

# Disproof of the Neighborhood Conjecture with Implications to SAT

Heidi Gebauer \*

## Abstract

We study a Maker/Breaker game described by Beck. As a result we disprove a conjecture of Beck on positional games, establish a connection between this game and SAT and construct an unsatisfiable  $k$ -CNF formula with few occurrences per variable, thereby improving a previous result by Hoory and Szeider and showing that the bound obtained from the Lovász Local Lemma is tight up to a constant factor.

The Maker/Breaker game we study is as follows. Maker and Breaker take turns in choosing vertices from a given  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{F}$ , with Maker going first. Maker's goal is to completely occupy a hyperedge and Breaker tries to avoid this. Beck conjectures that if the maximum neighborhood size of  $\mathcal{F}$  is at most  $2^{n-1}$  then Breaker has a winning strategy. We disprove this conjecture by establishing an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum neighborhood size  $3 \cdot 2^{n-3}$  where Maker has a winning strategy. Moreover, we show how to construct an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree  $\frac{2^{n-1}}{n}$  where Maker has a winning strategy.

In addition we show that each  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree at most  $\frac{2^{n-2}}{en}$  has a proper halving 2-coloring, which solves another open problem posed by Beck related to the Neighborhood Conjecture.

Finally, we establish a connection between SAT and the Maker/Breaker game we study. We can use this connection to derive new results in SAT. A  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula is a boolean formula in conjunctive normal form where every clause contains exactly  $k$  literals and every variable occurs in at most  $s$  clauses. The  $(k, s)$ -SAT problem is the satisfiability problem restricted to  $(k, s)$ -CNF formulas. Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza showed that for every  $k \geq 3$  there is an integer  $f(k)$  such that every  $(k, f(k))$ -formula is satisfiable, but  $(k, f(k) + 1)$ -SAT is already NP-complete (it is not known whether  $f(k)$  is computable). Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza also gave the best known lower bound  $f(k) = \Omega\left(\frac{2^k}{k}\right)$ , which is a consequence of the Lovász Local Lemma. We prove that, in fact,  $f(k) = \Theta\left(\frac{2^k}{k}\right)$ , improving upon the best known upper bound  $O\left((\log k) \cdot \frac{2^k}{k}\right)$  by Hoory and Szeider.

## 1 Introduction

A *hypergraph* is a pair  $(V, E)$ , where  $V$  is a finite set whose elements are called *vertices* and  $E$  is a family of subsets of  $V$ , called *hyperedges*. We study the following Maker/Breaker game. Maker and Breaker take turns in claiming one previously unclaimed vertex of a given  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{F}$ , with Maker going first. Maker wins if he claims all vertices of some hyperedge of  $\mathcal{F}$ , otherwise Breaker wins. We say that Maker uses a *pairing strategy* if after claiming his first vertex he divides all but at most one of the remaining vertices of  $\mathcal{F}$  into pairs and whenever Breaker claims one vertex of a pair he takes the other one.

---

\*Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich, CH-8092 Switzerland. Email: gebauerh@inf.ethz.ch. Research is supported by the SNF Grant 200021-118001/1.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph. The *degree*  $d(v)$  of a vertex  $v$  is the number of hyperedges containing  $v$  and the *maximum degree*  $\Delta(\mathcal{F})$  of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{F}$  is the maximum degree of its vertices. The *neighborhood*  $N(e)$  of a hyperedge  $e$  is the set of hyperedges of  $\mathcal{F}$  which intersect  $e$  and the *maximum neighborhood size* of  $\mathcal{F}$  is the maximum of  $|N(e)|$  where  $e$  runs over all hyperedges of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

The famous Erdős-Selfridge Theorem [6] states that for each  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{F}$  with less than  $2^{n-1}$  hyperedges Breaker has a winning strategy. This upper bound on the number of hyperedges is best possible as the following example shows. Let  $T$  be a rooted binary tree with  $n$  levels and let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the hypergraph whose hyperedges are exactly the sets  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$  such that  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}$  is a path from the root to a leaf. Note that the number of hyperedges of  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $2^{n-1}$ . To win the game on  $\mathcal{G}$  Maker can use the following strategy. In his first move he claims the root  $m_1$  of  $T$ . Let  $b_1$  denote the vertex occupied by Breaker in his subsequent move. In his second move Maker claims the child  $m_2$  of  $m_1$  such that  $m_2$  lies in the subtree of  $m_1$  not containing  $b_1$ . More generally, in his  $i$ th move Maker selects the child  $m_i$  of his previously occupied node  $m_{i-1}$  such that the subtree rooted at  $m_i$  contains no Breaker's node. Note that such a child  $m_i$  always exists since the vertex previously claimed by Breaker is either in the left or in the right subtree of  $m_{i-1}$  (but not in both!). Using this strategy Maker can achieve to own some set  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$  of vertices such that  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}$  is a path from the root to a leaf, which corresponds to some hyperedge of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Hence Maker has a winning strategy on  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Note that both the maximum neighborhood size and the maximum degree of  $\mathcal{G}$  are  $2^{n-1}$ , thus equally large as the number of hyperedges of  $\mathcal{G}$ . This provides some evidence that in order to be a Maker's win a hypergraph must have largely overlapping hyperedges. Moreover, Beck [3] conjectured that the main criterion for whether a hypergraph is a Breaker's win is not the cardinality of the hyperedge set but rather the maximum neighborhood size, i.e. the actual reason why each hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with less than  $2^{n-1}$  edges is a Breaker's win is that the maximum neighborhood of  $\mathcal{H}$  is smaller than  $2^{n-1}$ .

**Neighborhood Conjecture** (Open Problem 9.1(a), [3]) Assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph, and its maximum neighborhood size is smaller than  $2^{n-1}$ . Is it true that by playing on  $\mathcal{F}$  Breaker has a winning strategy?

Further motivation for the Neighborhood Conjecture is the well-known Erdős-Lovász 2-coloring Theorem – a direct consequence of the famous Lovász Local Lemma – which states that every  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum neighborhood size at most  $2^{n-3}$  has a proper 2-coloring. An interesting feature of this theorem is that the board size does not matter. In this paper we prove by applying again the Lovász Local Lemma that in addition every  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum neighborhood size at most  $\frac{2^{n-4}}{n}$  has a so called *proper halving* 2-coloring, i.e., a proper 2-coloring in which the number of red vertices and the number of blue vertices differ by at most 1 (see Theorem 1.5 for details). This guarantees the existence of a course of the game at whose end Breaker owns at least one vertex of each hyperedge and thus is the winner. Hence it is a priori not completely impossible that Breaker has a winning strategy.

In our first theorem we prove that the Neighborhood Conjecture, in this strongest of its forms, is not true, even if we require Maker to use a pairing strategy.

