

# Generating all subsets of a finite set with disjoint unions

David Ellis\*, Benny Sudakov†

May 2011

## Abstract

If  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, we call a family  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  a  $k$ -generator for  $X$  if every  $x \subset X$  can be expressed as a union of at most  $k$  disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Frein, Lévêque and Sebő [10] conjectured that for  $n > 2k$ , the smallest  $k$ -generators for  $X$  are obtained by taking a partition of  $X$  into classes of sizes as equal as possible, and taking the union of the power-sets of the classes. We prove this conjecture for all sufficiently large  $n$  when  $k = 2$ , and for  $n$  a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$  when  $k \geq 3$ .

*Keywords:* generator, disjoint unions.

*2000 MSC:* 05Dxx.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $X$  be an  $n$ -element set, and let  $\mathcal{P}X$  denote the set of all subsets of  $X$ . We call a family  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  a  $k$ -generator for  $X$  if every  $x \subset X$  can be expressed as a union of at most  $k$  disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . For example, let  $(V_i)_{i=1}^k$  be a partition of  $X$  into  $k$  classes of sizes as equal as possible; then

$$\mathcal{F}_{n,k} := \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}(V_i) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$$

---

\*St John's College, Cambridge, CB2 1TP, UK.

†Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. Research supported in part by NSF CAREER award DMS-0812005 and by a USA-Israeli BSF grant.

is a  $k$ -generator for  $X$ . We call a  $k$ -generator of this form *canonical*. If  $n = qk + r$ , where  $0 \leq r < k$ , then

$$|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}| = (k - r)(2^q - 1) + r(2^{q+1} - 1) = (k + r)2^q - k.$$

Frein, Lévêque and Sebő [10] conjectured that for any  $k \leq n$ , this is the smallest possible size of a  $k$ -generator for  $X$ .

**Conjecture 1** (Frein, Lévêque, Sebő). *If  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set,  $k \leq n$ , and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a  $k$ -generator for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ . If  $n > 2k$ , equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a canonical  $k$ -generator for  $X$ .*

They proved this for  $k \leq n \leq 3k$ , but their methods do not seem to work for larger  $n$ .

For  $k = 2$ , Conjecture 1 is a weakening of a conjecture of Erdős. We call a family  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  a  $k$ -base for  $X$  if every  $x \subset X$  can be expressed as a union of at most  $k$  (not necessarily disjoint) sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Erdős (see [11]) made the following

**Conjecture 2** (Erdős). *If  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a 2-base for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,2}|$ .*

In fact, Frein, Lévêque and Sebő [10] made the analogous conjecture for all  $k$ .

**Conjecture 3** (Frein, Lévêque, Sebő). *If  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set,  $k \leq n$ , and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a  $k$ -base for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ . If  $n > 2k$ , equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a canonical  $k$ -generator for  $X$ .*

Again, they were able to prove this for  $k \leq n \leq 3k$ .

In this paper, we study  $k$ -generators when  $n$  is large compared to  $k$ . Our main results are as follows.

**Theorem 4.** *If  $n$  is sufficiently large,  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a 2-generator for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,2}|$ . Equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{F}_{n,2}$ .*

**Theorem 5.** *If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n$  is a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$ ,  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $k$ -generator for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ . Equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ .*

In other words, we prove Conjecture 1 for all sufficiently large  $n$  when  $k = 2$ , and for  $n$  a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$  when  $k \geq 3$ . We use some ideas of Alon and Frankl [1], and also techniques of the first author from [5], in which asymptotic results were obtained.

As noted in [10], if  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a  $k$ -generator (or even a  $k$ -base) for  $X$ , then the number of ways of choosing at most  $k$  sets from  $\mathcal{G}$  is clearly at least the number of subsets of  $X$ . Therefore  $|\mathcal{G}|^k \geq 2^n$ , which immediately gives

$$|\mathcal{G}| \geq 2^{n/k}.$$

Moreover, if  $|\mathcal{G}| = m$ , then

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{m}{i} \geq 2^n. \quad (1)$$

Crudely, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{m}{i} \leq 2m^{k-1},$$

so

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{m}{i} \leq \binom{m}{k} + 2m^{k-1}.$$

Hence, if  $k$  is fixed, then

$$(1 + O(1/m)) \binom{m}{k} \geq 2^n,$$

so

$$|\mathcal{G}| \geq (k!)^{1/k} 2^{n/k} (1 - o(1)). \quad (2)$$

Observe that if  $n = qk + r$ , where  $0 \leq r < k$ , then

$$|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}| = (k+r)2^q - k < (k+r)2^q = k2^{n/k} (1 + r/k) 2^{-r/k} < c_0 k 2^{n/k}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$c_0 := \frac{2}{2^{1/\log 2} \log 2} = 1.061 \text{ (to 3 d.p.)}.$$

Now for some preliminaries. We use the following standard notation. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[n]$  will denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  are disjoint sets, we will sometimes write their union as  $x \sqcup y$ , rather than  $x \cup y$ , to emphasize the fact that the sets are disjoint.

If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $G$  is a graph,  $K_k(G)$  will denote the number of  $k$ -cliques in  $G$ . Let  $T_s(n)$  denote the  $s$ -partite Turán graph (the complete  $s$ -partite graph on  $n$  vertices with parts of sizes as equal as possible), and let  $t_s(n) = e(T_s(n))$ . For  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $C_l$  will denote the cycle of length  $l$ .

If  $F$  is a (labelled) graph on  $f$  vertices, with vertex-set  $\{v_1, \dots, v_f\}$  say, and  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_f) \in \mathbb{N}^f$ , we define the  $\mathbf{t}$ -blow-up of  $F$ ,  $F \otimes \mathbf{t}$ , to be the

graph obtained by replacing  $v_i$  with an independent set  $V_i$  of size  $t_i$ , and joining each vertex of  $V_i$  to each vertex of  $V_j$  whenever  $v_i v_j$  is an edge of  $F$ . With slight abuse of notation, we will write  $F \otimes t$  for the symmetric blow-up  $F \otimes (t, \dots, t)$ .

If  $F$  and  $G$  are graphs, we write  $c_F(G)$  for the number of injective graph homomorphisms from  $F$  to  $G$ , meaning injections from  $V(F)$  to  $V(G)$  which take edges of  $F$  to edges of  $G$ . The *density of  $F$  in  $G$*  is defined to be

$$d_F(G) = \frac{c_F(G)}{|G|(|G| - 1) \cdots (|G| - |F| + 1)},$$

i.e. the probability that a uniform random injective map from  $V(F)$  to  $V(G)$  is a graph homomorphism from  $F$  to  $G$ . Hence, when  $F = K_k$ , the density of  $K_k$ 's in an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  is simply  $K_k(G)/\binom{n}{k}$ .

Although we will be interested in the density  $d_F(G)$ , it will sometimes be more convenient to work with the following closely related quantity, which behaves very nicely when we take blow-ups. We write  $\text{Hom}_F(G)$  for the number of homomorphisms from  $F$  to  $G$ , and we define the *homomorphism density of  $F$  in  $G$*  to be

$$h_F(G) = \frac{\text{Hom}_F(G)}{|G|^{|F|}},$$

i.e. the probability that a uniform random map from  $V(F)$  to  $V(G)$  is a graph homomorphism from  $F$  to  $G$ .

Observe that if  $F$  is a graph on  $f$  vertices, and  $G$  is a graph on  $n$  vertices, then the number of homomorphisms from  $F$  to  $G$  which are not injections is clearly at most

$$\binom{f}{2} n^{f-1}.$$

Hence,

$$d_G(F) \geq \frac{h_G(F)n^f - \binom{f}{2}n^{f-1}}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-f+1)} \geq h_G(F) - O(1/n), \quad (4)$$

if  $f$  is fixed. In the other direction,

$$d_F(G) \leq \frac{n^f}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-f+1)} h_F(G) \leq (1 + O(1/n)) h_F(G) \quad (5)$$

if  $f$  is fixed. Hence, when working inside large graphs, we can pass freely between the density of a fixed graph  $F$  and its homomorphism density, with an 'error' of only  $O(1/n)$ .

Finally, we will make frequent use of the AM/GM inequality:

**Theorem 6.** *If  $x_1, \dots, x_n \geq 0$ , then*

$$\left( \prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^{1/n} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

## 2 The case $k \mid n$ via extremal graph theory.

For  $n$  a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$ , it turns out to be possible to prove Conjecture 1 using stability versions of Turán-type results. We will prove the following

**Theorem 5.** *If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n$  is a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$ ,  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $k$ -generator for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ . Equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ .*

We need a few more definitions. Let  $H$  denote the graph with vertex-set  $\mathcal{P}X$ , where we join two subsets  $x, y \subset X$  if they are disjoint. With slight abuse of terminology, we call  $H$  the ‘Kneser’ graph on  $\mathcal{P}X$  (although this usually means the analogous graph on  $X^{(r)}$ ). If  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$ , we say that  $\mathcal{G}$   $k$ -generates  $\mathcal{F}$  if every set in  $\mathcal{F}$  is a disjoint union of at most  $k$  sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**The main steps of the proof:** First, we will show that for any  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq \Omega(2^{n/k})$ , the density of  $K_{k+1}$ ’s in the induced subgraph  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ .

Secondly, we will observe that if  $n$  is a sufficiently large multiple of  $k$ , and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  has size close to  $|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$  and  $k$ -generates almost all subsets of  $X$ , then  $K_k(H[\mathcal{G}])$  is very close to  $K_k(T_k(|\mathcal{G}|))$ , the number of  $K_k$ ’s in the  $k$ -partite Turán graph on  $|\mathcal{G}|$  vertices.

We will then prove that if  $G$  is any graph with small  $K_{k+1}$ -density, and with  $K_k(G)$  close to  $K_k(T_k(|G|))$ , then  $G$  can be made  $k$ -partite by removing a small number of edges. This can be seen as a (strengthened) variant of the Simonovits Stability Theorem [9], which states that any  $K_{k+1}$ -free graph  $G$  with  $e(G)$  close to the maximum  $e(T_k(|G|))$ , can be made  $k$ -partite by removing a small number of edges.

This will enable us to conclude that  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  can be made  $k$ -partite by the removal of a small number of edges, and therefore the structure of  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  is close to that of the Turán graph  $T_k(|\mathcal{G}|)$ . This in turn will enable us to show that the structure of  $\mathcal{G}$  is close to that of a canonical  $k$ -generator  $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$  (Proposition 9).

Finally, we will use a perturbation argument to show that if  $n$  is sufficiently large, and  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ , then  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ , completing the proof.

