

COMBINATORIAL PROBLEMS ON SUBSETS  
AND THEIR INTERSECTIONS

by

M.Deza, P.Erdos, N.M.Singhi

July 1975

M.Deza, Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques, Paris, France

P.Erdos, The Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

N.M.Singhi, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521, USA.

COMBINATORIAL PROBLEMS ON SUBSETS

M.Deza, 3 rue de Duras, 75008 Paris  
France

ABSTRACT

Let  $|S| = n$ ,  $m(n; \ell_1, \ell_2, k)$  respectively  $m'(n, \ell_1, \ell, k)$  denote the cardinality of the largest family of subsets  $A_i \subset S$  satisfying  $|A_i| = k$  (respectively  $|A_i| \leq k$ ) and  $|A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2}| = \ell_1$  or  $\ell_2$ . In this paper we prove

a)  $m(n, 0, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n}{2}$ ,  $m'(n, 0, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n}{2} + n + 1$ ; equality, iff  $k = 2$ ;

b)  $m(n, 0, \ell_2, k) \leq n$ , if  $\ell_2 \neq k$ , with equality for an infinity of  $n$ .

For  $n \geq n_0(k)$  we show that:

a)  $m(n_1, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n-\ell_1}{2}$ ,  $m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n-\ell_1}{2} + (n-\ell_1) + 1$ ;

b) more exactly,  $m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \left[ \frac{n-\ell_1}{k-\ell_1} \left[ \frac{n-\ell_2}{k-\ell_2} \right] \right]$  with equality for an infinity of  $n$ .

Let integers  $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \ell_2 < k < n$  be given. Denote by  $M(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k)$  any maximal system  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$  of different sets such that

$$\left| \bigcup_{A_i \in \alpha} A_i \right| \leq n, \quad |A_i| = k (A_i \in \alpha), \quad |A_i \cap A_j| = \ell_1, \ell_2 (A_i, A_j \in \alpha, i \neq j), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{by } m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) = |M(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k)|, \quad (2)$$

by  $M'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k)$  any maximal system  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$  such that,

$$\left| \bigcup_{A_i \in \alpha} A_i \right| \leq n, \quad |A_i| \leq k (A_i \in \alpha), \quad |A_i \cap A_j| = \ell_1, \ell_2 (A_i, A_j \in \alpha, i \neq j), \quad (1')$$

$$\text{and by } m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) = |M'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k)|. \quad (2')$$

Let  $\ell > 0$  be a given integer. The *kernal* of the system  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$  is the intersection  $K(\alpha) = \bigcap_{A_i \in \alpha} A_i$ .  $|\alpha| > 2$ . (3)

System  $\alpha$  is an  $\ell$ -*star*, if

$$|K(\alpha)| \geq \ell. \quad (4)$$

System  $\alpha$  is a  $\Lambda$ -*system*, if

$$\text{all sets } A_i \setminus K(\alpha) \text{ are disjoint}. \quad (5)$$

Assume first  $\ell_1 = \ell_2 = \ell$ . Then Ryser proved the following (in other terms) Theorem 1 ([8])

$$m(n, \ell, \ell, k) \leq n, \quad (6)$$

$$m'(n, \ell, \ell, k) \leq n + 1, \quad (6')$$

equality holds, if there exist an  $(n, k, \ell)$ -design.

In fact, it was also shown in Theorem 1 of [8], that if  $\alpha = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  satisfies  $|\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i| = n$ ,  $|A_i \cap A_j| = \ell (\forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$  then it is either  $(n, k, \ell)$ -design or a  $\lambda$ -design,  $\lambda = \ell$ . Theorem 1 is a generalization of the <sup>de</sup>Bruijn-Erdos's Theorem (case  $\ell = 1$ ), which in turn is a generalization of Fisher's inequality for  $(b, v, r, k, \lambda)$ -design. Deza proved (in other terms)

Theorem 2 ([2])

There is an  $r(k, \ell)$  such that

$$r(k, \ell) \leq k^2 - k + 1, \quad (7)$$

$$n > \ell + r(k, \ell)(k - \ell) \Rightarrow m(n, \ell, \ell, k) > r(k, \ell) \Rightarrow$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{any } M(n, \ell, \ell, k) \text{ is a } \Delta\text{-system} \Rightarrow m(n, \ell, \ell, k) = \left\lceil \frac{n - \ell}{k - \ell} \right\rceil, \quad (8)$$

$$n > \ell + r(k, \ell) - 1 \Rightarrow m'(n, \ell, \ell, k) > r(k, \ell) \Rightarrow$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{any } M'(n, \ell, \ell, k) \text{ is a } \Delta\text{-system} \Rightarrow m'(n, \ell, \ell, k) = n - \ell + 1. \quad (8')$$

