

Linear Turán numbers of acyclic quadruple systems*

Lin-Peng Zhang^{a,b,c}, Ligong Wang^{a,b,c,†}

^a School of Mathematics and Statistics

Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710129, P.R. China.

^b Xi'an-Budapest Joint Research Center for Combinatorics

Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710129, P.R. China.

^c International Joint Research Center on Operations Research, Optimization and Artificial Intelligence
Xi'an, Shaanxi 710129, P.R. China.

E-mail: lpzhangmath@163.com, lgwangmath@163.com

Abstract

A hypergraph H is called *linear* if every pair of vertices in H is contained in at most one edge. Given a family \mathcal{F} of r -uniform hypergraphs, an r -uniform hypergraph H is called \mathcal{F} -free if H does not contain any member of \mathcal{F} as a subhypergraph. The *linear Turán number* $ex_r^{lin}(n, \mathcal{F})$ of \mathcal{F} is the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free linear r -uniform hypergraphs on n vertices. A linear r -uniform hypergraph is called *acyclic* if it can be constructed starting from one single edge then at each step adding a new edge that intersect the union of the vertices of the previous edges in at most one vertex. Recently, Gyárfás, Ruszinkó and Sárközy [*Linear Turán numbers of acyclic triple systems, European J. Combin. 99 (2022) 103435.*] initiated the study of the linear Turán numbers of acyclic linear triple systems. In this paper, we extend their results to linear quadruple systems. Among acyclic linear quadruple systems, we concentrate on small trees, paths and matchings. For the case of small trees, we find that for a linear tree T , $ex_4^{lin}(n, T)$ relates to difficult problems on Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$. For example, we show that $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_4) \leq \frac{5n}{4}$ with equality holds if and only if the linear quadruple system is the disjoint union of $S(2, 4, 16)$. Denote by E_4^+ the linear tree consisting of three pairwise disjoint quadruples and a fourth one intersecting all of them. We prove that $12\lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor \leq ex_4^{lin}(n, E_4^+) \leq \frac{14(n-s)}{9}$, where s is the number of vertices in G with degree at least 8. Denote by M_k and P_k the set of k pairwise disjoint quadruples and the linear path with k quadruples, respectively. For the case of paths, we show that $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_k) \leq 2.5kn$. For the case of matchings, we prove that for fixed k and sufficiently large n , $ex_4^{lin}(n, M_k) = g(n, k)$ where $g(n, k)$ denotes the maximum number of quadruples that can intersect $k - 1$ vertices in a linear quadruple system on n vertices.

Key Words: linear Turán number; linear quadruple system; acyclic; Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$

AMS Subject Classification (2020): 05C65, 05C35, 05C05

*Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12271439) and China Scholarship Council (No. 202206290003).

†Corresponding author.

1 Introduction

We use standard notation and terminology. A hypergraph $H = (V(H), E(H))$ consists of a set $V(H)$ of vertices and a set $E(H)$ of edges, where each edge is a subset of $V(H)$. In particular, if each edge in a hypergraph H is an r -element subset of $V(H)$, then H is an r -uniform hypergraph (or r -graph for short). When $r = 2$, it reduce to a simple graph. Generally, we call a 3-graph the triple system where each edge is a triple and a 4-graph the quadruple system where each edge is a quadruple. For any $v \in V(H)$, the *degree* $d(v)$ of the vertex v is the number of edges containing v . For an edge $e \in E(H)$ and a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(H)$, e and S are *incident* if the edge e contain at least one vertex of S . For any two edges $e, f \in E(H)$, e and f are *intersecting* (or say e *intersects* f) if $|e \cap f| \geq 1$. For positive integers k and $a \leq b$, we use $[k]$ and $[a, b]$ to denote the integer set from 1 to k and the integer set from a to b , respectively.

For a hypergraph H and a family \mathcal{F} of hypergraphs, H is called \mathcal{F} -free if H does not contain any member of \mathcal{F} as a subhypergraph. The *Turán number* $ex_r(n, \mathcal{F})$ of \mathcal{F} is the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free r -graphs on n vertices. The Turán numbers of hypergraphs have been studied extensively, we refer the reader to the surveys [10, 12, 19, 21] and the book [15]. Recently, the study on the Turán numbers of hypergraphs have been extended to the linear hypergraphs. A hypergraph H is *linear* if every pair of vertices in H is contained in at most one edge. Given a family \mathcal{F} of r -graphs, the *linear Turán number* $ex_r^{lin}(n, \mathcal{F})$ of \mathcal{F} is the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free linear r -graphs on n vertices. When $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$, instead of $ex_r^{lin}(n, \{F\})$ we write $ex_r^{lin}(n, F)$. This notion was firstly been proposed by Collier-Cartaino, Graber and Jiang [5] in 2018. However, the study on linear Turán number can be traced back to the famous (6, 3)-problem which studied by Brown, Erdős and Sós [2] in 1973. The (6, 3)-problem says that what is the maximum number of edges of triple systems not carrying three edges on six vertices. A Berge cycle Berge- C_k of length k in a hypergraph H is an alternating sequence $v_1e_1v_2e_2 \cdots v_ke_k$, where $v_i \in V(H), e_i \in E(H)$ for $i \in [k]$, $v_i, v_{i+1} \in e_i$ for $i \in [k-1]$ and $v_k, v_1 \in e_k$. In 1976, by applying the regularity lemma [26], Ruzsa and Szemerédi [23] proved the *triangle removal lemma* which can be phrased as

$$n^{2 - \frac{c}{\sqrt{\log n}}} \leq ex_3^{lin}(n, \text{Berge-}C_3) = o(n^2)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant. After that, the linear Turán number of Berge- C_k has been studied extensively, see [8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 27].

A linear r -graph is called *acyclic* if it can be constructed starting from one single edge then at each step adding a new edge that intersect the union of the vertices of the previous edges in at most one vertex. An acyclic linear r -graph is a *linear r -tree* if at each step the new edge we add intersect the union of the vertices of the previous edges in exactly one vertex. In particular, a *linear r -star* is a linear r -tree whose edges are all intersecting in the same one vertex. A *linear r -path* is a linear r -tree whose edges are all consecutive. Denote by $T_k^{(r)}$, $S_k^{(r)}$ and $P_k^{(r)}$ the linear r -tree with k edges, the linear r -star with k edges and the linear r -path with k edges, respectively. Note that $|V(T_k^{(r)})| = (r-1)k + 1$. For the disconnected case, an r -matching is a set of pairwise disjoint edges in an r -graph. Denote by $M_k^{(r)}$ an r -matching with k edges. Recently, Gyárfás, Ruszinkó and Sárközy [17] initiated the study of $ex_3^{lin}(n, F)$ for $F \in \{T_k^{(3)}, P_3^{(3)}, B_4, P_4^{(3)}, E_4, P_k^{(3)}, M_k^{(3)}\}$, where $E(B_4) = \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{3, 4, 5\}, \{3, 6, 7\}, \{7, 8, 9\}\}$, $E(E_4) = \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{7, 8, 9\}, \{1, 4, 7\}\}$ and $V(B_4) = V(E_4) = [9]$.

Later, Carbonero, Fletcher, Guo, Gyarfas, Wang and Yan [3] conjectured that $ex_3^{lin}(n, E_4) \sim \frac{3n}{2}$. Furthermore, Fletcher [9] proved that $ex_3^{lin}(n, E_4) < \frac{5n}{3}$. Recently, Tang, Wu, Zhang and Zheng [25] proved that if H is an E_4 -free 3-graph on n vertices, then $|E(H)| \leq \frac{3(n-s)}{2}$ where s is the number of vertices in H with degree at least 6.

In this paper, we consider the acyclic linear quadruple systems. Among acyclic linear quadruple systems, we concentrate on general trees, paths, small trees and matchings. For convenience, we use T_k , S_k , P_k and M_k to denote the linear 4-tree with k edges, the linear 4-star with k edges, the linear 4-path with k edges and the 4-matching with k edges, respectively. In the next three subsections, we give the results for general trees, paths, small trees and matchings respectively.

1.1 Results for general linear 4-trees

We can obtain an upper bound of $ex_4^{lin}(n, T_k)$ by analyzing the characterization of linear 4-trees.

