Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2003) 12, 191–201. © 2003 Cambridge University Press
DOI: 10.1017/S0963548302005527 Printed in the United Kingdom

The Clarkson–Shor Technique Revisited and Extended

MICHA SHARIR†

School of Computer Science, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel
and
Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University,
New York, NY 10012, USA
(e-mail: sharir@cs.tau.ac.il)

Received 18 October 2001; revised 26 September 2002

We provide an alternative, simpler and more general derivation of the Clarkson–Shor probabilistic technique [7] and use it to obtain several extensions and new combinatorial bounds.

1. Introduction

In an abstract and general setting, the Clarkson–Shor technique [7] (originally presented by Clarkson [6]) deals with the following type of problem. Let S be a set of n objects, and C a set of *configurations*, each defined by d objects of S, for some constant integer parameter d. We are also given a *conflict relationship* between objects $a \in S$ and configurations $c \in C$, where it is assumed that the d objects that define c are not in conflict with it. The *weight* of a configuration c is the number of objects that are in conflict with c.

As a concrete example, let S be a set of n lines (the objects) in the plane. A configuration is a vertex of the arrangement $\mathscr{A}(S)$, defined by $d = 2$ lines. A line is in conflict with a vertex if it passes below the vertex. The zero-weight vertices are those that appear on the lower envelope of the lines, and their number is at most $n - 1$. Vertices of weight k belong to the *kth level* of the arrangement.

Let $C_0(S)$ denote the set of 0-weight configurations, let $C_k(S)$ denote the set of configurations of weight exactly k, and let $C_{\leqslant k}(S)$ denote the set of configurations of weight at most k, where k is any integer between 0 and $n - d$. Put $N_0(S) = |C_0(S)|$,

† Work on this paper was supported by NSF Grants CCR-97-32101 and CCR-00-98246, by a grant from the US–Israeli Binational Science Foundation, by a grant from the Israeli Academy of Sciences Center of Excellence program in Geometric Computing at Tel Aviv University, and by the Hermann Minkowski–MINERVA Center for Geometry at Tel Aviv University.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$N_k(S) = |C_k(S)|$, and $N_{\leqslant k}(S) = |C_{\leqslant k}(S)|$. We also let $N_0(n)$ (resp. $N_k(n)$, $N_{\leqslant k}(n)$) denote the maximum of $N_0(S)$ (resp. of $N_k(S)$, $N_{\leqslant k}(S)$), over all sets S of n objects of this kind.

The Clarkson–Shor technique provides the following upper bound for $N_{\leqslant k}(S)$.

Theorem 1.1. (Clarkson and Shor [7])

$$N_{\leqslant k}(n) = O(k^d N_0(n/k)). \tag{1.1}$$

We derive a somewhat different bound, which can then be manipulated to yield the Clarkson–Shor bound: see below.

Theorem 1.2.

$$N_{\leqslant k}(S) \leqslant \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^d(1-pk)}, \tag{1.2}$$

for any $0 < p < 1/k$, where R_p is a random sample of objects from S, where each object is chosen independently with probability p, and $N_0(R_p)$ is the number of configurations, all of whose defining objects are in R_p and none of whose conflicting objects are in R_p.

Remark. Theorem 1.1 can in fact also be stated in terms of expectation: it asserts that $N_{\leqslant k}(S)$ is upper-bounded by $O(k^d)$ times the expected value of $N_0(R'_{n/k})$, where $R'_{n/k}$ is a random sample of n/k objects from S, where all such samples are chosen with equal probability.

By now, the Clarkson–Shor technique needs no praise – it has become a cornerstone of many of the developments in computational and combinatorial geometry in the past decade, for example, in the analysis of randomized incremental algorithms [12], and in the derivation of sharp bounds on the complexity of lower envelopes and other substructures in higher-dimensional arrangements [14]. This paper serves two main purposes.

(i) It puts the Clarkson–Shor technique in a somewhat different context, leading to a simpler proof and perhaps also to a better understanding of the technique.

