

# Kleitman's conjecture for central families

Jonathan Cary

March 26, 2024

## Abstract

Chvátal conjectured that a star is amongst the largest intersecting subfamilies of a finite subset-closed family of sets. Kleitman later strengthened Chvátal's conjecture, suggesting that maximal intersecting subfamilies of  $2^{[n]}$  when naturally embedded into  $\mathbb{R}^{2^{[n]}}$  take on a particular form. We provide a construction which succeeds in expressing certain families as required by Kleitman's conjecture. We then provide a partial characterization of these families, showing central and certain near-central families in particular to be amongst them.

## 1 Introduction

We say a family of sets  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting if  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}^* = \{A^c : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  be the setwise complement of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Moreover, we say a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  is self-dual if  $\mathcal{F} \sqcup \mathcal{F}^* = 2^{[n]}$ . We define the star centered on  $a$  of a family  $\mathcal{F}$  to be  $\mathcal{S}_a(\mathcal{F}) = \{A \in \mathcal{F} : a \in A\}$ .

It is well-known that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  is a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is superset-closed and self-dual [1]. We will use this result throughout the paper.

In 1961, Erdős, Ko, and Rado published their seminal theorem [4], that for any family  $\mathcal{F} = \binom{[n]}{k}$  where  $2k \leq n$ , amongst the largest intersecting subfamilies of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star, known as the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem.

In 1972, Chvátal conjectured the following variant of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem.

**Conjecture 1.1.** [3] Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  be subset-closed. Then amongst the largest intersecting subfamilies of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star.

Kleitman later strengthened Chvátal's conjecture in 1979 in the following way.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ . We define the  $\mathbb{R}^{2^{[n]}}$  embedding of  $\mathcal{F}$

$$\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{A \subseteq [n]} e_A \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } A \in \mathcal{F} \wedge A^c \notin \mathcal{F} \\ -1, & \text{if } A \notin \mathcal{F} \wedge A^c \in \mathcal{F} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Conjecture 1.2.** [6] Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$ . Then

$$\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{a \in [n]} c_a \vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) + \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]} \lambda_{(A,B)} (e_B - e_A)$$

where  $\sum_{a \in [n]} c_a = 1$  and all  $(c_a)_{a \in [n]}$  and  $(\lambda_{(A,B)})_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]}$  are non-negative.

Note that in Kleitman's original statement of his conjecture, the vector of a family is formed from the sum of unit vectors of its sets, without negative components. These two forms are equivalent however. We can see how Kleitman's conjecture implies Chvátal's as follows.

**Lemma 1.1.** *Conjecture 1.2 implies 1.1.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  a subset-closed family.

By Kleitman's conjecture,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \vec{\mathcal{G}} &= \left( \sum_{a \in [n]} c_a \vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) + \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]} \lambda_{(A,B)} (e_B - e_A) \right) \cdot \vec{\mathcal{G}} \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in [n]} c_a (\vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) \cdot \vec{\mathcal{G}}) \\ &\leq \max\{\vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) \cdot \vec{\mathcal{G}}\}_{a \in [n]}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\vec{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \vec{\mathcal{G}} = 4|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}| - 2|\mathcal{G}|,$$

Chvátal's conjecture thus follows.  $\square$

There are a number of partial results on Chvátal's conjecture. Chvátal [3] first showed his own conjecture to hold for all left-compressed subset-closed families. This result would later be generalized by Wang and Wang [9], then by Snevily [8], and most recently by Borg [2]. Kleitman and Magnanti [7] showed Chvátal's conjecture to hold for intersecting families contained in the union of two stars. More recently, Friedgut, et al. [5] suggested a connection between Kleitman's conjecture and correlation inequalities.

## 2 A construction for Kleitman's conjecture

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$ . We construct coefficients satisfying Kleitman's conjecture as follows. Take the hypercube of vertices  $2^{[n]}$  and edges  $(A, B) \in 2^{[n]} \times 2^{[n]}$  such that  $|A \oplus B| = 1$ . For all vertices  $A \in \mathcal{F}^*$ , construct all directed paths from  $A$  to  $A^c$ , traversing each axis once. Call  $\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)$  the sum of all such paths. We show that each edge of  $\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)$  is directed away from the vertex  $\emptyset$ . It then follows that if the sum of each minimal axis crossing is  $n!$ , then coefficients as required by Kleitman's conjecture can be constructed from  $\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A commonly used technique in variants of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem is shifting, where a shift operator  $s$  injectively maps a set  $A$  to  $s(\mathcal{F}, A)$ . For brevity, we will write  $s(\mathcal{F})$  for  $\{s(\mathcal{F}, A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ .

Let  $(s_i)_{i \in [k]}$  be a sequence of shift operators,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ , and  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . We define the partial composition sequence  $(\Gamma_s^i)_{i \in [0, k]}$  as follows.

$$\Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F}, A) = \begin{cases} A, & \text{if } i = 0 \\ s_i(\Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}), \Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}, A)), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F}) = \{\Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F}, A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $s$  be a shift operator,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . Consider the directed graph  $(2^{[n]}, 2^{[n]} \times 2^{[n]})$ . The shift operator  $s$  can be seen as moving  $\mathcal{F}$  to  $s(\mathcal{F})$  via edges  $(A, s(\mathcal{F}, A))$ . We thus define the natural mapping from the edge traversed by  $A$  under  $s$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{2^{[n]} \times 2^{[n]}}$

$$E_s(\mathcal{F}, A) = e_{(s(\mathcal{F}, A), A)} - e_{(A, s(\mathcal{F}, A))}.$$

Moreover, let  $(s_i)_{i \in [k]}$  be a sequence of shift operators,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ , and  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . We define

$$E_s^i(\mathcal{F}, A) = E_{s_i}(\Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}), \Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}, A)).$$

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $(s_i)_{i \in [0, k]}$  be a sequence of shift operators,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ , and  $A \subseteq [n]$ . Then

$$\sum_{B \subseteq [n]} \left( \sum_{C \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i \in [k]} E_s^i(\mathcal{F}, C) \right)_{(A, A \oplus B)} = 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^k(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \mathcal{F}}.$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{B \subseteq [n]} \left( \sum_{C \in \mathcal{F}} E_{s_i}(\Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}), \Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}, C)) \right)_{(A, A \oplus B)} \\ &= \sum_{B \subseteq [n]} \left( \sum_{C \in \mathcal{F}} e_{(\Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F}, C), \Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}, C))} - e_{(\Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}, C), \Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F}, C))} \right)_{(A, A \oplus B)} \\ &= 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^i(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^{i-1}(\mathcal{F})} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from  $\Gamma_s^{i-1}$  and  $\Gamma_s^i$  being injective.

We now proceed by induction. The case of  $k = 0$  is trivial. For the inductive

step, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{B \subseteq [n]} \left( \sum_{C \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i \in [k]} E_s^i(\mathcal{F}, C) \right)_{(A, A \oplus B)} \\
&= 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \mathcal{F}} + \sum_{B \subseteq [n]} \left( \sum_{C \in \mathcal{F}} E_s^k(\mathcal{F}, C) \right)_{(A, A \oplus B)} \\
&= 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \mathcal{F}} + 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^k(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})} \\
&= 1_{A \in \Gamma_s^k(\mathcal{F})} - 1_{A \in \mathcal{F}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , and  $a \in [n]$ . We define the following shift operators.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_a(\mathcal{F}, A) &= A \oplus \{a\} \\
\beta_a(\mathcal{F}, A) &= \begin{cases} A \cup \{a\}, & \text{if } A \cup \{a\} \notin \mathcal{F} \\ A, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation on  $[n]$ . Note that  $\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F}) = \{A \oplus B : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  where  $B = \{\sigma(i)\}_{i \in [k]}$ . We will sometimes write this as  $B \oplus \mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation on  $[n]$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  subset-closed, and  $k \in [0, n]$ . Then  $\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F}) = \Gamma_{\beta \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F})$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. The case of  $k = 0$  is trivial. For the inductive step, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F}) &= \alpha_{\sigma(k)}(\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})) \\
&= \Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^{k-1}(\alpha_{\sigma(k)}(\mathcal{F})) \\
&= \Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^{k-1}(\beta_{\sigma(k)}(\mathcal{F})) \\
&= \beta_{\sigma(k)}(\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})) \\
&= \beta_{\sigma(k)}(\Gamma_{\beta \circ \sigma}^{k-1}(\mathcal{F})) \\
&= \Gamma_{\beta \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F})
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from  $\mathcal{F}$  being subset-closed, the fourth from  $\sigma$  being a permutation, and the fifth from the inductive hypothesis. □

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ . We define the sum of all paths induced by  $\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  over all permutations  $\sigma$

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \sum_{A \subseteq [n]} \sum_{k \in [n]} E_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^k(\mathcal{F}, A)$$

where  $\Sigma$  is the set of permutations on  $[n]$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ ,  $A \subseteq [n]$ , and  $B \subseteq [n] \setminus A$ . We define

$$(\mathcal{F}/A)(B) = \{C \subseteq A : B \cup C \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Note that for  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^A$ , we have  $(\mathcal{F}/A)^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq 2^{[n] \setminus A}$ , and thus complements of sets of the preimage of  $\mathcal{G}$  will be taken with respect to  $[n] \setminus A$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ ,  $a \in [n]$  and  $A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{a\}$ . Then

