# SOME MORE PROBLEMS ON ELEMENTARY GEOMETRY 

P. Erdös

In the May 1975 issue of this Gazette I published a paper on geometric problems. I here solve one of them and state a few new ones.

I stated in my previous paper the following problem: Is it true that to every $k$ there is an $n_{k}$ so that if there are given $n_{k}$ points in the plane in general position (i.e. no three on a line no four on a circle) one can always find $k$ of them so that all the $\binom{k}{3}$ triples determine circles of different radii.

I overlooked at that time that a simple and straightforward argument gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{k} \leq k+2\binom{k-1}{2}\binom{k-1}{3} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove (1) let $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, m=k+2\binom{k-1}{2}\binom{k-1}{3}$ be $m$ points in general position and let $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{\ell}$ be a maximal set of points so that all the $\binom{\ell}{3}$ triples determine cirlces of different radii. If $\ell \geq k$ there is nothing to prove. Thus assume $\ell<k$ and we will arrive at a contradiction. Denote by $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{( }^{l}\binom{3}{3}$ the radii of the circles determined by $\left\{x_{i}, x_{j}, x_{k}\right\}, 1 \leq i<j<k \leq l$. It follows from the maximality property of $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{\ell}$ that for every $u, \ell<u \leq m$ the radius of one of the circles

$$
\left\{x_{i}, x_{j}, x_{u}\right\}, 1 \leq i<j \leq \ell<u \leq m
$$

equals one of the $r$ 's. Observe that there are at most two circles of radius $r$ passing through two points $x_{i}$ and $x_{j}$. Thus the $n-\ell$ points $x_{a}$, $\ell<u \leq m$ must lie on at most $2\binom{\ell}{2}\binom{\ell}{3}$ circles and since they are in general position each of these circles contains at most one of these points. Thus finally $(\ell<k)$

$$
m \leq \ell+2\binom{\ell}{2}\binom{\ell}{3} \leq k-1+2\binom{k-1}{2}\binom{k-1}{3}
$$

which proves (1).
Probably (1) is very far from being best possible.
A few days ago in conversation with J. Hammer we asked the following question: Let $f(n)$ be the largest integer so that any set of $n$ points in the plane - no three on a line contains at least $f(n)$ convex subsets. Determine or estimate $f(n)$. It seems unlikely that an exact formula can be found for $f(n)$. I proved that there are two constants $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
n^{c_{1} \log n}<f(n)<n^{c_{2} \log n} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

An old question of E. Klein (Mrs. Szekeres) states: Let $m_{k}$ be the smallest integer so that if $m_{k}$ points are given, no three on a line, then one can always select $k$ of them which form the vertices of a convex $k$-gon. Szekeres and I proved

$$
\begin{equation*}
n^{k-2}+1 \leq m_{k} \leq\binom{ 2 k-4}{k-2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Szekeres conjectured that there is equality on the left of (3). (3) implies (2) without much trouble. The upper bound of (2) is an immediate consequence. Consider a set of $n$ points so that no subset of more than $\left[\frac{\log n}{\log 2}\right]+1=t$ points is convex. The existence of such a set is guaranteed by (3). Thus clearly

$$
f(n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{t}\binom{n}{i}<n^{c_{2} \log n}
$$

The proof of the lower bound in (2) is a little more complicated. Let $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ be any $n$ points in the plane no three on a line. Put $[\sqrt{n}]=T$. By (3) every subset of size $T$ of our $n$ points has a convex subset of size $r$ where

$$
r>\frac{\log T}{\log 4} \geq \frac{\log n}{4}
$$

Thus our set $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ contains at least $\binom{n}{T}$ convex subsets of size $r$ but these $r$ sets are not necessarily distinct. The same convex set $x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{r}}$ occurs at most $\binom{n-r}{T-r}$ times (since there are $\binom{n-r}{T-r}$ sets of size $T$ containing $x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{r}}$ ). Thus

$$
f(n)>\binom{n}{T}\binom{n-r}{T-r}>\left(\frac{n}{T}\right)^{r}>n^{e_{1} \log n}
$$

which completes the proof of (2).
Probably there is a constant $c$ so that

$$
\lim _{n=\infty} \log f(n) /(\log n)^{2}=c
$$

I then somewhat modified our original question: Let $h(n)$ be the smallest integer so that any set of $n$ points no three of them on a line determine at least $h(n)$ convex subsets which have no $x_{i}$ in their interior. I have no satisfactory bounds for $h(n)$. E. Klein's original proof easily gives that every set of $n \geq 5$ points contains a convex quadrilateral with no point in its interior. I can not prove a similar theorem for a convex pentagon and perhaps one can give for every $n$, $n$ points so that every convex pentagon determined by these points contains at least one of the

It is a curious fact in combinatorics that finite problems are often very much more difficult than infinite ones. For example I proved that every subset $\zeta$ of $E_{n}$ (the $n$ dimensional Euclidean space), ( $\zeta$ ) $=m \geq \aleph_{0}$ contains a subset $\zeta_{1}$, ( $\zeta_{1}$ ) = $m$ so that all the distances between points of $\zeta_{1}$ are distinct. The analogous finite problem is very difficult. Let $m$ be a finite number and denote by $g_{n}(m)$ the largest integer so that every set $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}$ in $E_{n}$ contains a subset of $g_{n}(m)$ points all whose distances are distinct. I can not even determine $g_{1}(m)$.

Ulam and I to call attention to this situation made the following joke: During the second world war the U.S. navy had the slogan: The difficult we do right away the impossible takes some time. We say: The infinite we do right away, the finite may take some time.
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* Ehrenfeucht has recently proved that for sufficiently large $n$ there is a convex pentagon which contains no points of the set in its interior.
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