

Independent set sequence of linear hyperpaths

David Galvin* Courtney Sharpe†

September 25, 2024

Abstract

The independent set sequence of trees has been well studied, with much effort devoted to the (still open) question of Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős on whether the independent set sequence of any tree is unimodal.

Much less attention has been given to the independent set sequence of hypertrees. Here we study one natural first question in this realm — the unimodality of the strong independent set sequence of linear uniform hyperpaths. Via both an inductive and a combinatorial argument we obtain an explicit expression for the terms of this sequence, and we establish unimodality via an interlacing roots argument. We also suggest some further questions.

1 Introduction

In 1987 Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős considered the *vertex independent set sequence*, or simply *independent set sequence*, of a graph. This is the sequence $(i_k(G))_{k \geq 0}$ where $i_k(G)$ is the number of vertex independent sets (sets of pairwise non-adjacent vertices) of size k in a graph G .

The *edge independent set sequence*, better known as the *matching sequence*, is the sequence $(m_k(G))_{k \geq 0}$ where $m_k(G)$ is the number of matchings (sets of pairwise disjoint edges) of size k in G . A corollary of a seminal result of Heilmann and Lieb [9] is that the matching sequence is always unimodal, that is, that there is a mode k such that

$$m_0(G) \leq m_1(G) \leq \cdots \leq m_k(G) \geq m_{k+1}(G) \geq \cdots .$$

The notion of unimodality (and the related ideas of log-concavity and real-rootedness) are ubiquitous in combinatorics; see for example the surveys [4, 5, 14].

Wilf asked the question “is the independent set sequence of every graph similarly unimodal?”. In [1] it is reported that he was skeptical of an affirmative answer, and it turned out that his skepticism was justified. Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős [1] showed that the independent set sequence of a graph can fail spectacularly to be unimodal. Specifically, they

*Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN; dgalvin1@nd.edu. Research supported in part by the Simons Foundation Gift number 854277.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN; csharp2@alumni.nd.edu.

showed that for every m and every permutation π of $\{1, \dots, m\}$, there is a graph G whose largest independent set has size m , and for which

$$i_{\pi(1)} < i_{\pi(2)} < \dots < i_{\pi(m)}.$$

In other words, the independent set sequence can exhibit arbitrary rises and falls. (Note that we do not consider i_0 here as it always takes the smallest possible non-zero value, 1).

This “roller coaster” observation naturally led Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős to consider whether there are infinite families of graphs for which the independent set sequence *is* unimodal. Since the matching sequence of a graph is the independent set sequence of its line graph, it follows from Heilmann and Lieb’s result that line graphs have unimodal independent set sequences. This was generalized by Hamidoune [7]: claw-free graphs (graphs without an induced $K_{1,3}$) have unimodal independent set sequences.

Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős asked about another very basic family of graphs. It is easy to check that the independent set sequence of all paths is unimodal (the n -edge path has $\binom{n-k+2}{k}$ independent sets of size k), and even easier to check that the same is true of all stars. That unimodality holds for these two most extreme trees (connected acyclic graphs) provides some reason to expect that it holds for all trees.

Question 1.1. Do all trees have unimodal independent set sequence? What about all forests?

The *independent set polynomial* $p_G(x)$ is the generating polynomial $\sum_{k \geq 0} i_k(G)x^k$. It is an easy check that if G has components G_1, \dots, G_m then $p_G(x) = p_{G_1}(x) \cdots p_{G_m}(x)$. Since the product of polynomials with unimodal coefficient sequences need not have a unimodal coefficient sequence, an affirmative answer to Question 1.1 for trees does not obviously imply an affirmative answer for forests.

Remarkably, Question 1.1 remains fairly wide open. It has been verified for some infinite, mostly recursively defined, families of trees (see e.g. [6] and the reference therein). It has also been verified for all trees on 26 or fewer vertices [11]. Notably, although all trees on 25 or fewer vertices satisfy the stronger property that their independence polynomials are log-concave (i.e., satisfy $a_k^2 \geq a_{k-1}a_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$), two trees on 26 vertices are found in [11] to have unimodal but not log-concave independent set sequences, and in [10] infinite families of trees with non-log-concave (though still unimodal) independent set sequences are found. This perhaps explains why Question 1.1 has proven to be so thorny — typically it is easier to demonstrate log-concavity than unimodality.

Even answering Question 1.1 for the uniform random labelled tree (i.e., showing that at least a proportion $1 - o(1)$ of all labelled trees on n vertices have unimodal independent set sequence) has proven to be a difficult problem. See [2, 8] where this question is addressed and only partial results are obtained.

1.1 Hypertrees

The goal of this paper is to begin the project of considering Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős’ question for *hypertrees*. A *hypergraph* is a pair (V, E) where V is a set of vertices and E is a

set of *edges*, or subsets of V . (If all subsets have size 2 then a hypergraph is simply a graph). H is a *hypertree* if there is a tree $\text{tree}(H)$ on vertex set $V(H)$ with the property that for each $e \in E(H)$ the subgraph of $\text{tree}(H)$ induced by e is connected. Every tree T is a hypertree — just take $\text{tree}(T) = T$.

Before asking any question about independent sets in hypertrees, we need to clarify what we mean, since as is almost always the case when moving from graphs to hypergraphs, there are competing definitions. A *weak independent set* in a hypergraph is a subset of vertices that does not contain all the vertices of any edge of the hypergraph, while a *strong independent set* is one that contains at most one vertex from each edge. (Note that these two notions coincide for a graph).

Convention 1.2. In this note we work exclusively with strong independent sets, and will simply refer to them as *independent sets* from here on.

