

# Intersecting families with large shadow degree

Peter Frankl<sup>1</sup>, Jian Wang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Rényi Institute, Budapest, Hungary

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics  
Taiyuan University of Technology  
Taiyuan 030024, P. R. China

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

## Abstract

A  $k$ -uniform family  $\mathcal{F}$  is called *intersecting* if  $F \cap F' \neq \emptyset$  for all  $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ . The shadow family  $\partial\mathcal{F}$  is the family of  $(k-1)$ -element sets that are contained in some members of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The *shadow degree* (or *minimum positive co-degree*) of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined as the maximum integer  $r$  such that every  $E \in \partial\mathcal{F}$  is contained in at least  $r$  members of  $\mathcal{F}$ . In 2021, Balogh, Lemons and Palmer determined the maximum size of an intersecting  $k$ -uniform family with shadow degree at least  $r$  for  $n \geq n_0(k, r)$ , where  $n_0(k, r)$  is doubly exponential in  $k$  for  $4 \leq r \leq k$ . In the present paper, we present a short proof of this result for  $n \geq 2(r+1)^r k^{\frac{2k-1}{2r-1}}$  and  $4 \leq r \leq k$ .

## 1 Introduction

Let  $[n]$  be the standard  $n$ -element set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $2^{[n]}$  denote the power set of  $[n]$  and let  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  denote the collection of all  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n]$ . A subset  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  is called a  $k$ -uniform family. We call  $\mathcal{F}$  an *intersecting family* if  $F \cap F' \neq \emptyset$  for all  $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ . The *matching number*  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  is the maximum number of disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The *transversal number*  $\tau(\mathcal{F})$  is the minimum size of  $T \subset [n]$  such that  $T \cap F \neq \emptyset$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ .

One of the most important results in extremal set theory is the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem.

**Theorem 1.1 (Erdős-Ko-Rado [2]).** *Suppose that  $n \geq 2k > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  is intersecting, then*

$$(1.1) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}.$$

For  $n > 2k$ , the equality holds in (1.1) if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : x \in F\} =: \mathcal{S}_x$  for some  $x \in [n]$ .

A subfamily of  $\mathcal{S}_x$  is called a *star*. Hilton and Milner proved a strong stability result of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem.

**Theorem 1.2 (Hilton-Milner Theorem [6]).** *Suppose that  $n > 2k \geq 4$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  is an intersecting family that is not a star, then*

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

Let us define the Hilton-Milner family

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

showing that (1.2) is best possible.

For  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  and  $E \subset [n]$ , let

$$\mathcal{F}(E) = \{F \setminus E : E \subset F \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

If  $E = \{x\}$  then we simply write  $\mathcal{F}(x)$ . Define the *immediate shadow*  $\partial\mathcal{F}$  and the *shadow degree* (or *minimum positive co-degree*)  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F})$  as

$$\partial\mathcal{F} = \left\{ E \in \binom{[n]}{k-1} : E \subset F \in \mathcal{F} \right\} \text{ and } \delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) = \min\{|\mathcal{F}(E)| : E \in \partial\mathcal{F}\}.$$

It is easy to check that  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{S}_x) = 1$  and  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{H}(n, k)) = 1$ .

It is natural to ask for the maximum size of an intersecting family with shadow degree at least  $r$ . Let us define the function:

$$f(n, k, r) = \max \left\{ |\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k} \text{ with } \delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r \right\}.$$

Note that Theorem 1.1 implies  $f(n, k, 1) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$  for  $n \geq 2k$ .

**Example 1.3.** For  $n \geq 2k$ ,  $k \geq r \geq 1$  define

$$\mathcal{L}(n, k, r) = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : |F \cap [2r-1]| \geq r \right\}.$$

Clearly  $\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)$  is intersecting,  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{L}) = r$  and

$$|\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)| = \sum_{r \leq i \leq 2r-1} \binom{2r-1}{i} \binom{n-2r+1}{k-i}.$$

In 2021, Balogh, Lemons and Palmer proved the following results.