For  $\ell = 1$  and infinitely many  $k$  (7) is best possible. We obtain from [1], [2] and [7] that

$$k^2 - k + 1 \geq \max(\ell + 2, (k - \ell)^2 + k - \ell + 1) \geq r(k, \ell) \geq \max(\ell + 2, q^2 + q + 1), \quad (9)$$

where  $q = \max q^*$ , such that  $q^* \leq k - \ell$  and  $PG(2, q^*)$  exists. The function  $r(k, \ell)$  and several generalizations of it were considered in detail in [3].

In this paper we consider the case  $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ . From now on we assume  $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ . It is evident that

$$m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \geq m(n - \ell_1, 0, \ell_2 - \ell_1, k - \ell_1), \quad (10)$$

$$m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \geq m(n - \ell_1, 0, \ell_2 - \ell_1, k - \ell_1), \quad (10')$$

since for example if  $\alpha = \{A_i\} = M(n - \ell_1, 0, \ell_2 - \ell_1, k - \ell_1)$

and  $|\Lambda| = \ell_1$ ,  $\Lambda \cap (\cup_{A_i \in \alpha} A_i) = \emptyset$  then

$$|\{A_i \cup \Lambda\}| \leq m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k).$$

Deza and Erdos proved the following ~~Theorem~~ <sup>Theorem</sup> (this is inversion of (10), (10') and generalization of Theorem 2).

Theorem 3 ([4])

Let  $0 < \ell_1 < \ell_2 < k < n$ . There are  $s(k)$  and  $s'(k)$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) &> \frac{\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1}{k} n + s(k) \Rightarrow \text{any } M(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \text{ is an } \ell_1\text{-star} \Rightarrow \\
 &\Rightarrow m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) = \max \left( \frac{\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1}{k} n + s(k), m(n - \ell_1, 0, \ell_2 - \ell_1, k - \ell_1) \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) &> (\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1) n + s'(k) \Rightarrow \text{any } M'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \text{ is an } \ell\text{-star} \Rightarrow \\
 &\Rightarrow m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) = \max \left( (\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1) n + s'(k), m'(n - \ell_1, 0, \ell_2 - \ell_1, k - \ell_1) \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{11'}$$

Assume now  $\ell_1 = 0, \ell_2 = \ell > 0$ .

Theorem 4. Let  $0 < \ell < k < n$ . Then

$$m(n, 0, \ell, k) = \binom{n}{2} \quad \text{for } k = 2, \tag{12}$$

$$m(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq \left\lceil \frac{n^2}{k} \right\rceil \quad \text{for } k > 2,$$

$$m(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \left\lceil \frac{n - \ell}{k - \ell} \right\rceil \right\rceil \quad \text{for } n > \ell + r(k, \ell)(k - \ell), \tag{13}$$

$$m(n, 0, \ell, k) = \frac{n(n - \ell)}{k(k - \ell)} \quad \text{for the case } \ell | k \text{ and}$$

$$n > f_0(k, \ell), \quad \ell | n, \quad \frac{k}{\ell} - 1 \mid \frac{n}{\ell} - 1, \quad \frac{k}{\ell} \left( \frac{k}{\ell} - 1 \right) \mid \frac{n}{\ell} \left( \frac{n}{\ell} - 1 \right);$$

$$m(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq n \quad \text{if } \ell \nmid k, \tag{14}$$

$m(n, 0, \ell, k) = n$  ~~for~~  $v \mid n$  where  $v$  is an integer, such that <sup>and</sup> there exists a  $(v, k, \ell)$ -design.

