

# Small families of partially shattering permutations

António Girão<sup>†</sup>    Lukas Michel<sup>†</sup>    Youri Tamitegama<sup>†</sup>

9 July 2024

## Abstract

We say that a family of permutations  $t$ -shatters a set if it induces at least  $t$  distinct permutations on that set. What is the minimum number  $f_k(n, t)$  of permutations of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  that  $t$ -shatter all subsets of size  $k$ ? For  $t \leq 2$ ,  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(1)$ . Spencer showed that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log \log n)$  for  $3 \leq t \leq k$  and  $f_k(n, k!) = \Theta(\log n)$ . In 1996, Füredi asked whether partial shattering with permutations must always fall into one of these three regimes. Johnson and Wickes recently settled the case  $k = 3$  affirmatively and proved that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log n)$  for  $t > 2(k - 1)!$ .

We give a surprising negative answer to the question of Füredi by showing that a fourth regime exists for  $k \geq 4$ . We establish that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$  for certain values of  $t$  and prove that this is the only other regime when  $k = 4$ . We also show that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log n)$  for  $t > 2^{k-1}$ . This greatly narrows the range of  $t$  for which the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  is unknown.

## 1 Introduction

A family  $\mathcal{P}$  of permutations of  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  *shatters* a set  $X \subseteq [n]$  if the permutations of  $\mathcal{P}$  induce every possible permutation on the elements of  $X$ . Shattering families of permutations were first studied by Spencer [12] who asked the following question.

What is the smallest family of permutations of  $[n]$  that shatters all subsets of a fixed size  $k$ ?

Spencer [12] showed that such families have size  $\Theta(\log n)$ , with subsequent work improving the constant of the lower bound [6, 5, 9].

A natural refinement of this problem is to consider partial shattering. For  $t \geq 1$ , we say that a family  $\mathcal{P}$   *$t$ -shatters* a set  $X$  if  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at least  $t$  distinct permutations on  $X$ . Let  $f_k(n, t)$  be the minimum number of permutations of  $[n]$  that  $t$ -shatter all subsets of size  $k$ . From above we know that  $f_k(n, k!) = \Theta(\log n)$ , and monotone permutations can be used to prove that  $f_k(n, t) = t$  for  $t \leq 2$ . Moreover, an argument of Hajnal

---

<sup>†</sup>Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, United Kingdom ( [{girao,michel,tamitegama}@maths.ox.ac.uk](mailto:{girao,michel,tamitegama}@maths.ox.ac.uk})).

and Spencer [12] shows that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log \log n)$  for  $3 \leq t \leq k$ .<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  falls into at least three distinct regimes.

In 1996, Füredi [5] asked whether these might be the only possible regimes, even in a much more general version of partial shattering. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a family of sets of permutations of  $[k]$ . Then, a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of permutations of  $[n]$  is  *$\mathcal{S}$ -mixing* if for every subset  $X \subseteq [n]$  of size  $k$ , the set of permutations that  $\mathcal{P}$  induces on  $X$  is a member of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{S}$  is *monotone* if for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $S \subseteq T$  we have  $T \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $\mathcal{S}$  is the family of sets with at least  $t$  permutations of  $[k]$ , then  $\mathcal{S}$  is monotone and  $\mathcal{S}$ -mixing families are exactly those families that  $t$ -shatter all subsets of size  $k$ .

Even in this more general  $\mathcal{S}$ -mixing framework, the minimum size of an  $\mathcal{S}$ -mixing family in all previously known cases was in one of the three regimes  $\Theta(1)$ ,  $\Theta(\log \log n)$ , and  $\Theta(\log n)$ . This prompted Füredi [5] to ask the following question.

**Question 1.1** (Füredi, 1996). *If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a monotone family of sets of permutations of  $[k]$ , is the minimum size of an  $\mathcal{S}$ -mixing family either  $\Theta(1)$ ,  $\Theta(\log \log n)$ , or  $\Theta(\log n)$ ?*

Johnson and Wickes [7] recently made progress on this question for  $f_k(n, t)$ . They showed that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log n)$  for  $t > 2(k-1)!$ . Together with the previously known asymptotics, this yields the following partial classification.

**Theorem 1.2** (Johnson, Wickes, 2023). *Let  $k \geq 3$  be an integer. Then,*

$$f_k(n, t) = \begin{cases} t & \text{for } t \leq 2, \\ \Theta(\log \log n) & \text{for } 3 \leq t \leq k, \\ \Theta(\log n) & \text{for } 2(k-1)! < t \leq k!. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, Johnson and Wickes [7] settled the case  $k = 3$  completely by additionally proving that  $f_3(n, 4) = \Theta(\log \log n)$ . Given these results, they reiterated Füredi's question and asked specifically whether  $f_k(n, t)$  must always fall into one of the three regimes  $\Theta(1)$ ,  $\Theta(\log \log n)$ , and  $\Theta(\log n)$  [1, 7].

We answer the questions of Füredi and of Johnson and Wickes negatively. For  $k \geq 4$ , we show that a fourth regime exists with  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$ . More generally, we improve the partial classification of the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  as follows.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $k \geq 4$  be an integer. Then,*

$$f_k(n, t) = \begin{cases} t & \text{for } t \leq 2, \\ \Theta(\log \log n) & \text{for } 3 \leq t \leq 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}, \\ \Theta(\sqrt{\log n}) & \text{for } 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} < t \leq \min\{2k, 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} + 4\}, \\ \Theta(\log n) & \text{for } 2^{k-1} < t \leq k!. \end{cases}$$

For  $k = 4$ , this settles the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_4(n, t)$  completely as all values of  $t$  are covered. However, if  $k$  is large, there is still an exponential gap between the regime  $\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$  and  $\Theta(\log n)$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Spencer [12] considered the slightly different problem of determining the minimum number of permutations such that for every subset  $X \subseteq [n]$  of size  $k$  and every element  $x \in X$ , there is a permutation where  $x$  is the largest element of  $X$ . Johnson and Wickes [7] observed that this transfers to  $f_k(n, t)$ .

