arXiv:1205.6063v3 [math.CO] 27 Mar 2013

The Edge-Isoperimetric Problem in $(\mathbb{N}^2, \infty)$

Emmanuel Tsukerman*

Abstract

We consider the edge-isoperimetric problem on the graph of the infinite grid $\mathbb{N}^2$ in the ℓ_∞ metric. We first show that the solutions are not nested, so that techniques other than compressions have to be used. We then show that for any given volume of sets in $\mathbb{N}^2$, there exists an optimal set of a specific geometric form and describe this form. We continue on to prove that the optimal perimeter has asymptotic growth rate $2\sqrt{7x}$ as a function of the volume and obtain upper and lower bounds for the optimal perimeter which are within the small additive constant of $\frac{35}{2}$ of one another, thus effectively solving the discrete isoperimetric inequality on this graph. Finally, we prove that there exist arbitrarily long consecutive values of the volume for which the minimum perimeter is the same.

1 Background

Isoperimetric problems are classical objects of study in mathematics. In general, such problems ask for sets whose boundary is smallest for a given volume. A classic example dating back to ancient Greece is to determine the shape in the plane for which the perimeter is minimized subject to a volume constraint.

Discrete isoperimetric problems deal with isoperimetric problems on discrete spaces, such as graphs. Two notions of the boundary which are commonly considered are the vertex boundary and the edge boundary. These are defined as follows. Let A be a set of vertices in a graph $G = (V, E)$. The vertex boundary of A is defined to be the set $\{v \in V \backslash A : v \sim a \text{ for some } a \in A\}$.

*Stanford University, emantsuk@stanford.edu

In contrast, the *edge boundary* of A is defined to be the set $\{e \in E : e = \{v, a\}$ for some $a \in A$ and $v \in V \setminus A\}$. The vertex (edge) isoperimetric problem for G asks for the minimum possible cardinality of the vertex (edge) boundary for a k-element subset of V for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

One of the setting in which discrete vertex- and edge-isoperimetric problems have previously been studied is the graph of the infinite grid viewed in the ℓ_1 metric, in which two nodes are adjacent whenever their distance in the ℓ_1 metric is 1 (see [1] for the vertex-isoperimetric problem and [2] for the edge-isoperimetric problem). Natural analogues of these problems are the vertex- and edge-isoperimetric problems on the infinite grid in the ℓ_∞ metric. Since the metrics ℓ_1 and ℓ_∞ are dual, one hopes for interesting connections between the two problems. Only very recently has this family of graphs began to be studied in [3], in which the vertex-isoperimetric problem is solved.

1.1 The Edge-Isoperimetric Problem on $(\mathbb{N}^2, \infty)$

Let G be a graph. For every $x \in V(G)$, we let $N_{V(G)}(x) = \{y \in V(G) : \{x, y\} \in E(G)\}$ denote its vertex-neighbourhood.

Definition 1.1 *A graph G is induced by a p-norm, $0 < p \leq \infty$, if there exists some constant c such that for every $x \in V(g)$, $N_V(x) = \{y \in V(G) : 0 < \|x - y\|_p \leq c\}$.*

We will be considering the graph $\mathbb{N}^2$ induced by the ∞-norm with $c = 1$. That is, the graph for which $x \sim y$ iff $\max_i |x_i - y_i| = 1$. The set of edges is $E(G) = \{\{x, y\} : x, y \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\|x - y\|_\infty = \max_i |x_i - y_i| = 1\}$. We consider the edge-isoperimetric problem on this graph. One immediate difficulty in solving the problem is that optimal sets are not nested.

Proposition 1.2 *The optimal sets of $\mathbb{N}^2$ are not nested.*

Proof. Figure 1 shows the uniquely determined up to reflection in $y = x$ sequence of nested optimal sets of $\mathbb{N}^2$. Figure 2 shows a set with $|A| = 11$ which has a smaller perimeter than the optimal nested set with $|A| = 11$. □

Nested optimal sets are crucial for the standard technique of compression and the fact that the optimal sets are not nested means that such an approach




Figure 1: The unique (up to reflection in the line $y = x$) sequence of optimal nested sets for $1 \leq |A| \leq 11$. The optimal nested set with $|A| = 11$ has $|\partial A| = 17$.




