

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

May 10, 2022

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 3) The Undergrad Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 3) The Undergrad Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 4) The committee that gives out teaching awards reads the teaching evals to help make a decision.

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 3) The Undergrad Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 4) The committee that gives out teaching awards reads the teaching evals to help make a decision.
- 5) When a teacher goes up for tenure, the teaching evals are used in the teaching report.

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 3) The Undergrad Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 4) The committee that gives out teaching awards reads the teaching evals to help make a decision.
- 5) When a teacher goes up for tenure, the teaching evals are used in the teaching report.
- 6) The biggest problem we have for all of the above is when not that many students fill them out. Hence

# Please Fill Out All of Your Courses Teaching Evals

- 1) Teachers read their teaching eval comments for self-improvement.
- 2) The Teach Eval Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 3) The Undergrad Chair reads others teaching evals and may discuss it with the teacher.
- 4) The committee that gives out teaching awards reads the teaching evals to help make a decision.
- 5) When a teacher goes up for tenure, the teaching evals are used in the teaching report.
- 6) The biggest problem we have for all of the above is when not that many students fill them out. Hence
- 7) **Please Fill Out the Teaching Evals in All of your Courses**

# Topics Not Covered in Grad Ramsey 2022

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

- ▶ Could cover if I had more time. Might cover it next time.

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

- ▶ Could cover if I had more time. Might cover it next time.
- ▶ Bill just not that interested.

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

- ▶ Could cover if I had more time. Might cover it next time.
- ▶ Bill just not that interested.
- ▶ Too hard for Students.

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

- ▶ Could cover if I had more time. Might cover it next time.
- ▶ Bill just not that interested.
- ▶ Too hard for Students.
- ▶ Too hard for Bill.

# We Didn't Cover X Because...

What topics in Ramsey theory didn't we cover?

Why didn't we cover them?

- ▶ Could cover if I had more time. Might cover it next time.
- ▶ Bill just not that interested.
- ▶ Too hard for Students.
- ▶ Too hard for Bill.
- ▶ Some combination of the above.

# Could Have Covered: VDW

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Canonical VDW

**Can VDW** For all  $k$  there exists  $W = W(k)$  such that for any  $\text{COL}: [W] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists  $a, d$  such that either

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all the same color

or

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all different colors

# Canonical VDW

**Can VDW** For all  $k$  there exists  $W = W(k)$  such that for any  $\text{COL}: [W] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists  $a, d$  such that either

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all the same color

or

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all different colors

- ▶ Nice proof, but it relies on 2-dim VDW thm.

# Canonical VDW

**Can VDW** For all  $k$  there exists  $W = W(k)$  such that for any  $\text{COL}: [W] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists  $a, d$  such that either

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all the same color

or

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all different colors

- ▶ Nice proof, but it relies on 2-dim VDW thm.
- ▶ There is a version for multidim VDW, but its messy.

# Canonical VDW

**Can VDW** For all  $k$  there exists  $W = W(k)$  such that for any  $\text{COL}: [W] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists  $a, d$  such that either

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all the same color

or

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all different colors

- ▶ Nice proof, but it relies on 2-dim VDW thm.
- ▶ There is a version for multidim VDW, but its messy.
- ▶ Certainly could have taught this semester.

# Canonical VDW

**Can VDW** For all  $k$  there exists  $W = W(k)$  such that for any  $\text{COL}: [W] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists  $a, d$  such that either

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all the same color

or

$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d$  are all different colors

- ▶ Nice proof, but it relies on 2-dim VDW thm.
- ▶ There is a version for multidim VDW, but its messy.
- ▶ Certainly could have taught this semester.

**Research** Better bounds on Can VDW Numbers.

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm to Number Theory

Can use Extended VDW's thm to prove the following

# Interesting App of VDW's Thm to Number Theory

Can use Extended VDW's thm to prove the following

- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive squares mod  $p$ .

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm to Number Theory

Can use Extended VDW's thm to prove the following

- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive non-squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ <https://blog.computationalcomplexity.org/2009/08/application-of-vdw-theorem-to-number.html>

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm to Number Theory

Can use Extended VDW's thm to prove the following

- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive non-squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ <https://blog.computationalcomplexity.org/2009/08/application-of-vdw-theorem-to-number.html>

I could have proven this in class and might next time I teach it.

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm to Number Theory

Can use Extended VDW's thm to prove the following

- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ For all  $k$  there exists  $p_0$  such that for all primes  $p \geq p_0$  there are  $k$  consecutive non-squares mod  $p$ .
- ▶ <https://blog.computationalcomplexity.org/2009/08/application-of-vdw-theorem-to-number.html>

I could have proven this in class and might next time I teach it.

**Research** The proof gives VDW-like bounds. Hard NT gives better bounds. Get better bounds in elementary way.

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .

## Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .  
They want to know if  $A + B + C = 2^n - 1$ .

## Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .

They want to know if  $A + B + C = 2^n - 1$ .

They can do this by communicating  $n$  bits. Can they do better?

## Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .

They want to know if  $A + B + C = 2^n - 1$ .

They can do this by communicating  $n$  bits. Can they do better?

Using large sets without 3-APs can show they can do this in  $\sim \sqrt{n}$  bits.

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .

They want to know if  $A + B + C = 2^n - 1$ .

They can do this by communicating  $n$  bits. Can they do better?

Using large sets without 3-APs can show they can do this in  $\sim \sqrt{n}$  bits.

Lower bound of  $\Omega(\log \log n)$  (By Gasarch! Honest!)

# Interesting App of VDWs Thm Comm. Comp

Alice, Bob, Carol have an  $n$ -bit number on their foreheads:  $A, B, C$ .

