

A sharp threshold for a random version of Sperner's Theorem

József Balogh* Robert A. Krueger†

May 23, 2022

Abstract

The Boolean lattice $\mathcal{P}(n)$ consists of all subsets of $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ partially ordered under the containment relation. Sperner's Theorem states that the largest antichain of the Boolean lattice is given by a middle layer: the collection of all sets of size $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, or also, if n is odd, the collection of all sets of size $\lceil n/2 \rceil$. Given p , choose each subset of $[n]$ with probability p independently. We show that for every constant $p > 3/4$, the largest antichain among these subsets is also given by a middle layer, with probability tending to 1 as n tends to infinity. This $3/4$ is best possible, and we also characterize the largest antichains for every constant $p > 1/2$. Our proof is based on some new variations of Sapozhenko's graph container method.

Keywords: Sperner's Theorem, graph container method, random poset.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05D40, 05D05, 60C05.

1 Introduction

An *antichain* in a poset P is a collection of pairwise incomparable elements of P , and the *width* of P , denoted by $w(P)$, is the size of the largest antichain in P . The *Boolean lattice* $\mathcal{P}(n)$ is the poset consisting of all subsets of $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ partially ordered by containment. The Boolean lattice is naturally partitioned into antichains which we call the *layers* of the Boolean lattice, denoted by $\binom{[n]}{k}$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$, which are all subsets of $[n]$ of size k . In 1928, Sperner [28] proved that the width of the Boolean lattice is attained by a layer of the Boolean lattice — in particular, the *middle layer(s)* $\binom{[n]}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ and $\binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA. E-mail: jobal@illinois.edu. Research supported by NSF RTG Grant DMS-1937241, NSF Grant DMS-1764123, Arnold O. Beckman Research Award (UIUC Campus Research Board RB 18132), the Langan Scholar Fund (UIUC), and the Simons Fellowship.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA. Email: rak5@illinois.edu. Research supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE 21-46756.

A trend in modern combinatorics is the study of random versions of classic results, e.g. [3, 6, 26, 27] (see [24] for a survey). For a set A and probability $0 \leq p \leq 1$, we let A_p denote a random subset of A , where each element of A is included independently with probability p . Typically, A , and possibly p , depends on some counting parameter n . We say that A_p satisfies a property P *with high probability (w.h.p.)* if the probability A_p satisfies P tends to 1 as n tends to infinity. We say A_p satisfies a property P *with very high probability (w.v.h.p.)* if the probability A_p does not satisfy P is $o(1/n)$. A (*coarse*) *threshold* $p_0 = p_0(n)$ for P is a function such that for $p = \omega(p_0)$, A_p satisfies P w.h.p., and for $p = o(p_0)$, A_p does not satisfy P w.h.p. A threshold is *sharp* if for every constant $\varepsilon > 0$, we have that $p > (1 + \varepsilon)p_0$ implies A_p satisfies P w.h.p., and $p < (1 - \varepsilon)p_0$ implies A_p does not satisfy P w.h.p.

We are interested in $w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)$, the size of the largest antichain in a random induced subposet of the Boolean lattice, and the structure of the maximum size antichains. Answering a question of Erdős, Rényi [23] determined the threshold for $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$ to satisfy $w(X) = |X|$, that is, the threshold for $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ to be an antichain. Kohayakawa and Kreuter [15] determined $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)/|\mathcal{P}(n)_p|$ for all $p = p(n)$ w.h.p. When this limit is strictly between 0 and 1, they also show that there is an antichain of size $(1 - o(1))w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)$ contained in some (depending on p) consecutive layers centered on the middle layer(s) w.h.p. This characterization is generalized by Osthus [21] to when $w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)/|\mathcal{P}(n)_p| \rightarrow 0$: for $p = \omega((r/n)^r \log n)$, where $r = r(n)$ is an integer-valued function, we have w.h.p. that

$$w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p) \leq (1 + O(1/r) + o(1))p \sum_{-r/2 \leq j < r/2} \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + j}.$$

A lower bound given by the maximum antichain in some consecutive layers shows that this result determines $w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)$ asymptotically w.h.p. when $r \rightarrow \infty$, that is, when p decays faster than polynomially. Balogh, Mycroft, and Treglown [4] asymptotically determined $w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)$ w.h.p. when p decays polynomially in n using a two-phase container method. Namely they showed that $p_0 = 1/n^r$, for constant integers r , is a coarse threshold for

$$w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p) = (1 + o(1))p \sum_{-r/2 \leq j < r/2} \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + j} = (1 + o(1))pr \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}.$$

The case $r = 1$ solves a problem posed by Kohayakawa and Kreuter (in a draft of [15]), as for $p = \omega(1/n)$, the width of $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ is asymptotically equal to the size of a middle layer (this special case was proven independently by Collares Neto and Morris [5]). Kohayakawa and Kreuter also wondered about the threshold for the width to be exactly equal to the size of a middle layer. Hamm and Kahn [11] proved, as a consequence of a proof of a similar random version of the Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem, that there exists a constant $p < 1$ such that for $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$,

$$w(X) = \max \left\{ X \cap \binom{[n]}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}, X \cap \binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \right\}$$

w.h.p., calling this a “more literal [random] counterpart of Sperner’s Theorem.” Our main result is that this statement holds w.h.p. for every constant $p > 3/4$, which is best possible.

Theorem 1. *For every constant $p > 3/4$, the largest antichain in $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ is (one of) the middle layer(s), with high probability.*

Call a set $v \in \binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}$ *isolated* if v appears in $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$ but no subset of v of size $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ appears in X . To see that $p_0 = 3/4$ in Theorem 1 is best possible, note that the probability that v is isolated is

$$p_0(1 - p_0)^{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 1} = 3 \cdot 4^{-\lceil n/2 \rceil - 2}.$$

Since there are $\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 1} \approx 2^n$ choices for v , an easy second moment calculation shows that w.h.p. isolated v exist for every constant $p < 3/4$, and hence $X \cap \binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ is not a maximal antichain in $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$ w.h.p.

Our proof of Theorem 1 combines Sapozhenko's graph containers [25] with Hamm and Kahn's proof [11], which itself is inspired by Sapozhenko's containers. An early combinatorial problem about posets was posed by Dedekind [7] in 1897, when he asked for the number of antichains in $\mathcal{P}(n)$. Korshunov [17] solved this problem asymptotically, and Sapozhenko developed, generalized, and simplified Korshunov's arguments into a powerful asymptotic enumeration technique. Sapozhenko's containers also provided a simplified method of asymptotically counting the number of independent sets in the hypercube, originally due to Korshunov and Sapozhenko [18]; see [9] for an excellent exposition in English. In recent years, the containers have proven quite versatile, being employed in various statistical physics models. See Galvin and Kahn [10] for an early example of this, see Jenssen and Keevash [12] for a recent and encompassing paper, and see Jenssen and Perkins [13] for a gentler introduction to the statistical physics models and tools. We also mention that Balogh, Garcia, and Li [1] applied Sapozhenko's containers to the same graph that we work on in our main technical theorem, Theorem 4, although our analysis is very different.

We actually prove a more precise result, akin to a 'hitting time' statement. Expanding the above definition, for $v \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ (resp. $k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$), we say that v is *nearly isolated* if v is in $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$, but at most one subset (resp. superset) of v of size $k - 1$ (resp. $k + 1$) is in X .

