

# $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or Configuration Forbidden Families on Set Systems and Vector Spaces over Finite Fields

Jiuqiang Liu<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Guihai Yu<sup>a,\*</sup>, Lihua Feng<sup>c</sup>, and Yongtao Li<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> College of Big Data Statistics, Guizhou University of Finance and Economics  
Guiyang, Guizhou, 550025, China

<sup>b</sup> Department of Mathematics, Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, MI 48197, USA

<sup>c</sup> School of Mathematics and Statistics, HNP-LAMA, Central South University  
Changsha, Hunan, 410083, China

E-mail: jiuqiang68@126.com, yuguihai@mail.gufe.edu.cn, fenglh@163.com

May 1, 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, we derive a tight upper bound for the size of an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of the  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  over finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  which gives a  $q$ -analogue of the Erdős'  $k$ -Sperner Theorem, and we then establish a general relationship between upper bounds for the sizes of families of subsets of  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with property  $P$  and upper bounds for the sizes of families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with property  $P$ , where  $P$  is either  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or forbidding certain configuration. Applying this relationship, we derive generalizations of the well known results about the famous Erdős matching conjecture and Erdős-Chvátal simplex conjecture to linear lattices.

**Key words:** Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, Erdős matching conjecture; Erdős-Chvátal simplex conjecture; hereditary property;  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting family; Sperner family

**AMS Classifications:** 05D05.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout the paper, we denote  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . A family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$  is called  $t$ -*intersecting* if  $|E \cap F| \geq t$  for every pair of distinct subsets  $E, F \in \mathcal{F}$ , and it is called *intersecting* when  $t = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers with  $0 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_s$ . A family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$  is called  $\mathcal{L}$ -*intersecting* if  $|E \cap F| \in \mathcal{L}$  for every pair of subsets  $E, F$  in  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $k$ -*uniform* if it is a collection of  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$ . Thus, a  $k$ -uniform intersecting family is  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting for  $\mathcal{L} = \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ . A  $k$ -uniform  $t$ -intersecting family is a special

---

\*The corresponding author

$\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting family with  $\mathcal{L} = \{t, t + 1, \dots, k - 1\}$ . A *Boolean lattice*  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is the set  $2^{[n]}$  of all subsets of  $[n]$  with the ordering being the containment relation and a *linear lattice*  $\mathcal{L}_n(q)$  is the set of all subspaces of the  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with the ordering being the relation of inclusion of subspaces.

In 1961, Erdős, Ko, and Rado [11] proved the following classical result.

**Theorem 1.1** (Erdős, Ko, and Rado, [11]). *Let  $n \geq 2k$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $k$ -uniform intersecting family of subsets of  $[n]$ . Then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ , with equality only when  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of all  $k$ -subsets containing a common element.*

Since then, many intersection theorems have appeared in the literature, see, for example, the next three well-known theorems.

**Theorem 1.2** (Ray-Chaudhuri and Wilson, [28]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $k$ -uniform  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting family of subsets of  $[n]$ , then  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s}$ .*

**Theorem 1.3** (Frankl and Wilson, [14]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers. If  $\mathcal{A}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting family of subsets of  $[n]$ , then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \dots + \binom{n}{0}.$$

In terms of the parameters  $n$  and  $s$ , the inequality in Theorem 1.3 is best possible, as shown by the set of all subsets of  $[n]$  with sizes at most  $s$  and taking  $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$ .

**Theorem 1.4** (Alon, Babai, and Suzuki, [2]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers and  $K = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r\}$  be a set of integers satisfying  $k_i > s - r$  for every  $i$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$  is a family of subsets of  $[n]$  such that  $|A_i| \in K$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $|A_i \cap A_j| \in \mathcal{L}$  for every pair  $i \neq j$ . Then*

$$m \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \dots + \binom{n}{s-r+1}.$$

Recall that a family of subsets of  $[n]$  is called a *Sperner family* (or antichain) if there are no two different members of the family such that one of them contains the other, and a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$  is  *$k$ -Sperner* if all chains in  $\mathcal{F}$  have length at most  $k$ . Define  $\sum(n, k)$  to be the sum of the  $k$  largest binomial coefficients of order  $n$ , i.e.,  $\sum(n, k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor + i}$ . Let  $\sum^*(n, k)$  be the collection of families consisting of the corresponding full levels, i.e., if  $n + k$  is odd, then  $\sum^*(n, k)$  contains one family  $\cup_{i=1}^k \binom{[n]}{\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor + i}$  (where  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  is the set of all  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$ ); if  $n + k$  is even, then  $\sum^*(n, k)$  contains two families of the same size  $\cup_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{[n]}{\frac{n-k}{2} + i}$  and  $\cup_{i=1}^k \binom{[n]}{\frac{n-k}{2} + i}$ . The following theorem by Erdős [9] generalizes the classical Sperner theorem.

**Theorem 1.5** (Erdős, [9]). *Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $k$ -Sperner family of subsets of  $[n]$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \sum(n, k).$$

Moreover, if  $|\mathcal{A}| = \sum(n, k)$ , then  $\mathcal{A} \in \sum^*(n, k)$ .

Throughout this paper, we denote the Gaussian (or  $q$ -binomial) coefficient of order  $n$  by

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \prod_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} \frac{q^{n-i} - 1}{q^{k-i} - 1}. \quad (1)$$

It is well known that the number of all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  is equal to  $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ .

Results on the sizes of families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  analogous to those theorems on  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting families of subsets of  $[n]$  have appeared in the literature. The next generalization of Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem (Theorem 1.1) is proved by Greene and Kleitman [16] and Hsieh [18].

**Theorem 1.6** (Greene and Kleitman [16], Hsieh [18]). *Let  $n \geq 2k + 1$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  satisfying that  $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) > 0$  for any distinct subspaces  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and equality holds if and only if there exists a 1-dimensional subspace  $R$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  such that  $R \subseteq V$  for every  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Frankl and Graham [13] derived the following theorem on  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Frankl and Graham [13]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers. Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  such that  $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) \in \mathcal{L}$  for any distinct subspaces  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s \end{bmatrix}.$$

In 1990, Lefmann [23] proved the following  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting theorem for ranked finite lattices, and in 2001, Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri [27] extended to quasi-polynomial semi-lattices.