They want to know if  $A + B + C = 2^n - 1$ .

They can do this by communicating  $n$  bits. Can they do better?

Using large sets without 3-APs can show they can do this in  $\sim \sqrt{n}$  bits.

Lower bound of  $\Omega(\log \log n)$  (By Gasarch! Honest!)

Certainly could have done this and have in past semesters.

# Folkman's Thm

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k = 0.$$

# Folkman's Thm

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k = 0.$$

There is a version for a particular systems of linear equations.

# Folkman's Thm

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k = 0.$$

There is a version for a particular systems of linear equations.

**Folkman's Thm** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $N = N(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[N] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that ALL non-empty sums of the  $x_i$ 's are the same color.

# Folkman's Thm

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k = 0.$$

There is a version for a particular systems of linear equations.

**Folkman's Thm** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $N = N(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[N] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that ALL non-empty sums of the  $x_i$ 's are the same color.

Great thm, nice proof. Might cover it in the future.

# Research Questions

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.
- ▶ **Example**  $4x + 5y = 10z$ :

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.
- ▶ **Example**  $4x + 5y = 10z$ :
  - $\exists$  COL:  $[\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [6]$  with no mono sol.
  - $\forall$  COL:  $[\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [1]$  is mono sol.

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.
- ▶ **Example**  $4x + 5y = 10z$ :
  - $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [6] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
  - $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Find  $c$  such that

- $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
- $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c - 1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Can ask this question for many equations.

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.
- ▶ **Example**  $4x + 5y = 10z$ :
  - $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [6] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
  - $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Find  $c$  such that

- $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
- $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c - 1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Can ask this question for many equations.

- ▶ Canonical Version of Rado or Folkman's Thm.

# Research Questions

- ▶ Better Bounds on Rado and Folkman Numbers.
- ▶ Given a coloring actually FIND mono solution.
- ▶ **Example**  $4x + 5y = 10z$ :
  - $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [6] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
  - $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Find  $c$  such that

- $\exists \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c] \text{ with no mono sol.}$
- $\forall \text{ COL: } [\mathbb{N}] \rightarrow [c - 1] \text{ is mono sol.}$

Can ask this question for many equations.

- ▶ Canonical Version of Rado or Folkman's Thm.
- ▶ Caution: Some of this may be known.

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: [H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\left\{ x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\} \right\}$$

is monochromatic.

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\left\{ x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\} \right\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\left\{ x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\} \right\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

**H Irreducibility Thm** (2 var case). If  $p(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$  is irred then there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $p(x, a) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irred.

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\{x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

**H Irreducibility Thm** (2 var case). If  $p(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$  is irred then there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $p(x, a) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irred.

- ▶ HIT is an important thm and a legit app (to math).

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: [H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\left\{x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\}\right\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

**H Irreducibility Thm** (2 var case). If  $p(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$  is irred then there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $p(x, a) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irred.

- ▶ HIT is an important thm and a legit app (to math).
- ▶ As the FIRST Ramseyian Thm it is important historically.

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\{x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

**H Irreducibility Thm** (2 var case). If  $p(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$  is irred then there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $p(x, a) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irred.

- ▶ HIT is an important thm and a legit app (to math).
- ▶ As the FIRST Ramseyian Thm it is important historically.
- ▶ Only presentation in English with modern notation Villarino, Gasarch, Regan: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.06303>

# Hilbert's Cube Lemma

**Hilbert's Cube Lemma** For all  $k, c$  there exists  $H = H(k, c)$  such that for all COL:  $[H] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k$  such that

$$\left\{ x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i x_i : b_i \in \{0, 1\} \right\}$$

is monochromatic. Hilbert saw it as a Lemma to prove:

**H Irreducibility Thm** (2 var case). If  $p(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$  is irred then there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $p(x, a) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irred.

- ▶ HIT is an important thm and a legit app (to math).
- ▶ As the FIRST Ramseyian Thm it is important historically.
- ▶ Only presentation in English with modern notation Villarino, Gasarch, Regan: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.06303>
- ▶ I've taught before and could teach again.

# Roth's Thm

Roth's Theorem was prove in 1954 and is a special case of Szemerédi's Theorem which was proven in 1974.

**Roth's Thm** Every set of upper positive density has a 3-AP.

# Roth's Thm

Roth's Theorem was proved in 1954 and is a special case of Szemerédi's Theorem which was proven in 1974.

**Roth's Thm** Every set of upper positive density has a 3-AP.

- ▶ There is a combinatorial proof that I have taught in the past.

# Roth's Thm

Roth's Theorem was prove in 1954 and is a special case of Szemerédi's Theorem which was proven in 1974.

**Roth's Thm** Every set of upper positive density has a 3-AP.

- ▶ There is a combinatorial proof that I have taught in the past.
- ▶ There is an analytic proof which is the easiest analytic proof of results of this type, so perhaps could and should be taught.

# Roth's Thm

Roth's Theorem was prove in 1954 and is a special case of Szemerédi's Theorem which was proven in 1974.

**Roth's Thm** Every set of upper positive density has a 3-AP.

- ▶ There is a combinatorial proof that I have taught in the past.
- ▶ There is an analytic proof which is the easiest analytic proof of results of this type, so perhaps could and should be taught.
- ▶ There is a computer-assisted proof  
<https://sites.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/akherim/DavidWilsonMasterThesis.pdf>  
This is Roth's proof done with the ideas showing and the computation rightly put into the background.

# Roth's Thm

Roth's Theorem was proved in 1954 and is a special case of Szemerédi's Theorem which was proven in 1974.