In fact, equality (12) is trivial, because  $m(n,0,\ell, 2) = m(n,0,1,2) \leq |\{A_i: |A_i| = 2\}| = \binom{n}{2}$ . It is easy to see that  $M(n^*,0,1,k^*)$  is a *pairwise balanced design* PBD $[k^*, n^*]$ . R.M. Wilson proved in [9] that a PBD  $[k^*,n^*]$  exists if  $n^* > f_0(k^*)$ ,  $k^*|n^*$ ,  $k^*(k^*-1) | n^*(n^*-1)$ . In this case, we have  $m(n^*, 0, 1, k^*) = \frac{n^*(n^*-1)}{k^*(k^*-1)}$ . Now we take a  $\ell$ -multiple of PBD  $[k^*, n^*]$  and put  $n = \ell n^*$ ,  $k = \ell k^*$ . We obtain

$$m(n,0,\ell,k) \geq m(n^*,0,1,k^*) = \frac{\frac{n}{\ell}(\frac{n}{\ell} - 1)}{\frac{k}{\ell}(\frac{k}{\ell} - 1)} = \frac{n(n-\ell)}{k(k-\ell)}$$

for  $n^* = \frac{n}{\ell} > f_0(k^*)$ , i.e.  $n > \ell f_0(k/\ell)$ . If also  $n > \ell + r(k,\ell)(k-\ell)$  holds then we have equality in (13). We obtain second inequality (14) by taking  $n/v$   $(v,k,\ell)$ -designs  $\alpha_j = \{A_{ij}\}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n/v$ , such that

$$\left( \bigcup_{A_{ij_1} \in \alpha_{j_1}} A_{ij_1} \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{A_{ij_2} \in \alpha_{j_2}} A_{ij_2} \right) = \emptyset \text{ for } 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n/v ;$$

It is evident that  $m(n,0,\ell,k) \geq |\alpha_1| n/v = n$ . Now we will prove <sup>the</sup> upper bounds (12), (13), (14). Let any  $M(n,0,\ell,k) = \alpha = \{A_i\}$  be given. We have

$$|\alpha|k \leq n m(n,\ell,\ell,k) \text{ and so } |\alpha| \leq \left\lceil \frac{m(n,\ell,\ell,k)n}{k} \right\rceil . \tag{15}$$

Now inequality (12) follows from (15) and (6) of Theorem 1; inequality (13) follows from (15) and (8) of Theorem 2.

To prove (14), assume that there exists  $M(n,0,\ell,k) = \{A_1 A_2, \dots, A_b\}$ ,  $b > n$ . Let  $\bigcup_{i=1}^b A_i = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ .



Define  $n \times b$  incidence matrix  $N$  as follows:

$$N = (n_{ij}) \text{ where } b_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_i \in A_j \\ 0 & \text{if } x_i \notin A_j \end{cases} .$$

Clearly,  $N^T N = (b_{ij})$ , where

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } |A_i \cap A_j| = 0 \\ \ell & \text{if } |A_i \cap A_j| = \ell \end{cases} .$$

Since  $N$  is  $n \times b$  matrix and  $b > n$ ,  $N^T N$  is singular. Hence there exists a rational vector  $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_b)^T$  such that

$$N^T N (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_b)^T = 0 . \tag{16}$$

Now by choosing  $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_b)$  suitably we can assume that  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_b$  are integers and if  $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_r}$  are the nonzero integers among these, then

$$\text{g.c.d. } (y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_r}) = 1 .$$

Now from (16) we have  $ky_i + \ell(\sum y_j) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$  (17)

where terms in the sum  $\sum y_j$  are those for which  $b_{ij} = \ell$ .

Hence from (17),  $\ell | ky_i$  for each  $i$ , in particular,

$\ell | k y_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . Since  $\text{g.c.d. } (y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_r}) = 1$  we have a contradiction and so  $\ell | k$ .

Theorem 5. Let  $0 < \ell < k < n$ . Then

$$m'(n, 0, \ell, k) = \binom{n}{2} + n + 1 \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \quad (18)$$

$$m'(n, 0, \ell, k) = 9 < \binom{n}{2} + n + 1 \quad \text{for } n = 4, k = 3, \ell = 2,$$

and  $m'(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n(n+1)}{\ell+1} \right\rfloor + n + 1 < \binom{n}{2} + n + 1$  otherwise;

$$m'(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n(n-\ell+1)}{\ell+1} \right\rfloor + n + 1 \quad \text{for } n > \ell + r(k, \ell) - 1. \quad (19)$$

In fact, the proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4. But instead of (15) we have  $|\alpha| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{nm'(n, \ell, \ell, k)}{\ell+1} \right\rfloor + n + 1$  for (15')  
 $M'(n, 0, \ell, k) = \alpha = \{A_i\}$  because denoting  $\alpha^* = \{A_i \in \alpha : |A_i| \geq \ell + 1\}$ , we obtain

$$|\alpha^*| (\ell+1) \leq nm'(n, \ell, \ell, k),$$

$$|\alpha^*| \geq |\alpha| - m'(n, 0, 0, \ell).$$

Now we return to the general case.