**Theorem 1.3** is based on a series of new lower and upper bounds on  $f_k(n, t)$ . First, we show that the lower bound  $f_k(n, t) = \Omega(\log n)$  holds for a wider range of values of  $t$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $t > 2^{k-1}$ . Then,  $f_k(n, t) = \Omega(\log n)$ .*

The main observation for this result is that for any small family  $\mathcal{P}$  of permutations of  $[n]$ , we can construct two large subsets  $A, B \subseteq [n]$  that are ordered in the following sense: for each permutation of  $\mathcal{P}$  either all elements of  $A$  are smaller than all elements of  $B$ , or all elements of  $B$  are smaller than all elements of  $A$ . By recursively constructing ordered sets in  $A$ , we find a subset of size  $k$  that is only  $2^{k-1}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .

For smaller values of  $t$ , we provide a new lower bound of the form  $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $t > 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ . Then,  $f_k(n, t) = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ .*

The proof of this result is inspired by the proof of **Theorem 1.4**. However, instead of only constructing ordered sets in  $A$ , we recursively construct ordered sets both in  $A$  and in  $B$ . We then use a Ramsey-theoretic argument about vertex-coloured binary trees to find a subset of size  $k$  that is only  $2^{\lceil \log k \rceil}$ -shattered.

We note that the lower bound on  $t$  in **Theorem 1.5** cannot be replaced by anything smaller. Indeed, a careful analysis of the construction of Hajnal and Spencer [12] shows that  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log \log n)$  for  $3 \leq t \leq 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ . We provide an equivalent construction which proves this and which serves as a motivating example for what follows.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $t \leq 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ . Then,  $f_k(n, t) = \mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ .*

Our construction identifies  $[n]$  with  $[2]^d$  for  $d = \log_2 n$ . Then, we consider lexicographic permutations of  $[2]^d$  which are permutations where the order of  $x, y \in [2]^d$  only depends on the values  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  for the first position  $i$  with  $x_i \neq y_i$ . We show that an appropriate choice of these permutations ensures that all subsets of size  $k$  are  $2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ -shattered.

Finally, for  $k \geq 4$ , we show that there exist  $t > 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$  with  $f_k(n, t) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n})$ . Together with **Theorem 1.5**, this establishes the existence of a fourth regime for  $f_k(n, t)$ .

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $k \geq 4$  and  $t \leq \min\{2k, 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} + 4\}$ . Then,  $f_k(n, t) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n})$ .*

This result is proved similar to **Theorem 1.6**, but we identify  $[n]$  with  $[2^d]^d$  for  $d = \sqrt{\log_2 n}$ . Then, most subsets of size  $k$  are  $2k$ -shattered by lexicographic permutations, and the remaining subsets have a very specific structure. We exploit this structure and add a few more permutations which ensure that all subsets of size  $k$  are  $t$ -shattered.

We remark that partial shattering with permutations is quite different to partial shattering with sets. A family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$  *shatters* a set  $X \subseteq [n]$  if for every subset  $Y \subseteq X$  there exists  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \cap X = Y$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$   *$t$ -shatters*  $X$  if for at least  $t$  distinct subsets  $Y \subseteq X$  there exists  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \cap X = Y$ . The study of shattering families of sets dates back to the seminal works of Sauer [10], Shelah [11], and Vapnik and Chervonenkis [13].

As for permutations, Kleitman and Spencer [8] showed that the minimum number of subsets of  $[n]$  that shatter all subsets of size  $k$  is  $\Theta(\log n)$ . However, in the case of partial shattering, the family  $\{\emptyset, [n]\}$  2-shatters all subsets of size  $k$ , and every family that

3-shatters all subsets of size  $k$  already needs  $\Omega(\log n)$  sets.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, partial shattering with sets only has the two regimes  $\Theta(1)$  and  $\Theta(\log n)$ .

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In [Section 2](#) we prove the lower bounds of [Theorems 1.4](#) and [1.5](#). Afterwards, in [Section 3](#), we prove the upper bounds of [Theorems 1.6](#) and [1.7](#). We finish with some open problems in [Section 4](#).

**Notation.** Throughout the paper, a permutation  $\rho$  of a set  $X$  is a total order of the elements of  $X$ . We denote this order by  $<_\rho$ . Note that if  $Y \subseteq X$ , then  $\rho$  induces a permutation on  $Y$ . If  $\rho$  is a permutation of  $A \cup B$ , we write  $A <_\rho B$  if for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  we have  $a <_\rho b$ .

## 2 Lower bounds

To prove lower bounds for  $f_k(n, t)$ , we first need to define the concept of ordered sets. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of permutations of a set  $X$ . Then, we say that a pair of disjoint subsets  $A, B \subseteq X$  is  *$\mathcal{P}$ -ordered* if for each permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  either  $A <_\rho B$  or  $B <_\rho A$ . The following result shows that any set contains large  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered subsets.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X$  be a set and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of  $m$  permutations of  $X$ . Then, there exists a  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair  $A, B \subseteq X$  with  $\min\{|A|, |B|\} \geq \lfloor |X|/2^{m+1} \rfloor$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_m\}$  and define  $\mathcal{P}_i = \{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_i\}$ . We inductively construct a  $\mathcal{P}_i$ -ordered pair  $A_i, B_i \subseteq X$  with  $|A_i| = |B_i| \geq \lfloor |X|/2^{i+1} \rfloor$ . For  $i = 0$ , we choose  $A_0, B_0 \subseteq X$  as two disjoint subsets of size  $\lfloor |X|/2 \rfloor$ .