When considering the independent set sequence of trees (in the ordinary graph setting), a natural place to start is with the family of paths. Here things are quite straightforward. Let $P_{n,2}$ be the (graph) path on n edges (the subscript 2 indicating that we are working with graphs), and let $p_{n,2}^k$ be the number of independent sets of size k in $P_{n,2}$. (Note that we use slightly non-standard notation here, with $P_{n,2}$ being the path on n edges (and so $n + 1$ vertices) rather than on n vertices (and so $n - 1$ edges). We adapt this convention because it is better suited to the hypergraph setting.) We have the following observations:

1. It is easy to generate a recurrence relation that expresses $p_{n,2}^k$ in terms of $p_{n',2}^{k'}$'s with $n' + k' < n + k$, and so to quickly generate tables of values.
2. It is easy to conjecture, based on these tables, that (modulo some initial conditions)

$$p_{n,2}^k = \binom{n - k + 2}{k}.$$
3. It is easy to prove this explicit formula by induction.
4. It is easy to give a direct combinatorial argument for this formula (via a modified “stars-and-bars” argument).
5. It is easy to use this formula to deduce unimodality and log-concavity of the independent set sequences of paths.

It turns out that things get significantly more complicated when we move from paths to hyperpaths. Let us consider the simplest possible hyperpath setup, the ℓ -uniform, n -edge, linear hyperpath, which we will denote $P_{n,\ell}$. This hypergraph has n edges, e_1, \dots, e_n , each of size ℓ . Consecutive edges (e_i and e_{i+1}) have exactly one vertex, v_i say, in common, no other pairs of edges have vertices in common, and all the v_i 's are distinct (see Figure 1). Denote by $p_{n,\ell}^k$ the number of independent sets of size k in this hyperpath.

Even for $P_{n,\ell}$ ($\ell > 2$), little comes easily. As we will see in the sequel:

1. The natural recurrence relation to calculate $p_{n,\ell}^k$ requires introducing an auxiliary hyperpath, and is a pair of coupled recurrence relations.




Figure 1: The linear hyperpaths $P_{n,\ell}$ (top) and $Q_{n,\ell}$ (bottom).

2. It is possible, but certainly not easy, to conjecture an explicit formula for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ based on values produced from the recurrences. This formula involves a sum of products of binomial coefficients.
3. It is fairly straightforward (if a little messy) to prove this explicit formula by induction.
4. It is less straightforward to give a direct combinatorial argument for this formula.
5. It is not at all clear how to use this formula to deduce unimodality and log-concavity of the independent set sequences of linear uniform hyperpaths.

The main point of this note is an analysis of $p_{n,\ell}^k$, including the verification that for each $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 3$ the sequence $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k \geq 0}$ is unimodal. To obtain this result, we have to take a detour into the world of real-rooted polynomials.

In Section 2 we detail our results, and in Section 3 we give proofs. Section 4 makes some comments and presents some open problems.

2 Results

For $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 2$, denote by $P_{n,\ell}$ the ℓ -uniform linear hyperpath with n edges. Our main concern is with the quantity $p_{n,\ell}^k$, the number of (strong) independent sets of size k in $P_{n,\ell}$. We have the following explicit count.

Theorem 2.1. *For all $\ell \geq 2$, we have*

- $p_{0,\ell}^k = 1$ if $k = 0$ and $p_{0,\ell}^k = 0$ if $k > 0$,
- $p_{1,\ell}^0 = 1$, $p_{1,\ell}^1 = \ell$ and $p_{1,\ell}^k = 0$ for $k \geq 2$,
- $p_{n,\ell}^0 = 1$ for $n \geq 0$,
- $p_{n,\ell}^1 = 0$ for $n = 0$ and $p_{n,\ell}^1 = n\ell - (n - 1)$ for $n > 0$, and (the main point)

- for $n \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$

$$p_{n,\ell}^k = (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}. \quad (1)$$

Notice that when $\ell = 2$ (1) reduces to $p_{n,2}^k = \binom{n-k+2}{k}$ (as long as we interpret $0^0 = 1$), which is the familiar formula for the number of independent sets of size k in the path on n edges.

From (1) it is far from obvious that $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a unimodal sequence for any ℓ other than $\ell = 2$, but this is the case, and in fact we have a stronger result. A sequence $(a_k)_{k=0}^n$ is *log concave* if for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ it holds that $a_k^2 \geq a_{k-1}a_{k+1}$. If the sequence is non-negative and has no internal zeroes (meaning that there is no triple $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq n$ with $a_i > 0$, $a_j = 0$ and $a_k > 0$) then it is easy to check that the sequence is unimodal. Often log concavity of a sequence is easier to establish than unimodality, since to verify unimodality one must identify the location of the mode, but there is no such difficulty when establishing log concavity.

There is a stronger property of finite sequences than log concavity. A sequence $(a_k)_{k=0}^n$ is *real rooted* if the polynomial $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k$ has only real roots. A result that ultimately goes back to Newton is that if a non-negative sequence is real rooted, then it is log concave, and in fact satisfies the stronger inequality

$$a_k^2 \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{n-k}\right) a_{k-1}a_{k+1}$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ (see e.g. [3, Section 9.3]). We establish the following:

Theorem 2.2. *For all $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 2$, the sequence $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k=0}^n$ is real rooted.*

Noting that $p_{n,\ell}^k = 0$ for $k > n$, and that $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k=0}^n$ is easily seen to have no internal zeroes (since a subset of an independent set is an independent set), Theorem 2.2 implies that $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k=0}^n$ is unimodal.

3 Proofs

In Section 3.1 we give an initial (conjectural) derivation of the formula for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ for $n, k \geq 2$ given in Theorem 2.1, and then prove it by induction. In Section 3.2 we give a more satisfying combinatorial explanation for the formula. In Section 3.3 we prove Theorem 2.2.

3.1 Deriving a formula for $p_{n,\ell}^k$

For ordinary paths, there is a very simple recurrence for calculating $p_{n,2}^k$ (once suitable initial conditions have been established), namely

$$p_{n,2}^k = p_{n-1,2}^k + p_{n-2,2}^{k-1},$$

obtained by considering whether or not the first vertex of the path in in the independent set.

For $\ell \geq 3$ we need to introduce an auxiliary hypergraph, which we denote by $Q_{n,\ell}$, that is obtained from the hyperpath $P_{n,\ell}$ by removing the vertex v_1 (so $Q_{n,\ell}$ has one edge of size $\ell - 1$, with the rest having size ℓ ; see Figure 1). Let the edges of $Q_{n,\ell}$ be e'_1, e_2, \dots, e_n , and denote by $q_{n,\ell}^k$ the number of independent sets of size k in $Q_{n,\ell}$.

