Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07] proved, using substantial incidence-geometric machinery, the bound  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega_d(mn \cdot \epsilon^{d-1})$ , but did not explicitly analyze the dimension-dependent constant.)

On the flip side, in Theorem 4.1 we give an explicit construction which has  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \leq O(mn \cdot 2^{-O(d)})$ ; however,  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) = \Theta(mn \cdot 1/\sqrt{d})$ . Since the incidence density of this construction is not constant, it is too small to falsify the most general conjecture (Conjecture 2.9), which posits that if the incidence density is constant, there is a somewhat large bipartite subgraph. Theorem 4.1 is proven by modifying a lattice-based construction of Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07] using probabilistic techniques, in order to gain a factor of  $\sqrt{d}$  in  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ . (That is, Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07]’s construction has only  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) = \Theta(mn/d)$ . Other explicit constructions, discussed in §5, have  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega(mn)$  but only achieve  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \leq O(mn \cdot 2^{-O(\sqrt{d})})$  [Lov16; Lov21; Pál21; FW21].)

## 1.4 Organization of the rest of the paper

In §2, we introduce new notions (partitions and parallel partitions) which describe covering structures of point-hyperplane configurations, and using these properties, describe our various incidence-geometric conjectures which relax the log-rank conjecture (Conjecture 1.1). We also prove that some of them (specifically, Conjecture 2.7) are in fact equivalent to the log-rank conjecture. §3 gives our exponential lower-bound on bipartite subgraph density (Theorem 3.1) and §4 gives our exponential upper-bound on bipartite subgraph density when the incidence density is  $\Theta(1/\sqrt{d})$  (Theorem 4.1).

Finally, in §5, we report on constructions (specifically describing the one due to Pálvölgyi [Pál21]) which demonstrate that  $O(\sqrt{d})$  is the best possible exponent in Conjecture 2.9. These constructions arise from products of Boolean matrices, and we pose special cases of our general conjectures for these types of matrices as interesting variants. We conclude this section with some discussion.

---

<sup>4</sup>This also provides a simple proof of the incidence-geometric fact that, fixing  $d$  and  $\epsilon$ , we have  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega_{\epsilon,d}(mn)$ ; as observed by Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07, p. 3], this behavior is not present in random bipartite graphs with edge density  $\epsilon$ , even with  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ .

## 1.5 Notation

We follow notation which is mostly derived from Apfelbaum and Sharir’s work [AS07].  $\mathcal{P}$  denotes a set of points and  $\mathcal{H}$  a set of hyperplanes, and  $n = |\mathcal{P}|$  and  $m = |\mathcal{H}|$ .<sup>5</sup> In real space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , a  $j$ -flat is a  $j$ -dimensional affine subspace. Hence, a point is a 0-flat and a hyperplane is a  $(d - 1)$ -flat. A configuration  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  of points and hyperplanes determine a point-hyperplane *incidence graph*  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ , which is a bipartite graph with left-vertex set  $\mathcal{P}$ , right-vertex set  $\mathcal{H}$ , and with an edge  $(p, h)$  iff  $p$  is incident to  $h$ .  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  denotes the total number of incidences between  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  (which is equal to the number of edges in  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ ).  $rs(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is the largest number of edges in any complete bipartite subgraph of  $G(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ .

We employ standard asymptotic notation; we use subscripts to denote arbitrary dependence on implicit constants, e.g.,  $f \leq O_{z_1, \dots, z_k}(g)$  implies that there exists a constant  $C$ , depending arbitrarily on  $z_1, \dots, z_k$ , such that  $f(x) \leq Cg(x)$  for sufficiently large  $x$ . We use  $f \leq \tilde{O}(g)$  to denote “ $f \leq O(g \cdot \text{polylog}(g))$ ”. We use  $[n]$  to denote the set of integers  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

A *submatrix* of or *rectangle* in a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$  is given by two subsets  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$  and denoted  $M|_{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}$ . We use these terms interchangeably.

## 2 Incidence-geometric reformulations of the log-rank conjecture

In this section we present some reformulations of the log-rank conjecture in terms of incidence geometric questions. The conjectures start with some unpublished work of Golovnev, Meka, Sudan and Velusamy [Gol+19] who raised Conjecture 2.5 below explicitly and also went on to propose a stronger form of Conjecture 2.9 (which was [SS21, Conjecture 5]). The latter turns out to be false (and this was already known — see [Lov16] and §5), and so we propose several new variants here and prove some equivalences.

### 2.1 The “original” reformulation

To begin, we introduce new notions of structured point-hyperplane configurations.

**Definition 2.1** (Parallel  $k$ -partition). *Let  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be a point-hyperplane configuration. A parallel  $k$ -partition for  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is a partition of  $\mathcal{H}$  into disjoint blocks  $\mathcal{H}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{H}_\ell$  of size  $k$  such that (1) within each block  $\mathcal{H}_i$ , the hyperplanes are all mutually parallel, and (2) for each block  $\mathcal{H}_i$  and point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $p$  is incident to one of the hyperplanes of  $\mathcal{H}_i$ .*

We can also relax the requirement of parallelism:

**Definition 2.2** ( $k$ -partition). *Let  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be a point-hyperplane configuration. A  $k$ -partition for  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is a partition of  $\mathcal{H}$  into disjoint blocks  $\mathcal{H}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{H}_\ell$  of size  $k$  such that for each block  $\mathcal{H}_i$  and point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $p$  is incident to at least one of the hyperplanes of  $\mathcal{H}_i$ .*

Note that every parallel  $k$ -partition is a  $k$ -partition, and any  $k$ -partitionable configuration has incidence density at least  $1/k$ .

