

# A LOCAL VERSION OF KATONA'S INTERSECTION THEOREM

MARCELO SALES AND BJARNE SCHÜLKE

ABSTRACT. Katona's intersection theorem states that every intersecting family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  satisfies  $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\mathcal{F}|$ , where  $\partial\mathcal{F} = \{F \setminus x : x \in F \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is the shadow of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Frankl conjectured that for  $n > 2k$  and every intersecting family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$ , there is some  $i \in [n]$  such that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(i)|$ , where  $\mathcal{F}(i) = \{F \setminus i : i \in F \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is the link of  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $i$ . Here, we prove this conjecture in a very strong form for  $n > \binom{k+1}{2}$ . In particular, our result implies that for any  $j \in [k]$ , there is a  $j$ -set  $\{a_1, \dots, a_j\} \in [n]^{(j)}$  such that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(a_1, \dots, a_j)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(a_1, \dots, a_j)|$ . A similar statement is also obtained for cross-intersecting families.

## §1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, let  $n, k, \ell$  be positive integers. Let  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and for a set  $X$  let  $X^{(k)} = \{A \subseteq X : |A| = k\}$  be the set of  $k$ -subsets of  $X$ . A family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  is called *intersecting* if  $F \cap F' \neq \emptyset$  for all  $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$  and the *shadow* of  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$\partial\mathcal{F} = \{F \setminus x : x \in F \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Extremal properties of shadows and intersecting families are amongst the most prominent topics in extremal set theory. For instance, two cornerstones of the area are the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem [7], which determines the maximum size of an intersecting family and the Kruskal–Katona theorem [8, 9], which provides a solution for the minimisation problem of the shadow.

The following celebrated theorem due to Katona [5] combines these two concepts by bounding the size of the shadow of an intersecting family.

**Theorem 1.1** ([5]). *Suppose  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  is intersecting. Then  $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\mathcal{F}|$ .*

Theorem 1.1 was proved in a more general setting in [5]. Recently, the result was improved by Frankl and Katona [4] and Liu and Mubayi [6] for intersecting families of larger size. It is also worth to note the cross-intersecting variant of Theorem 1.1 that Frankl proved in [1]. Given integers  $k, \ell \geq 1$ , a pair of families  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [n]^{(\ell)}$  is *cross-intersecting* if for every  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  we have  $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$ .

---

*Key words and phrases.* Extremal set theory, intersecting families, shadow.

**Theorem 1.2** ([1]). *Let  $1 \leq k, \ell \leq n$  be positive integers and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [n]^{(\ell)}$  be cross-intersecting families. Then either  $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\mathcal{F}|$  or  $|\partial\mathcal{G}| \geq |\mathcal{G}|$ .*

In this paper we establish a local version of Theorem 1.1. For a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  and sets  $A, B \subseteq [n]$ , we define

$$\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{B}) = \{F \setminus A : F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ such that } A \subseteq F \text{ and } B \cap F = \emptyset\}$$

as the link of  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $A$  induced on  $[n] \setminus B$ . Notice that for  $B = \emptyset$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A) := \mathcal{F}(A, \emptyset)$  is just the usual link of  $\mathcal{F}$  at  $A$ . If on the other hand  $A = \emptyset$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(\overline{B}) := \mathcal{F}(\emptyset, \overline{B})$  is just the induced hypergraph on the set  $[n] \setminus B$ . Observe that  $\partial(\mathcal{F}(A)) = (\partial\mathcal{F})(A)$  and  $\partial(\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{B})) \subseteq (\partial\mathcal{F})(A, \overline{B})$ . We write  $\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{B}) := \partial(\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{B}))$ .

Frankl [3] conjectured the following local version of Theorem 1.1: Let  $n > 2k$  and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  be an intersecting family. Then there exists a vertex  $i \in [n]$  such that the link of  $i$  satisfies  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(i)|$ . We prove this conjecture for  $n > \binom{k+1}{2}$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $n > \binom{k+1}{2}$  and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  be intersecting. Then there exists an  $i \in [n]$  such that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(i)|$ .*

Frankl [3] further conjectured that a local version of Theorem 1.2 should hold. We prove it for  $n > k\ell$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *Suppose that for  $n > k\ell$ , the families  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [n]^{(\ell)}$  are cross-intersecting. Then there is some  $i \in [n]$  such that*

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(i)| \text{ or } |\partial\mathcal{G}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{G}(i)|.$$

Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 will be deduced from a more general result. To formulate it compactly, let us further introduce the following definition.