**Theorem 1.1.** *There is an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with maximum neighborhood size  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3}$  where Maker has a winning pairing strategy.*

In his book [3] Beck also poses the following weakening of the Neighborhood Conjecture.

**Open Problem 1.** (*Open Problem 9.1(b), [3]*) *If the Neighborhood Conjecture is too difficult (or false) then how about if the upper bound on the maximum neighborhood size is replaced by an upper bound  $\frac{2^{n-c}}{n}$  on the maximum degree where  $c$  is a sufficiently large constant?*

In the hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  we will construct to prove Theorem 1.1 one vertex has degree  $2^{n-2}$ , which is still high. However, the existence of vertices with high degree is not crucial. We also establish a hypergraph with maximum degree  $\frac{2^{n-1}}{n}$  on which Maker has a winning strategy. In this case the maximum neighborhood size is at most  $2^{n-1} - n$ , which is weaker than Theorem 1.1 but also disproving the Neighborhood Conjecture.

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $n$  is a sufficiently large power of 2 there is an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree  $\frac{2^{n-1}}{n}$  where Maker has a winning pairing strategy.*

The bound in Theorem 1.2 is not tight. Indeed, we can prove the following

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $c = \frac{64}{63}$ . For every sufficiently large  $n$  with  $cn$  being a power of 2 there is an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree  $\frac{2^{n-1}}{cn}$  where Maker has a winning pairing strategy.*

Note that by Theorem 1.2 the answer to Open Problem 1 for  $c = 1$  is no. Since the proof of Theorem 1.2 contains several technical lemmas and long calculations we first establish a slightly weaker construction revealing one of the main ideas of the proof.

**Theorem 1.4.** *For every  $n \geq 4$  there is an  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree  $\frac{2^{n+2}}{n}$  where Maker has a winning pairing strategy.*

In his book [3] Beck also poses several further weakenings of the Neighborhood Conjecture. The last one is as follows.

**Open Problem 2.** (*Open Problem 9.1(f), [3]*) *How about if we just want a proper halving 2-coloring?*

It is already known that the answer to Open Problem 2 is positive if the maximum degree is at most  $(\frac{3}{2} - o(1))^n$ . According to Beck [3] the real question is whether or not  $\frac{3}{2}$  can be replaced by 2. We prove that the answer is yes.

**Theorem 1.5.** *For every  $n$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{F}$  with maximum degree at most  $\frac{2^{n-2}}{en}$  there is a proper halving 2-coloring.*

**Connection to SAT** Our results also have implications to SAT. Following the standard notation we denote by  $(k, s)$ -CNF the set of boolean formulas  $\mathcal{F}$  in conjunctive normal form where every clause of  $\mathcal{F}$  has exactly  $k$  distinct literals and each variable occurs in at most  $s$  clauses of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Moreover, we denote by  $(k, s)$ -SAT the satisfiability problem restricted to formulas in  $(k, s)$ -CNF. Tovey [17] proved that every  $(3,3)$ -CNF formula is satisfiable but  $(3,4)$ -SAT is NP-complete. Hence  $(3, s)$ -SAT is trivial for  $s \leq 3$ , and NP-complete for  $s \geq 4$ . Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza [11] generalized this result by showing that for every  $k \geq 3$  there is some integer  $s = f(k)$  such that

- (i) every  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula with  $s \leq f(k)$  is satisfiable, and
- (ii)  $(k, s + 1)$ -SAT is already NP-complete.

For positive integers  $k$  the function  $f$  can be defined by the equation

$$f(k) := \max\{s : \text{every } (k, s)\text{-CNF formula is satisfiable}\}$$

The best known lower bound for  $f(k)$ , a consequence of Lovász Local Lemma, is due to Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza [11].

**Theorem 1.6. (Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza [11])**  $f(k) \geq \lfloor \frac{2^k}{ek} \rfloor$

From the other side Savický and Sgall [14] showed that  $f(k) = O(k^{1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$  where  $\alpha = \log_3 4 - 1 \approx 0.26$ . This was improved by Hoory and Szeider [8] who proved that  $f(k) = O((\log k) \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ , which is the best known upper bound. We close the gap between upper and lower bound by showing that  $f(k) = \Theta(\frac{2^k}{k})$ , implying that the lower bound in Theorem 1.6 is asymptotically tight. To this end we introduce a new function  $f_{\text{bal}}$  which bounds  $f$  from above. Then we establish an upper bound for  $f_{\text{bal}}(k)$ , which also serves as an upper bound for  $f(k)$ .

A  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula is called *balanced* if every literal occurs in at most  $\frac{s}{2}$  clauses. Similarly to  $f$  we define the function  $f_{\text{bal}}$  by the equation

$$f_{\text{bal}}(k) := \max\{s : \text{every balanced } (k, s)\text{-CNF formula is satisfiable}\}$$

Clearly,  $f(k) \leq f_{\text{bal}}(k)$ . We can show that the lower bound of Theorem 1.6 is best possible up to a factor of  $e$ .

**Theorem 1.7.** *If  $k$  is a sufficiently large power of 2 then  $f_{\text{bal}}(k) \leq \frac{2^k}{k} - 1$ . For every sufficiently large  $k$  (not necessarily a power of 2) we have  $f_{\text{bal}}(k) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k} - 1$ .*

The first part of Theorem 1.7 will be deduced from Theorem 1.2. It is relatively easy to conclude from this proof that for large enough  $k$  we have  $f_{\text{bal}}(k) \leq r - 1$  for every  $r \geq \frac{2^k}{k}$  which is a power of 2, implying the second part.

By a standard application of the Lopsided Lovász Local Lemma [7] Theorem 1.6 can be modified as follows.

**Theorem 1.8.**  $f_{\text{bal}}(k) \geq \lfloor \frac{2^{k+1}}{ek} \rfloor$

This shows that our upper bound in Theorem 1.7 is best possible within a factor of  $\frac{e}{2}$ .

Recently Moser [13] showed that for  $s \leq \frac{2^{k-6}}{k}$  not only every  $(k, s)$ -CNF has a satisfying assignment but there is also an algorithm computing such an assignment efficiently. Theorem 1.7 proves that this bound is asymptotically tight. Indeed, for some  $(k, \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF formulas we can not find a satisfying assignment efficiently, simply because there is none.

