

Extremal t -intersecting families for direct products

Tian Yao Benjian Lv Kaishun Wang*

Sch. Math. Sci. & Lab. Math. Com. Sys., Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

Abstract

In this paper, by shifting technique we study t -intersecting families for direct products where the ground set is divided into several parts. Assuming the size of each part is sufficiently large, we determine all extremal t -intersecting families for direct products. We also prove that every largest t -intersecting subfamily of a more general family introduced by Katona is trivial under certain conditions.

AMS classification: 05D05.

Key words: Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem; direct products; t -intersecting families; cross t -intersecting families; shifting technique.

1 Introduction

Let n and k be two integers with $0 \leq k \leq n$. For an n -element set X , denote the set of all subsets and the collection of all k -subsets of X by 2^X and $\binom{X}{k}$, respectively. Given a positive integer t , we say a family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^X$ is t -intersecting if $|A \cap B| \geq t$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$. A t -intersecting family is called *trivial* if every element of this family contains a fixed t -subset of X . When $t = 1$, we usually omit t . The famous Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem [7] states that if $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{X}{k}$ is t -intersecting and $n > n_0(k, t)$, then

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

and the equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{F} = \{F \in \binom{X}{k} : T \subset F\}$ for some $T \in \binom{X}{t}$.

It is well-known that the smallest value of $n_0(k, t)$ is $(t+1)(k-t+1)$, which was proved by Frankl [8] for $t \geq 15$, and confirmed by Wilson [20] for all t via the eigenvalue method. In [8], Frankl also put forward a conjecture about the

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: yaotian@mail.bnu.edu.cn(T. Yao),
bjlv@bnu.edu.cn(B. Lv), wangks@bnu.edu.cn(K. Wang)

maximum size of a t -intersecting subfamily of $\binom{X}{k}$ for $n > 2k - t$. This conjecture was proved by Ahlswede and Khachatryan [2].

The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem has been extended to different mathematical objects, such as vector spaces [11, 18], attenuated spaces [12], permutation groups [6], 2-transitive groups [13], labeled sets [3] and partition sets [16].

In [9], Frankl studied intersecting families for direct products. For convenience, set $X = [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ in the following. Let p, n_1, \dots, n_p be positive integers such that $n = n_1 + \dots + n_p$. Then X can be partitioned into p parts X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p where

$$X_1 = [n_1], \quad X_i = \left[\sum_{j \leq i} n_j \right] \setminus \left[\sum_{j \leq i-1} n_j \right], \quad i = 2, \dots, p.$$

For positive integers $k_i \in [n_i]$ with $k = k_1 + \dots + k_p$, write

$$\mathcal{H}_1 := \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{k_1, \dots, k_p} = \left\{ F \in \binom{X}{k} : |F \cap X_i| = k_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, p \right\}.$$

Observe that $|\mathcal{H}_1| = \prod_{j \in [p]} \binom{n_j}{k_j}$. For each $x \in X_l$, the size of $\{A \in \mathcal{H}_1 : x \in A\}$ is $k_l |\mathcal{H}_1| / n_l$. Frankl gave the maximum size of an intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_1 by the eigenvalue method.

Theorem 1.1. ([9]) Suppose $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ is an intersecting family and $n_i \geq 2k_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Then

$$\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{|\mathcal{H}_1|} \leq \max_{i \in [p]} \frac{k_i}{n_i}.$$

Recently, Kwan et al. [17] determined the maximum size of a non-trivially intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_1 when n_1, \dots, n_p are sufficiently large and so disproved a conjecture of Alon and Katona, which was also mentioned in [14]. The maximum sum of sizes of cross intersecting subfamilies of \mathcal{H}_1 was determined by Kong et al. [15]. Ahlswede et al. [1] completely determined the maximum size of a (t_1, \dots, t_p) -intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_1 , in which any two sets intersect in at least t_i elements of X_i for some $i \in [p]$.