Next, we define properties of matrices which we will soon show are analogous to parallel  $k$ -partitionability:

**Definition 2.3** ( $k$ -listability and  $k$ -arity). *A matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is  $k$ -listable if every column of  $M$  contains at most  $k$  distinct entries. Moreover, it is  $k$ -ary if  $M$  contains at most  $k$  total distinct entries.*

---

<sup>5</sup>Our use of  $n$  to denote the number of points and  $m$  to denote the number of hyperplanes is opposite to Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07]. Also, Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07] use  $\Pi$  instead of  $\mathcal{H}$  to denote the hyperplane-set.

Note that 1-listability is equivalent to every column being constant, and that  $k$ -arity implies  $k$ -listability.

Parallel  $k$ -partitioned configurations correspond in a natural way to  $k$ -listable matrices. Next, we describe this correspondence by defining a matrix associated with every configuration, and conversely, a configuration associated with every matrix.

Given a configuration  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  of  $n$  points and  $m$  hyperplanes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with a parallel  $k$ -partition  $\mathcal{H}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{H}_\ell$ , let  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be the  $n \times m$ , rank- $d$  matrix defined as follows: Let  $p_i$  be the  $i$ -th point in  $\mathcal{P}$  and let  $a_j$  be the unit normal vector corresponding to the hyperplanes in block  $\mathcal{H}_j$ . Then the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is  $\langle p_i, a_j \rangle$ .

Now we describe the configuration  $\text{Con}(M)$  associated with a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  of rank  $d$ . Let  $M = PQ$  where  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ . Let  $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the rows of  $P$  and let  $q_1, \dots, q_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denote the columns of  $Q$ . For  $j \in [m]$  let  $B_j$  denote the set of distinct entries in column  $j$  of  $M$ . For  $b \in B_j$ , define  $h_j^b$  as the hyperplane determined by the equation  $\langle x, q_j \rangle = b$  over  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We define the configuration

$$\text{Con}(M) := (\{p_i : i \in [n]\}, \{h_j^b : j \in [m], b \in B_j\}).$$

The basic facts about the correspondence between matrices and configurations are summarized in Proposition 2.4 below. Given a set  $\mathcal{H}$  of hyperplanes, define the *offset set*  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  as  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) := \{b(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** *1. If  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is a parallel  $k$ -partitioned configuration, then  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is  $k$ -listable and  $|\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})|$ -ary and has rank  $\leq |\mathcal{H}|$ .*

*2. If a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  is  $k$ -listable and  $k'$ -ary and has rank  $d$ , then  $\text{Con}(M)$  has a parallel  $k$ -partition,  $|\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(M))| \leq k'$ , and  $\text{Con}(M)$  contains  $dk$  hyperplanes.*

*3. If  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is a parallel  $k$ -partitioned configuration, then  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  has a 1-listable submatrix of size at least  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  (and hence a monochromatic rectangle of size at least  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/|\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})|$ ).*

*4. If  $M$  has a monochromatic rectangle of size  $r$ , then  $\text{rs}(\text{Con}(M)) \geq r$ .*

The proofs follows immediately from the definitions and so we omit them. According to this correspondence and Proposition 2.4, the following conjecture is equivalent to Conjecture 1.1:

**Conjecture 2.5** (Parallel 2-partitioned configurations have large bipartite subgraphs [Gol+19]). *In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be a parallel 2-partitioned configuration with  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) = \{0, 1\}$ . Then*

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}.$$

**Theorem 2.6.** *Conjecture 1.1 holds if and only if Conjecture 2.5 does.*

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Given any parallel 2-partitioned configuration  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we may assemble the matrix  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ . By Proposition 2.4,  $\text{rank}(\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})) \leq d$  and  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  is binary, i.e.,  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  has two distinct entries,  $a$  and  $b$ . Letting  $\widetilde{M} := (\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) - a)/(b - a)$ , we have  $\text{rank}(\widetilde{M}) = \text{rank}(\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}))$  (since neither subtracting a constant nor rescaling changes rank). Assuming the log-rank conjecture, by the converse to Theorem 1.2,  $\widetilde{M}$  has a monochromatic rectangle of size  $\geq |\mathcal{P}||\mathcal{H}| \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ ; hence so does  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ , so by Proposition 2.4,  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq |\mathcal{P}||\mathcal{H}| \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ . ( $\impliedby$ ) Given any binary matrix  $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$  of rank at most  $d$ , we may form the configuration  $\text{Con}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , which has by Proposition 2.4 a parallel 2-partition and  $2m$  hyperplanes. Assuming Conjecture 2.5,  $\text{rs}(\text{Con}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})) \geq 2mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ . Hence by Proposition 2.4 again,  $M$  contains a monochromatic rectangle of size at least  $mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ , which suffices by Theorem 1.2 to prove the log-rank conjecture.  $\square$

