

A Product Version of the Hilton-Milner Theorem

Peter Frankl¹, Jian Wang²

¹Rényi Institute, Budapest, Hungary

²Department of Mathematics
Taiyuan University of Technology
Taiyuan 030024, P. R. China

E-mail: ¹frankl.peter@renyi.hu, ²wangjian01@tyut.edu.cn

Abstract

Two families \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} of k -subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ are called non-trivial cross-intersecting if $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}, G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\cap\{F: F \in \mathcal{F}\} = \emptyset = \cap\{G: G \in \mathcal{G}\}$. In the present paper, we determine the maximum product of the sizes of two non-trivial cross-intersecting families of k -subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for $n \geq 4k, k \geq 8$, which is a product version of the classical Hilton-Milner Theorem.

1 Introduction

For a positive integer n let $[n]$ denote the standard n -set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ set also $[i, j] = \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$. For an integer k let $\binom{[n]}{k}$ denote the collection of all subsets of $[n]$. Subsets of $\binom{[n]}{k}$ are called k -graphs or k -uniform families.

A k -graph \mathcal{F} is called t -intersecting if $|F \cap F'| \geq t$ for all $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$. Analogously, two k -graphs \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are called *cross t -intersecting* if $|F \cap G| \geq t$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$. In case of $t = 1$ we omit the 1 and use the term *cross-intersecting*.

One of the central results of extremal set theory is the Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem.

Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem ([5]). Let $n > k > t > 0$ and suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ is t -intersecting then for $n \geq n_0(k, t)$,

$$(1.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-t}{k-t}.$$

We should mention that the exact value of $n_0(k, t)$ is $(k-t+1)(t+1)$. For $t = 1$ it was determined already in [5], for $t \geq 15$ it is due to [6]. Finally Wilson [28] closed the gap $2 \leq t \leq 14$ with a proof valid for all t .

Let us note that the *full t -star*, $\left\{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : [t] \subset F\right\}$ shows that (1.1) is best possible. In general, for a set $T \subset [n]$ let $\mathcal{S}_T = \left\{S \in \binom{[n]}{k} : T \subset S\right\}$ denote the *star of T* .

For the case $t = 1$ the classical Hilton-Milner Theorem is a strong stability result. Recall that a family \mathcal{F} is called *non-trivial* if $\cap\{F: F \in \mathcal{F}\} = \emptyset$.

Hilton-Milner Theorem ([19]). If $n > 2k$ and $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ is non-trivial intersecting, then

$$(1.2) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1 =: h(n, k).$$

By now there are many different proofs known for this important result, cf. [2, 3, 12, 15, 10, 20, 25] etc. Let

$$\mathcal{HM}(n, k) = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F, F \cap [2, k+1] \neq \emptyset \right\} \cup \{[2, k+1]\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{HM}(n, k)$ is a non-trivial intersecting family and it shows that (1.2) is best possible.

Let us state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are non-trivial cross-intersecting families, $n \geq 4k$, $k \geq 8$. Then*

$$(1.3) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2 = \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1 \right)^2.$$

We can prove the same statement for $n \geq 5k$, $k \geq 7$ or $n \geq 8k$, $k \geq 6$ as well using the same proof.

Besides $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{HM}(n, k)$, for any $A, B \in \binom{[2, n]}{k}$ with $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ the construction

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F, F \cap A \neq \emptyset \right\} \cup \{B\}, \\ \mathcal{G} &= \left\{ G \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in G, G \cap B \neq \emptyset \right\} \cup \{A\} \end{aligned}$$

also attains equality in (1.3).

In the next section we will state several theorems involving the product of the sizes of cross-intersecting families. Some are important and powerful. However, to the best of our knowledge (1.3) is the first such result that implies the Hilton-Milner Theorem (just set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$).

In our proofs, we need two simple inequalities involving binomial coefficients.

Proposition 1.2. *Let n, k, i be positive integers. Then*

$$(1.4) \quad \binom{n-i}{k} \geq \left(\frac{n-k-(i-1)}{n-(i-1)} \right)^i \binom{n}{k},$$

$$(1.5) \quad \binom{n-i}{k-i} \binom{n}{k} \leq \binom{n-i+1}{k-i+1} \binom{n-1}{k-1}, \text{ for } n \geq k \geq i \geq 2.$$

Proof. Since

$$\frac{\binom{n-i}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} = \frac{(n-k)(n-k-1)\dots(n-k-(i-1))}{n(n-1)\dots(n-(i-1))} \geq \left(\frac{n-k-(i-1)}{n-(i-1)} \right)^i,$$

we have (1.4) holds.

For (1.5), simply note that

$$\frac{\binom{n-i}{k-i} \binom{n}{k}}{\binom{n-i+1}{k-i+1} \binom{n-1}{k-1}} = \frac{n(k-i+1)}{k(n-i+1)} = \frac{kn - (i-1)n}{kn - (i-1)k} \leq 1,$$

and the inequality follows. □

Let us recall the following common notations:

$$\mathcal{F}(i) = \{F \setminus \{i\} : i \in F \in \mathcal{F}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}(\bar{i}) = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : i \notin F\}.$$

Note that $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}(i)| + |\mathcal{F}(\bar{i})|$. For $P \subset Q \subset [n]$, let

$$\mathcal{F}(P, Q) = \{F \setminus Q : F \in \mathcal{F}, F \cap Q = P\}.$$

We also use $\mathcal{F}(\bar{Q})$ to denote $\mathcal{F}(\emptyset, Q)$. For $\mathcal{F}(\{i\}, Q)$ we simply write $\mathcal{F}(i, Q)$.

2 Earlier product theorems and some tools

In this section, we review some earlier theorems concerning the product of cross-intersecting families. We also recall Hilton's Lemma and give some corollaries that will be used later.

Theorem 2.1 (Pyber [26]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are cross-intersecting, $n \geq 2k$. Then*

$$(2.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}^2.$$

Theorem 2.2 (Matsumoto-Tokushige [24]). *Let k, ℓ be positive integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2\ell$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ are cross-intersecting. Then*

$$(2.2) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} \binom{n-1}{\ell-1}.$$

Note that for the case $n \geq 3k \geq 3\ell$, (2.2) was already proved by Pyber [26]. For a short proof of (2.1) cf. [14]. In that paper some more precise product results are proven.

Example 2.3. *Let $2 \leq s \leq k+1$ and define two families*

$$\mathcal{A}_s = \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in A, A \cap [2, s] = \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_s = \mathcal{S}_{\{1\}} \cup \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{k} : [2, s] \subset B \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that \mathcal{A}_s and \mathcal{B}_s are cross-intersecting.

Theorem 2.4 ([14]). *Let $3 \leq s \leq k+1$, $n \geq 2k$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are cross-intersecting and*

$$|\mathcal{B}| \geq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-s}{k-s+1}.$$

Then

$$(2.3) \quad |\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-s}{k-1} \right) \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-s}{k-s-1} \right) = |\mathcal{A}_s||\mathcal{B}_s|.$$

An important tool for proving the above results is the Kruskal-Katona Theorem ([23, 21], cf. [8] or [22] for short proofs of it).

Daykin [4] was the first to show that the Kruskal-Katona Theorem implies the $t=1$ case of the Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem. Hilton [18] gave a very useful reformulation of the Kruskal-Katona Theorem. To state it let us recall the definition of the lexicographic order on $\binom{[n]}{k}$. For two distinct sets $F, G \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ we say that F precedes G if

$$\min\{i : i \in F \setminus G\} < \min\{i : i \in G \setminus F\}.$$

E.g., $(1, 7)$ precedes $(2, 3)$. For a positive integer b let $\mathcal{L}(n, b, m)$ denote the first m members of $\binom{[n]}{b}$.