**Definition 1.5.** *We say that  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  is pseudo-intersecting if  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(\overline{X})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(\overline{X})|$  for all  $X \subseteq [n]$ .*

Note that for  $A \subseteq [n]$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$ , the link  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  being pseudo-intersecting means that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})|$  for every  $X \subseteq [n]$ . The term pseudo-intersecting comes from the following observation: If  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  is intersecting, then for every  $X \subseteq [n]$  we have  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(\overline{X})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(\overline{X})|$ . This is a consequence of Theorem 1.1 and the fact that  $\mathcal{F}(\overline{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  is intersecting. Note that if  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for  $A \in [n]^{(j)}$  with  $j < k$ , then  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A)|$ . That is, the pseudo-intersecting property of  $\mathcal{F}(i)$  implies the local version of Katona's intersecting theorem.

The next result shows that one can always find a pseudo-intersecting link in an intersecting family. In particular, it implies Theorem 1.3 for  $n > \binom{k+1}{2}$ .

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  be intersecting. Then there are sets  $M_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq M_k \subseteq [n]$  with  $|M_i| \geq n - \sum_{i \leq j \leq k} j$  such that for all  $A \in M_i^{(i)}$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting.*

Note that the link of every subset of  $M_1$  is pseudo-intersecting. In particular, for any intersecting family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$ , the inequality  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(i)|$  holds for all but at most  $\binom{k+1}{2}$  vertices  $i$ .

Our general result for cross-intersecting families reads as follows. For  $n > k\ell$  it implies Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [n]^{(\ell)}$  be cross-intersecting. Then there are sets  $M_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq M_k \subseteq [n]$  with  $|M_i| \geq n - (k+1-i)\ell$  such that one of the following holds.*

- *The family  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $i \in [k]$  and  $A \subseteq M_i^{(i)}$ ,*
- *or  $\mathcal{G}(B)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \subseteq M_2$ .*

A family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([n])$  is called  $t$ -union if  $|F \cup F'| \leq t$  for every  $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ . A family  $\mathcal{F}$  is an *antichain* if  $F \not\subseteq F'$  for every  $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ . Kiselev, Kupavskii and Patkós made the following conjecture on the minimum degree of  $(2\ell + 1)$ -union antichains.<sup>1</sup>

**Conjecture 1.8** ([3]). *Suppose that  $1 \leq 2\ell+1 < n$ , and that  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([n])$  is a  $(2\ell+1)$ -union antichain. Then  $\delta(\mathcal{F}) \leq \binom{n-1}{\ell-1}$ .*

In [3], Frankl solved Conjecture 1.8 for  $n \geq \ell^3 + \ell^2 + \frac{3}{2}\ell$ . He also noted that one could obtain better bounds by proving a local version of Theorem 1.1 (see Proposition 3.4(i), [3]). In particular, by using his reduction, Theorem 1.3 implies Conjecture 1.8 for  $n > \binom{\ell+2}{2}$ .

## §2. TOOLS

In this section we introduce the main technical lemma in the proof. Roughly speaking, in our proof we will inductively construct sets  $M_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A \subseteq M_i^{(i)}$ . The following lemma will help with the induction step. We directly formulate it in the setup in which it will be used.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [n]^{(k)}$  and let  $A, M \subseteq [n]$ . If  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M \setminus A})$  is pseudo-intersecting and  $\mathcal{F}(A \cup x)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $x \in M \setminus A$ , then  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting.*

*Proof.* Let  $X \subseteq [n]$  be given. We need to show that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})|$ . Note that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X \cup M) \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X \cup M) \setminus A})|$  holds by assumption. Hence, it is enough to show that if

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X' \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X' \setminus A})| \tag{2.1}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>They formulated their conjecture as an upper bound on the diversity of an intersecting antichain, which is equivalent.

holds for some  $X \subsetneq X' \subseteq X \cup M$ , then  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A})|$  for some  $x \in X' \setminus (X \cup A)$ . So let  $X'$  with  $X \subsetneq X' \subseteq X \cup M$  satisfy (2.1) and let  $x \in X' \setminus (X \cup A)$  be arbitrary. Given a family  $\mathcal{H}$  and a vertex  $x$ , let  $\mathcal{H}^{\cup x} = \{H \cup \{x\} : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . Observe that

$$\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A}) = \mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X' \setminus A}) \cup (\mathcal{F}(A \cup x, \overline{X' \setminus (A \cup x)}))^{\cup x} \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A}) \supseteq \partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X' \setminus A}) \cup (\partial\mathcal{F}(A \cup x, \overline{X' \setminus (A \cup x)}))^{\cup x}. \quad (2.3)$$

Since we have (2.1) and since

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}(A \cup x, \overline{X' \setminus (A \cup x)})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A \cup x, \overline{X' \setminus (A \cup x)})|$$

holds because  $\mathcal{F}(A \cup x)$  is pseudo-intersecting, (2.2) and (2.3) imply that

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{(X' \setminus x) \setminus A})|.$$

This is all we had to show.  $\square$

### §3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.6 AND 1.7

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* The proof proceeds inductively by constructing sets  $M_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$  such that for all  $A \in M_i^{(i)}$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting and  $|M_i| \geq n - \sum_{i \leq j \leq k} j$ .