**Roth's Thm** Every set of upper positive density has a 3-AP.

- ▶ There is a combinatorial proof that I have taught in the past.
- ▶ There is an analytic proof which is the easiest analytic proof of results of this type, so perhaps could and should be taught.
- ▶ There is a computer-assisted proof  
<https://sites.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/akherim/DavidWilsonMasterThesis.pdf>  
This is Roth's proof done with the ideas showing and the computation rightly put into the background.
- ▶ **Research** Get better bounds: How big a subset of  $\{1, \dots, 1000\}$  before guaranteed a 3-AP? 4-AP? etc.

# A Stupid App of Schur's Thm to Number Theory

Schur's Theorem is a special case or Rado's Theorem.

**Schur's Thm** For all  $c$  there exists  $S = S(c)$  such that for all  
COL:  $[S] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x, y, z$  same color such that  $x + y = z$ .

# A Stupid App of Schur's Thm to Number Theory

Schur's Theorem is a special case or Rado's Theorem.

**Schur's Thm** For all  $c$  there exists  $S = S(c)$  such that for all  
COL:  $[S] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x, y, z$  same color such that  $x + y = z$ .

**FLT** For all  $n \geq 3$  there does not exist  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  
 $x^n + y^n = z^n$ . (The  $n = 4$  case was done by Fermat.)

# A Stupid App of Schur's Thm to Number Theory

Schur's Theorem is a special case or Rado's Theorem.

**Schur's Thm** For all  $c$  there exists  $S = S(c)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: [S] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists  $x, y, z$  same color such that  $x + y = z$ .

**FLT** For all  $n \geq 3$  there does not exist  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x^n + y^n = z^n$ . (The  $n = 4$  case was done by Fermat.)

Gasarch proved:

**Thm** (Schur's Thm + FLT(4)) implies there are an infinite number of primes. <https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/schurflt.pdf>

# Rado's Theorem over the Reals

## Vote

For all  $COL: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $w, x, y, z$  all the same color:

$$w + x = y + z$$

- ▶ TRUE
- ▶ FALSE
- ▶ OTHER

# Rado's Theorem over the Reals

## Vote

For all  $COL: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $w, x, y, z$  all the same color:

$$w + x = y + z$$

- ▶ TRUE
- ▶ FALSE
- ▶ OTHER

OTHER: Statement is equiv to  $\neg CH$  and hence is Ind of ZFC.

# Rado's Theorem over the Reals

## Vote

For all  $COL: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $w, x, y, z$  all the same color:

$$w + x = y + z$$

- ▶ TRUE
- ▶ FALSE
- ▶ OTHER

OTHER: Statement is equiv to  $\neg CH$  and hence is Ind of ZFC.

Proven by Erdos. Write up by Fenner and Gasarch is here:

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/BLOGPAPERS/radozfc.pdf>

# Could have Covered: Ramsey

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Other Ramsey Numbers

## Other Ramsey Numbers

$R(C_k)$  is least  $n$  such that for all 2-coloring of  $\binom{[n]}{2}$  there exists monochromatic  $k$ -cycle.

## Other Ramsey Numbers

$R(C_k)$  is least  $n$  such that for all 2-coloring of  $\binom{[n]}{2}$  there exists monochromatic  $k$ -cycle.

### Sample Thm

$$R(C_k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k = 3 \text{ or } k = 4 \\ 2k - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 5 \text{ and } k \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{3k}{2} - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 4 \text{ and } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

## Other Ramsey Numbers

$R(C_k)$  is least  $n$  such that for all 2-coloring of  $\binom{[n]}{2}$  there exists monochromatic  $k$ -cycle.

### Sample Thm

$$R(C_k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k = 3 \text{ or } k = 4 \\ 2k - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 5 \text{ and } k \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{3k}{2} - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 4 \text{ and } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Their are many results and the proofs are elementary.

## Other Ramsey Numbers

$R(C_k)$  is least  $n$  such that for all 2-coloring of  $\binom{[n]}{2}$  there exists monochromatic  $k$ -cycle.

### Sample Thm

$$R(C_k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k = 3 \text{ or } k = 4 \\ 2k - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 5 \text{ and } k \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{3k}{2} - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 4 \text{ and } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Their are many results and the proofs are elementary.
- ▶ I would need to learn it (this is a PRO). I may have a student writeup the proofs for a project. Then I'll see if its interesting.

## Other Ramsey Numbers

$R(C_k)$  is least  $n$  such that for all 2-coloring of  $\binom{[n]}{2}$  there exists monochromatic  $k$ -cycle.

### Sample Thm

$$R(C_k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } k = 3 \text{ or } k = 4 \\ 2k - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 5 \text{ and } k \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{3k}{2} - 1 & \text{if } k \geq 4 \text{ and } k \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Their are many results and the proofs are elementary.
- ▶ I would need to learn it (this is a PRO). I may have a student writeup the proofs for a project. Then I'll see if its interesting.
- ▶ For every result of this type see <https://www.combinatorics.org/files/Surveys/ds1/ds1v15-2017.pdf>

# Research Projects

- ▶ Actually FIND the colorings.
- ▶ Simplify or unify the proofs
- ▶ **Ramsey Games** Example: Parameter  $k, n$ . Players RED and BLUE alternate coloring the edges of  $K_n$ . RED goes first. The first player to get a  $C_k$  in their color wins.
  1. For which  $n$  does RED have a winning strategy?
  2. Design an ML to play this well (my REU project)
  3. EVERY thm in Ramsey Thm (and the VDW part) can be made into a game and lead to research projects.

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

We did:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{4k}}$ .

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

We did:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{4k}}$ .