There are a pair of coupled recurrences for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ and $q_{n,\ell}^k$, obtained by considering whether or not the independent set includes a vertex from $e_1 \setminus \{v_\ell\}$ or $e'_1 \setminus \{v_\ell\}$. Indeed, for $n, k \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n,\ell}^k &= p_{n-1,\ell}^k + (\ell - 1)q_{n-1,\ell}^{k-1} \\ &\text{and} \\ q_{n,\ell}^k &= p_{n-1,\ell}^k + (\ell - 2)q_{n-1,\ell}^{k-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Observe that when $\ell = 2$ the second relation above reduces to $q_{n,\ell}^k = p_{n-1,\ell}^k$, and the system above is easily seen to reduce to the standard recurrence for $p_{n,2}^k$.

The initial conditions for the recurrences for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ and $q_{n,\ell}^k$ are:

- For $n = 0$: $p_{0,\ell}^0 = q_{0,\ell}^0 = 1$ (due to the empty set) and $p_{0,\ell}^k = q_{0,\ell}^k = 0$ for $k \geq 1$.
- For $n = 1$: $p_{1,\ell}^0 = q_{1,\ell}^0 = 1$, $p_{1,\ell}^1 = \ell$, $q_{1,\ell}^1 = \ell - 1$, and $p_{1,\ell}^k = q_{1,\ell}^k = 0$ for $k \geq 2$.
- For $k = 0$: $p_{n,\ell}^0 = q_{n,\ell}^0 = 1$.
- For $k = 1$: $p_{n,\ell}^1 = n\ell - (n - 1)$ and $q_{n,\ell}^1 = n\ell - n$ for $n \geq 2$.

To conjecture an explicit formula for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ for $n, k \geq 2$, we generate many values using the coupled recurrence relations, and consult the [On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences \(OEIS\)](#) [13]. For $\ell = 3$, the initial part of the array $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{n,k \geq 0}$ is shown in Table 1 (blank entries are 0).

$p_{n,3}^k$	$k = 0$	1	2	3	4	5	6	\dots
$n = 0$	1							
1	1	3						
2	1	5	4					
3	1	7	12	4				
4	1	9	24	20	4			
5	1	11	40	56	28	4		
6	1	13	60	120	104	36	4	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots

Table 1: The count of independent sets of size k in $P_{n,3}^k$.

All entries from the $k = 2$ column on appear to be multiples of 4. Table 2 shows the most likely contender from OEIS for the k th column of the array in Table 1 ($k \geq 2$) once this factor of 4 is pulled out. Table 2 also shows each sequence's ordinary generating function (as given at OEIS).

k	Sequence	Likely OEIS match	Generating Function
2	(1, 3, 6, 10, ...)	A000217	$\frac{x}{(1-x)^3}$
3	(1, 5, 14, 30, ...)	A000330	$\frac{x(1+x)}{(1-x)^4}$
4	(1, 7, 26, 70, ...)	A006325	$\frac{-x^2(x+1)^2}{(x-1)^5}$
5	(1, 9, 42, 138, ...)	A061927	$\frac{x(1+x)^3}{(-1+x)^6}$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots

Table 2: The generating functions of each column sequence from Table 1, for $P_{n,3}$.

Adjusting each generating function by multiplying by an appropriate power of x (to make sure that the non-zero terms of the associated sequence begin at the correct place), we are led to conjecture that for $k \geq 2$ we have

$$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,3}^k x^n = \frac{4x^k(1+x)^{k-2}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}.$$

and going through the same process for the $q_{n,3}^k$'s leads to the conjecture that

$$\sum_{n \geq k} q_{n,3}^k x^n = \frac{2x^k(1+x)^{k-1}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}.$$

This process can be repeated for larger values of ℓ ; the results for $\ell \leq 6$ (and just for $p_{n,\ell}^k$) are shown in Table 3.

ℓ	Conjectured Generating Function
3	$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,3}^k x^n = \frac{4x^k(1+x)^{k-2}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}$
4	$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,4}^k x^n = \frac{9x^k(2+x)^{k-2}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}$
5	$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,5}^k x^n = \frac{25x^k(3+x)^{k-2}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}$
6	$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,6}^k x^n = \frac{36x^k(4+x)^{k-2}}{(1-x)^{k+1}}$
\vdots	\vdots

Table 3: The conjectured generating functions for each $P_{n,\ell}$, found in patterns from ℓ -triangle arrays.

All of this data motivates the conjectures that for each $k \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 3$, we have

$$\sum_{n \geq k} p_{n,\ell}^k x^n = \frac{(\ell - 1)^2 x^k ((\ell - 2) + x)^{k-2}}{(1 - x)^{k+1}}$$

and

$$\sum_{n \geq k} q_{n,\ell}^k x^n = \frac{(\ell - 1) x^k ((\ell - 2) + x)^{k-1}}{(1 - x)^{k+1}}.$$

Using the generating function identity

$$\frac{1}{(1 - x)^{k+1}} = \binom{k}{k} + \binom{k+1}{k} x + \binom{k+2}{k} x^2 + \binom{k+3}{k} x^3 + \dots$$

for the denominators above, and the binomial theorem for the numerators, we can extract the coefficient of x^n from the right-hand side of the two expressions above. All of this computation leads to the following two conjectural expressions: First, for $n, k \geq 2$ the number of independent sets of size k in $P_{n,\ell}$ can be computed as follows:

$$p_{n,\ell}^k = (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}$$

(this is (1)) and second, the number of independent sets of size k in $Q_{n,\ell}$ can be computed as follows:

$$q_{n,\ell}^k = (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-1}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}. \quad (3)$$

We now proceed to verify the correctness of (1) and (3).

Proof. (Validity of (1) and (3)) We proceed by a (simultaneous) induction on $n + k$, utilizing the recurrences (2). Since we are claiming that both formulae are valid for $n, k \geq 2$, there is nothing to do for $k \leq 1$ (and any $n \geq 0$) or $n \leq 1$ (and any $k \geq 0$). It will turn out to be useful to dispense with the case $k = 2$ (and $n \geq 2$), as well as $n = 2$ (and $k \geq 3$), before beginning the induction on $n + k$.