Now suppose we have constructed  $A_i$  and  $B_i$ . Let  $\ell = |A_i| = |B_i| \geq \lfloor |X|/2^{i+1} \rfloor$  and consider the subset  $L$  of the  $\ell$  largest elements of  $A_i \cup B_i$  under  $<_{\rho_{i+1}}$ . Note that either  $|L \cap A_i| \geq \ell/2$  or  $|L \cap B_i| \geq \ell/2$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $|L \cap A_i| \geq \ell/2$ .

Set  $A_{i+1} = L \cap A_i$  and  $B_{i+1} = B_i \setminus L$ . Since  $b <_{\rho_{i+1}} a$  for all  $a \in A_{i+1}$  and  $b \in B_{i+1}$ , the pair  $(A_{i+1}, B_{i+1})$  is  $\mathcal{P}_{i+1}$ -ordered. We also have  $|A_{i+1}| \geq \ell/2 \geq \lfloor |X|/2^{i+2} \rfloor$  and  $|B_{i+1}| = \ell - |L \cap B_i| = \ell - (\ell - |L \cap A_i|) = |A_{i+1}|$ , as required.

For  $i = m$ , the pair  $(A_m, B_m)$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered with  $\min\{|A_m|, |B_m|\} \geq \lfloor |X|/2^{m+1} \rfloor$ .  $\square$

Using  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs, we can prove [Theorem 1.4](#). For this, we construct a sequence of nested  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs  $A_i, B_i \subseteq A_{i-1}$  for  $i \in [k]$ , where  $A_0 = [n]$ . Then, if we pick an element  $x_i \in B_i$  for each  $i \in [k]$ , the fact that all pairs are  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered implies that  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  is only  $2^{k-1}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ , as required.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $t > 2^{k-1}$ . We claim that  $f_k(n, t) > (\log_2 n)/k - 1$ . Indeed, suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is a family of  $m$  permutations of  $[n]$  with  $m \leq (\log_2 n)/k - 1$ , and so  $n \geq 2^{k(m+1)}$ . We show that there is a subset of size  $k$  that is not  $t$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>If  $n \geq k \cdot 2^{|\mathcal{F}|}$ , one of the intersections  $\bigcap_{F \in \mathcal{F}} A_F$  with  $A_F \in \{F, [n] \setminus F\}$  must have size at least  $k$ , and any subset  $X \subseteq \bigcap_{F \in \mathcal{F}} A_F$  of size  $k$  satisfies  $F \cap X \in \{\emptyset, X\}$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

To do so, we inductively construct a sequence of  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs as follows. Start with  $A_0 = [n]$ . Then, for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , apply [Lemma 2.1](#) to  $A_{i-1}$  to obtain a  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair  $A_i, B_i \subseteq A_{i-1}$  with  $\min\{|A_i|, |B_i|\} \geq \lfloor |A_{i-1}|/2^{m+1} \rfloor$ . Note that this implies that  $\min\{|A_i|, |B_i|\} \geq \lfloor n/2^{i(m+1)} \rfloor \geq \lfloor n/2^{k(m+1)} \rfloor \geq 1$ , and so  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are non-empty.

For each  $i \in [k]$ , pick  $x_i \in B_i$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{P}$  does not  $t$ -shatter the set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . Indeed, let  $i \in [k-1]$ . Note that  $x_j \in A_i$  for all  $j > i$ . Since  $(A_i, B_i)$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered, it follows that for each permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  we either have  $x_i <_\rho \{x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k\}$  or  $\{x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k\} <_\rho x_i$ . This provides two choices for the position of  $x_i$  relative to  $\{x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k\}$ . Moreover, given such a choice for each  $i \in [k-1]$ , this uniquely determines the permutation that  $\rho$  induces on  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at most  $2^{k-1}$  permutations on  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ , and therefore does not  $t$ -shatter  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ .  $\square$

To prove [Theorem 1.5](#), we will construct a complete binary tree of nested  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs. Namely, for each  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair  $(A, B)$  that we obtain, we recursively construct new  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs in each of  $A$  and  $B$ .

This is useful for the following reason. Suppose that  $k = 4$ ,  $(A, B)$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair, and two  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs  $A', B' \subseteq A$  and  $A'', B'' \subseteq B$  in the tree are *synchronised* in the sense that for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  we have  $A' <_\rho B'$  if and only if  $A'' <_\rho B''$ . Pick  $x_1 \in A', x_2 \in B', x_3 \in A'',$  and  $x_4 \in B''$ . Then, since  $(A, B)$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered, we have  $\{x_1, x_2\} <_\rho \{x_3, x_4\}$  or  $\{x_3, x_4\} <_\rho \{x_1, x_2\}$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ , and since  $(A', B')$  and  $(A'', B'')$  are synchronised, we have  $x_1 <_\rho x_2$  if and only if  $x_3 <_\rho x_4$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at most 4 permutations on  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$  which is less than  $2^{k-1} = 8$ .