(ii) It facilitates the extension of the context in which the technique can be applied. We obtain in fact several results which do not seem to be derivable directly by the original technique, even though there exist alternative techniques that one could use for deriving the bounds obtained here.

Our proof technique is a simple extension of the probabilistic proof of the *Crossing Lemma* of Leighton [11] and of Ajtai, Chvátal, Newborn and Szemerédi [2], which asserts that a simple graph with E edges and n vertices drawn in the plane has $\Omega(E^3/n^2)$ pairs of crossing edges, provided that $E \geqslant 4n$. (This proof is so elegant that it has achieved the status of 'a proof from the Book' in [1].) On one hand, this technique is quite general, but, on the other hand, in almost all applications to date, it has been applied to crossings between edges of graphs drawn in the plane (see [4, 8] for some exceptions). It is our hope that the results reported here might constitute a step towards a wider range of applications of the technique.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. Analysis

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 1.2, we first establish the following more general result.

Let C' be any subset of configurations. Let X be the number of conflicts with the configurations of C'; that is,

$$X = |\{(a, c) \mid a \in S,\ c \in C',\ a \text{ is in conflict with } c\}|.$$

We then have

$$X \geqslant |C'| - N_0(S). \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, if $|C'| > N_0(S)$ then C' contains at least one configuration c that has at least one conflict, contributing at least 1 to the count X. Remove c from C' and repeat this argument, and keep doing so as long as $|C'| > N_0(S)$.

Draw a random sample R of objects from S, by drawing each $a \in S$ independently, with the same probability p. Let C'_R denote the set of configurations in C' that appear in R, that is, those configurations for which all d defining objects are chosen in R, and let X_R denote the number of conflicts of these configurations in R, that is, the number of pairs (a, c) such that $c \in C'_R$, $a \in R$ and a is in conflict with c.

By (2.1), we have

$$X_R \geqslant |C'_R| - N_0(R),$$

so the same holds for the expectation of this inequality, which can be written as

$$\mathbf{E}(X_R) \geqslant \mathbf{E}(|C'_R|) - \mathbf{E}(N_0(R)).$$

It follows from the construction that

$$\mathbf{E}(|C'_R|) = |C'|p^d \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}(X_R) = Xp^{d+1}.$$

Hence we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *For any set C' of configurations, which have a total of X conflicts, and for any probability $0 < p \leqslant 1$, we have*

$$Xp \geqslant |C'| - \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^d}, \tag{2.2}$$

where R_p is as in the statement of Theorem 1.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let us specialize Theorem 2.1 to the case $C' = C_{\leqslant k}(S)$. In this case we have, by definition, $X \leqslant kN_{\leqslant k}(S)$, which implies

$$(1 - pk)N_{\leqslant k}(S) \leqslant \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^d},$$

and therefore completes the proof. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A quick illustration. Consider the case of lines and vertices mentioned in the Introduction. In this case $N_0(R_p)$ is the number of vertices on the lower envelope of R_p, which is at most $|R_p| - 1$. Hence, $\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p)) \leqslant \mathbf{E}(|R_p| - 1) \leqslant np$, so

$$N_{\leqslant k}(S) \leqslant \frac{np}{p^2(1-pk)} \leqslant 4nk,$$

by choosing $p = 1/(2k)$. (This bound is well known; in fact, a tight bound of nk is given in [3].)

The Clarkson–Shor bound. Let us turn (1.2) into the more familiar bound given in Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $N_0(S) \leqslant A\binom{n}{\gamma}$, for any set S of n objects of the given kind, and for some integer parameter $\gamma \geqslant 1$ and constant $A > 0$. We have

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\binom{|R_p|}{\gamma}\right] = \binom{n}{\gamma} p^\gamma.$$

Indeed, the left-hand side is the expected number of γ-tuples of distinct objects in R_p. The right-hand side provides an explicit expression for this quantity, observing that there are $\binom{n}{\gamma}$ γ-tuples of distinct objects in S, and that the probability of any of them materializing in R_p is p^γ.