## 2.2 Relaxations of Conjecture 2.5

We could hope to relax the structure we require in Conjecture 2.5, to only require the presence of a parallel partition of fixed size:

**Conjecture 2.7** (Parallel partitioned configurations have large bipartite subgraphs). *The following is true for every fixed integer  $k > 1$ . In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be a configuration with a parallel  $k$ -partition. Then*

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}.$$

*Equivalently, by Proposition 2.4, all  $k$ -listable matrices  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  contain 1-listable submatrices of size at least  $mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ .*

We will show in §2.3 that Conjecture 2.7 is actually equivalent to Conjecture 2.5 (and thus to the log-rank conjecture). Next, we could relax the *parallel* requirement of partition:

**Conjecture 2.8** (Partitioned configurations have large bipartite subgraphs). *The following is true for every fixed integer  $k > 1$ . In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  be a configuration with a  $k$ -partition. Then*

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}.$$

Ultimately, we might hope to drop the partitioning requirement entirely, and conjecture that for every collection  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$  points and  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $m$  hyperplanes, as long as  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \epsilon mn$  for some fixed constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq mn \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ . Indeed the previous version of this paper [SS21] contained such a conjecture, but this is unfortunately known to be false [Lov16; Lov21; Pál21; FW21]; see §5. The strongest possible version of such a statement that may yet turn out to be true is the following conjecture (which is roughly an incidence-geometric restatement of [Lov16, Conjecture 5.1]):

**Conjecture 2.9** (Configurations with incidence density  $\Omega(1)$  have somewhat large bipartite subgraphs). *The following is true for every fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ . In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a collection of  $n$  points and  $\mathcal{H}$  a collection of  $m$  hyperplanes, such that  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \epsilon \cdot mn$ . Then*

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq mn \cdot 2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}.$$

We note that Conjecture 2.9 is too weak to prove the log-rank conjecture (Conjecture 1.1). It would, however, yield a result roughly matching the current best upper bound, due to Lovett [Lov16], on communication complexity as a function of the rank (up to some logarithmic factors).

## 2.3 Equivalence of Conjecture 2.5 and 2.7

In this section, we show that Conjecture 2.7 is implied by Conjecture 2.5.

**Lemma 2.10** (Folklore). *If  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  has rank  $d$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{R}[X]$  is a real polynomial, then the matrix  $N$  given by  $N_{ij} = p(M_{ij})$  for every  $(i, j) \in [n] \times [m]$  has rank at most  $\sum_{c \in S(p)} d^c$ , where  $S(p) := \{c \geq 0 : p \text{ contains a nonzero monomial of degree } c\}$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that rank is subadditive: If  $A$  and  $B$  are matrices, then  $\text{rank}(A + B) \leq \text{rank}(A) + \text{rank}(B)$ . Hence it suffices to show that for any  $c$ , the matrix  $N$  given by  $N_{ij} = M_{ij}^c$  has rank at most  $d^c$ .

If  $M$  has rank  $d$ , we can write  $M = PQ$  for some  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ ; let  $p_i$  and  $q_j$  denote the  $i$ -th row of  $P$  and the  $j$ -th column of  $Q$ , respectively. We have  $M_{ij} = \langle p_i, q_j \rangle$  by definition. Then let

$p'_i := p_i^{\otimes c}$ , i.e., the  $c$ -fold self-tensor product of  $p_i$ , which is the  $d^c$ -dimensional vector whose entries correspond to products of each possible sequence of  $c$  elements of  $p_i$ . Similarly, let  $q'_j := q_j^{\otimes c}$ . Hence we have

$$N_{ij} = M_{ij}^c = \langle p_i, q_j \rangle^c = \left( \sum_{k=1}^d p_{i,k} q_{j,k} \right)^c = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_c \in [d]} p_{i,k_1} q_{j,k_1} \cdots p_{i,k_c} q_{j,k_c} = \langle p'_i, q'_j \rangle,$$

where  $p_{i,k}$  and  $q_{j,k}$  denote the  $k$ -th entries of  $p_i$  and  $q_j$ , respectively. Hence letting  $P' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d^c}$  be the matrix whose  $i$ -th row is  $p'_i$  and  $Q' \in \mathbb{R}^{d^c \times m}$  be the matrix whose  $j$ -th column is  $q'_j$ , we have  $N = P'Q'$ , so  $N$  has rank at most  $d^c$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.11.** *If the log-rank conjecture holds (in the form of Conjecture 2.5), then Conjecture 2.7 holds. In particular, assuming Conjecture 2.5, for all integers  $k > 2$ , there exists a polynomial  $p_k$  such that the following is true. Every  $k$ -listable, rank- $d$  matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  has a 1-listable submatrix  $M' \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times m'}$  of size  $m'n' \geq mn \cdot 2^{-p_k(\log d)}$ .*