Theorem 2. *For every constant $p > 1/2$, there exists $k \in \{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lceil n/2 \rceil\}$ such that every largest antichain in $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$ consists of sets in $X \cap \binom{[n]}{k}$ together with nearly isolated sets in $\binom{[n]}{k-1} \cup \binom{[n]}{k+1}$, with high probability.*

Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1, as for constant $p > 3/4$, there are no nearly isolated sets, by an easy first moment calculation. The $p_0 = 1/2$ in Theorem 2 is also best possible, as for every constant $p < 1/2$, we expect to see the following structure for $k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$: sets $u, v \in \binom{[n]}{k+1} \cap X$ that share a subset u' in $\binom{[n]}{k} \cap X$, and at most one set $v' \neq u'$ is a subset of either u or v appearing in $X \cap \binom{[n]}{k}$, where $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$. That is, one of u or v is not nearly isolated, but u and v together act like two nearly isolated sets, in the sense that u and v together with $(\binom{[n]}{k} \cap X) \setminus \{u', v'\}$ form an antichain. To see that this structure appears below $p_0 = 1/2$, note that there are roughly $(n/2)^3 \binom{n}{n/2} \approx 2^n$ choices for u, v, u' , and v' , and the probability that they form the desired structure in our random subfamily is roughly $p_0^4(1 - p_0)^{2(n/2)-3} = 2^{n+1}$.

Theorem 2 gives a precise description of the maximum antichains of $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ for constant $p > 1/2$. It is easy to conjecture a precise description for smaller, but constant, p , as the maximum antichains should consist almost entirely of a whole layer together with ‘defects’ like nearly isolated sets and the structures described in the previous paragraph. We conjecture that this roughly holds for p above the $1/n$ threshold, which we recall is the threshold for the width to be asymptotically equal to the size of a middle layer [4, 5].

Conjecture 3. *For $p = \omega(1/n)$, the maximum antichains of $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ are contained in three consecutive layers, with high probability.*

If true, the bound on p is tight, as for $p = C/n$ with constant C , w.h.p. we see some sets $v \in \binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 2} \cap X$ such that removing any one or two elements of v results in a set which is not in $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$.

An ℓ -chain in a poset P is ℓ elements A_1, \dots, A_ℓ such that $A_1 \leq \dots \leq A_\ell$ in P . An antichain is a collection which contains no 2-chain. Erdős [8] generalized Sperner’s Theorem, showing that the largest subsets of $\mathcal{P}(n)$ with no ℓ -chain are some $\ell - 1$ layers, in particular, the $\ell - 1$ consecutive layers centered about a middle layer. It would be interesting to generalize Theorem 1 from antichains to collections with no ℓ -chain, for constant ℓ . We expect the threshold to be the same.

Theorems 1 and 2 follow from the following theorem, where we take n odd and only consider antichains in the middle two layers. To state the theorem, we need some definitions. Let G be a bipartite graph with Y as one side of the bipartition. We say $A \subseteq Y$ is *closed* if there is no $A' \supsetneq A$ such that $N(A') = N(A)$. We say that $A \subseteq Y$ is *2-linked* if there is no $B \subsetneq A$ such that $N(B)$ is disjoint from $N(A \setminus B)$; in other words, $A \cup N(A)$ induces a connected subgraph of G . We denote by M the ‘‘middle two layers’’ graph: the bipartite graph with parts $L_k = \binom{[2k-1]}{k}$ and $L_{k-1} = \binom{[2k-1]}{k-1}$ and edges given by the containment relation.

Theorem 4. *Let $p > 1/2$ be a constant, and let $X = V(M)_p$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. With very high probability, that is with probability $1 - o(1/k)$, every closed, 2-linked, $A \subseteq L_k$ (or $A \subseteq L_{k-1}$) with $1 < |A|$ and $|N(A)| \geq (1 + 1/2k)|A|$ satisfies $|N(A) \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq c(|N(A)| - |A|)$.*

Note that M is symmetric with respect to its bipartition, so the statement for $A \subseteq L_{k-1}$ easily follows from the statement for $A \subseteq L_k$. The proof of Theorem 4 is easy for small A (see Section 3), so the main difficulty of the proof is handling large A ; see Section 1.1 for the proof idea. The $1/2$ in Theorem 4 is technically best possible, although this condition is only required to get the conclusion for $|A| = 2$. If we only consider $|A| \geq \ell$, then $p > 1 - 2^{-2/\ell}$ should suffice, but we do not know how to prove such a statement. However, it does follow easily that if $p > 3/4$ is constant, then Theorem 4 also holds for $|A| = 1$; see Section 3. We show that Theorem 4 implies Theorems 1 and 2 in Section 2.

Note that the maximal independent sets of M , which are some of the maximal antichains in $\mathcal{P}(n)$, are given by $A \cup (L_{k-1} \setminus N(A))$ for closed $A \subseteq L_k$, and hence Theorem 4 is saying something about the independent sets of a random induced subgraph of M . Alternatively,

Theorem 4 can be viewed as proving a Hall-type condition for a random induced subgraph of M . In fact, the methods used here will apply to a wide class of bipartite graphs and can even be transferred to non-bipartite graphs, as was done by Hamm and Kahn [11] to the Kneser graph; all that is necessary is some almost-regularity and vertex-isoperimetry. Hamm and Kahn [11] essentially proved Theorem 4 with $p = 1 - \varepsilon$ for some small constant $\varepsilon > 0$, but with an important difference: they looked at the graph formed by the layers $\binom{[2k]}{k}$ and $\binom{[2k]}{k-1}$. Unfortunately, our methods do not extend to this graph because the degrees of vertices in $\binom{[2k]}{k}$ are smaller than the degrees of vertices in $\binom{[2k]}{k-1}$.

In a follow-up paper, we plan to consider the independence number of an induced random subgraph of the hypercube, essentially proving a variant of Theorem 4 with M replaced by the whole hypercube. We use an additional trick to push the $1/2$ down to somewhere below 0.45 , but we are still far away from anything which is $o(1)$, let alone the $\omega(1/n)$ in Conjecture 3.

We mention a variant of Theorem 4 that is better understood. If we keep the edges of M with probability p instead of the vertices, then we obtain a variant of Theorem 4 where p may be taken much smaller. We essentially do this in a paper with Luo [2], where we get a different random version of the Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem.

Finally, we mention that the length of $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$ has also been studied. The *length* of a poset is the size of the longest chain. In fact, Kohayakawa, Kreuter, and Osthus [16] determined some rather precise information about the length of $\mathcal{P}(n)_p$. This problem seems to be rather different than determining $w(\mathcal{P}(n)_p)$, using much more of the structure of $\mathcal{P}(n)$ than we do here.

1.1 Proof idea

Our proof follows Hamm and Kahn’s proof [11], presented in our notation, with an important detour in Section 5.

To prove Theorem 4, we should know how $|N(A)|$ compares to $|A|$. For M , the “middle two layers” graph, this is given by the Kruskal-Katona theorem, a weaker form of which is due to Lovász. For real z we define $\binom{z}{k} = \frac{z(z-1)\dots(z-k+1)}{k!}$, and we let $\partial_* A = \{v \setminus \{i\} : i \in v \in A\}$ denote the *lower shadow* of A .

Theorem 5 (Kruskal [19], Katona [14], Lovász (Problem 13.31(b) of [20])). *Let $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ be of size $\binom{z}{k}$ for $z \geq k$. Then $|\partial_* A| \geq \binom{z}{k-1}$.*

Using this, we derive a convenient expression for how much sets in M ‘expand;’ see Proposition 2.3 of [11] for a similar inequality. All logarithms are natural unless otherwise indicated.