First we consider $k = 2$. We begin by showing, by induction on n , that (1) holds when $k = 2$. Specifically we are claiming that for $n \geq 2$

$$p_{n,\ell}^2 = (\ell - 1)^2 \binom{n}{2}.$$

This is easily checked to be true at $n = 2$. For $n > 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n,\ell}^2 &= p_{n-1,\ell}^2 + (\ell - 1) q_{n-1,\ell}^1 \quad (\text{by (2)}) \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \binom{n-1}{2} + (\ell - 1)^2 \binom{n-1}{1} \quad (\text{by induction and initial conditions for (2)}) \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \binom{n}{2} \quad (\text{by Pascal's identity}), \end{aligned}$$

completing the induction.

Next we show that (3) holds for $k = 2$ and $n \geq 2$, that is, that

$$q_{n,\ell}^2 = (\ell - 1) \left[(\ell - 2) \binom{n}{2} + \binom{n-1}{2} \right]$$

for $n \geq 2$. This is an easy check at $n = 2$, and for $n > 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{n,\ell}^2 &= p_{n-1,\ell}^2 + (\ell - 2)q_{n-1,\ell}^1 \quad (\text{by (2)}) \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \binom{n}{2} + (\ell - 2)(\ell - 1)(n - 1) \quad (\text{by above and initial conditions for (2)}) \\ &= (\ell - 1) \left[(\ell - 2) \binom{n}{2} + \binom{n-1}{2} \right] \quad (\text{by straightforward algebraic manipulations}). \end{aligned}$$

Next we consider $n = 2$. For $k \geq 3$ we have both $p_{2,\ell}^k = 0$ and $q_{2,\ell}^k = 0$ (since a 2-edge hypergraph cannot support an independent set of size greater than 2), and this is exactly what (1) and (3) predict, owing to the factor of $\binom{2-j}{3}$ (that evaluates to 0) in every summand.

We can now begin the induction argument. All pairs (n, k) with $n + k \leq 5$ have already been considered, so we assume $n + k \geq 6$. We may also assume $n \geq 3$, $k \geq 3$, as the cases $n \leq 2$ or $k \leq 2$ have already been considered.

We start by verifying (1). By (2) (valid since $n, k \geq 3$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n,\ell}^k &= p_{n-1,\ell}^k + (\ell - 1)q_{n-1,\ell}^{k-1} \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k} \\ &\quad + (\ell - 1) \left[(\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k-1} \right] \quad (\text{by induction}) \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \left[\binom{n-1-j}{k} + \binom{n-1-j}{k-1} \right] \\ &= (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k} \quad (\text{by Pascal's identity}). \end{aligned}$$

This verifies the validity of (1) for the pair (n, k) .

We now turn to (3), which turns out to be a little trickier. As with (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{n,\ell}^k &= p_{n-1,\ell}^k + (\ell - 2)q_{n-1,\ell}^{k-1} \\
&= (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k} \\
&\quad + (\ell - 2) \left[(\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k-1} \right] \\
&= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \left[(\ell - 1) \binom{n-1-j}{k} + (\ell - 2) \binom{n-1-j}{k-1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The mismatch between the coefficients $\ell - 1$ and $\ell - 2$ above precludes a quick application of Pascal's identity. However, observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\ell - 1) \binom{n-1-j}{k} + (\ell - 2) \binom{n-1-j}{k} &= (\ell - 2) \binom{n-1-j}{k} + (\ell - 2) \binom{n-1-j}{k-1} \\
&\quad + \binom{n-1-j}{k} \\
&= (\ell - 2) \binom{n-j}{k} + \binom{n-1-j}{k}
\end{aligned}$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{n,\ell}^k &= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \left[(\ell - 2) \binom{n-j}{k} + \binom{n-1-j}{k} \right] \\
&= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k} + \\
&\quad (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-1-j}{k} \\
&= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k} + (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j-1} \binom{n-j}{k} \\
&= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k} + (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-2}{j-1} \binom{n-j}{k} \\
&= (\ell - 1) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-1} \binom{k-1}{j} \binom{n-j}{k},
\end{aligned}$$

concluding the inductive proof of (3). The third equality above (the main point) is just a shift of index in the second summation, while the last equality is an application of Pascal's identity. □

3.2 Combinatorial proof of the formula for $p_{n\ell}^k$

In Section 3.1 we established inductively that for $n, k \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 3$ we have

$$p_{n,\ell}^k = (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}.$$

Here we give a combinatorial proof of this formula. Let $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^k$ be the set of independent sets of size k in the hypergraph $P_{n,\ell}$. We will partition $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^k$ into $k-1$ blocks, $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,0}, \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,1}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,k-2}$, with the property that for each j

$$|\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}| = (\ell - 1)^2 (\ell - 2)^{k-2-j} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}. \quad (4)$$

The partitioning will be done by identifying a statistic associated with an independent set (ranging from 0 to $k-2$); $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ will be those independent sets with statistic j . We will then establish (4) by a direct count.

Let $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be an independent set in $P_{n,\ell}$ of size k , with $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_k$ in the natural linear order on the vertices of $P_{n,\ell}$. To v_i we associate a *marked edge* e_i of $P_{n,\ell}$ via the following rule:

- if there is a unique edge that contains v_i , then that unique edge is the marked edge; and
- if v_i is in two edges of $P_{n,\ell}$, then the later (rightmost) edge of the two is the marked edge.

Note that the number of marked edges is $|I|$. We refer to the collection of marked edges as the *skeleton* of I . (See Figure 2.)




Figure 2: An independent set of size $k = 4$ in the hyperpath $P_{6,5}$. The marked edges are highlighted in teal, while the forced and free vertices are noted in the figure.

For $i = 2, \dots, k-1$, say that v_i is *forced* if v_i is the leftmost vertex of e_i (so, the vertex that e_i has in common with the edge of $P_{n,\ell}$ that comes immediately to its left), and *free* otherwise. (Again see Figure 2.) Note that for $i = 1$ and $i = k$ we do not define forced or free.

We are now ready to define the statistic j :

For $j = 0, \dots, k - 2$, let $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ be the set of independent sets in $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^k$ that have exactly j forced vertices.