*Proof.* Firstly, we argue that it is enough to prove the theorem only for matrices  $M$  which (1) have no 1-listable (i.e., constant) columns and (2) contain a 0 and 1 in every column. Firstly, we reduce to the case where (1) holds: If at least half of  $M$ 's columns are 1-listable, then we immediately have a 1-listable submatrix of  $M$  containing all the rows and at least half the columns. Otherwise, we may throw out all the 1-listable columns, thereby reducing the total number of columns by at most half. Next, we reduce to the case where (2) holds as well. Since (1) holds, we can let  $\{a_j, b_j\}_{j \in [m]}$  with  $a_j \neq b_j$  be such that  $j$ -th column of  $M$  contains  $a_j$  and  $b_j$ . Let  $A$  be the rank-1 matrix in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  with column  $j$  being the constant vector  $(a_j, \dots, a_j)$ . Let  $D$  be the  $m \times m$  diagonal matrix with  $(j, j)$ -th entry being  $1/(b_j - a_j)$ . Now let  $N := (M - A)D$ . Then  $\text{rank}(N) \leq \text{rank}(M - A) \leq d + 1$  by subadditivity of rank, and moreover every column of  $N$  contains some 0 entry and some 1 entry. And proving the theorem for  $N$  immediately implies the theorem for  $M$ , since if  $S \subseteq [n], T \subseteq [m]$  are such that  $N|_{S \times T}$  is a 1-listable submatrix of  $N$ , then  $(N + AD)|_{S \times T}$  is 1-listable and hence so is  $M|_{S \times T}$ .

Now, we will prove the theorem by induction on  $k$ . The  $k = 2$  case is implied by the log-rank conjecture (Conjecture 1.1), since if every column of  $M$  is 2-listable and contains a 0 and 1,  $M$  is precisely a Boolean matrix. (Let  $p_2$  be the polynomial given by the log-rank conjecture.)

For general  $k$ , assume the theorem holds for  $k - 1$ , and let  $p_k(x)$  satisfy  $p_k(x) \geq p_{k-1}(\log((2^x + 1)(2^x + 2))) + p_2(x)$  for all  $x \geq 1$  (e.g.,  $p_k(x) = p_{k-1}((x + 1)^2) + p_2(x)$  will do). For an arbitrary  $k$ -listable, rank- $d$  matrix  $M$  with a 0 and a 1 in every column, let  $\widetilde{M}$  be the matrix with  $\widetilde{M}_{ij} := M_{ij}(M_{ij} - 1)$ .  $\widetilde{M}$  has rank at most  $(d + 1)(d + 2)$  by Lemma 2.10. Also  $\widetilde{M}$  is  $(k - 1)$ -listable (since 0 and 1s of  $M$  became 0 in  $\widetilde{M}$ ). So by induction there is a submatrix of  $\widetilde{M}$  given by rows  $S$  and columns  $T$  such that  $\widetilde{M}|_{S \times T}$  is 1-listable, and  $|S||T| \geq mn \cdot 2^{p_{k-1}(\log(d+1)(d+2))}$ . Now  $M|_{S \times T}$  is 2-listable, and moreover,  $\text{rank}(M|_{S \times T}) \leq \text{rank}(M) = d$  (since the rank of a submatrix never exceeds the original matrix's rank). We thus conclude, now using the base case  $k = 2$ , that there exist  $S' \subseteq S$  and  $T' \subseteq T$  with  $M|_{S' \times T'}$  being 1-listable and  $|S'||T'| \geq |S||T| \cdot 2^{-p_2(\log d)}$ . Combining the above we have  $|S'||T'| \geq mn \cdot 2^{-p_2(\log d)} \cdot 2^{-p_{k-1}(\log(d+1)(d+2))} \geq 2^{-p_k(\log d)}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Exponential lower bound on bipartite subgraph density using probabilistic method

We use the probabilistic method to prove the following:



**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  be a set of  $n$  points and  $m$  hyperplanes, respectively, in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , such that  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \epsilon mn$ . If  $n$  is sufficiently large (in particular, if  $\frac{\epsilon^d}{2}n > 1$ ), then*

$$\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon^{2d}}{d}mn\right).$$

We rely on the following standard fact, which the reader may verify:

**Proposition 3.2.** *In  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $S$  be a  $j$ -flat and  $h$  a hyperplane. Suppose that  $S \cap h \supsetneq \emptyset$  and  $h \not\supset S$ . Then  $S \cap h$  is a  $(j-1)$ -flat.*

That is, the operation of “nontrivial intersection with a hyperplane” reduces the dimension of a flat by one.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Consider the following randomized process for choosing an affine subspace  $S$ : Select  $H_1, \dots, H_d$  uniformly from  $\mathcal{H}$ , and output  $S := H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_d$ . Let **manypoints** denote the event that  $\Pr_{p \sim \mathcal{P}}[p \in S] \geq \frac{\epsilon^d}{2}$ . For  $j \in [d]$ , let **badplane<sub>j</sub>** denote the event that both  $\Pr_{h \sim \mathcal{H}}[h \supseteq H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_{j-1}] \geq \frac{\epsilon^d}{3d}$  and  $H_j \not\supseteq H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_{j-1}$ . (In the case  $j = 1$ , we define the empty intersection as all of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , so that **badplane<sub>1</sub>** never occurs.) Intuitively, **badplane<sub>j</sub>** represents the event that  $H_j$  is a bad choice of a new hyperplane, because a random hyperplane  $h$  is not likely to reduce the dimension of the intersection while  $H_j$  does.