The formula we will construct to prove Theorem 1.7 belongs to the class MU(1) of minimal unsatisfiable CNF-formulas  $\mathcal{F}$  where  $m(\mathcal{F}) - n(\mathcal{F}) = 1$  with  $m(\mathcal{F})$  denoting the number of clauses of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $n(\mathcal{F})$  denoting the number of variables of  $\mathcal{F}$ . This is in contrast to the approach of Hoory and Szeider, whose derivation of the previously best known upper bound of  $f(k) = O((\log k) \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$  did not go via an MU(1) formula. Formulas in MU(1) have been widely studied (see, e.g., [1], [5], [10], [12], [16]). It is an open question whether the unsatisfiable CNF-formulas with the smallest possible number of occurrences per variable (i.e. the unsatisfiable  $(k, f(k) + 1)$ -CNF formulas) are members of MU(1). Scheder [15] showed that for almost disjoint  $k$ -CNF formulas (i.e. CNF-formulas where any two clauses have at most one variable in common) this is not true, i.e., no almost disjoint

unsatisfiable  $(k, \tilde{f}(k) + 1)$ -CNF formula is in MU(1), with  $\tilde{f}(k)$  denoting the maximum  $s$  such that every almost disjoint  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula is satisfiable.

Hoory and Szeider [9] considered the function  $f_1(k) := \max\{s : \text{every } (k, s)\text{-CNF formula in MU(1) is satisfiable}\}$ . Clearly,  $f_1(k) \geq f(k)$ . They investigated further on  $f_1(k)$ , showed that it is computable and determined the exact values of  $f_1(k)$  up to  $k = 9$ . However, it is not clear how close  $f(k)$  and  $f_1(k)$  are. The construction we establish to prove Theorem 1.7 implies at least the asymptotic equality of  $f(k)$  and  $f_1(k)$ .

**Corollary 1.9.** *For large enough  $k$  we have  $f_1(k) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k}$ , implying that  $f(k), f_1(k) = \Theta(\frac{2^k}{k})$ . Moreover, for infinitely many  $k$  we have  $f_1(k) \leq \frac{2^k}{k}$ .*

Theorem 1.7 and Corollary 1.9 are a consequence of the following theorem, which establishes a connection between the game we study and SAT. We denote by a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree at most  $s$  where Maker has a winning pairing strategy.

**Theorem 1.10.** *We have*

- (i) *if there is a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph then there is an unsatisfiable balanced  $(k, 2s)$ -CNF formula, and*
- (ii) *if there is an unsatisfiable  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula then there is a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph.*

Note that Theorem 1.7 follows directly from Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.10.

Instead of the maximum degree we could also consider the maximum neighborhood of a formula. To this end we regard a corresponding analogon of  $f(k)$ : Let  $l(k)$  denote the largest integer such that every  $k$ -CNF formula with maximum neighborhood size at most  $l(k)$  is satisfiable. Recall that the Local Lemma gives that  $l(k) \geq \lfloor \frac{2^k}{e} \rfloor - 1$ . From the other side the ‘‘complete formula’’ (i.e. the  $k$ -CNF formula containing all  $2^k$  clauses over  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ ) shows that  $l(k) \leq 2^k - 2$ . The constructions we establish to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.7 lower this upper bound by a factor of 2 (resp.  $\frac{3}{2}$ ).

**Theorem 1.11.** *We have*

- (i)  $l(k) \leq 2^{k-1} - 1$  for  $k$  being a sufficiently large power of 2, and
- (ii)  $l(k) \leq 2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2}$  for  $k \geq 3$

Actually we can slightly improve our upper bounds on  $f(k)$  and  $l(k)$ .

**Theorem 1.12.** *Let  $c = \frac{64}{63}$ . For every sufficiently large  $k$  with  $ck$  being a power of 2 we have*

- (i)  $f(k) \leq \frac{2^{k-1}}{ck} - 1$  and
- (ii)  $l(k) \leq \frac{2^{k-1}}{c} - 1$

**Notation** Ceiling and floor signs are routinely omitted whenever they are not crucial for clarity. Throughout this paper  $\log$  stands for the binary logarithm. A *binary tree* is an ordered tree where every node has either two or no children. Let  $T$  be a rooted binary tree. A *path* of  $T$  is a sequence of vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_j$  of  $T$  where  $v_k$  is a child of  $v_{k-1}$  for every  $k = 2, \dots, j$ . A *branch* of  $T$  is a path starting at the root of  $T$  and a *full branch* of  $T$  is a path from the root to a leaf.

We define  $\mathcal{H}_T = \mathcal{H}_T(n)$  as the  $n$ -uniform hypergraph whose hyperedges are the paths of length  $n - 1$  in  $T$  ending at a leaf. Let  $\mathcal{C}_n$  be the set of hypergraphs  $\mathcal{H}_T$  where every leaf of  $T$  has depth at least  $n - 1$ . The hypergraphs we will construct to prove Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.2 all belong to  $\mathcal{C}_n$ . Depending on the context we consider a hyperedge  $e$  of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}_T$  either as a set or as a path in  $T$ . So we will sometimes speak of the start or end node of a hyperedge.

**Organization of this paper** In Section 2 we give a counterexample to the Neighborhood Conjecture in the strongest of its forms by proving Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 we establish more regular counterexample hypergraphs and prove Theorem 1.4, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. In Section 4 we establish a strong connection between the game we study and SAT and prove Theorem 1.10, Corollary 1.9, Theorem 1.11 and Theorem 1.12. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is relegated to the appendix.

## 2 Counterexample to the Neighborhood Conjecture

The next observation will play a crucial role in this paper.

**Observation 2.1.** *Let  $T$  be a binary tree such that every leaf has depth at least  $n - 1$ . Then Maker has a winning pairing strategy on  $\mathcal{H}_T$ .*

This can be seen as follows. Since by assumption every leaf has distance at most  $n - 1$  from the root every full branch of  $T$  contains a hyperedge. The two children of a vertex are called *siblings*. The set of non-root nodes of  $T$  can be divided into pairs of siblings. By first claiming the root of  $T$  and then pairing every node with its sibling Maker can finally achieve some full branch of  $T$ , which by assumption contains a hyperedge.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1:* Due to Observation 2.1 it suffices to show the following.

**Lemma 2.2.** *There is a binary tree  $T$  where every leaf has depth at least  $n - 1$  such that  $\mathcal{H}_T$  has maximum neighborhood size  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3}$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $T'$  be a full binary tree with  $n - 1$  levels. For each leaf  $u$  of  $T'$  we proceed as follows: We add two children  $v, w$  to  $u$  and let  $v$  be a leaf. Then we attach a full binary tree  $S$  with  $n - 2$  levels to  $w$  (such that  $w$  is the root of  $S$ ). For each leaf  $u'$  of  $S$  we add two children  $v', w'$  to  $u'$  and let  $v'$  be a leaf. Note that the hyperedge ending at  $v'$  starts at  $u$ . Finally, we attach a full binary tree  $S'$  with  $n - 1$  levels to  $w'$  (such that  $w'$  is the root of  $S'$ ), see Figure 1. Let  $T$  denote the resulting tree. Clearly, every leaf of  $T$  has depth at least  $n - 1$ . It remains to show that the maximum neighborhood of  $\mathcal{H}_T$  is at most  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3}$ .

