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#### Abstract

This paper is concerned with two conjectures which are intimately related. The first is a generalization to hypergraphs of Vizing's Theorem on the chromatic index of a graph and the second is the well-known conjecture of Erdős, Faber and Lovász which deals with the problem of coloring a family of cliques intersecting in at most one vertex. We are led to study a special class of uniform and linear hypergraphs for which a number of properties are established.


## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we address the problem of coloring hyperedges of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, in the case where $\mathcal{H}$ is loopless and linear [2, 3]. Two main conjectures have been proposed. The first one (the last chronologically) is a conjecture of several authors which is a generalization of Vizing's Theorem on the coloration of edges in a graph (cf. [28]). We postpone to Section 2 all the required definitions and notations.

Theorem 1.1 (Vizing's Theorem, 1964). The chromatic index of any simple graph $\Gamma$ satisfies

$$
\mathrm{q}(\Gamma) \leq \Delta(\Gamma)+1
$$

One can wonder if this result can be generalized to hypergraphs. Actually, this theorem suggested the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2 (Generalized Vizing's Theorem). Every linear hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ without loop verifies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)$ is the maximum degree of the 2 -section $[\mathcal{H}]_{2}$ of $\mathcal{H}$.
This conjecture was independently proposed, around 1985 by several authors, including Berge (cf. [3]), Füredi (cf. [16] where the conjecture is proven for intersecting hypergraphs) and Meyniel (unpublished).

The second one is closely related to the first and deals on the coloring of vertices of a graph formed by a families of $n$ cliques each having $n$ vertices and intersecting in at most one vertex.

Conjecture 1.3 (Erdős-FAbEr-LovÁsz). Every graph $\Gamma$ formed by a family of $n$ cliques each having $n$ vertices and intersecting in at most one vertex has chromatic number verifying $\chi(\Gamma) \leq n$.

[^0]This conjecture can be implemented in hypergraph's language by considering cliques as hyperedges. Transposing it to the dual gives the following statement.

Conjecture 1.4 (Erdős-FABER-Lovász). Every linear hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ without loop and having $n$ vertices verifies $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$.

It is easy to see that Conjecture 1.2 implies Conjecture 1.4 since $\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right) \leq n-1$ when $\mathcal{H}$ is linear. There are very few results on these conjectures, especially on Conjecture 1.2 (see [16, 3]).

In this article we solve the Berge-Füredi Conjecture 1.2 whenever the antirank is bounded from below by the square root of the number of vertices. We first provide a criterion ensuring that $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies the desired bound (1) and use it to show our main result in regards to Conjecture 1.2 (cf. Theorem 1.6).

Theorem 1.5. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a linear hypergraph such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall e \in E, \exists x \in e \text { such that } \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \leq|e| \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that if $\Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq \operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ then (2) is satisfied, whence $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1$ by Theorem 1.5. Thus the validity of Conjecture 1.2 depends actually on the remaining case $\Delta(\mathcal{H})>\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$.

In [24] the author shows that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq|V|$ whenever $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})>|V|^{1 / 2}$. In [29] it is proven that it remains true under the weaker condition $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq|V|^{1 / 2}$ We improve this result by showing the following statement.
Theorem 1.6. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a linear hypergraph such that $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq|V|^{1 / 2}$. Then

$$
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1
$$

The special case in Theorem 1.6 where $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})=|V|^{1 / 2}$ highlights an attractive class, denoted $\mathscr{H}_{k}$, of linear and $k$-uniform hypergraphs which will be studied separately (see beginning of Section 4 for detailed definition). We will obtain various remarkable properties in Theorem 3.6 and Section 4 (see Theorems 4.3 and 4.4) which will raise up several questions. This is the core of this paper.

## 2. Definitions, notations and general properties

Throughout this article, we shall use the notation $|S|$ for the cardinality of a finite set $S$. In what follows $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ denotes a hypergraph where $V(\mathcal{H})=V$ is the set of vertices and $E(\mathcal{H})=E$ is the set of hyperedges.

- $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be linear if $\left|e \cap e^{\prime}\right| \leq 1$ for any pair of distinct hyperedges $e, e^{\prime} \in E$.
- $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be $k$-uniform if $|e|=k$ for any $e \in E$.
- We denote by $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ the antirank of $\mathcal{H}$, namely the minimum cardinality of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$. We have $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 2$ if and only if $H$ has no loop. If $\mathcal{H}$ has no hyperedge then $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ is fixed to be equal to $\infty$. The rank of $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by $\mathrm{r}(\mathcal{H}):=\max \{|e|, e \in E\}$.
- For $x \in V$ let $\mathcal{H}(x)=\{e \in E: e \ni x\}$ denote the star centered at $x$.
- For $e \in E, \mathcal{H} \backslash e$ denotes the partial hypergraph $(V, E \backslash\{e\})$.
- The degree of a vertex $x$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is defined $\operatorname{by~}_{\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}}(x)=|\{e \in E: x \in e\}|$. The minimum degree is denoted by $\delta(\mathcal{H})$ and the maximum degree by $\Delta(\mathcal{H})$. We have the following identity
which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{x \in V} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=\sum_{e \in E}|e|, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

whis implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
|E| \leq \frac{|V| \Delta(\mathcal{H})}{\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $\mathcal{H}$ is linear and if $\delta(\mathcal{H}) \geq 2$ and $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 2$, we have the uniform upper bounds

$$
\begin{gather*}
\forall x \in V, \quad \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \leq \frac{|V|-1}{\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})-1}  \tag{6}\\
\forall e \in E, \quad|e| \leq \frac{|E|-1}{\delta(\mathcal{H})-1}
\end{gather*}
$$

- $\mathcal{H}$ is said $d$-regular if $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=d$ for any $x \in V$.
- The degree of a hyperedge $e$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$
\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=|\{a \in E \backslash\{e\}: a \cap e \neq \varnothing\}| .
$$

Note that this definition is different from that sometimes given in the literature (see for instance [4]). We have the following bounds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=\sum_{x \in e}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \sum_{e \in E} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=\sum_{x \in V}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right) \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

- The 2-section of $\mathcal{H}$ is the simple graph, denoted by $[\mathcal{H}]_{2}$, whose vertices are those of $\mathcal{H}$ and for which two distinct vertices form an edge if and only if they both belong to a common hyperedge $e$ of $\mathcal{H}$. For any $x \in V$ we have

$$
\operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}(x)=\sum_{\substack{e \in E \\ e \ni x}}(|e|-1),
$$

giving the following lower bound on the maximum degree in $[\mathcal{H}]_{2}$

$$
\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right) \geq(\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})-1) \Delta(\mathcal{H})
$$

and, when $\mathcal{H}$ is linear, the following identity

$$
\sum_{x \in V} \operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}(x)=\sum_{e \in E}\left(|e|^{2}-|e|\right) .
$$

- The line-graph of $\mathcal{H}$ denoted by $\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is the simple graph whose vertices are hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$ and such that there is an edge between $e, e^{\prime} \in E, e \neq e^{\prime}$, if $e \cap e^{\prime} \neq \varnothing$. We have $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{H})}(e)=\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)$ for any $e \in E$.
- Let $A$ be the incidence matrix of the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ supposed without any isolated vertex and $A^{t}$ be its transpose. The hypergraph whose incidence matrix is $A^{t}$ is called the dual hypergraph of $\mathcal{H}$ and denoted by $\mathcal{H}^{*}=\left(V^{*}, E^{*}\right)$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}^{*}$ is without isolated vertex and $\left(\mathcal{H}^{*}\right)^{*}=\mathcal{H}$. We may notice that the second identity in (8) is relied to (11) by duality. Note also that $\delta(\mathcal{H})=\operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{*}\right)$.
- A $k$-coloring of hyperedges or hyperedge $k$-coloring of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is the assignment of one color from the set $\{1,2,3, \ldots, k\}$ to every hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$ in such a way that no two intersecting hyperedges have the same color.
- The chromatic index of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})$, is the least integer $k$ such that there exists a hyperedge $k$-coloring of $\mathcal{H}$. It is not difficult to see that (cf. [4])

$$
\delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta_{0}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}),
$$

where $\Delta_{0}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the cardinality of the largest subset $S$ of $E$ such that $e, e^{\prime} \in S \Longrightarrow e \cap e^{\prime} \neq \varnothing$.