**Theorem 1.8** (Lefmann [23], Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri [27]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers. Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  satisfying that  $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) \in \mathcal{L}$  for any distinct subspaces  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s-1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alon et al. [2] derived the next result in 1991.

**Theorem 1.9** (Alon, Babai, and Suzuki [2]). *Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_s\}$  be a set of  $s$  nonnegative integers. Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  satisfying that  $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) \in \mathcal{L}$  for any distinct subspaces  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\dim(V_i) \in \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r\}$  with  $k_i > s - r$  for every  $i$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s-1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + \begin{bmatrix} n \\ s-r+1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We say that a family  $\mathcal{V}$  of subspaces is *Sperner* (or *antichain*) if no subspace is contained in another subspace in  $\mathcal{V}$ , and  $\mathcal{V}$  is *k-Sperner* if all chains in  $\mathcal{V}$  have length at most  $k$ . The following well-known Sperner theorem for families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  can be found in [8], which is a vector space analogue of the classical Sperner theorem.

**Theorem 1.10** (*q-Analogue Sperner Theorem*). *Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \left[ \begin{matrix} n \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \end{matrix} \right].$$

We denote  $\sum[n, k]$  to be the sum of the  $k$  largest  $q$ -binomial coefficients of order  $n$ , i.e.,  $\sum[n, k] = \sum_{i=1}^k \left[ \begin{matrix} n \\ \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor + i \end{matrix} \right]$ . Let  $\sum^*[n, k]$  be the collection of families consisting of the corresponding full levels, i.e., if  $n+k$  is odd, then  $\sum^*[n, k]$  contains one family  $\cup_{i=1}^k \left[ \begin{matrix} [n] \\ \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor + i \end{matrix} \right]$  (where  $\left[ \begin{matrix} [n] \\ k \end{matrix} \right]$  denotes the set of all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ ); if  $n+k$  is even, then  $\sum^*[n, k]$  contains two families of the same size  $\cup_{i=0}^{k-1} \left[ \begin{matrix} [n] \\ \frac{n-k}{2} + i \end{matrix} \right]$  and  $\cup_{i=1}^k \left[ \begin{matrix} [n] \\ \frac{n-k}{2} + i \end{matrix} \right]$ .

The following  $q$ -analogue of Erdős' theorem (Theorem 1.5) is implied by Theorem 2 in [29], which generalizes Theorem 1.10 to  $k$ -Sperner families.

**Theorem 1.11** (*Samotij [29]*). *Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \sum[n, k].$$

Moreover, if  $|\mathcal{V}| = \sum[n, k]$ , then  $\mathcal{V} \in \sum^*[n, k]$ .

We say that a family  $\mathcal{V}$  of subspaces is *intersecting* if  $\dim(V_i \cap V_j) > 0$  for any pair of distinct  $V_i, V_j \in \mathcal{V}$ . Here, our first main result is the following theorem on an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  which improves considerably the bound in Theorem 1.11, where  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}[R]$  denotes the set of all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces containing a given subspace  $R$  in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ .

**Theorem 1.12** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  such that  $\dim(V) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  for every  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \left[ \begin{matrix} n-1 \\ j-1 \end{matrix} \right]$$

and equality holds if and only if there exists a 1-dimensional subspace  $R$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  such that  $\mathcal{V}_j = \{V \in \mathcal{V} \mid \dim(V) = j\} = \mathcal{L}_{n,j}[R]$  for each  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ .

Note that for  $\left[ \begin{matrix} n \\ k \end{matrix} \right]$  defined by (1), one has

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} n \\ k \end{matrix} \right] = q^k \left[ \begin{matrix} n-1 \\ k \end{matrix} \right] + \left[ \begin{matrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{matrix} \right].$$

The bound in Theorem 1.12 is considerably smaller than that in Theorem 1.11.

We say that a property  $P$  of families is *hereditary* if for any family  $\mathcal{F}$  with property  $P$ , every subfamily of  $\mathcal{F}$  has property  $P$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting, Sperner, and  $k$ -Sperner are hereditary properties.

Our next main result establishes a general relationship between upper bounds for the sizes of  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting families of subsets of  $[n]$  and upper bounds for the sizes of  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Denote

$$f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k) = c_k \binom{n}{k} + c_{k-1} \binom{n}{k-1} + \dots + c_0 \binom{n}{0},$$

$$f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k) = c_k \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} + c_{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + c_0 \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $0 \leq c_i \leq 1$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$  and  $0 < c_k \leq 1$ .

**Theorem 1.13** *Let  $P$  be a hereditary property which is  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or  $T$ -configuration forbidden, where  $\mathcal{L}$  is a set of nonnegative integers and  $T$  is a given configuration. Assume that  $k$  is fixed and  $n \geq 2k$ . If any family in  $2^{[n]}$  satisfying property  $P$  has at most  $f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$  members, then any family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with property  $P$  has at most  $f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$  members for  $n$  sufficiently large.*

By Theorem 1.13, one sees easily that for  $n$  sufficiently large, Theorems 1.2–1.4 give rise to Theorems 1.7–1.9, respectively.

Let  $0 < c \leq 1$  and

$$f^*(n, k, c) = c \binom{n}{k},$$

$$f_q^*(n, k, c) = c \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

For uniform families, we have the following similar result without requiring  $n$  to be sufficiently large.

**Theorem 1.14** *Let  $P$  be a hereditary property which is  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or  $T$ -configuration forbidden, where  $\mathcal{L}$  is a set of nonnegative integers and  $T$  is a given configuration. Assume that  $k$  is fixed and  $n \geq 2k$ . If any family in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  satisfying property  $P$  has at most  $f^*(n, k, c)$  members, then any family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with property  $P$  has at most  $f_q^*(n, k, c)$  members.*

A collection  $M$  of pairwise disjoint sets is called a *matching*. The *matching number*  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  of a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  is the size of the largest matching that  $\mathcal{F}$  contains. Note that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting if  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ . Erdős [10] provided the following well-known conjecture about the maximum size of a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) \leq s$ .