Proposition 1.1. *Let T_k be a linear 4-tree with $k > 1$ quadruples. Then $ex_4^{lin}(n, T_k) \leq (3k - 5)n$.*

Proof. Let H be a T_k -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with more than $(3k - 5)n$ quadruples. We may assume that H is a minimal counterexample. Then we have that each vertex of H has degree at least $3k - 4$, otherwise we can find a smaller counterexample by deleting a vertex with a smaller degree. Then by the greedy algorithm we can construct a linear 4-tree T_k , adding one quadruple at each step such that the new quadruple intersect the union of vertices of the previous edges in the required vertex. \square

We note that lower bounds for linear Turan numbers of linear 4-trees relate to Steiner systems $S(2, 4, n)$. A *Steiner system* $S(t, k, n)$ is a pair (V, \mathcal{B}) where V is an n -element vertex set and \mathcal{B} is a family of k -element subsets of V called *blocks* such that each t -element subset of V is contained in exactly one block. Steiner system with $t = 2$ and $k = 3$ is called *Steiner triple system*, denoted by $STS(n)$. For more details of Steiner triple systems see [4]. Steiner system with $t = 3$ and $k = 4$ is called *Steiner quadruple system*, denoted by $SQS(n)$. Here, we consider the Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$ on n vertices. Hanani [18] proved that a Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$ exists if and only if $n \equiv 1, 4 \pmod{12}$. Thus, configurations $S(2, 4, 13)$ and $S(2, 4, 16)$ exist (we depict these two configurations in the Appendix of this paper). For more details of Steiner systems $S(2, 4, n)$ see survey [22].

We can obtain a natural lower bound for $ex_4^{lin}(n, T_k)$ when we can use Steiner systems $S(2, 4, 3k - 2)$ as components and n is divisible by $3k - 2$.

Proposition 1.2. *If $(3k - 2) | n$ and $3k - 2 \equiv 1, 4 \pmod{12}$, then $ex_4^{lin}(n, T_k) \geq \frac{n(k-1)}{4}$. This is sharp when T_k is the linear 4-star S_k .*

1.2 Results for small linear 4-trees and linear 4-paths

For $k = 2$, it is trivial that $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_2) = \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$. For $k = 3$, we have the following result.

Proposition 1.3. *$ex_4^{lin}(n, P_3) \leq n$ with equality if and only if the linear quadruple system is the union of disjoint Steiner systems $S(2, 4, 13)$.*

There are four non-isomorphic linear 4-trees T_k with $k = 4$. The case of linear 4-star S_4 is treated in Proposition 1.2. There also are three linear 4-trees with four quadruples except the linear 4-star S_4 . Denote by S_3^+ the linear 4-tree obtained from S_3 by appending a quadruple at a vertex of degree one (see Figure 1, where straight lines with 4 vertices indicate quadruples).




Figure 1: Configuration S_3^+




Figure 2: Configuration E_4^+

Theorem 1.1. *Let $F \in \{S_3^+, P_4\}$. Then*

$$ex_4^{lin}(n, F) \leq \frac{5n}{4}.$$

Equality holds if and only if the linear quadruple system is the union of disjoint Steiner systems $S(2, 4, 16)$.

Denote by E_4^+ the linear 4-tree obtained from three pairwise disjoint quadruples by adding one quadruple that intersect all of them (see Figure 2, where straight lines with 4 vertices indicate quadruples). For convenience, we let $\varepsilon = 0$ for $n - 4 \equiv 0, 1, 2 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 1$ for $n - 4 \equiv 3, 4 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 2$ for $n - 4 \equiv 5 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 4$ for $n - 4 \equiv 6 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 5$ for $n - 4 \equiv 7 \pmod{9}$, and $\varepsilon = 8$ for $n - 4 \equiv 8 \pmod{9}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be any E_4^+ -free linear 4-graph G on n vertices. Then its number of edges satisfies*

$$12 \lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor + \varepsilon \leq |E(G)| \leq \frac{14(n-s)}{9},$$

where s is the number of vertices in G with degree at least 8.

For a linear 4-path P_k , we slightly improve the general bound of Proposition 1.1.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n, k \geq 1$ be two positive integers. Then $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_k) \leq 2.5kn$.*

1.3 Result for 4-matchings

In 1959, Erdős and Gallai [7] determined the Turán number of matchings. In 1965, Erdős [6] extended this problem to hypergraph, proved that for sufficiently large n , the maximum number of edges in an $M_k^{(r)}$ -free r -graph occurs if all edges intersect a fixed set of $k - 1$ vertices. For linear Turán number, Gyárfás, Ruszinkó and Sárközy [17] obtained an analogue result.

Theorem 1.4 ([17]). *Let n, k be two positive integers. For $n > 16(k - 1)^2 + 1$,*

$$ex_3^{lin}(n, M_k^{(3)}) = f(n, k),$$

where $f(n, k)$ denotes the maximum number of triples that can intersect a fixed $(k - 1)$ -element vertex subset in a linear triple system on n vertices.

In this paper, we extend their result to 4-matchings.

Theorem 1.5. *Let n, k be two positive integers. For $n > 37(k - 1)^2 + 3$,*

$$ex_4^{lin}(n, M_k) = g(n, k),$$

where $g(n, k)$ denotes the maximum number of quadruples that can intersect a fixed $(k - 1)$ -element vertex subset in a linear quadruple system on n vertices.

Note that Theorem 1.5 holds only for sufficiently large n . For example, $g(n, 2) = \lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor < ex_4^{lin}(n, M_2) = 13$ for $n < 40$ as the Steiner system $S(2, 4, 13)$ shows. For $k = 2$, $n \geq 40$ is the sharp threshold in Theorem 1.5, because in a linear quadruple system pairwise intersecting quadruples either form a linear 4-star or form a subsystem of the Steiner system $S(2, 4, 13)$.

2 Proofs of Proposition 1.3, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Firstly, we prove that $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_3) \leq n$. Let H be a P_3 -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with more than n quadruples. We may assume that H is a minimal counterexample. By the minimality, H contains only one connected component. Otherwise H contain at least two connected components H_1 and H_2 . Then $e(H) = e(H_1) + e(H_2) > n$. Therefore either $e(H_1) > |V(H_1)|$ or $e(H_2) > |V(H_2)|$ holds, otherwise $e(H) = e(H_1) + e(H_2) \leq |V(H_1)| + |V(H_2)| = n$, a contradiction. Thus, we find a smaller counterexample, a contradiction. We claim that each vertex of H has degree at least two, otherwise we can find a smaller counterexample by deleting a vertex with a smaller degree. We may assume that H contains a vertex with degree at least 5, otherwise $e(H) \leq n$. Thus we can select a linear 4-star S_k with center vertex p , where $k \geq 5$. Then we select another vertex q in S_k . Since the vertex q has degree at least two, there is a quadruple e such that $q \in e$ but $p \notin e$. Then e with two suitable quadruples of S_k form a P_3 , a contradiction. Thus, $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_3) \leq n$.

From the above argument we can also see that if H is a P_3 -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with exactly n quadruples, then each connected component of H is 4-regular, *i.e.* each vertex of H has degree 4. Select one linear 4-star $A = S_4$, we claim that any quadruple intersecting it must be completely inside A . Otherwise, we can find a P_3 leading to a contradiction. Thus, each connected component of H is 4-regular on 13 vertices, *i.e.* the Steiner system $S(2, 4, 13)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $F \in \{S_3^+, P_4\}$. Firstly, we prove that $ex_4^{lin}(n, F) \leq \frac{5n}{4}$. Let H be an F -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with more than $\frac{5n}{4}$ quadruples. We may assume that H is a minimal counterexample. By the minimality, H contains only one connected component. We claim that each vertex of H has degree at least two, otherwise we can find a smaller counterexample by deleting a vertex with a smaller degree. We may assume that H contains a vertex with degree at least 6, otherwise $e(H) \leq \frac{5n}{4}$. Thus we can select a linear 4-star S_k with center vertex p , where $k \geq 6$. Let $e_i = \{p, x_i, y_i, z_i\}$, $i \in [k]$ be the quadruples of S_k . In the following, we will first discuss the case of $F = S_3^+$ and then $F = P_4$.

Case 1. $F = S_3^+$. Select another vertex $q \neq p$ in S_k . Since the vertex q has degree at least two, there is a quadruple e such that $q \in e$ but $p \notin e$. Then e with three suitable quadruples of S_k form an S_3^+ , a contradiction. Therefore if H is an S_3^+ -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with exactly $\frac{5n}{4}$ quadruples, then each connected component of H is 5-regular. Select one linear 4-star $A = S_5$, we claim that any quadruple intersecting it must be completely inside A . Otherwise, we can find an S_3^+ leading to a contradiction. Thus, each connected component of H is 5-regular on 16 vertices, *i.e.* the Steiner system $S(2, 4, 16)$.

Case 2. $F = P_4$. In this case, we first give the following claim.

Claim 2.1. $V(S_k) = V(H)$.