**Proposition 1.4** ([1]). *If  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  is a non-empty intersecting with  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r$  then  $r \leq k$ .*

**Theorem 1.5** ([1]). *Let  $2 \leq r \leq k \leq n$ . If  $n \geq n_0(k, r)$  with  $n_0(k, 2) = \frac{k^4}{3}$ ,  $n_0(k, 3) = 2k^5$  and  $n_0(k, r) = ((k+1)k^r 2^k)^{2k} \frac{(2k-2r)^{k-r}}{\binom{2r-1}{r}}$  for  $r \geq 4$ , then*

$$(1.3) \quad f(n, k, r) = |\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)|.$$

In [4], we proved Theorem 1.5 for  $n_0(k, 2) = 28k$ ,  $n_0(k, r) = Ck^{2(r+1)k}$  for  $3 \leq r < k$  and  $n_0(k, k) = 2k - 1$ .

In the present paper, by applying a result of Tuza [8], we give a short proof of Theorem 1.5, which provides a considerably improvement of  $n_0(k, r)$  for  $4 \leq r < k$ . Precisely, we prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $4 \leq r \leq k - 1$ . If  $n \geq 2(r+1)^r k \frac{\binom{2k-1}{k}}{\binom{2r-1}{r}}$ , then*

$$(1.4) \quad f(n, k, r) = |\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)|.$$

Our proof works for the case  $r = 3$  as well. However in that case the bounds given by Balogh, Lemons and Palmer [1] are better.

We say that  $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^{[n]}$  is a *critical* intersecting family if  $\mathcal{H}$  is intersecting and  $(\mathcal{H} \setminus \{H\}) \cup (H \setminus \{x\})$  is no longer intersecting for any  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $x \in H$ . The *rank* of  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined as  $\max\{|H|: H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ .

We need the following result of Tuza.

**Theorem 1.7 (Corollary 12 in [8]).** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a critical intersecting family with rank  $k$ . Then*

$$|\cup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H| \leq \binom{2k-1}{k-1} + \binom{2k-4}{k-2}.$$

For  $k = 3$  and  $r = 2$ , we determine  $f(n, 3, 2)$  for the full range.

**Theorem 1.8.** *For  $n \geq 6$ ,  $f(n, 3, 2) = |\mathcal{L}(n, 3, 2)|$ .*

## 2 A slightly weaker bound for Tuza's result

Even though Tuza's proof is not too long it is quite involved. Let us include here a short proof inspired by Katona [7] for a slightly weaker result.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^{[n]}$  is a critical intersecting hypergraph of rank  $k$ ,  $\cup \mathcal{H} = [n]$ . Then*

$$n \leq \binom{2k-3}{k-1} (2k-1).$$

*Proof.* For  $1 \leq i \leq n$  let us fix a pair  $(G_i, H_i)$ ,  $G_i, H_i \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $G_i \cap H_i = \{i\}$ . Let  $\pi = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be an arbitrary permutation of  $[n]$ . We say that  $\pi$  separates  $(G_i, H_i)$  if letting  $j$  be defined by  $x_j = i$ , either  $G_i \subset \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$  and  $H_i \subset \{x_j, \dots, x_n\}$  or  $H_i \subset \{x_1, \dots, x_j\}$  and  $G_i \subset \{x_j, \dots, x_n\}$ . Set  $g = |G_i|$ ,  $h = |H_i|$ ,  $|G_i \cup H_i| = g + h - 1$ .

Whether  $\pi$  separates  $(G_i, H_i)$  depends only on the relative position of the elements of  $G_i \cup H_i$ . Easy computation shows that the number of  $\pi$  separating  $(G_i, H_i)$  is

$$2 \frac{n!(g-1)!(h-1)!}{(g+h-1)!} = \frac{2n!}{\binom{g+h-2}{g-1}(g+h-1)} \geq \frac{2n!}{\binom{2k-2}{k-1}(2k-1)}.$$