Hilton's Lemma ([18]). Let n, a, b be positive integers, $n > a + b$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subset \binom{[n]}{a}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \binom{[n]}{b}$ are cross-intersecting. Then $\mathcal{L}(n, a, |\mathcal{A}|)$ and $\mathcal{L}(n, b, |\mathcal{B}|)$ are cross-intersecting as well.

For a family $\mathcal{A} \subset \binom{[n]}{a}$ and an integer b define the family of transversals (of size b) $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$\mathcal{T}^{(b)}(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{b} : B \cap A \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A} \right\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are cross-intersecting iff $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{T}^{(b)}(\mathcal{A})$.

Let us use this notation to prove three corollaries of Hilton's Lemma.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $t \geq 1$.*

$$(2.4) \quad \text{If } |\mathcal{A}| \geq \binom{n-1}{a-1} + \dots + \binom{n-t}{a-1} \text{ then } |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n-t}{k-t}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(n, a, |\mathcal{A}|) \supset \mathcal{L}\left(n, a, \binom{n-1}{a-1} + \dots + \binom{n-t}{a-1}\right) &= \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{a} : A \cap [t] \neq \emptyset \right\} \\ &=: \mathcal{E}(n, a, t). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{T}^{(b)}(\mathcal{E}(n, a, t))$ is the t -star $\{B \in \binom{[n]}{b} : [t] \subset B\}$, the statement follows. \square

Corollary 2.6.

$$(2.5) \quad \text{If } |\mathcal{A}| > \binom{n-1}{a-1} - \binom{n-b-1}{a-1} \text{ then } |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n-1}{b-1}.$$

Proof. Suppose indirectly $|\mathcal{B}| \geq \binom{n-1}{b-1} + 1$. Consider

$$\mathcal{L}\left(n, b, \binom{n-1}{b-1} + 1\right) = \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{b} : 1 \in B \right\} \cup \{[2, b+1]\}.$$

Noting that

$$\mathcal{T}^{(a)}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(n, b, \binom{n-1}{b-1} + 1\right)\right) = \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{a} : 1 \in A, A \cap [2, b+1] \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

has size $\binom{n-1}{a-1} - \binom{n-b-1}{a-1}$ the desired contradiction follows. \square

Corollary 2.7.

$$(2.6) \quad \text{If } |\mathcal{A}| > \binom{n-1}{a-1} + \binom{n-2}{a-1} + \binom{n-4}{a-2} \text{ then } |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n-3}{b-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(n, a, |\mathcal{A}|) \supset \mathcal{L}\left(n, a, \binom{n-1}{a-1} + \binom{n-2}{a-1} + \binom{n-4}{a-2}\right) \\ = \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{a} : 1 \in A \text{ or } 2 \in A \text{ or } \{3, 4\} \subset A \right\} =: \mathcal{D}(n, a). \end{aligned}$$

Then clearly

$$\mathcal{T}^{(b)}(\mathcal{D}(n, a)) = \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{b} : \{1, 2, 3\} \subset B \text{ or } \{1, 2, 4\} \subset B \right\}$$

and the statement follows. \square

For later use let us prove one more consequence of Hilton's Lemma. We state it in the special case that we need in Section 3.

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are cross-intersecting, $n > 2k$. Let*

$$\binom{n-4}{k-4} < |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-3}{k-3},$$

and

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} < |\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} + \binom{n-4}{k-1}.$$

Define

$$f = |\mathcal{F}| - \binom{n-4}{k-4} \text{ and } g = |\mathcal{G}| - \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-3}{k-1}.$$

Then

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{g}{\binom{n-4}{k-1}} + \frac{f}{\binom{n-4}{k-3}} \leq 1.$$

Proof. Note that all

$$F \in \mathcal{L}(n, k, |\mathcal{F}|) \setminus \mathcal{L}\left(n, k, \binom{n-4}{k-4}\right)$$

satisfy $F \cap [4] = [3]$. Let \mathcal{F}_0 be the family of size f formed by the corresponding sets $F \setminus [4] \in \binom{[5, n]}{k-3}$.

Also, for all

$$G \in \mathcal{L}(n, k, |\mathcal{G}|) \setminus \mathcal{L}\left(n, k, \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1}\right),$$

$G \cap [4] = \{4\}$ follows from $g \leq \binom{n-4}{k-1}$ (a consequence of (2.4)). Let $\mathcal{G}_0 \subset \binom{[5, n]}{k-1}$ be formed by the corresponding sets $G \setminus [4]$. Obviously, \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{G}_0 are cross-intersecting. The inequality (2.7) is essentially due to Sperner [27] but let us repeat the simple argument. Define a bipartite graph with partite sets $\binom{[5, n]}{k-3}$ and $\binom{[5, n]}{k-1}$ by putting an edge between $F \in \binom{[5, n]}{k-3}$ and $G \in \binom{[5, n]}{k-1}$ iff $F \cap G = \emptyset$. This bipartite graph is bi-regular implying that the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_0)$ satisfies

$$|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_0)| / \binom{n-4}{k-1} \geq |\mathcal{F}_0| / \binom{n-4}{k-3}.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}_0$ is an independent set, $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_0) \cap \mathcal{G}_0 = \emptyset$ implying

$$\frac{|\mathcal{G}_0|}{\binom{n-4}{k-1}} + \frac{|\mathcal{F}_0|}{\binom{n-4}{k-3}} \leq 1. \quad \square$$

3 Some size restrictions for the general case and the proof for shifted-resistant families

Throughout the proof we assume that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are non-trivial, cross-intersecting and

$$(3.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \geq h(n, k)^2.$$

Proposition 3.1. *For $n \geq 2k - 1$, $k \geq 3$*

$$(3.2) \quad \left(\binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} \right) \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} \right) < \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right)^2.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} \leq \frac{n-1}{k-1} \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right).$$

Since $n \geq 2k - 1$ implies $\frac{n-1}{k-1} \leq \frac{n-3}{k-2} < \frac{n-2}{k-2}$, we infer

$$\frac{n-1}{k-1} \left(\binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} \right) \leq \frac{n-2}{k-2} \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \frac{n-3}{k-2} \binom{n-4}{k-3} \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2}.$$

Thus (3.2) follows. \square

Proposition 3.2. *In proving Theorem 1.1 we may assume that*

$$(3.3) \quad \min \{ |\mathcal{F}|, |\mathcal{G}| \} > \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3},$$

$$(3.4) \quad \max \{ |\mathcal{F}|, |\mathcal{G}| \} \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

Proof. By symmetry assume that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{G}|$. If $|\mathcal{F}| < \binom{n-4}{k-4}$, then applying (1.5) twice we obtain

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < \binom{n-4}{k-4} \binom{n}{k} < \binom{n-2}{k-2}^2 < h(n, k)^2.$$

If $|\mathcal{G}| > \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-4}{k}$ then by (2.5) we have $|\mathcal{F}| < \binom{n-4}{k-4}$. Thus we may assume that $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \binom{n-4}{k-4}$ and $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-4}{k}$.