To find synchronised  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs, we use a Ramsey-theoretic argument about vertex-coloured binary trees. For that, we need to introduce some terminology. A *binary tree*  $T$  rooted at a vertex  $r$  is a tree where  $r$  has degree 0 or 2 and every other vertex has degree 1 or 3. A leaf of  $T$  is a vertex of degree at most 1. The *layer* of  $T$  at height  $h$  is the set  $N_h(r) \subseteq V(T)$  of those vertices at graph distance exactly  $h$  from  $r$ . For a vertex  $v \in N_h(r)$ , its children are its neighbours in  $N_{h+1}(r)$ , and if  $v \neq r$  then its parent is its neighbour in  $N_{h-1}(r)$ . Clearly,  $|N_h(r)| \leq 2^h$ . If there exists some  $h$  such that  $|N_h(r)| = 2^h$  and  $|N_{h+1}(r)| = 0$ , then  $T$  is a *complete binary tree* of height  $h$ .

Let  $S$  be a second binary tree with root  $q$ . A *subdivision* of  $S$  in  $T$  is an injective map  $\varphi: V(S) \rightarrow V(T)$  such that for all vertices  $v \in V(S) \setminus \{q\}$  with parent  $p$ ,  $\varphi(v)$  is contained in the subtree of  $T$  rooted at  $\varphi(p)$ . If the vertices of  $T$  are coloured (not necessarily properly), we say that the layers of the subdivision are *monochromatic* if  $\varphi(N_h(q))$  is monochromatic for all  $h$ . We often identify  $V(S)$  with  $\varphi(V(S))$ .

In our proof,  $T$  will be a complete binary tree whose vertices correspond to nested  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs, and we colour the vertices of  $T$  in such a way that monochromatic layers correspond to collections of synchronised  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs. Then, if we find a subdivision of a complete binary tree of height  $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$  in  $T$  with monochromatic layers, we can pick one element from each of its leaves to obtain a set of size  $k$  that is only  $2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ , as required.

To do this, we need to find such subdivisions in large vertex-coloured complete binary trees. For all integers  $c \geq 1$  and  $h \geq 0$ , let  $g(c, h)$  be the smallest integer such that

every complete binary tree of height  $g(c, h)$  whose vertices are coloured with  $c$  colours contains a subdivision of a complete binary tree of height  $h$  with monochromatic layers. We prove the following upper bound on  $g(c, h)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *For all integers  $c \geq 1$  and  $h \geq 0$  we have  $g(c, h) \leq h \lceil \log_2(c^{h-1} + 1) \rceil$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $h$ . If  $h = 0$ , a complete binary tree of height  $h$  is a single vertex, and so  $g(c, 0) = 0$ .

If  $h \geq 1$ , let  $d = \lceil \log_2(c^{h-1} + 1) \rceil$  and let  $T$  be a complete binary tree with root  $r$  and height  $d + g(c, h - 1)$  that is coloured with  $c$  colours. For each vertex  $v \in N_d(r)$ , the subtree of  $T$  rooted at  $v$  has height  $g(c, h - 1)$  and must therefore contain a subdivision  $S_v$  of a complete binary tree of height  $h - 1$  with monochromatic layers. Since such subdivisions admit at most  $c^{h-1}$  valid colourings and  $|N_d(r)| = 2^d \geq c^{h-1} + 1$ , there must be two subdivisions  $S_u$  and  $S_v$  whose colourings coincide. Then, the subdivision formed by  $S_u$ ,  $S_v$ , and the lowest common ancestor of  $u$  and  $v$  is a subdivision of a complete binary tree of height  $h$  with monochromatic layers.

Therefore, we get that

$$g(c, h) \leq d + g(c, h - 1) \leq d + (h - 1) \lceil \log_2(c^{h-2} + 1) \rceil \leq h \lceil \log_2(c^{h-1} + 1) \rceil. \quad \square$$

Using the strategy outlined above, we now prove our lower bound for  $t > 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* Let  $h = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil$  and  $t > 2^h$ . We claim  $f_k(n, t) > \sqrt{\log_2 n}/h - 1$ . Indeed, suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is a family of  $m$  permutations of  $[n]$  with  $m \leq \sqrt{\log_2 n}/h - 1$ , and so using Lemma 2.2 we get  $\log_2 n \geq h^2(m + 1)^2 \geq g(2^m, h)(m + 1)$ . We show that there is a subset of size  $k$  that is not  $t$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Consider a complete binary tree  $T$  of height  $g(2^m, h)$ . We associate to each vertex  $v$  of  $T$  a set  $X_v \subseteq [n]$  and a  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair  $A_v, B_v \subseteq X_v$  as follows. For the root  $r$  of  $T$ , let  $X_r = [n]$  and let  $A_r, B_r \subseteq X_r$  be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair given by Lemma 2.1. Then, for a vertex  $v$  of  $T$  with  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pair  $(A_v, B_v)$  and children  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , let  $X_{v_1} = A_v$  and  $X_{v_2} = B_v$ , and let  $A_{v_1}, B_{v_1} \subseteq X_{v_1}$  and  $A_{v_2}, B_{v_2} \subseteq X_{v_2}$  be  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered pairs given by Lemma 2.1. This implies that  $|X_w| \geq \lfloor n/2^{g(2^m, h)(m+1)} \rfloor \geq 1$  for every  $w \in V(T)$ , and so  $X_w$  is non-empty.

Colour each vertex  $v \in V(T)$  with a colour  $c_v$  as follows. For  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ , let

$$c_v(\rho) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A_v <_\rho B_v, \\ 0 & \text{if } B_v <_\rho A_v. \end{cases}$$

Since  $(A_v, B_v)$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered, this is well-defined. This colours each vertex of  $T$  with one of  $2^m$  colours. By Lemma 2.2,  $T$  admits a subdivision of a complete binary tree  $S$  of height  $h$  with monochromatic layers. Let  $q$  be the root of  $S$ .