**Conjecture 1.15** (*Erdős Matching Conjecture [10]*). Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $n \geq (s+1)k$  and  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) \leq s$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \max \left\{ \binom{(s+1)k-1}{k}, \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k} \right\}.$$

In section 4, we provide applications of Theorems 1.13 and 1.14. In particular, we derive generalizations of the well known results about Erdős-Chvátal simplex conjecture and Erdős matching conjecture.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.12

First, we show that  $\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right]$  satisfies the following symmetric and unimodal properties similar to those of the binomial coefficients.

**Lemma 2.1** For  $0 \leq k < l \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ , we have

$$(i) \quad \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right] = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ n-k \end{smallmatrix} \right],$$

$$(ii) \quad \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right] < \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ l \end{smallmatrix} \right].$$

**Proof.** For (i), it follows from the fact

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ n-k \end{smallmatrix} \right] &= \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n-k-1} \frac{q^{n-i} - 1}{q^{n-k-i} - 1} \\ &= \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q^{n-(n-k)+1} - 1)}{(q^{n-k} - 1)(q^{n-k-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1)} \\ &= \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q^{n-(n-k)+1} - 1)}{(q^{n-k} - 1)(q^{n-k-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1)} \cdot \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1)}{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1)} \\ &= \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \cdots (q^{n-k+1} - 1)}{(q^k - 1)(q^{k-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1)} = \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For (ii), it suffices to show that for  $k+1 \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ ,

$$\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right] < \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k+1 \end{smallmatrix} \right].$$

Note that

$$\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k+1 \end{smallmatrix} \right] = \frac{q^{n-k} - 1}{q^{k+1} - 1} \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right].$$

For  $k+1 \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ , we have  $n-k > k+1$ . It follows that

$$\left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right] < \left[ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k+1 \end{smallmatrix} \right]. \quad \square$$

The following LYM type inequality for intersecting Sperner families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  is given in [31]. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}[R]$  denotes the set of all  $k$ -dimensional subspaces containing a given subspace  $R$  in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Wang, [31]). Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is an intersecting Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \frac{|\mathcal{V}_k|}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} \leq 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_k = \{V \in \mathcal{V} \mid \dim(V) = k\}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{L}_{n,k}[R]$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and some 1-dimensional subspace  $R$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ .

**Lemma 2.3** If a family  $\mathcal{V}$  of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  is intersecting  $k$ -Sperner, then  $\mathcal{V}$  is the union of  $k$  disjoint intersecting antichains.

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m\}$  be a family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is intersecting  $k$ -Sperner. We now show that  $\mathcal{V}$  is the union of  $k$  intersecting antichains. Define the required  $k$  antichains recursively as follows: Let  $\mathcal{W}_1$  denote the family of all minimal subspaces in  $\mathcal{V}$ , and if  $\mathcal{W}_j$  is defined for all  $1 \leq j < i$ , then denote  $\mathcal{W}_i$  to be the family of all minimal subspaces in  $\mathcal{V} \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{W}_j)$ . This process continues and stops at  $i = h$ . Then  $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \dots, \mathcal{W}_h$  are disjoint intersecting antichains by definition. We claim that  $h \leq k$ . For every  $V \in \mathcal{W}_i$ , there exists a  $V' \in \mathcal{W}_{i-1}$  such that  $V' \subseteq V$ . Hence, if there exists a subspace in  $\mathcal{W}_{k+1}$ , then we would have a  $(k+1)$ -chain in  $\mathcal{V}$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $h \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is the union of  $k$  disjoint intersecting antichains.  $\square$

As an easy consequence of Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, one has the next extension of Theorem 2.2 to intersecting  $k$ -Sperner families.

**Theorem 2.4** Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . For  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , let  $\mathcal{V}_j = \{V \in \mathcal{V} \mid \dim(V) = j\}$ . If  $\dim(V) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \frac{|\mathcal{V}_j|}{\binom{n-1}{j-1}} \leq k.$$

**Proof.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m\}$  is an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . By Lemma 2.3,  $\mathcal{V}$  is the union of  $k$  intersecting antichains  $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \dots, \mathcal{W}_k$ . Applying Theorem 2.2 on each of these antichains  $\mathcal{W}_i$  and adding all the inequalities up, one obtains the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5** Suppose that for integers  $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and nonnegative real numbers  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$ , the following inequalities hold:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \frac{|f_j|}{\binom{n-1}{j-1}} \leq k,$$

$$f_i \leq \binom{n-1}{i-1} \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} f_j \leq \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n-1}{j-1}.$$

**Proof.** Consider the vector  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor})$  which maximizes  $\sum f_i$ . For  $\binom{n-1}{j-1} < \binom{n-1}{i-1}$ , the inequalities  $f_i < \binom{n-1}{i-1}$  and  $f_j > 0$  would lead to a bigger  $\sum f_i$  by replacing  $f_i$  and  $f_j$  by  $f_i + \varepsilon \binom{n-1}{i-1}$  and  $f_j - \varepsilon \binom{n-1}{j-1}$ , where  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough, giving a contradiction. It follows that we have either  $f_i = \binom{n-1}{i-1}$  or  $f_i = 0$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.1, the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.12.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  such that  $\dim(V) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_j = \{V \in \mathcal{V} \mid \dim(V) = j\}$  and  $f_j = |\mathcal{V}_j|$  for each  $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Since  $\mathcal{V}$  is intersecting,  $\mathcal{V}_j$  is intersecting and  $j$ -uniform for each  $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . It follows from Theorem 1.6 that  $f_j = |\mathcal{V}_j| \leq \binom{n-1}{j-1}$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . By Theorem 2.4, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \frac{|\mathcal{V}_j|}{\binom{n-1}{j-1}} \leq k. \quad (2)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$|\mathcal{V}| = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} f_j \leq \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n-1}{j-1}.$$