In fact, we will first show that if  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq \Omega(2^{n/k})$ , then the homomorphism density of  $K_{k+1} \otimes t$  in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ , provided  $t$  is sufficiently large depending on  $k$ . Hence, we will need the following (relatively well-known) lemma relating the homomorphism density of a graph to that of its blow-up.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $F$  be a graph on  $f$  vertices, let  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_f) \in \mathbb{N}^f$ , and let  $F \otimes \mathbf{t}$  denote the  $\mathbf{t}$ -blow-up of  $F$ . If the homomorphism density of  $F$  in  $G$  is  $p$ , then the homomorphism density of  $F \otimes \mathbf{t}$  in  $G$  is at least  $p^{t_1 t_2 \dots t_f}$ .*

*Proof.* This is a simple convexity argument, essentially that of [9]. It will suffice to prove the statement of the lemma when  $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, r)$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . We think of  $F$  as a (labelled) graph on vertex set  $[f] = \{1, 2, \dots, f\}$ , and  $G$  as a (labelled) graph on vertex set  $[n]$ . Define the function  $\chi : [n]^f \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by

$$\chi(v_1, \dots, v_f) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \mapsto v_i \text{ is a homomorphism from } F \text{ to } G, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$h_F(G) = \frac{1}{n^f} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_f) \in [n]^f} \chi(v_1, \dots, v_f) = p.$$

The homomorphism density  $h_{F \otimes (1, \dots, 1, r)}(G)$  of  $F \otimes (1, \dots, 1, r)$  in  $G$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{F \otimes (1, \dots, 1, r)}(G) &= \frac{1}{n^{f-1+r}} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f^{(1)}, v_f^{(2)}, \dots, v_f^{(r)}) \in [n]^{f-1+r}} \prod_{i=1}^r \chi(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f^{(i)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{f-1}} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}) \in [n]^{f-1}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v_f \in [n]} \chi(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f) \right)^r \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{n^{f-1}} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}) \in [n]^{f-1}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v_f \in [n]} \chi(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f) \right) \right)^r \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{n^f} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f) \in [n]^f} \chi(v_1, \dots, v_{f-1}, v_f) \right)^r \\ &= p^r. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the inequality follows from applying Jensen's Inequality to the convex function  $x \mapsto x^r$ . This proves the lemma for  $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, r)$ . By

symmetry, the statement of the lemma holds for all vectors of the form  $(1, \dots, 1, r, 1, \dots, 1)$ . Clearly, we may obtain  $F \otimes \mathbf{t}$  from  $F$  by a sequence of blow-ups by these vectors, proving the lemma.  $\square$

The following lemma (a rephrasing of Lemma 4.2 in Alon and Frankl [1]) gives an upper bound on the homomorphism density of  $K_{k+1} \otimes t$  in large induced subgraphs of the Kneser graph  $H$ .

**Lemma 8.** *If  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| = m = 2^{(\delta+1/(k+1))n}$ , then*

$$h_{K_{k+1} \otimes t}(H[\mathcal{A}]) \leq (k+1)2^{-n(\delta t-1)}.$$

*Proof.* We follow the proof of Alon and Frankl cited above. Choose  $(k+1)t$  members of  $\mathcal{A}$  uniformly at random with replacement,  $(A_i^{(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq k+1, 1 \leq j \leq t}$ . The homomorphism density of  $K_{k+1} \otimes t$  in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is precisely the probability that the unions

$$U_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^t A_i^{(j)}$$

are pairwise disjoint. If this event occurs, then  $|U_i| \leq n/(k+1)$  for some  $i$ . For each  $i \in [k]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|U_i| \leq n/(k+1)\} &= \Pr\left(\bigcup_{S \subset X: |S| \leq n/(k+1)} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^t \{A_i^{(j)} \subset S\}\right)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{|S| \leq n/(k+1)} \Pr\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^t \{A_i^{(j)} \subset S\}\right) \\ &= \sum_{|S| \leq n/(k+1)} (2^{|S|}/m)^t \\ &\leq 2^n (2^{n/(k+1)}/m)^t \\ &= 2^{-n(\delta t-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k \{|U_i| \leq n/(k+1)\}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \Pr\{|U_i| \leq n/(k+1)\} \leq (k+1)2^{-n(\delta t-1)}.$$

Therefore,

$$h_{K_{k+1} \otimes t}(H[\mathcal{A}]) \leq (k+1)2^{-n(\delta t-1)},$$

as required.  $\square$

From the trivial bound above, any  $k$ -generator  $\mathcal{G}$  has  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq 2^{n/k}$ , so  $\delta \geq 1/(k(k+1))$ , and therefore, choosing  $t = t_k := 2k(k+1)$ , we see that

$$h_{K_{k+1} \otimes t_k}(H[\mathcal{G}]) \leq (k+1)2^{-n}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 7,

$$h_{K_{k+1}}(H[\mathcal{G}]) \leq O_k(2^{-n/t_k}).$$

Therefore, by (5),

$$d_{K_{k+1}}(H[\mathcal{G}]) \leq O_k(2^{-n/t_k}) \leq 2^{-a_k n} \quad (6)$$

provided  $n$  is sufficiently large depending on  $k$ , where  $a_k > 0$  depends only on  $k$ .

Assume now that  $n$  is a multiple of  $k$ , so that  $|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}| = k2^{n/k} - k$ . We will prove the following ‘stability’ result.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. If  $n$  is a multiple of  $k$ , and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  has  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq (1+\eta)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$  and  $k$ -generates at least  $(1-\epsilon)2^n$  subsets of  $X$ , then there exists an equipartition  $(S_i)_{i=1}^k$  of  $X$  such that*

$$|\mathcal{G} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}S_i)| \geq (1 - C_k \epsilon^{1/k} - D_k \eta^{1/k} - 2^{-\xi_k n})|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|,$$

where  $C_k, D_k, \xi_k > 0$  depend only on  $k$ .

We first collect some results used in the proof. We will need the following theorem of Erdős [7].

**Theorem 10** (Erdős). *If  $r \leq k$ , and  $G$  is a  $K_{k+1}$ -free graph on  $n$  vertices, then*

$$K_r(G) \leq K_r(T_k(n)).$$

We will also need the following well-known lemma, which states that a dense  $k$ -partite graph has an induced subgraph with high minimum degree.

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex,  $k$ -partite graph with*

$$e(G) \geq (1 - 1/k - \delta)n^2/2.$$

*Then there exists an induced subgraph  $G' \subset G$  with  $|G'| = n' \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta})n$  and minimum degree  $\delta(G') \geq (1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(n' - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* We perform the following algorithm to produce  $G'$ . Let  $G_1 = G$ . Suppose that at stage  $i$ , we have a graph  $G_i$  on  $n - i + 1$  vertices. If there is a vertex  $v$  of  $G_i$  with  $d(v) < (1 - 1/k - \eta)(n - i)$ , let  $G_{i+1} = G_i - v$ ; otherwise, stop and set  $G' = G_i$ . Suppose the process terminates after  $j = \alpha n$  steps. Then we have removed at most

$$(1 - 1/k - \eta) \sum_{i=1}^j (n - i) = (1 - 1/k - \eta) \left( \binom{n}{2} - \binom{n-j}{2} \right)$$

edges, and the remaining graph has at most

$$\binom{k}{2} \left( \frac{n-j}{k} \right)^2 = (1 - \alpha)^2 (1 - 1/k) n^2 / 2$$

edges. But our original graph had at least

$$(1 - 1/k - \delta) n^2 / 2$$

edges, and therefore

$$(1 - 1/k - \eta)(1 - (1 - \alpha)^2) n^2 / 2 + (1 - \alpha)^2 (1 - 1/k) n^2 / 2 \geq (1 - 1/k - \delta) n^2 / 2,$$

so

$$\eta(1 - \alpha)^2 \geq \eta - \delta.$$

Choosing  $\eta = \sqrt{\delta}$ , we obtain

$$\eta(1 - \alpha)^2 \geq \eta(1 - \eta),$$

and therefore

$$(1 - \alpha)^2 \geq 1 - \eta,$$

so

$$\alpha \leq 1 - (1 - \eta)^{1/2} \leq \eta.$$

Hence, our induced subgraph  $G'$  has order

$$|G'| = n' \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta})n,$$

and minimum degree

$$\delta(G') \geq (1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(n' - 1).$$

□

We will also need Shearer's Entropy Lemma.

**Lemma 12** (Shearer’s Entropy Lemma, [4]). *Let  $S$  be a finite set, and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an  $r$ -cover of  $S$ , meaning a collection of subsets of  $S$  such that every element of  $S$  is contained in at least  $r$  sets in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a collection of subsets of  $S$ . For  $A \subset S$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_A = \{F \cap A : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$  denote the projection of  $\mathcal{F}$  onto the set  $A$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}|^r \leq \prod_{A \in \mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{F}_A|.$$

In addition, we require two ‘stability’ versions of Turán-type results in extremal graph theory. The first states that a graph with a very small  $K_{k+1}$ -density cannot have  $K_r$ -density much higher than the  $k$ -partite Turán graph on the same number of vertices, for any  $r \leq k$ .

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $r \leq k$  be integers. Then there exist  $C, D > 0$  such that for any  $\alpha \geq 0$ , any  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  with  $K_{k+1}$ -density at most  $\alpha$  has  $K_r$ -density at most*

$$\frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} (1 + C\alpha^{1/(k+2)} + D/n).$$

*Proof.* We use a straightforward sampling argument. Let  $G$  be as in the statement of the lemma. Let  $\zeta \binom{n}{l}$  be the number of  $l$ -subsets  $U \subset V(G)$  such that  $G[U]$  contains a copy of  $K_{k+1}$ , so that  $\zeta$  is simply the probability that a uniform random  $l$ -subset of  $V(G)$  contains a  $K_{k+1}$ . Simple counting (or the union bound) gives

$$\zeta \leq \binom{l}{k+1} \alpha.$$

By Theorem 10, each  $K_{k+1}$ -free  $G[U]$  contains at most

$$\binom{k}{r} \left(\frac{l}{k}\right)^r$$

$K_r$ ’s. Therefore, the density of  $K_r$ ’s in each such  $G[U]$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d_{K_r}(G[U]) &\leq \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} \frac{l^r}{l(l-1) \cdots (l-r+1)} \\ &\leq \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} (1 + O(1/l)). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Note that one can choose a random  $r$ -set in graph  $G$  by first choosing a random  $l$ -set  $U$ , and then choosing a random  $r$ -subset of  $U$ . The density of

$K_r$ 's in  $G$  is simply the probability that a uniform random  $r$ -subset of  $V(G)$  induces a  $K_r$ , and therefore

$$d_{K_r}(G) = \mathbb{E}_U[d_{K_k}(G[U])],$$

where the expectation is taken over a uniform random choice of  $U$ . If  $U$  is  $K_{k+1}$ -free, which happens with probability  $1 - \zeta$ , we use the upper bound (7); if  $U$  contains a  $K_{k+1}$ , which happens with probability  $\zeta$ , we use the trivial bound  $d_{K_k}(G[U]) \leq 1$ . We see that the density of  $K_r$ 's in  $G$  satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{K_r}(G) &\leq (1 - \zeta) \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} (1 + O(1/l)) + \zeta \\ &\leq \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} + O(1/l) + \binom{l}{k+1} \alpha \\ &\leq \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-r+1)}{k^r} + O(1/l) + l^{k+1} \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $l = \min\{\lfloor \alpha^{-1/(k+2)} \rfloor, n\}$  proves the lemma.  $\square$

The second result states that an  $n$ -vertex graph with a small  $K_{k+1}$ -density, a  $K_k$ -density not too much less than that of  $T_k(n)$ , and a  $K_{k-1}$ -density not too much more than that of  $T_k(n)$ , can be made into a  $k$ -partite graph by the removal of only a small number of edges.