We begin the backward induction with  $i = k$ . If  $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ , we would be done, so let  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and set  $M_k = [n] \setminus F$  (in particular,  $|M_k| \geq n - k$ ). Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting, we have  $\mathcal{F} \cap M_k^{(k)} = \emptyset$ . Thus, for  $A \in M_k^{(k)}$  and  $X \subseteq [n]$  we have  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A}) = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})| \geq |\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{X \setminus A})|$  for all  $X \subseteq [n]$ , meaning that  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for  $A \in M_k^{(k)}$ .

Now assume that for some  $i$  with  $2 \leq i \leq k$ , a set  $M_i \subseteq [n]$  with  $|M_i| \geq n - \sum_{i \leq j \leq k} j$  has been defined such that  $\mathcal{F}(A^+)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A^+ \in M_i^{(i)}$ . Next, we will argue that we only need to delete at most one  $(i-1)$ -set from  $M_i$  to obtain a set  $M_{i-1}$  as desired.

If for all  $A \in M_i^{(i-1)}$  the family  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M_i \setminus A})$  is pseudo-intersecting, then we set  $M_{i-1} = M_i$ . Since the induction hypothesis tells us that for every  $A \in M_i^{(i-1)}$  and  $x \in M_i \setminus A$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A \cup x)$  is pseudo-intersecting, Lemma 2.1 implies that  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting. So let us assume that  $\mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  is not pseudo-intersecting for some  $B \in M_i^{(i-1)}$ . Then there is some  $M \subseteq [n]$  with  $M_i \subseteq M$  such that  $|\partial\mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M \setminus B})| < |\mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M \setminus B})|$  and we set  $M_{i-1} = M_i \setminus B$ .

**Claim 3.1.** *For every  $A \in M_{i-1}^{(i-1)}$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M_i \setminus A})$  is pseudo-intersecting.*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in M_{i-1}^{(i-1)}$ ,  $M' \subseteq [n]$  with  $M_i \subseteq M'$  and consider  $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M' \setminus A})$  and  $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M' \setminus B})$ . Then  $F_1 \cup A, F_2 \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F_1, F_2 \subseteq [n] \setminus M_i \subseteq [n] \setminus (A \cup B)$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint and  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting,  $F_1 \cap F_2 \neq \emptyset$  and so  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M' \setminus A})$  and  $\mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M' \setminus B})$  are cross-intersecting. Theorem 1.2 implies that  $|\partial\mathcal{H}| \geq |\mathcal{H}|$  has to hold for some  $\mathcal{H} \in \{\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M' \setminus A}), \mathcal{F}(B, \overline{M' \setminus B})\}$ . By the choice of  $B$  and  $M$ , this yields the statement of the claim.  $\square$

Together with the induction hypothesis, this claim allows us to apply Lemma 2.1 which yields that  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A \in M_{i-1}^{(i-1)}$ . Further note that in either case  $|M_{i-1}| \geq |M_i| - i + 1 \geq n - \sum_{i-1 \leq j \leq k} j$ . Therefore, in either case  $M_{i-1}$  is as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* Again, we aim to inductively construct sets  $M_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$  such that for all  $A \in M_i^{(i)}$ , the family  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting and  $|M_i| \geq n - (k - i + 1)\ell$ . If at any point, we should not be able to proceed, i.e., we fail to construct the set  $M_{i-1}$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  will be pseudo-intersecting for all  $A \subseteq M_i$ .

We begin the backwards induction with  $i = k$ . If  $\mathcal{G} = \emptyset$ , we are done, so let  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  and set  $M_k = [n] \setminus G$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are cross-intersecting, this means that  $\mathcal{F} \cap M_k^{(k)} = \emptyset$  and therefore,  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A \in M_k^{(k)}$ . Further, we have  $|M_k| \geq n - \ell$ .