Theorem 6. Let  $0 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < k \leq n$ . Then

$$m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n-\ell_1}{2} \text{ for } n \leq k + \sqrt{k^2 + 2s(k, \ell)} , \quad (20)$$

$$m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n-\ell_1}{2} + (n-\ell_1) + 1 \text{ for } n \leq (\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1) + \sqrt{(\ell_2^2 - \ell_2 + 1)^2 2s'(k, \ell)} \quad (20')$$

$$m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \left[ \frac{\binom{n-\ell_1}{k-\ell_1}}{\binom{n-\ell_2}{k-\ell_2}} \right] \text{ for } n \geq n_0(k, \ell) , \quad (21)$$

$$m'(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \left[ \frac{\binom{n-\ell_1}{\ell_2 - \ell_1 + 1}}{\binom{n-\ell_2}{\ell_2 - \ell_1 + 1}} \right] + (n-\ell_1) + 1 \text{ for } n \geq n_0(k, \ell) ; \quad (21')$$

$$m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq n \text{ for } \ell_2 - \ell_1 \mid k - \ell_1, \quad n \geq n_0(k, \ell) . \quad (22)$$

In fact, (20), (21), (22) follow from Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, applied to the case  $m(n-\ell_1, \ell_1-\ell_1, \ell_2-\ell_1, k-\ell_1)$ . Similarly, we obtain (20'), (21').

This paper was initiated by the following problem of R.Lemmon communicated to P.Erdos by A.Stone:

Estimate  $f(m, \ell, k) = \min \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m A_i \right|$  if there exists a family  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m$  such that  $|A_i| = k (1 \leq i \leq m)$ ,  $|A_i \cap A_j| = \ell (1 \leq i < j \leq m)$ . A.Stone and R.Lemmon considered  $f(m, \ell, k)$  for small  $n$ ; it is easy to show that  $f(m, \ell, k) \geq mk - \ell \binom{m}{2}$  with equality for  $m = k/\ell + 1$ , if  $\ell \mid k$ .

The following problems are still open:

1) Does  $m(n, \ell_1, \ell_2, k) \leq \binom{n}{2}$  hold for  $\ell_1 > 0$  and all  $n$  (not only for the case  $n \geq n_0(k)$  as in Theorem 6) ? This is a conjecture of Erdos and Lovasz ;

2) Does a maximal system  $\alpha = \{A_i\}$  of subsets of an  $n$ -set such that

$$|A_i| = k \quad (\forall A_i \in \alpha), \quad (A_i \cap A_j) = \emptyset, \quad \ell_2, \ell_3 \quad (\forall A_i, A_j \in \alpha, \quad i \neq j)$$

contain at most  $\binom{n}{3}$  sets? Also, it would be interesting to find analog of equality (13) for this case.

3) Find an analog of (14) for  $m'(n, 0, \ell, k)$  ; we proved only  $m'(n, 0, \ell, k) \leq n$  for  $\ell > k/2$  .

## REFERENCES

- [1.] M.Deza, Une propriété extrémale des plans projectifs finis dans une classe de codes équidistants, *Discrete Math.* 6 (1973) 343-352.
- [2.] M.Deza, Solution d'un problème de Erdos-Lovasz, *J.Comb. Theory B.* Vol. 16-2 (1974).
- [3.] M.Deza, Matrices dont deux lignes quelconques coïncident dans un nombre donné de positions communes (to appear in *J.Comb.Theory*).
- [4.] M.Deza, P.Erdos, On intersection proprieties of the systems of finite sets (to appear in *Aequationes Math.*)
- [5.] P.Erdos and R.Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of sets, *Journ. London Math.Soc.* 35 (1960) 85-90.
- [6.] P.Erdos, Chao Ko and R.Rado, Intersections theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J.Math. Oxford (2)*, 12(1961) 313-320.
- [7.] R.C.Mullin, An asymptotic property of  $(\tau, \lambda)$ -systems, *Utilitas Math.* Vol.3 (1973) 139-152.
- [8.] M.J.Ryser, An extension of a theorem of de Bruijn and Erdos on combinatorial designs, *J.Comb. Theory A.* Vol. 10-2 (1968) 246-259.
- [9.] R.M. Wilson, An existence theorem for pairwise balanced designs II, *J.Comb. Theory A.* Vol. 13 (1972) 246-273.