Should the same  $\pi$  separate  $(G_i, H_i)$  and  $(G_j, H_j)$  with  $x_i$  preceding  $x_j$  in  $\pi$ , either  $G_i$  or  $H_i$  completely precedes either  $G_j$  or  $H_j$ , contradicting  $\nu(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ . Consequently,

$$n \times \frac{2n!}{\binom{2k-2}{k-1}(2k-1)} \leq n!.$$

It follows that

$$|\cup \mathcal{H}| = n \leq \binom{2k-3}{k-1} (2k-1). \quad \square$$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.6

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  be a non-empty intersecting family with  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{H}) \geq k$ . Then  $\mathcal{H} = \binom{Y}{k}$  for some  $Y \subset [n]$  with  $|Y| = 2k - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let us first prove the following claim.

**Claim 3.2.** To every  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  there exists  $H' \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $|H \cap H'| = 1$ .

*Proof.* To fixed  $H \in \mathcal{H}$  choose  $G \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $|G \cap H|$  minimal. By  $\nu(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ ,  $G \cap H \neq \emptyset$ . Say  $t = |G \cap H| \geq 2$ . Fix  $G_0 \in \binom{G}{k-1}$ ,  $|G_0 \cap H| = |G \cap H| - 1 = t - 1 \geq 1$ . Then  $|H \setminus G_0| = k - (t - 1) < k$ . Hence there exists  $x \in [n]$  such that  $G_0 \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $x \notin H$ . Thus

$$|(G_0 \cup \{x\}) \cap H| = |G_0 \cap H| < |G \cap H|,$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

For notational convenience let  $H_1 = [k]$ ,  $H_2 = [k, 2k - 1] \in \mathcal{H}$ .

**Claim 3.3.** Suppose that  $|G \cap H_i| = 1$  ( $i = 1$  or  $2$ ) then  $G \subset [2k - 1]$ .

*Proof.* By symmetry let  $i = 1$ . Define  $j$  by  $G \cap H_1 = \{j\}$ . Using  $|\mathcal{H}([k+1, 2k-1])| \geq k$  and  $\nu(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ ,  $\tilde{H} := [k+1, 2k-1] \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{H}$ . If  $\tilde{H} = G$  we are done. Otherwise  $|\tilde{H} \cap G| < k$ . Hence there exists  $x \notin \tilde{H} \cap G$ ,  $\tilde{H}_1 := ([k] \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{x\} \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then either  $\tilde{H}_1 \cap \tilde{H}$  or  $\tilde{H}_1 \cap G$  is empty, a contradiction.  $\square$

To prove Proposition 3.1 assume indirectly that there exists  $G \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $G \not\subset [2k-1]$  and choose  $|G \cap H_1|$  to be minimal. By Claim 3.3  $|G \cap H_1| =: t \geq 2$ . Fix  $G_0 \in \binom{G}{k-1}$  with  $|G_0 \cap H_1| = t - 1$ . Since  $|H_1 \setminus G_0| < k$  there is  $x \notin H_1$  with  $\tilde{G} := G_0 \cup \{x\}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\tilde{G} \not\subset [2k-1]$ ,  $|\tilde{G} \cap H_1| = t - 1$ , the final contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $X$  be a finite set. For  $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^X$ , let  $p(\mathcal{H}) = \min\{|H| : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . For  $p(\mathcal{H}) \leq i \leq k$ , define

$$\mathcal{H}^{(i)} = \{H \in \mathcal{H} : |H| = i\}.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^X$  be an intersecting family with  $p(\mathcal{H}) = p$ . If  $\tau(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}) \geq r$  then for  $p \leq i \leq k$ ,*

$$|\mathcal{H}^{(i)}| \leq p^r \binom{|X| - r}{i - r}.$$

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by a branching process. During the proof a sequence  $S = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell)$  is an ordered sequence of distinct elements of  $X$  and we use  $\widehat{S}$  to denote the underlying unordered set  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell\}$ . At the first stage, we choose  $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  and define  $|H_1|$  sequences  $(x_1)$ ,  $x_1 \in H_1$ .