- A hyperedge $e \in E$ is said critical in $\mathcal{H}$ if $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H} \backslash e)=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1$. $\mathcal{H}$ is itself said critical if all its hyperedges are critical.
- Let $\Gamma$ be a simple graph. A $k$-coloring of the vertices of $\Gamma$ is an assignment of one color from the set $\{1,2,3, \ldots, k\}$ to every vertex of the graph such that no two adjacent vertices have the same color. The smallest $k$ such that $\Gamma$ has a $k$-coloring, denoted by $\chi(\Gamma)$, is called the chromatic number of $\Gamma$.
It is known (see for instance [6, Corollary 7.1.7, p. 235]) that $\chi(\Gamma) \leq \Delta(\Gamma)+1$, thus we have the upper bound

$$
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\chi(\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{H})) \leq \Delta(\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{H}))+1 \leq \mathrm{r}(\mathcal{H})(\Delta(\mathcal{H})-1)+1 .
$$

Hence if $\mathcal{H}$ is $k$-uniform, that is $\mathrm{r}(\mathcal{H})=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})=k$, then by (10) the bound (3) holds whenever $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \Delta(\mathcal{H})$. By Theorem 1.5 and the remark that follows, the uniformity of $\mathcal{H}$ is actually not required.

- The strong chromatic number of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is the chromatic number of its 2 -section. We denote it by $\chi(\mathcal{H})$ and we have $\chi(\mathcal{H})=\chi\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)$. Notice that the (weak) chromatic number of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ (not used in this article) is the least integer $k$ for which there exists a vertex $k$-coloring of $\mathcal{H}$ such that any hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$ is not monochromatic.
- In a graph or a hypergraph, we say that a color $i$ is incident to a vertex $x$ if there is a (hyper-)edge with color $i$ which contains $x$.
- Two linear hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ without loop are said to be isomorphic if there exists a bijection $f$ from $V$ onto $V^{\prime}$ such that

$$
\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right\} \in E \Longleftrightarrow\left\{f\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, f\left(x_{t}\right)\right\} \in E^{\prime}
$$

In this case it is clear that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$.

- $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be a finite affine plane if there exists $k \geq 2$ such that
$-|V|=k^{2}$ and $\forall x \in V, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k+1$;
$-|E|=k^{2}+k$ and $\forall e \in E,|e|=k$;
$-\forall x, y \in V, x \neq y$, there exists a unique hyperedge $e$ such that $\{x, y\} \subset e$;
- $\forall a \in E$ and $x \in V \backslash a$, there exists a unique hyperedge $e$ such that $x \in e$ and $e \cap a=\varnothing$.
Hence $\mathcal{H}$ is a linear $k$-uniform and $(k+1)$-regular hypergraph. Moreover $E$ can be partitioned into $k+1$ sets of $k$ disjoint hyperedges. This implies that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=k+1$.
When $k$ is a prime power, let denote by $\mathbb{F}_{k}$ the Galois field with cardinality $k$. By identifying lines with hyperedges the field plane $\mathbb{F}_{k}^{2}$ is a finite affine plane and denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{k}$.
For a same prime power $k$, it may exist several non-isomorphic finite affine planes (for instance when $k=9$ ) with $k^{2}$ vertices. When $k$ is not a prime power it is conjectured that there is no finite affine plane with $k^{2}$ vertices (known as the Prime Power Conjecture).


## 3. Proofs and remarks

3.1. When all hyperedges are large. The following result shows that the number hyperedges in a linear hypergraph hugely depends on the antirank in a anti-proportional way. Before we notice that (5) and (10) give together $|E| \leq \frac{n}{k^{2}-k} \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)$ (with the notation of the next lemma) without any restriction on $2 \leq k \leq n$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and $k=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ be its antirank. If $k^{2}>n$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|E| \leq \frac{n(k-1)}{k^{2}-n} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq k \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|E| \geq \frac{n}{2 k} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

since otherwise (13) is plainly satisfied whenever $k^{2}>n$. From (8), Cauchy inequality and (4), we infer

$$
\sum_{e \in E}\left(\mathrm{~d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)+|e|\right)=\sum_{x \in V} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)^{2} \geq \frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{x \in V} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)\right)^{2}=\frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{e \in E}|e|\right)^{2}
$$

Thus

$$
\sum_{e \in E} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e) \geq n\left(\lambda^{2}-\lambda\right)
$$

where $\lambda=\lambda(\mathcal{H})=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{e \in E}|e|$. Since $\lambda \geq \frac{k|E|}{n}$, we have $\lambda \geq 1 / 2$ by (15), thus $\sum_{e \in E} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e) \geq k|E|\left(\frac{k|E|}{n}-1\right)$. We obtain by (7)

$$
|E|(|E|-1) \geq k|E|\left(\frac{k|E|}{n}-1\right)
$$

giving

$$
\left(\frac{k^{2}}{n}-1\right)|E| \leq k-1
$$

This yields (13). Bound (14) follows from (6).
As a direct consequence of (13) we get by (10)

$$
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq|E| \leq \frac{n}{k^{2}-n} \times \frac{\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)}{\Delta(\mathcal{H})}
$$

whenever $k^{2}>n$. If in addition $n=o\left(k^{2}\right)$ then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=o\left(\frac{\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)}{\Delta(\mathcal{H})}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see also $\S 3.3$ ). Note also that (14) implies (2). So when $k^{2}>n$, (3) will follow from Theorem 1.5. In order to deduce Theorem 1.6 from it, we essentially need to consider the equality case $n=k^{2}$ (see §3.3).
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first show a simple but useful lemma related to critical hyperedges.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a hypergraph without loop and $e \in E$ be a critical hyperedge, that is $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H} \backslash e)=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1$. Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1 \leq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-2 \geq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)$. Let $k=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1$ and $C=$ $\left\{c_{1}, \ldots, c_{k}\right\}$ be the set of colors which are necessary to color the hyperedges of $\mathcal{H} \backslash e$. In order to color $\mathcal{H}$ is remains to fix a permitted color for $e$. Since $e$ intersects $\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e) \leq$ $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-2$ hyperedges, there exists $c_{i} \in C$ which is not used for coloring those hyperedges. One then assigns the color $c_{i}$ to $e$ and we get $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq k$, a contradiction.

We continue with two easy properties in regard to Condition (2).
Lemma 3.3. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a hypergraph satisfying (2). Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall e \in E \text { such that }|e|=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}), \exists x \in e \text { such that } \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \leq \operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for any $e^{\prime} \in E$ the partial hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\mathcal{H} \backslash e^{\prime}=\left(V, E \backslash\left\{e^{\prime}\right\}\right)$ also satisfies (2).
Proof. The implication $(2) \Longrightarrow(16)$ is plain.
Let $e \in E \backslash\left\{e^{\prime}\right\}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies (2), there exists $x \in V$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \leq|e|$. We easily conclude since $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}}(x) \leq \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$.