Claim 3.1. *For each $n \geq 2, k \geq 2, \ell \geq 3$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - 2$, (4) holds.*

This claim furnishes a combinatorial proof of the explicit formula for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ (1), the number of strong independent sets in the family of ℓ -uniform, linear hyperpaths. The interested reader could similarly combinatorially prove the explicit formula for $q_{n,\ell}^k$ (3), but that is less interesting, since $Q_{n,\ell}$ was simply an auxiliary hypergraph that helped us find values of $p_{n,\ell}^k$ by a recurrence relation.

Proof. (Claim 3.1.) We will make extensive use of the following observation, which follows from a simple stars-and-bars argument:

The number of solutions to the equation $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_t = m$, with all x_i 's non-negative integers (and m a non-negative integer), in which exactly s of the x_i 's are constrained to be at least 1, exactly r of them are constrained to be equal to 0, and the rest are constrained to be at least 0, is

$$\binom{t - r - 1 + m - s}{t - r - 1}. \quad (5)$$

The relevance of this observation stems from the fact that the k edges in the skeleton give rise to a collection of $k + 1$ intervals of consecutive unmarked edges among the $n - k$ unmarked edges. Specifically, the first interval is the collection of unmarked edges to the left of the first marked edge (this collection may be empty). The second interval is the collection of unmarked edges between the first marked edge and the second marked edge, not including the marked edges, and so on, up to the $(k + 1)$ st interval, which is the collection of unmarked edges to the right of the last marked edge. Letting a_i be the number of unmarked edges in the i th interval (so a_i is the number unmarked edges between e_{i-1} and e_i for $i = 2, \dots, k$) we get that each skeleton gives rise to an equation $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{k+1} = n - k$, with all the a_i 's integers greater than or equal to 0.

We further partition $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ into four blocks:

$\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, \geq 1)$ is the set of independent sets in $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ in which $a_k = 0$ and $a_{k+1} \geq 1$.

$\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, 0)$ is the set of independent sets in $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ in which $a_k = a_{k+1} = 0$.

$\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, \geq 1)$ is the set of independent sets in $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ in which $a_k, a_{k+1} \geq 1$.

$\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, 0)$ is the set of independent sets in $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}$ in which $a_k \geq 1$ and $a_{k+1} = 0$.

We start by enumerating $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, \geq 1)$. As described earlier, the skeleton induces a composition $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{k+1} = n - k$ with all the a_i 's integers greater than or equal to 0. We have the specific restriction $a_k = 0$.

Additionally, we have j forced vertices. When we force a vertex (say the first vertex of e_i), the edge to the left of e_i cannot be marked. Thus the interval of unmarked edges to the left of an edge that has a forced vertex must be non-empty, which means that j of the a_i 's

must be at least 1. But we also in this case have unmarked edges following the last marked edge, leading to one more a_i that must be at least 1 (specifically a_{k+1}). Notice the rest of the intervals have no constraints on their lengths — they may be empty or non-empty.

We may thus apply (5) with $m = n - k$, $t = k + 1$, $s = j + 1$ and $r = 1$ to conclude that the number of skeletons in this case is given by $\binom{n - j - 2}{k - 1}$.

We must further decide where among the $k - 2$ middle edges of the skeleton the j edges that are forced occur, or, equivalently, where the $k - 2 - j$ free edges occur. This is accounted for by a factor $\binom{k - 2}{k - 2 - j}$.

Inside each of the $k - 2 - j$ free edges in the skeleton we must choose which vertex from the edge is actually in the independent set. That vertex must be one of the $\ell - 2$ vertices in the center of the edge (since the edge is free, we cannot choose the first vertex, and we also cannot choose the last overlapping vertex, as that would be the marked vertex in the next edge). This leads to a factor of $(\ell - 2)^{k - 2 - j}$.

Considering the first edge e_1 , we must choose one of the vertices in that edge to be in the independent set. We cannot choose the final vertex of the edge; that would cause the edge immediately to the right of e_1 to be marked, and e_1 not to be marked. So we have $\ell - 1$ options.

The analysis of the previous three paragraphs will be common to all four cases, so it is convenient to set

$$A := (\ell - 1)(\ell - 2)^{k - 2 - j} \binom{k - 2}{k - 2 - j}. \quad (6)$$

Finally looking at edge e_k , the last marked edge: we cannot choose the first vertex of e_k to be in the independent set, or else the previous edge (immediately to the left of e_k) could not have been marked. Since the hypergraph has edges after e_k , we also cannot choose the last vertex of e_k to be in the independent set (if we did, that vertex would have caused the edge immediately to the right of e_k to have been the marked edge associated with that vertex.) Thus we are left with $(\ell - 2)$ options to choose from for the vertex of the independent set that is in e_k .

It follows that

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, \geq 1) \right| = A(\ell - 2) \binom{n - j - 2}{k - 1}. \quad (7)$$

We now move on to enumerating $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, 0)$. Again the skeleton induces a composition $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{k+1} = n - k$ with all the a_i 's integers greater than or equal to 0, and with the specific restriction $a_k = 0$.

As before each of the j forced vertices give rise to a restriction $a_i \geq 1$, and in this case there is no further such restriction. We may thus apply (5) with $m = n - k$, $t = k + 1$, $s = j$ and $r = 1$ to conclude that the number of skeletons in this case is given by $\binom{n - j - 2}{k - 2}$.

Deciding where among the $k - 2$ middle edges of the skeleton the j edges that are forced occur, choosing a vertex from inside each of the $k - 2 - j$ free edges to be in the independent set, and choosing a vertex from e_1 to be in the independent set, together give a contribution of $(\ell - 1)(\ell - 2)^{k - 2 - j} \binom{k - 2}{k - 2 - j}$, as before.

To finish this case, again we look at the last marked edge e_k . Again we cannot choose the first vertex to be a part of the independent set, or else the previous edge could not be marked (contradicting $a_k = 0$). Since the last vertex of e_k is not the first vertex of a later edge, we can choose the final vertex of e_k to be the vertex of the independent set from e_k . Thus in this case we have $(\ell - 1)$ options to choose from for the vertex of the independent set that is in e_k .