For each leaf  $\ell$  of  $S$ , pick  $y_\ell \in X_\ell$ , and let  $Y = \{y_\ell : \ell \in N_h^S(q)\}$  be the set of all of these elements. Note that  $|Y| = 2^h \geq k$ . We claim that  $Y$  is not  $t$ -shattered. Indeed, consider the colouring that a fixed permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  induces on the first  $h$  layers  $N_{<h}^S(q)$  of  $S$

by assigning  $c_v(\rho)$  to each  $v \in N_{<h}^S(q)$ . Since each layer of  $S$  is monochromatic, this colours  $N_{<h}^S(q)$  with one of at most  $2^h$  distinct colourings (across all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ ).

Now, for any two distinct leaves  $\ell, \ell' \in N_h^S(q)$ , the lowest common ancestor  $v \in N_{<h}^S(q)$  of  $\ell$  and  $\ell'$  satisfies  $y_\ell \in A_v$  and  $y_{\ell'} \in B_v$  (or vice versa). Then, if  $c_v(\rho) = 1$ , we have  $A_v <_\rho B_v$  and so  $y_\ell <_\rho y_{\ell'}$ , and if  $c_v(\rho) = 0$  we have  $B_v <_\rho A_v$  and so  $y_{\ell'} <_\rho y_\ell$ . Thus, the colours  $c_v(\rho)$  for the vertices  $v \in N_{<h}^S(q)$  uniquely determine the permutation that  $\rho$  induces on  $Y$ . Since there are at most  $2^h$  distinct colourings of  $N_{<h}^S(q)$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at most  $2^h$  permutations on  $Y$ , and therefore does not  $t$ -shatter  $Y$ .  $\square$

### 3 Upper bounds

To prove our upper bounds on  $f_k(n, t)$ , we use lexicographic permutations. Identify  $[n]$  with a subset of  $[b]^d$  where  $b \geq 2$  and  $d \geq \lceil \log_b n \rceil$  and define a *lex-permutation*  $\rho$  of  $[b]^d$  to be a permutation that is constructed as follows. For each  $i \in [d]$ , pick a permutation  $\rho_i$  of  $[b]$ . Then, for distinct  $x, y \in [b]^d$ , set  $x <_\rho y$  if and only if  $x_i <_{\rho_i} y_i$  where  $i = i(x, y) = \min\{i \in [d] : x_i \neq y_i\}$ . That is, the relative order of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\rho$  is entirely determined by the first position where  $x$  and  $y$  differ. It is easy to check that  $<_\rho$  is a total order, and so  $\rho$  is a permutation.

We say that a family of permutations  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $[b]^d$  is *k-lex-shattering* if it is a family of lex-permutations such that the following holds. Let  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [d]$  be a subset of size at most  $k$ , and for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  fix a permutation  $\sigma_i$  of a subset  $Y_i \subseteq [b]$  of size at most  $k$ . Then, there exists a permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\rho_i$  induces  $\sigma_i$  on  $Y_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . We will later show that  $k$ -lex-shattering families  $2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ -shatter every subset of size  $k$ . However, we first have to show that small  $k$ -lex-shattering families exist.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , there exists a  $k$ -lex-shattering family of  $[b]^d$  with size  $\mathcal{O}(\log(bd))$ .*

*Proof.* By [Theorem 1.2](#), there is a family  $\mathcal{Q}$  of permutations of  $[bd]$  with size  $\mathcal{O}(\log(bd))$  that shatters every subset of size  $k^2$ . For each  $\tau \in \mathcal{Q}$ , construct a lex-permutation  $\rho^\tau$  such that  $\rho_i^\tau$  is the permutation that  $\tau$  induces on  $(i-1)b + [b] = \{(i-1)b + 1, \dots, ib\}$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{P} = \{\rho^\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{Q}\}$  is  $k$ -lex-shattering.

Indeed, let  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [d]$  have size at most  $k$ , and for every  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  let  $\sigma_i$  be a permutation of a subset  $Y_i \subseteq [b]$  of size at most  $k$ . Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  shatters the set  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} ((i-1)b + Y_i)$ , there exists a permutation  $\tau \in \mathcal{Q}$  which induces  $\sigma_i$  on  $(i-1)b + Y_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . This implies that  $\rho_i^\tau$  induces  $\sigma_i$  on  $Y_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ .  $\square$

To determine the permutations that a  $k$ -lex-shattering family  $\mathcal{P}$  induces on a subset  $X$ , consider the lexicographic structure of  $X$ . Let  $i(X) = \inf\{i(x, y) : x, y \in X\}$  be the first position where two elements of  $X$  differ, and let  $S(X) = \{x_{i(X)} : x \in X\}$  denote the *slice* of  $X$  at that position if  $i(X) < \infty$ . This partitions  $X$  into the subsets  $X_s = \{x \in X : x_{i(X)} = s\}$  for  $s \in S(X)$ . Note that the sets  $X_s$  are pairwise  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered and that their relative order in a permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  is determined by the permutation that  $\rho_{i(X)}$  induces on  $S(X)$ . We will denote this permutation by  $\rho(X)$ .