Remark 3.4. We stress that fact that Condition (2) is hereditary, namely

$$
\mathcal{H} \text { satisfies }(2) \Longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \backslash e^{\prime} \text { satisfies }(2)
$$

but it is no longer the case with Condition (16). This hereditary property will play a central role along the induction argument in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We argue by induction on the number of hyperedges. If $|E|=1$, clearly $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=1 \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1$ and we are done.
Let $m \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ with $|E|=m+1$ hyperedges.
Let $e_{0}$ be such that $\left|e_{0}\right|=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ and $x_{0} \in e_{0}$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq\left|e_{0}\right|=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{0}=\mathcal{H} \backslash e_{0}$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}_{0}$ has $m$ hyperedges and satisfies (2) since $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}_{0}}(x) \leq \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$. Therefore we may apply our induction hypothesis to $\mathcal{H}_{0}$. We distinguish two cases.

- If $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right)=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1$ then by Lemma 3.2 and (10) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1 \leq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right) & =\sum_{\substack{x \in e_{0} \\
x \neq x_{0}}}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)+\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right)-1 \\
& \leq\left(\left|e_{0}\right|-1\right)\left(\max _{x \in e_{0}} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)+\left|e_{0}\right|-1 \\
& =(\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})-1) \max _{x \in e_{0}} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \\
& \leq(\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})-1) \Delta(\mathcal{H}) \\
& \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

- Otherwise $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right)=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})$ and by induction hypothesis we get

$$
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right) \leq \Delta\left(\left[\mathcal{H}_{0}\right]_{2}\right)+1 \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1 .
$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.5.
3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.6. If $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ satisfies (2) then by Theorem 1.5 we infer the desired result. Assume the contrary, that is there exists $e_{0} \in E$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall x \in e_{0} \quad \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \geq\left|e_{0}\right|+1 \geq \operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})+1=k+1 \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our assumption on the antirank of $\mathcal{H}$ can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
k \geq|V|^{1 / 2} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall use the notation $S=\left\{a \in E: a \cap e_{0}=\varnothing\right\}$ the set of hyperedges which are parallel to $e_{0}$ and let $s=|S|$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
|E|=\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)+1+s \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step 1: let $x \in e_{0}$. By (17), (18) and (19) we have following inequalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
k^{2} \geq|V| \geq \operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}(x)+1=\sum_{\substack{e \in E \\
e \ni x}}(|e|-1)+1=\sum_{\substack{e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\} \\
e \ni>}}(|e|-1)+\left|e_{0}\right| \\
\quad \geq\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)(k-1)+k \geq k(k-1)+k=k^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies that the above inequalities are all equalities. This gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - }|V|=k^{2}, \\
& \text { - } \operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}(x)=k^{2}-1, \\
& \text { - } \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k+1,
\end{aligned}
$$

We infer

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)=\sum_{x \in e_{0}}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)=k^{2}, \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|E| \geq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)+1=k^{2}+1 \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Step 2: we prove that $\mathcal{H}$ is $k$-uniform and that $\forall y \in V \backslash e_{0}, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \geq k$.

- $\left|e_{0}\right|=k$ by (17), since $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k+1$ for $x \in e_{0}$.
- Let $a \in E \backslash\left(S \cup\left\{e_{0}\right\}\right)$. Then $a \cap e_{0}=\{x\}$ for some vertex $x \in e_{0}$.

As in Step 1, we may again write

$$
k^{2}-1=\operatorname{deg}_{[H]_{2}}(x)=\sum_{\substack{e \in E \\ e \ni x}}(|e|-1)=\sum_{\substack{e \in E \backslash\{a\} \\ e \ni x}}(|e|-1)+|a|-1
$$

thus

$$
k^{2}-1 \geq\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)(k-1)+|a|-1=k(k-1)+|a|-1 .
$$

This implies $|a| \leq k$ yielding $|a|=k$ by (18).

- Let $e_{0}=\left\{x_{0}, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}\right\}$. Then for any $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, we have $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{i}\right)=$ $k+1$. We let $\mathcal{H}\left(x_{i}\right)=\left\{e_{0}, e_{i, 1}, \ldots, e_{i, k}\right\}$ be the star centered at $x_{i}, 0 \leq i \leq k-1$. From above $\left|e_{i, j}\right|=k, 1 \leq j \leq k$, thus for any $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, we have

$$
\left|e_{0} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} e_{i, j}\right|=\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\left|e_{i, j}\right|-1\right)+\left|e_{0}\right|=k(k-1)+k=k^{2}=|V|
$$

giving

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=e_{0} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} e_{i, j}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq k-1 \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that any vertex $y$ in $V \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}$ is adjacent to $x_{i}$ for any $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. Hence for such $y$ there exist distinct hyperedges $a_{i}, 0 \leq i \leq k-1$, such that both $x_{i}$ and $y$ are in $a_{i}$. This gives $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(y) \geq k$.

- Let $a \in S$. We see by (23) that any vertex of $a$ is in some $e_{0, j} \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}, 1 \leq j \leq k$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is linear, we have $\left|a \cap e_{0, j}\right| \leq 1,1 \leq j \leq k$. We obtain $|a| \leq k$ and finally $|a|=k$ by (18).
We infer that $\mathcal{H}$ is $k$-uniform.
Step 3: let $a, b \in S, a \neq b$. If $y \in a \cap b$, then $y$ is adjacent to each $x_{i}, 0 \leq i \leq k-1$ through $k$ many hyperedges. Therefore considering in addition $a$ and $b$, it follows that $y$ is contained in $k+2$ many hyperedges, a contradiction. Hence $a \cap b=\varnothing$. In other words two hyperedges parallel to $e_{0}$ are indeed parallel.

Since $\mathcal{H}$ is $k$-uniform we have $k^{2}=|V| \geq\left|e_{0}\right|+\sum_{a \in S}|a|=k+k s$ hence $0 \leq s \leq k-1$. By (20) and (21) we infer

$$
|E|=\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)+1+s=k^{2}+s+1
$$

Step 4: the partial hypergraph $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}=(V, E \backslash S)$ belongs to the class $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ of all hypergraphs $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}=(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ satisfying

- $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is linear and $k$-uniform,
- $|\tilde{V}|=k^{2}$,
- $|\tilde{E}|=k^{2}+1$,
- and there exists $e_{0} \in \tilde{E}$ such that
$-\forall x \in e_{0}, \operatorname{deg}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(x)=k+1$,
$-\forall x \in V \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}, \operatorname{deg}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(x) \geq k$.

If we have a hyperedge coloring of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, then assigning to all hyperedges in $S$ the same color already assigned to $e_{0}$ provides a hyperedge coloring of $\mathcal{H}$. Thus $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$. It remains to show that $\mathrm{q}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1$. This will follow from Theorem 3.6 iii below. Note that it is possible to get this bound by a shorter argument but instead we make the choice to study more widely the class $\mathscr{H}_{k}$.

Before stating and proving Theorem 3.6 we outline geometric properties for hypergraphs of $\mathscr{H}_{k}$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $k \geq 2, \mathcal{H}=(V, E) \in \mathscr{H}_{k}, e_{0} \in E$ satisfy (17) and $e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}$. Then
i) We have $\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)=k^{2}$ and for any $a \in E, a \cap e_{0} \neq \varnothing$. In other words there is no hyperedge parallel to $e_{0}$.
ii) There exists $x_{0} \in e_{0}$ such that $e \cap e_{0}=\left\{x_{0}\right\}$.
iii) For any $x \in e_{0} \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ there exists a unique hyperedge $a \in \mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}$ such that $a \cap e=\varnothing$.
iv) Assume $k \geq 3$. It may exist $x \in V \backslash\left(e_{0} \cup e\right)$ and distinct hyperedges $a, a^{\prime}$ such that $a \cap e=a^{\prime} \cap e=\varnothing$ and $a \cap a^{\prime}=\{x\}$.
v) It is not true in general that $a \cap e=a^{\prime} \cap e=\varnothing \Longrightarrow a \cap a^{\prime}=\varnothing$.