**Claim:** Every hyperedge  $e$  of  $\mathcal{H}_T$  intersects at most  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3}$  other hyperedges.

In order to prove this claim, we fix six vertices  $u, u', v, v', w, w'$  according to the above description, i.e.,  $u$  is a node on level  $n - 2$  whose children are  $v$  and  $w$ ,  $u'$  is a descendant of  $w$  on level  $2n - 4$  whose children are  $v'$  and  $w'$ . Let  $e$  be a hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}_T$ . Note that the start node of  $e$  is either the root  $r$  of  $T$ , a node on the same level as  $u$  or a node on the same level as  $u'$ . We now distinguish these cases.

(a) The start node of  $e$  is  $r$ . By symmetry we assume that  $e$  ends at  $v$ . According to the construction of  $T$  the hyperedge  $e$  intersects the  $2^{n-2} - 1$  other hyperedges starting at  $r$  and the  $2^{n-3}$  hyperedges starting at  $u$ . So altogether  $e$  intersects  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3} - 1$  hyperedges, as claimed.

(b) The start node of  $e$  is on the same level as  $u$ . By symmetry we suppose that  $e$  starts at  $u$  and ends at  $v'$ . The hyperedges intersecting  $e$  can be divided into the following three categories.

- The hyperedge starting at  $r$  and ending at  $v$ ,
- the  $2^{n-3} - 1$  hyperedges different from  $e$  starting at  $u$ , and
- the  $2^{n-2}$  hyperedges starting at  $u'$ ,




Figure 1: An illustration of  $\mathcal{H}_T$ . The marked paths represent exemplary hyperedges.

implying that  $e$  intersects at most  $2^{n-2} + 2^{n-3}$  hyperedges in total.

(c) The start node of  $e$  is on the same level as  $u'$ . By symmetry we assume that  $e$  starts at  $u'$ . Then  $e$  intersects the  $2^{n-2} - 1$  other hyperedges starting at  $u'$  and the hyperedge starting at  $u$  and ending at  $v'$ , thus  $2^{n-2}$  hyperedges altogether.  $\square$

### 3 A Degree-Regular hypergraph with small maximum degree which is a Maker's win.

Let  $T$  be a binary tree where every leaf has depth at least  $n - 1$  and let  $v$  be a vertex of  $T$ . Note that the degree of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{H}_T$  equals the number of leaf descendants of  $v$  which have distance at most  $n - 1$  from  $v$ .

#### 3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.4:

Let  $s = \frac{2^{n+1}}{2^{\lceil \log n \rceil}}$  and note that  $s \leq \frac{2^{n+2}}{n}$ . Observation 2.1 guarantees that it suffices to construct a binary tree  $T$  where every leaf has depth at least  $n - 1$  such that the degree of every vertex in  $\mathcal{H}_T$  is at most  $s$ . Let  $T'$  be a full binary tree of height  $n - 1$ . We subdivide its leaves into intervals of length  $\frac{2^{\lceil \log n \rceil}}{2}$ . Let  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{\frac{2^{\lceil \log n \rceil}}{2} - 1}\}$  be such an interval. Then we attach a full binary subtree of height  $i$  to  $v_i$ . Let  $T$  denote the resulting tree. It suffices to prove the following.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $T$ . Then  $d(v) \leq s$  in  $\mathcal{H}_T$ .*

*Proof:* We apply induction on the depth  $i$  of  $v$ . For  $i = 0$  the claim is clearly true. Indeed, the degree of the root is  $\frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}} = \frac{2^n}{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}} = \frac{s}{2}$ . Now suppose that  $v$  has depth  $i \in \{1, \dots, \frac{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}}{2} - 1\}$ .

Note that the set of descendants of  $v$  on level  $n-1$  can be subdivided into  $\frac{2^{n-1-i}}{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}} \geq 1$  intervals. Let  $v'$  denote the parent of  $v$ . By construction the number of leaf descendants which have distance at most  $n-2$  from  $v$  equals  $\frac{d(v')}{2}$ . Moreover, every interval  $\{v_0, \dots, v_{\frac{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}}{2}-1}\}$  gives raise to  $2^i$  leaves on level  $n-1+i$ , implying that the number of leaf descendants of  $v$  which have distance exactly  $n-1$  from  $v$  equals  $\frac{2^{n-1-i}}{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}} \cdot 2^i = \frac{2^n}{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}} = \frac{s}{2}$ . So altogether  $d(v) \leq \frac{d(v')}{2} + \frac{s}{2} \leq s$ . It remains to consider the case where  $v$  has depth at least  $\frac{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}}{2}$ . By construction no leaf of  $T$  has depth larger than  $\frac{2^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor}}{2} + n - 2$ , implying that the degree of  $v$  is at most the degree of its parent.  $\square$

### 3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2:

Let  $s = \frac{2^{n-1}}{n}$ . Due to Observation 2.1 it suffices to prove the following.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There is a nonempty binary tree  $T$  where*

- (i) *every leaf has depth at least  $n-1$  and*
- (ii) *for every vertex  $v$  of  $T$  the number of leaf descendants which have distance at most  $n-1$  from  $v$  is bounded by  $s$ .*

*Proof:* We need some notation first. Let  $T$  be a binary tree and let  $v$  be a vertex of  $T$ . In the following we slightly abuse notation and denote by the *degree*  $d(v)$  of  $v$  the number of leaf descendants which have distance at most  $n-1$  from  $v$ . (Note that if some leaves of  $T$  have depth smaller than  $n-1$ ,  $d(v)$  might differ from the degree of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{H}_T$ .) Moreover, to every node  $w$  of  $T$  we assign a *distance-sequence*  $D_w = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  where  $x_i \cdot \frac{s}{2^{i+1}}$  is the number of leaf descendants of  $w$  which have distance  $n-1-i$  from  $w$ . This notation encodes the degree of  $w$  in a weighted fashion, which allows us to describe our most frequent operations in a more compact way. Note that  $d(w) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i \cdot \frac{s}{2^{i+1}}$ .