Lemma 6. *For $A \subseteq L_k$ with $|A| = a$, we have*

$$t := |N(A)| - |A| \geq a \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{\binom{2k-1}{k}}{a}.$$

Proof. Let $|A| = \binom{2k-1-y}{k}$ where $0 \leq y \leq k-1$. By Theorem 5, we have

$$|N(A)| - |A| \geq \binom{2k-1-y}{k-1} - \binom{2k-1-y}{k} = \frac{y}{k-y} \binom{2k-1-y}{k}.$$

It suffices to show that $f(y) \geq 0$, where

$$f(y) = \frac{y}{k-y} - \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{\binom{2k-1}{k}}{\binom{2k-1-y}{k}}.$$

Indeed, $f(0) = 0$, and

$$f'(y) = \frac{k}{(k-y)^2} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{2k-1-i-y} \geq \frac{k}{(k-y)^2} - \frac{1}{k-y} \geq 0. \quad \square$$

The rough idea of the proof of Theorem 4 is to find S and F such that $A \subseteq S$, $F \subseteq N(A)$, $|S| < |F| - \ell$ for some ℓ , and $|S \cap X| = p|S| \pm \ell/2$, $|F \cap X| = p|F| \pm \ell/2$ w.v.h.p. Then we have

$$|A \cap X| \leq |S \cap X| \leq p|S| + \ell/2 \leq p|F| - \ell/2 \leq |F \cap X| \leq |N(A) \cap X|.$$

For each A , we might show the existence of S and F with the first three properties, and then show that across all A , there are actually few choices for S and F . Using standard concentration arguments we can then get that $|S \cap X|$ and $|F \cap X|$ are concentrated about their means w.v.h.p. for all choices of S and F .

Unfortunately, the above scenario does not happen perfectly. In fact, all we can guarantee is $|S| \leq |F| + \ell$, so we must also use that $|(S \setminus A) \cap X|$ and $|(N(A) \setminus F) \cap X|$ are likely large in order to get the above inequality chain to work out. This also allows us to get a stronger lower bound on $|N(A) \cap X| - |A \cap X|$.

We break the proof into three phases. In the first phase we obtain ‘weak’ versions of S and F described in the above sketch. In the second phase, we strengthen these weak versions. In the final phase, we give the argument showing $|N(A) \cap X| - |A \cap X|$ is large for all A w.v.h.p. We distill these into two lemmas, for which we need some definitions. Recall that $t = |N(A)| - |A|$.

Definition 7. We say that (S', F') is a weak container for A if $A \subseteq S'$, $F' \subseteq N(A)$, $|S' \setminus A| = O(t)$, and $|N(A) \setminus F'| = O(t)$. We say that (S, F) is a strong container for A if (S, F) is a weak container and also satisfies $|S| \leq |F| + o(t)$.

Note that, assuming $A \subseteq S'$ and $F' \subseteq N(A)$, the conditions $|S' \setminus A| = O(t)$ and $|N(A) \setminus F'| = O(t)$ together are equivalent to $|S'| \leq |F'| + O(t)$. This explains the way in which strong containers are a stronger version of weak containers.

To state the two container lemmas, we need a convenient way to count the choices for the containers across all A . The *cost* of a choice of an object is the \log_2 of the number of

choices for that object. For example, the cost of a subset Y of a given set Z is precisely $|Z|$, while the cost of a subset Y (of Z) of size k is

$$\log_2 \binom{|Z|}{k} \leq k \log_2 \frac{e|Z|}{k},$$

a fact which we will use often. We denote by $\text{Cost}(Y)$ the cost of Y and denote by $\text{Cost}(Y|Z)$ the cost of Y given a choice of Z . Formally, $\text{Cost}(Y) = \log_2 |\mathcal{Y}|$, where \mathcal{Y} is the collection of all choices of Y ; we often leave this collection implicit.

We say that a collection \mathcal{Y} of sets is t -concentrated if $\|Y_p - p|Y|\| \leq o(t)$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ w.v.h.p. We typically just say that “ Y is concentrated” when we mean that the collection of all choices of Y is t -concentrated, where $t = |N(A)| - |A|$ has already been fixed. The following are some easy consequences of this definition, the first following from the Chernoff bound.

Proposition 8. *If p is constant and $\text{Cost}(Y) = o(t^2/|Y|)$, then Y is concentrated.*

Proposition 9. *If $|Y| = o(t)$, then Y is concentrated.*

Proposition 10. *If Y and Z are disjoint and concentrated, then $Y \cup Z$ is concentrated. If $Y \subseteq Z$ are both concentrated, then $Z \setminus Y$ is concentrated.*

We are ready to state our two lemmas, which guarantee low-cost concentrated containers.

Lemma 11. *There exists concentrated weak containers for all 2-linked $A \subseteq L_k$ with $t \geq a/2k$, where $|A| = a \geq \log_2 k$, of cost at most $o(t)$.*

Formally, there exists a global constant K , a function $w(k)$ which tends to infinity as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and collections \mathcal{W}_t of pairs (S', F') for all t , with $|\mathcal{W}_t| \leq 2^{t/w}$ such that the following holds w.v.h.p. for all t simultaneously: for all 2-linked $A \subseteq L_k$ with $t = |N(A)| - |A| \geq |A|/2k \geq \log_2 k/2k$, there exists $(S', F') \in \mathcal{W}_t$ with $A \subseteq S'$, $F' \subseteq N(A)$, $|S'| \leq |F'| + Kt$, $\|S'_p - p|S'|\| \leq t/w$, and $\|F'_p - p|F'|\| \leq t/w$.

Hamm and Kahn [11] essentially proved Lemma 11 in a slightly different graph. Lemma 11, through the argument given in Section 6, yields Theorem 1 with $p = 1 - \varepsilon$, where ε is some constant depending on the K in Lemma 11, which is what defines weak containers. We present their proof not just for completeness, but also to phrase everything in terms of “cost” and “concentration,” which we feel brings the formal proof closer to the heuristic intuition guiding the proof. Our other main contribution to the theory of graph containers is the low-cost transformation of concentrated weak containers into concentrated strong containers, stated in the next Lemma.

Lemma 12. *Given concentrated weak containers of cost at most $o(t)$, there exist concentrated strong containers of cost at most $o(t)$. Formally, replace K by $1/w$ in the formal description of Lemma 11.*

The proof of Lemma 12 essentially follows a proof of Sapozhenko [25], as described by Galvin (Lemma 5.5 in [9]), except that we must modify it to ensure that everything remains concentrated.

We prove Lemma 11 in Section 4 and Lemma 12 in Section 5. In Section 6, we use these lemmas to prove Theorem 4.

Asymptotic Notation. We heavily use asymptotic notation as it simplifies our calculations and definitions. Recall that $f(n) = O(g(n))$, or equivalently $g(n) = \Omega(f(n))$, if there exists a constant K such that $f(n) \leq Kg(n)$ for all sufficiently large n . We say $f(n) = o(g(n))$, or equivalently $g(n) = \omega(f(n))$, if $f(n)/g(n)$ tends to 0 as n tends to infinity.

Technically, most uses of $O(\cdot)$ or $o(\cdot)$ in this paper could be replaced by a sufficiently large or small constant, respectively. However, the asymptotic notation hides irrelevant arithmetic on these expressions. For example, we could say that S is ε -concentrated if $||S_p| - p|| \leq \varepsilon t$ for all choices of S w.v.h.p. Then if A and B are disjoint sets and both ε -concentrated, we have that $A \cup B$ is 2ε -concentrated. In what follows, the value of ε is irrelevant as long as it is small, so we increase readability by using asymptotic notation.

2 Theorem 4 implies Theorem 2

Hamm and Kahn [11] give a sketch of how Theorem 4 implies Theorem 1. More work is required to deduce Theorem 2. We first generalize Theorem 4 to apply to any pair of consecutive layers. For $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n)$, let the *lower shadow* of A be $\partial_* A = \{v \setminus \{i\} : i \in v \in A\}$ and the *upper shadow* of A be $\partial^* A = \{v \cup \{i\} : i \notin v \in A\}$. When $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, let $\partial A = \partial_* A$, and when $k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, let $\partial A = \partial^* A$, which we simply call the *shadow* of A . This definition is non-standard but helps simplify our statements, so we use only when it will not cause confusion. Extending the definitions from M , we say that $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ is *closed* if there is no $A \subsetneq A' \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $\partial A = \partial A'$, and we say that $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ is *2-linked* if there is no $B \subsetneq A$ such that ∂B is disjoint from $\partial(A \setminus B)$.