If we partition a set  $X_s$  in the same way, this yields a partition of  $X_s$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered sets whose relative order is determined by  $\rho(X_s)$ . Continuing recursively like this, it follows that the order that  $\rho$  induces on  $X$  is determined by the permutations  $\rho(Y)$  for  $Y \subseteq X$ . This is captured by the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\rho$  be a lex-permutation of  $[b]^d$  and let  $X \subseteq [b]^d$ . Then, the permutation that  $\rho$  induces on  $X$  is uniquely determined by the set of permutations  $\rho(Y)$  for  $Y \subseteq X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in X$  and  $i = i(x, y)$ . Then,  $Y = \{x, y\} \subseteq X$  and  $\rho(Y)$  is the permutation that  $\rho_i$  induces on  $S(Y) = \{x_i, y_i\}$ . This implies that  $x <_\rho y$  if and only if  $x_i <_{\rho_i} y_i$  which in turn is equivalent to  $x_i <_{\rho(Y)} y_i$ . So, the permutation that  $\rho$  induces on  $X$  is determined by the set of permutations  $\rho(Y)$  for  $Y \subseteq X$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  are lex-permutations with  $\rho(Y) \neq \tau(Y)$  for some  $Y \subseteq X$ . Let  $i = i(Y)$ . Since  $\rho(Y) \neq \tau(Y)$ , there must exist  $x, y \in Y$  with  $i(x, y) = i$  such that  $x_i <_{\rho(Y)} y_i$  and  $y_i <_{\tau(Y)} x_i$  (or vice versa). As above, this is equivalent to  $x <_\rho y$  and  $y <_\tau x$ , and so  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  induce different permutations on  $X$ .  $\square$

Next, we deduce a lower bound on the number of permutations that  $\mathcal{P}$  induces on  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}(X) = \{i(Y) : Y \subseteq X \text{ and } i(Y) < \infty\}$ . We rely on the following observation.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a  $k$ -lex-shattering family of permutations of  $[b]^d$  and let  $X \subseteq [b]^d$  be a subset of size  $k$ . For each  $i \in \mathcal{I}(X)$ , let  $Y_i \subseteq X$  be such that  $i(Y_i) = i$ . Then,  $X$  is  $(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}(X)} |S(Y_i)|!)$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* We claim that  $|\mathcal{I}(X)| < k$ . Indeed, write  $<$  for the standard lexicographic order on  $[b]^d$ , so  $x < y$  if and only if  $x_i < y_i$  where  $i = i(x, y)$ . Note that if  $x, y, z \in [b]^d$  satisfy  $x < y < z$ , then  $i(x, z) = \min\{i(x, y), i(y, z)\}$ . Therefore, if we write  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_k$ , this implies that  $\mathcal{I}(X) = \{i(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}) : \ell \in [k-1]\}$ , and so  $|\mathcal{I}(X)| \leq k-1$  as claimed.

Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is  $k$ -lex-shattering, it follows that if  $\sigma_i$  is a permutation of  $S(Y_i)$  for every  $i \in \mathcal{I}(X)$ , then there is a permutation  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\rho(Y_i) = \sigma_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}(X)$ . By [Lemma 3.2](#), each choice of the permutations  $\sigma_i$  induces a different permutation on  $X$ , and so  $X$  is  $(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}(X)} |S(Y_i)|!)$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .  $\square$

To maximise this product, consider again the decomposition of  $X$  into its lexicographic structure from above. Suppose that we only pick the largest set  $X_s$  whenever we recursively continue the decomposition, and let the sets obtained during this process be the sets  $Y_i$ . Then, we will show that  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)|! \geq 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ , and so every set of size  $k$  is  $2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ . This suffices to prove [Theorem 1.6](#).

For [Theorem 1.7](#), we will additionally infer some structural information about  $X$  whenever  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ . Later, this information will allow us to add more permutations to  $\mathcal{P}$  which ensure that  $X$  is  $t$ -shattered for some  $t > 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ . Overall, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a  $k$ -lex-shattering family of permutations of  $[b]^d$ , and let  $h = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}$  is a family that  $2^h$ -shatters all subsets of  $[b]^d$  of size  $k$ . Moreover, if  $X \subseteq [b]^d$  is a subset*



of size  $k$  that  $\mathcal{P}$  does not  $2k$ -shatter, then the set  $\mathcal{I}(X)$  has size  $h$ , all  $Y \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) < \infty$  satisfy  $|S(Y)| = 2$ , and all  $Y, Z \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) = i(Z) < \infty$  satisfy  $S(Y) = S(Z)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X \subseteq [b]^d$  be a subset of size  $k$  and let  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(X)$ .

**Claim 3.5.** *There exist sets  $Y_i \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y_i) = i$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)| \geq k$ .*

*Proof.* We prove by induction on  $j$  that for all  $0 \leq j \leq d$  there exist sets  $Y_i \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y_i) = i$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{I} \cap [j]$  and a subset  $Z \subseteq X$  which satisfy  $i(Z) > j$  and  $|Z| \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cap [j]} |S(Y_i)| \geq k$ . Applying this with  $j = d$  proves the claim.

For  $j = 0$ , let  $Z = X$ . Now suppose we have constructed such sets for  $j - 1$ . If  $i(Z) > j$ , the same sets work for  $j$ , where we choose any  $Y_j \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y_j) = j$  if  $j \in \mathcal{I}$ .

