1. A symmetric chain decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ can be constructed from that of $\mathcal{B}_{n}$. For $n=1, \mathcal{B}_{1}$ itself is a symmetric chain and forms the required decomposition. Given a symmetric chain decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{n}$, for each chain $X_{k} \subset X_{k+1} \cdots \subset X_{n-k}$, add the chains $X_{k} \subset$ $X_{k+1} \subset \cdots \subset X_{n-k} \subset\left(X_{n-k} \cup\{n+1\}\right)$ and the chain $\left(X_{k} \cup\{n+1\}\right) \subset$ $\cdots \subset\left(X_{n-k-1} \cup\{n+1\}\right)$ if $k<n-k$. It is easy to verify that each of the constructed chains is symmetric and every set in $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ is in exactly one chain.

It is also possible to give an explict description of these chains, that is, an $O(n)$-time algorithm to find the next and the previous element in the chain containing a given subset $X$, if there is any.
Since every symmetric chain must contain an element of the middle level(s), the number of chains is at most $\binom{n}{\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}$, hence the maximum antichain has size at most $\binom{n}{\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}$.
2. Suppose $A$ is any antichain of size $\binom{n}{\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}$. By the inequality proved in class, also called the LYM inequality,

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{\left|A_{i}\right|}} \leq 1 .
$$

Since $\binom{n}{\left|A_{i}\right|} \leq\binom{ n}{\lfloor n / 2\rfloor}$, for this inequality to hold, each term must be equal to $\frac{1}{(\lfloor n / 2\rfloor)}$, that is each $A_{i}$ has size $\lfloor n / 2\rfloor$ or $\lceil n / 2\rceil$. This implies that if $n$ is even, each $A_{i}$ has size $n / 2$. Thus $A$ must be the set of all subsets of size $n / 2$. If $n$ is odd, each $A_{i}$ has size $(n+1) / 2$ or $(n-1) / 2$. Suppose there are $k$ sets in $A$ of size $(n+1) / 2$ where $0<k<\binom{n}{(n+1) / 2}$. Then the Kruskal-Katona theorem implies that the shadow of these sets has size $>k$, which implies some set in $A$ of size $(n-1) / 2$ is contained in the shadow. This contradicts the fact that $A$ is an antichain.
It is also possible to give a direct proof for the case when $n$ is odd. Consider the bipartite graph formed by subsets of size $(n-1) / 2$ and $(n+1) / 2$, where two subsets are adjacent iff they differ in excatly one element. This graph is regular with each vertex of degree $(n+1) / 2$ and it is connected. This implies that the shadow of any collection of $k$ subsets of size $(n+1) / 2$ has size $>k$, if $0<k<\binom{n}{(n+1) / 2}$.
3. The proof is again by induction on $n$. If $n=1$, the only possible antichains are $\{\emptyset\},\{1\}$, and the result is trivially true. Suppose the
statement is true for $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. Let $A$ be any antichain in $\mathcal{B}_{n}$ such that every maximal chain in $\mathcal{B}_{n}$ contains exactly one subset in $A$. Suppose $A$ contains subsets of different cardinalities and let $X$ be a subset in $A$ of minimum cardinality. Then $|X|<n$ and we may assume, without loss of generality, that $n \notin X$. Let $A^{\prime}=A \cap \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. If there is a maximal chain in $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ that does not contain any element of $A^{\prime}$, then by adding the set $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$ to it, we get a maximal chain in $\mathcal{B}_{n}$ that does not contain any element of $A$, a contradiction. (Note that $\{1,2, \ldots, n\} \notin A$ otherwise $A$ cannot contain any other subset.) Therefore every maximal chain in $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ contains some element of $A^{\prime}$. Therfore by induction, $A^{\prime}$ consists of all subsets of $\{1,2, \ldots, n-1\}$ with size $k$, for some $k$. Since $X \in A^{\prime}$, we have $k=|X|$. Let $Y$ be a subset in $A$ of cardinality greater than $|X|$ (this exists by assumption). Then $Y \notin A^{\prime}$ and $n \in Y$. However, by deleting $n$ and possibly some other elements from $Y$, we get a subset of size $k$ not containing $n$ that is a subset of $Y$. This subset is in $A^{\prime}$, which contradicts the fact that $A$ is an antichain.
4. First show that every graph with at least $2 m$ vertices and minimum degree at least $m$ contains a matching of size $m$. This is also by induction. For $m=1$, this is trivial. Suppose $u_{i} v_{i}$, for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ is a matching of size $m-1$ in a graph with at least $2 m$ vertices and minimum degree at least $m$. Let $A$ be the remaining vertices. If there is an edge joining two vertices in $A$, we get a matching of size $m$. Therefore each vertex in $A$ is adjacent to at least $m$ of the vertices $u_{i}, v_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Let $x, y$ be any two vertices in $A$. Then there must exist an edge $u_{i} v_{i}$ such that there are at least 3 edges joining $\left\{u_{i}, v_{i}\right\}$ to $\{x, y\}$. This implies we can replace the edge $u_{i} v_{i}$ by either $x u_{i}, y v_{i}$ or $x v_{i}, y u_{i}$ to get a matching of size $m$ in $G$.