In each subsequent stage, we pick a sequence  $S = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$  with  $\ell < r$ . By  $\tau(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}) \geq r$  one can choose  $H_S \in \mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  with  $\widehat{S} \cap H_S = \emptyset$ . Then replace  $S$  by the  $p$  sequences  $(x_1, \dots, x_\ell, y)$  with  $y \in H_S$ . Eventually we shall obtain  $p^r$  sequences of length  $r$ .

**Claim 3.5.** For each  $H \in \mathcal{H}$ , there is a sequence  $S$  with  $\widehat{S} \subset H$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$  be a sequence of maximal length that occurred at some stage of the branching process satisfying  $\widehat{S} \subset H$ . Let us suppose indirectly that  $\ell < r$ . Since  $H_1 \cap H \neq \emptyset$  at the first stage, there is a sequence  $(x_1)$  with  $x_1 \in H_1$  such that  $\{x_1\} \subset H$ . Thus  $\ell \geq 1$ . Since  $\ell < r$ , at some stage  $S$  was picked and there is some  $H_S \in \mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  with  $\widehat{S} \cap H_S = \emptyset$  being chosen. Since  $H \cap H_S \neq \emptyset$ , there is some  $y \in H \cap H_S$ . Then  $(x_1, \dots, x_\ell, y)$  is a longer sequence satisfying  $\{x_1, \dots, x_\ell, y\} \subset H$ , contradicting the maximality of  $\ell$ .  $\square$

Since there are only  $\binom{|X|-r}{i-r}$  choices for the remaining elements of  $H \in \mathcal{H}^{(i)}$ , the lemma is proven.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  be an intersecting family. Then  $\tau(\mathcal{F}) \geq \delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F})$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $\delta = \delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F})$  and let  $D$  be an arbitrary set with  $|D| = \delta - 1$ . We want to prove that  $D \cap F = \emptyset$  for some  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Argue indirectly pick an  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $0 \neq |D \cap F|$  minimal. Choose  $x \in D \cap F$  and consider  $F \setminus \{x\}$ . Note that  $|D \setminus \{x\}| = \delta - 2$  and there are at least  $\delta - 1$  choices for  $y \neq x$  with  $(F \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\} =: F' \in \mathcal{F}$ . By choosing  $y \notin D$ ,  $|D \cap F'| < |D \cap F|$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  be an intersecting family. Define the *trace*  $\mathcal{F}|_X$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  as the set  $\{F \cap X : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . We say that  $X$  is a *support* of  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $\mathcal{F}|_X$  is intersecting.

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* Let  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  be an intersecting family with  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r$ . Let  $X$  be a support of  $\mathcal{F}$  of minimum size. Let  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}|_X$  and let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{H}$  be the family of minimal (for containment) members of  $\mathcal{H}$ . It is easy to check that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a critical intersecting family and  $\cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B = X$ . Then by Theorem 1.7

$$(3.1) \quad |X| = |\cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B| \leq \binom{2k-1}{k-1} + \binom{2k-4}{k-2} \leq \binom{2k}{k-1}.$$

Let  $p = p(\mathcal{H})$ .

**Claim 3.7.**  $\mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  is intersecting with  $\delta_{p-1}^+(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}) \geq r$ .

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is a support,  $H \cap H' \neq \emptyset$  for  $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}^{(p)}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  is intersecting.

Fix  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $H = F \cap X \in \mathcal{H}^{(p)}$  and let  $R \in \binom{H}{p-1}$ . Since  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r$ , there are  $r$  distinct elements  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r$  such that  $F'_j := ((F \setminus X) \cup R \cup \{x_j\}) \in \mathcal{F}$ . If  $x_j \notin X$  then  $F'_j \cap X = R \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $|R| = p - 1$ , contradicting the minimality of  $p$ . Thus  $x_j \in X$  for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ , proving  $\delta_{p-1}^+(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}) \geq r$ .  $\square$