Proof. Indeed, if there exists one vertex $w \in V(H)$ but $w \notin V(S_k)$, then the shortest path P from w to $V(S_k)$ has just one quadruple. Otherwise, we can extend P to a P_4 with two suitable quadruples of S_k , a contradiction. Thus there exist two quadruples f_1, f_2 containing w such that both of them intersect S_k in vertices different from the center vertex p of S_k . In the following, we will discuss two cases.

Case 1. $k \geq 7$. Since $k \geq 7$, we can find a quadruple (say e_i) of S_k disjoint from $(f_1 \cap S_k) \cup (f_2 \cap S_k)$. Then we can find a P_4 containing the quadruples e_i, e_j, f_1, f_2 unless both of f_1 and f_2 intersect the same three quadruples of S_k , where $e_j \in E(S_k)$ is a quadruple containing a vertex from $f_1 \cap S_k$. If both of f_1 and f_2 intersect the same three quadruples of S_k , say e_1, e_2 and e_3 , then we consider an arbitrary vertex $v \in e_i$ with $i \geq 4$. Since v has degree at least two, there must exist a quadruple f_3 containing v different from e_i . Note that $w \notin f_3$. Otherwise we can find a P_4 containing the quadruples f_1, f_3, e_i, e'_i , where $e'_i \in E(S_k)$ and $e'_i \cap (f_1 \cup f_3) = \emptyset$. Then we claim that either (i): $|f_3 \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 \cup e_3)| = 3$ and $f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \emptyset$ or (ii): $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 2$. Indeed, if $f_3 \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 \cup e_3) = \emptyset$ then the quadruples f_3, e_i, e_1, f_1 form a P_4 , a contradiction. If $1 \leq |f_3 \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 \cup e_3)| \leq 2$ and $f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \emptyset$, then we can find a P_4 containing the quadruples f_1, e_j, e_i, f_3 ($e_j \in \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ satisfies that $e_j \cap f_3 = \emptyset$), a contradiction. If $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 1$ (without loss of generality, $|f_3 \cap f_1| = 1$), then we can find a P_4 containing the quadruples e_i, f_3, f_1, f_2 , a contradiction. Thus, the claim holds. However, there are only 9 pairs of vertices between f_1 and f_2 and one remaining triple among e_1, e_2 and e_3 , but we have at least 12 vertices that may play the role of v , a contradiction.

Case 2. $k = 6$. We have two possibilities for f_1 and f_2 : (i) both of f_1 and f_2 intersect the same three quadruples of S_6 ; (ii) $f_1 \cup f_2$ intersect all quadruples of S_6 . In any other cases, we can find a P_4 defined by f_1, f_2 and two suitable quadruples leading to a contradiction. We consider firstly the possibility (i). Assume that f_1 and f_2 intersect the same three quadruples e_1, e_2, e_3 of S_6 . Consider an arbitrary vertex v of e_i with $i \geq 4$, there must exist a quadruple f_3 containing v different from e_i . For another vertex u in e_i , there must exist a quadruple f_4 containing u different from e_i . Assume $f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \emptyset$. If $|f_3 \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 \cup e_3)| = 3$, then we can find a P_4 defined by f_4 , one of f_1, f_2, f_3 and two suitable quadruples from S_6

or f_4 , two of f_1, f_2, f_3 and one suitable quadruple from S_6 leading to a contradiction. If $|f_3 \cap (e_1 \cup e_2 \cup e_3)| \leq 2$, then we can find a P_4 defined by f_3 , one of f_1, f_2 and two suitable quadruples from S_6 leading to a contradiction. Assume $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 1$. Then we can find a P_4 defined by the quadruples e_i, f_3, f_1, f_2 leading to a contradiction. Assume $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 2$. Then we can find a P_4 defined by e_i, f_3, f_1 and one suitable quadruple from S_6 leading to a contradiction.

Consider the second possibility (ii). Without loss of generality, assume that $f_1 \cap e_i = \{x_i\}$ and $f_2 \cap e_j = \{x_j\}$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, j \in \{4, 5, 6\}$. Consider another vertex $y_1 \in e_1$, there must exist a quadruple f_3 containing y_1 different from e_1 . If $f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \emptyset$, then we can find a P_4 defined by the quadruples f_3, e_1, f_1, f_2 in this order leading to a contradiction. If $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 1$, then we can find a P_4 defined by f_3, f_1, f_2 and one suitable quadruple from S_6 leading to a contradiction. If $|f_3 \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)| = 2$, then we can find a P_4 defined by f_3 , one of f_1, f_2 and two suitable quadruples from S_6 leading to a contradiction.

Combining all the cases, the claim holds, *i.e.* $V(S_k) = V(H)$. \square

Also, we claim that there exists a pair f_1, f_2 of intersecting quadruples in H not containing the center vertex p of S_k . Indeed, otherwise H contain at most $\frac{n-1}{4} + \frac{n-1}{3} < \frac{5n}{4}$ edges, a contradiction. We have three possibilities for f_1 and f_2 : (i) f_1 and f_2 intersect exactly the same four quadruples of S_k , say e_1, e_2, e_3 and e_4 ; (ii) $k = 7$ and $f_1 \cup f_2$ intersect all quadruples of S_7 ; (iii) $k = 6$ and $f_1 \cup f_2$ intersect all quadruples of S_6 . In any other cases, we can find a P_4 defined by f_1, f_2 and two suitable quadruples leading to a contradiction. Then for $k > 7$, we always have the first possibility (i). Then we consider the vertex x_5 in e_5 . There must exist a quadruple f_3 containing x_5 different from e_5 . Based on the above argument, f_3 cannot intersect f_1 , but f_1 and f_3 with two suitable quadruples of S_k form a P_4 , a contradiction. Thus we have either $k = 7, n = 22$ and $|E(H)| \geq 28$ or $k = 6, n = 19$ and $|E(H)| \geq 24$. If $k = 7$, then for any pair of intersecting quadruples in H not containing the center vertex p of S_7 we must have the above two possibilities (i) and (ii). If $k = 6$, then for any pair of intersecting quadruples in H not containing the center vertex p of S_6 we must have the possibilities (i) and (iii).

We claim that there must exist two disjoint quadruples g, h in H not containing the center vertex p of S_k for $k \in \{6, 7\}$. Indeed, otherwise for $k = 7$ ($k = 6$) the at least 21 (18) remaining quadruples not containing p are pairwise intersecting. Thus they form a linear 4-star or a subsystem of $S(2, 4, 13)$. But within 21 (18) vertices there is no room for an S_{21} (S_{18}) and subsystem of an $S(2, 4, 13)$ cannot have 21 (18) quadruples either. Thus we have g, h as required. For $k \in \{6, 7\}$, we can find a P_4 defined by g, h and two suitable quadruples of S_k leading to a contraction unless g and h intersect the same four quadruples e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 of S_k . Assume that $g = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $h = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$. For $e_5 \in E(S_k)$ ($k \in \{6, 7\}$), there must exist a quadruple f containing x_5 but not containing p in H . Furthermore, we have that $f \cap g \neq \emptyset$ and $f \cap h \neq \emptyset$ must hold for $k \in \{6, 7\}$. Otherwise we can find a P_4 formed by f , one of $\{g, h\}$ and two suitable quadruples, a contradiction. If $k = 7$, then we can find a P_4 defined by f , one of $\{g, h\}$ and two suitable quadruples, a contradiction. If $k = 6$, then there must exist two quadruples f' and f'' such that $y_5 \in f', z_5 \in f''$ and $e_5 \notin \{f', f''\}$. Thus we also have $f' \cap g \neq \emptyset, f' \cap h \neq \emptyset$ and $f'' \cap g \neq \emptyset, f'' \cap h \neq \emptyset$. Since $f \cap g \neq \emptyset$ and $f \cap h \neq \emptyset$, f and g (f and h) must satisfy the possibility (iii). The same argument hold for f' and f'' . If f, f', f'' are pairwise disjoint, then we can find a P_4 defined by two of $\{f, f', f''\}$ and two suitable quadruples of S_6 , a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $f \cap f' \neq \emptyset$. If $f \cap f' \in \cup_{i=1}^4 e_i$, then f and f' don't satisfy the possibilities (i) and (iii), a contradiction.

Thus, $f \cap f' \in e_6$.