By the union bound, since  $\epsilon \leq 1$ , we know that the probability of the event “either **manypoints** doesn’t occur or **badplane<sub>j</sub>** occurs for some  $j$ ” is at most  $1 - \frac{\epsilon^d}{6} < 1$ . Hence, there exists a list of hyperplanes  $h_1, \dots, h_d$  such that **manypoints** occurs and none of the events **badplane<sub>j</sub>** occur. But it cannot be the case that for all  $j$ ,  $h_j \not\supseteq h_1 \cap \dots \cap h_{j-1}$ , since then Proposition 3.2 implies that  $S$  is either a point or empty, so **manypoints** cannot occur by assumption. Hence for some  $j$ ,  $\Pr_{h \sim \mathcal{H}}[h \supseteq h_1 \cap \dots \cap h_{j-1}] \geq \frac{\epsilon^d}{3d}$ , and correspondingly,  $\Pr_{h \sim \mathcal{H}}[h \supseteq S] \geq \frac{\epsilon^d}{3d}$ . Hence  $S$  is incident to at least  $\frac{\epsilon^d}{2}n$  points and  $\frac{\epsilon^d}{3d}m$  hyperplanes, as desired.  $\square$

## 4 Explicit upper bound construction with exponentially small bipartite subgraphs but sub-constant incidence density

In this section, we present a lattice-based explicit upper bound construction, which modifies an upper bound construction of Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07, Theorem 1.3] (itself based on ideas from Elekes and Tóth [ET05]). We construct configurations  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$  of points and hyperplanes with exponentially small bipartite subgraphs (i.e.,  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn \leq O(2^{-d})$ ). Such configurations would *almost* be a counterexample to Conjecture 2.9, except that the fraction of incidences  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn = \Theta(1/\sqrt{d})$  vanishes as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ , whereas a counterexample to Conjecture 2.9 would need  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn \geq \Omega(1)$ .

Our result is as follows:

**Theorem 4.1.** *For every  $d > 0$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$  points and a set  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $m$  hyperplanes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \Omega(nm/\sqrt{d})$  and  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \leq O(mn \cdot 2^{-d}/\sqrt{d})$ .*

The only difference between Theorem 4.1 and Apfelbaum and Sharir’s result [AS07, Theorem 1.3] is the gain of a  $\sqrt{d}$  factor in the lower bound on  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ , which will be achieved by exhibiting a dense subset of Apfelbaum and Sharir’s construction (see Claim 4.5 below).

Specifically, we will construct configurations with  $n = \Theta(2^d \sqrt{d})$  points,  $m = \Theta(2^d)$  hyperplanes,  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) = \Theta(2^{2d})$  incidences, and a bipartite subgraph upper bound  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \leq O(2^d)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Assume for simplicity that  $d - 1$  is a perfect square which is divisible by 4. Consider the set of points

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_d) : x_1, \dots, x_{d-1} \in \{0, 1\}, x_d \in \left\{ \frac{d-1}{4} - \sqrt{d-1}, \dots, \frac{d-1}{4} + \sqrt{d-1} \right\} \right\}$$

and the set of hyperplanes

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_i a_i x_i = 0 \right\} : a_1, \dots, a_{d-1} \in \{0, 1\}, a_d = -1 \right\}.$$

By construction,  $n = |\mathcal{P}| = 2^{d-1} \cdot (2\sqrt{d} + 1) = \Theta(2^d \sqrt{d})$  and  $m = |\mathcal{H}| = 2^{d-1} = \Theta(2^d)$ . Also define the “universe” of points

$$\mathcal{U} := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) : x_1, \dots, x_{d-1} \in \{0, 1\}, x_d \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}\}.$$

$\mathcal{U}$  contains  $\mathcal{P}$  and numbers  $2^{d-1} \cdot d$  points in total.

Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07, pp. 16-17] proved the following three claims:

**Claim 4.2.**  $I(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H}) = 2^{2d-2}$ .

**Claim 4.3.** Let  $f \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $j$ -flat. Then  $f$  intersects  $\mathcal{U}$  in at most  $2^{d-j-1}$  points.

**Claim 4.4.** Let  $f \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $j$ -flat that is contained in some hyperplane  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .  $f$  is contained in at most  $2^j$  hyperplanes of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The latter two claims together imply that  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H}) = O(2^d)$ ; we include proofs of all three in Appendix A for completeness. Finally, we have:

**Claim 4.5.**  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq (1 - 2/e)2^{2d-2} = \Theta(2^d)$ .

*Proof.* We proceed probabilistically, showing that “many” settings of the values  $x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}$  result in a value for  $x_d = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i$  that lies within the interval  $[(d-1)/4 - \sqrt{d-1}, (d-1)/4 + \sqrt{d-1}]$ . Consider the following experiment: Choose  $x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}$  uniformly and independently from  $\{0, 1\}$ , and output **Succeed** if the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i$  lies in the aforementioned interval.