**Theorem 14.** *Let  $G$  be an  $n$ -vertex graph with  $K_{k+1}$ -density at most  $\alpha$ ,  $K_{k-1}$ -density at most*

$$(1 + \beta) \frac{k!}{k^{k-1}},$$

*and  $K_k$ -density at least*

$$(1 - \gamma) \frac{k!}{k^k},$$

*where  $\gamma \leq 1/2$ . Then  $G$  can be made into a  $k$ -partite graph  $G_0$  by removing at most*

$$\left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{n}{2}$$

*edges, which removes at most*

$$\left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{k}{2} \binom{n}{k}$$

$K_k$ 's.

*Proof.* If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $G$  is a graph, let

$$\mathcal{K}_k(G) = \{S \in V(G)^{(k)} : G[S] \text{ is a clique}\}$$

denote the set of all  $k$ -sets that induce a clique in  $G$ . If  $S \subset V(G)$ , let  $N(S)$  denote the set of vertices of  $G$  joined to all vertices in  $S$ , i.e. the intersection of the neighbourhoods of the vertices in  $S$ , and let  $d(S) = |N(S)|$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$ , let

$$f_G(S) = \sum_{T \subset S, |T|=k-1} d(T).$$

We begin by sketching the proof. The fact that the ratio between the  $K_k$ -density of  $G$  and the  $K_{k-1}$ -density of  $G$  is very close to  $1/k$  will imply that the average  $\mathbb{E}f_G(S)$  over all sets  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$  is not too far below  $n$ . The fact that the  $K_{k+1}$ -density of  $G$  is small will mean that for most sets  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$ , every  $(k-1)$ -subset  $T \subset S$  has  $N(T)$  spanning few edges of  $G$ , and any two distinct  $(k-1)$ -subsets  $T, T' \subset S$  have  $|N(T) \cap N(T')|$  small. Hence, if we pick such a set  $S$  which has  $f_G(S)$  not too far below the average, the sets  $\{N(T) : T \subset S, |T| = k-1\}$  will be almost pairwise disjoint, will cover most of the vertices of  $G$ , and will each span few edges of  $G$ . Small alterations will produce a  $k$ -partition of  $V(G)$  with few edges of  $G$  within each class, proving the theorem.

We now proceed with the proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}f_G &= \frac{\sum_{S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)} \sum_{T \subset S, |T|=k-1} d(T)}{K_k(G)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{T \in \mathcal{K}_{k-1}(G)} d(T)^2}{K_k(G)} \\ &\geq \frac{\left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{K}_{k-1}(G)} d(T)\right)^2}{K_{k-1}(G)K_k(G)} \\ &= \frac{(kK_k(G))^2}{K_{k-1}(G)K_k(G)} \\ &= k^2 \frac{K_k(G)}{K_{k-1}(G)} \\ &\geq k^2(1-\gamma) \frac{k!}{k^k} \frac{1}{1+\beta} \frac{k^{k-1}}{k!} \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\binom{n}{k-1}} \\ &= \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\beta} (n-k+1). \end{aligned}$$

(The first inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz, and the second from our assumptions on the  $K_k$ -density and the  $K_{k-1}$ -density of  $G$ .)

We call a set  $T \in \mathcal{K}_{k-1}(G)$  *dangerous* if it is contained in at least  $\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n-k+1}{2}$   $K_{k+1}$ 's. Let  $D$  denote the number of dangerous  $(k-1)$ -sets. Double-counting the number of times a  $(k-1)$ -set is contained in a  $K_{k+1}$ , we obtain:

$$D\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n-k+1}{2} \leq \binom{k+1}{2} \alpha \binom{n}{k+1},$$

since there are at most  $\alpha \binom{n}{k+1}$   $K_{k+1}$ 's in  $G$ . Hence,

$$D \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n}{k-1}.$$

Similarly, we call a set  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$  *treacherous* if it is contained in at least  $\sqrt{\alpha}(n-k)$   $K_{k+1}$ 's. Double-counting the number of times a  $k$ -set is contained in a  $K_{k+1}$ , we see that there are at most  $\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n}{k}$  treacherous  $k$ -sets.

Call a set  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$  *bad* if it is treacherous, or contains at least one dangerous  $(k-1)$ -set; otherwise, call  $S$  *good*. Then the number of bad  $k$ -sets is at most

$$\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n}{k} + (n-k+1)\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n}{k-1} = (k+1)\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n}{k},$$

so the fraction of sets in  $\mathcal{K}_k(G)$  which are bad is at most

$$\frac{(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)\frac{k!}{k^k}} = \frac{k^k(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)k!}.$$

Suppose that

$$\max\{|f_G(S)| : S \text{ is good}\} < (1-\psi)(n-k+1).$$

Observe that for any  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$ , we have

$$f_G(S) \leq k(n-k+1),$$

since  $d(T) \leq n-k+1$  for each  $T \in S^{(k-1)}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}f_G &< \left( \left(1 - \frac{k^k(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)k!}\right) (1-\psi) + \frac{k^k(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)k!} k \right) (n-k+1) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \psi + \frac{k^{k+1}(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)k!}\right) (n-k+1), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction if

$$\psi = \psi_0 := 1 - \frac{1-\gamma}{1+\beta} + \frac{k^{k+1}(k+1)\sqrt{\alpha}}{(1-\gamma)k!} \leq \gamma + \beta + \frac{2k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha}.$$

Let  $S \in \mathcal{K}_k(G)$  be a good  $k$ -set such that  $f_G(S) \geq (1 - \psi_0)(n - k + 1)$ . Write  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ , let  $T_i = S \setminus \{v_i\}$  for each  $i$ , and let  $N_i = N(T_i)$  for each  $i$ . Observe that  $N_i \cap N_j = N(S)$  for each  $i \neq j$ , and  $|N(S)| = d(S) \leq \sqrt{\alpha}(n - k)$ . Let  $W_i = N_i \setminus N(S)$  for each  $i$ ; observe that the  $W_i$ 's are pairwise disjoint. Let

$$R = V(G) \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k W_i$$

be the set of 'leftover' vertices.

Observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |N_i \setminus N(S)| = f_G(S) - kN(S) \geq (1 - \psi)(n - k + 1) - k\sqrt{\alpha}(n - k),$$

and therefore the number of leftover vertices satisfies

$$|R| < (\psi + k\sqrt{\alpha})n + k.$$

We now produce a  $k$ -partition  $(V_i)_{i=1}^k$  of  $V(G)$  by extending the partition  $(W_i)_{i=1}^k$  of  $V(G) \setminus R$  arbitrarily to  $R$ , i.e., we partition the leftover vertices arbitrarily. Now delete all edges of  $G$  within  $V_i$  for each  $i$ . The number of edges within  $N_i$  is precisely the number of  $K_{k+1}$ 's containing  $T_i$ , which is at most  $\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n-k+1}{2}$ . The number of edges incident with  $R$  is trivially at most  $(\psi + k\sqrt{\alpha})n(n-1) + k(n-1)$ . Hence, the number of edges deleted was at most

$$\begin{aligned} & (\psi + k\sqrt{\alpha})n(n-1) + k(n-1) + k\sqrt{\alpha} \binom{n-k+1}{2} \\ & \leq \left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{n}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Removing an edge removes at most  $\binom{n-2}{k-2}$   $K_k$ 's, and therefore the total number of  $K_k$ 's removed is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{n}{2} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \\ & = \left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{k}{2} \binom{n}{k}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

Note that the two results above together imply the following

**Corollary 15.** For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist constants  $A_k, B_k > 0$  such that the following holds. For any  $\alpha \geq 0$ , if  $G$  is an  $n$ -vertex graph with  $K_{k+1}$ -density at most  $\alpha$ , and  $K_k$ -density at least

$$(1 - \gamma) \frac{k!}{k^k},$$

where  $\gamma \leq 1/2$ , then  $G$  can be made into a  $k$ -partite graph  $G_0$  by removing at most

$$(2\gamma + A_k \alpha^{1/(k+2)} + B_k/n) \binom{n}{2}$$

edges, which removes at most

$$(2\gamma + A_k \alpha^{1/(k+2)} + B_k/n) \binom{k}{2} \binom{n}{k}$$

$K_k$ 's.

*Proof of Proposition 9.* Suppose  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  has  $|\mathcal{G}| = m \leq (1 + \eta)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ , and  $k$ -generates at least  $(1 - \epsilon)2^n$  subsets of  $X$ . Our aim is to show that  $\mathcal{G}$  is close to a canonical  $k$ -generator. We may assume that  $\epsilon \leq 1/C_k^k$  and  $\eta \leq 1/D_k^k$ , so by choosing  $C_k$  and  $D_k$  appropriately large, we may assume throughout that  $\epsilon$  and  $\eta$  are small. By choosing  $\xi_k$  appropriately small, we may assume that  $n \geq n_0(k)$ , where  $n_0(k)$  is any function of  $k$ .

We first apply Lemma 13 and Theorem 14 with  $G = H[\mathcal{G}]$ , where  $H$  is the Kneser graph on  $\mathcal{P}X$ ,  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{G}| = m \leq (1 + \eta)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$   $k$ -generates at least  $(1 - \epsilon)2^n$  subsets of  $X$ . By (6), we have

$$d_{K_{k+1}}(H[\mathcal{G}]) \leq 2^{-a_k n},$$

and therefore we may take  $\alpha = 2^{-a_k n}$ . Applying Lemma 13 with  $r = k - 1$ , we may take  $\beta = 2^{-b_k n}$  for some  $b_k > 0$ .