**Observation 3.3.** *We have*

- (i) *Let  $T, T'$  be binary trees whose roots have distance sequence  $(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  and  $(x'_0, \dots, x'_{n-1})$ , respectively. Let  $v$  be a vertex with left subtree  $T$  and right subtree  $T'$ . Then*

$$D_v = \left( \frac{x_1 + x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1} + x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0 \right).$$

- (ii) *Let  $T'$  be a binary tree whose root has distance sequence  $(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  and let  $T$  be a full binary tree of height  $h \leq n-1$ . By attaching a copy of  $T'$  to every leaf  $l$  of  $T$  (such that  $l$  is the root of  $T'$ ) we obtain  $D_v = (x_h, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$  for the root  $v$  of  $T$ .*

We need some more notation. Let  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ . A  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ -tree is a nonempty binary tree where every node has degree at most  $s$  and  $D_r = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  for the root  $r$ . A sequence  $(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  is *plausible* if  $x_i \cdot \frac{s}{2^{i+1}} \in \mathbb{N}$  for every  $i, i = 0, \dots, n-1$ . (Clearly, every sequence  $(x_0, \dots, x_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$  with  $x_0, \dots, x_{\log s-1} \in \mathbb{N}$  is plausible.) Note that  $D_v$  is plausible for every node  $v$  of a binary tree. To prove Lemma 3.2 it suffices to show the following.

**Lemma 3.4.** *There is an  $(x_0, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree for some  $x_0 \geq 0$ .*



Lemma 3.4 guarantees that there is a nonempty binary tree where every vertex has degree at most  $s$  and every leaf has depth at least  $n - 1$ , which implies Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.4:* We divide the proof of Lemma 3.4 into three propositions. Let  $r = \lfloor \frac{\log s}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *There is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.*

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $j \leq \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .*

*If there is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{j+1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree then there is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{r-j}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_j, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.*

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $i \leq r - 1$ .*

*If there is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}_{i+1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree then there is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.*

Note that Proposition 3.5 - 3.7 together imply Lemma 3.4 (with  $x_0 = 0$ ). Before proving Proposition 3.5 - 3.7 we first state some general propositions. For every distance sequence  $(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  we let  $\overline{\deg}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  denote the degree of a vertex  $v$  with  $D_v = (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  divided by  $s$ , i.e.,  $\overline{\deg}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{x_i}{2^{i+1}}$ .

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $r \leq \log s$  and let  $y_r, y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{\log s-1}$  be integers such that*

$\overline{\deg}(y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0) \leq 1$ . *Then (i)  $\overline{\deg}(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_r, y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0) \leq 1$  and*

*(ii) if there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_r, y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree then there is a  $(y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.*

*Proof:* We first show (ii). Let  $T'$  be a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_r, y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree and let  $T$  be a full

binary tree of height  $r$ . To each leaf  $l$  of  $T$  we attach a copy of  $T'$  (such that  $l$  is the root of  $T'$ ). According to Observation 3.3 (for  $h = r$ ) we have  $D_v = (y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$  for the root  $v$  of  $T$ . It remains to show that every vertex has degree at most  $s$ . Let  $v_i$  be a node on level  $i$  of  $T$ . Note that due to Observation 3.3 (for  $h = i$ ) we obtain  $D_{v_i} = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_i, y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

We get  $\overline{\deg}(D_{v_i}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^i} + \sum_{j=0}^{\log s-1-r} \frac{y_{r+j}}{2^{i+1+j}} = 1 - \frac{1}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^i} \cdot \overline{\deg}(y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0) \leq 1$ .

The last inequality follows directly from our assumption that  $\overline{\deg}(y_r, \dots, y_{\log s-1}, 0, \dots, 0) \leq 1$ . Hence every vertex of  $T$  has degree at most  $s$ , which concludes the proof of (ii). By inserting  $i = r$  in the above proof we immediately obtain (i).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1}$  be integers such that  $(0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}),$*

*$(0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1}), (\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0)$  are plausible and  $\overline{\deg}(\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0) \leq 1$ . Then*

*(i)  $\overline{\deg}(0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}), \overline{\deg}(0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1}) \leq 1$  and*

*(ii) If there is a  $(0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ -tree and a  $(0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1})$ -tree then there is a  $(\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0)$ -tree.*

*Proof:* (i) follows directly from the fact that  $\overline{\deg}(0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{x_i}{2^{i+1}} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \frac{x_{i+1}}{2 \cdot 2^{i+1}} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \frac{x_{i+1} + x'_{i+1}}{2 \cdot 2^{i+1}} = \overline{\deg}(\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0) \leq 1$  (and similarly for  $\overline{\deg}(0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1})$ ). So it remains to show (ii). Let  $T_1$  be a  $(0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ -tree and let  $T_2$  be a  $(0, x'_1, \dots, x'_{n-1})$ -tree. We take a new node  $w$  and attach  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  as left and right subtree, respectively and let  $T$  denote the resulting tree. By Observation 3.3  $D_w = (\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0)$ . Together with the fact that  $\overline{\deg}(\frac{x_1+x'_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{x_{n-1}+x'_{n-1}}{2}, 0) \leq 1$  this implies (ii).  $\square$

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\log s - 1}$  be integers with  $\sum_{i=0}^{\log s - 1} y_i \geq 2^{n - \log s}$  such that  $\overline{\deg}(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\log s - 1}, 0, \dots, 0) \leq 1$ . Then there is a  $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\log s - 1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.*

*Proof:* Note that a tree consisting of a single node is a  $(0, 0, \dots, 0, 2^{n - \log s})$ -tree. By repeatedly applying Proposition 3.9 we get that there is a  $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+n-\log s}, 2^{n-\log s}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-i-1})$ -tree for every  $i \leq \log s - 1$ .

Suppose that there are  $y_i$   $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+n-\log s}, 2^{n-\log s}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-i-1})$ -trees for every  $i \in \{0, \dots, \log s - 1\}$ . So all in all there are  $\sum_{i=0}^{\log s - 1} y_i \geq 2^{n-\log s}$  trees. Applying Proposition 3.9  $n - \log s$  times shows that there is a  $(y_0, \dots, y_{\log s - 1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree.  $\square$

It remains to show Proposition 3.5 - 3.7.

*Proof of Proposition 3.5:* By Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 2})$ -tree. According to Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that

there exists both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s - r - 3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{n}{2}}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\frac{n}{2} - 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{n}{2}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T'$ . (Note that the term  $\frac{n}{2} - 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$  is nonnegative.) Note

that Proposition 3.10 guarantees the existence of  $T$ . So it remains to show that we can obtain  $T'$ . By Proposition 3.8 this can be reduced to showing the existence of a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{n}{2} - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{n}{2}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 2})$ -tree  $T''$ . Due to Proposition 3.10  $T''$  can be obtained.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.6:* Due to Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{r-j}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. (Note that  $(r-j+1) + (r-j) + j = 2r-j+1 \leq \log s - 1$ .)

By assumption there is a

$(\underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{j+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. So by Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that we can obtain a

$(\underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{j+1}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. (Note that  $r - 2j - 1 > 0$ .) We distinguish two cases.