By assumption, $N_0(R_p) \leqslant A\binom{|R_p|}{\gamma}$. Hence, $\mathbf{E}[N_0(R_p)] \leqslant Ap^\gamma\binom{n}{\gamma}$, and (1.2) becomes

$$N_{\leqslant k}(S) \leqslant \frac{A\binom{n}{\gamma}}{p^{d-\gamma}(1-pk)}.$$

Now choose $p = \beta/k$, for some parameter $\beta \in (0,1)$, to obtain

$$N_{\leqslant k}(S) \leqslant \frac{A\binom{n}{\gamma}k^{d-\gamma}}{\beta^{d-\gamma}(1-\beta)}.$$

The denominator is maximized when $\beta = (d-\gamma)/(d-\gamma+1)$, which is easily seen to yield

$$N_{\leqslant k}(n) \leqslant A(d-\gamma+1)e\binom{n}{\gamma}k^{d-\gamma}. \tag{2.3}$$

This is essentially the Clarkson–Shor result (1.1), which asserts, in this case, that

$$N_{\leqslant k}(n) = O\left(k^d N_0\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)\right) = O\left(k^d \cdot A\binom{n/k}{\gamma}\right) = O(k^{d-\gamma}n^\gamma),$$

which is indeed proportional to the right-hand side of (2.3).

3. Extensions: simple constraints

Recall that inequality (2.2) of Theorem 2.1 is fairly general, and does not impose any specific assumptions on the set C'. We next apply this theorem to several other problems involving sets of configurations C' whose overall number of conflicts can be upper-bounded by some other simple argument, which will lead to various new upper bounds on the size of such sets C'. In the following section, we will extend the technique further, by considering conflicts between a configuration and *several* objects.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Configurations for which no object is in conflict with many. Here we consider an 'inverse problem', where we wish to bound the maximum possible size of a set $C^*_{\leqslant k}$ of configurations so that no object is in conflict with more than k configurations in $C^*_{\leqslant k}$.

For such sets we have trivially $X \leqslant nk$. Assume also, as above, that $N_0(n) \leqslant A\binom{n}{\gamma}$, for some integer $\gamma \geqslant 1$ and constant $A > 0$. Then (2.2) becomes

$$|C^*_{\leqslant k}| \leqslant nkp + \frac{A\binom{n}{\gamma}}{p^{d-\gamma}}.$$

Choose

$$p = \left(\frac{A\binom{n}{\gamma}}{nk}\right)^{1/(d-\gamma+1)},$$

which makes sense only when $k \geqslant A\binom{n}{\gamma}/n$. Assuming this to be the case, we have

$$|C^*_{\leqslant k}| = O\left(n^{d/(d-\gamma+1)}k^{(d-\gamma)/(d-\gamma+1)}\right).$$

If $k < A\binom{n}{\gamma}/n$, choose $p = 1$ to obtain $|C^*_{\leqslant k}| \leqslant 2A\binom{n}{\gamma}$. We thus obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume the above abstract set-up of objects, configurations, and conflicts, and suppose that the number of configurations with no conflicts in any set of n objects is $O(n^\gamma)$. Let $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n^d$ be a given parameter. Then the maximum cardinality of any set of configurations with the property that no object is in conflict with more than k of them is*

$$O\left(n^\gamma + n^{d/(d-\gamma+1)}k^{(d-\gamma)/(d-\gamma+1)}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

□

Example 1. Suppose that, as in the Introduction, the objects are n lines in the plane, the configurations are vertices of their arrangement, and a vertex is in conflict with a line if the vertex lies above the line. In this case we have $d = 2$, $\gamma = 1$, and we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.2. *The maximum number of vertices in an arrangement of n lines in the plane, such that none of the lines passes below more than k of them, is $O(nk^{1/2})$. This bound is tight in the worst case. Dually, the maximum number of lines connecting pairs of points in an n-element point set in the plane, such that none of the given points lies below more than k connecting lines, is $O(nk^{1/2})$, which again is worst-case tight.*

The lower bound is obtained as follows. Take $n/k^{1/2}$ lines, all appearing along their lower envelope. Replace each line by a bundle of $k^{1/2}$ parallel lines sufficiently close to each other. Each vertex of the lower envelope of the original lines is replaced by k new vertices. Collecting all these vertices, we obtain a set of $nk^{1/2}$ vertices, and it is clear that no line passes below more than $2k$ of them. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Example 2. A similar problem can be stated and analysed for hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, where the configurations are vertices in an arrangement of n hyperplanes, with the parameter d equal to the dimension, and $\gamma = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$, as follows.