Note that  $F \cap X$  is a transversal of  $\mathcal{F}$  for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . By Lemma 3.6 we infer that  $p \geq \tau(\mathcal{F}) \geq \delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r$ . If  $p = r$ , then by Claim 3.7 and Proposition 3.1 we infer that  $\mathcal{H}^{(p)} = \binom{Y}{r}$  for some  $Y \in \binom{X}{2r-1}$ . We claim that  $|F \cap Y| \geq r$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Indeed the opposite would mean that  $F \cap H = \emptyset$  for some  $H \in \binom{Y}{r}$ . Choose  $E \in \binom{[n] \setminus X}{k-r}$  such that  $H \cup E \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then  $F \cap (H \cup E) \cap X = F \cap H = \emptyset$ , contradicting the fact that  $X$  is a support. Consequently  $\mathcal{F} \subset \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : |F \cap Y| \geq r\}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}$  is contained in an isomorphic copy of  $\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)$ . Thus we may assume that  $p \geq r + 1$ .

By Claim 3.7 and Lemma 3.6, we have  $\tau(\mathcal{H}^{(p)}) \geq r$ . Then by Lemma 3.4,

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum_{p \leq i \leq k} |\mathcal{H}^{(i)}| \binom{n - |X|}{k - i} \leq \sum_{p \leq i \leq k} p^r \binom{|X| - r}{i - r} \binom{n - |X|}{k - i}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\binom{|X|-r}{i-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-i}}{\binom{|X|-r}{i+1-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-i-1}} = \frac{i+1-r}{|X|-i} \cdot \frac{n-|X|-k+i+1}{k-i}.$$

Since both  $\frac{i+1-r}{|X|-i}$  and  $\frac{n-|X|-k+i+1}{k-i}$  are monotone increasing functions of  $i$ , plugging in  $i = r+1$  we obtain

$$\frac{2}{|X|-r-1} \cdot \frac{n-|X|-k+r+2}{k-r-1} > \frac{2(k-1)(|X|-1)}{(k-3)(|X|-1)} > 2$$

for  $n \geq k \binom{2k}{k-1} > k|X|$ . Thus,

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum_{p \leq i \leq k} |\mathcal{H}^{(i)}| \binom{n-|X|}{k-i} < 2p^r \binom{|X|-r}{p-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-p}.$$

Since  $p \geq r+1 > r$  implies  $\left(\frac{p}{p+1}\right)^r \geq \left(\frac{r}{r+1}\right)^r \geq \frac{1}{e}$ , for  $n \geq (2k+1) \binom{2k}{k-1} > (2k+1)|X|$  we have

$$\frac{p^r \binom{|X|-r}{p-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-p}}{(p+1)^r \binom{|X|-r}{p+1-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-p-1}} \geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \frac{2}{|X|-r-1} \cdot \frac{n-|X|-k+r+2}{k-r-1} \geq \frac{4k(|X|-1)}{ek(|X|-1)} > 1.$$

By  $p \geq r+1$ , it follows that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2p^r \binom{|X|-r}{p-r} \binom{n-|X|}{k-p} < 2(r+1)^r (|X|-r) \binom{n-|X|}{k-r-1}.$$

By the minimality of  $X$ , for any  $x \in X$  there exists  $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{x\}$ .

It follows that  $|X| \geq |H_1 \cup H_2| \geq 2r+1$ . Thus, for  $n \geq 2(r+1)^r k \binom{2k-1}{2r-1}$  we have

$$|\mathcal{F}| < 2(r+1)^r (|X|-r) \binom{n-2r}{k-r-1} \leq \binom{2r-1}{r} \binom{n-2r+1}{k-r} < |\mathcal{L}(n, k, r)|. \quad \square$$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.8

A collection of sets  $F_1, \dots, F_\ell$  is called a *sunflower of size  $\ell$  with kernel  $C$*  if  $F_i \cap F_j = C$  for all distinct  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  is intersecting and  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq 2$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no sunflower of size 3 and kernel of size 1.*