We have  $|\mathcal{G}| = m \leq (1 + \eta)(k2^{n/k} - k)$ , so

$$\binom{m}{k} \leq \frac{m^k}{k!} < \frac{(1 + \eta)^k k^k}{k!} 2^n.$$

Notice that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{m}{i} \leq km^{k-1} \leq k((1 + \eta)k2^{n/k})^{k-1} < (1 + \eta)^{k-1} k^k 2^{(1-1/k)n}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{G}$   $k$ -generates at least  $(1 - \epsilon)2^n$  subsets of  $X$ , we have

$$K_k(H[\mathcal{G}]) \geq (1 - \epsilon)2^n - (1 + \eta)^{k-1} k^k 2^{(1-1/k)n}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{K_k}(H[\mathcal{G}]) &= \frac{K_k(H[\mathcal{G}])}{\binom{m}{k}} \\
&\geq \frac{(1-\epsilon)2^n - (1+\eta)^{k-1}k^k 2^{(1-1/k)n}}{\binom{(1+\eta)^k 2^{n/k}}{k}} \\
&\geq \frac{1-\epsilon - (1+\eta)^{k-1}k^k 2^{-n/k}}{(1+\eta)^k} \frac{k!}{k^k} \\
&\geq (1-\epsilon - k\eta - k^k 2^{-n/k}) \frac{k!}{k^k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from

$$\frac{1-\epsilon}{(1+\eta)^k} \geq (1-\epsilon)(1-\eta)^k \geq (1-\epsilon)(1-k\eta) \geq 1-\epsilon - k\eta.$$

Therefore, the  $K_k$ -density of  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  satisfies

$$d_{K_k}(H[\mathcal{G}]) \geq (1-\gamma) \frac{k!}{k^k},$$

where

$$\gamma = \epsilon + k\eta + k^k 2^{-n/k}.$$

Let

$$\psi = \left( 2\beta + 2\gamma + \frac{8k^{k+1}(k+1)}{k!} \sqrt{\alpha} + 2k/n \right) \binom{k}{2}.$$

By Theorem 14, there exists a  $k$ -partite subgraph  $G_0$  of  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
K_k(G_0) &\geq K_k(H[\mathcal{G}]) - \psi \binom{m}{k} \\
&\geq (1-\epsilon)2^n - (1+\eta)^{k-1}k^k 2^{(1-1/k)n} - \psi \binom{m}{k} \\
&\geq \left( 1-\epsilon - \frac{(1+\eta)^k k^k}{k!} \psi - (1+\eta)^{k-1}k^k 2^{-k/n} \right) 2^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Writing

$$\phi = \epsilon + \frac{(1+\eta)^k k^k}{k!} \psi + (1+\eta)^{k-1}k^k 2^{-k/n},$$

we have

$$K_k(G_0) \geq (1-\phi)2^n.$$

Let  $V_1, \dots, V_k$  be the vertex-classes of  $G_0$ . By the AM/GM inequality,

$$K_k(G_0) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k |V_i| \leq \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k |V_i|}{k} \right)^k = (m/k)^k,$$

and therefore

$$|\mathcal{G}| = m \geq k(K_k(G_0))^{1/k} \geq k(1 - \phi)^{1/k} 2^{n/k}, \quad (8)$$

recovering the asymptotic result of [5].

Moreover, any  $k$ -partite graph  $G_0$  satisfies

$$e(G_0) \geq \binom{k}{2} (K_k(G_0))^{2/k}.$$

To see this, simply apply Shearer's Entropy Lemma with  $S = V(G_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}_k(G_0)$ , and  $\mathcal{A} = \{V_i \cup V_j : i \neq j\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $(k-1)$ -cover of  $V(G_0)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}_{V_i \cup V_j} \subset E_{G_0}(V_i, V_j)$ , and therefore

$$(K_k(G_0))^{k-1} \leq \prod_{\{i,j\} \in [k]^{(2)}} e_{G_0}(V_i, V_j).$$

Applying the AM/GM inequality gives:

$$(K_k(G_0))^{k-1} \leq \prod_{\{i,j\}} e_{G_0}(V_i, V_j) \leq \left( \frac{\sum_{\{i,j\}} e_{G_0}(V_i, V_j)}{\binom{k}{2}} \right)^{\binom{k}{2}} = \left( \frac{e(G_0)}{\binom{k}{2}} \right)^{\binom{k}{2}},$$

and therefore

$$e(G_0) \geq \binom{k}{2} (K_k(G_0))^{2/k},$$

as required.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} e(G_0) &\geq \binom{k}{2} (1 - \phi)^{2/k} 2^{2n/k} \\ &\geq \binom{k}{2} (1 - \phi)^{2/k} \left( \frac{m}{(1 + \eta)k} \right)^2 \\ &\geq (1 - \eta)^2 (1 - \phi)^{2/k} (1 - 1/k) m^2 / 2 \\ &\geq (1 - 2\eta - \phi^{2/k}) (1 - 1/k) m^2 / 2 \\ &= (1 - \delta) (1 - 1/k) m^2 / 2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta = 2\eta + \phi^{2/k}$ .

Hence,  $G_0$  is a  $k$ -partite subgraph of  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  with  $|G_0| = |\mathcal{G}| = m$ , and  $e(G_0) \geq (1 - \delta - 1/k)m^2/2$ . Applying Lemma 11 to  $G_0$ , we see that there exists an induced subgraph  $H'$  of  $G_0$  with

$$|H'| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta})|\mathcal{G}|, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\delta(H') \geq (1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(|H'| - 1).$$

Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  be the vertex-classes of  $H'$ ; note that these are families of subsets of  $X$ . Clearly, for each  $i \in [k]$ ,

$$|Y_i| \leq |H'| - \delta(H') \leq (1/k + \sqrt{\delta})|H'| + 1. \quad (10)$$

Hence, for each  $i \in [k]$ ,

$$|Y_i| \geq |H'| - (k-1)((1/k + \sqrt{\delta})|H'| + 1) \geq (1/k - (k-1)\sqrt{\delta})|H'| - k + 1. \quad (11)$$

For each  $i \in [k]$ , let

$$S_i = \bigcup_{y \in Y_i} y$$

be the union of all sets in  $Y_i$ . We claim that the  $S_i$ 's are pairwise disjoint. Suppose for a contradiction that  $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Then there exist  $y_1 \in Y_1$  and  $y_2 \in Y_2$  which both contain some element  $p \in X$ . Since

$$\delta(H') \geq (1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(|H'| - 1),$$

at least  $(1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(|H'| - 1)$  sets in  $\cup_{i \neq 1} Y_i$  do not contain  $p$ . By (10),

$$|\cup_{i \neq 1} Y_i| = \sum_{i \neq 1} |Y_i| \leq (1 - 1/k + (k-1)\sqrt{\delta})|H'| + k - 1,$$

and therefore the number of sets in  $\cup_{i \neq 1} Y_i$  containing  $p$  is at most

$$(1 - 1/k + (k-1)\sqrt{\delta})|H'| + k - 1 - (1 - 1/k - \sqrt{\delta})(|H'| - 1) \leq k\sqrt{\delta}|H'| + k.$$

The same holds for the number of sets in  $\cup_{i \neq 2} Y_i$  containing  $p$ , so the total number of sets in  $H'$  containing  $p$  is at most

$$2k\sqrt{\delta}|H'| + 2k.$$

Hence, the total number of sets in  $\mathcal{G}$  containing  $p$  is at most

$$(2k + 1)\sqrt{\delta}m + 2k.$$

But then the number of ways of choosing at most  $k$  disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{G}$  with one containing  $p$  is at most

$$(1 + m^{k-1})((2k + 1)\sqrt{\delta}m + 2k) = O_k(\sqrt{\delta})2^n + O_k(2^{(1-1/k)n}) < 2^{n-1} - \epsilon 2^n,$$

contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{G}$   $k$ -generates all but  $\epsilon 2^n$  of the sets containing  $p$ .

Hence, we may conclude that the  $S_i$ 's are pairwise disjoint. By definition,  $Y_i \subset \mathcal{P}S_i$ , and therefore  $|Y_i| \leq 2^{|S_i|}$ . But from (11),

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_i| &\geq (1 - k(k-1)\sqrt{\delta})|H'|/k - k + 1 \\ &\geq (1 - k(k-1)\sqrt{\delta})(1 - \sqrt{\delta})|\mathcal{G}|/k - k + 1 \\ &\geq (1 - k(k-1)\sqrt{\delta})(1 - \sqrt{\delta})(1 - \phi)^{1/k}2^{n/k} - k + 1 \\ &\geq (1 - (k(k-1) + 1)\sqrt{\delta} - \phi^{1/k})2^{n/k} - k + 1 \\ &> (1 - k^2\sqrt{\delta} - \phi^{1/k})2^{n/k} - k \\ &> 2^{n/k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

using (9) and (8) for the second and third inequalities respectively. Hence, we must have  $|S_i| \geq n/k$  for each  $i$ , and therefore  $|S_i| = n/k$  for each  $i$ , i.e.  $(S_i)_{i=1}^k$  is an equipartition of  $X$ . Putting everything together and recalling that  $\delta = 2\eta + \phi^{2/k}$  and  $\phi = O_k(\epsilon + \eta + 2^{-c_k n})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{G} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}S_i)| &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k |Y_i| \\ &\geq (1 - k^2\sqrt{\delta} - \phi^{1/k})k2^{n/k} - k^2 \\ &\geq (1 - C_k\epsilon^{1/k} - D_k\eta^{1/k} - 2^{-\xi_k n})k2^{n/k} \end{aligned}$$

(provided  $n$  is sufficiently large depending on  $k$ ), where  $C_k, D_k, \xi_k > 0$  depend only on  $k$ . This proves Proposition 9.  $\square$

We now prove the following

**Proposition 16.** *Let  $\nu(n) = o(1)$ . If  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $k$ -generator for  $X$  with  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$ , and*

$$|\mathcal{G} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}S_i)| \geq (1 - \nu)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|,$$

where  $(S_i)_{i=1}^k$  is a partition of  $X$  into  $k$  classes of sizes as equal as possible, then provided  $n$  is sufficiently large depending on  $k$ , we have  $|\mathcal{G}| = |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}|$  and

$$\mathcal{G} = \cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}S_i \setminus \{\emptyset\}.$$

Note that  $n$  is no longer assumed to be a multiple of  $k$ ; the case  $k = 2$  and  $n$  odd will be needed in Section 3.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $(S_i)_{i=1}^k$  be as in the statement of the proposition. For each  $i \in [k]$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_i = (\mathcal{P}S_i \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \setminus \mathcal{G}$  be the collection of all nonempty subsets of  $S_i$  which are not in  $\mathcal{G}$ . By our assumption on  $\mathcal{G}$ , we know that  $|\mathcal{F}_i| \leq o(2^{|S_i|})$  for each  $i \in [k]$ . Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}(S_i)$$

be the collection of ‘extra’ sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; let  $|\mathcal{E}| = M$ .

By relabeling the  $S_i$ ’s, we may assume that  $|\mathcal{F}_1| \geq |\mathcal{F}_2| \geq \dots \geq |\mathcal{F}_k|$ . By our assumption on  $|\mathcal{G}|$ ,  $M \leq k|\mathcal{F}_1|$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{R} = \{y_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k : y_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, s_i \subset S_i \forall i \geq 2\};$$

observe that the sets  $y_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k$  are all distinct, so  $|\mathcal{R}| = |\mathcal{F}_1|2^{n-|S_1|}$ . By considering the number of sets in  $\mathcal{E}$  needed for  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $k$ -generate  $\mathcal{R}$ , we will show that  $M > k|\mathcal{F}_1|$  unless  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \emptyset$ . (In fact, our argument would also show that  $M > p_k|\mathcal{F}_1|$  unless  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \emptyset$ , for any  $p_k > 0$  depending only on  $k$ .)