Let

$$|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{n-4}{k-4} + \alpha \binom{n-4}{k-3}, \quad |\mathcal{G}| = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} + \beta \binom{n-4}{k-1}.$$

Note that (2.7) implies $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$ and thereby

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-3}{k-3} - \beta \binom{n-4}{k-3}.$$

Since $\frac{n-k}{n-3} > \frac{n-k-2}{n-3}$ implies

$$\frac{\binom{n-4}{k-3}}{\binom{n-3}{k-3}} > \frac{\binom{n-4}{k-1}}{\binom{n-3}{k-1}} > \frac{\binom{n-4}{k-1}}{\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1}},$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| &\leq \left(\binom{n-3}{k-3} - \beta \binom{n-4}{k-3} \right) \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} + \beta \binom{n-4}{k-1} \right) \\
(3.5) \quad &\leq \binom{n-3}{k-3} \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By (1.5) we know

$$\binom{n-3}{k-3} \binom{n-1}{k-1} < \binom{n-2}{k-2}^2.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n-3}{k-3} \binom{n-2}{k-1} &\leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} \binom{n-3}{k-2} \frac{k-2}{n-2} \frac{n-2}{k-1} < \binom{n-2}{k-2} \binom{n-3}{k-2}, \\
\binom{n-3}{k-3} \binom{n-3}{k-1} &\leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} \binom{n-4}{k-2} \frac{k-2}{n-2} \frac{n-3}{k-1} < \binom{n-2}{k-2} \binom{n-4}{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus from (3.5) and $k \geq 3$ we obtain

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right) < h(n, k)^2,$$

contradicting (3.1). Thus we may assume that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \geq \binom{n-3}{k-3} \text{ and } |\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-1}.$$

If $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{k-4}{k-3}$, then by (3.2)

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right)^2 < h(n, k)^2,$$

contradicting (3.1) again. Thus we may further assume $|\mathcal{F}| > \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3}$. Then by (2.6) it implies that

$$|\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-4}{k-2}. \quad \square$$

We need the following computational bound to estimate the size of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} below.

Lemma 3.3. For $n \geq 4k$ and $k \geq 8$,

$$(3.6) \quad h(n, k) > \frac{32}{9} \binom{n-2}{k-2} > 3 \binom{n-2}{k-2},$$

$$(3.7) \quad h(n, k) > \frac{9}{4} \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \frac{9}{4} \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

Proof. Since $n \geq (j-1)k/2$ implies $\frac{n-k-j+3}{n-j+1} \geq \frac{n-k}{n}$, by (1.4) and $n \geq 4k$ we infer

$$\frac{\binom{n-j}{k-2}}{\binom{n-2}{k-2}} \geq \left(\frac{n-k-j+3}{n-j+1} \right)^{j-2} \geq \left(\frac{n-k}{n} \right)^{j-2} \geq \left(\frac{3}{4} \right)^{j-2}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq 9.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j=2}^9 \binom{n-j}{k-2} \geq \binom{n-2}{k-2} \sum_{j=2}^9 \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{j-2} = \frac{1 - \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^8}{1 - \frac{3}{4}} \binom{n-2}{k-2} > \frac{32}{9} \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Thus by $k \geq 8$ we have

$$h(n, k) > \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \geq \sum_{j=2}^9 \binom{n-j}{k-2} > \frac{32}{9} \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

By (1.4) and $n \geq 4k$ we also have

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{j=2}^4 \binom{n-j}{k-2} \geq \binom{n-2}{k-2} \left(1 + \frac{3}{4} + \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2\right) > \frac{9}{4} \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\binom{n-j}{k-2}}{\binom{n-4}{k-2}} \geq \left(\frac{n-k-j+3}{n-j+1}\right)^{j-4} \geq \left(\frac{n-k}{n}\right)^{j-4} \geq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{j-4}, \quad 5 \leq j \leq 9.$$

We infer

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{j=5}^9 \binom{n-j}{k-2} \geq \binom{n-4}{k-2} \left(\frac{3}{4} + \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^3 + \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^4 + \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^5\right) > \frac{9}{4} \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

Adding (3.8) and (3.9) we obtain (3.7). \square

To prove the theorem we apply shifting, a powerful method that can be traced back to [5]. For $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, define the shift

$$S_{ij}(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_{ij}(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

where

$$S_{ij}(F) = \begin{cases} (F \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}, & j \in F, i \notin F \text{ and } (F \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{F}; \\ F, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is well known (cf. [9]) that shifting preserves the cross-intersecting property.

Let us define the *shifting partial order* \prec . For two k -sets A and B where $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, $a_1 < \dots < a_k$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$, $b_1 < \dots < b_k$ we say that A precedes B and denote it by $A \prec B$ if $a_i \leq b_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ is called *shifted* (or *initial*) if $A \prec B$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}$ always imply $A \in \mathcal{F}$. By repeated shifting one can transform an arbitrary k -graph into a shifted k -graph with the same number of edges.

The only problem with shifting is that it might destroy the non-triviality of \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{G} or both.

Fact 3.4. *If $S_{ij}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\{i\}}$, then*

$$(i) \quad \mathcal{F}(\overline{ij}) = \emptyset \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathcal{F}(i) \cap \mathcal{F}(j) = \emptyset. \text{ (Note that this is equivalent with } \mathcal{F}(\overline{ij}) \cap \mathcal{F}(i\overline{j}) = \emptyset).$$

With all this preparation we are ready to state and prove the main result of this section.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $n \geq 4k$, $k \geq 8$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. Suppose that there exist disjoint pairs $(a, b), (c, d)$ such that $S_{ab}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$ and $S_{cd}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$. Then*

$$(3.10) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < h(n, k)^2.$$

Proof. For notational convenience assume that $(a, b) = (1, 2)$ and $(c, d) = (3, 4)$. Arguing indirectly we assume (3.1). For $i = 2, 3, 4$, define

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \{F \setminus [4] : F \in \mathcal{F}, |F \cap [4]| = i\}.$$

Since $S_{ij}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\{i\}}$ for $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ and $(3, 4)$ implies $(1, 2), (3, 4) \in \mathcal{T}^{(2)}(\mathcal{F})$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad |F \cap [5, n]| \leq k - 2 \text{ for all } F \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Claim 1. For every $E \in \mathcal{F}_2$, there are at most two choices for $S \in \binom{[4]}{2}$ with $E \cup S \in \mathcal{F}$. For every $T \in \mathcal{F}_3$, there are at most two choices for $R \in \binom{[4]}{3}$ with $T \cup R \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Suppose that for some $E \in \mathcal{F}_2$ there are three choices for $S \in \binom{[4]}{2}$ with $E \cup S \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that Fact 3.4 (i) implies $S \neq (1, 2)$ and $S \neq (3, 4)$. Choose S_1, S_2 such that $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, assume that $S_1 = (1, 3)$ and $S_2 = (1, 4)$, then $E \cup \{1\} \in \mathcal{F}(3) \cap \mathcal{F}(4)$, contradicting Fact 3.4 (ii).

Similarly, suppose that for some $T \in \mathcal{F}_3$ there are three choices for $R \in \binom{[4]}{3}$ with $T \cup R \in \mathcal{F}$. Then we may choose R_1, R_2 such that $R_1 \cap R_2 = (1, 2)$ or $(3, 4)$. Without loss of generality, assume that $R_1 = (1, 2, 3)$ and $R_2 = (1, 2, 4)$, then $T \cup \{1, 2\} \in \mathcal{F}(3) \cap \mathcal{F}(4)$, contradicting Fact 3.4 (ii). \square

By Claim 1 we have

$$(3.12) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq 2|\mathcal{F}_2| + 2|\mathcal{F}_3| + |\mathcal{F}_4|.$$

It follows that

$$(3.13) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq 2 \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 2 \binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4} = \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

By (3.7), for $n \geq 4k$, $k \geq 8$ we have $|\mathcal{F}| < \frac{4}{9}h(n, k)$. Then the indirect assumption (3.1) implies

$$(3.14) \quad |\mathcal{G}| > \frac{9}{4}h(n, k).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ P \in \binom{[4]}{2} : P \cap (1, 2) \neq \emptyset, P \cap (3, 4) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Claim 2.

$$(3.15) \quad \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| > 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3}.$$