Assume f and f' satisfy the possibility (i). Then f and f' intersect e_5, e_6 and the same two quadruples from $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, say e_1, e_2 . If f'' is disjoint with f and f' , then f'' intersect e_5, e_6, e_3 and e_4 . But we can find a P_4 defined by f'' , one of $\{f, f'\}$ and two suitable quadruples of S_6 , a contradiction. We may assume that f'' intersect f and f' . Note that f, f' and f'' intersect $e_6 \in E(S_6)$ in the same vertex, say x_6 . Consider another vertex y_6 in e_6 , there must exist a quadruple \tilde{f} contains y_6 but not containing p in H . Note that \tilde{f} must intersect at least one of f, f' and f'' . Then we can find a P_4 defined by \tilde{f} , two of $\{f, f', f''\}$ and one suitable quadruple of S_6 or \tilde{f} , one of $\{f, f', f''\}$ and two suitable quadruples of S_6 , a contradiction. This finishes the proof of $ex_4^{lin}(n, P_4) \leq \frac{5n}{4}$.

Assume f and f' satisfy the possibility (iii). If f'' is disjoint with f and f' , then the two statements $f'' \cup f$ covers exactly 4 quadruples of S_6 and $f'' \cup f'$ covers exactly 4 quadruples of S_6 must hold. But this contradict the facts $(f \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}) \cup (f' \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}) = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ and $(f \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}) \cap (f' \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}) = \emptyset$. We may assume that f'' intersect f and f' . Note that f, f' and f'' intersect $e_6 \in E(S_6)$ in the same vertex, say x_6 . Consider another vertex y_6 in e_6 , there must exist a quadruple \tilde{f} contains y_6 but not containing p in H . Note that \tilde{f} must intersect at least one of f, f' and f'' . Then we can find a P_4 defined by \tilde{f} , two of $\{f, f', f''\}$ and one suitable quadruple of S_6 or \tilde{f} , one of $\{f, f', f''\}$ and two suitable quadruples of S_6 , a contradiction.

In the case of $|E(H)| = \frac{5n}{4}$, the above argument shows that each connected component of H is 5-regular. We claim that any connected component of H containing an S_5 must contain only the vertices of S_5 . Otherwise if w is not on S_5 , then all the five quadruples f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5 on a vertex w must intersect S_5 . If there exists one quadruple of f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5 which is disjoint with S_5 , then by the connectivity condition we can find a P_4 , a contradiction. Moreover, if any f_i intersects S_5 in one vertex then it with f_j ($j \neq i$) and two suitable quadruples of S_5 form a P_4 , a contradiction. Denote by $N_2(w)$ ($N_3(w)$) the set of quadruples from $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5\}$ intersecting S_5 in two (three) vertices. Let $|N_2(w)| = n_2$ and $|N_3(w)| = n_3$. If $f_i, f_j \in N_3(w)$, then either f_i and f_j intersect the same three quadruples of S_5 or $f_i \cup f_j$ intersect all the five quadruples of S_5 . Otherwise we can find a P_4 defined by the quadruples f_i, f_j and two suitable quadruples leading to a contradiction. Then we have $n_3 \leq 3$. And if $f_i, f_j \in N_2(w)$, then f_i and f_j must intersect the same two quadruples of S_5 . Thus, $2 \leq n_2 \leq 3$. It follows from $n_2 + n_3 = 5$ that either $n_2 = 2$ and $n_3 = 3$ or $n_2 = 3$ and $n_3 = 2$. If $f_i \in N_2(w)$ and $f_j \in N_3(w)$, then we have that $f_i \cup f_j$ intersect all the five quadruples of S_5 . We consider a vertex $v \in f_i$ with $v \neq w, f_i \in N_2(w)$ and $v \notin V(S_5)$. Note that the above argument for w also holds for v . Thus there is a quadruple g_i containing v intersecting S_5 in two quadruples. Then we can find a P_4 defined by f_i, g_i, f_j ($f_j \in N_3(w)$) and one suitable quadruple from S_5 , a contradiction. This proves that each connected component of H is 5-regular on 16 vertices, i.e. $S(2, 4, 16)$. \square

Before we prove Theorem 1.2, we give the following key lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let H be a E_4^+ -free graph and $e = \{u, v, w, z\} \in E(H)$ satisfy $D(e) \geq (7, 7, 6, 6)$. Then, the vertex set of all edges sharing a vertex with $\{u, v, w, z\}$,*

$$S = \cup_{f \in E(H), f \cap \{u, v, w, z\} \neq \emptyset} f,$$

contains exactly 22 vertices and all vertices in S have degree at most 7. The set of edges that contain at least one vertex in S ,

$$E_S = \{f : f \in E(G), f \cap S \neq \emptyset\},$$

contains at most 25 edges, and all elements of E_S are subsets of S . In other words, the subgraph $G[S]$ is a connected component of G .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $d(z) \geq 7, d(w) \geq 7, d(v) \geq 6$ and $d(u) \geq 6$. As $D(e) = (7, 7, 5, 2)$ is impossible, we must have $d(w) = d(z) = 7$. Denote by $G(p)$ the set of all vertices distinct from u, v, w, z that lie on the same edge with p for any $p \in \{u, v, w, z\}$. At first, we note that $G(w) = G(z)$. Otherwise, we assume that there exists an edge $e_1 \neq e$ adjacent to w contain some vertex not in $G(z)$. Then at most two edges adjacent to z other than e contains a vertex in e_1 , so at least four edges adjacent to z are disjoint from e_1 . Since $d(x) \geq 5$, we can take an edge e_2 adjacent to x that is disjoint from e_1 , then take an edge e_3 adjacent to z that is disjoint from e_1 and e_2 . Thus, e, e_1, e_2, e_3 forms an E_4^+ , a contradiction.

Similarly, we have $G(u), G(v) \subset G(w)$. Since the proofs are similar, it suffices to show $G(u) \subset G(w)$. Suppose to the contrary that there exists an edge $e_1 \neq e$ adjacent to u contain some vertex not in $G(w)$. Then, we can take an edge e_3 adjacent to z that is disjoint from e_1 . Among the six edges adjacent to w , at most three can intersect e_3 , and at most two can intersect e_1 . Thus, we can choose e_2 adjacent to w that is disjoint from e_1 and e_3 . Thus, e, e_1, e_2, e_3 forms an E_4^+ , a contradiction.

Thus, $S \setminus \{u, v, w, z\} = G(w) = G(z)$ and $G(u), G(v) \subset G(w)$. Define F as the set of all edges in $E(G)$ that adjacent to one of the vertices in S , but is disjoint from $\{u, v, w, z\}$. It suffices to show that $F = \emptyset$.

Denote by $G(z) = \{a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, b_2, c_2, a_3, b_3, c_3, a_4, b_4, c_4, a_5, b_5, c_5, a_6, b_6, c_6\}$ such that $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, \{z, a_2, b_2, c_2\}, \{z, a_3, b_3, c_3\}, \{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\}, \{z, a_5, b_5, c_5\}, \{z, a_6, b_6, c_6\}$ are edges in $E(G)$.

(i) Define an auxiliary bipartite graph $H = (X_H, Y_H, E_H)$ as follows; $X_H = \{e_i | w \in e_i\}, Y_H = \{e_j | z \in e_j\}, E_H = \{\{e_i, e_j\} | e_i \cap e_j \neq \emptyset\}$. We claim that H contains a $K_{3,3}$. We first choose $e \in G(u)$. Define $V_1 = e \cap S, W_1 = \{e_i | e_i \cap V_1 \neq \emptyset\} \subset X_H \cup Y_H$. Hence we have $|V_1| \leq 3, |W_1| \leq 6, |H - W_1| \geq 6$. Note that if there is no E_4^+ in G , $H - W_1$ has to be a complete bipartite graph. Since $|H - W_1| \geq 6$ and two parts have the same order, there must exists a $K_{3,3}$ in $H - W_1$. So H contains a $K_{3,3}$. Thus, we have $H = K_{3,3} \cup K_{3,3}$.

By symmetry we can assume that $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, \{z, a_2, b_2, c_2\}, \{z, a_3, b_3, c_3\}$ are in a $K_{3,3}$ and $\{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\}, \{z, a_5, b_5, c_5\}, \{z, a_6, b_6, c_6\}$ are in the other one. Further, we can assume that $\{w, a_1, a_2, a_3\}, \{w, b_1, b_2, b_3\}, \{w, c_1, c_2, c_3\}, \{w, a_4, a_5, a_6\}, \{w, b_4, b_5, b_6\}, \{w, c_4, c_5, c_6\} \in E(G)$.

(ii) Denote by $V_1 = \{a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, b_2, c_2, a_3, b_3, c_3\}$ and $V_2 = \{a_4, b_4, c_4, a_5, b_5, c_5, a_6, b_6, c_6\}$. We have symmetry between V_1 and V_2 , and symmetry inside $V_i, i = 1, 2$ as well. We claim that there exists no edge containing v that contains exactly one vertex from one vertex set in $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and two vertices from another vertex set in $\{V_1, V_2\}$. Otherwise, we let it be $\{v, a_1, a_4, b_5\}$ by symmetry. Then $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, \{v, a_1, a_4, b_5\}, \{z, a_6, b_6, c_6\}, \{w, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ form an E_4^+ , a contradiction.