Otherwise,  $i(Z) = j$ . Let  $Y_j = Z$ , and for every  $s \in S(Z)$  let  $Z_s = \{z \in Z : z_j = s\}$ . Pick  $s \in S(Z)$  such that  $|Z_s| \geq |Z|/|S(Z)|$ . Note that  $i(Z_s) > j$  and  $|Z_s| \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cap [j]} |S(Y_i)| \geq (|Z|/|S(Z)|) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cap [j-1]} |S(Y_i)| \cdot |S(Z)| \geq k$ . So we have constructed the sets for  $j$ . ■

For all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , let  $Y_i \subseteq X$  be a set with  $i(Y_i) = i$  that maximises  $|S(Y_i)|$ . By **Claim 3.5**,  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)| \geq k$ , and by **Lemma 3.3**  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at least  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)|!$  permutations on  $X$ . If  $|S(Y_i)| \geq 3$  for some  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , then  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)|! \geq 2 \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)| \geq 2k \geq 2^h$ . Otherwise,  $|S(Y_i)| = 2$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Then, since  $2^{|\mathcal{I}|} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)| \geq k$ , we have  $|\mathcal{I}| \geq h$  and so  $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)|! = 2^{|\mathcal{I}|} \geq 2^h$ . This shows that  $X$  is  $2^h$ -shattered.

Moreover, if  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered, these arguments imply that  $|S(Y_i)| = 2$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $|\mathcal{I}| = h$ . Suppose that for some  $j \in \mathcal{I}$  there exists a set  $Z \subseteq X$  with  $i(Z) = j$  and  $S(Y_j) \neq S(Z)$ . Then, by the maximality of  $Y_j$ ,  $|S(Z)| = 2$  and so  $|S(Y_j) \cap S(Z)| \leq 1$ . In particular, for any pair of permutations  $\sigma$  of  $S(Y_j)$  and  $\tau$  of  $S(Z)$ , there is a permutation  $\sigma_j$  of  $S(Y_j) \cup S(Z)$  that induces  $\sigma$  on  $S(Y_j)$  and  $\tau$  on  $S(Z)$ . By the same argument as in the proof of **Lemma 3.3**, it follows that  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at least  $|S(Z)|! \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} |S(Y_i)|! \geq 2k$  permutations on  $X$ . This contradicts the fact that  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered. □

With  $b = 2$  and  $d = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ , **Theorem 1.6** is an immediate consequence of **Lemmas 3.1** and **3.4**. We remark that while the description of our construction differs significantly from that of Spencer [12], these constructions are essentially equivalent.

To prove **Theorem 1.7**, start with a  $k$ -lex-shattering family  $\mathcal{P}$ . By **Lemma 3.4**, most subsets of size  $k$  are  $2k$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ , and even if a subset  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered, it is nevertheless  $2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil}$ -shattered and it has a very specific structure. We exploit this structure by adding new permutations to  $\mathcal{P}$  which induce at least four additional permutation on  $X$  and thereby ensure that  $X$  is  $(2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} + 4)$ -shattered.

To do so, we add a constant number of new permutations for each position  $i \in [d]$ . Let  $<$  and  $>$  denote the standard and reverse permutations of  $[b]$ .<sup>3</sup> Then, for all  $\sigma, \tau \in \{<, >\}$ , let  $\pi_{i,\sigma,\tau}$  be the permutation of  $[b]^d$  with  $x <_{\pi_{i,\sigma,\tau}} y$  if and only if either  $x_i <_{\sigma} y_i$ , or

<sup>3</sup>That is, for  $x, y \in [b]$  set  $x << y$  if and only if  $x < y$ , and  $x <> y$  if and only if  $x > y$ .

$x_i = y_i$  and  $x_{i(x,y)} <_{\tau} y_{i(x,y)}$ . That is,  $\pi_{i,\sigma,\tau}$  first sorts according to position  $i$  and only afterwards behaves like a lex-permutation. Define

$$\mathcal{Q}_i = \{\pi_{i,\sigma,\tau} : \sigma, \tau \in \{<, >\}\}.$$

If  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered, we show that for an appropriate  $i \in [d]$  the permutations of  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  induce four additional permutations on  $X$ , as required.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* Let  $b = 2^d$ ,  $d = \lceil \sqrt{\log_2 n} \rceil$ , and  $h = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil$ . By Lemma 3.1, there exists a  $k$ -lex-shattering family  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $[b]^d$  with size  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n})$ . Define  $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P} \cup \bigcup_{i \in [d]} \mathcal{Q}_i$  and note that  $\mathcal{R}$  has size  $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

We claim that every subset  $X \subseteq [b]^d$  of size  $k$  is  $\min\{2k, 2^h + 4\}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{R}$ . Indeed, suppose that  $X$  is not  $2k$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, by Lemma 3.4, we know that the set  $\mathcal{I}(X)$  has size  $h$ , all  $Y \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) < \infty$  satisfy  $|S(Y)| = 2$ , and all  $Y, Z \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) = i(Z) < \infty$  satisfy  $S(Y) = S(Z)$ .

Write  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_k$ . Note that  $i(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}) \in \mathcal{I}(X)$  for all  $\ell \in [k-1]$ . Since  $k \geq 4$ , one can check that  $k-1 > h = |\mathcal{I}(X)|$ . So there must exist  $1 \leq \ell < m < k$  with  $i(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}) = i(x_m, x_{m+1})$ . Let  $i = i(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1})$  and  $j = i(x_{\ell+1}, x_m)$ .

If  $j \geq i$ , then  $i(x_{\ell+1}, x_{m+1}) = i$  and  $i(x_\ell, x_{m+1}) = i$ . So,  $Y = \{x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, x_{m+1}\} \subseteq X$  satisfies  $|S(Y)| = 3$ . This contradicts the fact that all  $Y \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) < \infty$  satisfy  $|S(Y)| = 2$ . Therefore,  $j < i$ . In particular,  $(x_\ell)_j = (x_{\ell+1})_j < (x_m)_j = (x_{m+1})_j$ , and so  $(\{x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}\}, \{x_m, x_{m+1}\})$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ -ordered.