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| \leq 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3}$. Note that Fact 3.4 (i) implies $|\mathcal{F}(\{1, 2\}, [4])| = |\mathcal{F}(\{3, 4\}, [4])| = 0$. Then by Claim 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}| &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| + 2|\mathcal{F}_3| + |\mathcal{F}_4| \\ &\leq 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3} + 2 \binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4} \\ &= 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-3}{k-3} \\ &< 3 \binom{n-3}{k-3} + 3 \binom{n-5}{k-3}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.7) it follows that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 3 \left(\frac{k-2}{n-2} \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \frac{k-2}{n-4} \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right) < \frac{4(k-1)}{3(n-1)} h(n, k).$$

By (3.1) and (3.6),

$$(3.16) \quad |\mathcal{G}| > \frac{3(n-1)}{4(k-1)} h(n, k) > \frac{3(n-1)}{4(k-1)} 3 \binom{n-2}{k-2} > 2 \binom{n-1}{k-1},$$

contradicting (3.4). \square

Claim 3.

$$(3.17) \quad |\mathcal{G}(\overline{[4]})| \leq \binom{n-7}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-3}.$$

Proof. By Claim 1 and (3.15), we infer

$$2|\mathcal{F}_2| \geq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| > 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3}.$$

It follows that $|\mathcal{F}_2| > 2 \binom{n-5}{k-3} > \binom{n-5}{k-3} + \binom{n-6}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-4}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{G}(\overline{[4]})$ are cross-intersecting, by (2.6) we obtain (3.17). \square

Claim 4. For $i \in [4]$,

$$(3.18) \quad |\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| \leq \binom{n-4}{k-1} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-1}.$$

Proof. Since \mathcal{F} is non-trivial, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $i \notin F$. Let $E = F \cap [5, n]$. By (3.11), $|E| \leq k-2$. Now the cross-intersection implies $E \cap E' \neq \emptyset$ for each $E' \in \mathcal{G}(i, [4])$. Thus the claim follows. \square

Claim 5. At most five of $\mathcal{G}(P, [4])$, $P \in \binom{[4]}{2}$ have size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-3} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-3}$.

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $|\mathcal{G}(P, [4])| > \binom{n-5}{k-3} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-3}$ for all $P \in \binom{[4]}{2}$. Then for each $P \in \binom{[4]}{2}$ let $P' = [4] \setminus P$. Apply (2.5) with $a = b = k-2$ to the cross-intersecting families $\mathcal{G}(P, [4])$ and $\mathcal{F}(P', [4])$, we infer $|\mathcal{F}(P', [4])| \leq \binom{n-5}{k-3}$. Then

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| \leq 4 \binom{n-5}{k-3},$$

contradicting (3.15). \square

By Claim 5, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{P \subset [4], |P| \geq 2} |\mathcal{G}(P, [4])| &\leq 5 \binom{n-4}{k-2} + \binom{n-5}{k-3} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-3} + 4 \binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4} \\
&< 2 \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 3 \left(\binom{n-4}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} \right) + \left(\binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4} \right) \\
&\quad + \binom{n-5}{k-3} \\
&= 2 \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 3 \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-5}{k-3} \\
&= 2 \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 2 \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-5}{k-3} \\
(3.19) \quad &< 2 \binom{n-2}{k-2} + 2 \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Claim 6. Exactly two of $\mathcal{G}(1, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(2, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(3, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(4, [4])$ have size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2}$.

Proof. Suppose that at least three of $\mathcal{G}(1, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(2, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(3, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(4, [4])$ have size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-3} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-3}$. Then for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists $i \in [4]$ such that $i \notin P$ and $|\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| > \binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2}$. Apply (2.5) to $\mathcal{G}(i, [4])$ and $\mathcal{F}(P, [4])$ with $a = k-1$ and $b = k-2$, we infer $|\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| \leq \binom{n-5}{k-3}$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, contradicting (3.15). Thus, at most two of $\mathcal{G}(1, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(2, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(3, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(4, [4])$ have size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-3} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-3}$.

Suppose that at most one of them has size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2}$. Then by (3.18) we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| \leq \binom{n-4}{k-1} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-1} + 3 \left(\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2} \right).$$

Using

$$\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2} \leq \binom{n-4}{k-2} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-2},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| &\leq \binom{n-4}{k-1} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-1} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-2} \\
&\quad + 2 \left(\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2} \right) \\
&< \binom{n-3}{k-1} - \binom{n-1-k}{k-1} + 2 \binom{n-5}{k-2} \\
(3.20) \quad &< h(n, k) - \binom{n-2}{k-2} - \binom{n-3}{k-2} + 2 \binom{n-5}{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding (3.17), (3.19) and (3.20),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{G}| &= \sum_{\emptyset \neq P \subset [4]} |\mathcal{G}(P, [4])| + |\mathcal{G}(\overline{[4]})| \\ &< h(n, k) + \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 2\binom{n-5}{k-2} + \binom{n-7}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $k \geq 7$ implies $h(n, k) \geq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq 8} \binom{n-i}{k-2}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{G}| &< 2h(n, k) + \binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-6}{k-2} - \binom{n-7}{k-2} - \binom{n-8}{k-2} + \binom{n-7}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-3} \\ &= 2h(n, k) + \binom{n-6}{k-3} + \binom{n-7}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-3} - \binom{n-7}{k-2} - \binom{n-8}{k-2} \\ &\leq 2h(n, k) + 2\binom{n-6}{k-3} - 2\binom{n-8}{k-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n \geq 4k$ and $k \geq 3$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{n-8}{k-2}}{\binom{n-6}{k-3}} &= \frac{(n-k-3)(n-k-4)(n-k-5)}{(n-6)(n-7)(k-2)} \\ &\geq \frac{(3k-3)(3k-4)(3k-5)}{(4k-6)(4k-7)(k-2)} > \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^2 \times 3 > 1. \end{aligned}$$

we infer $|\mathcal{G}| < 2h(n, k)$, contradicting (3.14). \square

Now consider a pair (i, P) , $P \in \binom{[4]}{2}$, $i \in [4] \setminus P$ and $|\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| > \binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2}$. Apply (2.5) to $\mathcal{G}(i, [4])$ and $\mathcal{F}(P, [4])$ with $a = k-1$, $b = k-2$, we infer $|\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| \leq \binom{n-5}{k-3}$. By Claim 6, exactly two of $\mathcal{G}(1, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(2, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(3, [4])$, $\mathcal{G}(4, [4])$ have size greater than $\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2}$. Hence, at most one $P \in \{(1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 3), (2, 4)\}$ satisfies $|\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| > \binom{n-5}{k-3}$. It follows that

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| \leq \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 3\binom{n-5}{k-3}.$$

Then by Claim 1 and the identity $\binom{n-2}{k-2} = \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 2\binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}| &\leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\mathcal{F}(P, [4])| + 2|\mathcal{F}_3| + |\mathcal{F}_4| \\ &\leq 3\binom{n-5}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} + 2\binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-4} \\ &= \binom{n-2}{k-2} + 3\binom{n-5}{k-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for $n \geq 4k$,

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} + 3\binom{n-5}{k-3} = \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \frac{3(k-2)}{n-4} \binom{n-4}{k-2} < \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \frac{3}{4} \binom{n-4}{k-2},$$

by (3.6) and (3.7) we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}| &< \frac{1}{4} \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \frac{3}{4} \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right) \\
&< \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{9}{32} h(n, k) + \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{4}{9} h(n, k) \\
(3.21) \quad &= \frac{155}{384} h(n, k) < \frac{32}{73} h(n, k).
\end{aligned}$$