Let  $N$  be the number of sets in  $\mathcal{R}$  which may be expressed as a disjoint union of two sets in  $\mathcal{E}$  and at most  $k-2$  other sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} N &\leq \binom{M}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} \binom{m}{i} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}k^2|\mathcal{F}_1|^2(k-1) \frac{(c_0k2^{n/k})^{k-2}}{(k-2)!} \\ &\leq 4c_0^{k-2}k^k \left( \frac{|\mathcal{F}_1|}{2^{|S_1|}} \right) |\mathcal{F}_1|2^{n-|S_1|} \\ &= o(1)|\mathcal{F}_1|2^{n-|S_1|} \\ &= o(|\mathcal{R}|), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where we have used  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq |\mathcal{F}_{n,k}| \leq c_0k2^{n/k}$  (see (3)),  $|S_1| \leq \lceil n/k \rceil$ , and  $|\mathcal{F}_1| = o(2^{|S_1|})$  in the second, third and fourth lines respectively.

Now fix  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ . For  $j \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_j(x_1)$  be the collection of  $(k-1)$ -tuples  $(s_2, \dots, s_k) \in \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k$  such that

$$x_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k$$

may be expressed as a disjoint union

$$y_1 \sqcup y_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup y_k$$

with  $y_j \in \mathcal{E}$  but  $y_i \subset S_i \forall i \neq j$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}^*(x_1)$  be the collection of  $(k-1)$ -tuples  $(s_2, \dots, s_k) \in \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k$  such that

$$x_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k$$

may be expressed as a disjoint union of two sets in  $\mathcal{E}$  and at most  $k - 2$  other sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Now fix  $j \neq 1$ . For each  $(s_2, \dots, s_k) \in \mathcal{A}_j(x_1)$ , we may write

$$x_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k = s'_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_{j-1} \sqcup y_j \sqcup s_{j+1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k,$$

where  $y_j = s_j \sqcup (x_1 \setminus s'_1) \in \mathcal{E}$ . Since  $y_j \cap S_j = s_j$ , different  $s_j$ 's correspond to different  $y_j$ 's  $\in \mathcal{E}$ , and so there are at most  $|\mathcal{E}| = M$  choices for  $s_j$ . Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{A}_j(x_1)| \leq 2^{n-|S_1|-|S_j|} M \leq 2^{n-|S_1|-|S_j|} k |\mathcal{F}_1| \leq 2k \left( \frac{|\mathcal{F}_1|}{2^{|S_1|}} \right) 2^{n-|S_1|},$$

the last inequality following from the fact that  $|S_j| \geq |S_1| - 1$ . Hence,

$$\sum_{j=2}^k |\mathcal{A}_j(x_1)| \leq 2k(k-1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{F}_1|}{2^{|S_1|}} \right) 2^{n-|S_1|} = o(1) 2^{n-|S_1|}. \quad (13)$$

Observe that for each  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}^*(x_1) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{A}_j(x_1) = \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \mathcal{P}S_3 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k,$$

and therefore

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(x_1)| + |\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)| + \sum_{j=2}^k |\mathcal{A}_j(x_1)| \geq 2^{n-|S_1|},$$

so by (13),

$$|\mathcal{A}^*(x_1)| + |\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)| \geq (1 - o(1)) 2^{n-|S_1|}.$$

Call  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$  ‘bad’ if  $|\mathcal{A}^*(x_1)| \geq 2^{-(k+2)} 2^{n-|S_1|}$ ; otherwise, call  $x_1$  ‘good’. By (12), at most a  $o(1)$ -fraction of the sets in  $\mathcal{F}_1$  are bad, so at least a  $1 - o(1)$  fraction are good. For each good set  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ , notice that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)| \geq (1 - 2^{-(k+2)} - o(1)) 2^{n-|S_1|}.$$

Now perform the following process. Choose any  $(s_2, \dots, s_k) \in \mathcal{A}_1(x_1)$ ; we may write

$$x_1 \sqcup s_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s_k = z^{(1)} \sqcup s'_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup s'_k$$

with  $(s'_2, \dots, s'_k) \in \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k$ ,  $z^{(1)} \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $z^{(1)} \cap S_1 = x_1$ , and  $z^{(1)} \setminus S_1 \neq \emptyset$ . Pick  $p_1 \in z^{(1)} \setminus S_1$ . At most  $\frac{1}{2} 2^{n-|S_1|}$  of the members of  $\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)$  have union containing  $p_1$ , so there are at least

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} - 2^{-(k+2)} - o(1)\right) 2^{n-|S_1|}$$

remaining members of  $\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)$ . Choose one of these,  $(t_2, \dots, t_k)$  say. By definition, we may write

$$x_1 \sqcup t_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup t_k = z^{(2)} \sqcup t'_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup t'_k$$

with  $(t'_2, \dots, t'_k) \in \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k$ ,  $z^{(2)} \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $z^{(2)} \cap S_1 = x_1$ , and  $z^{(2)} \setminus S_1 \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $p_1 \notin z^{(2)}$ , we must have  $z^{(2)} \neq z^{(1)}$ . Pick  $p_2 \in z^{(2)} \setminus S_1$ , and repeat. At most  $\frac{3}{4}2^{n-|S_1|}$  of the members of  $\mathcal{A}_1(x_1)$  have union containing  $p_1$  or  $p_2$ ; there are at least

$$\left(\frac{1}{4} - 2^{-(k+2)} - o(1)\right)2^{n-|S_1|}$$

members remaining. Choose one of these,  $(u_2, \dots, u_k)$  say. By definition, we may write

$$x_1 \sqcup u_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup u_k = z^{(3)} \sqcup u'_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup u'_k$$

with  $(u'_2, \dots, u'_k) \in \mathcal{P}S_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}S_k$ ,  $z^{(3)} \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $z^{(3)} \cap S_1 = x_1$ , and  $z^{(3)} \setminus S_1 \neq \emptyset$ . Note that again  $z^{(3)}$  is distinct from  $z^{(1)}, z^{(2)}$ , since  $p_1, p_2 \notin z^{(3)}$ . Continuing this process for  $k+1$  steps, we end up with a collection of  $k+1$  distinct sets  $z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(k+1)} \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $z^{(l)} \cap S_1 = x_1 \forall l \in [k+1]$ . Do this for each good set  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ ; the collections produced are clearly pairwise disjoint. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{E}| \geq (k+1)(1 - o(1))|\mathcal{F}_1|.$$

This is a contradiction, unless  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \emptyset$ . Hence, we must have  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \dots = \mathcal{F}_k = \emptyset$ , and therefore

$$\mathcal{G} = \cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}(S_i) \setminus \{\emptyset\},$$

proving Proposition 16, and completing the proof of Theorem 5.  $\square$

### 3 The case $k = 2$ via bipartite subgraphs of $H$ .

Our aim in this section is to prove the  $k = 2$  case of Conjecture 1 for all sufficiently large *odd*  $n$ , which together with the  $k = 2$  case of Theorem 5 will imply

**Theorem 4.** *If  $n$  is sufficiently large,  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a 2-generator for  $X$ , then  $|\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{F}_{n,2}|$ . Equality holds only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is of the form  $\mathcal{F}_{n,2}$ .*

Recall that

$$|\mathcal{F}_{n,2}| = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 2^{n/2} - 2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ 3 \cdot 2^{(n-1)/2} - 2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose that  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a 2-generator for  $X$  with  $|\mathcal{G}| = m \leq |\mathcal{F}_{n,2}|$ . The counting argument in the Introduction gives

$$1 + m + \binom{m}{2} \geq 2^n,$$

which implies that

$$|\mathcal{G}| \geq (1 - o(1))\sqrt{2}2^{n/2}.$$

For  $n$  odd, we wish to improve this bound by a factor of approximately 1.5.

Our first aim is to prove that induced subgraphs of the Kneser graph  $H$  which have order  $\Omega(2^{n/2})$  are  $o(1)$ -close to being bipartite (Proposition 18).

Recall that a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is said to be  $\epsilon$ -close to being bipartite if it can be made bipartite by the removal of at most  $\epsilon|V|^2$  edges, and  $\epsilon$ -far from being bipartite if it requires the removal of at least  $\epsilon|V|^2$  edges to make it bipartite.

Using Szemerédi's Regularity Lemma, Bollobás, Erdős, Simonovits and Szemerédi [3] proved the following.

**Theorem 17** (Bollobás, Erdős, Simonovits, Szemerédi). *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $g(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$  depending on  $\epsilon$  alone such that for any graph  $G$  which is  $\epsilon$ -far from being bipartite, the probability that a uniform random induced subgraph of  $G$  of order  $g(\epsilon)$  is non-bipartite is at least  $1/2$ .*

Building on methods of Goldreich, Goldwasser and Ron [12], Alon and Krivelevich [2] proved without using the Regularity Lemma that in fact, one may take

$$g(\epsilon) \leq \frac{(\log(1/\epsilon))^b}{\epsilon} \tag{14}$$

where  $b > 0$  is an absolute constant. As observed in [2], this is tight up to the poly-logarithmic factor, since necessarily,

$$g(\epsilon) \geq \frac{1}{6\epsilon}.$$

We will first show that for any fixed  $c > 0$  and  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq c2^{n/2}$ , then the density of  $C_{2l+1}$ 's in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is at most  $o(1)$ . To prove this, we will show that for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any fixed  $c > 0$ , if  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq c2^{n/2}$ , then the homomorphism density of  $C_{2l+1} \otimes t$  in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ . Using Lemma 7, we will deduce that the homomorphism density of  $C_{2l+1}$  in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ , implying that the density of  $C_{2l+1}$ 's in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ . This will show that  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $o(1)$ -close to being bipartite (Proposition 18). To obtain a sharper estimate for the  $o(1)$  term

in Proposition 18, we will use (14), although to prove Theorem 4, any  $o(1)$  term would suffice, so one could in fact use Theorem 17 instead of (14).

We are now ready to prove the following

**Proposition 18.** *Let  $c > 0$ . Then there exists  $b > 0$  such that for any  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq c2^{n/2}$ , the induced subgraph  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  can be made bipartite by removing at most*

$$\frac{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^b}{\log_2 n} |\mathcal{A}|^2$$

*edges.*

*Proof.* Fix  $c > 0$ ; let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| = m \geq c2^{n/2}$ . First, we show that for any fixed  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the homomorphism density of  $C_{2l+1} \otimes t$ 's in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is at most  $o(1)$ . The argument is a strengthening of that used by Alon and Frankl to prove Lemma 4.2 in [1].

Let  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  to be chosen later. Choose  $(2l+1)t$  members of  $\mathcal{A}$  uniformly at random with replacement,  $(A_i^{(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq 2l+1, 1 \leq j \leq t}$ . The homomorphism density of  $C_{2l+1} \otimes t$  in  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is precisely the probability that the unions

$$U_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^t A_i^{(j)}$$

satisfy  $U_i \cap U_{i+1} = \emptyset$  for each  $i$  (where the addition is modulo  $2l+1$ ).