Note that since each  $a_i x_i \sim \text{Bern}(1/4)$  independently, the expectation of  $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i$  is  $(d-1)/4$ . Then the Chernoff bound gives us

$$\Pr \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i \notin \left[ (d-1)/4 - \sqrt{d}, (d-1)/4 + \sqrt{d} \right] \right] \leq 2 \exp \left( -(1/\sqrt{d})^2 d \right) = 2/e.$$

Thus, the experiment outputs **Succeed** with probability at least  $1 - 2/e$ , which is constant. Hence  $I(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H}) \geq (1 - 2/e)I(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H}) = (1 - 2/e)2^{2d-2}$ .  $\square$

Claim 4.5 suffices to prove the theorem, since we have also that  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H}) \geq \text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})$ .  $\square$

## 5 Discussion: Upper bounds from cross-intersecting families, and why Conjecture 2.9 is necessarily weak

In this section, we report on constructions [Lov16; Lov21; Pál21; FW21] which show that  $O(\sqrt{d})$  is the best possible exponent we could hope for in Conjecture 2.9, i.e., we exhibit explicit configurations with  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn \leq 2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$  and  $\text{I}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{H})/mn \geq \Omega(1)$  (see Theorem 5.3 below). These constructions all arise from *products of Boolean matrices*, and there are a number of natural questions in this area which we pose. A length- $d$  Boolean vector can be viewed as the indicator of a subset of  $[d]$ , and using the language of set systems will provide another helpful perspective on the log-rank conjecture. (Using this perspective to construct counterexamples was suggested by [Lov21] and [FW21].)

Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([d])$  be two set systems on  $[d]$ . Following are two notions which describe patterns among the intersection sizes  $|A \cap B|$  for  $A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}$ . For  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ , we say that  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are  $\epsilon$ -almost cross-disjoint if  $\Pr_{A \sim \mathcal{A}, B \sim \mathcal{B}}[A \cap B \neq \emptyset] \leq \epsilon$ , and *exactly cross-disjoint* in the special case  $\epsilon = 0$ . Following [Sne03], for  $L \subseteq \{0, \dots, d\}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are  $L$ -cross-intersecting if for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $|A \cap B| \subseteq L$ .<sup>6</sup>

These notions have linear-algebraic interpretations. If  $|\mathcal{A}| = n$  and  $|\mathcal{B}| = m$ , we can define the  $n \times m$  matrix  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \{0, \dots, d\}^{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}}$  whose  $(A, B)$ -th entry is  $|A \cap B|$ .  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are  $\epsilon$ -almost cross-disjoint iff all but  $\epsilon$ -fraction of  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ 's entries are zeros.  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are  $L$ -cross-intersecting iff  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is  $|L|$ -ary.

We have two conjectures about pairs of set systems. The first conjecture would be implied by Conjecture 2.9:

**Conjecture 5.1.** *The following is true for every fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([d])$  be  $\epsilon$ -almost cross-disjoint. Then there exists  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  are exactly cross-disjoint, and  $|\mathcal{R}||\mathcal{S}| \geq |\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \cdot 2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$ . Equivalently,  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  contains a 0-monochromatic rectangle of density at least  $2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$ .*

The second conjecture would be implied by Conjecture 2.7:

**Conjecture 5.2.** *The following is true for every fixed  $\ell > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([d])$  be  $L$ -cross-intersecting, where  $|L| = \ell$ . Then there exists  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , and  $t \in L$ , such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}, B \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $|A \cap B| = t$ , and  $|\mathcal{R}||\mathcal{S}| \geq |\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \cdot 2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ . Equivalently,  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  contains a monochromatic rectangle of density at least  $2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$ .*

Lovett [Lov21] independently suggested studying the special case of Conjecture 5.2 where  $\ell = 2$ , which is perhaps the simplest combinatorial version of the log-rank conjecture. (He notes that in the subcase where  $\ell = 2$  and  $0 \in L$ , Conjecture 5.2 is known to hold, since the “log-nonnegative-rank conjecture” is known to hold (and rescaling to get a Boolean matrix).)

The following example based on the idea of Pálvölgyi [Pál21] shows the necessity of the exponent  $O(\sqrt{d})$  in Conjectures 2.9 and 5.1.

**Theorem 5.3.** *The following is true for every  $\epsilon$  in a dense subset of  $(0, 1)$ . There exists an infinite, increasing sequence of dimensions  $d_1, d_2, \dots$ , and an infinite sequence of set systems  $(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$  on  $[d_i]$ , such that  $(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$  is  $\delta(i)$ -almost cross-disjoint with  $\delta(i) \rightarrow \epsilon$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , but  $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i)$  contains no 0-monochromatic submatrices of density larger than  $2^{-\Omega(\sqrt{d})}$ .*

<sup>6</sup>However, we do allow  $0 \in L$ , in contrast to e.g. [Sne03].

*Proof.* Consider any positive rational number  $\alpha$ ; we will prove the theorem for  $\epsilon := e^{-1/\alpha}$  (note that the image of  $\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$  under the map  $\alpha \mapsto e^{-1/\alpha}$  is dense in  $(0, 1)$  by continuity).

Consider, in increasing order, all values  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $a := ab$  is also an integer (there are infinitely many such  $b$  by rationality). Let  $d_i := ab$ . We will identify subsets of  $[d_i]$  with  $[a] \times [b]$ , i.e., with  $a$  times  $b$  Boolean matrices. Let  $\mathcal{A}_i \subset [d_i]$  be the subset of matrices which have exactly one 1 in every column, and let  $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{A}_i$ . If  $n := |\mathcal{A}_i|$  and  $m := |\mathcal{B}_i|$ , then we have  $n = m = a^b$ .