Suppose that the equality holds above. Then it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.5 that we must have  $|\mathcal{V}_i| = f_i = \binom{n-1}{i-1}$  or  $|\mathcal{V}_i| = f_i = 0$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Thus, it follows from Theorem 1.6 that  $\mathcal{V}_j = \mathcal{L}_{n,j}[R_j]$  with  $\dim(R_j) = 1$  for each  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Moreover, since  $n \geq 2k + 1$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is intersecting, we must have  $R_i = R_j = R$  for all  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1 \leq i, j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ , where  $R$  is a fixed 1-dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . For otherwise, if  $R_i \neq R_j$  for some  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - k + 1 \leq i, j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  with  $i \neq j$ , then there exist  $W_i \in \mathcal{V}_i$  and  $W_j \in \mathcal{V}_j$  such that  $\dim(W_i \cap W_j) = 0$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\mathcal{V}$  is intersecting.  $\square$

### 3 Proofs of Theorems 1.13 and 1.14

We begin with the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $k \geq 1$  be fixed and  $n \geq 2k + 2$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_0$  such that for  $n \geq n_0$ , we have*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i} < \varepsilon \binom{n}{k+1},$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i} < \varepsilon \binom{n}{k+1}.$$

**Proof.** We first prove (i). Since  $\binom{n}{k+1} = \frac{n-k}{k+1} \binom{n}{k}$ , we have

$$\varepsilon \binom{n}{k+1} - (k+1) \binom{n}{k} = \left( \frac{\varepsilon(n-k)}{k+1} - (k+1) \right) \binom{n}{k}.$$



For  $n > \frac{(k+1)^2}{\varepsilon} + k$ , we have  $\frac{\varepsilon(n-k)}{k+1} - (k+1) > 0$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i} \leq (k+1)\binom{n}{k}$ . It follows that

$$\varepsilon \binom{n}{k+1} > (k+1) \binom{n}{k} \geq \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n}{i}.$$

For (ii), note that

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k+1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{q^{n-k} - 1}{q^{k+1} - 1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similar to (i), by applying Lemma 2.1, one has the desired inequality in (ii).  $\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 3.1, one can derive the next fact easily. Recall that

$$f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k) = c_k \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} + c_{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + c_0 \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $0 \leq c_i \leq 1$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq k$ .

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $k \geq 1$  be fixed and  $n \geq 2k$ . For  $n$  sufficiently large, if  $f_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_k) > f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$ , then we have  $b_k > c_k$  or there exists  $j_0 < k$  such that  $b_j = c_j$  for all  $j_0 + 1 \leq j \leq k$  and  $b_{j_0} > c_{j_0}$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose that  $j_0$  is the largest integer between 0 and  $k$  such that  $b_{j_0} \neq c_{j_0}$ . Then we have either  $b_k \neq c_k$  or  $j_0 < k$  and  $b_j = c_j$  for all  $j_0 + 1 \leq j \leq k$ . By Lemma 3.1 (ii), we must have either  $b_k > c_k$  or  $b_j = c_j$  for all  $j_0 + 1 \leq j \leq k$  and  $b_{j_0} > c_{j_0}$  for  $n$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

Next, we introduce some notions and the following covering lemma by Gerbner [15]. Let  $S$  be a set and  $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_n$  be a partition (In the discussions here,  $S$  is either the set  $2^{[n]}$  of all subsets of  $[n]$  or the set of all subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , and  $S_i$  will be level  $i$ , i.e.,  $S_i = \binom{[n]}{i}$  or the set of all  $i$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , respectively). Given a vector  $t = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , we say a family  $\Gamma$  of subsets of  $S$  is a  $t$ -covering family of  $S$  if for each  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , each member in  $S_i$  is contained in exactly  $t_i$  sets in the family  $\Gamma$ .

Given a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq S$ , let  $f_i = |\mathcal{F} \cap S_i|$  and  $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n)$  is called the *profile vector* of  $\mathcal{F}$ . For a weight  $\bar{w} = (w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n)$  and a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq S$ , let  $\bar{w}(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{i=0}^n w_i |\mathcal{F} \cap S_i|$ . Denote  $\bar{w}/t = (w_0/t_0, w_1/t_1, \dots, w_n/t_n)$ . The following lemma is Lemma 2.1 in [15].

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $P$  be a hereditary property of subsets (families) of  $S$  and  $\Gamma$  be a  $t$ -covering family of  $S$ . Assume that there exists a real number  $x$  such that for every  $G \in \Gamma$ , every subset  $G'$  of  $G$  with property  $P$  has  $\bar{w}/t(G') \leq x$ . Then  $\bar{w}(\mathcal{F}) \leq |\Gamma|x$  for every  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq S$  with property  $P$ .*

Let  $S = \mathcal{L}_n(q)$  be the set of all subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Denote  $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_n$  for a partition of  $S$  such that  $S_i$  is the set of all  $i$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . We construct a  $t$ -covering family  $\Gamma$  of  $S$  such that every  $\mathcal{G} \in \Gamma$  is a subfamily in  $\mathcal{L}_n(q)$  isomorphic to Boolean lattice  $\mathcal{B}_n$  (the set  $2^{[n]}$  of all subsets of  $[n]$  with the ordering being the containment relation) as follows: Choose an arbitrary basis  $B = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  and let  $\mathcal{G}_B = \{\text{span}(U) \mid U \subseteq B\}$ , i.e., the family of all subspaces that are generated by subsets of the vectors in  $B$ . Obviously the function that maps

$H \subseteq [n]$  to the subspace  $\text{span}\{v_x \mid x \in H\}$  keeps inclusion and intersection properties. Let  $\Gamma$  be the collection of the families  $\mathcal{G}_B$  over all bases  $B$ , i.e.,  $\Gamma = \{\mathcal{G}_B \mid B \text{ is a basis of } \mathbb{F}_q^n\}$ . Denote

$$\alpha(q, n) = \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^n - q)(q^n - q^2) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{n!}. \quad (3)$$

Let  $t = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n)$  be such that for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$t_i = \frac{(q^i - 1)(q^i - q) \cdots (q^i - q^{i-1})(q^n - q^i) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{i!(n-i)!}. \quad (4)$$

The next lemma follows from an easy counting.