*Proof.* Let  $F_1, F_2, F_3 \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F_i \cap F_j = \{x\}$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ . Consider  $G \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $G \neq F_3$  with  $F_3 \setminus \{x\} \subset G$ . Then  $G \cap F_1 \neq \emptyset$  and  $G \cap F_2 \neq \emptyset$  imply  $|G| \geq k+1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Fact 4.2.** *If  $\delta_{k-1}^+(\mathcal{F}) \geq r$  then  $\delta_{k-2}^+(\mathcal{F}(x)) \geq r$  for any  $x \in [n]$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $E \in \mathcal{F}(x)$  and  $R \in \binom{E}{k-2}$ ,  $R \cup \{x\}$  is covered by at least  $r$  sets in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since all these sets contain  $x$ , it follows that  $\delta_{k-2}^+(\mathcal{F}(x)) \geq r$ .  $\square$

For  $Y \in \binom{[n]}{2r-1}$ , define

$$\mathcal{L}(n, k, Y) = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : |F \cap Y| \geq r \right\}.$$

For  $\mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{2}$ , we use  $\delta(\mathcal{G})$  to denote the minimum degree of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.8.* Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset \binom{[n]}{3}$  be an intersecting family with  $\delta_2^+(\mathcal{T}) \geq 2$ . Let  $X \subset [n]$  be a minimal support and let  $y \in [n] \setminus X$ . By Fact 4.2 we infer that  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  is a graph with minimum degree at least 2.

Since  $X$  is a minimal support, for any  $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad T \cap T' = \{z\} \text{ implies } z \in X.$$

Since  $y \notin X$ , by (4.1) we infer that  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  is intersecting. By Proposition 3.1 we have either  $\mathcal{T}(y) = \emptyset$  or  $\mathcal{T}(y) = \binom{Y}{2}$  for some  $Y$  with  $|Y| = 3$ .

**Claim 4.3.** Let  $z \in [n]$ . If  $\mathcal{T}(z) = \binom{Y}{2}$  for some  $Y$  with  $|Y| = 3$ , then  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{L}(n, 3, Y)$ .

*Proof.* Choose  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . If  $z \in T$  then  $|T \cap Y| = 2$  by definition. If  $z \notin T$  then by  $\nu(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ ,  $T \cap P \neq \emptyset$  for each pair  $P \in \binom{Y}{2}$ . Hence  $|T \cap Y| \geq 2$ .  $\square$

Claim 4.3 shows that  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{L}(n, 3, 2)|$  unless  $\mathcal{T}(y) = \emptyset$  for all  $y \in [n] \setminus X$ . Thus we may assume that  $X = [n]$ . Since  $X$  is a support of minimal size, for each  $x \in [n]$  there exist  $T_x, T'_x \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $T_x \cap T'_x = \{x\}$ . In particular  $\nu(\mathcal{T}(x)) \geq 2$ . By proposition 4.1 equality holds.

**Claim 4.4.**  $\partial\mathcal{T} = \binom{[n]}{2}$  and the vertex set of  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is  $[n] \setminus \{x\}$  for any  $x \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that there exist  $x, y \in [n]$  with  $x \neq y$  such that  $\{x, y\} \notin \partial\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{v_1, v_2\} \in \mathcal{T}(x)$  be a matching. By  $\nu(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{T}(x), \mathcal{T}(y)$  are cross-intersecting. It follows that  $\mathcal{T}(y) \subset \{\{u_i, v_j\} : i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2\}$ . Since  $\delta(\mathcal{T}(x)) \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{T}(y) = \{\{u_i, v_j\} : i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2\}$ . Then by the cross-intersecting property we infer that  $\mathcal{T}(x) = \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{v_1, v_2\}\}$ , contradicting  $\delta(\mathcal{T}(y)) \geq 2$ . Thus  $\partial\mathcal{T} = \binom{[n]}{2}$ . It follows that the vertex set of  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is  $[n] \setminus \{x\}$ .  $\square$

For  $n = 6$  the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem implies  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq \binom{6-1}{3-1} = 10 = 3n - 8$ . If  $|\mathcal{T}| = 10$  then  $|\mathcal{T}| \binom{3}{2} = 2 \binom{6}{2}$ . Hence every 2-subset of  $[6]$  is contained in exactly two edges of  $\mathcal{T}$ . There is a unique 2-design with these properties (cf. e.g. [5]). Summarizing, for  $n = 6$  there are three distinct triple-systems achieving equality. Namely,  $\binom{[5]}{3}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(6, 3, 2)$  and the above 2-design.