It follows that

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0,0) \right| = A(\ell - 1) \binom{n - j - 2}{k - 2}. \quad (8)$$

To enumerate $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, \geq 1)$, note that here we have $a_k \geq 1$ instead of $a_k = 0$, but otherwise our considerations of r and s are the same as in the case of $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, \geq 1)$. Thus $s = j + 2$ and $r = 0$ and this leads to a count of $\binom{n - j - 2}{k}$ for the number of skeletons.

Deciding where among the $k - 2$ middle edges of the skeleton the j edges that are forced occur, choosing a vertex from inside each of the $k - 2 - j$ free edges to be in the independent set, and choosing a vertex from e_1 to be in the independent set, together give a contribution of $(\ell - 1)(\ell - 2)^{k-2-j} \binom{k - 2}{k - 2 - j}$, as before.

Now looking at e_k , we find that, unlike the first two cases, we can include the first vertex as the vertex from e_k that causes it to be marked, since the edge immediately to the left of e_k is unmarked. And since there are edges in the hyperpath after (to the right of) e_k in this case, similar to our consideration of $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, \geq 1)$ we cannot choose the final vertex of e_k to be the vertex of e_k that is in the independent set. Thus we have $(\ell - 1)$ options for the vertex of the independent set coming from e_k .

It follows that

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, \geq 1) \right| = A(\ell - 1) \binom{n - j - 2}{k}. \quad (9)$$

Finally, we consider $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, 0)$. Similar to arguments in the previous cases, we have here $r = 1$ and $s = j + 1$, so we have $\binom{n - j - 2}{k - 1}$ as the count of the number of skeletons.

As in all previous cases, deciding where among the $k - 2$ middle edges of the skeleton the j edges that are forced occur, choosing a vertex from inside each of the $k - 2 - j$ free edges to be in the independent set, and choosing a vertex from e_1 to be in the independent set, together give a contribution of $(\ell - 1)(\ell - 2)^{k-2-j} \binom{k - 2}{k - 2 - j}$.

Finally we look again to edge e_k . Similarly to our consideration of $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, \geq 1)$ we can choose the first vertex of e_k to be the vertex from e_k that is in the independent set, and similarly to $\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(0, 0)$ we can also choose the final vertex. Thus we have ℓ options in this case for the final vertex of the independent set.

It follows that

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}(\geq 1, \geq 1) \right| = A\ell \binom{n - j - 2}{k - 1}. \quad (10)$$

Combining (7), (8), (9) and (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}|}{A} &= (\ell-2) \binom{n-j-2}{k-1} + (\ell-1) \binom{n-j-2}{k-2} + \\ &\quad (\ell-1) \binom{n-j-2}{k} + \ell \binom{n-j-2}{k-1} \\ &= (\ell-1) \left(\binom{n-j-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-j-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-j-2}{k} + \binom{n-j-2}{k-1} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$= (\ell-1) \left(\binom{n-j-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-j-1}{k} \right) \quad (12)$$

$$= (\ell-1) \binom{n-j}{k}. \quad (13)$$

Here (11) comes from a simple rearrangement of summands — taking one of the $\binom{n-j-2}{k-1}$'s from the $\ell \binom{n-j-2}{k-1}$ term, and moving it over to the $(\ell-2) \binom{n-j-2}{k-1}$ term. We also use Pascal's identity twice in (12) on adjacent binomial coefficients and again in (13). Recalling the definition of A from (6) we obtain

$$|\mathcal{P}_{n,\ell}^{k,j}| = (\ell-1)(\ell-2)^{k-2-j} \binom{n-j}{k} \binom{k-2}{k-2-j},$$

which is (4). □

3.3 Proof of real rootedness

The explicit formula (1) is far too complicated to allow a direct proof that for each fixed n and ℓ the sequence $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k=0}^n$ is unimodal. Instead we establish unimodality by showing that the generating polynomial of the sequence $(p_{n,\ell}^k)_{k=0}^n$ is real rooted (and so not just unimodal, but in fact log concave).

Set

$$P_{n,\ell}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} p_{n,\ell}^k x^k \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{n,\ell}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} q_{n,\ell}^k x^k.$$

Then the recurrences for $p_{n,\ell}^k$ and $q_{n,\ell}^k$ readily translate into recurrences for $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ and $Q_{n,\ell}(x)$ (as before by first considering those independent sets in which none of the vertices unique to the first edge are in the independent set, and then considering those in which one such vertex is in the independent set). For $n \geq 2$, the recurrences are

$$P_{n,\ell}(x) = P_{n-1,\ell}(x) + (\ell-1)xQ_{n-1,\ell}(x), \quad (14)$$

$$Q_{n,\ell}(x) = P_{n-1,\ell}(x) + (\ell-2)xQ_{n-1,\ell}(x), \quad (15)$$

with initial conditions

- $P_{0,\ell}(x) = Q_{0,\ell}(x) = 1$,

- $P_{1,\ell}(x) = 1 + \ell x$, and
- $Q_{1,\ell}(x) = 1 + (\ell - 1)x$.

The pair of recurrences (14), (15) can be used to obtain a recurrence that only involves $P_{n,\ell}(x)$. From (14) we have

$$Q_{n-1,\ell}(x) = \frac{P_{n,\ell}(x) - P_{n-1,\ell}(x)}{(\ell - 1)x}. \quad (16)$$

Shifting index from n to $n + 1$ this says that

$$Q_{n,\ell}(x) = \frac{P_{n+1,\ell}(x) - P_{n,\ell}(x)}{(\ell - 1)x}. \quad (17)$$

Taking (15), and using (17) for $Q_{n,\ell}(x)$ and (16) for $Q_{n-1,\ell}(x)$, we get

$$\frac{P_{n+1,\ell}(x) - P_{n,\ell}(x)}{(\ell - 1)x} = P_{n-1,\ell}(x) + \frac{(\ell - 2)x(P_{n,\ell}(x) - P_{n-1,\ell}(x))}{(\ell - 1)x}.$$

Rearranging terms, we get that for $n \geq 2$,

$$P_{n+1,\ell}(x) = (1 + (\ell - 2)x)P_{n,\ell}(x) + xP_{n-1,\ell}(x).$$

Shifting index again, this says that for $n \geq 3$,

$$P_{n,\ell}(x) = (1 + (\ell - 2)x)P_{n-1,\ell}(x) + xP_{n-2,\ell}(x). \quad (18)$$

Combining this with the initial conditions

- $P_{0,\ell}(x) = 1$ and $P_{1,\ell}(x) = 1 + \ell x$ (as introduced above), and
- $P_{2,\ell}(x) = 1 + (2\ell - 1)x + (\ell - 1)^2 x^2$

we have completely decoupled $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ from $Q_{n,\ell}(x)$.