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $S = \mathcal{L}_n(q)$  be the set of all subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  and  $\Gamma = \{\mathcal{G}_B \mid B \text{ is a basis of } \mathbb{F}_q^n\}$ . Then  $|\Gamma| = \alpha(q, n)$  and  $\Gamma$  is a  $t$ -covering of  $S$  with  $t = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n)$  given in (4).*

**Proof.** To show  $|\Gamma| = \alpha(q, n)$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  has  $\alpha(q, n)$  different bases. To obtain a basis  $B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  for  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , one can choose  $n$  nonzero linearly independent vectors in the order  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$  so that  $v_j \notin \text{span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{j-1}\}$  as follows: There are  $q^n - 1$  ways to choose  $v_1$ , and then there are  $q^n - q$  ways to choose  $v_2$ ,  $q^n - q^2$  ways to choose  $v_3$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $q^n - q^{n-1}$  ways to choose  $v_n$ . Thus, there are  $(q^n - 1)(q^n - q)(q^n - q^2) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})$  combined ways to form  $B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  (in order). Clearly, there are  $n!$  ways (permutations on  $B$ ) to form the same  $B$  (without order). It follows that there are

$$\alpha(q, n) = \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^n - q)(q^n - q^2) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{n!}$$

different bases in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ .

For any  $i$ -dimensional subspace  $V$  in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , similar to the argument above, there are

$$\frac{(q^i - 1)(q^i - q) \cdots (q^i - q^{i-1})}{i!}$$

different bases in  $V$ . For each basis  $D$  in  $V$ , one can extend  $D$  to a basis of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  in

$$\frac{(q^n - q^i)(q^n - q^{i+1}) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{(n-i)!}$$

different ways. Therefore,  $V$  is contained in

$$t_i = \frac{(q^i - 1)(q^i - q) \cdots (q^i - q^{i-1})(q^n - q^i) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{i!(n-i)!}$$

different  $\mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma$ . It follows that  $\Gamma$  is a  $t$ -covering of  $S = \mathcal{L}_n(q)$ .  $\square$

The following proof for Theorem 1.13 is motivated by the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [15].

**Proof of Theorem 1.13.** Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family in  $\mathcal{L}_n(q)$  satisfying property  $P$  which is either  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or  $T$ -configuration forbidden. Let  $\Gamma = \{\mathcal{G}_B \mid B \text{ is a basis of } \mathbb{F}_q^n\}$ . By Lemma 3.4,  $\Gamma$  is a  $t$ -covering of  $S = \mathcal{L}_n(q)$ . Let  $w_i = t_i$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . Then  $\overline{w/t} =$

$(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . Since every  $\mathcal{G} \in \Gamma$  is isomorphic to Boolean lattice  $\mathcal{B}_n$ , by the assumption, the largest weight  $\overline{w/t}(\mathcal{G}')$  among all subfamilies  $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  satisfying  $P$ , i.e., the largest cardinality of such  $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  is  $f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$ . By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\overline{w}(\mathcal{V}) \leq |\Gamma|f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k). \quad (5)$$

To the contrary, suppose that  $|\mathcal{V}| > f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$ . Then there exists  $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n)$  with  $0 \leq b_j \leq 1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n$  such that

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = b_n \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} + b_{n-1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n-1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + b_0 \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$\left| \mathcal{V} \cap \begin{bmatrix} [n] \\ j \end{bmatrix} \right| = b_j \begin{bmatrix} n \\ j \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq n,$$

where  $\begin{bmatrix} [n] \\ j \end{bmatrix}$  denotes the set of all  $j$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{w}(\mathcal{V}) &= \sum_{i=0}^n b_i w_i \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \frac{(q^i - 1)(q^i - q) \dots (q^i - q^{i-1})(q^n - q^i) \dots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{i!(n-i)!} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \frac{(q^i - 1) \dots (q^i - q^{i-1})(q^n - q^i) \dots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{i!(n-i)!} \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{(q^n - 1)(q^n - q) \dots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{(q^i - 1) \dots (q^i - q^{i-1})(q^n - q^i) \dots (q^n - q^{n-1})} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \frac{\alpha(n, q)n!}{i!(n-i)!} = \sum_{i=0}^h b_i |\Gamma| \binom{n}{i} \\ &= g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) |\Gamma|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \binom{n}{i}$ . Combining with (5), we obtain

$$g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) \leq f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k). \quad (6)$$

Since  $\binom{n}{j} = \binom{n}{n-j}$  and  $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ n-j \end{bmatrix}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  by Lemma 2.1, we may combine symmetric  $j$ -th and  $(n-j)$ -th terms in  $g_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_n)$  and  $g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \binom{n}{i}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ , and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{V}| &= g_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = g_q(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}) = b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \end{bmatrix} + b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + b'_0 \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) &= g(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}) = b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} + b'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} + \dots + b'_0 \binom{n}{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 \leq b_j \leq b'_j = b_j + b_{n-j} \leq 2$  for each  $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  with an exception that  $b'_{\frac{n}{2}} = b_{\frac{n}{2}}$  when  $n$  is even. Assume that  $h$  is the largest integer such that  $h \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and  $b'_h > 0$ . Then we have

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = g_q(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_h) > f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k).$$

By Lemma 3.1 (ii), we must have either  $h > k$  or  $h = k$  and

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_k) > f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k).$$

We consider the following two cases:

**Case 1.**  $h = k$ . We have  $g_q(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_k) = f_q(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_k) > f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$ . It follows from Lemma 3.2 that either  $b'_k > c_k$  or there exists  $j_0 < k$  such that  $b'_j = c_j$  for all  $j_0 + 1 \leq j \leq k$  and  $b'_{j_0} > c_{j_0}$ . Thus, by Lemma 3.1 (i), we have that for  $n$  sufficiently large,

$$g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = g(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_k) = \sum_{i=0}^k b'_i \binom{n}{i} = f(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_k) > f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k),$$

contradicting (6).

**Case 2.**  $h > k$ . Since  $k + 1 \leq h \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ , we have  $\binom{n}{h} \geq \binom{n}{k+1}$ . It follows from Lemma 3.1 (i) that

$$g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = g(n, b'_0, \dots, b'_h) \geq b'_h \binom{n}{k+1} > f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k)$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large, contradicting (6) again.