Better is known:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{2k}}$ .

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

We did:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{4k}}$ .

Better is known:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{2k}}$ .

The proof is nice but long.

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

We did:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{4k}}$ .

Better is known:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{2k}}$ .

The proof is nice but long.

I would need to refresh on it to see if appropriate.

# Better Bounds on 3-Hypergraph Ramsey

We did:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{4k}}$ .

Better is known:

**Thm**  $R_3(k) \leq 2^{2^{2k}}$ .

The proof is nice but long.

I would need to refresh on it to see if appropriate.

**Research** Use their technique on other Ramsey problems.

# Better Bounds on Can Ramsey

Lefmann and Rodl proved

**Thm**  $CR(k) \leq 2^{O(k^2 \log k)}$ .

# Better Bounds on Can Ramsey

Lefmann and Rodl proved

**Thm**  $CR(k) \leq 2^{O(k^2 \log k)}$ .

- ▶ Their paper: <https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrodl.pdf>

# Better Bounds on Can Ramsey

Lefmann and Rodl proved

**Thm**  $CR(k) \leq 2^{O(k^2 \log k)}$ .

- ▶ Their paper: <https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrod1.pdf>
- ▶ Proof is Milet-style.

# Better Bounds on Can Ramsey

Lefmann and Rodl proved

**Thm**  $CR(k) \leq 2^{O(k^2 \log k)}$ .

- ▶ Their paper: [https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/ TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrod1.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrod1.pdf)
- ▶ Proof is Miletic-style.
- ▶ I have written up the construction. It's in my treatise on Can Ramsey: [https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/ COURSES/858/S20/notes/canramsey.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canramsey.pdf)

# Better Bounds on Can Ramsey

Lefmann and Rodl proved

**Thm**  $CR(k) \leq 2^{O(k^2 \log k)}$ .

- ▶ Their paper: [https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/ TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrod1.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/vdw/leftmannrod1.pdf)
- ▶ Proof is Miletic-style.
- ▶ I have written up the construction. It's in my treatise on Can Ramsey: [https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/ COURSES/858/S20/notes/canramsey.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canramsey.pdf)
- ▶ Do we really need more Can Ramsey in the course?

# Large Can Ramsey

The following is well known; however, I may be the first person to write down the proof.

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canlarge.pdf>

**Thm** For all  $k$  there exists  $n = n(k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \binom{\{k, \dots, n\}}{2} \rightarrow [\omega]$  there is a large set that is either homog, min-homog, max-homog, rainbow.

# Large Can Ramsey

The following is well known; however, I may be the first person to write down the proof.

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canlarge.pdf>

**Thm** For all  $k$  there exists  $n = n(k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \binom{\{k, \dots, n\}}{2} \rightarrow [\omega]$  there is a large set that is either homog, min-homog, max-homog, rainbow.

- ▶ Main Thm has inf-can, fin-can, large-can as corollaries.

# Large Can Ramsey

The following is well known; however, I may be the first person to write down the proof.

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canlarge.pdf>

**Thm** For all  $k$  there exists  $n = n(k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \binom{\{k, \dots, n\}}{2} \rightarrow [\omega]$  there is a large set that is either homog, min-homog, max-homog, rainbow.

- ▶ Main Thm has inf-can, fin-can, large-can as corollaries.
- ▶ Thm is mostly the proof of can from 4-hypergraph Ramsey.

# Large Can Ramsey

The following is well known; however, I may be the first person to write down the proof.

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canlarge.pdf>

**Thm** For all  $k$  there exists  $n = n(k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \binom{\{k, \dots, n\}}{2} \rightarrow [\omega]$  there is a large set that is either homog, min-homog, max-homog, rainbow.

- ▶ Main Thm has inf-can, fin-can, large-can as corollaries.
- ▶ Thm is mostly the proof of can from 4-hypergraph Ramsey.
- ▶ Bounds on  $n(k)$  are in terms of the  $LR_4$ .

# Large Can Ramsey

The following is well known; however, I may be the first person to write down the proof.

<http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/canlarge.pdf>

**Thm** For all  $k$  there exists  $n = n(k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \binom{\{k, \dots, n\}}{2} \rightarrow [\omega]$  there is a large set that is either homog, min-homog, max-homog, rainbow.

- ▶ Main Thm has inf-can, fin-can, large-can as corollaries.
- ▶ Thm is mostly the proof of can from 4-hypergraph Ramsey.
- ▶ Bounds on  $n(k)$  are in terms of the  $LR_4$ .

**Research** Get the bound in terms of  $LR_3$  or lower.

## $a$ -ary Can Ramsey

**Thm** For all  $a, k \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $C = C(a, k)$  such that for all  $\text{COL}: \left[ \binom{[C]}{a} \right] \rightarrow [\omega]$  there exists a set  $H$ ,  $|H| = k$  and  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_L \leq a$  such that for all  $p_1 < \dots < p_a \in H$  and  $q_1 < \dots < q_a \in H$

$\text{COL}(p_1, \dots, p_a) = \text{COL}(q_1, \dots, q_a)$  iff  $(p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_L}) = (q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_L})$

- ▶ Similar to the proof on graphs, but messier.
- ▶ *On canonical Ramsey numbers for coloring three-element sets* by Lefmann and Rodl behind paywalls, lost to humanity.
- ▶ Optimal results due to Shelah:  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/math/9509229> A hard read.

**Research** Give easier proofs of bounds.

# Could have Covered: Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Sample Thm** Let  $T$  be a triangle with a 30, 90, or 150 degree angle. For every 2-coloring of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  there exists three points that form triangle  $T$  (note- actually form  $T$ , not just similar to  $T$ ) that are monochromatic.

# Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Sample Thm** Let  $T$  be a triangle with a 30, 90, or 150 degree angle. For every 2-coloring of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  there exists three points that form triangle  $T$  (note- actually form  $T$ , not just similar to  $T$ ) that are monochromatic.

- ▶ Just getting to interesting results would a take while.

# Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Sample Thm** Let  $T$  be a triangle with a 30, 90, or 150 degree angle. For every 2-coloring of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  there exists three points that form triangle  $T$  (note- actually form  $T$ , not just similar to  $T$ ) that are monochromatic.

- ▶ Just getting to interesting results would a take while.
- ▶ Would need to dump some other topic.

# Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Sample Thm** Let  $T$  be a triangle with a 30, 90, or 150 degree angle. For every 2-coloring of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  there exists three points that form triangle  $T$  (note- actually form  $T$ , not just similar to  $T$ ) that are monochromatic.

- ▶ Just getting to interesting results would a take while.
- ▶ Would need to dump some other topic.
- ▶ Bill would need to relearn the material (this is a PRO).

# Euclidean Ramsey Theory

**Sample Thm** Let  $T$  be a triangle with a 30, 90, or 150 degree angle. For every 2-coloring of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  there exists three points that form triangle  $T$  (note- actually form  $T$ , not just similar to  $T$ ) that are monochromatic.

- ▶ Just getting to interesting results would a take while.
- ▶ Would need to dump some other topic.
- ▶ Bill would need to relearn the material (this is a PRO).
- ▶ For more:  
<https://www.csun.edu/~ctoth/Handbook/chap11.pdf>

# Results Bill Likes But Would be Hard to Teach:VDW

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory

**Def**  $L$  is a language. Game:

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory

**Def**  $L$  is a language. Game:

- ▶ Alice is Poly time and she has  $x$ ,  $|x| = n$ .

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory

**Def**  $L$  is a language. Game:

- ▶ Alice is Poly time and she has  $x$ ,  $|x| = n$ .
- ▶ Bob is all powerful and he has nothing.

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory

**Def**  $L$  is a language. Game:

- ▶ Alice is Poly time and she has  $x$ ,  $|x| = n$ .
- ▶ Bob is all powerful and he has nothing.
- ▶ They cooperate to determine if  $x \in L$ . Alice could just send Bob  $x$ . That takes  $n$  bits.

## App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory Cont

Let  $L$  be the set of all 3-colorable graphs (or any NPC graph problem). Note size is  $O(n^2)$ . Is there a protocol for Alice and Bob in  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  bits for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ?

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory Cont

Let  $L$  be the set of all 3-colorable graphs (or any NPC graph problem). Note size is  $O(n^2)$ . Is there a protocol for Alice and Bob in  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  bits for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ?

- ▶ Dell and van Melkebeek showed that if there is a protocol in  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  bits then the Poly Hierarchy Collapses to  $\Sigma_2^P$ . The proof used large 3-free set. <https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/ramsey/dell.pdf>

# App of 3-Free Sets to Complexity Theory Cont

Let  $L$  be the set of all 3-colorable graphs (or any NPC graph problem). Note size is  $O(n^2)$ . Is there a protocol for Alice and Bob in  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  bits for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ?

- ▶ Dell and van Melkebeek showed that if there is a protocol in  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  bits then the Poly Hierarchy Collapses to  $\Sigma_2^P$ . The proof used large 3-free set. <https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/TOPICS/ramsey/dell.pdf>
- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge.

# Hindman's Thm

**Hindman's Thm** For any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists an infinite  $A$  such that all finite sums of elements of  $A$  are the same color.

# Hindman's Thm

**Hindman's Thm** For any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists an infinite  $A$  such that all finite sums of elements of  $A$  are the same color.

- ▶ Proof use ultrafilters, so hard, but nowhere near as hard as Szemerédi's Result.

# Hindman's Thm

**Hindman's Thm** For any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists an infinite  $A$  such that all finite sums of elements of  $A$  are the same color.

- ▶ Proof use ultrafilters, so hard, but nowhere near as hard as Szemerédi's Result.
- ▶ I would need to brush up on this one (this is a PRO)

# Hindman's Thm

**Hindman's Thm** For any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists an infinite  $A$  such that all finite sums of elements of  $A$  are the same color.

- ▶ Proof use ultrafilters, so hard, but nowhere near as hard as Szemerédi's Result.
- ▶ I would need to brush up on this one (this is a PRO)
- ▶ `https://web.williams.edu/Mathematics/lg5/Hindman.pdf`

# Hindman's Thm

**Hindman's Thm** For any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$  there exists an infinite  $A$  such that all finite sums of elements of  $A$  are the same color.

- ▶ Proof use ultrafilters, so hard, but nowhere near as hard as Szemerédi's Result.
- ▶ I would need to brush up on this one (this is a PRO)
- ▶ `https://web.williams.edu/Mathematics/lg5/Hindman.pdf`
- ▶ **Research** Come up with an elementary proof.

# Results Bill Likes But Would be Hard to Teach: Ramsey

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Results from Logic

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!
- ▶ Important: measures how nonconstructive the proof of Ramsey's Thm.

# Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!
- ▶ Important: measures how nonconstructive the proof of Ramsey's Thm.
- ▶ Part of **Recursive Combinatorics**. My survey:  
<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf>

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!
- ▶ Important: measures how nonconstructive the proof of Ramsey's Thm.
- ▶ Part of **Recursive Combinatorics**. My survey:

https:

[//www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf)

**Thm** The full  $a$ -ary  $c$ -color Large Ramsey Thm cannot be proven from Peano Arithmetic.

# Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!
- ▶ Important: measures how nonconstructive the proof of Ramsey's Thm.
- ▶ Part of **Recursive Combinatorics**. My survey:

https:

[//www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf)

**Thm** The full  $a$ -ary  $c$ -color Large Ramsey Thm cannot be proven from Peano Arithmetic.

- ▶ The first natural Thm to be shown ind. of PA.