We now prove the following result, which is a simple modification of a well-known proof in the area of real-rootedness that goes back at least to Heilmann and Lieb [9].

Theorem 3.2. *Let $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ be defined by the recurrence (18), with the initial conditions on $P_{0,\ell}(x)$, $P_{1,\ell}(x)$ and $P_{2,\ell}(x)$ as given above. All n of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$'s roots are real.*

Proof. We prove, by induction on n , the following stronger statement:

all n of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$'s roots are real, negative, and distinct; all $n - 1$ of $P_{n-1,\ell}(x)$'s roots are real, negative, and distinct; and moreover, the roots of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ and $P_{n-1,\ell}(x)$ interlace, meaning that if $0 > s_1 > s_2 > \dots > s_{n-1}$ are the roots of $P_{n-1,\ell}(x)$, and $0 > r_1 > r_2 > \dots > r_n$ are the roots of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$, then we have

$$0 > r_1 > s_1 > r_2 > s_2 > \dots > s_{n-1} > r_n.$$

The base cases $n = 1, 2, 3$ are easy (if somewhat tedious) to verify. For the induction step, let $n \geq 3$ be given. From the recurrence we have

$$P_{n+1,\ell}(x) = (1 + (\ell - 2)x)P_{n,\ell}(x) + xP_{n-1,\ell}(x).$$

We want to use this to establish both that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has all $n + 1$ of its roots real, negative and distinct, and that moreover, that the roots of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ and $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ interlace, meaning if $0 > t_1 > t_2 > \cdots > t_{n+1}$ are the roots of $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$, then we have

$$0 > t_1 > r_1 > t_2 > r_2 > \cdots > r_n > t_{n+1}.$$

We begin by observing that for every m , $P_{m,\ell}(0) = 1$ and that (because $p_{m,\ell}^1 > 0$) $P'_{m,\ell}(0) > 0$, so that $P_{m,\ell}(x)$ is increasing around $x = 0$.

Evaluating $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ at $x = r_1$ (the least negative root of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$) we get

$$P_{n+1,\ell}(r_1) = (1 + (\ell - 2)r_1)P_{n,\ell}(r_1) + r_1P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) = 0 + r_1P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) < 0.$$

To justify that $r_1P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) < 0$ note that $r_1 < 0$ and that $P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) > 0$. To see this latter, note since $P_{n-1,\ell}(0) > 0$ we have $P_{n-1,\ell}(x) > 0$ for all $x > s_1$ (where recall s_1 is the least negative root of $P_{n-1,\ell}(x)$), and so since by induction $s_1 < r_1$ we get $P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) > 0$. Since $P_{n+1,\ell}(0) > 0$ and $P_{n+1,\ell}(0) < 0$ we get that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has at least one root in the interval $(r_1, 0)$.

Evaluating $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ at $x = r_2$ (the next least negative root of $P_{n,\ell}(x)$) we get

$$P_{n+1,\ell}(r_2) = (1 + (\ell - 2)r_1)P_{n,\ell}(r_2) + r_2P_{n-1,\ell}(r_2) = 0 + r_2P_{n-1,\ell}(r_2) > 0.$$

To justify that $r_1P_{n-1,\ell}(r_1) > 0$ note that $r_2 < 0$ and that $P_{n-1,\ell}(r_2) < 0$. To see this latter, note $P_{n-1,\ell}(x) < 0$ for all $s_2 < x < s_1$ and so since by induction $s_2 < r_2 < s_1$ we get $P_{n-1,\ell}(r_2) < 0$. Since $P_{n+1,\ell}(r_1) < 0$ and $P_{n+1,\ell}(r_2) > 0$ we get that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has at least one root in the interval (r_2, r_1) . (See Figure 3 for an illustration of the relationship between $P_{n,\ell}$ and $P_{n-1,\ell}$ that leads to these conclusions.)

Continuing in this manner we find that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has at least one root in each of the n disjoint intervals $(r_n, r_{n-1}), (r_{n-1}, r_{n-2}), \dots, (r_2, r_1), (r_1, 0)$.

We claim that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ also has a root that is in the interval $(-\infty, r_n)$. If this were true, then because $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has degree $n + 1$ and we have accounted for at least $n + 1$ roots, we would in fact have accounted for all the roots, and shown that indeed $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has $n + 1$ real negative and distinct roots t_1, \dots, t_{n+1} satisfying $t_{n+1} < r_n < t_n < \cdots < r_2 < t_2 < r_1 < t_1 < 0$, completing the induction step.

To check that $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ has a root in the interval $(-\infty, r_n)$, we evaluate both $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ and $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ at $x = -\infty$ (or at a very large negative number). Let's first consider even n . Then to the left (negative side) of r_n — that is, for $x < r_n$ — $P_{n,\ell}(x)$ is positive, and in fact tends to $+\infty$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Additionally, $P_{n+1,\ell}(r_n)$ is (from the argument above) positive. We also have that $n + 1$ is odd, so $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ tends to $+\infty$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Since $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ is positive at r_n and negative at $-\infty$, there is indeed a root of $P_{n+1,\ell}(x)$ in the interval $(-\infty, r_n)$. A similar argument works when n is odd, to reach the same conclusion. \square




Figure 3: The inductive relationship between $P_{n,\ell}$ and $P_{n-1,\ell}$.