By Claim 6 and (3.18),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |\mathcal{G}(i, [4])| &\leq 2 \left(\binom{n-4}{k-1} - \binom{n-2-k}{k-2} \right) + 2 \left(\binom{n-5}{k-2} - \binom{n-3-k}{k-2} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(\binom{n-3}{k-1} - \binom{n-1-k}{k-2} \right) \\
(3.22) \quad &= 2h(n, k) - 2 \binom{n-2}{k-2} - 2 \binom{n-3}{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding (3.17), (3.19) and (3.22),

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{G}| &= |\mathcal{G}(\overline{[4]})| + \sum_{\emptyset \neq P \subset [4]} |\mathcal{G}(P, [4])| \\
&\leq 2h(n, k) + \binom{n-4}{k-2} + \binom{n-7}{k-3} + \binom{n-8}{k-3} \\
(3.23) \quad &\leq 2h(n, k) + \binom{n-2}{k-2} \stackrel{(3.6)}{<} \frac{73}{32} h(n, k).
\end{aligned}$$

But now (3.21) and (3.23) imply $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < h(n, k)^2$, contradicting (3.1). This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

4 The shifted case and the proof of the main theorem

In this section, we determine the maximum product of sizes of non-trivial shifted cross-intersecting families.

First, we determine the maximum sum of sizes of non-trivial shifted cross-intersecting families \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} with $(2, 5, 7, \dots, 2k-1, 2k+1) \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ by modifying an injective map introduced in [10].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $n \geq k > 0$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be cross-intersecting. Suppose that both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are non-trivial shifted families. Moreover $(2, 5, 7, \dots, 2k-1, 2k+1) \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$(4.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 2h(n, k).$$

Proof. We claim that for every $H \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ there exists ℓ such that $|H \cap [2\ell]| \geq \ell$. Moreover, if $1 \notin H$ then $\ell \geq 2$. Arguing indirectly, assume that no such ℓ exists for $H = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$ where $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k$. For $\ell = 1$ this implies $a_1 \geq 2$. For $\ell \geq 2$ we infer $a_\ell > 2\ell$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, k$. By shiftedness, we see that $(2, 5, 7, \dots, 2k+1) \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$, a contradiction. Let $\ell(H)$ be the maximal ℓ such that $|H \cap [2\ell]| \geq \ell$.

Recall the notation $A \triangle B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$, the symmetric difference. Define the function $\phi: \phi(H) = H \triangle [2\ell(H)]$.

Claim 7. For $G, G' \in \mathcal{G}$, $\phi(G) \neq \phi(G')$.

Proof. If $\ell(G) = \ell(G') := \ell$ then $\phi(G) \Delta [2\ell] = G \neq G' = \phi(G') \Delta [2\ell]$ implies $\phi(G) \neq \phi(G')$. On the other hand if $\ell(G) > \ell(G')$ then

$$|\phi(G) \cap [2\ell(G)]| = \ell > |\phi(G') \cap [2\ell(G)]|$$

by the maximality of $\ell(G')$. □

Claim 8. For $G \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{1})$, $\phi(G) \setminus \{1\} \notin \mathcal{F}(1)$.

Proof. Set $\ell = \ell(G)$. Let $G = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ with $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_k$. The maximal choice of ℓ implies

$$[2\ell] \cap G = \{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}, \quad x_{\ell+1} > 2\ell + 2, \dots, x_k > 2k.$$

By shiftedness $(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \cup (2\ell + 2, 2\ell + 4, \dots, 2k) \in \mathcal{G}$. Note that $G \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{1})$ implies $x_1 \geq 2$. If $\phi(G) \setminus \{1\} = ([2, 2\ell] \setminus (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)) \cup (2\ell + 2, 2\ell + 4, \dots, 2k) \in \mathcal{F}(1)$ then by shiftedness $([2\ell] \Delta (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)) \cup (2\ell + 1, 2\ell + 3, \dots, 2k - 1) \in \mathcal{F}$ and it contradicts the cross-intersecting property. □

Claim 9. If $H \neq [2, k + 1]$, $H \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$, $1 \notin H$ then $\phi(H) \cap [2, k + 1] \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. There are two cases. Let $\ell = \ell(H)$. If $2\ell \geq k + 1$ then $[2, k + 1] \subset [2\ell]$. Consequently, we can choose $x \in [2, k + 1] \setminus H$ since $H \neq [2, k + 1]$. Thus $x \in [2\ell] \setminus H \subset H \Delta [2\ell]$, i.e., $x \in [2, k + 1] \cap \phi(H)$. As we noted before, $1 \notin H$ and $(2, 5, 7, \dots, 2k - 1, 2k + 1) \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ imply that $\ell \geq 2$. If $k + 1 > 2\ell$ then $\ell \geq 2$ implies the existence of $x \in [2, 2\ell] \setminus H$ and hence $x \in H \Delta [2\ell]$. It follows that $x \in [2, k + 1] \cap \phi(H)$. □

Note that the non-triviality and the shiftedness imply $[2, k + 1] \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$. From Claims 7, 8 and 9, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(1)| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1})| &= |\mathcal{F}(1)| + |\phi(\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}) \setminus \{[2, k + 1]\})| + 1 \\ (4.2) \quad &\leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Switching the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad |\mathcal{F}(\bar{1})| + |\mathcal{G}(1)| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1.$$

Adding (4.2) and (4.3), we get (4.1). □

Recall the following inequality from [6], for a proof using linear algebra cf. [11].

Lemma 4.2 ([6]). *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be a shifted family with $0 \leq t < k$. If $[t] \cup \{t + 2, t + 4, \dots, 2k - t\} \notin \mathcal{F}$, then*

$$(4.4) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k-t-1}.$$

Proposition 4.3. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial and cross-intersecting, $n \geq 4k$, $k \geq 8$. If both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are shifted, then

$$(4.5) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2.$$

Proof. We may assume that $(1, 3, 5, \dots, 2k-1) \notin \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$. Indeed, if $(1, 3, 5, \dots, 2k-1) \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$, then by cross-intersection we infer $(2, 4, \dots, 2k) \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. By shiftedness, it follows that $(2, 5, 7, \dots, 2k-1, 2k+1) \notin \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. By (4.1),

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \left(\frac{|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}|}{2} \right)^2 \leq h(n, k)^2$$

and we are done.

By symmetry assume that $(1, 3, 5, \dots, 2k-1) \notin \mathcal{F}$. Then by (4.4) we have

$$(4.6) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k-2}.$$

By (3.3) and $n \geq 4k$, we obtain that

$$|\mathcal{F}| > \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} = \frac{n-3}{k-3} \binom{n-4}{k-4} + \frac{n-k}{k-3} \binom{n-4}{k-4} > 7 \binom{n-4}{k-4}.$$

By (1.4) and $n \geq 4k$,

$$|\mathcal{F}| > 7 \binom{n-4}{k-4} > \left(\frac{4}{3} \right)^4 \binom{n-4}{k-4} > \left(\frac{n-3}{n-k+1} \right)^4 \binom{n-4}{k-4} > \binom{n}{k-4}.$$

Then Lemma 4.2 implies that $(1, 2, 3, 5, 7, \dots, 2k-3) \in \mathcal{F}$.

We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. $(1, 2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k-2) \notin \mathcal{F}$.