Suppose $G$ is a graph with $n$ vertices and more than $f(m, n)$ edges. Then $n \geq 2 m$ (Kruskal-Katona). If every vertex has degree at least $m$, the result follows by the previous argument. On the other hand, if there exists a vertex of degree at most $m-1$, delete the endpoints of any edge incident with it. This reduces the total number of edges by at most $m-1+n-2=m+n-3$. By simple manipulations, it can be seen that $f(m, n)-(m+n-3) \geq f(m-1, n-2)$. Therefore by induction, the remaining graph has a matching of size $m-1$, which together with the deleted edge gives a matching of size $m$ in $G$.
5. The proof is by induction on $n$. The statement is trivial for $n=1$ and
it is easy to verify it for $n=2$. Let $0<x_{1}<x_{2}<\cdots<x_{n-1}<S$ be the points at which the holes are located. Note that only holes in the interval $(0, S)$ are important. Also assume without loss of generality that $a_{1}<a_{2}<\cdots<a_{n}$. The proof breaks into two cases.
Case 1. Suppose $S-a_{n}<x_{n-1}$. Let $m$ be the smallest number such that $S-a_{m} \leq x_{n-1}$. If any of the points $S-a_{i}$ for $m \leq i \leq n$ is not a hole, then by induction, the grasshopper can move from 0 to $S-a_{i}$ using jumps $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{n}$ and avoiding the holes $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-2}$. Then a jump of $a_{i}$ gives the required sequence of jumps. We may assume $S-a_{i}$ is a hole for $m \leq i \leq n$. In particular $S-a_{n}=x_{j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n-2$. Consider the set of points $S-a_{n}-a_{i}$ for $1 \leq i<m$. If any one of these is not a hole, the grasshopper can move from 0 to $S-a_{n}-a_{i}$ using jumps $a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ and avoiding the holes $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-3}$ then jump to $S-a_{i}$ and then to $S$. Note that $S-a_{n}-a_{i}<x_{n-2}$ but $S-a_{i}>x_{n-1}$ in this case. Since there are only $n-1$ holes, one of these two cases must hold as the holes obtained for distinct values of $i$ must be distinct.
Case 2. $S-a_{n} \geq x_{n-1}$. By induction, the grasshopper can move from 0 to $S-a_{n}$ using jumps $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ and avoiding the holes $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-2}$. If in this path, the grasshopper lands on the hole at $x_{n-1}$, replace the jump that takes it to $x_{n-1}$ by $a_{n}$ and then take the remaining jumps arbitrarily. Since $a_{n}$ is the largest jump, replacing the jump by $a_{n}$ will take the grasshopper beyond $x_{n-1}$. Since $x_{n-1}$ is the furthest hole, remaining jumps can be taken arbitrarily.