Therefore, we have

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq f_q(n, c_0, \dots, c_k).$$

□

We remark that the inequality (6) in the proof of Theorem 1.13 above can be obtained without using Lemma 3.3 as follows: By Lemma 3.4,  $\Gamma = \{\mathcal{G}_B \mid B \text{ is a basis of } \mathbb{F}_q^n\}$  is a  $t$ -covering of  $S = \mathcal{L}_n(q)$ , i.e., every  $i$ -dimensional subspace in  $S_i = \binom{[n]}{i}$  is contained in  $t_i$  members in  $\Gamma$ . Denote  $\mathcal{V}_j = \mathcal{V} \cap \binom{[n]}{j}$  for each  $0 \leq j \leq n$ . Let

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = b_n \binom{n}{n} + b_{n-1} \binom{n}{n-1} + \dots + b_0 \binom{n}{0}$$

with

$$|\mathcal{V}_j| = \left| \mathcal{V} \cap \binom{[n]}{j} \right| = b_j \binom{n}{j} \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq n,$$

where  $0 \leq b_j \leq 1$  for every  $0 \leq j \leq n$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}_B$  is isomorphic to Boolean lattice  $\mathcal{B}_n$  for each basis  $B$  of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma} |\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{G}_B| \leq |\Gamma| \cdot f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k).$$

On the other hand, since every  $i$ -dimensional subspace in  $S_i$  is contained in  $t_i$  members in  $\Gamma$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma} |\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{G}_B| = \sum_{\mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma} \sum_{i=0}^n |\mathcal{V}_i \cap \mathcal{G}_B| = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma} |\mathcal{V}_i \cap \mathcal{G}_B|$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^n |\mathcal{V}_i| \cdot t_i = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} \cdot t_i = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i |\Gamma| \binom{n}{i},$$

where the last equality is due to the following double counting

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} \cdot t_i = \left| \{(V, \mathcal{G}_B) \mid \dim(V) = i, \mathcal{G}_B \in \Gamma \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{G}_B\} \right| = |\Gamma| \binom{n}{i}.$$

Combining the expressions above, we have

$$g(n, b_0, \dots, b_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i \binom{n}{i} \leq f(n, c_0, \dots, c_k).$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.14.** Assume that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  satisfying property  $P$ . Let

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, k, a) = a \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} \text{ with } 0 < a \leq 1.$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.13 above, we have

$$g(n, k, a) = a \binom{n}{k} \leq f^*(n, k, c) = c \binom{n}{k}. \quad (7)$$

To the contrary, suppose that

$$|\mathcal{V}| = g_q(n, k, a) = a \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} > f_q^*(n, k, c) = c \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have  $a > c$  which implies

$$g(n, k, a) = a \binom{n}{k} > f^*(n, k, c) = c \binom{n}{k},$$

contradicting (7). Therefore, the theorem follows.  $\square$

## 4 Applications

Clearly, by applying Theorem 1.13, one concludes that, for  $n$  sufficiently large, Theorems 1.7–1.9 follow from Theorems 1.2–1.4, respectively.

Next, we provide some applications of Theorem 1.14.

Note that

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1} = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{k}, \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{q^k - 1}{q^n - 1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

## 4.1 Erdős-Chvátal Simplex Conjecture

A  $d$ -simplex is defined to be a collection  $A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}$  of subsets of size  $k$  of  $[n]$  such that the intersection of all of them is empty, but the intersection of any  $d$  of them is non-empty. A  $d$ -cluster is a collection  $A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}$  of subsets of size  $k$  of  $[n]$  such that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{d+1} A_i = \emptyset$  and  $|\bigcup_{i=1}^{d+1} A_i| \leq 2k$ . If  $\{A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}\}$  is both a  $d$ -simplex and a  $d$ -cluster, we say that it is a  $d$ -simplex-cluster.

In 1971, Erdős conjectured that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$  with no 2-simplex (also known as a triangle) satisfies

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}.$$

In 1974, Chvátal [5] generalized Erdős' conjecture as follows.

**Conjecture 4.1** (Erdős-Chvátal Simplex Conjecture [5]). *Suppose  $k \geq d+1 \geq 3$ ,  $n \geq \frac{k(d+1)}{d}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$  with no  $d$ -simplex. Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k},$$

with equality only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star.

In 2005, Mubayi and Verstraëte [26] proved that the Erdős-Chvátal Simplex Conjecture is true for  $d = 2$ , and in 2021, Currier [6] proved that the conjecture holds when  $d \geq 3$  and  $n \geq 2k - d + 2$  as shown below.

**Theorem 4.2** (Mubayi and Verstraëte [26], Currier [6]). *Suppose  $k \geq d+1 \geq 3$ ,  $n \geq 2k - d + 2$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$  with no  $d$ -simplex-cluster. Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k},$$

with equality if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star.

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{d+1}\}$  be a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $d$ -simplex if  $\dim(\bigcap_{i=1}^{d+1} A_i) = 0$  but  $\dim(\bigcap_{j=1}^d A_{i_j}) > 0$  for any  $d$  distinct members  $A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_d} \in \mathcal{A}$ . A family  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{d+1}\}$  of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  is a  $d$ -cluster if  $\dim(\bigcap_{i=1}^{d+1} A_i) = 0$  and  $\dim(\text{span}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{d+1} A_i)) \leq 2k$ . A family  $\{A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}\}$  is a  $d$ -simplex-cluster if it is both a  $d$ -simplex and a  $d$ -cluster.

Recall that

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = q^k \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} + q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The following asymptotic  $q$ -analogue of Theorem 4.2 follows easily from Theorems 1.14 and 4.2.

**Theorem 4.3** *Let  $k \geq d+1 \geq 3$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with no  $d$ -simplex-cluster. Then for  $n$  sufficiently large,*

$$|\mathcal{V}| < q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Proof.** First, note that forbidding  $d$ -simplex-cluster is a hereditary property. Using the identity (8) and applying Theorems 1.14 and 4.2 with

$$f^*(n, k, \frac{k}{n}) = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1},$$

we conclude that

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq f_q^*(n, k, \frac{k}{n}) = \frac{k}{n} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{n} \frac{q^n - 1}{(q^k - 1)q^{n-k}} = 0$ , it follows from (9) and (10) that for  $n$  sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{V}| &\leq \frac{k}{n} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \frac{k}{n} \cdot \frac{q^n - 1}{q^k - 1} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{k}{n} \frac{q^n - 1}{(q^k - 1)q^{n-k}} q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} < q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Recently, Liu [24] proved the next result which confirms a conjecture by Mubayi and Verstraëte [26].