Lemma 13. *Let $p > 1/2$ be constant, and let $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. With high probability, for every $k \in [n] \setminus \{\lceil n/2 \rceil, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\}$, every closed, 2-linked $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $|A| > 1$ satisfies $|\partial A \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq c(|\partial A| - |A|)$.*

Proof. As the other case is symmetric to this one, we assume $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil$. By the Kruskal-Katona theorem, for $|A| = \binom{x}{k}$ we have

$$|\partial A| = |\partial_* A| \geq \binom{x}{k-1} = \frac{k}{x-k+1} \binom{x}{k} \geq \frac{k}{n-k+1} |A| \geq \frac{n/2+1}{n/2} |A| \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) |A|. \quad (1)$$

Viewing A as a subset of $\binom{[2k-1]}{k}$, which we may do because ∂_* does not depend on n , the conclusion of Theorem 4 gives the desired conclusion. Because this holds with very high probability, taking a union bound over all k finishes the proof. \square

Although Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1, we give a complete proof of Theorem 1 first as a warm-up for Theorem 2. A *2-linked component* of $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ is a maximally 2-linked subset of A . For $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$, let $[A]$ denote the *closure* of A , the largest A' with $\partial A = \partial A'$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $p > 3/4$ be constant, and let $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$. We assume that the conclusions of Theorem 4 and Lemma 13 hold, even for $|A| = 1$. For $|A| = 1$, see Section 3 to see how Theorem 4 and Lemma 13 hold for constant $p > 3/4$.

Let B be a maximum antichain in X , and let $B_k = B \cap \binom{[n]}{k}$ be the layers of B . Consider the highest nonempty layer B_k of B , that is, the nonempty B_k with largest k . If $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil$, then letting B'_k be a 2-linked component of B_k , we claim that $B' = (B \setminus B'_k) \cup (\partial_* B'_k \cap X)$ is a larger antichain than B in X . Indeed, by definition, B' is an antichain in X , and $|B'| > |B|$ because of Lemma 13 applied to the closure of B'_k . This contradicts the maximality of B , and hence $k \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Similarly, the lowest nonempty layer of B is at layer number $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ or above. If n is even, this implies that B is contained in the middle layer, as desired. If n is odd, one of $[B_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}]$ or $[B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}]$ has size at most $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ by Theorem 5. Since M is symmetric with respect to L_k and L_{k-1} , we may suppose it is $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ whose closure has size at most $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$, so by Lemma 6, $|\partial_* B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}| \geq (1 + \frac{1}{2^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}}) |B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}|$. If $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \neq \emptyset$, then $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cup (\partial_* B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cap X)$ is a larger antichain than B in X by Theorem 4, contradicting the maximality of B . Thus B is contained within one of the middle two layers. \square

To prove Theorem 2, we modify the previous argument by taking special care of 2-linked components of size 1 in the layers of the maximum antichain.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $p = 1/2 + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is constant, and let $X = \mathcal{P}(n)_p$ be such that the conclusions of Theorem 4 and Lemma 13 hold, which happens with high probability.

We first claim that with high probability the number of nearly isolated sets is at most $2^{n/2}$. Recall that $v \in \mathcal{P}(n)$ is nearly isolated if $v \in X$ but $|\partial\{v\} \cap X| \leq 1$. Since $|\partial\{v\}| \geq n/2$ for every v , the expected number of such sets is at most

$$2^n p \left((1-p)^{n/2} + \frac{n}{2} p (1-p)^{n/2-1} \right) \leq 2^{n/2} \cdot O(ne^{-\varepsilon n}).$$

The claim follows by Markov's inequality, so we assume the claim holds for X .

Let B be a maximum antichain in X , and let $B_k = B \cap \binom{[n]}{k}$ be the layers of B . Consider the highest nonempty layer B_k of B , that is, the nonempty B_k with the largest k . If $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and B_k has a 2-linked component B'_k of size greater than 1, then $(B \setminus B'_k) \cup (\partial_* B'_k \cap X)$ is a larger antichain than B in X , as seen by applying Lemma 13 to the closure of B'_k . If B_k has a 2-linked component B'_k of size 1 which is not a nearly isolated set, then by definition, $(B \setminus B'_k) \cup (\partial_* B'_k \cap X)$ is larger antichain than B in X . Thus if $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil$, B_k consists entirely of nearly isolated sets, and hence $|B_k| \leq 2^{n/2}$.

If $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1$, we claim that

$$(B \setminus (B_k \cup B_{k-1})) \cup ((\partial_* \partial_* B_k \cup \partial_* B_{k-1}) \cap X)$$

is a larger antichain than B in X . If $|\partial_* B_k| \cdot \log n \leq |B_{k-1}|$, then by (1), we have

$$|\partial_*(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1})| - |[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]| \geq \frac{1}{k} |\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}| \geq \frac{\log n}{2k} |\partial_* B_k|.$$

If $|\partial_* B_k| \cdot \log n \geq |B_{k-1}|$, then $|\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}| \leq (1 + \log n) |\partial_* B_k| \leq (1 + \log n) n 2^{n/2}$. Since $[A] \subseteq \partial_* \partial_* A$ for $A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, we have that $|[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]| \leq (1 + \log n) n^3 2^{n/2}$,

and hence by Lemma 6, viewing $[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]$ as a subset of $\binom{[2k-3]}{k-1}$, we have

$$|\partial_*(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1})| - |[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]| \geq \Omega(|[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]|) \geq \frac{\log n}{k} |\partial_* B_k|.$$

Applying Lemma 13 to the closure of each 2-linked component of $\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_*(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}) \cap X| &\geq |(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}) \cap X| + c(|\partial_*(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1})| - |[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]|) \\ &\geq |B_{k-1}| + c \frac{\log n}{2k} |\partial_* B_k| > |B_{k-1}| + \frac{1}{k} |\partial_* B_k| = |B_{k-1}| + |B_k|, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. Thus $k \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1$.

A similar argument yields that the lowest layer of B is in layer number at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$. If n is even, then since $B_{n/2+1}$ and $B_{n/2-1}$ consist entirely of nearly isolated sets, we are done.

Now assume n is odd. By Theorem 5, one of $[B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}]$ or $[B_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}]$ has size at most $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Without loss of generality, suppose it is $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ whose closure has size at most $\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Then the above argument works similarly for $k = \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1$, using Theorem 4 instead of Lemma 13, where we obtain lower bounds on

$$|\partial_*(\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1})| - |[\partial_* B_k \cup B_{k-1}]|$$

required for Theorem 4 from $|B_k| \leq 2^{n/2}$, and $|[B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}]| \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$, and Lemma 6. Thus $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}$ is empty. Similar to an argument at the beginning of the proof, since $|[B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}]| \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$, we get that $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ consists entirely of nearly isolated sets by Theorem 4. This means that B consists of $B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ together with nearly isolated vertices in $\binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil + 1}$ and $\binom{[n]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil - 1}$. \square

3 When a is small

We make effective use of containers when $a = |A|$ is large in Lemmas 11 and 12. When a is small, we have no need for the containers and can compute the cost of A directly. We first recall a well-known lemma.

Lemma 14 ([11] Proposition 2.6). *Let G be a graph with maximum degree at most d and let v be a vertex of G . Then the number of trees in G rooted at v with a vertices is at most $(ed)^{a-1}$.*

We need a stronger version of Lemma 6 for small a , which is just a special case of the Kruskal-Katona Theorem (not the simplified version which is Theorem 5).

Lemma 15. *For $A \subseteq L_k$ with $|A| = a \leq k$, we have $|N(A)| \geq ka - \binom{a}{2}$.*

We recall the definition of the graph M as the bipartite graph with parts $L_k = \binom{[2k-1]}{k}$ and $L_{k-1} = \binom{[2k-1]}{k-1}$ and edge relation given by containment.