Corollary 3.3. *The maximum number of vertices in an arrangement of n hyperplanes in* $\mathbb{R}^d$, *for which no hyperplane passes below more than k of them, is*

$$O\left(n^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor} + n^{d/(\lceil d/2 \rceil + 1)} k^{\lceil d/2 \rceil/(\lceil d/2 \rceil + 1)}\right),$$

and this bound is tight in the worst case. The same bound holds for the maximum number of hyperplanes spanned by a set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ *so that no point lies below more than k of them.*

The lower bound follows from a construction similar to that for the planar case, which is based on the upper bound theorem for convex polytopes. □

In $d = 3$ dimensions, we get the bound $O(nk^{2/3})$. By using a standard lifting transform from the plane to three dimensions [10] and by specializing the preceding corollary to $d = 3$, we also obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.4. *The maximum number of circles spanned by n points in the plane, such that none of the given points lies in more than k circles, is* $O(nk^{2/3})$, *and this bound is tight in the worst case.* □

4. Extensions: more general conflicts

So far, we have only considered conflicts, each involving one configuration and one single object, but the technique is sufficiently powerful to allow us to consider more elaborate types of conflicts, each involving one configuration and *several* objects. We illustrate this by two examples.

Example 1. The objects are lines in the plane, the configurations are triangles bounded by triples of the lines, and a triangle Δ is in conflict with a pair of other lines ℓ_1, ℓ_2 if the vertex $\ell_1 \cap \ell_2$ lies in the interior of Δ.

Example 2. Here the objects are points in 3-space, the configurations are triangles spanned by triples of the points, and a triangle Δ is in conflict with a pair of other points u, v if and only if the segment uv crosses the relative interior of Δ.

Handling conflicts of this kind can be done by a straightforward modification of the method of Section 2. Specifically, suppose that a conflict involves one configuration and b objects. Starting from the inequality $X \geqslant |C'| - N_0(S)$, which clearly holds in this case too, and passing to a random sample R_p as above, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(|C'_R|) = |C'|p^d \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}(X_R) = Xp^{d+b},$$

so we obtain the following result.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 4.1. *For any set C' of configurations, which have a total of X conflicts, each involving one configuration and b objects, and for any probability $0 < p \leqslant 1$, we have*

$$Xp^b \geqslant |C'| - \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^d}, \tag{4.1}$$

where R_p is as in the statement of Theorem 1.2. □

We next apply this theorem to the examples mentioned above.

4.1. Triangles and vertices in a line arrangement

Theorem 4.2. *In an arrangement of n lines in the plane in general position, there are at most $O(n^2k^{1/2})$ triangles whose edges lie on three of the given lines and which contain at most k vertices of the arrangement in their interiors. This bound is tight in the worst case.*

Proof. Let L be the given set of lines. Here the objects are the lines of L and the configurations are triangles bounded by triples of lines in L. Conflicts are more involved: a triangle is in conflict with a vertex of $\mathscr{A}(L)$ if it contains the vertex in its interior. Thus a conflict is defined in terms of 5 lines: three defining the triangle and two defining the vertex.

Claim. The number $N_0(L)$ of triangles spanned by three lines of L and containing no vertex of $\mathscr{A}(L)$ in their interior is $O(n^2)$.

Indeed, let T_0 be the set of triangles that are bounded by three lines of L and do not contain any vertex in their interior. The number of triangles in T_0 that are not crossed by any line of L is clearly $O(n^2)$ – they are faces of the arrangement.