Case 1  $j \leq \frac{n}{8}$ . According to Proposition 3.9 we are left with proving the existence of both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r-\frac{n}{4}-1}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{\frac{n}{4}-2j}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{r-\frac{n}{4}-1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T$  and a  $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{r-\frac{n}{4}-1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T'$ .

We observe that in the sequence corresponding to  $T$  all but the first  $\log s$  entries are zero. (This can be seen by distinguishing the cases  $j > 0$  and  $j = 0$ .) So we can apply Proposition 3.10, which guarantees the existence of  $T$ . To show that we can obtain  $T'$  it suffices by Proposition 3.8 to prove that there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{4n-8r+8}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{r-\frac{n}{4}-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. (Note that

$(4n-8r+8) + (r+3) + (r-\frac{n}{4}-1) \leq \frac{15}{4}n - 6r + 10 \leq \frac{3}{4}n + O(\log n) \leq \log s$ .) Due to Proposition 3.10 such a tree exists.

Case 2  $j \geq \frac{n}{8}$ . According to Proposition 3.9 we are left with proving the existence of both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{j-\frac{n}{8}}, \underbrace{16, \dots, 16}_{\frac{n}{8}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 16, \dots, 16}_{j-\frac{n}{8}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T'$

Proposition 3.10 guarantees the existence of  $T$ . To show that we can obtain  $T'$  it suffices by Proposition 3.8 to prove that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{n}{8}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 16, \dots, 16}_{j-\frac{n}{8}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. Due to Proposition 3.10 such a tree exists.

ists.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.7:* Note that by assumption  $i \leq r-1 \leq \frac{\log s-4}{2}$ . By Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\log s-i-3}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. By the fact that there is a

$(\underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{i+1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree and Proposition 3.9 we are left with showing that there is a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+2}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1  $i \leq \frac{n}{4}$ . By Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that there is both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-\frac{n}{2}-4}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\frac{n}{2}-2i}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-\frac{n}{2}-4}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T'$ . Proposition 3.10 guarantees that  $T$  exists. It remains to

show that  $T'$  can be obtained. According to Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{n}{2}-i+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-\frac{n}{2}-4}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree, which exists due to Proposition 3.10.

Case 2  $i \geq \frac{n}{4}$ . Due to Proposition 3.9 we are left with showing that there is both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{i-\frac{n}{4}}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{\frac{n}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{i-\frac{n}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T'$ . Due to Proposition 3.10  $T$  exists. To show that

$T'$  can be obtained it suffices to prove that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{n}{4}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{i-\frac{n}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree, which exists due to Proposition 3.10.  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We consider the proof of Theorem 1.2, plug in  $s := \frac{2^{n-1}}{cn}$  (instead of  $s := \frac{2^{n-1}}{n}$ ) and modify the proofs of Proposition 3.5 - 3.7. This will form our proof of Theorem 1.3. So it remains to adapt the proofs of Proposition 3.5 - 3.7.

*Proof of Proposition 3.5:* By Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 2})$ -tree. According to Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that there exists both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s - r - 3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{cn}{2}}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\frac{cn}{2} - 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{\lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{cn}{2}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 2})$ -tree  $T'$ . (Note that the term  $\frac{cn}{2} - 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor$  is nonnegative.) Note

that Proposition 3.10 guarantees the existence of  $T$ . So it remains to show that we can obtain  $T'$ . By Proposition 3.8 this can be reduced to showing the existence of a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{cn}{2} - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{\log s - r - 4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{cn}{2}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 2})$ -tree  $T''$ . Let  $t := \frac{cn}{2} - \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor + 2 \cdot (\log s - r - 4) + 4 \cdot (\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil + 2 \lfloor \frac{r}{2} \rfloor - \frac{cn}{2})$ . We have  $t \geq \frac{15}{4}n - \frac{3}{2}cn + O(\log n) \geq 2cn$  (since  $c < \frac{15}{14}$ ). So by Proposition 3.10  $T''$  can be obtained.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.6:* Due to Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{r-j}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. (Note that  $(r-j+1) + (r-j) + j = 2r-j+1 \leq \log s - 1$ .) By assumption there is a

$(\underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_{j+1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. So by Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that we can obtain a  $(\underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{r-j-1}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{j+1}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. (Note that  $r - 2j - 1 > 0$ .) We distinguish two cases.

Case 1  $j \leq \frac{cn}{8}$ . According to Proposition 3.9 we are left with proving the existence of both a  $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r - \frac{cn}{4} - 1}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{\frac{cn}{4} - 2j}, \underbrace{0, 16, \dots, 16}_j, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T$  and a  $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{r - \frac{cn}{4} - 1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T'$ .

We observe that in the sequence corresponding to  $T$  all but the first  $\log s$  entries are zero. (This can be seen by distinguishing the cases  $j > 0$  and  $j = 0$ .) So we can apply Proposition 3.10, which guarantees the existence of  $T$ . To show that we can obtain  $T'$  it suffices by Proposition 3.8 to prove that there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{4cn - 8r + 8}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{r - \frac{cn}{4} - 1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree. (Note that

$(4cn - 8r + 8) + (r + 3) + (r - \frac{cn}{4} - 1) \leq \frac{15}{4}cn - 6r + 10 \leq (1 - \epsilon)n + O(\log n)$  for some constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ; additionally  $(1 - \epsilon)n + O(\log n) \leq \log s$ .) Due to Proposition 3.10 such a tree exists.

Case 2  $j \geq \frac{cn}{8}$ . According to Proposition 3.9 we are left with proving the existence of both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{j - \frac{cn}{8}}, \underbrace{16, \dots, 16}_{\frac{cn}{8}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{0, 16, \dots, 16}_{j - \frac{cn}{8}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n - \log s + 1})$ -tree  $T'$

Proposition 3.10 guarantees the existence of  $T$ . To show that we can obtain  $T'$  it suffices by Proposition 3.8 to prove that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{cn}{8}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{r+3}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{r-2j-1}, \underbrace{16, \dots, 16}_{j-\frac{cn}{8}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. Due to Proposition 3.10 such a tree exists. Indeed,  $\frac{cn}{8} + 8(r-2j-1) + 16(j-\frac{cn}{8}) = 4n - \frac{15}{8}cn + O(\log n) \geq 2cn$  (since  $c < \frac{32}{31}$ ).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.7:* Note that by assumption  $i \leq r-1 \leq \frac{\log s-4}{2}$ . By Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\log s-i-3}, \underbrace{0, 2, \dots, 2}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. By the fact that there is a  $(0, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{i+1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree and Proposition 3.9 we are left with showing that there is a  $(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+2}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 4, \dots, 4}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1  $i \leq \frac{cn}{4}$ . By Proposition 3.9 it suffices to show that there is both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-\frac{cn}{2}-4}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\frac{cn}{2}-2i}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-\frac{cn}{2}-4}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T'$ . Proposition 3.10 guarantees that  $T$  exists. It remains to

show that  $T'$  can be obtained. According to Proposition 3.8 it suffices to show that there is a  $(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{cn}{2}-i}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-\frac{cn}{2}-4}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T''$ . We have  $\frac{cn}{2} - i + 4 \cdot (\log s - \frac{cn}{2} - 4) \geq 4n - \frac{7}{4}cn + O(\log n) \geq 2cn$  (since  $c < \frac{15}{16}$ ) and so Proposition 3.10 proves that  $T''$  exists.