We claim that if this occurs, then  $|U_i| < (\frac{1}{2} - \eta)n$  for some  $i$ , provided  $\eta < 1/(4l+2)$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $U_i \cap U_{i+1} = \emptyset$  for each  $i$ , and  $|U_i| \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \eta)n$  for each  $i$ . Then  $|U_{i+2} \setminus U_i| \leq n - |U_{i+1}| - |U_i| \leq 2\eta n$  for each  $i \in [2l-1]$ . Since  $U_{2l+1} \setminus U_1 \subset \cup_{j=1}^l (U_{2j+1} \setminus U_{2j-1})$ , we have  $|U_{2l+1} \setminus U_1| \leq \sum_{j=1}^l |U_{2j+1} \setminus U_{2j-1}| \leq 2l\eta n$ . It follows that  $|U_1 \cap U_{2l+1}| \geq (1/2 - (2l+1)\eta)n > 0$  if  $\eta < 1/(4l+2)$ , a contradiction.

We now show that the probability of this event is very small. Fix  $i \in [k]$ .

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{|U_i| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n\} &= \Pr\left(\bigcup_{S \subset X: |S| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^t \{A_i^{(j)} \subset S\}\right)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{|S| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n} \Pr\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^t \{A_i^{(j)} \subset S\}\right) \\
&= \sum_{|S| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n} (2^{|S|}/m)^t \\
&\leq 2^n \left(\frac{2^{(1/2 - \eta)n}}{c2^{n/2}}\right)^t \\
&= 2^{-(\eta t - 1)n} c^{-t} \\
&\leq 2^{-n} c^{-t},
\end{aligned}$$

provided  $t \geq 2/\eta$ . Hence,

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{2l+1} \{|U_i| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n\}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2l+1} \Pr\{|U_i| \leq (1/2 - \eta)n\} \leq (2l+1)2^{-n} c^{-t}.$$

Therefore,

$$h_{C_{2l+1} \otimes t}(H[\mathcal{A}]) \leq (2l+1)2^{-n} c^{-t}.$$

Choose  $\eta = \frac{1}{8l}$  and  $t = 2/\eta = 16l$ . By Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{C_{2l+1}}(H[\mathcal{A}]) &\leq ((2l+1)2^{-n} c^{-t})^{1/t^{2l+1}} \\
&= (2l+1)^{1/(16l)^{2l+1}} 2^{-n/(16l)^{2l+1}} c^{-1/(16l)^{2l}} \\
&= O(2^{-n/(16l)^{2l+1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the number of  $(2s+1)$ -subsets of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing an odd cycle of  $H$  is at most

$$\sum_{l=1}^s m^{2l+1} h_{C_{2l+1}}(H[\mathcal{A}]) \binom{m - (2l+1)}{2(s-l)}.$$

Hence, the probability that a uniform random  $(2s+1)$ -subset of  $\mathcal{A}$  contains an odd cycle of  $H$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=1}^s \frac{m^{2l+1}}{m(m-1) \cdots (m-2l)} (2s+1)(2s) \cdots (2(s-l)+1) h_{C_{2l+1}}(H[\mathcal{A}]) \\
\leq s(2s+1)! O(2^{-n/(16s)^{2s+1}}),
\end{aligned}$$

(provided  $s \leq O(\sqrt{m})$ ). This can be made  $< 1/2$  by choosing

$$s = a \log_2 n / \log_2 \log_2 n,$$

for some suitable  $a > 0$  depending only on  $c$ . By (14), it follows that  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  is  $((\log_2 \log_2 n)^b / \log_2 n)$ -close to being bipartite, for some suitable  $b > 0$  depending only on  $c$ , proving the proposition.  $\square$

Before proving Theorem 4 for  $n$  odd, we need some more definitions. Let  $X$  be a finite set. If  $A \subset \mathcal{P}X$ , and  $i \in X$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^- &= \{x \in A : i \notin x\}, \\ A_i^+ &= \{x \setminus \{i\} : x \in A, i \in x\}; \end{aligned}$$

these are respectively called the *lower* and *upper  $i$ -sections* of  $A$ .

If  $Y$  and  $Z$  are disjoint subsets of  $X$ , we write  $H[Y, Z]$  for the bipartite subgraph of the Kneser graph  $H$  consisting of all edges between  $Y$  and  $Z$ . If  $B$  is a bipartite subgraph of  $H$  with vertex-sets  $Y$  and  $Z$ , and  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}X$ , we say that  $B$  *2-generates*  $\mathcal{F}$  if for every set  $x \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exist  $y \in Y$  and  $z \in Z$  such that  $y \cap z = \emptyset$ ,  $yz \in E(B)$ , and  $y \sqcup z = x$ , i.e. every set in  $\mathcal{F}$  corresponds to an edge of  $B$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4 for  $n$  odd.* Suppose that  $n = 2l + 1 \geq 3$  is odd,  $X$  is an  $n$ -element set, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}X$  is a 2-generator for  $X$  with  $|\mathcal{G}| = m \leq |\mathcal{F}_{n,2}| = 3 \cdot 2^l - 2$ . Observe that

$$e(H[\mathcal{G}]) \geq 2^{2l+1} - |\mathcal{G}| - 1 \geq 2^{2l+1} - 3 \cdot 2^l + 1,$$

and therefore  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  has edge-density at least

$$\frac{2^{2l+1} - 3 \cdot 2^l + 1}{\binom{|\mathcal{G}|}{2}} \geq \frac{2^{2l+1} - 3 \cdot 2^l + 1}{\frac{1}{2}(3 \cdot 2^l - 2)(3 \cdot 2^l - 3)} > \frac{4}{9}.$$

(Here, the last inequality rearranges to the statement  $l > 0$ .) By Proposition 18 applied to  $\mathcal{G}$ , we can remove at most

$$\frac{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^b}{\log_2 n} |\mathcal{G}|^2 < \frac{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^b}{\log_2 n} 9 \cdot 2^{2l}$$

edges from  $H[\mathcal{G}]$  to produce a bipartite graph  $B$ . Let  $Y, Z$  be the vertex-classes of  $B$ ; we may assume that  $Y \sqcup Z = \mathcal{G}$ . Define  $\epsilon > 0$  by

$$|\{y \sqcup z : y \in Y, z \in Z, y \cap z = \emptyset\}| = (1 - \epsilon)2^{2l+1};$$

then clearly, we have

$$e(B) \geq (1 - \epsilon)2^{2l+1}. \quad (15)$$

Note that

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{9}{2} \frac{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^b}{\log_2 n} + 3 \cdot 2^{-(l+1)} = O\left(\frac{(\log_2 \log_2 n)^b}{\log_2 n}\right) = o(1).$$

Let

$$\alpha = |Y|/2^l, \quad \beta = |Z|/2^l.$$

By assumption,  $\alpha + \beta \leq 3 - 2^{-(l-1)} < 3$ . Since  $|Y||Z| \geq e(B) \geq (2 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l}$ , we have  $\alpha\beta \geq 2 - 2\epsilon$ . This implies that

$$1 - 2\epsilon < \alpha, \beta < 2 + 2\epsilon. \quad (16)$$

(To see this, simply observe that to maximize  $\alpha\beta$  subject to the conditions  $\alpha \leq 1 - 2\epsilon$  and  $\alpha + \beta \leq 3$ , it is best to take  $\alpha = 1 - 2\epsilon$  and  $\beta = 2 + 2\epsilon$ , giving  $\alpha\beta = 2 - 2\epsilon - 4\epsilon^2 < 2 - 2\epsilon$ , a contradiction. It follows that we must have  $\alpha > 1 - 2\epsilon$ , so  $\beta < 2 + 2\epsilon$ ; (16) follows by symmetry.)

From now on, we think of  $X$  as the set  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \{i \in [n] : |Y_i^+| \geq |Y|/3\}, \\ W_2 &= \{i \in [n] : |Z_i^+| \geq |Z|/3\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, we prove the following

**Claim 1.**  $W_1 \cup W_2 = [n]$ .

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that  $W_1 \cup W_2 \neq [n]$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $n \notin W_1 \cup W_2$ . Let

$$\theta = |Y_n^+|/|Y|, \quad \phi = |Z_n^+|/|Z|;$$

then we have  $\theta, \phi \leq 1/3$ . Observe that the number  $e_n$  of edges between  $Y$  and  $Z$  which generate a set containing  $n$  satisfies

$$(1 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l} \leq e_n \leq (\theta\alpha(1 - \phi)\beta + \phi\beta(1 - \theta)\alpha)2^{2l} = (\theta + \phi - 2\theta\phi)\alpha\beta 2^{2l}. \quad (17)$$

(Here, the left-hand inequality comes from the fact that  $B$  2-generates all but at most  $\epsilon 2^{2l+1}$  subsets of  $[n]$ , and therefore  $B$  2-generates at least  $(1 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l}$  sets containing  $n$ .)

Notice that the function

$$f(\theta, \phi) = \theta + \phi - 2\theta\phi, \quad 0 \leq \theta, \phi \leq 1/3$$

is a strictly increasing function of both  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  for  $0 \leq \theta, \phi \leq 1/3$ , and therefore attains its maximum of  $4/9$  at  $\theta = \phi = 1/3$ . Therefore,

$$1 - 2\epsilon \leq \frac{4}{9}\alpha\beta;$$

since  $\alpha + \beta \leq 3$ , we have

$$3/2 - 3\sqrt{\epsilon/2} \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 3/2 + 3\sqrt{\epsilon/2}.$$

Moreover, by the AM/GM inequality,  $\alpha\beta \leq 9/4$ , so

$$1 - 2\epsilon \leq \frac{9}{4}f(\theta, \phi), \quad (18)$$

and therefore

$$1/3 - 8\epsilon/3 \leq \theta, \phi \leq 1/3.$$

Thus  $|Y|, |Z| = (3/2 - o(1))2^l$  and  $\theta, \phi = 1/3 - o(1)$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_n^+| &= 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1)), \\ |Z_n^+| &= 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1)), \\ |Y_n^-| &= 2^l(1 + o(1)), \\ |Z_n^-| &= 2^l(1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{G}_n^- = Y_n^- \cup Z_n^-$  must 2-generate all but at most  $o(2^{2l})$  of the sets in  $\mathcal{P}\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\} = \mathcal{P}\{1, 2, \dots, 2l\}$ , and therefore, by Proposition 9 for  $k = 2$  and  $n$  even, there exists an equipartition  $S_1 \cup S_2$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2l\}$  such that  $Y_n^-$  contains at least  $(1 - o(1))2^l$  members of  $\mathcal{P}S_1$ , and  $Z_n^-$  contains at least  $(1 - o(1))2^l$  members of  $\mathcal{P}S_2$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \{y \in Y : y \cap S_2 = \emptyset\}, \\ V &= \{z \in Z : z \cap S_1 = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|U_n^-| = (1 - o(1))2^l$  and  $|V_n^-| = (1 - o(1))2^l$ , we must have  $|Y_n^- \setminus U_n^-| = o(2^l)$ , and  $|Z_n^- \setminus V_n^-| = o(2^l)$ . Our aim is now to show that  $|Y_n^+ \setminus U_n^+| = o(2^l)$ , and  $|Z_n^+ \setminus V_n^+| = o(2^l)$ .