(iii) Let $f \in F$. By symmetry we can assume that $a_1 \in f$. Then we have that $a_2, a_3, b_1, c_1 \notin f$. We claim that f cannot contain exactly one vertex a_1 in S . Otherwise, $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, \{w, b_1, b_2, b_3\}, \{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\}, f$ form an E_4^+ , a contradiction. Then we claim that $b_2, c_2, b_3, c_3 \notin f$. Suppose to the contrary that $b_2 \in f$. Since $d(v) \geq 6$, there must exists an edge containing v whose other three vertices are all from $V_1 - a_1$, say e' . Since at most two edges of $\{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\}, \{z, a_5, b_5, c_5\}, \{z, a_6, b_6, c_6\}$ intersect f , we can assume that $\{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\} \cap f = \emptyset$. Then $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, e', \{z, a_4, b_4, c_4\}, f$ form an E_4^+ , a contradiction.

Therefore by symmetry we can also assume $a_4 \in f$. Similarly, we have $b_5, c_5, b_6, c_6 \notin f$.

So f have exactly two vertices a_1, a_4 in S . Then there must exists one edge e'' containing v whose other three vertices are all from $V_1 - a_1$. Therefore $\{z, a_1, b_1, c_1\}, f, e'', \{z, a_5, b_5, c_5\}$ form an E_4^+ , a contradiction.

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For the lower bound of $ex_4^{lin}(n, E_4^+)$, we construct the linear quadruple system as follows. Note that $E(STS(9)) = 12$ and there exist four perfect 3-matchings in $STS(9)$, where $STS(9)$ is a Steiner triple system on 9 vertices. Consider perfect 3-matchings of m disjoint copies of $STS(9)$. We extend each of the four perfect 3-matchings into $3m$ quadruples with four distinct new vertices a, b, c, d . This construction is a linear quadruple system on $9m + 4$ vertices with $12m$ quadruples. Note that it is also E_4^+ -free. To find an E_4^+ in our construction, we need first select one edge and then select three disjoint edges containing three distinct vertices from our first edge. Without loss of generality, we choose one edge e containing a as our first edge. and then we need choose at least two disjoint edges containing two distinct vertices from $e \setminus \{a\}$, which is impossible since any two edges form two distinct perfect 3-matchings are intersecting. Thus, our construction is E_4^+ -free. Adjusting this construction according to divisibility, if $n - 4 \equiv 0, 1, 2 \pmod{9}$, then we let $\varepsilon = 0, \varepsilon = 1$ if $n - 4 \equiv 3, 4 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 2$ if $n - 4 \equiv 5 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 4$ if $n - 4 \equiv 6 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 5$ if $n - 4 \equiv 7 \pmod{9}$, $\varepsilon = 8$ if $n - 4 \equiv 8 \pmod{9}$. Thus, we have $ex_4^{lin}(n, E_4^+) \geq 12 \lfloor \frac{n-4}{9} \rfloor + \varepsilon$.

Now let us to show the upper bound of $ex_4^{lin}(n, E_4^+)$. Let H be any linear quadruple system on n vertices. Denote by $D(e) = \{d(a), d(b), d(c), d(d)\}$ the degree sequence of any edge $e = \{a, b, c, d\} \in E(H)$, where $d(a) \geq d(b) \geq d(c) \geq d(d)$. For any $f = \{u, v, w, z\} \in E(H)$ and $e = \{a, b, c, d\} \in E(H)$, we say $D(f) \geq D(e)$ if $d(u) \geq a, d(v) \geq b, d(w) \geq c$ and $d(z) \geq d$. Suppose to the contrary that H is the smallest linear 4-graph of size more than $\frac{14(n-s)}{9}$. Fort any $v \in V(G)$, we define $f(v) = 1$ if $d(v) \leq 7$ and $f(v) = 0$ otherwise. We follow the observation from Tang et al. as follows.

$$\sum_{e \in E(H)} \sum_{v \in V(H), v \in e} \frac{f(v)}{d(v)} = \sum_{v \in V(H)} \sum_{e \in E(H), v \in e} \frac{f(v)}{d(v)} = \sum_{v \in V(H)} f(v) = n - s.$$

Since $|E(H)| > 14(n-s)/9$, we have that there is an edge $e = \{u, v, w, z\} \in E(H)$ satisfying that

$$\frac{f(u)}{d(u)} + \frac{f(v)}{d(v)} + \frac{f(w)}{d(w)} + \frac{f(z)}{d(z)} < \frac{9}{14}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $d(u) \leq d(v) \leq d(w) \leq d(z)$. We note that $d(u) \geq 2, d(w) \geq 5$ and $d(z) \geq 7$, as otherwise the above inequality would be violated. Moreover, if $d(z) \geq 8$ then we can find a copy of E_4^+ by choosing an edge $e_1 \neq e$ adjacent to u , an edge e_2 adjacent to w that does not share a vertex with e_1 , and an edge e_3 adjacent to z that does not share a vertex with e_1 and e_2 , contradiction. Therefore, $d(z) = 7$ and the above inequality implies that $D(e) \geq (7, 7, 6, 6)$.

Assume that $G - S$ be the graph obtained by deleting the vertices S and the edges in E_S . By Lemma 2.1, the graph $G - S$ have $n' = n - 22$ vertices and at least $|E(G)| - 25$ edges. Furthermore, the number of vertices in $G - S$ of degree at least 8 is exactly s . Therefore, we have

$$|E(G - S)| \geq |E(G)| - 25 > \frac{14(n-s)}{9} - 25 > \frac{14(n' - s)}{9},$$

a contradiction. This completes Theorem 1.2. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let H be a P_k -free linear quadruple system on n vertices with more than $2.5kn$ quadruples. We may assume that H is a minimal counterexample (neither k nor n can be decreased). Since for $k = 2, 3, 4$ we have sharp results with bounds smaller than $2.5kn$ (see Proposition 1.3 and Theorem 1.1), we have that $n > 4$ and $k \geq 5$. By the minimality of H for k , H contains a path $P = P_{k-1}$ with quadruples $e_i = \{x_{3i-2}, x_{3i-1}, x_{3i}, x_{3i+1}\}$ for $i \in [k-1]$. Also, we claim that each vertex of H has degree at least $2.5k$, otherwise deleting a vertex with a smaller degree we will get a smaller counterexample, a contradiction.

For convenience, we call the vertices x_1, x_2, x_3 the *origin* vertices of P , the vertices $x_{3k-4}, x_{3k-3}, x_{3k-2}$ the *terminus* vertices of P and the other vertices of P the *internal* vertices of P . We call the vertices of H not in P the *external* vertices. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, denote by $A_1(x_i)$ the set of quadruples in H containing x_i , one internal vertex and two external vertices. For $j = 3k-4, 3k-3, 3k-2$, denote by $B_1(x_j)$ the set of quadruples in H containing x_j , one internal vertex and two external vertices. Note that we have the following inequalities.

$$|A_1(x_i)| \leq 3(k-3), |B_1(x_j)| \leq 3(k-3), \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq 3, 3k-4 \leq j \leq 3k-2. \quad (1)$$

Let $A_1 = A_1(x_1) \cup A_1(x_2) \cup A_1(x_3)$ and $B_1 = B_1(x_{3k-4}) \cup B_1(x_{3k-3}) \cup B_1(x_{3k-2})$. A *touching pair* is a pair of quadruples $f_1, f_2 \in E(H)$ such that $f_1 \in A_1$, $f_2 \in B_1$ and their internal vertices are the same x_{3i-1} or x_{3i} .

Claim 3.1. *There are no touching pairs in $E(H)$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $f_1 = \{x_1, p, q, x_{3i}\}$ and $f_2 = \{x_{3k-2}, s, t, x_{3i}\}$ is a touching pair, where p, q, s, t are distinct. We can find a P_k defined by $e_{i+1}, e_{i+2}, \dots, e_{k-1}, f_2, f_1, e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}$, a contradiction. \square

Two quadruples $f_1, f_2 \in E(H)$ are *crossing* over two consecutive internal vertices x_i, x_{i+1} if $f_1 \in A_1, f_2 \in B_1$ and $x_{i+1} \in f_1, x_i \in f_2$.