Each  $A \in \mathcal{A}_i$  is disjoint with  $(a - 1)^b$  sets in  $\mathcal{B}_i$ ; as  $b$  (and hence  $d_i$ ) approaches  $\infty$ , the ratio  $\frac{(a-1)^b}{m}$  approaches the constant  $e^{-1/\alpha}$ .

Moreover, consider any 0-monochromatic rectangle  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}_i$ . Defining  $R := \bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} r$  and  $S := \bigcup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} s$ , we see that  $R$  and  $S$  must be disjoint. Hence we may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{R}$  is the set of all matrices supported on  $R$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  the set of all points supported on  $S$ , and that  $R$  and  $S$  are complementary. Defining  $s_j := |\mathcal{R} \cap ([a] \times \{j\})|$  (i.e., the size of  $R$ 's support in column  $j$ ), we see that  $|\mathcal{R}| = s_1 \cdots s_b$  and  $|\mathcal{S}| = (a - s_1) \cdots (a - s_b)$ . This product is maximized when each  $s_j = \frac{a}{2}$ ; hence  $|\mathcal{R}| \cdot |\mathcal{S}| \leq \left(\frac{a}{2}\right)^{2b}$ . (This analysis also leads to a monochromatic rectangle with this size, assuming  $a$  is even.)  $\square$

An alternative proof was given by Lovett [Lov16; Lov21] and Fox and Wigderson [FW21]. This proof still sets  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$  but instead picks the sets in  $\mathcal{A}$  *randomly* with some appropriate sparsity, and deduces a similar  $2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$  bound.

Interestingly, we observe that our conjectured lower bound of  $2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$  for bipartite subgraph density (Conjecture 2.9) for *arbitrary* configurations (with incidence density  $\Omega(1)$ ) coincides with Lovett's currently-optimal bound of  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{rank}(f)})$  for the log-rank conjecture [Lov16], which may be interpreted as a bipartite subgraph density lower bound of  $2^{-\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})}$  for parallel 2-partitioned configurations. Lovett's analysis [Lov16] relies heavily on the binarity of the matrix (equiv. the binarity of the parallel partition); roughly, monochromatic rectangles are created by using a hyperplane rounding argument that exploits the gap between the two possible values for entries in the matrix. Altogether we are left in the unsettling situation where on one hand, the only way we know to prove a  $2^{-O(\sqrt{d})}$  bound uses binarity, but we believe that we should be able to get (1) a  $2^{-\text{polylog}(d)}$  bound using binarity (i.e., the log-rank conjecture/Conjecture 2.5) and (2) a  $2^{-O(\sqrt{d})}$  bound without using binarity (i.e., Conjecture 2.9).

Finally, we remark that although intersecting and cross-intersecting set systems are widely studied in extremal combinatorics, typically the goal in the literature is to bound the largest possible sizes of set systems (and often only in the so-called *uniform* case, where every set in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  has the same size). However, results in extremal combinatorics still have some interesting consequences towards our conjectures. For instance, Snevily [Sne03] showed that in the case  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([d])$  which are  $L$ -cross-intersecting and  $0 \notin L$ , we must have  $|\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{B}| \leq O(d^{|L|})$ . In linear-algebraic terms, if  $M = XX^T$  is  $\ell$ -ary where  $X$  is Boolean and of size  $n \times d$ , we must have  $d \geq \Omega(n^{1/\ell})$ .

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sasha Golovnev, Raghu Meka and Santhoshini Velusamy for permission to describe their work here. We would like to thank Shachar Lovett for his comments [Lov21] on the earlier version of this paper [SS21] and for his counterexample to our original Conjecture 5. We would also like to thank Dömötör Pálvölgyi, and Jacob Fox and Yuval Wigderson for their counterexamples to the same [Pál21; FW21]. We thank Dömötör Pálvölgyi for his generous permission to build on his example in §5.

## References

- [AS07] Roel Apfelbaum and Micha Sharir. “Large complete bipartite subgraphs in incidence graphs of points and hyperplanes”. In: *SIAM Journal of Discrete Mathematics* 21.3 (2007), pp. 707–725. DOI: [10.1137/050641375](https://doi.org/10.1137/050641375).
- [ET05] György Elekes and Csaba D. Tóth. “Incidences of not-too-degenerate hyperplanes”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry*. 2005, pp. 16–21. DOI: [10.1145/1064092.1064098](https://doi.org/10.1145/1064092.1064098).
- [FW21] Jacob Fox and Yuval Wigderson. Personal communication. Feb. 5, 2021.
- [Gol+19] Alexander Golovnev, Raghu Meka, Madhu Sudan, and Santhoshini Velusamy. Discussions from Summer 2019. 2019.
- [Lov16] Shachar Lovett. “Communication is Bounded by Root of Rank”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 63.1 (Feb. 2016). Conference version in STOC 2014. DOI: [10.1145/2724704](https://doi.org/10.1145/2724704).
- [Lov21] Shachar Lovett. Personal communication. Jan. 29, 2021.
- [LS88] László Lovász and Michael Saks. “Lattices, Möbius Functions and Communications Complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. SFCS 1988. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 1988, pp. 81–90. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1988.21](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1988.21).
- [MS82] Kurt Mehlhorn and Erik M. Schmidt. “Las Vegas is Better than Determinism in VLSI and Distributed Computing (Extended Abstract)”. In: *Proceedings of the 14th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 1982. San Francisco, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1982, pp. 330–337. DOI: [10.1145/800070.802208](https://doi.org/10.1145/800070.802208).
- [NW95] Noam Nisan and Avi Wigderson. “On rank vs. communication complexity”. In: *Combinatorica* 15 (1995). Conference version in FOCS 1994, pp. 557–565. URL: [10.1007/BF01192527](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01192527).
- [Pál21] Dömötör Pálvölgyi. Personal communication. Feb. 1, 2021.
- [Sne03] Hunter S. Snevily. “A Sharp Bound for the Number of Sets that Pairwise Intersect at  $k$  Positive Values”. In: *Combinatorica* 23.3 (2003), pp. 527–533. DOI: [10.1007/s00493-003-0031-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-003-0031-2).
- [SS21] Noah Singer and Madhu Sudan. *Point-hyperplane incidence geometry and the log-rank conjecture*. 2021. arXiv: [2101.09592v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.09592v1) [[math.CO](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.09592v1)].
- [Yao79] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. “Some Complexity Questions Related to Distributive Computing (Preliminary Report)”. In: *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 1979. Atlanta, Georgia, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1979, pp. 209–213. DOI: [10.1145/800135.804414](https://doi.org/10.1145/800135.804414).