Clearly, we have  $U_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}S_1$ , and  $V_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}S_2$ , so  $|U_n^-| \leq 2^l$  and  $|V_n^-| \leq 2^l$ . Moreover, each set  $x \in Y_n^+ \setminus U_n^+$  contains an element of  $S_2$ , and therefore  $x \cup \{n\}$  is disjoint from at most  $2^{l-1}$  sets in  $V_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}S_2$ . Similarly, each set  $x \in Z_n^+ \setminus V_n^+$  contains an element of  $S_1$ , and therefore  $x \cup \{n\}$  is disjoint from at most  $2^{l-1}$  sets in  $U_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}S_1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} e_n &\leq |U_n^+| |V_n^-| + |Y_n^+ \setminus U_n^+| 2^{l-1} + |V_n^+| |U_n^-| + |Z_n^+ \setminus V_n^+| 2^{l-1} \\ &\quad + |Y_n^- \setminus U_n^-| |Z_n^+| + |Z_n^- \setminus V_n^-| |Y_n^+| \\ &\leq |U_n^+| 2^l + |Y_n^+ \setminus U_n^+| 2^{l-1} + |V_n^+| 2^l + |Z_n^+ \setminus V_n^+| 2^{l-1} + o(2^{2l}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (17), we have  $e_n \geq (1 - o(1))2^{2l}$ . Since  $|Y_n^+| = 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1))$ , and  $|Z_n^+| = 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1))$ , we must have  $|Y_n^+ \setminus U_n^+| = o(2^l)$ , and  $|Z_n^+ \setminus V_n^+| = o(2^l)$ , as required.

We may conclude that  $|Y \setminus U| = o(2^l)$  and  $|Z \setminus V| = o(2^l)$ . Hence, there are at most  $o(2^l)$  sets in  $Y \cup Z = \mathcal{G}$  that intersect both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ . On the other hand, since  $|Y_n^+| = (1 - o(1))2^{l-1}$  and  $|Z_n^+| = (1 - o(1))2^{l-1}$ , there are at least  $(1 + o(1))2^{l-1}$  sets  $s_1 \subset S_1$  such that  $s_1 \cup \{n\} \notin Y$ , and there are at least  $(1 + o(1))2^{l-1}$  sets  $s_2 \subset S_2$  such that  $s_2 \cup \{n\} \notin Z$ . Taking all pairs  $s_1, s_2$  gives at least  $(1 + o(1))2^{2l-2}$  sets of the form

$$\{n\} \cup s_1 \cup s_2 \quad (s_1 \subset S_1, s_1 \cup \{n\} \notin Y, s_2 \subset S_2, s_2 \cup \{n\} \notin Z). \quad (19)$$

Each of these requires a set intersecting both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  to express it as a disjoint union of two sets from  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since there are  $o(2^l)$  members of  $\mathcal{G}$  intersecting both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  generates at most

$$(|\mathcal{G}| + 1)o(2^l) = o(2^{2l})$$

sets of the form (19), a contradiction. This proves the claim.  $\square$

We now prove the following

**Claim 2.**  $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Suppose for a contradiction that  $W_1 \cap W_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $n \in W_1 \cap W_2$ . As before, let

$$\theta = |Y_n^+|/|Y|, \quad \phi = |Z_n^+|/|Z|;$$

this time, we have  $\theta, \phi \geq 1/3$ . Observe that

$$(2 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l} \leq e(B) \leq (1 - \theta\phi)\alpha\beta 2^{2l}. \quad (20)$$

Here, the left-hand inequality is (15), and the right-hand inequality comes from the fact that there are no edges between pairs of sets  $(y, z) \in Y \times Z$  such that  $n \in y \cap z$ . Since  $1 - \theta\phi \leq 8/9$ , we have

$$2 - 2\epsilon \leq \frac{8}{9}\alpha\beta.$$

Since  $\alpha + \beta \leq 3$ , it follows that

$$\frac{3}{2}(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon}) \leq \alpha, \beta \leq \frac{3}{2}(1 + \sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

Since  $\alpha\beta \leq 9/4$ , we have

$$2 - 2\epsilon \leq \frac{9}{4}(1 - \theta\phi),$$

and therefore

$$1/3 \leq \theta, \phi \leq 1/3 + 8\epsilon/3.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_n^+| &= 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1)), \\ |Z_n^+| &= 2^{l-1}(1 - o(1)), \\ |Y_n^-| &= 2^l(1 + o(1)), \\ |Z_n^-| &= 2^l(1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

so exactly as in the proof of Claim 1, we obtain a contradiction.  $\square$

Claims 1 and 2 together imply that  $W_1 \cup W_2$  is a partition of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\} = \{1, 2, \dots, 2l + 1\}$ . We will now show that at least a  $(2/3 - o(1))$ -fraction of the sets in  $Y$  are subsets of  $W_1$ , and similarly at least a  $(2/3 - o(1))$ -fraction of the sets in  $Z$  are subsets of  $W_2$ . Let

$$\sigma = \frac{|Y \setminus \mathcal{P}(W_1)|}{|Y|}, \quad \tau = \frac{|Z \setminus \mathcal{P}(W_2)|}{|Z|}.$$

Let  $y \in Y \setminus \mathcal{P}(W_1)$ , and choose  $i \in y \cap W_2$ ; since at least  $|Z|/3$  of the sets in  $Z$  contain  $i$ ,  $y$  has at most  $2|Z|/3$  neighbours in  $Z$ . Hence,

$$(2 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l} \leq e(B) \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\sigma\alpha\beta + (1 - \sigma)\alpha\beta\right)2^{2l} = (1 - \sigma/3)\alpha\beta 2^{2l} \leq (1 - \sigma/3)\frac{9}{4}2^{2l}, \quad (21)$$

and therefore

$$\sigma \leq 1/3 + 8\epsilon/3,$$

so

$$|Y \cap \mathcal{P}(W_1)| \geq (2/3 - 8\epsilon/3)|Y|. \quad (22)$$

Similarly,  $\tau \leq 1/3 + 8\epsilon/3$ , and therefore  $|Z \cap \mathcal{P}(W_2)| \geq (2/3 - 8\epsilon/3)|Z|$ .

If  $|W_1| \leq l - 1$ , then  $|Y \cap \mathcal{P}(W_1)| \leq 2^{l-1}$ , so

$$|Y| \leq \frac{2^{l-1}}{2/3 - 8\epsilon/3} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{2^l}{1 - 4\epsilon} < (1 - 2\epsilon)2^l,$$

contradicting (16). Hence, we must have  $|W_1| \geq l$ . Similarly,  $|W_2| \geq l$ , so  $\{|W_1|, |W_2|\} = \{l, l + 1\}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $|W_1| = l$  and  $|W_2| = l + 1$ .

We now observe that

$$|Z| \geq (3/2 - 6\epsilon)2^l \quad (23)$$

To see this, suppose that  $|Z| = (3/2 - \eta)2^l$ . Since  $|Z| + |Y| < 3 \cdot 2^l$ , we have  $|Y| \leq (3/2 + \eta)2^l$ . Recall that any  $y \in Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1$  has at most  $2|Z|/3$  neighbours in  $Z$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2\epsilon)2^{2l} &\leq e(B) \\ &\leq |Y \cap \mathcal{P}W_1||Z| + |Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1|\frac{2}{3}|Z| \\ &\leq 2^l(\frac{3}{2} - \eta)2^l + (\frac{1}{2} + \eta)2^l\frac{2}{3}(\frac{3}{2} - \eta)2^l \\ &= (2 - \frac{1}{3}\eta - \frac{2}{3}\eta^2)2^{2l}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\eta \leq 6\epsilon$ , i.e.  $|Z| \geq (3/2 - 6\epsilon)2^l$ , as claimed. Since  $|Z| + |Y| < 3 \cdot 2^l$ , we have

$$|Y| \leq (3/2 + 6\epsilon)2^l. \quad (24)$$

We now prove the following

**Claim 3.** (a)  $|\mathcal{P}(W_1) \setminus Y| \leq 22\epsilon 2^l$ ;  
(b)  $|Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 2\epsilon)2^l$ .

*Proof.* We prove this by constructing another bipartite subgraph  $B_2$  of  $H$  with the same number of vertices as  $B$ , and comparing  $e(B_2)$  with  $e(B)$ . First, let

$$D = \min\{|\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z|, |Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2|\},$$

add  $D$  new members of  $\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z$  to  $Z$ , and delete  $D$  members of  $Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$ , producing a new set  $Z'$  and a new bipartite graph  $B_1 = H[Y, Z']$ . Since  $|Z'| = |Z| \leq (2 + 2\epsilon)2^l$ , we have  $|Z' \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq \epsilon 2^{2l+1}$ , i.e.  $Z'$  is almost contained within  $\mathcal{P}W_2$ . Notice that every member  $z \in Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$  had at most  $2|Y|/3$  neighbours in  $Y$ , and every new member of  $Z'$  has at least  $|Y \cap \mathcal{P}(W_1)| \geq (2/3 - 8\epsilon/3)|Y|$  neighbours in  $Y$ , using (22). Hence,

$$e(B) - e(B_1) \leq \frac{8\epsilon}{3}|Y|D \leq \frac{8\epsilon}{3}|Y|\frac{2}{3}|Z| \leq \frac{16\epsilon}{9}\frac{9}{4}2^{2l} = 4\epsilon 2^{2l},$$

and therefore

$$e(B_1) \geq e(B) - 2\epsilon 2^{2l+1} \geq (1 - 3\epsilon)2^{2l+1}.$$

Second, let

$$C = \min\{|\mathcal{P}W_1 \setminus Y|, |Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1|\},$$

add  $C$  new members of  $\mathcal{P}(W_1) \setminus Y$  to  $Y$ , and delete  $C$  members of  $Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1$ , producing a new set  $Y'$  and a new bipartite graph  $B_2 = H[Y', Z']$ . Since  $|Y| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)2^l$ , we have  $|Y' \cap \mathcal{P}W_1| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)2^l$ . Since every deleted member of  $Y$  contained an element of  $W_2$ , it had at most  $(1 + 2\epsilon)2^l$  neighbours in  $Z'$ . (Indeed, such member of  $Y$  intersects  $2^l$  sets in  $\mathcal{P}W_2$ , so has at most  $2^l$  neighbours in  $Z' \cap \mathcal{P}W_2$ ; there are  $|Z' \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq \epsilon 2^{2l+1}$  other sets in  $Z'$ .) On

the other hand, every new member of  $Y'$  is joined to all of  $Z' \cap \mathcal{P}W_2$ , which has size at least  $|Z \cap \mathcal{P}W_2| \geq (3/2 - 8\epsilon)2^l$ . It follows that

$$e(B_2) \geq e(B_1) + C(\frac{1}{2} - 10\epsilon)2^l \geq (1 - 3\epsilon)2^{2l+1} + C(\frac{1}{2} - 10\epsilon)2^l. \quad (25)$$

We now show that  $e(B_2) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{2l+1}$ . If  $|Y'| \geq 2^l$ , then write  $|Y'| = (1 + \phi)2^l$  where  $\phi \geq 0$ ;  $Y'$  contains all of  $\mathcal{P}W_1$ , and  $\phi 2^l$  ‘extra’ sets. We have  $|Z'| \leq (2 - \phi)2^l$ , and therefore by (23),  $\phi \leq 1/2 + 6\epsilon < 1$ . Note that every ‘extra’ set in  $Y' \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1$  has at most  $2^l$  neighbors in  $\mathcal{P}W_2$ , and therefore at most  $(1 + 2\epsilon)2^l$  neighbours in  $Z'$ . Hence,

$$e(B_2) \leq 2^l(2 - \phi)2^l + \phi 2^l(1 + 2\epsilon)2^l = (1 + \phi\epsilon)2^{2l+1} \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{2l+1}.$$

If, on the other hand,  $|Y'| \leq 2^l$ , then since  $|Y'| + |Z'| \leq 3 \cdot 2^l$ , we have  $e(B_2) \leq |Y'| |Z'| \leq 2^{2l+1}$ . Hence, we always have

$$e(B_2) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{2l+1}. \quad (26)$$

Combining (25) and (26), we see that

$$C \leq \frac{8\epsilon}{1/2 - 10\epsilon} 2^l \leq 20\epsilon 2^l,$$

provided  $\epsilon \leq 1/100$ .