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{F})_{(A, A \cup \{a\})} = \sum_{B \in A \oplus F(\{\emptyset\})} |B|! |B^c|! - \sum_{B \in A \oplus F(\{\{a\}\})} |B|! |B^c|!$$

where  $F(G) = (\mathcal{F}/\{a\})^{-1}(G)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation on  $[n]$ . We define  $i = \sigma^{-1}(a)$  the index of  $a$  in  $\sigma$  and  $B = \{\sigma_k\}_{k \in [1, i]}$  and  $C = \{\sigma_k\}_{k \in (i, n]}$  the set of values of  $\sigma$  occurring before and after  $a$  respectively. Under the action of  $\alpha_a$  on  $\Gamma_{\alpha \circ \sigma}^{i-1}(\mathcal{F}) = B \oplus \mathcal{F}$ , the edge  $(A, A \cup \{a\})$  is increased when  $((B \oplus \mathcal{F})/\{a\})(A) = \{\emptyset\}$ , decreased when  $((B \oplus \mathcal{F})/\{a\})(A) = \{\{a\}\}$ , and left unchanged otherwise. Noting that  $((B \oplus \mathcal{F})/\{a\})(A) = (\mathcal{F}/\{a\})(A \oplus B)$  and counting all  $|B|!|C|!$  permutations equivalent to  $\sigma$ , equality thus follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  be subset-closed,  $a \in [n]$ , and  $A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{a\}$ . Then

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{F})_{(A, A \cup \{a\})} = \sum_{B \in A \oplus F(\{\emptyset\})} |B|! |B^c|!$$

where  $F(\mathcal{G}) = (\mathcal{F}/\{a\})^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$ .

*Proof.* By subset-closure,  $F(\{\{a\}\}) = \emptyset$  due to lemma 2.2. Equality thus follows by lemma 2.3.  $\square$

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$ . We say  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\emptyset$ -minimal if

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(\emptyset, \{a\})} = \min\{\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(A, A \cup \{a\})}\}_{A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{a\}}$$

for all  $a \in [n]$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  be  $\emptyset$ -minimal. Then

$$\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{a \in [n]} c_a \vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) + \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]} \lambda_{(A, B)} (e_B - e_A)$$

where  $\sum_{a \in [n]} c_a = 1$  and all  $(c_a)_{a \in [n]}$  and  $(\lambda_{(A, B)})_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]}$  are non-negative.

*Proof.* Let

$$c_a = \frac{1}{n!} \Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(\emptyset, \{a\})}$$

and

$$\lambda_{(A,B)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n!}(\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(A,B)} - \Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(\emptyset, \{a\})}), & \text{if } B \setminus A = \{a\} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It thus follows that

$$\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{a \in [n]} c_a \vec{\mathcal{S}}_a(2^{[n]}) + \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]} \lambda_{(A,B)}(e_B - e_A)$$

and

$$\sum_{a \in [n]} c_a = 1$$

from lemma 2.1. Non-negativity of  $(c_a)_{a \in [n]}$  follows from lemma 2.4. Non-negativity of  $(\lambda_{(A,B)})_{A \subseteq B \subseteq [n]}$  follows from  $\emptyset$ -minimality of  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Central families

Though a complete characterization of  $\emptyset$ -minimal families remains to be given, here we show central and certain near-central families to be  $\emptyset$ -minimal. We also give examples of families for which this property fails to hold.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is central if  $2|A| \geq n$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$  be central. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\emptyset$ -minimal.

*Proof.* Let  $a \in [n]$ . We define  $F(\mathcal{G}) = (\mathcal{F}^* / \{a\})^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$ . By lemma 2.4,

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{F}^*)_{(A, A \cup \{a\})} = \sum_{B \in A \oplus F(\{\emptyset\})} |B|! |B^c|! = \sum_{B \in F(\{\emptyset\})} |A \oplus B|! |(A \oplus B)^c|!$$

for all  $A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{a\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is central, we have  $F(\{\emptyset\}) \subseteq \binom{[n] \setminus \{a\}}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \cup \binom{[n] \setminus \{a\}}{\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil}$ , and thus each  $|A \oplus B|! |(A \oplus B)^c|!$  is minimal when  $A = \emptyset$  for all  $B \in F(\{\emptyset\})$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[2n+1]}$  be central and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \binom{[2n+1]}{n}$  intersecting such that  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{2n}{n}$ . We define  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}^*) \cup \mathcal{G}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\emptyset$ -minimal.