## A Proofs of claims from Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07]

In this appendix, for completeness, we include proofs due to Apfelbaum and Sharir [AS07] of claims which together bound  $\text{rs}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$  (in the context of the proof of Theorem 4.1). Claim 4.2 has a short proof:

*Proof of Claim 4.2.* Consider any fixed hyperplane  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . Since  $a_d = -1$ , for any values  $x_1, \dots, x_{d-1} \in \{0, 1\}$ , there is a unique value  $x_d \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$  such that  $\sum_i a_i x_i = 0$ , i.e.,  $x_d = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i$ . Thus,  $|\mathcal{U} \cap h| = 2^{d-1}$ . Since  $|\mathcal{H}| = 2^{d-1}$ ,  $|\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{H}| = 2^{2d-2}$ .  $\square$

We need a bit more setup to prove Claims 4.3 and 4.4. For fixed  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , consider the linear map

$$\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \rightarrow h : (x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) \mapsto \left( x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x_i \right).$$

$\phi$  is an isomorphism whose inverse is a projection onto all but the last coordinate. Restricting  $\phi$  to the lattice  $\{0, 1\}^{d-1}$ , we get a bijection with the points  $\mathcal{U} \cap h$ . We also have the following helpful proposition:

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $f \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $j$ -flat. Then  $I(f, [k]^{d'}) \leq k^j$ . In particular,  $I(f, \{0, 1\}^{d'}) \leq 2^j$ .*

*Proof sketch.* Verify inductively on  $d'$  by splitting the lattice  $[k]^{d'}$  into a disjoint union of parallel sublattices:  $[k]^{d'} = (\{1\} \times [k]^{d'-1}) \sqcup \dots \sqcup (\{k\} \times [k]^{d'-1})$ .  $\square$

These ideas let us prove the two remaining claims.

*Proof of Claim 4.3.* The map  $\phi$  is an isomorphism, so the preimage  $\phi^{-1}(f)$  is a  $j$ -flat in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ . By Proposition A.1,  $I(\phi^{-1}(f), \{0, 1\}^{d-1}) \leq 2^j$ . Since  $\phi$  restricts to a bijection between  $\{0, 1\}^{d-1}$  and  $\mathcal{U} \cap h$ , and  $f \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ ,  $I(f, \mathcal{U}) \leq 2^j$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Claim 4.4.* Consider any plane  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $h \supseteq f$ . Let  $h$  be defined by the equation  $\langle a, x \rangle + b = 0$  over  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . View  $f$  as the image of an affine injection  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  given by  $x \mapsto Mx + v$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times j}$  has rank  $j$ , and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Since  $h \supseteq f$ , for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^j$ ,  $\langle a, My + v \rangle + b = 0$ . Hence  $\langle a, v \rangle + b = 0$  (plugging in  $y = 0$ ), so  $\langle a, My \rangle = 0$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^j$  (subtracting). Now  $a^\top M$  is simply a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^j$  (or more precisely, a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^j$ 's dual space); if its inner product with all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^j$  is zero, then it is zero. Thus,  $a \in \ker(M^\top)$ .

Let  $K := \ker(M^\top)$ . By rank-nullity, and since row-rank equals column-rank,

$$\dim(K) = d - \dim(\text{im}(M^\top)) = d - \dim(\text{im}(M)) = d - j.$$

Now consider the hyperplane  $h'$  defined by the equation  $x_d = -1$ . By definition  $a \in h'$ , so  $a \in K \cap h'$ . But  $K \not\subseteq h'$ , since  $0 \in K$  but  $0 \notin h'$ . Hence  $K \cap h'$  is a  $(d - j - 1)$ -flat by Proposition 3.2, so by Proposition A.1, there are at most  $2^{d-j-1}$  unique values of  $a$ . Finally, we observe that given  $a$ , we have  $b = -\langle a, v \rangle$ , so  $a$  uniquely determines  $b$ .  $\square$