Note that  $i(\{x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}\}) = i = i(\{x_m, x_{m+1}\})$ . Since all  $Y, Z \subseteq X$  with  $i(Y) = i(Z) < \infty$  satisfy  $S(Y) = S(Z)$ , we must therefore have  $(x_\ell)_i = (x_m)_i < (x_{\ell+1})_i = (x_{m+1})_i$ , and so  $(\{x_\ell, x_m\}, \{x_{\ell+1}, x_{m+1}\})$  is  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ -ordered.

In particular,  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  induce different permutations on  $X$ . Moreover, note that  $\{x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, x_m, x_{m+1}\}$  is 4-shattered by  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ . Since Lemma 3.4 implies that  $X$  is  $2^h$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ , it follows that  $X$  is  $(2^h + 4)$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{R}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Open Problems

In this paper, we have shown that at least four regimes exist for the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  when  $k \geq 4$ , and we narrowed the range of values of  $t$  for which the asymptotic behaviour is unknown. The main open problem is to determine the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  for  $k \geq 5$  and  $\min\{2k, 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} + 4\} < t \leq 2^{k-1}$ . The following remains possible.

**Question 4.1.** For all integers  $k$  and  $t$ , is the asymptotic behaviour of  $f_k(n, t)$  either  $\Theta(1)$ ,  $\Theta(\log \log n)$ ,  $\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$ , or  $\Theta(\log n)$ ?

We conjecture that Theorem 1.4 determines the entire range of values of  $t$  that satisfy  $f_k(n, t) = \Theta(\log n)$ .

**Conjecture 4.2.** Let  $k \geq 3$  and  $t \leq 2^{k-1}$ . Then,  $f_k(n, t) = o(\log n)$ .

Since we did not try to optimise the upper bound on  $t$  in [Theorem 1.7](#), we believe that constructions similar to ours could prove that  $f_k(n, t) = o(\log n)$  for a larger range of values of  $t$ . However, they seem to be far away from reaching  $t = 2^{k-1}$ .

In this context it seems important to mention the following inspiration for our approach that comes from the Erdős-Gyárfás problem [4]. If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a family of permutations of  $[n]$ , assign a colour  $c_{x,y}$  to every pair  $x, y \in [n]$  as follows. For  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}$ , let

$$c_{x,y}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x <_{\rho} y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This colouring uses  $2^{|\mathcal{P}|}$  colours, and if a subset  $X \subseteq [n]$  of size  $k$  spans at most  $\ell$  colours, then  $\mathcal{P}$  induces at most  $2^{\ell}$  permutations on  $X$ . We implicitly used this approach to prove [Theorems 1.4](#) and [1.5](#). Unfortunately, the converse does not hold:  $X$  can simultaneously span at least  $\ell$  colours and fail to be  $2^{\ell}$ -shattered by  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Nevertheless, Eichhorn and Mubayi [3] gave a colouring of  $K_n$  with  $2^{\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})}$  colours such that all subsets of size  $k$  span at least  $\ell = 2 \lceil \log_2 k \rceil - 2$  colours. This inspired our construction for [Theorem 1.7](#), even if our construction does not  $2^{\ell}$ -shatter all subsets of size  $k$ . Note that Conlon, Fox, Lee, and Sudakov [2] gave a colouring of  $K_n$  with  $2^{o(\log n)}$  colours such that all subsets of size  $k$  span at least  $k - 1$  colours. We hope that these colourings could inspire further progress towards better upper bounds on  $f_k(n, t)$ .

## References

- [1] R. Baber, N. Behague, A. Calbet, D. Ellis, J. Erde, R. Gray, M.-R. Ivan, B. Janzer, R. Johnson, L. Milićević et al. *A collection of open problems in celebration of Imre Leader's 60th birthday*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18163, 2023.
- [2] D. Conlon, J. Fox, C. Lee and B. Sudakov. *The Erdős–Gyárfás problem on generalized Ramsey numbers*. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, **110**(1):1–18, 2015.
- [3] D. Eichhorn and D. Mubayi. *Note-edge-coloring cliques with many colors on subcliques*. Combinatorica, **20**(3):441–444, 2000.
- [4] P. Erdős and A. Gyárfás. *A variant of the classical Ramsey problem*. Combinatorica, **17**:459–467, 1997.
- [5] Z. Füredi. *Scrambling permutations and entropy of hypergraphs*. Random Structures & Algorithms, **8**(2):97–104, 1996.
- [6] Y. Ishigami. *An extremal problem of  $d$  permutations containing every permutation of every  $t$  elements*. Discrete Mathematics, **159**(1-3):279–283, 1996.
- [7] J. R. Johnson and B. Wickes. *Shattering  $k$ -sets with permutations*. Order, pages 1–18, 2023.
- [8] D. J. Kleitman and J. Spencer. *Families of  $k$ -independent sets*. Discrete Mathematics, **6**(3):255–262, 1973.

- [9] J. Radhakrishnan. *A note on scrambling permutations*. Random Structures & Algorithms, **22**(4):435–439, 2003.
- [10] N. Sauer. *On the density of families of sets*. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, **13**(1):145–147, 1972.
- [11] S. Shelah. *A combinatorial problem; stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages*. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, **41**(1):247–261, 1972.
- [12] J. H. Spencer. *Minimal scrambling sets of simple orders*. Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, **22**:349–353, 1972.
- [13] V. N. Vapnik and A. Y. Chervonenkis. *On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities*. In *Measures of complexity: festschrift for Alexey Chervonenkis*, pages 11–30. Springer, 2015.