Suppose then that a triangle Δ of T_0 is crossed by at least one line ℓ but contains no vertex in its interior. Let a, b, c denote the vertices of Δ. If there exist lines that cross $\partial\Delta$ at the edges ab, ac, choose from among them the line whose intersections with these edges are further away from a, and denote it by ℓ_a (since all these lines do not cross inside Δ, ℓ_a is well-defined). Define ℓ_b, ℓ_c in an analogous fashion, when they exist. See Figure 1.(a). At least one of these lines must exist; assume, without loss of generality, that ℓ_a exists.

We charge Δ to an intersection point v of ℓ_a with $\partial\Delta$, say with the line ℓ_0 that contains ab. We claim that there can exist at most one other triangle Δ' in T_0 that is bounded by ℓ_0, lies on the same side of ℓ_0 as Δ, contains v on its boundary, and charges v. Indeed, suppose to the contrary that two such triangles Δ', Δ'' exist. The intersection $\Delta \cap \Delta'$ is a convex polygon that contains v on its boundary and is crossed by $\ell = \ell_a$. Hence ℓ must intersect the boundary of this region at a second point w. Without loss of generality, assume that w lies on $\partial\Delta$. Since w is a vertex of $\mathscr{A}(L)$, it cannot lie in the interior of Δ'. Hence, Δ and Δ' must share the vertex a, and their edges incident to a overlap in pairs. The same holds for Δ and Δ''. See Figure 1.(b).

Consider the three edges of $\Delta, \Delta', \Delta''$ opposite to a, and denote them by $bc, b'c'$, and $b''c''$, respectively. Suppose that there is a pair of these edges, say, bc and $b'c'$, that do not cross each other, with $b'c'$ closer to a than bc. Then the line ℓ_a for the triangle Δ must be either the line containing $b'c'$ or a line that lies further away from a. In either case, it

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press




Figure 1. (a) The lines ℓ_a, ℓ_b, ℓ_c for the triangle $\Delta = abc$
(b) A triple charging of a vertex v is impossible

cannot intersect ab at v, contrary to assumption. Hence we may assume that all three pairs among $bc, b'c', b''c''$ cross each other, in which case at least one of the three intersection points must lie inside the triangle bounded by the third edge, again a contradiction.

This implies that the number of triangles in question is at most proportional to the number of vertices v of the arrangement, so their number is $O(n^2)$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Let $N_{\leqslant k}(L)$ denote the number of triangles with weight at most k, and let X denote the total number of conflicts that they have, which is clearly upper-bounded by $X \leqslant kN_{\leqslant k}(L)$. Using Theorem 4.1, we thus obtain

$$kp^2 N_{\leqslant k}(L) \geqslant N_{\leqslant k}(L) - \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^3},$$

so

$$N_{\leqslant k}(L) \leqslant \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^3(1-kp^2)}.$$

Choosing $p = \beta/k^{1/2}$, for an appropriate $\beta < 1$, and using the fact that $N_0(n) = O(n^2)$, the upper bound of the theorem follows readily. The lower bound is obtained for an arrangement consisting of $n/3$ equally spaced horizontal lines, $n/3$ equally spaced vertical lines, which together form part of the integer grid, and $n/3$ additional equally spaced lines of slope 1, passing very near the grid points formed by the first two subfamilies. We leave the easy verification of the lower bound to the reader. □

Theorem 4.3. *In an arrangement of n lines in the plane, there are at most $O(n^2k^{1/3})$ triangles whose edges lie on three of the given lines and for which no vertex of the arrangement is contained in the interiors of more than k of the triangles. This bound is tight in the worst case.*

Proof. Here $X \leqslant k\binom{n}{\gamma}$, so, using Theorem 4.1, the number of such triangles is at most $O(n^2kp^2 + n^2/p)$. The theorem follows by choosing $p = 1/k^{1/3}$. The lower bound can be obtained from the same construction used in the preceding proof. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark. The claim in the proof of Theorem 4.2, concerning triangles that contain no vertex in their interior, does not seem to extend to vertical trapezoids in an arrangement of lines.