Lemma 16. *Let $p > 1/2$ be a constant, and let $X = V(M)_p$. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that with very high probability, every closed, 2-linked $A \subseteq L_k$ with $1 < |A| \leq \log_2 k$ satisfies $|N(A) \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq c(|N(A)| - |A|)$.*

Proof. Let J be the graph with vertex set L_k and adjacency given by the 2-linked relation: u is adjacent to v if and only if $N(u) \cap N(v) \neq \emptyset$. Note that J is a $k(k-1)$ -regular graph. We associate to each $A \subseteq L_k$ a spanning rooted tree in J . By Lemma 14, the cost of A is at most

$$\log_2 |L_k| + (a-1) \log_2(ek(k-1)) \leq 2k + 3a \log_2 k. \quad (2)$$

Let $p = 1 - 2^{-(1+\varepsilon)} > 1/2$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is constant, and let $\delta = \min\{\frac{\varepsilon/2}{1+\varepsilon}, (\varepsilon/12)^2\}$. By Lemma 15, the probability that $|N(A) \cap X| \leq \delta ka$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{ka - a^2/2}{\leq \delta ka} p^{\delta ka} (1-p)^{ka - \binom{a}{2} - \delta ka} &\leq \exp_2(\delta ka \log_2(4/\delta) - (1+\varepsilon)(1-\delta)ka) \\ &\leq \exp_2\left(3\sqrt{\delta}ka - (1+\varepsilon/2)ka\right) \leq \exp_2(-(1+\varepsilon/4)ka). \end{aligned}$$

This beats (2) when $a \geq 2$, allowing us to take a union bound over all A to conclude that

$$|N(A) \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq \delta ka - a \geq \frac{\delta}{2}ka \geq \frac{\delta}{2}(|N(A)| - |A|)$$

for all 2-linked $|A|$ with $1 < a \leq \log_2 k$ w.v.h.p. □

We note that for constant $p > 3/4$, Lemma 16 also applies for $a = 1$, since the probability that $|N(A) \cap X|$ is small is roughly $(1-p)^{ka} \leq 4^{-(1+\varepsilon)ka}$, beating the cost of A given by (2).

4 Weak containers

Recall that we work in the “middle two layers” graph M , where $A \subseteq L_k$ and $N(A) \subseteq L_{k-1}$. We let $G = N(A)$, $a = |A| \geq \log_2 k$, and $t = |N(A)| - |A| \geq a/2k$.

Proof of Lemma 11. We define our weak containers in several steps, conveniently summarized in Figure 1. We show the existence and other nice properties of the intermediary sets by claims throughout the proof. In between the claims, we bound the cost of the intermediary sets and show that they are concentrated.

Let G^h be the set of vertices $v \in L_{k-1}$ for which there are at least $k^3/(2\log^4 k)$ walks $vxyz$ where $x, z \in A$. Note that $G^h \subseteq G$. For $R \subseteq A$, define $T = N(N(N(R)))$, $F' = N(N(N(R)) \cap A)$, and $L = E(N(R), \overline{A})$,¹ where $\overline{A} = L_k \setminus A$ is the complement of A .

¹The choice of notation is meant to be a helpful reminder of the definition: R will be a *random* subset of A , T is the *triple* neighborhood of R , and L is the set of edges which *leak* from $N(R)$ to \overline{A} . The letters G , S and F are historical convention (see e.g. [9]).

Claim 17. *For every A , there exists a choice of R such that*

$$|R| \leq 18a \frac{\log^5 k}{k^3}, \quad (3)$$

$$|L| \leq 18t \frac{\log^5 k}{k}, \quad (4)$$

$$|G^h \setminus F'| \leq 9 \frac{t}{k^{1/5}}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. Let $R = A_q$ with $q = \frac{6 \log^5 k}{k^3}$, that is, we choose each element of A to be included in R independently with probability q . We first find upper bounds on the expected sizes of R , L , and $G^h \setminus F'$, and then by Markov's inequality, conclude the existence of an R that yields such upper bounds within a constant factor.

Clearly $\mathbb{E}|R| = aq$. Recalling that $t = |G| - |A|$, we have

$$|E(G, \bar{A})| = tk. \quad (6)$$

For each edge $e \in E(G, \bar{A})$, the probability that $e \in L$ is the probability that the endpoint of e in G has a neighbor which is in R , which is at most kq . Thus $\mathbb{E}|L| \leq tk \cdot kq \leq 6t \log^5 k/k$. Finally we bound $\mathbb{E}|G^h \setminus F'|$. For $v \in G^h$, consider all the vertices z which are endpoints of a walk $vxyz$ with $x, z \in A$. If the distance between v and z is 1, then all such walks have $x = z$, since every two vertices of L_k share at most one neighbor in L_{k-1} , and hence there are at most k^2 such walks over all choices of z . Since $v \in G^h$, there are at least $\frac{k^3}{2 \log^4 k} - k^2$ paths $vxyz$ with $x, z \in A$. This gives at least $\frac{k^3}{4 \log^4 k} - \frac{k^2}{2} \geq \frac{k^3}{5 \log^4 k}$ vertices $z \in A$ which are the endpoints of such paths, because between any two vertices at distance 3 from each other in M there are exactly two paths of length 3. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}|G^h \setminus F'| \leq |G|(1 - q)^{k^3/5 \log^4 k} \leq (a + t) \exp\left(-q \frac{k^3}{5 \log^4 k}\right) = \frac{a + t}{k^{6/5}} \leq 3t/k^{1/5},$$

where in the last step we used the assumption that $t \geq a/2k$.

By Markov's inequality, there exists a choice of R as desired. \square

Using (3) and simply the fact that $R \subseteq L_k$, we compute the cost of R as

$$\text{Cost}(R) \leq \log_2 \left(\binom{2k-1}{k} \right) \leq O \left(a \frac{\log^5 k}{k^3} \left(\log \frac{\binom{2k-1}{k}}{a} + 3 \log k \right) \right) \leq O \left(t \frac{\log^6 k}{k^2} \right), \quad (7)$$

where the last inequality follows by Lemma 6.

Also from (3), we trivially have

$$|T| \leq |R| \cdot k^3 \leq O(a \log^5 k). \quad (8)$$

Since T is determined by R , we have $\text{Cost}(T) = \text{Cost}(R)$, so we may conclude that T is concentrated by Proposition 8 and checking that

$$\frac{t^2}{|T|} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{t^2}{a \log^5 k}\right) \geq \Omega\left(\frac{t}{k \log^5 k}\right) \geq \omega(\text{Cost}(T)),$$

where we used again that $t \geq a/2k$.

Since L is a set of edges incident to $N(R)$, we have by (3), (4), and $t \geq a/2k$ that

$$\text{Cost}(L|R) \leq \log_2 \left(\begin{matrix} k \cdot |N(R)| \\ \leq O(t \log^5 k/k) \end{matrix} \right) \leq O\left(t \frac{\log^5 k}{k} \log \frac{k^2 \cdot |R|}{t \log^5 k/k}\right) = O\left(t \frac{\log^6 k}{k}\right).$$

Because F' is determined by R and L , we have

$$\text{Cost}(F') \leq \text{Cost}(R) + \text{Cost}(L|R) = O\left(t \frac{\log^6 k}{k}\right). \quad (9)$$

By the definitions of T , L , and F' , and by (4), we have

$$|T \setminus F'| \leq |L| \cdot k = O(t \log^5 k), \quad (10)$$

so $T \setminus F'$ is concentrated by Proposition 8, because

$$\frac{t^2}{|T \setminus F'|} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{t}{\log^5 k}\right) = \omega(\text{Cost}(T, F')).$$

By Proposition 10, together with the fact that T is concentrated, we have that F' is concentrated.