Proof. i) By (21) and since $|E|=k^{2}+1$, all hyperedges intersect $e_{0}$.
ii) follows from i).
iii) Existence: otherwise for any hyperedge $a \neq e_{0}$ and containing $x$, we have $a \cap e=$ $\left\{y_{a}\right\}$ for some vertex $y_{a} \in e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is linear the mapping $a \in \mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\} \mapsto$ $y_{a} \in e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ is injective. But $|\mathcal{H}(x)|=\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k+1$, hence $|e| \geq k+1$, a contradiction.
Uniqueness: let $a$ satisfy the desired conclusion. Then $a \cap e_{0}=\{x\}$ and $a \cap e=\varnothing$. By ii), each of the $k-1$ many vertices of $e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ lies in exactly one of the $k-1$ many hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}, a\right\}$. This gives a mapping $y \in e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\} \mapsto a_{y} \in \mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}, a\right\}$ which is injective by linearity of $\mathcal{H}$. Since $\left|e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}\right|=k-1=\left|\mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}, a\right\}\right|$ it is a bijection. It follows that for any $a^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}(x) \backslash\left\{e_{0}, a\right\}$, there exists $y \in e \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ such that $a^{\prime} \cap e=\{y\}$.
iv) and v) will follow from the construction of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ in iv) of Proposition 4.2.

Theorem 3.6. For any $k \geq 2$ and any $\mathcal{H} \in \mathscr{H}_{k}$, we have
i) $\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)=k^{2}-1$ and $\delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)=k^{2}-k$;
ii) $k+1 \leq \mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 1+k\left\lceil\frac{k}{2}\right\rceil$;
iii) $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)$.

Proof. i) Let $x_{i} \in e_{0}$, then $x_{i}$ is adjacent to any other vertex of $V$. Thus $\operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}\left(x_{i}\right)=$ $k^{2}-1$. If $x \in V \backslash e_{0}$ then $x$ belongs to $k$ different hyperedges thus admits $k^{2}-k$ adjacent vertices. We infer $\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)=k^{2}-1$ and $\delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)=k^{2}-k$.
ii) We fix $c_{0}$ the color of $e_{0}$, and for each even $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and any $0 \leq j \leq k$ we color $e_{i, j}$ with $c_{i, j}$. We need exactly

$$
1+\sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \leq \text { even }}} k=1+k\left\lceil\frac{k}{2}\right\rceil
$$

many different colors. Our aim is to show that they are sufficiently numerous to provide a hyperedge coloring of $\mathcal{H}$. For this it remains to color all hyperedges $e_{i, h}$ where $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ is odd and $1 \leq h \leq k$.

We fix an odd integer $1 \leq i \leq k-1$.

- For each $1 \leq j \leq k$ there exists a unique $1 \leq h=h(j) \leq k$ such that $e_{i-1, j} \cap$ $e_{i, h}=\varnothing$ : it suffices to apply iii) of Proposition 3.5 with $e=e_{i-1, j}$ and $x=x_{i}$.

We thus may define the map

$$
f: \begin{array}{clc}
\left\{e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}: x_{i-1} \in e\right\} & \longrightarrow & \left\{e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}: x_{i} \in e\right\} \\
e_{i-1, j} & \longmapsto & e_{i, h(j)}
\end{array}
$$

- $f$ is injective. Otherwise it would exist $1 \leq j \neq j^{\prime} \leq k$ such that $h(j)=h\left(j^{\prime}\right)$. Hence

$$
e_{i, h(j)} \backslash\left\{x_{i}\right\} \subset \bigsqcup_{\substack{1 \leq t \leq k \\ t \neq j, j^{\prime}}} e_{i-1, t} \backslash\left\{x_{i-1}\right\}
$$

Since $\left|e_{i, h(j)} \backslash\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right|=k-1$ and $\left|\left(e_{i, h(j)} \backslash\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right) \cap e_{i-1, t} \backslash\left\{x_{i-1}\right\}\right| \leq 1$ for any $1 \leq$ $t \neq j, j^{\prime} \leq k$ we deduce from the pigeon hole principle that $\left|e_{i, h(j)} \cap e_{i-1, t}\right| \geq 2$ for some $t$, a contradiction to the linearity of $\mathcal{H}$.

- Thus $f$ is bijective, that is for any $1 \leq h \leq k$ there exists $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $e_{i, h} \cap e_{i-1, j}=\varnothing$. This shows that hyperedge $e_{i, h}$ can be colored with $c_{i-1, j}$.
Statement iii) follows from i) and ii).
Remarks 3.7. i) There exist several sharp results for the chromatic index of linear $k$-uniform and $d$-regular hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}$ yielding in particular the asymptotic upper bound $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq(1+o(1)) d$ when $d \rightarrow \infty$, where the implied function in $o(1)$ may depend on $k$ (see [19, Section 2] for a rich survey on this topic). However they do not apply when $d=k$.
ii) The size of the hyperedge coloring of $\mathcal{H} \in \mathscr{H}_{k}$ given in Theorem 3.6 is certainly not optimal. For instance when $k=3$ we shall see in Proposition 4.2 that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 5$ while the algorithm provided by Theorem 3.6 yields $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq 7$. It could be interesting to improve the upper bound in ii) and to give the order of magnitude of $\max \left\{\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{H} \in \mathscr{H}_{k}\right\}$ in terms of $k$. See Proposition 4.2 for additional properties.


## 4. Studying the class $\mathscr{H}_{k}$

4.1. General facts. For any integer $k \geq 2$, we denote by $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ the set hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ such that
(C0) $\mathcal{H}$ is linear and $k$-uniform,
(C1) $|V|=k^{2}$,
(C2) $|E|=k^{2}+1$,
and there exists a hyperedge $e_{0}$ such that
(C3) $\forall x \in e_{0}, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k+1$,
(C4) $\forall x \in V \backslash e_{0}, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \geq k$.
We start with easy consequences of the definition.
Proposition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ satisfy Conditions (C0)-(C4). Then
i) $\forall x \in V \backslash e_{0}, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k$,
ii) $\forall e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}, \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=k^{2}-k+1$.

Proof. i) By (4) and (C2), we have $\sum_{x \in V} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=\left(k^{2}+1\right) k$, hence by (C3) and (C4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
k^{3}+k=(k+1) k+\left(k^{2}-k\right) k & \leq(k+1) k+\left(k^{2}-k\right) \min _{x \in V \backslash e_{0}} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \\
& \leq(k+1) k+\sum_{x \in V \backslash e_{0}} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=\left(k^{2}+1\right) k,
\end{aligned}
$$

since there are $\left(k^{2}-k\right)$ vertices not belonging to $e_{0}$. It follows that $\forall x \in V \backslash e_{0}$, $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=k$.
ii) For any $e \in E \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}$, we get from from the first equation in (8), (C3) and i)

$$
\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=\sum_{x \in e \cap e_{0}} k+\sum_{x \in e \backslash e_{0}}(k-1)=k+(k-1)^{2}=k^{2}-k+1
$$

since $\left|e \cap e_{0}\right|=1$ and $\left|e \backslash e_{0}\right|=k-1$.
Proposition 4.2. For any prime power $k$ there exists a hypergraph denoted by $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ in the class $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ such that
i) $\mathrm{q}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}\right)=k+1$,
ii) $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ is not maximal (for inclusion) in the class of all linear and $k$-uniform hypergraphs with $k^{2}$ vertices,
iii) $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ contains only one critical hyperedge, namely the unique hyperedge $e_{0}$ satisfying (C3) and (C4).

Proof. The field plane $\mathcal{A}_{k}=\mathbb{F}_{k}^{2}$ over $\mathbb{F}_{k}$ provides a $(k+1)$-regular and $k$-uniform linear hypergraph with $k^{2}$ vertices when considering the $k^{2}+k$ lines as its hyperedges. By removing any $k-1$ non intersecting hyperedges (namely parallel lines) from $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ we obtain a hypergraph $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ of $\mathscr{H}_{k}$.
i) Lines of $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ can be partitioned according to their slope. For each slope, any point appears only once on some line of $\mathcal{A}_{k}$. This shows that all the lines having a common slope can be colored with the same color. Since there are $k+1$ distinct slopes in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$, including the vertical one, we can conclude.
ii) This follows from the construction of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$.
iii) The unique line without any parallel line in $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ is obviously critical, while removing any other line does not decrease the chromatic index.
4.2. The cases $k=2,3$.