4.2. Triangles and crossing segments in a 3-dimensional point set

Theorem 4.4. *Given a set S of n points in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the maximum number of triangles spanned by the points of S that are crossed by at most k segments connecting pairs of points in S is $O(n^2k^{1/2})$.*

Proof. In this set-up, the objects are the points of S, configurations are triangles spanned by triples of points of S, and a conflict between a triangle Δ and a pair u, v of points of S occurs if the segment uv crosses the relative interior of Δ.

Let $T_{\leqslant k}$ denote the set of these triangles, and let X denote the number of conflicts between triangles in $T_{\leqslant k}$ and segments. We have $X \leqslant k|T_{\leqslant k}(S)|$. The results of [8, 17] assert that the maximum number of triangles spanned by S, such that no segment spanned by a pair of points crosses their relative interiors, is $O(n^2)$. Moreover, for any pair of such triangles that cross in this manner, an edge of one of them must cross the relative interior of the other. This is easily seen to imply that $N_0(S) = O(n^2)$. Hence, by Theorem 4.1, with $d = 3$ and $b = 2$, we have

$$kp^2|T_{\leqslant k}(S)| \geqslant |T_{\leqslant k}(S)| - \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^3},$$

so

$$|T_{\leqslant k}(S)| \leqslant \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_0(R_p))}{p^3(1-kp^2)}.$$

Choosing $p = \beta/k^{1/2}$, for an appropriate $\beta < 1$, and using the fact that $N_0(n) = O(n^2)$, the theorem follows readily. □

Theorem 4.5. *Given a set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the maximum number of triangles spanned by the points of S, so that no segment connecting a pair of points of S crosses more than k of them, is $O(n^2k^{1/3})$.*

Proof. Here we have $X \leqslant k\binom{n}{2}$, so the proof proceeds as in the proof of Theorem 4.3. □

Let S be a set of n points in three dimensions in general position, for n odd. A *halving triangle* of S is a triangle whose vertices belong to S, so that each halfspace bounded by the plane containing the triangle contains the same number of points of S (namely, $(n-3)/2$).

Corollary 4.6. *The number of halving triangles in an n-element point set in 3-space is $O(n^{8/3})$.*

Proof. By the Lovász lemma (see [5, 16]), any segment can cross at most $O(n^2)$ halving triangles, so the bound follows by substituting $k = O(n^2)$ in Theorem 4.5. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that this bound, which has already been derived in [8], is weaker than the best-known bound $O(n^{5/2})$ [16].

Corollary 4.7. *The maximum number of distinct triangles that lie on the boundaries of k convex polytopes spanned by a set of n points in 3-space is $O(n^2k^{1/3})$.*

Proof. Clearly, no segment crosses more than $2k$ of these triangles, so the bound is an immediate application of Theorem 4.5. □

This result has been obtained by Aronov and Dey [4] using a more involved argument. A simple alternative proof is given in [15].

5. Discussion

Clearly, this paper only scratches the surface of the realm of applications of this (extended) technique. For example, in the original set-up of the Crossing Lemma of [2, 11], a conflict occurs between two configurations (a conflict is a crossing between two edges, that is, between two configurations), a situation that we have not considered at all here, but one that should be amenable to the new technique as for the other cases studied here.

We believe that the ideas developed here will have additional applications. For example, our next planned step in this research is to find algorithmic applications for the new bounds, extending similar applications of the standard Clarkson–Shor bounds, *e.g.*, to the analysis of randomized incremental algorithms.

We end the paper by presenting an alternative interpretation of the analysis employed in this paper. Let S be a set of objects, and let A be a subset of S^q, for some q. Put $d_A = q$, and refer to it as the *dimension* of A. For any $R \subseteq S$, let $A_R = A \cap R^q$.