This implies (a). Indeed, if  $|\mathcal{P}W_1 \setminus Y| \leq C \leq 20\epsilon 2^l$ , then we are done. Otherwise, by the definition of  $C$ , we have  $|Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1| \leq 20\epsilon 2^l$ . Recall that by (16),  $|Y| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)2^l$ , and therefore

$$|Y \cap \mathcal{P}W_1| = |Y| - |Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1| \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)2^l - 20\epsilon 2^l = (1 - 22\epsilon)2^l.$$

Hence,

$$|\mathcal{P}(W_1) \setminus Y| \leq 22\epsilon 2^l, \quad (27)$$

proving (a).

Since  $e(B) \geq (1 - \epsilon)2^{2l+1}$ ,  $e(B_2) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{2l+1}$ , and  $e(B_2) \geq e(B_1)$ , we have

$$e(B_1) - e(B) \leq e(B_2) - e(B) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2^{2l+1} - (1 - \epsilon)2^{2l+1} = \epsilon 2^{2l+2} \quad (28)$$

We now use this to show that

$$D = \min\{|\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z|, |Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2|\} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} 2^l.$$

Suppose for a contradiction that  $D \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} 2^l$ ; then it is easy to see that there must exist  $z \in Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$  with at least

$$2|Y|/3 - 8\sqrt{\epsilon} 2^l$$

neighbours in  $Y$ . Indeed, suppose that every  $z \in Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$  has less than  $2|Y|/3 - 8\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$  neighbors in  $Y$ . Recall that every new member of  $Z'$  has at least  $(2/3 - 8\epsilon)|Y|$  neighbours in  $Y$ . Hence,

$$e(B_1) - e(B) > 8D(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon)|Y| \geq 8\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon)(1 - 2\epsilon)2^l \geq \epsilon 2^{2l+1}$$

since  $\epsilon < 1/16$ , contradicting (28).

Hence, we may choose  $z \in Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$  with at least

$$2|Y|/3 - 8\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$$

neighbours in  $Y$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $n \in z \cap W_1$ ; then none of these neighbours can contain  $n$ . Hence,  $Y$  contains at most

$$|Y|/3 + 8\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$$

sets containing  $n$ . But by (27),  $Y$  contains at least  $(1 - 44\epsilon)2^{l-1}$  of the subsets of  $W_1$  that contain  $n$ , and therefore  $|Y| \geq (3/2 - o(1))2^l$ . By (23), it follows that  $|Y| = (3/2 - o(1))2^l$  and  $|Z| = (3/2 + o(1))2^l$ , so  $Y$  contains  $(1 - o(1))2^{l-1}$  sets containing  $n$ . Hence, by (18), so does  $Z$ . As in the proof of Claim 1, we obtain a contradiction. This implies that

$$D = \min\{|\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z|, |Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2|\} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}2^l,$$

as desired.

This implies (b). Indeed, if  $|Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$ , then we are done. Otherwise, by the definition of  $D$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$ , and therefore

$$|Z \cap \mathcal{P}W_2| \geq (2 - \sqrt{\epsilon})2^l.$$

Since  $|Z| \leq (2 + 2\epsilon)2^l$ , we have

$$|Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| = |Z| - |Z \cap \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq (2 + 2\epsilon)2^l - (2 - \sqrt{\epsilon})2^l = (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 2\epsilon)2^l,$$

proving (b). □

We conclude by proving the following

**Claim 4.**

$$|\mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z| \leq 4\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus Z$$

be the collection of sets in  $\mathcal{P}W_2$  which are missing from  $Z$ , and let

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = Y \setminus \mathcal{P}W_1$$

be the set of ‘extra’ members of  $Y$ .

Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a 2-generator for  $X$ , we can express all  $|\mathcal{F}_2|2^l$  sets of the form

$$w_1 \sqcup f_2 \quad (w_1 \subset W_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2)$$

as a disjoint union of two sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . All but at most  $\epsilon 2^{2l+1}$  of these unions correspond to edges of  $B$ . Since  $|Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2| \leq (\sqrt{\epsilon} + 2\epsilon)2^l$ , there are at most  $(\sqrt{\epsilon} + 2\epsilon)2^l|Y|$  edges of  $B$  meeting sets in  $Z \setminus \mathcal{P}W_2$ . Call these edges of  $B$  ‘bad’, and the rest of the edges of  $B$  ‘good’. Fix  $f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ ; we can express all  $2^l$  sets of the form

$$w_1 \sqcup f_2 \quad (w_1 \subset W_1)$$

as a disjoint union of two sets in  $\mathcal{G}$ . If  $w_1 \sqcup f_2$  is represented by a good edge, then we may write

$$w_1 \sqcup f_2 = y_1 \sqcup w_2$$

where  $y_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1$  with  $y_1 \cap W_1 = w_1$ , and  $w_2 \subset W_2$ , so for every such  $w_1$ , there is a different  $y_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1$ . By (24),  $|Y| \leq (3/2 + 6\epsilon)2^l$ , and by (27),  $|Y \cap \mathcal{P}W_1| \geq (1 - 22\epsilon)2^l$ , so

$$|\mathcal{E}_1| = |Y| - |\mathcal{P}(W_1) \cap Y| \leq (3/2 + 6\epsilon)2^l - (1 - 22\epsilon)2^l = (1/2 + 28\epsilon)2^l.$$

Thus, for any  $f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ , at most  $(1/2 + 28\epsilon)2^l$  unions of the form  $w_1 \sqcup f_2$  correspond to good edges of  $B$ . All the other unions are generated by bad edges of  $B$  or are not generated by  $B$  at all, so

$$(1/2 - 28\epsilon)2^l|\mathcal{F}_2| \leq (2\epsilon + \sqrt{\epsilon})2^l|Y| + \epsilon 2^{2l+1}.$$

Since  $|Y| \leq (3/2 + 6\epsilon)2^l$  and  $\epsilon$  is small,  $|\mathcal{F}_2| \leq 4\sqrt{\epsilon}2^l$ , as required.  $\square$

We now know that  $Y$  contains all but at most  $o(2^l)$  of  $\mathcal{P}W_1$ , and  $Z$  contains all but at most  $o(2^l)$  of  $\mathcal{P}W_2$ . Since  $|Y| + |Z| < 3 \cdot 2^l$ , we may conclude that  $|Y| = (1 - o(1))2^l$  and  $|Z| = (2 - o(1))2^l$ . It follows from Proposition 16 that provided  $n$  is sufficiently large, we must have  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{P}(W_1) \cup \mathcal{P}(W_2) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ , completing the proof of Theorem 4.  $\square$

## 4 Conclusion

We have been unable to prove Conjecture 1 for  $k \geq 3$  and *all* sufficiently large  $n$ . Recall that if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $k$ -generator for an  $n$ -element set  $X$ , then

$$|\mathcal{G}| \geq 2^{n/k}.$$

In view of Proposition 18, it is natural to ask whether for any fixed  $k$ , all induced subgraphs of the Kneser graph  $H$  with  $\Omega(2^{n/k})$  vertices can be made  $k$ -partite by removing at most  $o(2^{2n/k})$  edges. This is false for  $k = 3$ , however, as the following example shows. Let  $n$  be a multiple of 6, and take an equipartition of  $[n]$  into 6 sets  $T_1, \dots, T_6$  of size  $n/6$ . Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{\{i,j\} \in [6]^{(2)}} (T_i \cup T_j);$$

then  $|\mathcal{A}| = 15(2^{n/3})$ , and  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  contains a  $2^{n/3}$ -blow-up of the Kneser graph  $K(6, 2)$ , which has chromatic number 4. It is easy to see that  $H[\mathcal{A}]$  requires the removal of at least  $2^{2n/3}$  edges to make it tripartite. Hence, a different argument to that in Section 3 will be required.

We believe Conjecture 1 to be true for all  $n$  and  $k$ , but it would seem that different techniques will be required to prove this.

## References

- [1] Alon, N., Frankl, P., The maximum number of disjoint pairs in a family of subsets, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 1 (1985), pp. 13–21.
- [2] Alon, N., Krivelevich, M., Testing  $k$ -colorability, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 15 (2002), Issue 2, pp. 211–227.
- [3] Bollobás, B., Erdős, P., Simonovits, M., Szemerédi, E., Extremal graphs without large forbidden subgraphs, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 3 (1978) pp. 29–41.
- [4] Chung, F.K.R., Frankl, P., Graham, R.L., Shearer, J.B., Some intersection theorems for ordered sets and graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 43 (1986), pp. 23–37.
- [5] Ellis, D., Note on generating all subsets of a finite set with disjoint unions, *Electron. J. Combin.* 16, (2009) no 1., Note 16.
- [6] Erdős, P., On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs, *Israel J. Math.* 2 (1964), pp. 183–190.
- [7] Erdős, P., On the number of complete subgraphs contained in certain graphs, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci., Ser. A* 7 (1962), pp. 459–464.

- [8] Erdős, P., Frankl, P., Ródl, V., The asymptotic number of graphs not containing a fixed subgraph and a problem for hypergraphs having no exponent, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 2 (1986), pp. 113–121.
- [9] Erdős, P., Simonovits, M., Supersaturated graphs and hypergraphs, *Combinatorica* **3** (1983), 181–192.
- [10] Frein, Y., Lévêque, B., Sebő, A., Generating all sets with bounded unions, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 17 (2008) pp. 641–660.
- [11] Füredi, Z., Katona, G.O.H., 2-bases of quadruples, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 15 (2006) pp. 131–141.
- [12] Goldreich, O., Goldwasser, S., and Ron, D., Property testing and its connection to learning and approximation, *Proc. 37th Annual IEEE FOCS* (1996), pp. 339–348.

David Ellis  
D.Ellis@dpmms.cam.ac.uk

Benny Sudakov  
b.sudakov@math.ucla.edu