Theorem 4.3. We have:
i) $\mathscr{H}_{2}$ contains just the graph $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{2}}$ up to isomorphism. It satisfies $\mathrm{q}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{2}}\right)=3$ and $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{2}}\right) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{2} \times \mathfrak{S}_{2}$, the Klein four-group.
ii) $\mathscr{H}_{3}$ possesses exactly two non isomorphic elements $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$ which satisfy $\mathrm{q}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right)=4$ and $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right)=5$.
iii) $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right)=\mathfrak{S}_{3} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_{3}$ and $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{2} \times \mathfrak{S}_{3}=D_{6}$, the dihedral group of degree 6 and order 12.

Proof. i) For $k=2$, we see easily that any hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ in $\mathscr{H}_{2}$ is obtained by removing a single edge from the complete simple graph on four vertices $K_{4}$, so that $\mathcal{H}=\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{2}}$ and $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=3$ by Proposition 4.2. Clearly any automorphism of $\mathcal{H}$ is allowed to permute both vertices of degree 2 in one side, and independently both vertices of degree 3 on the other. Hence the result.
ii) Let $(V, E) \in \mathscr{H}_{3}$. We suppose that $V=\mathbb{F}_{3}^{2}$ where we identify the vertex $(x, y)$ with the integer $3 x+y$ whose development in base 3 is $x y$. We may assume that the special hyperedge $e_{0}$ is $\{0,1,2\}$ simply denoted 012 . The 3 other hyperedges containing 0 can be set to 036,048 and 057 with the same short-hand notation. Note that at this stage, the vertices 3,6 can be permuted, likewise for 4,8 and for 5,7 . These 4 hyperedges are lines in the field plane $\mathbb{F}_{3}^{2}$. Now the 3 hyperedges containing 1 and different from $e_{0}$ are

$$
13 u, 16 v, 1 x w \quad \text { where }\{u, v, w, x\}=\{4,5,7,8\} \text {. }
$$

We must have $x=4$ or 8 since $\{w, x\} \neq\{5,7\}$ by the facts that hyperedge 057 is already defined and $\mathcal{H}$ is linear. Switching if necessary 4 and 8 , we may assume that $x=4$. This implies $w \in\{5,7\}$. Switching if necessary 5 and 7 we may set $w=7$. Since 3 and 6 are also permutable we may set $u=8$ and $v=5$. Up to isomorphism, hyperedges

$$
012,036,048,057,147,138,156
$$

are in $E$. We may observe on the following figure that they are lines in $\mathbb{F}_{3}^{2}$.


Figure 1. A partial hypergraph of $\mathcal{H}$ with 7 lines immersed in the field plane $\mathcal{A}_{3}$.

Let
$2 x w, 23 u, 26 v$ where $u \in\{4,5,7\}, v \in\{4,7,8\},\{w, x\}=\{\{4,5\},\{5,8\},\{7,8\}\}$,
be the 3 remaining hyperedges. At least one of them is a line in the plane. Indeed, otherwise we would have

$$
u \in\{4,5\}, v \in\{7,8\},\{w, x\}=\{\{4,5\},\{7,8\}\},
$$

a contradiction since $u, v, w, x$ are distinct.
Applying if necessary a linear transformation with matrix $\left(\begin{array}{cc}\alpha & 0 \\ \beta & 1\end{array}\right)$ for which the vertices $0,1,2$ are fixed, we may assume that 258 is in $E$. We get $\{u, v\}=\{4,7\}$.

- First case: if the set of hyperedges is

$$
E=\{012,036,048,057,147,138,156,258,237,246\}
$$

all the hyperedges are lines in the plane. We thus obtain the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}=$ $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$.


Figure 2. The hypergraph $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$.

- Second case: if the set of hyperedges is

$$
E^{\prime}=\{012,036,048,057,147,138,156,258,234,276\}
$$

we let $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$.


Figure 3. The hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$.

We infer that up to isomorphism the class $\mathscr{H}_{3}$ reduces to $\left\{\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}, \mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right\}$.
We have $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right) \leq 5$ since
$0 \curvearrowright 012 ; \quad 1 \curvearrowright 036,147,258 ; \quad 2 \curvearrowright 048,156 ; \quad 3 \curvearrowright 057,234 ; \quad 4 \curvearrowright 138,276 ;$
provides a hyperedge 5 -coloring of $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$. Now suppose by contradiction that 4 colors are sufficient. Without loss of generality, we may assume that we have made the following partial assignment of colors:

$$
0 \curvearrowright 012 ; \quad 1 \curvearrowright 036,147 ; \quad 2 \curvearrowright 048,156 ; \quad 3 \curvearrowright 057,138 .
$$

We see that hyperedge 234 then necessarily requires an additional color, contradiction. Hence $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right)=5$. Since $\mathrm{q}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right)=4$ by i), $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$ is not isomorphic to $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$. We conclude that $\left|\mathscr{H}_{3}\right|=2$.

Note also that $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$ is maximal in the class of 3 -uniform linear hypergraphs: adding a new hyperedge yields a non linear hypergraph. In contrast $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}=(V, E)$ can be completed with two additional lines, namely 345,678 . This shows by a different way that $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$ are non isomorphic.
iii) We use notation of ii) and only sketch the proof. Since $e_{0}$ contains all the vertices of degree $k+1$ in $\mathcal{H}$, the subset $e_{0}$ of $V$ is fixed by any automorphim $\varphi$ of $\mathcal{H}$. Denoting by $\varphi_{\mid e_{0}}$ the restriction of $\varphi$ to $e_{0}$, we get in both case $\mathcal{H}=\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}, \mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$, the homomorphism

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{H}) & \longrightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{3} \\
\varphi & \longmapsto \varphi_{\mid e_{0}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- When $\mathcal{H}=\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$ we have

$$
\text { ker } g=\langle p, t\rangle \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{3} \quad \text { where } \quad p=(435)(678) \text { and } t=(46)(57)(38)
$$

with usual notation for permutation running on the vertices $0,1 \ldots, 8$. We check easily that both permutations $u=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}4 & 5\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}6 & 8\end{array}\right)$ and $v=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & 1 & 2\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}4 & 3\end{array}\right)$ are automorphisms of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}$. Since $g(u)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1\end{array}\right)$ and $g(v)=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & 1 & 2\end{array}\right), g$ is surjective and $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right)\right|=36$.
Let $K=\langle u, v\rangle$. Since $u^{2}=v^{3}=\operatorname{id}$ and $u \circ v=v^{2} \circ u$, we have $K \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{3}$. Moreover $K \cap \operatorname{ker} g=\{\operatorname{id}\}$ thus finally $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right)=K \cdot \operatorname{ker} g$. Since $t \circ v \neq v \circ t$, this is a semi direct product, hence $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{3}}\right) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{3} \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_{3}$.

- When $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$ we have

$$
\operatorname{ker} g=\langle q\rangle \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{2} \quad \text { where } \quad q=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
3 & 6)(47)(5
\end{array}\right)
$$

Both permutations $r=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & 1\end{array}\right)(34)(67)$ and $s=\left(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 1 & 2\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{lll}4 & 3 & 5\end{array}\right)$ are automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$. Since $g(r)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1\end{array}\right)$ and $g(s)=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & 1 & 2\end{array}\right), g$ is surjective and $\left|\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right|=12$.
Let $K^{\prime}=\left\langle u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\rangle$ where $u^{\prime}=(012)(483)(567)$ and $v^{\prime}=(01)(34)(67)$ are automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}$. Since $u^{\prime 3}=v^{\prime 2}=$ id and $v^{\prime} \circ u^{\prime}=u^{\prime 2} \circ v^{\prime}$, we have $K^{\prime} \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{3}$. Moreover $K^{\prime} \cap \operatorname{ker} g=\{\operatorname{id}\}$ thus finally $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\mathcal{H}_{3}^{\prime}\right)=K^{\prime} \cdot \operatorname{ker} g \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{3} \times \mathfrak{S}_{2}=D_{6}$ since clearly the product is direct.