Figure 2: An optimal set having $|A| = 11$ has $|\partial A| = 16$. This set is better than the one of the same volume in Figure 1

will not be possible. Our approach to solving the problem will be to utilize the monotonicity of the optimal perimeter as a function of the volume. This will turn out to be a powerful tool for obtaining bounds, proving optimality and understanding the shape of optimal sets.

Theorem 1 *[4] Let G be a graph on $\mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{N}^d$ induced by a p-norm. The minimum edge-perimeter of sets in G is a monotonic increasing function of the volume.*

Recall that a walk on a graph is a sequence $v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \ldots$ with vertices v_i and edges e_i satisfying $e_i = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for every i.

Definition 1.3 *By a discrete curve, we will mean a countable set $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots\}$ of vertices such that there exists a walk on these vertices.*

A walk is simple if no vertices are repeated.

Definition 1.4 *A discrete curve is simple if there exists a corresponding walk which is simple.*

Given a set in $\mathbb{N}^2$, it can be made connected without increasing its volume by translating the connected components down and left. Moreover, it can be made to touch both axes. Call A the resulting set. Let X be the point on the x-axis with greatest x-coordinate and let Y be the point on the y-axis of greatest y-coordinate. There is a simple discrete curve C with endpoints X and Y. We argue that all points bounded by this curve and the axes are in A if A is optimal.

Lemma 1.5 *If A is an optimal set, then it contains all lattice points bounded by the simple discrete curve C connecting X and Y and the positive x- and y- axes.*

Proof. Assume otherwise. Consider the set B_C of points lying on or below C and let $B = B_C \cup A$. Let $A_C = B_C \cap A$ be the points of A lying on or below C. By assumption, $|B_C| > |A_C|$, so that $|B| > |A|$. We show that $|\partial B_C| < |\partial A_C|$. This implies that $|\partial B| < |\partial A|$, contradicting Theorem 1.
The perimeter ∂B_C of B_C consists not only of all edges of C which lie outside of B_C, but also of the edges of the outermost layer of points of $B_C \setminus C$ (see Figure 3. In particular, a point $a \in B_C \setminus C$ contributes whenever the following conditions are met. Point a is the vertex of a unit square $abcd$, the opposite corner c is in the complement of B_C, and the other two corners b and d are on C. In this case, edge ac is added to the perimeter. Suppose that such a point $a \in B_C \setminus A_C$ exists. Then the addition of a to A_C adds a diagonal edge ac to the count but takes away the two edges ab and ad. If a is part of more than one square, it is easy to see that the perimeter will still be strictly improved. If $B_C \setminus A_C$ contains some point which does not meet the conditions, then it does not contribute to the perimeter of B_C. Since there is at least one point of this form or of the prior form, filling in these points strictly improves the perimeter. This completes the proof. □




Figure 3: The discrete simple curve C is indicated by diamonds. The perimeter of the set bounded by C receives a contribution not only from the points of C, but also from the layer adjacent to C, e.g., point a.

Lemma 1.5 applies to every curve connecting the axes. We now argue that all of A is bounded by a curve of this form.

Lemma 1.6 *For every volume, there is an optimal set which consists of the points bounded by a curve connecting the axes.*

Proof. Let A be an optimal set. As shown, a curve $C \subset A$ connecting the two axes exists. Let A_C be the points of A on or below C. Let $E_C = A \setminus A_C$. If E_C is empty, we are done. So assume otherwise. Consider a connected component E'_C of E_C which neighbours C and is closest to the y-axis. If E'_C touches the y-axis, we may prolong C from X to the point at which E'_C touches the y-axis. So we assume that E'_C does not touch the y-axis. We may also assume that only one point of C neighbours E'_C. Otherwise, C may be prolonged to contain points of E'_C. Therefore we may translate E'_C and as long as it touches another set of A or an axis, the perimeter will not increase. Doing so, we may decrease the number of components of E_C until E_C is connected. We are then free to translate E_C so that it touches one of the axes, and by lemma 1.5 we are done. □

Definition 1.7 *Point $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a j-gap of a set A if $g \notin A$ and there exists some point $p \in A$ with $p_i = g_i \ \forall i \neq j$ and $g_j < p_j$.*

We will say that a set has no gaps with it has no j-gaps for any $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

Theorem 2 *For every volume, there is an optimal set which consists of the points bounded by a curve connecting the axes and which has no gaps.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.6, we may find an optimal set of the given volume which consists of the points bounded by a curve connecting the axes. This condition allows us to fill in the 1-gaps starting from the lowest gaps by adding points such as x in Figure 4, all the while decreasing the perimeter. By Theorem 1, the optimal perimeter is a monotonic increasing function of the volume, so we see that there can be no 1-gaps. The same argument applies to the 2-gaps. □

From now on, we assume that an optimal set is given in the form of Theorem 2. Let $A_t = \{x \in A : x_1 = t\}$.