## Results from Logic

**Thm** For every computable COL:  $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{a} \rightarrow [c]$  there is a  $\Pi_a$ -homogenous set. There is a computable coloring such that no homog set is  $\Sigma_a$ .

- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.
- ▶ Proof leads to a different proof of Ramsey's Thm!
- ▶ Important: measures how nonconstructive the proof of Ramsey's Thm.
- ▶ Part of **Recursive Combinatorics**. My survey:  
<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/papers/rcombsur.pdf>

**Thm** The full  $a$ -ary  $c$ -color Large Ramsey Thm cannot be proven from Peano Arithmetic.

- ▶ The first natural Thm to be shown ind. of PA.
- ▶ Too much prerequisite knowledge needed.

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

Here is the second thm

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

Here is the second thm

**Thm** Fix  $k$ . For large  $n$ , for all 2-colorings of  $K_n$  there exists  $\frac{n^2}{4^{k^2(1+o(1))}}$  mono  $K_k$ 's.

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

Here is the second thm

**Thm** Fix  $k$ . For large  $n$ , for all 2-colorings of  $K_n$  there exists  $\frac{n^2}{4^{k^2(1+o(1))}}$  mono  $K_k$ 's.

This result was deemed too trivial to actually write up until I wrote it up (with help from Nathan Grammel and Erik Metz) in an open problems column on this topic [https:](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

[//www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

Here is the second thm

**Thm** Fix  $k$ . For large  $n$ , for all 2-colorings of  $K_n$  there exists  $\frac{n^2}{4^{k^2(1+o(1))}}$  mono  $K_k$ 's.

This result was deemed too trivial to actually write up until I wrote it up (with help from Nathan Grammel and Erik Metz) in an open problems column on this topic [https:](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

[//www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

- ▶ Could teach this thm next time.

# Ramsey Multiplicity

Recall:

**Thm** For all 2-col of  $K_n$ , exists  $\frac{n^3}{24} - O(n^2)$  mono  $K_3$ 's.

This is the first thm in a field called **Ramsey Multiplicity**

Here is the second thm

**Thm** Fix  $k$ . For large  $n$ , for all 2-colorings of  $K_n$  there exists  $\frac{n^2}{4^{k^2(1+o(1))}}$  mono  $K_k$ 's.

This result was deemed too trivial to actually write up until I wrote it up (with help from Nathan Grammel and Erik Metz) in an open problems column on this topic [https:](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

[//www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf](https://www.cs.umd.edu/users/gasarch/open/Ramseymult.pdf)

- ▶ Could teach this thm next time.
- ▶ **Research** Look at col  $G$  to get mono  $H$  for other  $G$  and  $H$ .

# Results Bill Likes But Would be Hard to Teach: Complexity

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Complexity: $\Pi_2^P$ Completeness of Arrow

**Def**  $G \rightarrow (H_1, H_2)$  means that for every 2-coloring of the edges of  $G$  there is either a **RED**  $H_1$  or a **BLUE**  $H_2$ .

# Complexity: $\Pi_2^P$ Completeness of Arrow

**Def**  $G \rightarrow (H_1, H_2)$  means that for every 2-coloring of the edges of  $G$  there is either a **RED**  $H_1$  or a **BLUE**  $H_2$ .

Marcus Schaefer proved the following.

**Thm**  $\{(G, H_1, H_2) : G \rightarrow (H_1, H_2) \text{ is } \Pi_2^P\text{-complete.}$

See <http://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S20/notes/npramsey.pdf>

# Complexity: NP-Completeness of Grid Extension

*Grid Color Extension (GCE)* is the set of tuples  $(n, m, c, \chi)$  such that the following hold:

- ▶  $n, m, c \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\chi$  is a partial  $c$ -coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$  that is rectangle-free.
- ▶  $\chi$  can be extended to a rectangle-free coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$ .

# Complexity: NP-Completeness of Grid Extension

*Grid Color Extension (GCE)* is the set of tuples  $(n, m, c, \chi)$  such that the following hold:

- ▶  $n, m, c \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\chi$  is a partial  $c$ -coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$  that is rectangle-free.
- ▶  $\chi$  can be extended to a rectangle-free coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$ .

**Thm** (Apon, Gasarch, Lawler) *GCE* is NP-complete

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1205.3813.pdf>

# Complexity: NP-Completeness of Grid Extension

*Grid Color Extension (GCE)* is the set of tuples  $(n, m, c, \chi)$  such that the following hold:

- ▶  $n, m, c \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\chi$  is a partial  $c$ -coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$  that is rectangle-free.
- ▶  $\chi$  can be extended to a rectangle-free coloring of  $[n] \times [m]$ .

**Thm** (Apon, Gasarch, Lawler) *GCE* is NP-complete

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1205.3813.pdf>

Jacob Proofread This!

## Complexity: Long Proofs Required

**Def** Resolution proofs are a proof system to show that a Boolean Formula is NOT satisfiable. It is of interest to find a class of non-satisfiable formulas  $\phi_n$  that require (say)  $(1.5)^n$  long Res Proofs.

# Complexity: Long Proofs Required

**Def** Resolution proofs are a proof system to show that a Boolean Formula is NOT satisfiable. It is of interest to find a class of non-satisfiable formulas  $\phi_n$  that require (say)  $(1.5)^n$  long Res Proofs.