### 4.3. The general case.

Theorem 4.4. For any prime power $k \geq 3$, there exists a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\mathcal{H}_{k}^{\prime}$ in $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ such that
i) $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)=2 k-1$ and any hyperedge $(2 k-1)$-coloring of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ is unique up to an affine permutation on the vertices,
ii) $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ contains exactly $k$ many critical hyperedges,
iii) $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ is maximal (for inclusion) in the class of all linear and $k$-uniform hypergraphs with $k^{2}$ vertices,
iv) $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ are non isomorphic.

Proof. In the field plane $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ let $x_{0}$ be an arbitrary vertex and $\mathcal{H}\left(x_{0}\right)=\left\{e_{0}, e_{1}, \ldots, e_{k}\right\}$ be the star centered at $x_{0}$. Let $e_{1}=\left\{x_{0}, \ldots, x_{k-1}\right\}$ and $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k-1}$ be the parallel lines to $e_{0}$ with $a_{i} \cap e_{1}=\left\{x_{i}\right\}, 1 \leq i \leq k-1$. We apply to $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ the following changes on its set of hyperedges:

- $e_{2}, \ldots, e_{k}$ are removed,
- for any $1 \leq i \leq k-1, a_{i}$ is replaced by the hyperedge $a_{i}^{\prime}=\left\{x_{0}\right\} \cup\left(a_{i} \backslash\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right)$,
- $e_{1}$ and all other hyperedges, namely those intersecting $e_{0} \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}$ including $e_{0}$ itself, are kept unchanged.


Figure 4. From $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Vertices of $e_{0}$ and $e_{1}$ are labelled so that the lines $\left\langle x_{i}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ are parallel in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$.

We get a $k$-uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ such that $\left|V^{\prime}\right|=\left|V\left(\mathcal{A}_{k}\right)\right|=k^{2}$, $\left|E^{\prime}\right|=\left|E\left(\mathcal{A}_{k}\right)\right|-(k-1)=k^{2}+1$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}}(x)=\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{A}_{k}}(x)=k+1$ for any $x \in e_{0}$. Moreover $V^{\prime} \backslash e_{0}=\left\{x_{i, j}, 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k-1\right\}$ where $\left\{x_{i, j}\right\}=e_{i} \cap a_{j}$. It follows that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}}\left(x_{i, j}\right)=\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{A}_{k}}\left(x_{i, j}\right)-1$. Finally $\mathcal{H}^{\prime} \in \mathscr{H}_{k}$.
i) We now estimate $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$.

- We first fix a hyperedge coloring $\mathfrak{c}: \mathcal{H}^{\prime} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Hyperedges in the star $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)=\left\{e_{0}, a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k-1}^{\prime}, e_{1}\right\}$ are respectively colored by $k+1$ many distinct colors in the set $\mathcal{C}=\left\{c_{0}, c_{1}, \ldots, c_{k-1}, c_{k}\right\}$. Now the star $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)$ is composed by $e_{1}$ and the lines $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ of $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ passing thru $x_{1}$ and $y_{i}$ respectively where we have set $e_{0}=\left\{x_{0}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k-1}\right\}$. Vertices of $e_{0}$ are labelled so that the hyperedges passing thru $x_{i}, y_{i}(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ are parallel. We denote by $c_{i}^{\prime}$ $(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ the $k-1$ many distinct colors that are assigned to those lines $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$. For any $2 \leq j \leq k-1$, each line $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle$ intersects $a_{j}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$, thus intersects $a_{j}^{\prime}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ since the intersection vertex cannot be $x_{j}$ by linearity of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Thus $c_{i}^{\prime} \notin \mathcal{C} \backslash\left\{c_{1}\right\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Since there
is at most one line $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ that are colored by $c_{1}$, we infer $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \geq k+1+k-2=2 k-1$.
Note that if none of the lines $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ is colored by $c_{1}$, then the given hyperedge coloring $\mathfrak{c}$ has at least $2 k$ many colors. We use this fact in order to get an optimal coloring of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ in what follows.
- We proceed as follows. We color as before $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\left(x_{0}\right)$ by $k+1$ many distinct colors $c_{0}, \ldots, c_{k}$. We observed that $k-2$ among the $k-1$ lines $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ require new colors $c_{k+1}, \ldots, c_{2 k-2}$. We have to show that we can color the remaining hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ without any additional color.
Let $e$ be a not yet colored hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$.
- if $e$ is the last line $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i_{1}}\right\rangle$ passing thru $x_{1}$, then we must color it with $c_{1}$; we denote by $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{k} \backslash\{0\}$ its slope in the field plane $\mathcal{A}_{k}$;
- if $e \in\left\{e_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, e_{k-1}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a parallel line to $e_{1}$, then we must color it with $c_{k}$ since it intersects $e_{0}, a_{i}^{\prime},\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$;
- for each $2 \leq j \leq k-1$, the unique parallel $e=\left\langle x_{j}, y_{i_{j}}\right\rangle$ to $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i_{1}}\right\rangle$ needs to be colored with $c_{j}$ since it intersects $e_{0}, e_{1}, a_{i}^{\prime}(i \neq j)$ and $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle\left(i \neq i_{1}\right)$;
- for any $2 \leq j \leq k-1$ and $1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq i_{j}$, the line $e=\left\langle x_{j}, y_{i}\right\rangle$ can only be colored with the same color than that of its unique parallel in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\left(x_{1}\right)$.
By this way only hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ that are parallel lines in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ may have the same color. Indeed by construction, each color $c_{k+i-1}(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ is only assigned to disjoint hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ which are parallel lines in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$. Color $c_{0}$ is exclusive to $e_{0}$. Finally color $c_{j}(1 \leq j \leq k-1)$ is only assigned to both hyperedges $a_{j}^{\prime}$ and $\left\langle x_{j}, y_{i_{j}}\right\rangle$ which are non intersecting.
We thus have a hyperedge $(2 k-1)$-coloring of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Hence $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)=2 k-1$.
- We have shown in fact that hyperedge $(2 k-1)$-coloring of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ are parametrized by the slope $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{k} \backslash\{0\}$ of the parallel lines $\left\langle x_{j}, y_{i_{j}}\right\rangle(1 \leq j \leq k-1)$. Conversely different slopes $\lambda$ yield distinct coloring when vertices and hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ are fixed beforehand. Hence if we ignore color labels we infer that $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ admits exactly $k-1$ many hyperedge $(2 k-1)$-coloring $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, \lambda}, \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{k} \backslash\{0\}$.
Precisely each slope $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{k} \backslash\{0\}$ is associated to some admissible one to one mapping $j \longmapsto i_{j}$ from $\{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ on itself. It yields a permutation $\sigma$ on the $y_{j}$ 's and the $e_{j}^{\prime}$ 's respectively $\sigma: y_{j} \longmapsto y_{i_{j}}, e_{j}^{\prime} \longmapsto e_{i_{j}}^{\prime}$ which extends to a one to one mapping from the vertices of $e_{j}^{\prime}$ onto those of $\sigma\left(e_{j}^{\prime}\right)(1 \leq j \leq k-1)$ by sending $a_{i}^{\prime} \cap e_{j}^{\prime}$ on $a_{i}^{\prime} \cap \sigma\left(e_{j}^{\prime}\right)(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$, see Figure 4. Since $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ is immersed in the field plane $\mathcal{A}_{k}=\mathbb{F}_{k}^{2}$ we may consider that $e_{0}=\{0\} \times \mathbb{F}_{k}$ and $e_{1}=\mathbb{F}_{k} \times\{0\}$. It follows $\sigma$ is an affine transformation of the field plane, namely the dilation from axis $e_{1}$ towards axis $e_{0}$ by a factor of $\lambda$. We have $\sigma\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)=\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Indeed
$-\sigma$ permutes the $e_{j}^{\prime}$ 's,
$-\sigma\left(e_{0}\right)=e_{0}, \sigma\left(e_{1}\right)=e_{1}, \sigma\left(a_{i}^{\prime}\right)=a_{i}^{\prime}(2 \leq i \leq k-1)$,
$-\sigma\left(\left\langle x_{i}, y_{j}\right\rangle\right)=\left\langle x_{i}, \sigma\left(y_{j}\right)\right\rangle(1 \leq i, j \leq k-1)$.
It is thus an automorphim of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$. Finally