Figure 4: An optimal set A cannot have gaps since points such as x improve the perimeter when added to A.

Lemma 1.8 *An optimal set can be chosen to have at most one* $t \in \{1, 2, ..., k-1\}$ *for which* $|A_t| - |A_{t+1}| \geq 2$*, and this* t *can be chosen to be* $k-1$*.*

Proof. Let t_0 be the first t for which $|A_t| - |A_{t+1}| \geq 2$ and assume that $t_0 \neq k-1$. We can then transfer points from A_k to A_{t_0+1} until $|A_{t_0}| - |A_{t_0+1}| = 1$ or A_k has no more points left. Throughout, the perimeter does not increase because any point transferred shared at most 8 edges with other points, and after the transfer shares at least 8 edges. If $|A_{t_0}| - |A_{t_0+1}|$ is still greater than 2, then we can transfer points from column A_{k-1}, and continue in this way until either $|A_{t_0}| - |A_{t_0+1}| = 1$ or the number of columns has been reduced so that $t_0 + 1$ is the last column. □

Let us now view the heights of the columns as a function $h : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $h(t) = |A_t|$. For brevity we will say that h is constant whenever we mean that h is constant on its support. We have already shown in Theorem 2 that an optimal set exists which has h non-increasing. We will show that h can be made to take on a specific form. Before we do that, however, we note some special cases that are the only exceptions to the following Lemma. If $|A| = 1$, $|A| = 2$ or $|A| = 4$, then it is easy to see that for the optimal set h is constant. These are the only cases in which h will be constant, as we show next.

Lemma 1.9 *Without increasing the perimeter,* A *can be transformed into a set* B *for which* h_B *is constant on* $\{1, 2, ..., c-1\}$ *and strictly decreasing on*

$\{c, c+1, ..., k\}$. *Moreover, if* $|A| \neq 1, 2, 4$, *we can choose* $c < k$.

Proof. Let $S = \{x, x+1, ..., x+l\}$ be a maximal set of least x for which $h(x+i) < h(x+i-1)\ \forall i = 1, ..., l$. Assume further that $x + l < k$. We consider two cases: when $x+l = k-1$ and when $x+l < k-1$. In the former case, we take the top point from column A_k, which has at most 6 shared edges, and place it on top of column A_{k-1}, and now it has at least 6 shared edges. This reduces us to the second case. In this case, we take a point from column A_k, which can have at most 8 shared edges, and place it at the top of column A_{x+l}. Because $h(x+l) = h(x+l+1)$ and $h(x+l-1) = h(x+l)+1$, the new point has 8 shared edges, so the perimeter is not increased. We have now reduced S to $S \setminus \{x+l\}$, and we continue inductively. This shows that A can be transformed into a set B for which h_B is constant on $\{1, 2, ..., c-1\}$ and strictly decreasing on $\{c, c+1, ..., k\}$.

To see that we can choose $c < k$, assume that $|A| \neq 1, 2, 4$ and that h is constant. If $k = 1$, then we can take the top point of A_k and place it at A_2 without increasing the perimeter. If $k = 2$, we can take the point P at the top of A_k and place it at A_{k+1}. Since h_A was constant, P had at most 3 neighbours. Placing P at A_{k+1} guarantees 2 neighbours and 3 boundary edges, so the perimeter is not increased. For $k \geq 3$, we can take the point P from the top of A_k and place it at the top of A_1, and because $k \geq 3$, P will not have 2 neighbours and 3 boundary edges. □




Figure 5: Schematic depicting the form of an optimal set guaranteed by Lemmas 1.8 and 1.9. The first c columns have the same height $|A_1|$, the next $k - c - 1$ columns have heights decreasing by 1 at each step, and the last column A_k has height $|A_k|$ less than $|A_{k-1}|$.