**Theorem 4.4** (Liu [24]). *Let  $d \geq k \geq 4$  and  $n$  be sufficiently large. Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$  with no non-trivial intersecting subfamily of size  $d+1$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k},$$

with equality if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a star.

Since forbidden a non-trivial intersecting subfamily of size  $d+1$  is a hereditary property, the following  $q$ -analogue of Theorem 4.4 follows from Theorems 1.14 and 4.4 and (8) and (9).

**Theorem 4.5** *Let  $d \geq k \geq 4$  and  $n$  be sufficiently large. Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with no non-trivial intersecting subfamily of size  $d+1$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

## 4.2 Erdős Matching Conjecture

Recall that the *matching number*  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  of a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  is the size of the largest matching that  $\mathcal{F}$  contains and recall Erdős Matching Conjecture (or EMC for short) from Conjecture 1.15. Clearly, the case  $s = 1$  of the EMC is the classical Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem. Bollobás, Daykin and Erdős [3] established the EMC for  $n \geq 2k^3s$ ; Huang, Loh and Sudakov [19] proved the EMC for  $n \geq 3k^2s$ ; and Frankl [12] showed that the EMC holds for  $n \geq (2s+1)k - s$ .

**Theorem 4.6** (Bollobás, Daykin and Erdős [3], Frankl [12], Huang, Loh and Sudakov [19]). *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) \leq s$  and  $n \geq (2s+1)k - s$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k}.$$

We say that two subspaces are disjoint if their intersection is the trivial subspace (i.e., 0-dimensional subspace). A collection of pairwise disjoint subspaces is called a *matching*. Similar to the matching number  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ , one can define the matching number  $\nu_q(\mathcal{V})$  for a family  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  to be the size of the largest matching that  $\mathcal{V}$  contains.

Observe that a family  $\mathcal{F}$  has matching number  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) \leq s$  is a hereditary property. By applying Theorem 1.14, we obtain the next asymptotic  $q$ -analogue of Theorem 4.6. Note that for  $n \geq 2k + s$  and  $s \geq 1$ , one has

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-s \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Theorem 4.7** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with  $\nu_q(\mathcal{V}) \leq s$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Then for  $n$  sufficiently large,*

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Proof.** For  $n \geq (2k+1)s$ , by the identity (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k} \\ &= \left( \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k} \right) + \left( \binom{n-1}{k} - \binom{n-2}{k} \right) + \cdots + \left( \binom{n-s+1}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k} \right) \\ &= \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-2}{k-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-s}{k-1} \leq s \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \frac{sk}{n} \binom{n}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since a family  $\mathcal{F}$  has matching number  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) \leq s$  is a hereditary property, by applying Theorems 1.14 and 4.6 with

$$f^*(n, k, \frac{sk}{n}) = \frac{sk}{n} \binom{n}{k},$$

we obtain

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq f_q^*(n, k, \frac{sk}{n}) = \frac{sk}{n} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{sk}{n} \frac{q^n - 1}{(q^k - 1)q^{n-k}} = 0$ , it follows from (9) and (11) that for  $n$  sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{V}| &\leq \frac{sk}{n} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \frac{sk}{n} \cdot \frac{q^n - 1}{q^k - 1} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{sk}{n} \frac{q^n - 1}{(q^k - 1)q^{n-k}} q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} < q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Recently, Ihringer [20] provided the following conjecture about the largest  $s$ -EM-family of  $k$ -spaces.

**Conjecture 4.8** (Ihringer [20]) *For  $n \geq 2k$ , if  $Y$  is a largest  $s$ -EM-family of  $k$ -spaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ , then  $Y$  is the union of  $s$  intersecting families or its complement.*



Ihringer [20] proved that this conjecture holds if  $16s \leq \min\{q^{\frac{n-k-l+2}{3}}, q^{\frac{n-k-r}{3}}, q^{\frac{n}{2}-k+1}\}$ .

The next conjecture given by Aharoni and Howard [1] and Huang, Loh and Sudakov [19], independently, extends the Erdős Matching Conjecture to a rainbow (multipartite) setting.

**Conjecture 4.9** (*Rainbow Erdős Matching Conjecture [1] and [19]*). *Let  $n \geq (s+1)k$  and let  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{s+1} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ . If there are no pairwise disjoint  $F_1, \dots, F_{s+1}$ , where  $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, s+1$ , then*

$$\min_{i \in [s+1]} |\mathcal{F}_i| \leq \max \left\{ \binom{(s+1)k-1}{k}, \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k} \right\}.$$

We call this conjecture the REMC for short. Huang, Loh and Sudakov [19] proved that the REMC is true for  $n \geq 3k^2s$ , and recently, Lu, Wang and Yu [25] verified the REMC for  $n > 2sk$  and  $s$  sufficiently large, and Keller and Lifshitz [22] proved the REMC for  $n > Ck$ , where  $C$  depends only on  $s$ .

**Theorem 4.10** (*Huang, Loh and Sudakov [19], Keller and Lifshitz [22], and Lu, Wang and Yu [25]*). *Assume that  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{s+1} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ . If there are no pairwise disjoint  $F_1, \dots, F_{s+1}$ , where  $F_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, s+1$  and  $n > Ck$  with  $C$  depending on  $s$ , then*

$$\min_{i \in [s+1]} |\mathcal{F}_i| \leq \max \left\{ \binom{(s+1)k-1}{k}, \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s}{k} \right\}.$$

Note that forbidding rainbow matching of size  $s+1$  is a hereditary property. By applying Theorems 1.14 and 4.10 and using the identities (8) and (9), we obtain the next asymptotic  $q$ -analogue of Theorem 4.10 similar to the proof of Theorem 4.7.