Now assume that for some  $i$  with  $2 \leq i \leq k$  we have constructed sets  $M_j$  for all  $i \leq j \leq k$  as desired. First assume that  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  is not pseudo-intersecting for some  $B \in M_i^{(\leq \ell)}$ , i.e., there is some  $X \subseteq [n]$  with  $M_i \subseteq X$  such that  $|\partial\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{X \setminus B})| < |\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{X \setminus B})|$ . Then we set  $M_{i-1} = M_i \setminus B$  and readily notice that  $|M_{i-1}| \geq n - (k - i + 2)\ell$ . Further, observe that (similarly as in the proof of Claim 3.1) for all  $A \in M_{i-1}^{(i-1)}$  and  $M_i \subseteq M' \subseteq [n]$ , the families  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M' \setminus A})$  and  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{X \setminus B})$  are cross-intersecting since  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ,  $A \cup B \subseteq M_i \subseteq M'$ ,  $X$ , and since  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are cross-intersecting. Thus, by the choice of  $B$  and  $X$ , Theorem 1.2 yields that  $\mathcal{F}(A, \overline{M_i \setminus A})$  is pseudo-intersecting. Since the induction gives us that  $\mathcal{F}(A^+)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A^+ \in M_i^{(i)}$ , we are now in a position to apply Lemma 2.1 to conclude that  $\mathcal{F}_1(A)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $A \in M_{i-1}^{(i-1)}$ .

Next assume that  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \in M_i^{(\leq \ell)}$ . In this case we set  $M_1 = M_2 = \dots = M_i$ .

**Claim 3.2.** *The family  $\mathcal{G}(B)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \subseteq M_i = M_2$ .*

*Proof.* For  $B \subseteq M_i$  with  $|B| > \ell$ , the statement follows immediately. We proceed by backwards induction on  $j = |B|$  and begin with  $j = \ell$ . The induction start follows because for  $B$  of size  $\ell$ , we have  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{X \setminus B}) = \mathcal{G}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  for all  $X \subseteq [n]$  and  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  is pseudo-intersecting.

Given that for some  $j \leq \ell$ , the family  $\mathcal{G}(B^+)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B^+ \in M_i^{(j)}$ , we can apply Lemma 2.1 (since we are in the case that  $\mathcal{G}(B, \overline{M_i \setminus B})$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \in M_i^{(\leq \ell)}$ ) to conclude that  $\mathcal{G}(B)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \in M_i^{(j-1)}$  which finishes the induction step.  $\square$

Thus, we have shown that if we cannot construct all sets  $M_1, \dots, M_k$  as desired by induction, then there is a set  $M_2 \subseteq [n]$  with  $|M_2| \geq n - (k-1)\ell$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(B)$  is pseudo-intersecting for all  $B \subseteq M_2$ . In other words, we proved that indeed one of the statements in the theorem has to hold.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Alexandre Perozim de Faveri for fruitful discussions and Peter Frankl and Andrey Kupavskii for reading earlier versions of this paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Frankl, *Generalizations of theorems of Katona and Milner*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **27** (1976), no. 3-4, 359–363, DOI [10.1007/BF01902114](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01902114). MR414370 [↑1](#), [1.2](#)
- [2] P. Frankl, *The shifting technique in extremal set theory*, Surveys in combinatorics 1987 (New Cross, 1987), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 123, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1987, pp. 81–110. MR905277 [↑](#)
- [3] P. Frankl, *Minimum degree and diversity in intersecting antichains*, Acta Math. Hungar. **163** (2021), no. 2, 652–662, DOI [10.1007/s10474-020-01100-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10474-020-01100-y). MR4227804 [↑1](#), [1](#), [1.8](#), [1](#)
- [4] P. Frankl and G. O. H. Katona, *On strengthenings of the intersecting shadow theorem*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **184** (2021), Paper No. 105510, 21, DOI [10.1016/j.jcta.2021.105510](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2021.105510). MR4297030 [↑1](#)
- [5] Gy. Katona, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **15** (1964), 329–337, DOI [10.1007/BF01897141](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01897141). MR168468 [↑1](#), [1.1](#), [1](#)
- [6] X. Liu and D. Mubayi, *Tight bounds for Katona’s shadow intersection theorem*, European J. Combin. **97** (2021), Paper No. 103391, 17, DOI [10.1016/j.ejc.2021.103391](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2021.103391). MR4282634 [↑1](#)
- [7] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **12** (1961), 313–320, DOI [10.1093/qmath/12.1.313](https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/12.1.313). [↑1](#)
- [8] J. B. Kruskal, *The number of simplices in a complex*, Mathematical optimization techniques, 1963, pp. 251–278. [↑1](#)
- [9] G. Katona, *A theorem of finite sets*, Theory of graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), 1968, pp. 187–207. [↑1](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EMORY UNIVERSITY, ATLANTA, USA

*Email address:* `marcelo.tadeu.sales@emory.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA, USA

*Email address:* `schuelke@caltech.edu`