**Def** A graph is  $c$ -random if it does not contain a clique or ind set of size  $c \log n$ .

**Def**  $\phi_{n,c}$  is a Boolean Formula that says **every** graph on  $n$  vertices is  $c$ -random. (This is false for  $c$  around  $\frac{1}{2}$ .)

# Complexity: Long Proofs Required

**Def** Resolution proofs are a proof system to show that a Boolean Formula is NOT satisfiable. It is of interest to find a class of non-satisfiable formulas  $\phi_n$  that require (say)  $(1.5)^n$  long Res Proofs.

**Def** A graph is  $c$ -random if it does not contain a clique or ind set of size  $c \log n$ .

**Def**  $\phi_{n,c}$  is a Boolean Formula that says **every** graph on  $n$  vertices is  $c$ -random. (This is false for  $c$  around  $\frac{1}{2}$ .)

Lauria, Pudlak, Rodl, Thapen proved:

**Thm** For appropriate  $c$ , any resolution proof for  $\phi_{n,c}$  requires length  $n^{\Omega(\log n)}$ .

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1303.3166.pdf>

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.
- ▶ These results are Theoretical Computer science.

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.
- ▶ These results are Theoretical Computer science.
- ▶ These results show that  $TCS=Math$ .

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.
- ▶ These results are Theoretical Computer science.
- ▶ These results show that  $TCS=Math$ .
- ▶ Bill would have to learn these proofs.

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.
- ▶ These results are Theoretical Computer science.
- ▶ These results show that  $TCS=Math$ .
- ▶ Bill would have to learn these proofs.
- ▶ Would take time away from more proofs of Can Ramsey.

# PROS and CONS of Complexity of Ramsey

I will let you decide which are PROS and which are CONS.

- ▶ Students get to (or have to) learn some complexity theory.
- ▶ These results are Theoretical Computer science.
- ▶ These results show that  $TCS=Math$ .
- ▶ Bill would have to learn these proofs.
- ▶ Would take time away from more proofs of Can Ramsey.

**Research** What we **really** want is evidence that computing  $R(k)$  is hard. These results do not really do that. Maybe you can!

**Research** Look at the above results for particular cases and see if easier.

# Results Bill Does Not Care About But Should:VDW

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Rado's Thm for Matrices

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$x_1 a_1 + \dots + a_k x_k = 0.$$

# Rado's Thm for Matrices

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$x_1 a_1 + \dots + a_k x_k = 0.$$

There is a version for systems of linear equations.

# Rado's Thm for Matrices

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$x_1 a_1 + \dots + a_k x_k = 0.$$

There is a version for systems of linear equations.

It's a real pain to state and I don't care.

# Rado's Thm for Matrices

**Rado's Thm** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . TFAE

- ▶ Some subset of the  $a_i$ 's sums to 0.
- ▶ For all  $c$ , for all COL:  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [c]$  there exists mono solution to

$$x_1 a_1 + \dots + a_k x_k = 0.$$

There is a version for systems of linear equations.

It's a real pain to state and I don't care.

For a statement of the thm see the Wikipedia entry.

# Hales-Jewitt Thm

A Very General Thm from which we can derive cleanly VDW and Gallai-Witt.

# Hales-Jewitt Thm

A Very General Thm from which we can derive cleanly VDW and Gallai-Witt.

Too abstract for my tastes, but its very important!

# Hales-Jewitt Thm

A Very General Thm from which we can derive cleanly VDW and Gallai-Witt.

Too abstract for my tastes, but its very important!

See Wikipedia Entry for Statement.

# Hales-Jewitt Thm

A Very General Thm from which we can derive cleanly VDW and Gallai-Witt.

Too abstract for my tastes, but its very important!

See Wikipedia Entry for Statement.

This is someone else's slides on it. So I REALLY could have covered it!

https:

[//www.ti.inf.ethz.ch/ew/courses/extremal04/razen.pdf](https://www.ti.inf.ethz.ch/ew/courses/extremal04/razen.pdf)

# Ramsey's thm for n-parameter sets

Too complicated to state.

# Ramsey's thm for n-parameter sets

Too complicated to state.

Can derive Ramsey's Thm and the Hales-Jewitt Thm from it.

# Ramsey's thm for n-parameter sets

Too complicated to state.

Can derive Ramsey's Thm and the Hales-Jewitt Thm from it.

<https://www.ams.org/journals/tran/1971-159-00/S0002-9947-1971-0284352-8/S0002-9947-1971-0284352-8.pdf>

# Results Bill Does Not Care About But Should: Ramsey

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .  
So what to do?

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .  
So what to do?

- ▶ **Research Topic** Assume  $\neg AC$  and perhaps something else like *AD*.

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .  
So what to do?

- ▶ **Research Topic** Assume  $\neg AC$  and perhaps something else like *AD*.
- ▶ Look at restricted colorings, like Borel colorings. Leads to:  
<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S13/canrampol.pdf>

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .  
So what to do?

- ▶ **Research Topic** Assume  $\neg AC$  and perhaps something else like *AD*.
- ▶ Look at restricted colorings, like Borel colorings. Leads to:  
<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S13/canrampol.pdf>
- ▶ Prove what you can: If  $\kappa$  is a cardinal then for all COL:  $\binom{2^{\kappa+}}{2}$  there is a homog set of size  $\kappa$ .