Case 2  $i \geq \frac{cn}{4}$ . Due to Proposition 3.9 we are left with showing that there is both a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{i-\frac{cn}{4}}, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{\frac{cn}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T$  and a

$(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-2i-4}, 0, \underbrace{8, \dots, 8}_{i-\frac{cn}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T'$ . Due to Proposition 3.10  $T$  exists. To show that

$T'$  can be obtained it suffices to prove that there is a

$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{cn}{4}}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i+3}, \underbrace{4, \dots, 4}_{\log s-2i-4}, \underbrace{0, 8, \dots, 8}_{i-\frac{cn}{4}}, 0, \dots, 0)$ -tree  $T''$ .

We have  $\frac{cn}{4} + 4 \cdot (\log s - 2i - 4) + 8 \cdot (i - \frac{cn}{4}) \geq 4n - \frac{7}{4}cn + O(\log n) \geq 2cn$  (since  $c < \frac{16}{15}$ ) and therefore Proposition 3.10 guarantees the existence of  $T''$ .  $\square$

## 4 Constructing unsatisfiable $k$ -CNF formulas with small neighborhood

*Proof of Theorem 1.7:* Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.10 directly imply Theorem 1.7.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a hypergraph. We say that Maker uses a *pure pairing strategy* if at the beginning of the game he divides all but at most one of the vertices of  $\mathcal{F}$  into pairs, lets Breaker start the game, and whenever Breaker claims one vertex of a pair he takes the other one.

**Observation 4.1.** *If there is a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  then there is a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree at most  $s$  where Maker has a winning pure pairing strategy.*

This can be seen as follows. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph, let  $\mathcal{G}'$  be a disjoint copy of  $\mathcal{G}$  and let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the hypergraph with  $V(\mathcal{H}) = V(\mathcal{G}) \cup V(\mathcal{G}')$  and  $E(\mathcal{H}) = E(\mathcal{G}) \cup E(\mathcal{G}')$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph with maximum degree at most  $s$ . Moreover, let  $S$  and  $S'$  denote the winning pairing strategy of Maker in  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G}'$ , respectively, and let  $v_S$  and  $v_{S'}$  denote the corresponding vertices Maker claims in the first round. We consider the pure pairing strategy  $\tilde{S}$  where the pairings corresponding to  $S$  and  $S'$  are maintained and additionally  $v_S$  is paired with  $v_{S'}$ . Clearly  $\tilde{S}$  is a winning pure pairing strategy for Maker. Indeed, it allows him to play his original strategy in at least one of the hypergraphs  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}'$ , which implies that at the end Maker owns a full hyperedge of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.10:* We first show (i). Due to Observation 4.1 we can assume that there is a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  with maximum degree at most  $s$  where Maker has a winning pure pairing strategy  $S$ . Let  $(v_1, v'_1), (v_2, v'_2), \dots, (v_r, v'_r)$  be the pairing of  $V(\mathcal{G})$  corresponding to  $S$ . To construct an unsatisfiable balanced  $(k, 2s)$ -CNF formula we proceed as follows. First we form for every hyperedge  $e = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  a clause  $\mathcal{C}_e = (w_1 \vee w_2 \vee \dots \vee w_k)$  and set  $\mathcal{F} := \bigwedge_{e \in E(\mathcal{G})} \mathcal{C}_e$  with  $E(\mathcal{G})$  denoting the hyperedge set of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then we replace (in  $\mathcal{F}$ )  $v_i$  and  $v'_i$  with  $x_i$  and  $\bar{x}_i$ , respectively, for every  $i, i = 1, \dots, r$ . Note that by construction every literal  $x \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$  occurs in at most  $s$  clauses of  $\mathcal{F}$ . It remains to show that  $\mathcal{F}$  is unsatisfiable.

Note that by playing according to  $S$  Maker achieves that the outcome of the game corresponds to a valid assignment of  $\mathcal{F}$  with

$$x_i = \begin{cases} \text{true,} & \text{if Breaker claims } v_i \\ \text{false,} & \text{if Breaker claims } v'_i \end{cases}$$

Due to our construction  $\mathcal{F}$  is satisfiable if and only if Breaker has a winning strategy in  $\mathcal{G}$  against  $S$ . But by assumption  $S$  is a winning strategy for Maker, implying that  $\mathcal{F}$  is not satisfiable. It remains to prove (ii). Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an unsatisfiable  $(k, s)$ -CNF formula and let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$  be the set of variables of  $\mathcal{F}$ . To construct a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph we proceed as follows. For every clause  $\mathcal{C} = (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \dots \vee x_k)$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  we construct a hyperedge  $e_{\mathcal{C}} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$  and let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the hypergraph with vertex set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_r\}$  and hyperedge set  $\{e_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \text{ is a clause of } \mathcal{F}\}$ . We denote by  $S$  the pure pairing strategy where  $x_i$  is paired with  $\bar{x}_i$  for every  $i, i = 1, \dots, r$ . Similarly as above we get that Breaker has a winning strategy against  $S$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is satisfiable. Hence Maker has a winning (pure) pairing strategy on  $\mathcal{G}$  and therefore  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $(k, s)$ -hypergraph.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.9:* Davydov, Davydova, and Kleine Büning [5] established the following characterization for MU(1)-formulas. ( $\text{vbl}(F)$  denotes the set of variables which occur in the formula  $F$ .)

**Lemma 4.2. (Davydov, Davydova, and Kleine Büning [5])**  *$F \in \text{MU}(1)$  if and only if either  $F = \{\emptyset\}$  or  $F$  is the disjoint union of formulas  $F'_1, F'_2$  such that for a variable  $x$  we have*

- $\text{vbl}(F'_1) \cap \text{vbl}(F'_2) = \{x\}$  and  $\{x, \bar{x}\} \subseteq \bigcup_{C \in F} C$ ;
- $F_1 := \{C \setminus \{x\} : C \in F'_1\} \in \text{MU}(1)$ ;
- $F_2 := \{C \setminus \{\bar{x}\} : C \in F'_2\} \in \text{MU}(1)$ .