$$
\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, \lambda}(e)=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, 1}\left(\sigma^{-1}(e)\right), \quad \text { for any } e \in E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)
$$

This shows that for any coloring $\mathfrak{c}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ there exists an affine automorphism of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{c}(e)=\mathfrak{c}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, 1}\left(\sigma^{-1}(e)\right)$ for any $e \in E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$.
ii) Here we show that only $e_{0}, a_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, a_{k-1}^{\prime}$ are critical hyperedges in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$.

- By the coloring process implemented above, $a_{j}^{\prime}(2 \leq j \leq k-1)$ is the unique hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ with color $c_{j}$. By symmetry on the vertices $x_{i}(2 \leq i \leq k-1)$, there exists a hyperedge coloring of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ such that $a_{1}^{\prime}$ has an exclusive color $c_{1}$. Hence any $a_{j}^{\prime}(1 \leq j \leq k)$ is critical. It is clear that $e_{0}$ is also critical since it intersects all other hyperedges.
- Any parallel of $e_{1}$, including $e_{1}$ itself, intersects all the hyperdeges of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ which are not parallel to $e_{1}$. Removing one of them does not affect the number of required colors. Thus none of them is critical.
- In the first part of the proof of i), we notice that just coloring $e_{0}, e_{1}, a_{i}^{\prime},\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle$ $(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$ already required $2 k-1$ colors. We infer that none of the lines $\left\langle x_{j}, y_{i}\right\rangle$ is critical, $2 \leq j \leq k-1$ and $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. By symmetry of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ with regard to the vertices $x_{j}$, this is also true for the lines $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{i}\right\rangle, 1 \leq i \leq k-1$.
iii) Let $\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}$ be a $k$-uniform linear hypergraph with $k^{2}$ vertices such that $E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \subset E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Let $e \in E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Set $e_{1}^{\prime}=e_{1}$ and denote by $e_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, e_{k}^{\prime}$ its parallel lines in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ (see Figure 4). These hyperedges are also in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ hence form a partition of $V\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$. We thus have $e \cap e_{i}^{\prime}=\left\{z_{i}\right\}$ for distinct vertices $z_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq k$, and $e=\left\{z_{1}, \ldots, z_{k}\right\}$.
- If $z_{1}=x_{0}$ then $z_{2}$ is not in $e_{1}^{\prime}=e_{1}$ and does belong to some $a_{j}^{\prime}$. Since $x_{0} \in a_{j}^{\prime} \in$ $E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \subset E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}$ is linear, we infer $e=a_{j}^{\prime} \in E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$.
- Assume that $z_{1}=x_{j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq k-1$. Since $k \geq 3$ and $\left|a_{j}^{\prime} \cap e\right| \leq 1$, there exists $2 \leq i \leq k$ such that $z_{i} \notin a_{j}^{\prime}$. This implies that $z_{1}$ and $z_{i}$ lie on two distinct proper parallels to $e_{0}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$. We then see that the line $\left\langle z_{1}, z_{i}\right\rangle$ containing both $z_{1}$ and $z_{i}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{k}$ is distinct from the $a_{t}$ 's, $1 \leq t \leq k-1$, and from the $e_{t}$ 's, $0 \leq t \leq k$. Thus it is a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ as well of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}$. By linearity of $\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}$ we conclude that $e=\left\langle z_{1}, z_{i}\right\rangle \in E\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$.
iv) In view of Proposition 4.2 the result follows equivalently from i), ii) or iii).


### 4.4. Remarks and questions.

i) As a generalization of iii) of Theorem 4.3 and an extension of iv) of Theorem 4.4, it should be interesting to determine and to compare the groups of automorphisms of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}_{k}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{k}^{\prime}$.
ii) In Proposition 4.2 we investigated the case when $k$ is a prime power and we proved that $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ is not empty and that $\left|\mathscr{H}_{k}\right| \geq 2$. Estimating $\left|\mathscr{H}_{k}\right|$ seems to be a hard problem.
iii) When $k$ is not a prime power it is not obvious neither known that $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ is nonempty. In contrast with the prime power case we should mention that it is conjectured (known as the prime power Conjecture) that there is no affine plane with $k^{2}$ points. For instance for $k=6$ this is related to the 36 officers problem posed by Euler and to the existence of Graeco-Latin squares of order 6: there is no affine plane of order 6 (see $[27,26]$ ). However one can ask the question whether or not $\mathscr{H}_{6}$ is empty.
iv) Our construction of $\mathcal{H}_{k}^{\prime}$ the Theorem 4.4 starts from the affine plane $\mathcal{A}_{k}$. We may ask the question whether or not all hypergraphs of $\mathscr{H}_{k}$ can be derived in a certain way from $\mathcal{A}_{k}$. However, as also noticed in [9], we need to avoid hypergraphs in which parallel is an equivalence relation.

## 5. Further results

5.1. Some consequences. We first derive the following result establishing Conjecture 1.4 for hypergraphs with small maximum degree.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and without loop such that $\Delta(\mathcal{H}) \leq \sqrt{n}+1$. Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ be a critical partial hypergraph of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)=\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})$.

- If $\operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \geq \sqrt{n}$ we infer from [24] or from Theorem 1.6 that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \leq n$.
- If $\operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)<\sqrt{n}$ then we take $e \in E^{\prime}$ such that $|e|=\operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$. By Lemma 3.2 and (8) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)-1 & \leq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}}(e)=\sum_{x \in e}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}}(x)-1\right) \\
& \leq|e|\left(\Delta\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)-1\right) \leq \operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)(\Delta(\mathcal{H})-1)<n .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence the result.
Note that by (12) we have $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$ whenever $\mathrm{r}(\mathcal{H})(\Delta(\mathcal{H}-1)<n$. Thus by letting $u=\Delta(\mathcal{H})-\sqrt{n}-1$ with $0<u \leq \sqrt{n}-2$ we see that Conjecture 1.4 holds under the additional strong hypothesis on the $\operatorname{rank} \mathrm{r}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \sqrt{n}-u$.

The second statement extends the validity of Theorem 1.6 when $\mathcal{H}$ is a uniform linear hypergraph. The extension is moderate but allows us to drop down the threshold $\sqrt{|V|}$ for the antirank.