We can now find the perimeter of a generic set subject to the conditions in the Lemmas above in terms of $|A_1|$, $|A_k|$, k and c. There are $|A_1|$ horizontal edges and k vertical edges. There are $\sum_{t=1}^{k-1}(|A_t| - |A_{t+1}| + 1) + |A_k| = |A_1| + k - 1$ edges parallel to $e_1 + e_2$, $|A_k| - 1 + \max\{|A_{k-1}| - |A_k| - 1, 0\} = |A_k| - 1 + |A_{k-1}| - |A_k| - 1 = |A_{k-1}| - 2$ edges in the $e_1 - e_2$ direction, and $\sum_{t=2}^{k} \delta_{|A_t|,|A_{t-1}|} = c - 1$ edges in the direction $e_2 - e_1$. Consequently, the perimeter is $2|A_1| + |A_{k-1}| + c + 2k - 4 = 2|A_1| + |A_1| - (k - 1 - c) + c + 2k - 4$, which is equal to

$$|\partial A| = 3|A_1| + 2c + k - 3. \tag{1}$$

We also know that $\sum_{t=1}^{k} |A_t| = |A|$. Therefore $|A| = c|A_1| + \sum_{i=1}^{k-c-1}(|A_1| - i) + |A_k|$, which simplifies to

$$|A| = (k-1)|A_1| + |A_k| - \frac{(k-c-1)(k-c)}{2}. \tag{2}$$

Combining Theorem 1 on the monotonicity of the perimeter and equation 1, we obtain:

Corollary 1.10 *Let A be an optimal set with $|A_k| < |A_{k-1}| - 1$. Then the optimal perimeter of sets of cardinality $|A| + 1$ is $|\partial A|$ and an optimal set of cardinality $|A| + 1$ is given by $A \cup \{(k, |A_k| + 1)\}$.*

We now find an example showing that simplices are not always optimal. Consider the simplex given by $h_i = 15 - i$, $i = 1, 2, ..., 14$. By increasing $|A_1|$ by 1 while preserving the shape from Lemma 1.9, we get a truncated simplex given by $h_i = 16 - i$, $i = 1, 2, ..., 10$. The perimeter of the simplex is 56, whereas that of the truncated simplex is 55.

Given $|A_1|$, c and $|A|$, the set A is determined. Indeed, we know that

$$|A_i| = \begin{cases} |A_1| & i \leq c \\ |A_1| - i + c & c + 1 \leq i \leq k - 1 \\ |A| + \frac{(k-c-1)(k-c)}{2} - (k-1)|A_1| & i = k \end{cases}$$

Moreover, k is the unique positive integer such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-c-1} (|A_1| - i) < |A| - c|A_1| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-c} (|A_1| - i).$$

Solving for k, we obtain

$$k = \lceil \frac{1}{2}(-1 + 2|A_1| - \sqrt{1 + 8(\binom{|A_1|}{2} - |A| + c|A_1|)} \rceil + c.$$

Therefore the problem is to minimize

$$|\partial A| = 3|A_1| + 3c + \lceil \frac{1}{2}(-1 + 2|A_1| - \sqrt{1 + 8(\binom{|A_1|}{2} - |A| + c|A_1|))} \rceil - 3$$

$$= 4|A_1| + 3c - 3 - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{1 + 8(\binom{|A_1|}{2} - |A| + c|A_1|))} \rfloor.$$

Lemma 1.11 *Any set A can be transformed into one for which $|A_1| \geq c$.*

Proof. Assume that $|A_1| < c$. We reflect A in the line $y = x$ to obtain a new set B which has $|A_1|$ columns. The first $|A_k|$ are of height k. Columns $|A_k|+1$ through $|A_{k-1}|$ are of height $k-1$. The remaining columns decreased in height by steps of 1, with column $|A_{k-1}|+1$ having height $k-2$ and column $|A_1|$ having height c. Since $c > |A_1| > |A_{k-1}| - |A_k|$, we can take points from column $|A_1|$ of height c and place them on top of columns $|A_k|+1$,...,$|A_{k-1}|-1$ without increasing the perimeter. The resulting set has the form of Lemma 1.9. The new parameters are $|\tilde{A}_1| = k$, $\tilde{k} = |A_1|$ and $\tilde{c} = |A_{k-1}| - 1 = |A_1| - k + c$. Then

$$c > |A_1| \implies \tilde{c} = |A_1| - k + c < 2c - k.$$

Since $k > c$, $|\tilde{A}_1| > \tilde{c}$. □

In order to obtain a lower bound, we relax our problem to a continuous one:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{|A_1|,c\in\mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} & 4|A_1| + 3c - 3 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{1 + 8(\binom{|A_1|}{2} - |A| + c|A_1|)}) \\ \text{subject to} & 1 \leq |A_1| \leq |A|, \\ & \frac{|A| - \binom{|A_1|}{2}}{|A_1|} \leq c \leq |A_1|. \end{array}$$

For any $|A| \geq 2$, we can establish via a direct calculation that the minimum value of the objective is $\sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\sqrt{8|A|-1}-2$ given by the unconstrained minimizer $|A_1| = \frac{3\sqrt{8|A|-1}}{2\sqrt{14}}$ and $c = \frac{1}{28}(14+\sqrt{14}\sqrt{8|A|-1})$, and the value is better than the value of the function on the boundary of the feasible region.