In view of (4.4) the assumption $(1, 2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k-2) \notin \mathcal{F}$ implies for $n \geq 4k$

$$(4.7) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k-3} \stackrel{(1.4)}{<} \left(\frac{n-2}{n-k+1} \right)^3 \binom{n-3}{k-3} < \left(\frac{4}{3} \right)^3 \binom{n-3}{k-3} < 3 \binom{n-3}{k-3}.$$

By (3.4),

$$(4.8) \quad |\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} < 2 \binom{n-1}{k-1}.$$

From (4.7) and (4.8), we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < 6 \binom{n-1}{k-1} \binom{n-3}{k-3} \stackrel{(1.5)}{\leq} 6 \binom{n-2}{k-2}^2 \stackrel{(3.6)}{<} h(n, k)^2.$$

Case 2. $(1, 2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k-2) \in \mathcal{F}$.

By cross-intersection, $(3, 5, \dots, 2k+1) \notin \mathcal{G}$. Using that \mathcal{F} is non-trivial, $[2, k+1] \in \mathcal{F}$ follows. By cross-intersection again $G \cap [2, k+1] \neq \emptyset$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Consequently

$$|\mathcal{G}(1)| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} < h(n, k).$$

Consider $\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2) \subset \binom{[3, n]}{k-1}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\bar{2}) \neq \emptyset$ and \mathcal{F} is shifted, $\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2}) \neq \emptyset$. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}.$$

For $G \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})$ define $\tilde{G} = \{x-2: x \in G\}$ and set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \{\tilde{G}: G \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})\}.$$

Note that $(3, 5, \dots, 2k+1) \notin \mathcal{G}$ implies $(1, 3, \dots, 2k-1) \notin \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Applying (4.4) with $t=1$ yields

$$(4.10) \quad |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Thus,

$$(4.11) \quad |\mathcal{G}| \leq |\mathcal{G}(1)| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})| < 2h(n, k).$$

By (4.6) and (1.4), we obtain for $n \geq 4k$

$$(4.12) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k-2} \leq \left(\frac{n-1}{n-k+1}\right)^2 \binom{n-2}{k-2} < \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^2 \binom{n-2}{k-2} = \frac{16}{9} \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.11), we obtain

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < \frac{32}{9} \binom{n-2}{k-2} h(n, k) \stackrel{(3.6)}{<} h(n, k)^2. \quad \square$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.1 let us introduce the notion of shift-resistant pair. For a pair of families $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$, define the quantity

$$w(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i \in F} i + \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{j \in G} j.$$

Let us fix $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ so that \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} are non-trivial cross-intersecting, $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}|$ is maximal, moreover among such pairs $w(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is minimal. If in such pair \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are not both shifted then we say that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is shift-resistant.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is a shift-resistant cross-intersecting pair. Then for $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$ there exist disjoint pairs $(a, b), (c, d)$ such that $S_{ab}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$ and $S_{cd}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are not both shifted, without loss of generality suppose $S_{ab}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$. Note that this implies $F \cap (a, b) \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence

$$\mathcal{S}_{\{a, b\}} = \left\{ S \in \binom{[n]}{k} : (a, b) \subset S \right\} \subset \mathcal{G}$$

follows from the maximality of $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}|$.

Consider an arbitrary pair $(c, d) \subset [n] \setminus (a, b)$. First note that $S_{cd}(\mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$ cannot hold. Indeed, $\mathcal{S}_{\{a, b\}} \subset \mathcal{G}$ implies $\mathcal{G}(\bar{c}, \bar{d}) \neq \emptyset$ and thereby $S_{cd}(\mathcal{G}) \not\subset \mathcal{S}_c$. If $S_{cd}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$ then we are done. Thus we may assume that $S_{cd}(\mathcal{G}) \not\subset \mathcal{S}_c$. Now the minimality of $w(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ implies $S_{cd}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ and $S_{cd}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G}$ for all $(c, d) \subset [n] \setminus (a, b)$.

Let $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{k-1})$ be the $k-1$ smallest elements of $[n] \setminus (a, b)$. Then $\mathcal{F}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F}(\bar{a}) \neq \emptyset$ imply $\mathcal{F}(\bar{a}, b) \neq \emptyset$, moreover $S_{cd}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ for all $(c, d) \subset [n] \setminus (a, b)$ implies $D \in \mathcal{F}(\bar{a}, b)$. Similarly, $D \in \mathcal{F}(a, \bar{b})$. Thus $\mathcal{F}(\bar{a}, b) \cap \mathcal{F}(a, \bar{b}) \neq \emptyset$, contradicting $S_{ab}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be a pair of non-trivial cross-intersecting families with $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}|$ maximal. Moreover, we assume that $w(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is minimal among all such pairs. Then the minimality of $w(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ implies that either both of \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} are shifted or $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ forms a shift-resistant pair. If \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are both shifted then by Proposition 4.3 we conclude that $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$.

If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ forms a shift-resistant pair, then by Proposition 4.4 there exist disjoint pairs $(a, b), (c, d)$ such that either \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{G} (call it \mathcal{H}) satisfies $S_{ab}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$ and $S_{cd}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$. By symmetry assume that $S_{ab}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_a$ and $S_{cd}(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathcal{S}_c$. Then by Proposition 3.5 we conclude that $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| < h(n, k)^2$. \square

5 Further improvements and concluding remarks

The most intriguing problem is whether (1.3) of Theorem 1.1 holds for the full range, that is, for all n, k satisfying $n \geq 2k \geq 4$. Note that for $n = 2k$, $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq \binom{2k}{k} = 2h(n, k)$ is obvious. Consequently, $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$.

By a different argument, we can also prove Theorem 1.1 for $n \geq 3k$ and $k \geq 15$ as well. Let us first prove a statement of some independent interest.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are cross-intersecting, $n \geq 2k$ and $\min\{|\mathcal{F}|, |\mathcal{G}|\} \geq \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3}$. Then*

$$(5.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 2 \binom{n-1}{k-1}.$$

Proof. By Hilton's Lemma, without loss of generality, assume that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{L}(n, k, |\mathcal{F}|), \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{L}(n, k, |\mathcal{G}|)$, $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{G}|$ and $|\mathcal{G}| > \binom{n-1}{k-1}$. Thus $|\mathcal{G}(1)| = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ and $|\mathcal{F}(1)| = |\mathcal{F}|$. If $|\mathcal{G}(\bar{1})| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-1}$ then

$$|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| = |\mathcal{F}(1, 2)| + |\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})| + |\mathcal{G}(1)| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)|.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2}), \mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2) \subset \binom{[3, n]}{k-1}$ are cross-intersecting, we have

$$|\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| &= |\mathcal{F}(1, 2)| + |\mathcal{G}(1)| + (|\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)|) \\ &\leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} \\ &= 2 \binom{n-1}{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may assume that $|\mathcal{G}| > \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1}$.

Now

$$|\mathcal{G}| = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})| \text{ and } |\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}(1, 2)|.$$

By the assumption on $|\mathcal{F}|$, $\mathcal{F}(1, 2) \subset \binom{[n-2]}{k-2}$ satisfies $|\mathcal{F}(1, 2)| \geq \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3}$. Consequently $\{3, 4\} \subset G$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})$. We infer $|\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}, 3, 4)| = |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2})|$ and

$$|\mathcal{F}(1, 2)| = \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} + |\mathcal{F}(1, 2, \bar{3}, \bar{4})|.$$

As $\mathcal{F}(1, 2, \bar{3}, \bar{4})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}, 3, 4)$ are cross-intersecting, we have

$$|\mathcal{F}(1, 2, \bar{3}, \bar{4})| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}, 3, 4)| \leq \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| &= \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} + |\mathcal{F}(1, 2, \bar{3}, \bar{4})| + \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}, 3, 4)| \\ &\leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \binom{n-3}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-3} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \\ &= 2\binom{n-1}{k-1}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $n \geq 2k$ and let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. Let $|\mathcal{F}| = \alpha h(n, k)$ and suppose that $\alpha < 1$. Set $f(\alpha) = \frac{1+\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2}$. Then $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| > h(n, k)^2$ implies*

$$(5.2) \quad f(\alpha) \geq \prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i}.$$