Claim 3.2. *If $f_1, f_2 \in E(H)$ are crossing, then $f_1 \cap f_2 \neq \emptyset$ except for the case $i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f_1 = \{x_1, p, q, x_{i+1}\}$ and $f_2 = \{x_{3k-2}, s, t, x_i\}$, where p, q, s, t are distinct. If $i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, then we can find a P_k defined by $f_2, e_{k-1}, e_{k-2}, \dots, e_{\frac{i}{3}+1}, f_1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{\frac{i}{3}-1}$, a contradiction. If $i \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then we can find a P_k defined by $f_1, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{\frac{i-1}{3}}, f_2, e_{k-1}, e_{k-2}, \dots, e_{\frac{i+5}{3}}$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 3.3. *Assume that $f_1, f_2 \in E(H)$ are crossing over the internal vertices x_{3i}, x_{3i+1} and $x_a \in f_1$ is the origin vertex, $x_b \in f_2$ is the terminus vertex. Then there exist one origin vertex $v \neq x_a$ and one terminus vertex $w \neq x_b$ such that $\{v, x_{3i+1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of A_1 and $\{w, x_{3i}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of B_1 . Furthermore, if there exist exactly one origin vertex $v \in \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} - x_a$ and one terminus vertex $w \in \{x_{3k-4}, x_{3k-3}, x_{3k-2}\} - x_b$ such that $\{v, x_{3i+1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of A_1 and $\{w, x_{3i}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of B_1 , then there exists one terminus vertex u such that $\{u, x_{3i-1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of B_1 .*

Proof. By Claim 3.2, we have that $f_1 = \{x_a, l, s, x_{3i+1}\}, f_2 = \{x_b, l, t, x_{3i}\}$ and l, s, t are distinct. If $\{x_{a'}, x_{3i+1}\}$ and $\{x_{a''}, x_{3i+1}\}$ are covered by two quadruples g and h respectively, where $\{x_a, x_{a'}, x_{a''}\} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. Then by Claim 3.2 and the linearity of H , we have

$|h \cap g| = 2$, a contradiction. Thus, there exists one origin vertex $v \neq x_a$ such that $\{v, x_{3i+1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of A_1 . The proof of the second statement is similar. Assume that there exist exactly one origin vertex $v \in \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} - x_a$ and one terminus vertex $w \in \{x_{3k-4}, x_{3k-3}, x_{3k-2}\} - x_b$ such that $\{v, x_{3i+1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of A_1 and $\{w, x_{3i}\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of B_1 . Without loss of generality, we assume $g_1 = \{v, t, p, x_{3i+1}\} \in E(H)$, $g_2 = \{w, s, p, x_{3i}\} \in E(H)$, where l, s, t, p are distinct. Then there must be one terminus vertex u such that $\{u, x_{3i-1}\}$ is not covered by any quadruples of B_1 . Otherwise if there exists one terminus vertex u such that $g_3 = \{u, a, b, x_{3i-1}\} \in E(H)$, then we have that either $a, b \notin \{l, s\}$ or $a, b \notin \{t, p\}$ holds. Assume that $a, b \notin \{l, s\}$. Then we can find a P_k defined by $g_3, e_{k-1}, \dots, e_{i+1}, f_1, e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 3.4. *There exist an origin vertex x_a and a terminus vertex x_b of P such that $|A_1(x_a)| + |B_1(x_b)| \leq 4(k-3)$.*

Proof. By the inequality (1), we have $|A_1| + |B_1| \leq 18(k-3)$. Since $|A_1| + |B_1| = |A_1(x_1) + A_1(x_2) + A_1(x_3) + B_1(x_{3k-4}) + B_1(x_{3k-3}) + B_1(x_{3k-2})|$, it is enough for us to prove that $|A_1| + |B_1| \leq 12(k-3)$. We consider the number of "missing quadruples" from $A_1 \cup B_1$ as follows. For every fixed $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k-2\}$, we consider two cases.

Case 1. There is no quadruple in $A_1 \cup B_1$ containing x_{3i} . Then the pairs $\{x_{3i}, x_a\}$ and $\{x_{3i}, x_b\}$ are not covered by any quadruple of $A_1 \cup B_1$ for $x_a \in \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $x_b \in \{x_{3k-4}, x_{3k-3}, x_{3k-2}\}$. Thus we have six missing quadruples.

Case 2. There is a quadruple $e \in A_1 \cup B_1$ containing x_{3i} .

Case 2.1 There is a quadruple $e' \in A_1 \cup B_1$ such that e, e' is crossing over x_{3i}, x^* . If $e \in A_1$, then we have $x^* = x_{3i-1}$. By Claim 3.1, $\{x_{3i}, x_b\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of B_1 for any fixed $x_b \in \{x_{3k-4}, x_{3k-3}, x_{3k-2}\}$ and $\{x_{3i-1}, x_a\}$ is not covered by any quadruple of A_1 for any fixed $x_a \in \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. Thus we have six missing quadruples. If $e \in B_1$, then $x^* = x_{3i+1}$. By Claim 3.3, we have at least three missing quadruples. By Claim 3.1, $\{x_1, x_{3i}\}$, $\{x_2, x_{3i}\}$ and $\{x_3, x_{3i}\}$ are not covered by any quadruples of A_1 . Thus we have at least six missing quadruples.

Case 2.2. There exists no $e' \in A_1 \cup B_1$ such that e, e' is crossing over x_{3i}, x^* . Without loss of generality, assume that $e \in A_1$, then $\{x^*, x_{3k-4}\}$, $\{x^*, x_{3k-3}\}$ and $\{x^*, x_{3k-2}\}$ are not covered by any quadruple of B_1 . By Claim 3.1, we have $\{x_{3i}, x_{3k-4}\}$, $\{x_{3i}, x_{3k-3}\}$ and $\{x_{3i}, x_{3k-2}\}$ are not covered by any quadruple of A_1 . Thus we have at least six missing quadruples.

We conclude that among all cases we have at least six missing quadruples. Thus altogether we have at least $6(k-3)$ missing quadruples in $A_1 \cup B_1$. Then $|A_1| + |B_1| \leq 12(k-3)$. \square

Without loss of generality, assume that $|A_1(x_1)| + |B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 4(k-3)$. For $i \in \{2, 3\}$, we use $A_i(x_1)$ and $B_i(x_{3k-2})$ to denote the set of quadruples in H containing x_1 and intersecting $P - x_1$ in i vertices and the set of quadruples in H containing x_{3k-2} and intersecting $P - x_{3k-2}$ in i vertices, respectively. Since H is linear, We have

$$3|A_3(x_1)| + 2|A_2(x_1)| + |A_1(x_1)| \leq 3k - 3, \quad 3|B_3(x_{3k-2})| + 2|B_2(x_{3k-2})| + |B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 3k - 3.$$

Adding above two inequalities to the inequality $|A_1(x_1)| + |B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 4(k-3)$ we obtain

$$(3|A_3(x_1)| + 2|A_2(x_1)| + 2|A_1(x_1)|) + (3|B_3(x_{3k-2})| + 2|B_2(x_{3k-2})| + 2|B_1(x_{3k-2})|) \leq 10k - 18.$$

Then we have either $3|A_3(x_1)| + 2|A_2(x_1)| + 2|A_1(x_1)| \leq 5k - 9$ or $3|B_3(x_{3k-2})| + 2|B_2(x_{3k-2})| + 2|B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 5k - 9$. It follows that either $\frac{3}{2}|A_3(x_1)| + |A_2(x_1)| + |A_1(x_1)| \leq 2.5k - 4.5$ or

$\frac{3}{2}|B_3(x_{3k-2})|+|B_2(x_{3k-2})|+|B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 2.5k-4.5$. Thus we have either $d_H(x_1) = |A_3(x_1)|+|A_2(x_1)| + |A_1(x_1)| \leq 2.5k - 4.5$ or $d_H(x_{3k-2}) = |B_3(x_{3k-2})| + |B_2(x_{3k-2})| + |B_1(x_{3k-2})| \leq 2.5k - 4.5$, contradicting the minimum degree condition in a minimal counterexample. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Before proving Theorem 1.5, we first introduce the notion of $t - (m, k, \lambda)$ packing and some useful lemmas.

A $t - (m, k, \lambda)$ *packing* is a pair (V, \mathcal{B}) where V is a vertex set on m vertices and \mathcal{B} is a collection of k -subsets (called *blocks*) of V such that each t -subset of V is contained in *at most* λ blocks of \mathcal{B} . The *packing number* $D_\lambda(m, k, t)$ is the largest possible number of blocks in a $t - (m, k, \lambda)$ packing. A $t - (m, k, \lambda)$ packing is called *optimal* if $|\mathcal{B}| = D_\lambda(m, k, t)$. Thus, an $S(2, 4, m)$ is an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing with $D_1(m, 4, 2) = \frac{m(m-1)}{12}$.