4 Discussion and some questions

The starting point for this work was the desire to understand the natural analog in the hypergraph setting of Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős’ question concerning the unimodality of the independent set sequence of trees. We have settled the question (in the affirmative) for strong independent sets in a natural first family of hypergraphs to consider, namely uniform, linear hyperpaths. For strong independent sets in another natural family, namely uniform, linear hyperstars, unimodality of the independent set sequence is very easy to establish. But this is just the tip of an iceberg. We record here some of the obvious broader questions (at various levels of strength) that could be tackled.

- Question 4.1.**
1. Is the strong independent set sequence of all hypertrees unimodal?
 2. What about linear hypertrees, or uniform hypertrees, or uniform linear hypertrees?
 3. What if “strong independent set” is replaced with “weak independent set”?

Much of the progress to date on Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős’ tree question has consisted of establishing unimodality of the independent set sequence of trees that lie in particular (often recursively defined) families. One might tackle analogous families in the hypertree setting, although the fact that (as seen in this paper) significant complexity arises even in the simple family of linear uniform hyperpaths suggests that the results in the hypertree setting maybe be significantly harder than in the tree question.

One family of trees that has been studied for Alavi, Malde, Schwenk and Erdős’ question is the family of centipedes or combs (paths in which a pendant edge has been dropped from each vertex; see e.g. [12]). We have considered the family of uniform linear hypercombs. Let $C_{n,\ell}$ be the hypergraph that is obtained from $P_{n,\ell}$ by adding, for each vertex v that is in two edges, an edge of size ℓ that includes v and $\ell - 1$ new vertices, and also for one vertex w of

degree 1 in the first edge of $P_{n,\ell}$ and one vertex w' of degree 1 in the last edge of $P_{n,\ell}$ an edge of size ℓ that includes w and $\ell - 1$ new vertices, and an edge of size ℓ that includes w' and $\ell - 1$ new vertices. (See Figure 4.)




Figure 4: The linear uniform hypercomb $C_{6,5}$.

We have found a pair of coupled recurrence relations (involving a suitably defined auxiliary hypergraph) to compute the number of strong independent sets of $C_{n,\ell}$ of size k , and so via **Mathematica** have verified that $C_{n,\ell}$ has unimodal strong independent set sequence for all $n \leq 500$ and $\ell \leq 12$, but a proof of a general statement remains elusive.

Restricting back to the focus of this note, the linear uniform hyperpath, a number of tantalizing questions remain.

Question 4.2. For $\ell \geq 3$:

1. Is there a simple combinatorial explanation, that doesn't pass through the auxiliary hyperpath $Q_{n,\ell}$, for the generating function recurrence

$$P_{n,\ell}(x) = (1 + (\ell - 2)x)P_{n-1,\ell}(x) + xP_{n-2,\ell}(x),$$

or equivalently for the recurrence

$$p_{n,\ell}^k = p_{n-1,\ell}^k + p_{n-2,\ell}^{k-1} + (\ell - 2)p_{n-1,\ell}^{k-1}$$

(obtained from (18) by extracting coefficients of x^k from both sides)? When $\ell = 2$, both recurrences are easily explained by partitioning the set independent sets into those that include the first vertex of a path, and those that don't, but there does not seem to be a similarly straightforward explanation for the case $\ell \geq 3$.

2. Setting $x = 1$ in (18) we obtain a simple recurrence for $p_{n,\ell}$, the number of independent sets admitted by $P_{n,\ell}$, namely $p_{0,\ell} = 1$, $p_{1,\ell} = 1 + \ell$, $p_{2,\ell} = 1 + \ell^2$ and, for $n \geq 3$

$$p_{n,\ell} = (\ell - 1)p_{n-1,\ell} + p_{n-2,\ell}. \quad (19)$$

Is there a simple combinatorial explanation for (19)?

3. We have provided a combinatorial explanation for the identity (1)

$$p_{n,\ell}^k = (\ell - 1)^2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (\ell - 2)^{k-j-2} \binom{k-2}{j} \binom{n-j}{k}$$

(when $n, k \geq 2$). That explanation does not make it obvious that $p_{n,\ell}^k$ is a multiple of $(\ell - 1)^2$. Is there a simple explanation for this phenomenon?

References

- [1] Yousef Alavi, Paresh J. Malde, Allen J. Schwenk and Paul Erdős, The vertex independence sequence of a graph is not constrained, *Congressus Numerantium* **58** (1987), 15–23.
- [2] Abdul Basit and David Galvin, On the independent set sequence of a tree, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **28** (2021), article P3.23.
- [3] Miklós Bóna, Introduction to enumerative and analytic combinatorics (2nd edition), CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2016.
- [4] Petter Brändén, Unimodality, log-concavity, real-rootedness and beyond, in Handbook of enumerative combinatorics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015, 437–483.
- [5] Francesco Brenti, Log-concave and Unimodal sequences in Algebra, Combinatorics, and Geometry: an update, *Contemporary Mathematics* **178** (1994), 71–89.
- [6] David Galvin and Justin Hilyard, The independent set sequence of some families of trees, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* **70** (2018), 236–252.
- [7] Yahya Ould Hamidoune, On the numbers of independent k -sets in a clawfree graph, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B* **50** (1990), 241–244.
- [8] Steven Heilman, Independent Sets of Random Trees and of Sparse Random Graphs, arXiv:2006.04756 (2020)
- [9] Ole J. Heilmann and Elliot H. Lieb, Theory of Monomer-Dimer Systems, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **25** (1972), 190–233.
- [10] Ohr Kadrawi and Vadim E. Levit, The independence polynomial of trees is not always log-concave starting from order 26, arXiv:2305.01784 (2023)
- [11] Ohr Kadrawi, Vadim E. Levit, Ron Yosef and Matan Mizrahi, On Computing of Independence Polynomials of Trees, in Recent Research in Polynomials (edited by Faruk Özger), IntechOpen 2023, <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/1130709>.
- [12] Vadim E. Levit and Eugen Mandrescu, On well-covered trees with unimodal independence polynomials, Proceedings of the Thirty-third Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 2002), *Congressus Numerantium* **159** (2002), 193–202.
- [13] The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, published electronically at <https://oeis.org>, retrieved May 13 2024.
- [14] Richard P. Stanley, Log-concave and Unimodal sequences in Algebra, Combinatorics and Geometry, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **576** (1989), 500–535.