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathcal{F}$  being a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[2n+1]}$  implies that so too must be  $\mathcal{H}$ , since  $\mathcal{G}$  is intersecting and  $\mathcal{G}^*$  a subset-closed subfamily of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $a \in [2n+1]$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{H}^* / \{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) &= \left( (\mathcal{F}^* / \{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\{\emptyset\}} \right) \cup \mathcal{G}_{\{a\}} \\ &= \left( \left( \binom{[2n+1] \setminus \{a\}}{n} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\{\emptyset\}} \right) \cup \mathcal{G}_{\{a\}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{\{\emptyset\}} &= (\mathcal{G}/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) \cup (\mathcal{G}^*/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\{a\}\}) \\ \mathcal{G}_{\{\{a\}\}} &= (\mathcal{G}/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\{a\}\}) \cup (\mathcal{G}^*/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}).\end{aligned}$$

By lemma 2.4, to show that  $\emptyset$  minimizes  $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}^*)_{(A, A \cup \{a\})}$  amongst  $A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{a\}$ , it suffices to show that  $\emptyset$  maximizes  $|(A \oplus (\mathcal{H}^*/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\})) \cap \binom{[2n+1] \setminus \{a\}}{n}|$ , since for  $\emptyset$ , all sets of size not equal to  $n$  are either  $n - 1$  or  $n + 1$  and thus contributing minimally to  $\Lambda(\mathcal{H}^*)_{(A, A \cup \{a\})}$  amongst sets of size not equal to  $n$ .

We now proceed by cases, considering the parity of  $|A|$ . In the case that  $|A|$  is even,  $\emptyset$  must be maximal since all sets of parity equivalent to  $n$ , consisting of  $(\mathcal{F}^*/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\{\emptyset\}}$ , are already of size  $n$ . In the case that  $|A|$  is odd, at most  $|\mathcal{G}_{\{\{a\}\}}|$  sets could be of size  $n$ . Our assumption that  $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{2n}{n}$ , which implies that  $|(\mathcal{F}^*/\{a\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\{\emptyset\}}| \geq |\mathcal{G}_{\{\{a\}\}}|$ , thus suffices for maximality.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a maximal intersecting subfamily of  $2^{[n]}$  and  $A$  a minimal set of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\{|A|, |A^c|\} \neq \{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\}$ . We define*

$$\mathcal{G} = (\{B \subseteq [n+1] : B \cap [n] \in \mathcal{F}\} \setminus \{A\}) \cup \{A^c\}.$$

*Then  $\mathcal{G}$  is not  $\emptyset$ -minimal.*

*Proof.* We have

$$(\mathcal{G}^*/\{n+1\})^{-1}(\{\emptyset\}) = \{A, A^c\}.$$

Thus by lemma 2.4,  $\Lambda(\mathcal{G}^*)_{(B, B \cup \{n+1\})}$  is minimal for  $B \subseteq [n]$  if and only if  $|A \oplus B| \in \{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\}$ . Our restriction on  $A$  thus precludes  $\emptyset$  from being minimal.  $\square$

## 4 Conclusion

The first maximal intersecting families which fail to be  $\emptyset$ -minimal appear for  $n = 5$ . It appears that most  $\emptyset$ -minimal families are either central or nearly central, and for small  $n$  this covers all families. In general, behavior for large  $n$  appears difficult to predict, e.g. do  $\emptyset$ -minimal families have positive density amongst maximal intersecting subfamilies of  $2^{[n]}$  for large  $n$ ?

Generalizations of  $\Lambda$  can yield stronger results. One such generalization, where each edge involved in the construction of  $\Lambda$  is weighted by its associated permutation, suffices to provide constructions as required by Kleitman's conjecture for all maximal intersecting subfamilies of  $2^{[n]}$  for  $n = 5$ , though whether this continues for larger  $n$  remains to be investigated.

## References

- [1] I. Anderson. *Combinatorics of Finite Sets*. Oxford University Press, London, 1987.
- [2] P. Borg. On chvátal's conjecture and a conjecture on families of signed sets. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(1):140–145, 2011.

- [3] V. Chvátal. Intersecting families of edges in hypergraphs having the hereditary property. In *Hypergraph Seminar (Proc. First Working Sem., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1972; dedicated to Arnold Ross)*, volume 411 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 61–66, Berlin, 1974. Springer.
- [4] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford*, 12:313–320, 1961.
- [5] E. Friedgut, J. Kahn, G. Kalai, and N. Keller. Chvátal’s conjecture and correlation inequalities. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 156: 22–43, 2018.
- [6] D. Kleitman. Extremal hypergraph problems. In B. Bollobás, editor, *Proceedings of the 7th British Combinatorial Conference*, pages 44–65. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- [7] D. Kleitman and T. Magnanti. On the number of latent subsets of intersecting collections. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 16(2):215–220, 1974.
- [8] H. Snevily. A new result on chvátal’s conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 61(1):137–141, 1992.
- [9] D. Wang and P. Wang. Some results about the chvátal conjecture. *Discrete Mathematics*, 24(1):95–101, 1978.