The proofs of Theorem 1.2, Theorem 1.7, and Theorem 1.10 implicitly yield an unsatisfiable  $(k, \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF formula  $\mathcal{F}$  (for sufficiently large  $k$  which are a power of 2) and an unsatisfiable  $(k, 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF

formula  $\mathcal{F}'$  (for sufficiently large  $k$ ). It can be seen that  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  have the properties stated in Lemma 4.2, implying that they both belong to MU(1).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.11:* Part (ii) follows directly from the construction used in the proof of Lemma 2.2. (By Theorem 1.10 we can interpret the corresponding tree as a boolean formula  $\mathcal{F}$ . Carefully counting the maximum neighborhood size then shows that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $(k, 2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2} + 1)$ -CNF). It remains to prove part (i). This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2. Indeed, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the boolean formula corresponding to the tree guaranteed by Lemma 3.2. Note that  $\mathcal{F}$  has the property that two neighboring clauses  $C, D$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  always form a conflict. This implies that the neighborhood size of a clause  $(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \dots \vee x_k)$  is bounded by  $\sum_{i=1}^k d(\bar{x}_i)$  with  $d(\bar{x}_i)$  denoting the number of occurrences of  $\bar{x}_i$ . Moreover, by construction the boolean formula  $\mathcal{F}$  corresponding to the tree guaranteed by Lemma 3.2 has the property that every literal occurs in at most  $\frac{2^{k-1}}{k}$  clauses, implying that the maximum neighbourhood size of  $\mathcal{F}$  is at most  $k \cdot \frac{2^{k-1}}{k} = 2^{k-1}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.12:* Along similar lines as above we can show that Theorem 1.3 implies that  $f(k) \leq \frac{2^{k-1}}{ck} - 1$  and  $l(k) \leq \frac{2^{k-1}}{c} - 1$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgment:** We would like to thank Tibor Szabó for the intensive support and Emo Welzl for the numerous helpful remarks.

## References

- [1] R. Aharoni and N. Linial, Minimal non-two-colorable hypergraphs and minimal unsatisfiable formulas, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **43**, (1986), 196–204.
- [2] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method* *J. John Wiley & Sons* (2002).
- [3] J. Beck, *Combinatorial Games: Tic Tac Toe Theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications 114, 2008
- [4] J. Beck, Remarks on positional games, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **40**, (1982), 65–71.
- [5] G. Davydov, I. Davydova, and H. Kleine Büning, An efficient algorithm for the minimal unsatisfiability problem for a subclass of CNF, *Artif. Intell.* **23**, (1998), 229–245.
- [6] P. Erdős and J.L. Selfridge, On a combinatorial game, *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A* **14**, (1973), 298–301.
- [7] P. Erdős and J.Spencer, Lopsided Lovász local lemma and Latin transversals *Discrete Appl. Math.* **30**, (1991), 151–154.
- [8] S. Hoory and S.Szeider, A note on unsatisfiable k-CNF formulas with few occurrences per variable, *SIAM J. Discrete Math* **20** (2), (2006), 523–528.
- [9] S. Hoory and S.Szeider, Computing Unsatisfiable k-SAT Instances with Few Occurrences per Variable, *Theoretical Computer Science* **337** (1–3), (2005), 347–359.
- [10] H. Kleine Büning and X. Zhao, On the structure of some classes of minimal unsatisfiable formulas, *Discr. Appl. Math.* **130**(2), (2003), 185–207
- [11] J. Kratochvíl, P. Savický and Z. Tuza, One more occurrence of variables makes satisfiability jump from trivial to NP-complete, *SIAM J. Comput.* **22** (1), (1993), 203–210.
- [12] O. Kullmann, An application of matroid theory to the SAT problem, *Fifteenth Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity* (2000), 116–124
- [13] R. Moser, A constructive proof of the Lovasz Local Lemma, *Eprint, arXiv:0810.4812v2* (2008)

- [14] P. Savický and J. Sgall, DNF tautologies with a limited number of occurrences of every variable, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **238** (1–2), (2000), 495–498.
- [15] D. Scheder, Existence, Size, and Resolution Complexity of Almost Disjoint CNF Formulas, *submitted*
- [16] S. Szeider, Homomorphisms of conjunctive normal forms, *Discr. Appl. Math.* **130**(2), (2003), 351–365
- [17] C.A. Tovey, A simplified NP-complete satisfiability problem, *Discr. Appl. Math.* **8** (1), (1984), 85–89.

## Appendix

### A Establishing a proper halving 2-coloring

*Proof of Theorem 1.5:* For simplicity we only consider hypergraphs with an even number of vertices. We will show the following stronger claim.

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $n$ -uniform hypergraph with  $2r$  vertices and maximum degree at most  $\frac{2^{n-2}}{en}$ . Then for each pairing  $(v_1, v'_1), (v_2, v'_2), \dots, (v_r, v'_r)$  of  $V(\mathcal{F})$  there is a proper 2-coloring such that  $v_i$  and  $v'_i$  have different colors for every  $i, i = 1, \dots, r$ .*

Before starting with the proof we need some notation. Let  $P = (v_1, v'_1), (v_2, v'_2), \dots, (v_r, v'_r)$  be a pairing of  $V(\mathcal{F})$ . By a (proper)  $P$ -2-coloring we denote a (proper) 2-coloring of  $V(\mathcal{F})$  such that  $v_i$  and  $v'_i$  have different colors for every  $k, k = 1, \dots, r$ . Moreover, for every vertex  $x \in V(\mathcal{F})$  we denote by  $f(x)$  the vertex which is paired with  $x$  in  $P$  (i.e.,  $f(v_i) = v'_i$  and  $f(v'_i) = v_i$ ).

*Proof of Proposition A.1:* Suppose, for a contradiction, that there is a pairing  $P = (v_1, v'_1), (v_2, v'_2), \dots, (v_r, v'_r)$  of  $V(\mathcal{F})$  such that there is no proper  $P$ -2-coloring. For every hyperedge  $e = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  we add the hyperedge  $e' = (f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n))$  to  $\mathcal{F}$  and denote the resulting hypergraph by  $\mathcal{F}'$ . Note that  $\Delta(\mathcal{F}') \leq 2 \cdot \Delta(\mathcal{F}) \leq \frac{2^{n-1}}{en}$ . By construction, every  $P$ -2-coloring of  $V(\mathcal{F}')$  has both a monochromatic red hyperedge and a monochromatic blue hyperedge. Hence, if Maker plays the pairing strategy corresponding to  $P$  he can completely occupy some hyperedge by the end of the game. So there is an  $(n, \frac{2^{n-1}}{en})$ -hypergraph. Due to Theorem 1.10 there is an unsatisfiable  $(n, \frac{2^n}{en})$ -CNF formula, which contradicts Theorem 1.6.  $\square$