For a vertex v and a set of vertices Y , we define $d(v, Y) = |N(v) \cap Y|$ to be the degree of v to Y . Let $Q = \{v : d(v, T) \geq k/2\}$, so

$$|Q| \leq \frac{k|T|}{k/2} = 2|T| \leq O(a \log^5 k) \quad (11)$$

by (8). Since T determines Q , we have that Q is concentrated by Proposition 8, in the same way that we showed that T is concentrated. Let $E = \{v \in Q \setminus A : d(v, T \setminus G) \geq k/4\}$.

Claim 18. *For every A , there exists a choice of $R' \subseteq T \setminus G$ such that*

$$|R'| \leq O(t \log^6 k/k), \quad (12)$$

$$|E \setminus N(R')| \leq O(t). \quad (13)$$

Proof. Let $R' = (T \setminus G)_{q'}$, where $q' = 5 \frac{\log k}{k}$. By (10) and the fact that $F' \subseteq G$, we have $\mathbb{E}|R'| \leq O(t \log^6 k/k)$. Then using $|E| \leq |Q| \leq O(a \log^5 k)$ from (11), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|E \setminus N(R')| \leq |E|(1 - q')^{k/4} \leq O(a \log^5 k) \cdot \exp\left(-q' \frac{k}{4}\right) = O\left(a \frac{\log^5 k}{k^{5/4}}\right) \leq O(t).$$

By Markov's inequality, there exists a choice of R' as desired. \square




Figure 1: The intermediary sets used to construct weak containers. Each set can be defined by what is immediately above it in the diagram, except for the boxed sets, which also require A or $G = N(A)$ for their definition. We compute the cost of an intermediary set Y by computing $\text{Cost}(Y|Z)$, where Z is all the sets above Y , and adding it to $\text{Cost}(Z)$. The cost of the boxed sets is kept low because the size of the set that depends on A or G is appropriately small. The cost of the other sets is at most the cost of the sets above them.

Let $Q' = Q \setminus N(R')$. Since $R' \subseteq T$, we have by (12) and $t \geq a/2k$ that

$$\text{Cost}(R'|T) \leq \log_2 \left(\binom{|T|}{\leq O(t \log^6 k/k)} \right) \leq O \left(t \frac{\log^6 k}{k} \log \frac{a \log^5 k}{t \log^6 k/k} \right) \leq O \left(t \frac{\log^7 k}{k} \right). \quad (14)$$

Since $\text{Cost}(R', Q) = \text{Cost}(R'|T) + \text{Cost}(R)$, we have by (12),

$$\frac{t^2}{|Q \cap N(R')|} \geq \frac{t^2}{|N(R')|} \geq \Omega \left(\frac{t}{\log^6 k} \right) \geq \omega \left(t \frac{\log^7 k}{k} \right) \geq \omega(\text{Cost}(R', Q)).$$

Thus $Q \cap N(R')$ is concentrated, and hence by Proposition 10, Q' is concentrated.

Finally, let $S' = Q' \cup A$. Since $R' \cap G = \emptyset$, we have that $A \setminus Q' = A \setminus Q$. Thus to show that S' is concentrated, it suffices to show that $|A \setminus Q| = o(t)$ by Propositions 9 and 10. The following claim proves something slightly stronger that is needed for later and also proves that (S', F') is a weak container.

Claim 19. *For every A , we have that $|S' \setminus A| = O(t)$, $|G \setminus F'| = O(t)$, and $|A \setminus Q| = o(t/\log k)$.*

Proof. Each vertex of $(Q \setminus E) \setminus A$ sends at least $k/4$ edges to G , so by (6), we have $|(Q \setminus E) \setminus A| = O(t)$. Combining with (13), we have

$$|S' \setminus A| = |Q' \setminus A| = |(Q \setminus N(R')) \setminus A| \leq |(Q \setminus E) \setminus A| + |(E \setminus N(R')) \setminus A| = O(t).$$

To show that $|G \setminus F'| = O(t)$, by (5), it suffices to show that $|G \setminus G^h| = O(t)$. Define the following sets:

$$G^\ell = \{v \in G : d(v, A) < k/\log^2 k\}, \quad A^\ell = \{v \in A : d(v, G^\ell) > k/2\},$$

$$G^{\ell\ell} = \{v \in G : d(v, A \setminus A^\ell) < k/\log^2 k\}, \quad A^{\ell\ell} = \{v \in A : d(v, G^{\ell\ell}) \geq k/4\}.$$

Each vertex of G^ℓ sends at least $(1 - o(1))k$ edges to \bar{A} , so by (6),

$$|G^\ell| \leq \frac{tk}{(1 - o(1))k} = O(t).$$

Similarly, we have

$$|A^\ell| \leq \frac{|G^\ell|k/\log^2 k}{k/2} = O\left(\frac{t}{\log^2 k}\right),$$

$$|G^{\ell\ell}| \leq \frac{tk + |A^\ell|k}{(1 - o(1))k} = O(t),$$

$$|A^{\ell\ell}| \leq |A^\ell| + \frac{|G^{\ell\ell}|k/\log^2 k}{k/4} = O\left(\frac{t}{\log^2 k}\right). \quad (15)$$

If $v \in G \setminus G^{\ell\ell}$, then the number of $vxzy$ walks with $x, z \in A$ is at least $\frac{k}{\log^2 k} \cdot \frac{k}{2} \cdot \frac{k}{\log^2 k} = \frac{k^3}{2\log^4 k}$, so $v \in G^h$. This means $G \setminus G^h \subseteq G^{\ell\ell}$, giving $|G \setminus G^h| = O(t)$ as desired.

Note that if $v \in A \setminus Q$ has at least $k/4$ neighbors in $G \setminus G^h \subseteq G^{\ell\ell}$, then $v \in A^{\ell\ell}$. Otherwise, by the definition of Q , v has at least $k/4$ neighbors in $G^h \setminus T \subseteq G^h \setminus F'$. Thus by (5) and (15), we have

$$|A \setminus Q| \leq |A^{\ell\ell}| + \frac{|G^h \setminus F'|k}{k/4} = o(t/\log k). \quad \square$$

With Claim 19, we have thus far established that the (S', F') pairs are concentrated weak containers. Recall that the cost of F' is $o(t)$ by (9). Using Figure 1 as a guide and recalling the cost of R from (7) and the cost of R' from (14), we have

$$\text{Cost}(S') \leq \text{Cost}(A \setminus Q'|Q') + \text{Cost}(R'|R) + \text{Cost}(R) \leq \text{Cost}(A \setminus Q'|Q') + o(t).$$

All that is left to do is show that $\text{Cost}(A \setminus Q'|Q') = o(t)$. This is the only time we use that A is 2-linked and $a \geq \log_2 k$. Let J be the graph with vertex set L_k and adjacency given by the 2-linked relation: u is adjacent to v if and only if $N(u) \cap N(v) \neq \emptyset$. Note that J is $k(k-1)$ -regular, and A induces a connected subgraph of J . Assuming $A \cap Q' \neq \emptyset$, we associate to A a rooted forest in J , rooted in $A \cap Q'$, whose non-roots are exactly the vertices of $A \setminus Q'$. The number of choices for $A \setminus Q'$, given Q' , is at most the number of choices for such forests, given Q' . Assuming there are r roots, there are at most $\binom{|Q'|}{r}$ choices for roots, at most $\binom{|A \setminus Q'|}{r}$ ways to assign sizes of the trees in the forest to the roots, and at most $(ek(k-1))^{|A \setminus Q'|}$ ways

to grow the trees by Lemma 14. By Claim 19, we have $r \leq |A \setminus Q'| = o(t/\log k)$. Given that there are r roots, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost}(A \setminus Q'|Q') &\leq \log_2 \binom{|Q'|}{r} + \log_2 \binom{|A \setminus Q'|}{r} + |A \setminus Q'| \log_2(ek(k-1)) \\ &\leq r \log_2 \frac{e|Q'|}{r} + |A \setminus Q'| + 3|A \setminus Q'| \log_2 k \leq |A \setminus Q'| \log_2 \frac{e|Q'|}{|A \setminus Q'|} + 4|A \setminus Q'| \log_2 k. \end{aligned}$$