Proof. By (3.3) and Proposition 5.1, we infer $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 2\binom{n-1}{k-1}$. Note that $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| > h(n, k)^2$ implies $|\mathcal{G}| \geq h(n, k)/\alpha$. Therefore,

$$2\binom{n-1}{k-1} \geq |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \geq \left(\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) h(n, k) \geq \left(\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}\right).$$

By rearranging,

$$\left(\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha} - 2\right) \binom{n-1}{k-1} \leq \left(\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}.$$

Multiplying both sides by α we get

$$(1-\alpha)^2 \binom{n-1}{k-1} \leq (1+\alpha^2) \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}.$$

Thus,

$$f(\alpha) = \frac{1+\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} \geq \frac{\binom{n-1}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)\dots(n-k+1)}{(n-k-1)(n-k-2)\dots(n-2k+1)}. \quad \square$$

In case of shift-resistant families and $k \geq 9$ we succeeded to extend the proof to the whole range.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $n \geq 2k+1$, $k \geq 6$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. Suppose that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ forms a shift-resistant pair. Set $f(\alpha) = \frac{1+\alpha^2}{(1-\alpha)^2}$. If*

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} > f(0.64) \approx 10.8765,$$

then

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2.$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.4 and (3.13), we have

$$(5.3) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

For $n = 2k + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-4}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} &= \frac{k+1}{2k+1} \left(\frac{2k(2k-1)2(k-1) + k(k-1)(k-2)}{2k(2k-1)2(k-1)} \right) \\ &= \frac{k+1}{2k+1} \frac{3(3k-2)}{4(2k-1)} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{3k^2 + k - 2}{4k^2 - 1} > \frac{9}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\binom{x-d}{k} / \binom{x}{k}$ is an increasing function of x , for all $n \geq 2k + 1$,

$$(5.4) \quad \binom{n}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-4}{k} > \frac{25}{16} \binom{n}{k}.$$

By (5.4) we infer for $(n-2) \geq 2(k-2) + 1$,

$$\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-3}{k-2} + \binom{n-6}{k-2} > \frac{25}{16} \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

For $(n-4) \geq 2(k-2) + 1$,

$$\binom{n-4}{k-2} + \binom{n-5}{k-2} + \binom{n-7}{k-2} > \frac{25}{16} \binom{n-4}{k-2}.$$

Therefore,

$$h(n, k) \geq \sum_{2 \leq i \leq 7} \binom{n-i}{k-2} \geq \frac{25}{16} \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-4}{k-2} \right) \geq \frac{25}{16} |\mathcal{F}|,$$

implying that $\alpha = \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{h(n, k)} \leq \frac{16}{25} = 0.64$. Since $f(\alpha)$ is increasing in $[0, 1]$, we obtain

$$f(\alpha) \leq f(0.64) < \prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i}.$$

Then Lemma 5.2 implies $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$. □

Proposition 5.4. For $n \geq 2k$,

$$(5.5) \quad \prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} > \left(\frac{n - \frac{k}{2}}{n - \frac{3k}{2}} \right)^{k-1}.$$

Proof. Note that for $m > d > i > 0$,

$$(5.6) \quad \frac{m-d-i}{m-i} \cdot \frac{m-d+i}{m+i} < \left(\frac{m-d}{m} \right)^2.$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(m-d)^2 - i^2}{(m-d)^2} &< \frac{m^2 - i^2}{m^2}, \text{ that is} \\ \left(\frac{i}{m} \right)^2 &< \left(\frac{i}{m-d} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is true for $m > d > 0$. Applying (5.6) repeatedly with $m = n - \frac{k}{2}$ and $d = k$, we obtain

$$\frac{(n-k-1)(n-k-2)\dots(n-2k+1)}{(n-1)(n-2)\dots(n-k+1)} < \left(\frac{n-\frac{3k}{2}}{n-\frac{k}{2}}\right)^{k-1}$$

and (5.5) follows. \square

Corollary 5.5. *Let $n \geq 2k + 1$, $k \geq 9$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ forms a shift-resistant pair, then $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.1 we may assume that $2k \leq n \leq 4k$. By (5.5) and $k \geq 9$, it follows that

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} > \left(\frac{n-\frac{k}{2}}{n-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^{k-1} \geq \left(\frac{4k-\frac{k}{2}}{4k-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^8 = \left(\frac{7}{5}\right)^8 \approx 14.7579 > f(0.64).$$

By Proposition 5.3, we conclude that $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$. \square

Corollary 5.6. *Let $2k + 1 \leq n \leq 3.13k$, $k \geq 6$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ forms a shift-resistant pair, then $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$.*

Proof. By (5.5) and $k \geq 6$, it follows that

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} > \left(\frac{n-\frac{k}{2}}{n-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^{k-1} \geq \left(\frac{3.13k-\frac{k}{2}}{3.13k-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^5 = \left(\frac{2.63}{1.63}\right)^5 \approx 10.9356 > f(0.64).$$

By Proposition 5.3, we conclude that $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$. \square

Similarly, we can prove the same statement for $2k + 1 \leq n \leq 3.54k$, $k = 7$ or $2k + 1 \leq n \leq 3.96k$, $k = 8$.

Proposition 5.7. *Let $n \geq 3k$, $k \geq 14$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ be non-trivial cross-intersecting. If both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are shifted, then*

$$|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2.$$

Proof. By Theorem 1.1 we may assume that $3k \leq n \leq 4k$. Suppose that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{G}|$. By (4.6) we have $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k-2}$. Set $\alpha = \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{h(n, k)}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{h(n, k)}{|\mathcal{F}|} \geq \frac{\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}}{\binom{n}{k-2}}.$$

Note that $3k \leq n \leq 4k$ and $k \geq 14$ imply

$$\frac{\binom{n-1}{k-1}}{\binom{n}{k-2}} = \frac{(n-k+2)(n-k+1)}{(k-1)n} \geq \frac{4}{3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}}{\binom{n}{k-2}} &= \frac{(n-k-1)(n-k-2)\dots(n-2k+1)}{(k-1)n\dots(n-k+3)} \\
&\leq \frac{n-k-1}{k-1} \left(\frac{n-k-2}{n}\right)^{k-2} \\
&\leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{k-1}\right) \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{k-2} \\
&< 3.16 \times \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{12} < \frac{1}{9}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\frac{1}{\alpha} \geq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{1}{9} = \frac{11}{9}$, implying $\alpha \leq \frac{9}{11}$. Thus,

$$f(\alpha) \leq f\left(\frac{9}{11}\right) = 50.5.$$

By (5.5) and $k \geq 14$, it follows that

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} > \left(\frac{n-\frac{k}{2}}{n-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^{k-1} \geq \left(\frac{4k-\frac{k}{2}}{4k-\frac{3k}{2}}\right)^{13} = \left(\frac{7}{5}\right)^{13} \approx 79.3917 > f\left(\frac{9}{11}\right).$$

By Lemma 5.2 the proposition follows. \square

Applying Corollary 5.5, Proposition 5.7 and repeating the proof of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are non-trivial cross-intersecting families, $n \geq 3k$, $k \geq 14$. Then $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq h(n, k)^2$.*