# Ramsey Over the Reals Fails: So what to do?

**Thm** (AC) There is a coloring of  $\binom{\mathbb{R}}{2}$  with no homog set of size  $\mathbb{R}$ .  
So what to do?

- ▶ **Research Topic** Assume  $\neg AC$  and perhaps something else like *AD*.
- ▶ Look at restricted colorings, like Borel colorings. Leads to: <https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/COURSES/858/S13/canrampol.pdf>
- ▶ Prove what you can: If  $\kappa$  is a cardinal then for all COL:  $\binom{2^{\kappa+}}{2}$  there is a homog set of size  $\kappa$ .
- ▶ Ramsey Cardinals on Next Slide.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC. Not quite.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC. Not quite.

**Thm** ZFC cannot prove that such a  $\kappa$  exists.

**Pf** Such a  $\kappa$  would be a model of ZFC. No theory can prove the existence of a model for itself.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC. Not quite.

**Thm** ZFC cannot prove that such a  $\kappa$  exists.

**Pf** Such a  $\kappa$  would be a model of ZFC. No theory can prove the existence of a model for itself.

**What About...** Can ZFC prove that such a  $\kappa$  does not exist?

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC. Not quite.

**Thm** ZFC cannot prove that such a  $\kappa$  exists.

**Pf** Such a  $\kappa$  would be a model of ZFC. No theory can prove the existence of a model for itself.

**What About...** Can ZFC prove that such a  $\kappa$  does not exist?  
Unknown.

# Inaccessible Cardinals

**True and Obvious** If  $\alpha < \aleph_0$  then  $2^\alpha < \aleph_0$ .

**Question** Does there exist an infinite  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  such that  
If  $\alpha < \kappa$  then  $2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

OTHER. I know what you are thinking. Ind of ZFC. Not quite.

**Thm** ZFC cannot prove that such a  $\kappa$  exists.

**Pf** Such a  $\kappa$  would be a model of ZFC. No theory can prove the existence of a model for itself.

**What About...** Can ZFC prove that such a  $\kappa$  does not exist?  
Unknown.

**Def**  $\kappa$  is **inaccessible** if  $\alpha < \kappa \implies 2^\alpha < \kappa$ .

# Ramsey Cardinals

**Def** If for all COL:  $\binom{\kappa}{2}$  there is a homog set of size  $\kappa$  then  $\kappa$  is **Ramsey**.

**True**  $\aleph_0$  is Ramsey.

# Ramsey Cardinals

**Def** If for all COL:  $\binom{\kappa}{2}$  there is a homog set of size  $\kappa$  then  $\kappa$  is **Ramsey**.

**True**  $\aleph_0$  is Ramsey.

**Question** Does there exist a Ramsey cardinal  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  ?

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

# Ramsey Cardinals

**Def** If for all COL:  $\binom{\kappa}{2}$  there is a homog set of size  $\kappa$  then  $\kappa$  is **Ramsey**.

**True**  $\aleph_0$  is Ramsey.

**Question** Does there exist a Ramsey cardinal  $\kappa > \aleph_0$  ?

**Vote:** YES, NO, or OTHER.

**Thm** If  $\kappa$  is Ramsey then  $\kappa$  is inaccessible. (The converse is ind of ZFC but reasons to think its false.)

# Results Bill May One Day Learn But Still too Hard for the Students

**Exposition by William Gasarch**

May 10, 2022

# Ramsey's Thm with control of the differences

**Thm** For all  $c, k$  and for all order types  $\eta$  there exists  $N = N(c)$  such that for all COL:  $[N] \rightarrow [c]$  there exists a homog set  $a_1 < \dots < a_k$  such that

$$(a_2 - a_1, a_3 - a_2, \dots, a_n - a_{n-1})$$

are all distinct and are in order type  $\eta$ .

- ▶ First proven by Noga Alon and Jan Pach using VDW, so bounds on  $N(c)$  are large. Later Noga Alon, Alan Stacey, and Saharon Shelah got an iterated exp bound. None of this is written down anywhere.
- ▶ In 1995 Saharon Shelah got double exp bounds <https://arxiv.org/pdf/math/9502234.pdf>
- ▶ Shelah's paper is hard. I'm looking for easier proof of weaker results.

# Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers

Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers have given different proofs of:

**Sz Thm** If  $A$  has upper pos density then, for all  $k$ ,  $A$  contains a  $k$ -AP.

# Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers

Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers have given different proofs of:

**Sz Thm** If  $A$  has upper pos density then, for all  $k$ ,  $A$  contains a  $k$ -AP.

All the proofs look hard to learn and to teach.

# Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers

Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers have given different proofs of:

**Sz Thm** If  $A$  has upper pos density then, for all  $k$ ,  $A$  contains a  $k$ -AP.

All the proofs look hard to learn and to teach.

**Research** Easier Proof.

# Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers

Szemerédi, Furstenberg, Gowers have given different proofs of:

**Sz Thm** If  $A$  has upper pos density then, for all  $k$ ,  $A$  contains a  $k$ -AP.

All the proofs look hard to learn and to teach.

**Research** Easier Proof.

**Caveat** There is a proof of Sz thm for Hales-Jewitt which is said to be elementary.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/0910.3926>

# Green-Tao Thm

**Thm** For all  $k$  the set of primes has a  $k$ -AP.

# Green-Tao Thm

**Thm** For all  $k$  the set of primes has a  $k$ -AP.

Seems hard to learn and teach.

# Green-Tao Thm

**Thm** For all  $k$  the set of primes has a  $k$ -AP.

Seems hard to learn and teach.

**Research** Easier proof, perhaps of subcases.

# Green-Tao Thm

**Thm** For all  $k$  the set of primes has a  $k$ -AP.

Seems hard to learn and teach.

**Research** Easier proof, perhaps of subcases.

**Research** Look for the AP's.