Lemma 4.1 ([1]). *If $m \notin \{8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19\}$, then*

- (i) *for $m \equiv 0, 3 \pmod{12}$ an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing is a linear quadruple system whose quadruples cover all pairs of m vertices apart from m pairs which form a copy of $\frac{m}{3}K_3$ (the $\frac{m}{3}$ disjoint union of K_3);*
- (ii) *for $m \equiv 2, 8 \pmod{12}$ an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing is a linear quadruple system whose quadruples cover all pairs of m vertices apart from $\frac{m}{2}$ pairs which form a copy of $\frac{m}{2}K_2$ (the $\frac{m}{2}$ disjoint union of K_2);*
- (iii) *for $m \equiv 5, 11 \pmod{12}$ an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing is a linear quadruple system whose quadruples cover all pairs of m vertices apart from $\frac{m+3}{2}$ pairs which form a copy of $K_{1,4} \cup \frac{m-5}{2}K_2$ (the disjoint union of $K_{1,4}$ and $\frac{m-5}{2}$ disjoint edges);*
- (iv) *for $m \equiv 7, 10 \pmod{12}$ an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing is a linear quadruple system whose quadruples cover all pairs of m vertices apart from 9 pairs which form a copy of $K_{3,3}$;*
- (v) *for $m \equiv 6, 9 \pmod{12}$ an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing is a linear quadruple system whose quadruples cover all pairs of m vertices apart from $m + 3$ pairs which form a copy of $(K_6 \setminus K_4) \cup \frac{m-6}{3}K_3$ (the disjoint union of $K_6 \setminus K_4$ and $\frac{m-6}{3}$ disjoint triangles, where $K_6 \setminus K_4$ denotes the graph obtained from K_6 by deleting the edges from some K_4).*

Lemma 4.2 ([1, 24]).

$$\left\lfloor \frac{m}{4} \left\lfloor \frac{m-1}{3} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor - D_1(m, 4, 2) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m \equiv 7, 10 \pmod{12}, m \neq 10, 19 \text{ or } m = 9, 17; \\ 2, & \text{if } m = 8, 10, 11; \\ 3, & \text{if } m = 19; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 4.2, $D_1(8, 4, 2) = 2$, $D_1(9, 4, 2) = 3$, $D_1(10, 4, 2) = 5$, $D_1(11, 4, 2) = 6$, $D_1(17, 4, 2) = 20$ and $D_1(19, 4, 2) = 25$. An optimal $2 - (8, 4, 1)$ packing H_1 can be defined by $(V(H_1), E(H_1))$, where $V(H_1) = [8]$ and $E(H_1) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{5, 6, 7, 8\}\}$. An optimal $2 - (9, 4, 1)$ packing H_2 can be defined by $(V(H_2), E(H_2))$, where $V(H_2) = [9]$ and $E(H_2) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 7\}, \{3, 6, 8, 9\}\}$. An optimal $2 - (10, 4, 1)$ packing H_3 can be defined by

$(V(H_3), E(H_3))$, where $V(H_3) = [10]$ and $E(H_3) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{2, 5, 6, 7\}, \{1, 5, 9, 10\}, \{3, 7, 8, 10\}, \{4, 6, 8, 9\}\}$. An optimal $2 - (11, 4, 1)$ packing H_4 can be defined by $(V(H_4), E(H_4))$, where $V(H_4) = [11]$ and $E(H_4) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 7\}, \{1, 8, 9, 10\}, \{2, 5, 8, 11\}, \{3, 6, 9, 11\}, \{4, 7, 10, 11\}\}$. For $m = 17$, an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing can be obtained from $S(2, 4, 16)$ by adding an isolated vertex. For $m = 19$, Stinson [24] gave an optimal $2 - (m, 4, 1)$ packing $H = \{V(H), E(H)\}$, where $V(H) = [19]$ and $E(H) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 10\}, \{2, 5, 7, 17\}, \{3, 6, 8, 18\}, \{4, 7, 9, 18\}, \{5, 8, 9, 11\}, \{1, 7, 11, 12\}, \{1, 8, 13, 14\}, \{1, 9, 15, 16\}, \{2, 6, 11, 15\}, \{2, 8, 12, 16\}, \{3, 5, 13, 19\}, \{3, 7, 14, 15\}, \{3, 9, 10, 12\}, \{4, 5, 14, 16\}, \{4, 6, 12, 19\}, \{4, 8, 15, 17\}, \{6, 7, 13, 16\}, \{6, 9, 14, 17\}, \{7, 8, 10, 19\}, \{1, 17, 18, 19\}, \{2, 10, 14, 18\}, \{3, 11, 16, 17\}, \{4, 10, 11, 13\}, \{5, 12, 15, 18\}\}$.

Then we give a lower bound on $g(n, k)$ for large enough n .

Lemma 4.3. $g(n, k) \geq (k-1) \lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \rfloor + \frac{\binom{k-1}{2}}{6} - \frac{7}{2} - \frac{k+2}{6}$ for $n \geq 4k - 4$.

Proof. Let A be a fixed $(k-1)$ -element subset of n vertices. Then we can find an optimal $2 - (n, 4, 1)$ packing on A . By above argument about Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$ and optimal $2 - (n, 4, 1)$ packing, we know this leaves $0, k-1, \frac{k-1}{2}, \frac{k+2}{2}, 9, k+2$ pairs of vertices in A uncovered for $k-1 \notin \{8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19\}$. And for $k-1 \in \{8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19\}$ this leaves $15, 16, 19, 21$ pairs of vertices in A uncovered. Since $n - k + 1 \geq 3k - 3$, we can extend the vertices of A into quadruples using $k-1$ disjoint perfect 3-matchings of linear triple systems on the $n - k + 1$ vertices outside A . Thus we have at least

$$(k-1) \left\lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \right\rfloor + \frac{\binom{k-1}{2} - \max\{21, k-1, \frac{k-1}{2}, \frac{k+2}{2}, k+2\}}{\binom{4}{2}}$$

quadruples, proving the lemma. \square

In order to characterize the function $g(n, k)$, we give a simple upper bound on $g(n, k)$ as well.

Lemma 4.4. $g(n, k) \leq (k-1) \lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \rfloor + \frac{\binom{k-1}{2}}{2}$.

Proof. Let A be a fixed $(k-1)$ -element subset of vertices in a linear quadruple system H on n vertices such that all quadruples of H intersect A . For $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we use e_j to denote the number of edges intersecting A in j vertices. Note that the quadruples intersecting A in two vertices define a graph with vertex set A and degree sequence d_i for $i \in [k-1]$. Firstly, by the definition of Steiner triple system $STS(n)$ and Steiner system $S(2, 4, n)$, we have $e_3 \leq \frac{\binom{k-1}{3}}{3}$ and $e_4 \leq \frac{\binom{k-1}{4}}{6}$. It follows from H is linear that $e_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-k+1-2d_i}{3}$ and $e_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{d_i}{2}$. Hence, we have

$$e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4 \leq (k-1) \left\lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \right\rfloor + \frac{\binom{k-1}{2}}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{d_i}{6},$$

proving the lemma. \square

We prove Theorem 1.5 by induction on k . For $k = 1$, the result is trivial. For $k = 2$, the above statement shows that it also holds. Let $k \geq 3$. Assume that H is an M_k -free linear quadruple system on n vertices such that $|E(H)| > g(n, k)$ and $n > 37(k-1)^2 + 3$. By the

inductive hypothesis H contains M_{k-1} with quadruples $X_i = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}$ where $i \in [k-1]$. Similarly, we use E_2 to denote the set of quadruples in H intersecting $V(M_{k-1})$ in at least two vertices. Note that $|E_2| \leq \binom{4(k-1)}{2}$. When $k = 3$, we have $E_2 \leq 18$ since any quadruple in E_2 intersecting $V(M_2)$ in exactly two vertices or four vertices. Since H is M_k -free, the set E_1 of quadruples in H not in E_2 must intersect $V(M_{k-1})$ in exactly one vertex.