Theorem 5.2. Let $k \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a $k$-uniform linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices satisfying $n \leq k^{2}+k-2$. Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.6 we may assume that $n \geq k^{2}$. We set $u=n-k^{2}$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq u \leq k-2 \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since any partial hypergraph of $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies theorem's hypotheses, we may assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is critical. We distinguish two cases

- We first assume that there exists $e_{0} \in E$ and $x_{0} \in e_{0}$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq$ $\left|e_{0}\right|=k$. By Lemma 3.2 and (8) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})-1 \leq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right) & =\sum_{x \in e_{0}}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right) \\
& =\sum_{x \in e_{0} \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-\left|e_{0}\right|+\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\left|e_{0}\right|-1\right) \Delta(\mathcal{H})=(k-1) \Delta(\mathcal{H})=\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

- We now assume that $\forall x \in V \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \geq k+1$. By (6) we get

$$
\forall x \in V \quad \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x) \leq \frac{k^{2}+k-3}{k-1}<k+2
$$

hence $\mathcal{H}$ is $(k+1)$-regular. By (4) we thus infer

$$
|E|=\frac{(k+1) n}{k}=k^{2}+k+u+\frac{u}{k},
$$

implying $u=0$ by (24) since $|E|$ is an integer. Whence $|V|=k^{2}$ and $|E|=$ $k^{2}+k$. Our aim is to show that $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite affine plane yielding $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=k+1$.

For any $x \in V$ we have $\operatorname{deg}_{[\mathcal{H}]_{2}}(x)=\sum_{e \in \mathcal{H}(x)}(|e|-1)=k^{2}-1=|V|-1$ hence any pair of distinct vertices $(x, y)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ are adjacent. Denote by $e_{x, y}$ the unique hyperedge containing both $x$ and $y$.

Let $e \in E$. Then by (8) we have $\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=\sum_{x \in e}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)=k^{2}$. Since $|E|=k^{2}+k$ and $\mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=k^{2}$, there are $k-1$ many hyperedges $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k-1}$ such that $a_{i} \cap e=\varnothing, 1 \leq i \leq k-1$. If there were $y \in a_{i} \cap a_{j}$ with $i \neq j$, then $\mathcal{H}(y)$ would contain $k+2$ distinct hyperedges: $a_{i}, a_{j}$, and $e_{x, y}, x \in e$, a contradiction to $|\mathcal{H}(y)|=\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(y)=k+1$. Hence $a_{i} \cap a_{j}=\varnothing$ if $i \neq j$. This gives

$$
\left|e \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} a_{i}\right|=|e|+\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\left|a_{i}\right|=k^{2}=|V|,
$$

thus any $x \in V \backslash e$ belongs to exactly one of the hyperedges $a_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq k-1$, that is a parallel to $e$. We conclude that $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite affine plane and that $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=k+1$.
5.2. A generalization of Theorem 1.6. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a hypergraph with $n$ vertices. Then we can split $E$ as the disjoint union $E=E^{\prime} \sqcup E_{-}^{\prime \prime} \sqcup E_{+}^{\prime \prime}$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
E^{\prime} & =\{e \in E:|e| \geq \sqrt{n}\}, \\
E_{-}^{\prime \prime} & =\left\{e \in E \backslash E^{\prime}: \exists x_{0} \in e \text { such that } \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq|e|\right\}, \\
E_{+}^{\prime \prime} & =\left\{e \in E \backslash E^{\prime}: \forall x \in e, \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)>|e|\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 can be combined in order to obtain the following slight extension of both results. It shows that the bound (1) is true when $E_{+}^{\prime \prime}=\varnothing$.

Theorem 5.3. Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and without loop such that $E$ can be partitioned as $E=E^{\prime} \sqcup E^{\prime \prime}$ in such a way that the partial hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime}\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\prime \prime}=\left(V, E^{\prime \prime}\right)$ satisfy the following properties:
i) $\operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right) \geq \sqrt{n}$,
ii) $\forall e \in E^{\prime \prime},|e|<\sqrt{n}$,
iii) $\forall e \in E^{\prime \prime}, \exists x_{0} \in e$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq|e|$.

Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1$.
Proof. We argue by induction on $\left|E^{\prime \prime}\right|$. It runs as in the proof of Theorem 1.5.
When $E^{\prime \prime}=\varnothing$ then $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ and the result follows directly from Theorem 1.6.
When $E^{\prime \prime}=\left\{e_{0}, e_{1}, \ldots, e_{m}\right\}$ then the partial hypergraph

$$
\mathcal{H}_{0}:=\mathcal{H} \backslash e_{0}=\left(V, E^{\prime} \sqcup\left(E^{\prime \prime} \backslash\left\{e_{0}\right\}\right)\right)
$$

satisfies conditions i)-iii) and the induction hypothesis applies to $\mathcal{H}_{0}$. We even can assume that $\left|e_{0}\right|=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$ since $\left|e_{i}\right|<\sqrt{n} \leq \operatorname{ar}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m$. We distinguish two cases.

- If $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right)$, then by applying induction hypothesis to $\mathcal{H}_{0}$ we infer

$$
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right) \leq \Delta\left(\left[\mathcal{H}_{0}\right]_{2}\right)+1 \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1
$$

- If $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H})=\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0}\right)+1$ then we fix $x_{0} \in e_{0}$ such that $\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq\left|e_{0}\right|$ and we get by Lemma 3.2

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) & \leq \mathrm{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(e_{0}\right)+1=\sum_{\substack{x \in e_{0} \\
x \neq x_{0}}}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-1\right)+\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\left|e_{0}\right|-1\right) \max _{x \in e} \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}(x)-\left|e_{0}\right|+1+\operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \\
& \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1,
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\left|e_{0}\right|=\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H})$.
This completes the induction.
Remarks 5.4. i) Before applying this theorem it should be convenient to remove all isolated vertices and all but one vertices of degree one in each hyperedge so that the resulting hypergraph still verifies conditions i)-iii). Indeed this will not change the chromatic index but may improve on the upper bound.
ii) Let $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ and assume that $\left|E_{+}^{\prime \prime}\right|=r \geq 1$. The partial hypergraph $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}=\left(V, E \backslash E_{+}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ satisfies Theorem 5.3. Letting $\mathcal{H}_{+}^{\prime \prime}=\left(V, E_{+}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ we infer

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mathrm{q}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})+\mathrm{q}\left(\mathcal{H}_{+}^{\prime \prime}\right) \leq \Delta\left([\tilde{\mathcal{H}}]_{2}\right)+1+r \leq \Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right)+1+r . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $r$ can be very large, as large as the total number of hyperedges. If $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$ is a $k$-uniform and $(k+1)$-regular linear hypergraph with $k^{2}$ vertices, then $|E|=k(k+1)$ by (4). Adding an isolated vertex to $\mathcal{H}$ gives a hypergraph $\hat{\mathcal{H}}=(\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ in which $\hat{E}=\hat{E}_{+}^{\prime \prime}$. In this case the bound (25) is trivial.
iii) In fact the induction argument in the proof of Theorem 5.3 applies as well on the set of hyperedges

$$
E_{-}:=\left\{e \in E: \exists x_{0} \in e \text { such that } \operatorname{deg}_{\mathcal{H}}\left(x_{0}\right) \leq|e|\right\} .
$$

Hence if the partial hypergraph ( $V, E \backslash E_{-}$) satisfies Berge-Füredi bound (1) then $(V, E)$ also does. It follows that Conjecture 1.2 is true in general if it holds for every hypergraph $(V, E)$ such that $E_{-}$is empty.
5.3. Consequences for the Erdős-Faber-Lovász Conjecture. We noticed earlier that Conjecture 1.2 implies Conjecture 1.4, since $\Delta\left([\mathcal{H}]_{2}\right) \leq|V|-1$ for any hypergraph $\mathcal{H}=(V, E)$. Therefore we have the following corollaries.

Corollary 5.5. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and satisfying (2). Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$.
Corollary 5.6. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and satisfying $\operatorname{ar}(\mathcal{H}) \geq$ $n^{1 / 2}$. Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$.

Corollary 5.7. Let $\mathcal{H}=\left(V, E^{\prime} \sqcup E^{\prime \prime}\right)$ be a linear hypergraph with $n$ vertices and satisfying hypotheses of Theorem 5.3. Then $\mathrm{q}(\mathcal{H}) \leq n$.
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