The next proposition rules out many potential constructions that may prevent Theorem 1.1 holding for the full range.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $n \geq 2k \geq 4$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$, non-trivial, cross-intersecting. If $\mathcal{T}^{(2)}(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{T}^{(2)}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$ then*

$$(5.7) \quad |\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 2h(n, k).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $(1, 2) \cap H \neq \emptyset$ for all $H \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$. Obviously,

$$(5.8) \quad |\mathcal{F}([2])| + |\mathcal{G}([2])| \leq 2 \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})$, $\mathcal{G}(1, \bar{2})$, $\mathcal{F}(\bar{1}, 2)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)$ are non-empty by non-triviality. $\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})$ and $\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)$ are cross-intersecting $(k-1)$ -graphs on $[3, n]$. Consequently, by a classical result of Hilton and Milner [19] concerning non-empty cross-intersecting families we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad |\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2})| + |\mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2)| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1.$$

The same is true for $\mathcal{F}(\bar{1}, 2)$ and $\mathcal{G}(1, \bar{2})$:

$$(5.10) \quad |\mathcal{F}(\bar{1}, 2)| + |\mathcal{G}(1, \bar{2})| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1.$$

Summing up (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) yields

$$|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-2}{k-2} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1 \right) = 2h(n, k). \quad \square$$

Let us mention that the case $k = 2$, that is, if \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are non-trivial cross-intersecting graphs then $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq 9$ is easy to prove. If \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} share an edge then $|\mathcal{F}| + |\mathcal{G}| \leq 6$ follows from Proposition 5.1 and thereby $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq 9$. Arguing indirectly assume $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 4$ and let (x, y) be an edge of \mathcal{G} . Non-triviality of \mathcal{G} implies that both x and y have degree two in \mathcal{F} . Let u and v be the neighbors of x in \mathcal{F} . Then the only candidate for an edge in \mathcal{G} that does not contain x is (u, v) whence $(u, v) \in \mathcal{G}$. By cross-intersection the two neighbors of y in \mathcal{F} must be u and v as well. Now cross-intersection implies $\mathcal{G} = \{(x, y), (u, v)\}$ whence $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| = 8 < 9$.

Remark. There are many cases of equality in (5.7). Namely, let $A, B \in \binom{[3, n]}{k-1}$. Set

$$\mathcal{F}(1, \bar{2}) = \{A\}, \quad \mathcal{G}(\bar{1}, 2) = \left\{ G \in \binom{[3, n]}{k-1} : G \cap A \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

There are two possibilities for B .

- (a) $\mathcal{F}(\bar{1}, 2) = \{B\}, \quad \mathcal{G}(1, \bar{2}) = \left\{ G \in \binom{[n]}{k-1} : G \cap B \neq \emptyset \right\},$
- (b) $\mathcal{F}(\bar{1}, 2) = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k-1} : F \cap B \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{G}(1, \bar{2}) = \{B\}.$

Add $\mathcal{F}(1, 2) = \mathcal{G}(1, 2) = \binom{[3, n]}{k-2}$. Clearly $|\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| = h(n, k)^2$ holds only in case (b).

It is natural to consider the analogous product version of the more general Hilton-Milner-Frankl Theorem. To state this result let us define two types of families

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(n, k, t) &= \left\{ H \in \binom{[n]}{k} : [t] \subset H, H \cap [t+1, k+1] \neq \emptyset \right\} \cup \{[k+1] \setminus \{j\} : 1 \leq j \leq t\}, \\ \mathcal{A}(n, k, t) &= \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : |A \cap [t+2]| \geq t+1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ is non-trivial and t -intersecting, $n > (k - t + 1)(t + 1)$. Then*

$$(5.11) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \max \{ |\mathcal{H}(n, k, t)|, |\mathcal{A}(n, k, t)| \}.$$

For $t = 1$, $|\mathcal{H}(n, k, t)| \geq |\mathcal{A}(n, k, t)|$ and (5.11) reduces to the Hilton-Milner Theorem. For $t = 2$ and $n > n_0(k, t)$ it was proved in [7]. For $t \geq 20$ and all $n > (k - t + 1)(t + 1)$ it follows from [13], however it was first proved in full generality by [1].

Let us conclude this paper by announcing the corresponding product version.

Theorem 5.11 ([17]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ are non-trivial and cross t -intersecting, $n \geq 4(t + 2)^2 k^2$, $k \geq 5$. Then*

$$(5.12) \quad |\mathcal{F}||\mathcal{G}| \leq \max \{ |\mathcal{H}(n, k, t)|^2, |\mathcal{A}(n, k, t)|^2 \}.$$

References

- [1] R. Ahlswede and L.H. Khachatrian, The complete nontrivial-intersection theorem for systems of finite sets, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 76 (1996), 121–138.
- [2] N. Alon, Ph.D.Thesis, Hebrew University, 1983.
- [3] P. Borg, Intersecting and cross-intersecting families of labeled sets, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 15.1 (2008), N9.
- [4] D.E. Daykin, Erdős-Ko-Rado from Kruskal-Katona, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 17 (1972), 254–255.
- [5] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 12* (1961), 313–320.
- [6] P. Frankl, The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem is true for $n = ckt$, *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai* 18 (1978), 365–375.
- [7] P. Frankl, On intersecting families of finite sets, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 24 (1978), 146–161.
- [8] P. Frankl, A new short proof for the Kruskal-Katona theorem, *Discrete Math.* 48 (1984), 327–329.
- [9] P. Frankl, The shifting technique in extremal set theory, *Surveys in Combinatorics* 123 (1987), 81–110.
- [10] P. Frankl, A simple proof of the Hilton-Milner theorem, *Moscow Journal of Combinatorics and Number Theory* 8 (2019), 97–101.
- [11] P. Frankl, Linear independence, a unifying approach to shadow theorems, *European. J. Combin.* 57 (2016), 36–39.
- [12] P. Frankl, Z. Füredi, Non-trivial intersecting families, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 41 (1986), 150–153.
- [13] P. Frankl, Z. Füredi, Beyond the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 56 (1991), 182–194.
- [14] P. Frankl, A. Kupavskii, A size-sensitive inequality for cross-intersecting families, *European. J. Combin.* 62 (2017), 263–271.
- [15] P. Frankl, N. Tokushige, Some best possible inequalities concerning cross-intersecting families, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 61 (1992), 87–97.
- [16] P. Frankl, J. Wang, Intersections and distinct intersections in cross-intersecting families, arXiv:2205.00109, 2022.
- [17] P. Frankl, J. Wang, A product version of the Hilton-Milner-Frankl Theorem, in preparation.
- [18] A.J.W. Hilton, The Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem with valency conditions, unpublished manuscript, 1976.

- [19] A.J.W. Hilton, E.C. Milner, Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart.J. Math. Oxford Ser.* 18 (1967), 369–384.
- [20] G. Hurlbert, V. Kamat, New injective proofs of the Erdős-Ko-Rado and Hilton-Milner theorems, *Discrete Math.* 341 (2018), 1749–1754.
- [21] G.O.H. Katona, A theorem on finite sets, in: *Theory of Graphs, Proc. Colloq. Tihany, 1966*, Akad. Kiadó, Budapest, 1968; *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*, 1987, pp. 381–401.
- [22] P. Keevash, Shadows and intersections: stability and new proofs, *Adv. Math.* 218 (2008), 1685–1703.
- [23] J.B. Kruskal, The number of simplices in a complex, in: *Math. Optimization Techniques*, California Press, Berkeley, 1963, pp. 251–278.
- [24] M. Matsumoto, N. Tokushige, The exact bound in the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for cross-intersecting families, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 52 (1989), 90–97.
- [25] M. Mörs, A generalization of a theorem of Kruskal, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 1 (1985), 167–183.
- [26] L. Pyber, A new generalization of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* 43 (1986), 85–90.
- [27] E. Sperner, Ein Satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menger, *Math. Zeitschrift* 27 (1928), 544–548.
- [28] R. M. Wilson, The exact bound in the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *Combinatorica* 4 (1984), 247–257.