

Acknowledgment of Dr. Donald Knuth's role in formulation of the "DAG/POSET" conjecture

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.theory/2004-08/1435.html>

From: David Halitsky (dhalitsky_at_cumulativeinquiry.com)

Date: 08/05/04

Date: 5 Aug 2004 07:43:22 -0700

Background reference threads at sci.math for this thread are:

- 1)
DAG/POSET "consultancy fee" conjecture: sole thread here for all future postings
 - 2)
counting posets,dim=2
-

Posting:

The "DAG/POSET" conjecture posted to sci.math has engendered solid work at the two threads referenced above. Interim results at the first thread above will solidify with the return from vacation of Dr. David Wagner, who will review the work of Rieper/Stertenbrink/Houston/Busygin/Brown and clarify/correct (if necessary) and expand.

Because the "DAG/POSET" conjecture can now be considered legitimate (though "wrong,wrong.wrong" in my initial entirely ignorant formulation), I feel it necessary to acknowledge Dr. Donald Knuth's contribution to the formulation of this problem.

At the URL:

<http://www.CumulativeInquiry.com/StrucClues/knuth.pdf>

there is a reproduction of a 2-page handwritten note from Dr. Knuth, which he was kind enough to send in February 03 concerning my claim that "orderable DAGs" are 1:1 with dim 2 posets, and that this claim needs only a "proof without words" because it is essentially trivial. (Talk about "ignorant" – how "ignorant" was that?)

comp.theory: Acknowledgment of Dr. Donald Knuth's role in formulation of the "DAG/POSET" conjecture

If one takes a moment to scan Dr. Knuth's note, it will be seen that he anticipated virtually all of the problems and relevant cases which have motivated the discussion in the two sci.math threads noted above.

So, I felt it was proper to note his original contribution to this effort, inasmuch as I would not have bothered professional mathematicians about the matter were it not for the implicit encouragement in Dr. Knuth's remark that the "DAG/POSET" conjecture opens up "interesting and new" ground.

Please note also that Dr. Knuth, sometime ago, explicitly gave me permission to acknowledge his comments in the above-referenced pdf, once the "DAG/POSET" conjecture had been deemed legitimate by the relevant community(ies). I believe that the work already done and to be done at the above two threads satisfies this condition imposed by Dr. Knuth.

Finally, please note that the work engendered by Dr. Knuth's original observations (i.e. the work at the two above-referenced threads) is precisely the reason why "Cumulative Inquiry, Inc." was named "Cumulative Inquiry."