The last term is always $o(t)$ since $|A \setminus Q'| = o(t/\log k)$. The second-to-last term is clearly $o(t)$ if $\frac{e|Q'|}{|A \setminus Q'|} \leq k^3$, say, while otherwise we have that $|A \setminus Q'| \leq \frac{e|Q'|}{k^3} = O(a \log^5 k/k^3)$ by (11) and $Q' \subseteq Q$, and hence using $t \geq a/2k$ we get

$$|A \setminus Q'| \log_2 \frac{e|Q'|}{|A \setminus Q'|} \leq O\left(a \frac{\log^5 k}{k^3}\right) \cdot \log_2(e|L_k|) = O\left(t \frac{\log^5 k}{k}\right) = o(t).$$

Adding in the $\log |A \setminus Q'|$ cost of choosing the number of roots, we have that $\text{Cost}(A \setminus Q'|Q') = o(t)$ if $A \cap Q' \neq \emptyset$.

If $A \cap Q' = \emptyset$, then we choose a root for a fixed spanning tree of A in J , which comes with an additional cost of $\log_2 |L_k| = O(k)$. This is $o(t)$, since for $\log_2 k \leq a \leq k^3$, we have $t = \Omega(ak)$ by Theorem 5, and for larger a , we have $t \geq a/2k$. \square

5 Strong Containers

Recall that we work in the “middle two layers” graph M , where $A \subseteq L_k$ and $N(A) \subseteq L_{k-1}$. Recall that $G = N(A)$, $a = |A|$, and $t = |N(A)| - |A| \geq a/2k$.

Proof of Lemma 12. Suppose we have concentrated weak containers (S', F') at cost $o(t)$, as guaranteed by Lemma 11. We transform these (S', F') into concentrated strong containers (S, F) at an additional cost of $o(t)$. See Figure 2 for a convenient description of the dependencies of the intermediary sets. Let $\psi = \log^2 k$.

Recall that, for a vertex v and a set of vertices Y , we define $d(v, Y) = |N(v) \cap Y|$ to be the degree of v to Y . Let H be a minimum set of vertices of A such that $F'' := F' \cup N(H)$ satisfies that for every $v \in A$, $d(v, G \setminus F'') \leq \psi$.

Claim 20. *For every A , we have $|H| \leq O(t/\psi)$.*

Proof. It suffices to construct some such H which has size $O(t/\psi)$. We construct H greedily, considering vertices $v \in A$ one at a time and placing them in H if $d(v, G \setminus (F' \cup N(H))) > \psi$. Upon the addition of v to H , we reduce the size of $G \setminus (F' \cup N(H))$ by at least ψ . Thus $|H| \leq \frac{|G \setminus F'|}{\psi}$, which is $O(t/\psi)$ since (S', F') is a weak container. \square

As $H \subseteq S'$, we have by Claim 20 and $t \geq a/2k$ that

$$\text{Cost}(H|S') \leq \log_2 \binom{|S'|}{\leq O(t/\psi)} \leq O\left(\frac{t}{\psi} \log \frac{tk}{t/\psi}\right) \leq O\left(t \frac{\log k}{\psi}\right) \leq o(t).$$




Figure 2: The intermediary sets used to construct strong containers from weak containers. Each set can be defined by what is immediately above it via solid lines in the diagram. The dashed line represents a useful dependency when verifying that S'' is concentrated.

Since $F'' \subseteq G$, we have $|N(H) \setminus F'| = O(t)$, and hence

$$\frac{t^2}{|N(H) \setminus F'|} \geq \Omega(t) \geq \omega(\text{Cost}(H|S') + \text{Cost}(S', F')).$$

Thus $N(H) \setminus F'$ is concentrated by Proposition 8. Since F' is concentrated, by Proposition 10, we have that F'' is concentrated.

Let $S'' = \{v : d(v, F'') \geq k - \psi\}$. From the choice of H , we have that $A \subseteq S''$. Furthermore, by (6),

$$|S'' \setminus A| \leq \frac{tk}{k - \psi} = O(t). \quad (16)$$

Since $|S' \setminus A| = O(t)$, we have $|S' \Delta S''| = O(t)$. The costs of S' and S'' are both $o(t)$, so by Proposition 8, both $S' \setminus S''$ and $S'' \setminus S'$ are concentrated. Thus S'' is concentrated by Proposition 10.

Now let U be a minimum set of vertices of \overline{G} such that $S := S'' \setminus N(U)$ satisfies that for every $v \in \overline{G}$, $d(v, S) \leq \psi$, where $\overline{G} = L_{k-1} \setminus G$ is the complement of G .

Claim 21. *For every A , we have $|U| \leq O(t/\psi)$ and $U \subseteq N(S'')$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Claim 20. We may construct such U greedily, by considering vertices $v \in \overline{G}$ one at a time and placing them in U if $d(v, S'' \setminus N(U)) > \psi$.

Upon the addition of v to U , we reduce the size of $S'' \setminus N(U)$ by at least ψ . Since $U \subseteq \overline{G}$, we have that $S'' \setminus N(U)$ always contains A , and hence $|U| \leq \frac{|S'' \setminus A|}{\psi} = O(t/\psi)$ by (16). That $U \subseteq N(S'')$ follows from the minimality of U : for each vertex $v \in U$, $N(v)$ should intersect S'' . \square

We have by Claim 21 and $t \geq a/2k$ that

$$\text{Cost}(U|S'') \leq \log_2 \left(\begin{array}{l} |N(S'')| \\ \leq O(t/\psi) \end{array} \right) \leq O \left(\frac{t}{\psi} \log \frac{tk^2}{t/\psi} \right) \leq O \left(t \frac{\log k}{\psi} \right) \leq o(t).$$

Since U is disjoint from G , we have $A \subseteq S$ and $S'' \cap N(U) \subseteq S'' \setminus A$. By (16), we have

$$\frac{t^2}{|S'' \cap N(U)|} \geq \Omega(t) \geq \omega(\text{Cost}(U|S'') + \text{Cost}(S'')),$$

so $S'' \cap N(U)$ is concentrated by Proposition 8. Hence by Proposition 10, S is concentrated.

Finally, define $F = F'' \cup \{v : d(v, S) > \psi\}$, so $\text{Cost}(S, F) = o(t)$. By the construction of S , we have $F \subseteq G$, and hence $|F \setminus F''| = O(t)$. By Proposition 8, $|F \setminus F''|$ is concentrated, so by Proposition 10, F is concentrated.

All that remains to be checked is that $|S| \leq |F| + o(t)$. By construction of F , every $v \in \overline{F}$ satisfies $d(v, \overline{S}) \geq k - \psi$. For every $v \in S$, we have $v \in S''$, so $d(v, F) \geq d(v, F'') \geq k - \psi$. Recall that $|E(G, \overline{A})| = |G|k - |A|k = tk$. Each vertex in $G \setminus F$ contributes at least $k - \psi$ edges to $E(G, \overline{A})$, so $|G \setminus F| \leq \frac{tk}{k - \psi}$, and each vertex in $S \setminus A$ contributes at least $k - \psi$ edges to $E(\overline{A}, G)$, so $|S \setminus A| \leq \frac{tk}{k - \psi}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} k|F| + \frac{tk}{k - \psi}\psi &\geq k|F| + \psi|G \setminus F| \geq e(S, G) \\ &\geq k|A| + (k - \psi)|S \setminus A| = k|S| - \psi|S \setminus A| \geq k|S| - \frac{tk}{k - \psi}\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$|S| \leq |F| + \frac{2t\psi}{k - \psi} \leq |F| + o(t). \quad \square$$

Remark. It is in the final step of the proof of Lemma 12 that we use crucially that M is regular. The proof would still go through if the bipartite graph were bi-regular, meaning the degrees on the same side are all equal, and the degrees of vertices in A were larger than the degrees of vertices in $N(A)$.