**Theorem 4.11** *Assume that  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{s+1}$  are families of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . If there are no pairwise disjoint  $V_1, \dots, V_{s+1}$ , where  $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, s+1$ , then*

$$\min_{i \in [s+1]} |\mathcal{V}_i| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}$$

for  $n$  sufficiently large.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

In section 2, we derived an upper bound for an intersecting  $k$ -Sperner family of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  which gives a  $q$ -analogue of Erdős'  $k$ -Sperner Theorem. In section 3, we provided a general connection between upper bounds for the sizes of  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or  $T$ -configuration forbidden families of subsets of  $[n]$  and upper bounds for the sizes of  $\mathcal{L}$ -intersecting or  $T$ -configuration forbidden families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . As applications of Theorems 1.13 and 1.14, we provided some results on families of subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  which follow asymptotically from the corresponding theorems on families of subsets of  $[n]$ , including generalizations of existing results about the well-known Erdős matching conjecture and Erdős-Chvátal simplex conjecture.

We end this section with the following open problems which are  $q$ -analogues of Erdős-Chvátal Simplex Conjecture and Erdős Matching Conjecture.

**Conjecture 5.1** (*q-Analogue Erdős-Chvátal Simplex Conjecture*). Let  $k \geq d + 1 \geq 3$  and  $n \geq \frac{k(d+1)}{d}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with no  $d$ -simplex. Then

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq q^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Conjecture 5.2** (*q-Analogue Erdős Matching Conjecture*). Suppose that  $\mathcal{V}$  is a family of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with  $n \geq (s+1)k$  and  $\nu_q(\mathcal{V}) \leq s$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{V}| \leq \min \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix}, s \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

Theorems 4.3 and 4.7 show that the conjectures above are true when  $n$  is sufficiently large.

## Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to this work.

## Acknowledgement

The research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (71973103, 11861019, 12271527, 12071484). Guizhou Talent Development Project in Science and Technology (KY[2018]046), Natural Science Foundation of Guizhou ([2019]1047, [2020]1Z001, [2021]5609).

## References

- [1] R. Aharoni and D.M. Howard, A rainbow  $r$ -partite version of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 26 (2017), 321-337.
- [2] N. Alon, L. Babai, and H. Suzuki, Multilinear Polynomials and Frankl-Ray-Chaudhuri-Wilson Type Intersection Theorems, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 58 (1991), 165-180.
- [3] B. Bollobás, D.E. Daykin and P. Erdős, Sets of independent edges of a hypergraph, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.*, 27 (1976), 25-32.
- [4] B. Bollobás and P. Duchet, Helly families of maximal size, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 26 (1979), 197-200.
- [5] V. Chvátal, An extremal set-intersection theorem, *J. London Math. Soc.*, 9 (1974/1975), 355-359.
- [6] G. Currier, New Results on Simplex-Clusters in Set Systems, *Combinatorica*, 41 (2021), 495-506.

- [7] M. Deza and P. Frankl, Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem – 22 years later, *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Math.*, 4 (1983), 419-431.
- [8] K. Engel, Sperner Theory, Volume 65 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997
- [9] P. Erdős, On a lemma of Littlewood and Offord, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 52 (1945), 898-902.
- [10] P. Erdős, A problem on independent  $r$ -tuples, *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös Sect. Math.*, 8 (1965), 83-95.
- [11] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Q. J. Math. Oxford (2)*, 12 (1961), 313-320.
- [12] P. Frankl, Improved bounds for Erdős matching conjecture, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 120 (2013), 1068-1072.
- [13] P. Frankl and R. Graham, Intersection theorems for vector spaces, *Europ. J. Combin.*, 6 (1985), 183-187.
- [14] P. Frankl and R. M. Wilson, Intersection theorems with geometric consequences, *Combinatorica*, 1 (1981), 357-368.
- [15] D. Gerbner, The covering lemma and  $q$ -analogues of extremal set theory problems, *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea*, 2023, doi.org/10.26493/1855-3974.2677.b7f.
- [16] C. Greene and D. J. Kleitman, Proof techniques in the theory of finite sets, *MAA Studies in Math.*, 17 (1978), 12-79.
- [17] V. Grolmusz and B. Sudakov, On  $k$ -Wise Set-intersections and  $k$ -Wise Hamming-Distances, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 99 (2002), 180-190.
- [18] W. N. Hsieh, Intersection theorems for systems of finite vector spaces, *Discrete Math.*, 12 (1975), 1-16.
- [19] H. Huang, P. S. Loh and B. Sudakov, The Size of a Hypergraph and its Matching Number, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 21 (2012), 442-450.
- [20] F. Ihringer, Remarks on the Erdős Matching Conjecture for vector spaces, *Europ. J. Combin.*, 94 (2021), 103306.
- [21] P. Keevash and B. Sudakov, Set Systems with Restricted Cross-Intersection and the Minimum Rank of Inclusion Matrices, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 18 (2005), 713-727.
- [22] N. Keller and N. Lifshitz, The junta method for hypergraphs and the Erdős-Chvátal simplex conjecture, *Advances in Mathematics*, 392 (2021), 107991.

- [23] H. Lefmann, On families in finite lattices, *Europ. J. Combin.*, 11 (1990), 165-179.
- [24] X. Liu, Hypergraphs without non-trivial intersecting subgraphs, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 31 (2022), 1076-1091.
- [25] H. Lu, Y. Wang, and X. Yu, A better bound on the size of rainbow matchings, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 195 (2023), 105700.
- [26] D. Mubayi and J. Verstraëte, Proof of a conjecture of Erdős on triangles in set-systems, *Combinatorica*, 25 (2005), 599-614.
- [27] J. Qian and D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri, Extremal case of Frankl-Ray-Chaudhuri-Wilson inequality, *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 95 (2001), 293-306.
- [28] D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri and R. M. Wilson, On  $t$ -designs, *Osaka J. Math.*, 12 (1975), 737-744.
- [29] W. Samotij, Subsets of Posets Minimising the Number of Chains, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 371 (2019), 7259-7274.
- [30] H. S. Snevily, A Generalization of the Ray-Chaudhuri-Wilson Theorem, *J. Combin. Des.*, 3 (1995), 349-352.
- [31] J. Wang, Intersecting antichains and shadows in linear lattices, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A*, 118 (2011) 2092-2101.