

# Exact Intersections

## Algebraic Methods in Combinatorics, Lecture 6

We deduced from the Frankl-Wilson theorem that if  $\mathcal{A} \subset [n]^{(r)}$  is such that  $|x \cap y| \in L$  for any two distinct  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $L$  is a set of  $s$  non-negative integers, then

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s}.$$

What happens for non-uniform families, i.e. subsets of  $\mathcal{P}([n])$ ?

**Definition.** If  $L$  is a finite set of integers, a family  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$  is said to be  $L$ -intersecting if  $|A \cap B| \in L$  for any two distinct  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

We ask the following

**Question.** What is the maximum possible size of an  $L$ -intersecting family of subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ?

We write

$$M(n, L) = \max\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n]), \mathcal{A} \text{ is } L\text{-intersecting}\}.$$

We will see that an  $L$ -intersecting family of subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  has size at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i},$$

where  $s = |L|$ . So for  $L$  fixed and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $M(n, L)$  grows no faster than a polynomial of degree  $|L|$ . It is a longstanding open problem to determine, in terms of  $L$ , the rate of growth of  $M(n, L)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (for each fixed  $L$ ).

**Remark.** Similarly, we define

$$M(n, r, L) = \max\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subset [n]^{(r)}, \mathcal{A} \text{ is } L\text{-intersecting}\}.$$

Again, it would be interesting to determine, in terms of  $L$  and  $r$ , the rate of growth of  $M(n, r, L)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (for each fixed  $L$  and  $r$ ). It is not even known exactly which  $L$  and  $r$  force  $M(n, r, L)$  to be linear in  $n$ . For a survey of partial results, see the book by Babai and Frankl [1].

We start off with the simplest case,  $|L| = 1$ :

**Theorem 1** (Fisher). If  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$  is  $\{l\}$ -intersecting, i.e.  $|A \cap B| = l$  for any two distinct  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$  be  $\{l\}$ -intersecting. First, observe that if there exists  $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $|A_0| = l$ , then we are done. Indeed, every other set in  $\mathcal{A}$  then contains  $A_0$ , so the sets  $B \setminus A_0$  (for  $B \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{A_0\}$ ) must be pairwise disjoint, so  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n$ , as required.

Assume from now on that  $|A| > l$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . We claim that the characteristic vectors

$$\{\chi_A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

form a linearly independent set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . (In fact, this is true in the first case as well, but it is easier to use the above argument.)

To see this, suppose that

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A \chi_A = 0$$

for some real numbers  $\{c_A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . Taking the (standard Euclidean) inner product with  $\chi_B$  gives

$$c_B |B| + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{B\}} c_A |A \cap B| = 0,$$

and therefore

$$c_B (|B| - l) = -l \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{A}.$$

If  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A \neq 0$ , then for each  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $c_B$  is non-zero and has the opposite sign to  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} c_A = 0$ , so  $c_B = 0$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ , proving the claim.

Since  $\mathbb{R}^n$  has dimension  $n$ , it follows that  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n$ , proving the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark.** We have equality if  $l = 1$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{\{1\}\} \cup \{\{1, i\} : 2 \leq i \leq n\}$ , or if  $l = n - 2$  and  $\mathcal{A} = [n]^{\binom{n-1}{}}$ .

We now turn to the case of general  $L$ .

**Theorem 2** (Frankl, Wilson, 1981). *Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}[n]$  be  $L$ -intersecting, where  $|L| = s$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i}.$$

**Remark.** This is sharp when  $L = \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$ : take  $\mathcal{A} = [n]^{\binom{\leq s}}$ .

The proof we give is due to Babai (1988).

*Proof.* Write

$$\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\},$$

where  $|A_1| \geq |A_2| \geq \dots \geq |A_m|$ . We will find  $m$  linearly independent objects in a vector-space of dimension  $\sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i}$ . Our objects will be real-valued functions on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . For each set  $A_j$ , we will choose a function  $f_j : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$f_j(\chi_{A_j}) \neq 0 \quad \forall j \in [m],$$

but

$$f_j(\chi_{A_k}) = 0 \quad \forall k > j.$$

This ‘upper-triangular’ condition immediately implies that the  $f_j$ ’s are linearly independent.

**Claim.** Let  $U$  be a set, and let  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  be real-valued functions on  $U$ . If there exist points  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  such that

$$f_j(u_j) \neq 0 \quad \forall j \in [m],$$

but

$$f_j(u_k) = 0 \quad \forall k > j,$$

then the functions  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are linearly independent.

*Proof of Claim:* The  $m \times m$  matrix  $(f_j(u_k))_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq m}$  is strictly upper-triangular (upper triangular with all its diagonal entries non-zero). Such a matrix clearly has non-zero determinant, so its rows are linearly independent. In other words, the restrictions  $f_j|_{\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}}$  are linearly independent (as real-valued functions), so certainly the  $f_j$ 's are.  $\square$

For each  $j$ , define  $f_j : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \prod_{l \in L: l < |A_j|} \left( \sum_{i \in A_j} z_i - l \right).$$

We then have

$$f_j(\chi_{A_k}) = \prod_{l \in L: l < |A_j|} (|A_j \cap A_k| - l) \quad \forall j, k \in [m].$$

Hence,  $f_j(\chi_{A_j}) \neq 0$  for each  $j \in [m]$ , but  $f_k(\chi_{A_j}) = 0$  whenever  $k > j$ , as desired. It follows from the claim above that the  $f_j$ 's are linearly independent as real-valued functions on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ .

Observe that each function  $f_j$  can be considered as a polynomial in  $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  with total degree at most  $s$ . We now perform a process known as *multilinearization*: the idea is to find a *multilinear* polynomial  $\tilde{f}_j$  with total degree at most  $s$ , such that  $\tilde{f}_j$  agrees with  $f_j$  on all of  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . (A multivariate polynomial is *multilinear* iff it has degree at most 1 in each variable.)

For each  $j$ , express  $f_j$  as a real linear combination of monomials of the form

$$\prod_{i \in T} X_i^{a_i},$$

where  $a_i \geq 1$  for each  $i$ , and  $|T| \leq s$ . For each of these monomials, replace it by

$$\prod_{i \in T} X_i.$$

The resulting polynomial  $\tilde{f}_j$  clearly agrees with  $f_j$  on all of  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , and is a linear combination of monomials which are products of at most  $s$  distinct  $X_i$ 's, i.e. it is a multilinear polynomial of total degree at most  $s$ . The vector-space of multilinear polynomials of total degree at most  $s$  has dimension

$$\sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i};$$

indeed, the monomials of the form

$$\prod_{i \in T} X_i \quad (T \in [n]^{\leq s})$$

are a basis. Hence, the  $f_j$ 's live in a vector space of dimension at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^s \binom{n}{i},$$

proving the theorem. □

## References

- [1] L. Babai, P. Frankl, *Linear Algebra Methods in Combinatorics with Applications to Geometry and Computer Science*, Department of Computer Science, University of Chicago, preliminary version, 1992.