Suppose now that we have a finite collection $A_1, \ldots, A_v$ of such sets of ordered tuples, possibly with different dimensions d_{A_i}, with corresponding (positive or negative) constants $c_1, \ldots, c_v$, so that the linear relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{v} c_{A_i} |(A_i)_R| \leqslant f(|R|)$$

holds for any $R \subseteq S$, where $f(\cdot)$ is some function of $|R|$.

Then, for any $p \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{v} c_i p^{d_{A_i}} |A_i| \leqslant \mathbf{E}[f(|R_p|)]. \tag{5.1}$$

The proof of the Crossing Lemma of [2, 11] is an instance of this observation, using three sets A_1, A_2, A_3 of respective dimensions $1, 2, 4$, where A_1 is S, the set of vertices of the given graph, A_2 is the set of its edges, and A_3 is the set of edge crossings (each represented by the quadruple of the vertices incident to the pair of crossing edges). The linear relation is $|A_3| - |A_2| + 3|A_1| \geqslant 0$, and (5.1), with an appropriate choice of p, yields the lemma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The derivation of, say, Theorem 2.1 can also be interpreted as an application of (5.1) to the inequality (2.1), as the reader can easily verify. This interpretation also applies to other theorems derived in this paper.

This view of the analysis presented here shows that it is indeed strongly related to the original Crossing Lemma.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Sariel Har-Peled, Boris Aronov, Jirka Matoušek, János Pach, Shakhar Smorodinsky and Emo Welzl for useful discussions concerning the problems studied in this paper. Thanks are also extended to some anonymous members of the program committee of the 17th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry, June 2001, where an earlier version of this paper appeared, for their useful comments on the paper. In particular, the general interpretation outlined in Section 5 is taken from these comments. Finally, thanks are extended to an anonymous referee for careful reading of the paper and helpful comments.

References

[1] Aigner, M. and Ziegler, G. M. (1998) *Proofs from the Book*, Springer, Berlin.
[2] Ajtai, M., Chvátal, V., Newborn, M. M. and Szemerédi, E. (1982) Crossing-free subgraphs. *Ann. Discrete Math.* **12** 9–12.
[3] Alon, N. and Győri, E. (1986) The number of small semispaces of a finite set of points in the plane. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **41** 154–157.
[4] Aronov, B. and Dey, T. (2001) Polytopes in arrangements. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **25** 51–63.
[5] Bárány, I., Füredi, Z. and Lovász, L. (1990) On the number of halving planes. *Combinatorica* **10** 175–183.
[6] Clarkson, K. L. (1988) Applications of random sampling in computational geometry, II. In *Proc. 4th ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pp. 1–12.
[7] Clarkson, K. L. and Shor, P. W. (1989) Applications of random sampling in computational geometry, II. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **4** 387–421.
[8] Dey, T. K. and Edelsbrunner, H. (1994) Counting triangle crossings and halving planes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **12** 281–289.
[9] Dey, T. and Pach, J. (1998) Extremal problems for geometric hypergraphs. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **19** 473–484.
[10] Edelsbrunner, H. (1987) *Algorithms in Combinatorial Geometry*, Springer, Heidelberg.
[11] Leighton, F. T. (1983) *Complexity Issues in VLSI*, *Foundations of Computing Series*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
[12] Mulmuley, K. and Schwarzkopf, O. (1997) Randomized algorithms. In *Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry* (J. E. Goodman and J. O'Rourke, eds), CRC Press, pp. 633–652.
[13] Pach, J. and Agarwal, P. K. (1995) *Combinatorial Geometry*, Wiley-Interscience, New York.
[14] Sharir, M. and Agarwal, P. K. (1995) *Davenport Schinzel Sequences and their Geometric Applications*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
[15] Sharir, M. and Smorodinsky, S. Polytopes in arrangements. In preparation.
[16] Sharir, M., Smorodinsky, S. and Tardos, G. (2001) An improved bound for k-sets in three dimensions. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **26** 195–204.
[17] Székely, L. (1997) Crossing numbers and hard Erdős problems in discrete geometry. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **6** 353–358.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548302005527 Published online by Cambridge University Press