Similar with Gyárfás et al's notion, we call a quadruple $\{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}$ *good* if one of its vertex, say a_i , has degree larger than $4(k-1)$ in E_1 , otherwise we call it *bad*. Without loss of generality, we assume M_{k-1} contain j good quadruples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_j with vertices a_1, a_2, \dots, a_j of degree larger than $4(k-1)$ in E_1 , where $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. Note that for a fixed $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, if a vertex in X_i has degree at least four in E_1 , then the other three vertices of X_i have degree zero in E_1 . Otherwise we can find an M_k since the quadruple X_i can be replaced by two disjoint quadruples of E_1 . It follows that the number of quadruples in E_1 intersecting a good quadruple X_i equals to the degree of a_i in E_1 and the number of quadruples in E_1 intersecting a bad quadruple X_i is at most $4(k-1)$ for $k \geq 4$ (12 for $k = 3$). Combining all above analysis, we have

$$|E(H)| = |E_2| + |E_1| \leq \begin{cases} 18 + j \lfloor \frac{n-8}{3} \rfloor + 12(2-j), & \text{for } k = 3; \\ \binom{4(k-1)}{2} + j \lfloor \frac{n-4(k-1)}{3} \rfloor + 4(k-1)(k-1-j), & \text{for } k \geq 4. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We claim that for $j < k-1$, the inequality 2 contradicts the assumption $E(H) > g(n, k)$. It is enough for us to check that the right hand side of 2 is smaller than the lower bound of $g(n, k)$ in Lemma 4.3. When $k = 3$, it is easy for us to check that above statement hold. When $k \geq 4$, in order to make the above statement hold, by rewriting the second term of 2 as $j \lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \rfloor - j(k-1)$ and rearranging we need that

$$\binom{4(k-1)}{2} - \frac{k^2 - 5k - 44}{12} - j(k-1) + 4(k-1)(k-1-j) < (k-1-j) \left\lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \right\rfloor. \quad (3)$$

For 3, replacing $\lfloor \frac{n-k+1}{3} \rfloor$ by the smaller $\frac{n-k-2}{3}$, rearranging and multiplying by 3 we have

$$24(k-1)^2 - 6(k-1) - \frac{k^2 - 5k - 44}{4} - 3j(k-1) + (k-1-j)(13(k-1) + 3) < (k-1-j)n. \quad (4)$$

The last term on the left hand side of 4 is largest when $j = 0$ thus it is enough for us to prove that

$$24(k-1)^2 - 3(k-1) - \frac{k^2 - 5k - 44}{4} - 3j(k-1) + 13(k-1)^2 < (k-1-j)n. \quad (5)$$

And since the sum of the three terms with a negative sign on the left hand side of 5 is less than three for $k \geq 4$, we have

$$37(k-1)^2 + 3 < (k-1-j)n,$$

which is true by the assumption $n > 37(k-1)^2 + 3$.

If $j = k-1$, then all quadruples X_i are good for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. We claim that the vertex subset $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{k-1}\}$ intersect all quadruples in H . Otherwise there exists a quadruple B such that $V(B) \cap A = \emptyset$. Since the degrees of the vertices a_i are larger than $4(k-1)$, by the greedy algorithm we can find $k-1$ pairwise disjoint quadruples that are disjoint with B as well, a contradiction. We conclude that A intersect all quadruples in H implying that $|E(H)| \leq g(n, k)$. Thus, the theorem holds. \square

Appendix

Configurations $S(2, 4, 13)$ and $S(2, 4, 16)$ are as follows. $S(2, 4, 13) = (V(S(2, 4, 13)), E(S(2, 4, 13)))$ where $V(S(2, 4, 13)) = [13]$ and $E(S(2, 4, 13)) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 7\}, \{1, 8, 9, 10\}, \{1, 11, 12, 13\}, \{2, 5, 9, 13\}, \{2, 6, 10, 11\}, \{2, 7, 8, 12\}, \{3, 5, 10, 12\}, \{3, 6, 8, 13\}, \{3, 7, 9, 11\}, \{4, 5, 8, 11\}, \{4, 6, 9, 12\}, \{4, 7, 10, 13\}\}$. $S(2, 4, 16) = (V(S(2, 4, 16)), E(S(2, 4, 16)))$ where $V(S(2, 4, 16)) = [16]$ and $E(S(2, 4, 16)) = \{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 5, 6, 7\}, \{1, 8, 9, 10\}, \{1, 11, 12, 13\}, \{1, 14, 15, 16\}, \{2, 5, 9, 13\}, \{2, 8, 12, 16\}, \{2, 11, 15, 7\}, \{2, 14, 6, 10\}, \{3, 6, 8, 13\}, \{3, 9, 11, 16\}, \{3, 12, 14, 7\}, \{3, 15, 5, 10\}, \{4, 7, 8, 15\}, \{4, 10, 11, 6\}, \{4, 13, 14, 9\}, \{4, 16, 5, 12\}, \{5, 8, 11, 14\}, \{6, 9, 12, 15\}, \{7, 10, 13, 16\}\}$.




Figure 3: Configurations $S(2, 4, 13)$ and $S(2, 4, 16)$

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement

We wish to thank the anonymous referee for his or her valuable suggestions that improved the presentation of this paper.

References

- [1] A.E. Brouwer, Optimal packings of K_4 's into a K_n , J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 26 (1979) 278–297.
- [2] W.G. Brown, P. Erdős, V. Sós, On the existence of triangulated spheres in 3-graphs and related problems, Period. Math. Hungar. 3 (1973) 221–228.
- [3] A. Carbonero, W. Fletcher, J. Guo, A. Gyárfás, R. Wang, S. Yan, Crowns in linear 3-graphs, arXiv:2107.14713v1.
- [4] C.J. Colbourn, A. Rosa, Triple Systems, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999.

- [5] C. Collier-Cartaino, N. Graber, T. Jiang, Linear Turán numbers of r -uniform linear cycles and related Ramsey numbers, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 27 (2018) 358–386.
- [6] P. Erdős, A problem on independent r -tuples, *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest Eötvös Sect. Math.* 8 (1965) 92–95.
- [7] P. Erdős, T. Gallai, On the maximal paths and circuits of graphs, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* 10 (1959) 337–357.
- [8] B. Ergemlidze, E. Győri, A. Methuku, Asymptotics for the Turán number of cycles in 3-uniform linear hypergraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 163 (2019) 163–181.
- [9] W. Fletchler, Improved upper bound on the linear Turán number of the crown, [arXiv:2109.02729v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.02729v1).
- [10] Z. Füredi, Tuán type problems, *Surveys in Combinatorics*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Ser., 166, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991, 253–300.
- [11] Z. Füredi, A. Gyárfás, An extension of Mantel’s theorem to k -graphs, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 127 (2020) 263–268.
- [12] Z. Füredi, M. Simonovits, The history of degenerate (bipartite) extremal graph problems, Erdős centennial, 169–294, *Boyal Soc. Math. Stud.*, 25, János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013.
- [13] G. Gao, A. Chang, A linear hypergraph extension of the bipartite Turán problem, *European J. Combin.* 93 (2021) 103269.
- [14] D. Gerbner, A. Methuku, M. Vizer, Asymptotics for the Turán number of Berge- $K_{2,t}$, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 137 (2019) 264–290.
- [15] D. Gerbner, B. Patkós, *Extremal Finite Set Theory*, CRC press, Taylor and Francis group, 2019.
- [16] A. Gyárfás, G.N. Sárközy, Turán and ramsey numbers in linear triple systems, *Discrete Math.* 344 (2021) 112258.
- [17] A. Gyárfás, M. Ruszinkó, G.N. Sárközy, Linear Turán numbers of acyclic triple systems, *European J. Combin.* 99 (2022) 103435.
- [18] H. Hanani, The existence and construction of balanced incomplete block designs, *Ann. Math. Stat.* 32 (1961) 361–386.
- [19] P. Keevash, *Hypergraph Tuán problems*, *Surveys in Combinatorics*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Ser., 392, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2011, 83–139.
- [20] F. Lazebnik, J. Verstraëte, On hypergraphs of girth five, *Electron. J. Combin.* 10 (2003) #R25.
- [21] D. Mubayi, J. Verstraëte, A survey of Turán problems for expansions, *Recent Trends in Combinatorics*, IMA Math. Appl., 159, Springer, 2016, 117–143.

- [22] C. Reid, A. Rosa, Steiner systems $S(2, 4, v)$ -a survey, *Electron. J. Combin.* (1994)#DS18, Dynamic Surveys.
- [23] I.Z. Ruzsa, E. Szemerédi, Triple systems with no six points carrying three triangles, *Combinatorics, II, Colloq. Math. Sco. J. Bolyai*, North-Holland, 18 (1978) 939–945.
- [24] D.R. Stinson, Determination of a packing number, *Ars Combin.* 3 (1977) 89–114.
- [25] C. Tang, H. Wu, S. Zhang, Z. Zheng, On the Turán number of the linear 3-graph C_{13} , *Electron. J. Combin.* 29 (3)(2022)#P3.46.
- [26] E. Szemerédi, Regular partitions of graphs, *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes*, Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, 1976, 399–401.
- [27] C. Timmons, On r -uniform linear hypergraphs with no Berge- $K_{2,t}$, *Electron. J. Combin.* 244 (2017) 4–34.