6 Using strong containers

Proof of Theorem 4. Lemma 16 takes care of the case when $a \leq \log_2 k$, so we assume that $a \geq \log_2 k$. Hence Lemmas 11 and 12 hold, and strong containers exist.

We now abandon the asymptotic notation to be careful with the constants. Let $p = 1/2 + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is constant. Suppose we have strong containers, where $||S \cap X| - p|S|| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}t$ w.v.h.p., $||F \cap X| - p|F|| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}t$ w.v.h.p., and $|S| \leq |F| + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}t$ for all containers (S, F) , and moreover, the number of containers is at most $2^{\varepsilon t}$. If $|S| \leq |F| - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}t$, then we are already done, since (recalling that $G = N(A)$)

$$|G \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq |F \cap X| - |S \cap X| \geq p|F| - p|S| - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}t \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}t. \quad (17)$$

Hence we may suppose $|S| \geq |F| - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}t$. Our goal is to show that

$$|(S \setminus A) \cap X| + |(G \setminus F) \cap X| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}t \quad (18)$$

w.v.h.p. for all A , which improves (17) to

$$|G \cap X| - |A \cap X| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}t + p(|F| - |S|) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}t \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}t,$$

finishing the proof for $a \geq \log_2 k$ with $c = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$.

First we determine the cost of A . The following idea is made explicit by Park [22], but appears in an earlier work of Hamm and Kahn [11]. For every strong container (S, F) and every a and g , fix A^* of size a and $G^* = N(A^*)$ of size g which have (S, F) as a strong container. Note that A^* and G^* are determined by (S, F) .

Given A^* , to determine A it suffices to determine $A \setminus A^*$ and $A^* \setminus A$. The cost of $A \setminus A^*$ is at most $|S \setminus A^*|$, since $A \setminus A^* \subseteq S \setminus A^*$. Because A is closed, $A^* \setminus A$ consists of all the neighbors of $G^* \setminus G$ in A^* , hence $A^* \setminus A$ is determined by $G^* \setminus G$. Thus the cost of $A^* \setminus A$ is at most $|G^* \setminus F|$, since $G^* \setminus G \subseteq G^* \setminus F$. Let $t' = |S \setminus A| + |G \setminus F| = t + (|S| - |F|)$. Then the cost of A is at most $t' + \text{Cost}(S, F) \leq t' + \varepsilon t$.

Now we bound the probability that (18) occurs. Note that $|((S \setminus A) \cup (G \setminus F)) \cap X|$ is binomially distributed, so the probability that it is less than $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}t$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \varepsilon^2 t/4 \rfloor} \binom{t'}{i} p^i (1-p)^{t'-i} = 2^{-t'} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \varepsilon^2 t/4 \rfloor} \binom{t'}{i} (1+2\varepsilon)^i (1-2\varepsilon)^{t'-i} \\ & \leq 2^{-t'} \frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} \exp \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} \log \frac{4\varepsilon t'}{\varepsilon^2 t} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} \log(1+2\varepsilon) + \left(t' - \frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} \right) \log(1-2\varepsilon) \right) \\ & \leq 2^{-t'} \frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} \exp \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon t}{2} + \varepsilon^3 t - 2\varepsilon t' \right) \leq 2^{-t'} \frac{\varepsilon^2 t}{4} e^{-\varepsilon t}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing to $\text{Cost}(A) \leq t' + \varepsilon t$, we may take a union bound over all A and choices of $a = |A|$ and $g = |G|$ to get that w.v.h.p. $|(S \setminus A) \cap X| + |(G \setminus F) \cap X| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}t$. \square

References

- [1] J. Balogh, R. I. Garcia, and L. Li. Independent sets in the middle two layers of Boolean lattice. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 178:105341, 2021.
- [2] J. Balogh, R. A. Krueger, and H. Luo. Sharp threshold for the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem. *To appear in Random Structures & Algorithms*, 2022.
- [3] J. Balogh, R. Morris, and W. Samotij. Independent sets in hypergraphs. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 28(3):669–709, 2015.
- [4] J. Balogh, R. Mycroft, and A. Treglown. A random version of Sperner’s theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 128:104–110, 2014.
- [5] M. Collares Neto and R. Morris. Maximum-size antichains in random set-systems. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(2):308–321, 2016.
- [6] D. Conlon and W. T. Gowers. Combinatorial theorems in sparse random sets. *Annals of Mathematics (2)*, 184(2):367–454, 2016.
- [7] R. Dedekind. Über Zerlegungen von Zahlen Durch Ihre Grössten Gemeinsamen Theiler. In *Fest-Schrift der Herzoglichen Technischen Hochschule Carolo-Wilhelmina*, 1–40, Vieweg+Teubner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1897.
- [8] P. Erdős. On a lemma of Littlewood and Offord. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 51:898–902, 1945.
- [9] D. Galvin. Independent sets in the discrete hypercube. *arXiv:1901.01991*, 2019.
- [10] D. Galvin and J. Kahn. On Phase Transition in the Hard-Core Model on \mathbb{Z}^d . *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 13(2):137–164, 2004.
- [11] A. Hamm and J. Kahn. On Erdős-Ko-Rado for random hypergraphs II. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 28(1):61–80, 2019.
- [12] M. Jenssen and P. Keevash. Homomorphisms from the torus. *arXiv:2009.08315*, 2020.
- [13] M. Jenssen and W. Perkins. Independent sets in the hypercube revisited. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 102:645–669, 2020.
- [14] Gy. O. H. Katona. A theorem of finite sets. *Theory of Graphs* (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), 187–207, Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [15] Y. Kohayakawa and B. Kreuter. The width of random subsets of Boolean lattices. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 100(2):376–386, 2002.
- [16] Y. Kohayakawa, B. Kreuter, and D. Osthus. The length of random subsets of Boolean lattices. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 16(2):177–194, 2000.

- [17] A. D. Korshunov. On the number of monotone Boolean functions. *Problemy Kibernet.*, 38:5–108, 1981. (Russian)
- [18] A. D. Korshunov and A. A. Sapozhenko. The number of binary codes with distance 2. *Problemy Kibernet.*, 40:111–130, 1983. (Russian)
- [19] J. B. Kruskal. The number of simplices in a complex. *Mathematical optimization techniques*, 10:251–278, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1963.
- [20] L. Lovász, *Combinatorial problems and exercises*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993.
- [21] D. Osthus. Maximum antichains in random subsets of a finite set. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 90(2):336–346, 2000.
- [22] J. Park. Note on the number of balanced independent sets in the Hamming cube. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(2):P2.34, 2022.
- [23] A. Rényi. On random subsets of a finite set. *Mathematica (Cluj)*, 3(26):355–362, 1961.
- [24] V. Rödl and M. Schacht. Extremal results in random graphs. In *Erdős centennial*, 535–583, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [25] A. A. Sapozhenko. On the number of connected subsets with given cardinality of boundaries in bipartite graphs. *Metody Diskretn. Anal.*, 45:42–70, 1987. (Russian)
- [26] D. Saxton and A. Thomason. Hypergraph containers. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 201(3):925–992, 2015.
- [27] Mathias Schacht. Extremal results for random discrete structures. *Annals of Mathematics (2)*, 184(2):333–365, 2016.
- [28] E. Sperner. Ein Satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menge. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 27(1):544–548, 1928.