From now on assume  $n \geq 7$ .

**Claim 4.5.** For any  $x \in [n]$ ,  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  contains no  $C_{2\ell+1}$  for all  $\ell \geq 2$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\nu(\mathcal{T}(x)) = 2$ ,  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  contains no  $C_\ell$ ,  $\ell \geq 6$ . Also if it contains  $C_5$  then  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  has exactly 5 vertices. Say  $x = 1$ ,  $C_5$  is on  $[2, 6]$ . By  $n \geq 7$  we consider  $\mathcal{T}(7)$ . Now  $\tau(C_5) = 3$  implies the existence of  $(w, z) \in C_5$  with  $\{u, v, 7\} \cap \{1, w, z\} = \emptyset$ , contradicting  $\nu(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Claim 4.6.** For any  $x \in [n]$ ,  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is a  $K_{2, n-3}$ .

*Proof.* First let us show that  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is bipartite. By Claim 4.5 we are left to show that  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is triangle-free. Indeed, otherwise let  $y_1 y_2 y_3$  be a triangle in  $\mathcal{T}(x)$ . By Claim 4.4,  $\{u, v\} \in \partial\mathcal{T}$  for any  $\{u, v\} \in [n] \setminus \{y_1, y_2, y_3, x\}$ . By  $\delta_2^+(\mathcal{T}) \geq 2$ , we can choose  $w \in [n] \setminus \{x\}$  such that  $\{u, v, w\} \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then one of  $\{x, y_1, y_2\}, \{x, y_2, y_3\}, \{x, y_1, y_3\}$  is disjoint to  $\{u, v, w\}$ , contradicting  $\nu(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ . Thus  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  is bipartite.

By König-Hall Theorem all the edges of  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  are covered by two vertices, say  $\{y, z\}$ . Should they be in different partite sets, we get a contradiction with  $\delta(\mathcal{T}(x)) \geq 2$ . Thus  $\{y, z\}$  is one of the partite classes. Using  $\delta(\mathcal{T}(x)) \geq 2$  again, the bipartite graph  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  must be  $K_{2, n-3}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{T}(x) = \{\{u_i, v_j\} : i = 1, 2, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-3\}$ . Then  $\{x, u_1\}, \{x, u_2\} \in \mathcal{T}(v_1)$ . Since  $\delta_2^+(\mathcal{T}) \geq 2$ , there is some  $\{v_1, u_1, z\} \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $z \neq x$ . Since  $\{v_1, u_1, z\} \cap \{x, u_2, v_j\} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $j = 2, 3, \dots, n-3$ , we must have  $z = u_2$ . Thus  $\{\{x, u_1\}, \{x, u_2\}, \{u_1, u_2\}\} \subset \mathcal{T}(v_1)$ , contradicting Claim 4.6. Thus the theorem is proven.  $\square$

**Acknowledgement:** The first author's research was partially supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office NKFIH, grant K132696.

## References

- [1] J. Balogh, N. Lemons, and C. Palmer, Maximum size intersecting families of bounded minimum positive co-degree, *Siam J. Discrete Math.* 35 (3) (2021), 1525–1535.
- [2] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* 12 (1961), 313–320.
- [3] P. Frankl, Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem with conditions on the maximal degree, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 46 (2) (1987), 252–263.
- [4] P. Frankl, J. Wang, Intersecting families without unique shadow, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 33 (2024), 91–109.
- [5] Z. Füredi, An intersection problem with 6 extremes, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 42(3) (1983), 177–187.
- [6] A.J.W. Hilton, E.C. Milner, Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Q. J. Math.* 18 (1967), 369–384.
- [7] G.O.H. Katona, Solution of a problem of Ehrenfeucht and Mycielski, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 17 (1974), 265–266.
- [8] Z. Tuza, Critical hypergraphs and intersecting set-pair systems, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B* 39 (1985), 134–145.