To obtain an upper bound, we will utilize the monotonicity of the perimeter from Theorem 1. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $|A|^* = 7m^2$, $|A_1|^* = 3m$ and $c^* = m$. It is again a simple calculation to verify that these values give a feasible point. The function

$$g(|A_1|, c) = 4|A_1| + 3c - 2 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{1 + 8(\binom{|A_1|}{2} - |A| + c|A_1|)})$$

is an upper bound for the perimeter. For $|A|^* = 7m^2$,

$$g(|A_1|^*, c^*) = 15m - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{4m^2 - 12m + 1} - \frac{5}{2}$$

$$= \frac{15}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|^*} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4}{7}|A|^* - \frac{12}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|^*} + 1}.$$

For a general $|A|$, we find m such that $7(m-1)^2 < |A| \leq 7m^2$. Then $|A|^* \leq |A| + 2\sqrt{7|A|} - 8$, so that

$$|\partial A| \leq \frac{15}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A| + 2\sqrt{7|A|} - 8} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4}{7}(|A| + 2\sqrt{7|A|} - 8) - \frac{12}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A| + 2\sqrt{7|A|} - 8} + 1}.$$

This complicated expression is asymptotically

$$\frac{15}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|} = \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\sqrt{8|A|}.$$

Note, however, that the upper bound is real if and only if $|A| \geq 36$.

Theorem 3 *Let the cardinality of a set A be $|A| \geq 36$. Then the perimeter $|\partial A|$ is bounded below by*

$$\lceil \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\sqrt{8|A|-1} - 2 \rceil$$




Figure 6: Plot of the minimum perimeter, its lower and upper bounds from Theorem 3 vs. the volume $|A|$. Note that the lower bound and the minimum perimeter are nearly indistinguishable!

and above by

$$\lfloor \frac{15}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8}-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4}{7}(|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8)-\frac{12}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8}+1}\rfloor.$$

Moreover, the difference between the upper and lower bound does not exceed the constant $\frac{35}{2}$.

Proof. The upper and lower bounds were shown above. Rather than consider the upper bound as it stands, we consider the slightly weaker but simpler upper bound $u(|A|)$ equal to

$$\frac{15}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8}-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{4}{7}(|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8)-\frac{12}{\sqrt{7}}\sqrt{|A|+2\sqrt{7|A|}-8}}$$

obtained by dropping the 1 inside of the square root. Then a calculation shows that the difference $d(|A|)$ between the upper bound $u(|A|)$ and lower bound $l(|A|)=\sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\sqrt{8|A|-1}-2$ has a non-vanishing derivative. Moreover, at $|A|=39$, the first point at which this upper bound is defined, the derivative of the difference is positive, so that the difference is an increasing function. Taking the limit, we obtain the value $\frac{35}{2}$. For any $36 \leq |A| \leq 38$, a direct calculation shows that the difference is at most $\frac{35}{2}$. □

Note that the growth is slower than linear, though by Theorem 1 the perimeter is an increasing function. Therefore

Corollary 1.12 *There exist arbitrarily long consecutive values of the volume for which the minimum perimeter is the same.*

2 Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Simon Brendle for the support, help and suggestions throughout the writing of this paper.

References

[1] Wang, D.-L. and Wang, P. (1977) Discrete isoperimetric problems. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 32 860-870.

[2] Béla Bollobás and Imre Leader. Edge-isoperimetric inequalities in the grid. *Combinatorica*, 11(4):299-314, 1991.

[3] E. Veomett, A. J. Radcliffe.Vertex Isoperimetric Inequalities for a Family of Graphs on $\mathbb{Z}^k$. The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **19(2)** (2012), #P45.

[4] E. Tsukerman. Monotonicity of the optimal perimeter in isoperimetric problems on $\mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{N}^d$. Preprint. arXiv: 1303.4139.