In this paper, we study t -intersecting subfamilies of \mathcal{H}_1 . One of our main results is the following.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ is a t -intersecting family. If $n_i > 2(t+1)pk_i^2$ for any $i \in [p]$, then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \max_{\substack{t_1 + \dots + t_p = t \\ t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathbb{N}}} \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - t_i}{k_i - t_i}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if

$$\mathcal{F} = \{F \in \mathcal{H}_1 : T \subset F\},$$

where $T \in \binom{X}{t}$ such that

$$\frac{k_i - |T \cap X_i|}{n_i - |T \cap X_i|} \leq \frac{k_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1}{n_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1} \quad (1)$$

for any $i \in [p]$ whenever $|T \cap X_j| \geq 1$.

We remark here that t -intersecting subfamilies of \mathcal{H}_1 with maximum size may not be trivial when n_1, \dots, n_p are small. Under the condition that $p = t = 2$, $n_1 = 8$, $n_2 = 10$ and $k_1 = k_2 = 4$, it is routine to check that the 2-intersecting family $\{A \in \mathcal{H}_1 : |A \cap [4]| \geq 3\}$ has a larger size than the largest trivially 2-intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_1 .

In [14], Katona extended \mathcal{H}_1 to a more general case. For a non-empty finite set $\mathcal{R} \subset \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}^+ \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}^+}_p$, write

$$\mathcal{H}_2 := \bigcup_{(r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}} \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p}.$$

For convenience, let b and c denote the maximum and minimum of numbers appearing in some elements of \mathcal{R} , respectively. By the cyclic method, Katona proved the following result.

Theorem 1.3. ([14]) Suppose $p = 2$ and $n_1, n_2 \geq 9b^2$. If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ is intersecting, then $|\mathcal{F}|$ cannot exceed the size of the largest trivially intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_2 .

Our another main result extends Katona's result.

Theorem 1.4. Suppose $t \leq c$. If $n_i > 2(t+1)pb^{t+2}$ for any $i \in [p]$, then every largest t -intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_2 is trivial.

Write

$$\mathcal{H}_3 := \left\{ F \in \binom{X}{k} : |F \cap X_i| \geq a_i, i = 1, \dots, p \right\},$$

where a_1, \dots, a_p are integers with $a_1 + \dots + a_p \leq k$ and $0 \leq a_i < n_i$. In [10], Frankl et al. put forward the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.5. ([10]) If $n_i \geq 2a_i$ for all i and $n_i > k - \sum_{j=1}^p a_j + a_i$ for all but at most one $i \in [p]$ such that $a_i > 0$, then the largest intersecting subfamily of \mathcal{H}_3 is trivial.

As a corollary of Theorem 1.4, Conjecture 1.5 is true when a_1, \dots, a_p are positive and each X_i has a size larger than $4p(k - \sum_{i=1}^p a_i + \max_{i \in [p]} a_i)^3$.

In Section 2, we will focus on the shifting technique and prove some useful results for direct products. In Section 3, we will give the proof of our main results.

2 Shifting technique for direct products

In this section, we investigate the shifting technique and prove some useful results for direct products.

For any $i, j \in X$ and $F \subset X$, define

$$\delta_{i,j}(F) = \begin{cases} (F \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}, & j \in F, i \notin F; \\ F, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\Delta_{i,j}$ be the operation on a family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^X$ defined by

$$\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\delta_{i,j}(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{F \in \mathcal{F} : \delta_{i,j}(F) \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

We have $|\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F})| = |\mathcal{F}|$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^X$ is called *shifted* if $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ holds for any $i, j \in X$ with $i < j$. By applying such operations repeatedly to a subfamily of 2^X we can get a shifted family.

We say two non-empty subfamilies \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} of 2^X are *cross t -intersecting* if $|A \cap B| \geq t$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. The following lemma states that the shifting operation keeps such intersection property.

Lemma 2.1. ([4, Lemma 2.1]) Let \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{B} \subset 2^X$ be cross t -intersecting families.

- (i) For any $i, j \in X$, $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{B})$ are still cross t -intersecting.
- (ii) If $t \leq r \leq s \leq n$, $\mathcal{A} \subset \binom{X}{r}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \binom{X}{s}$, and \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are shifted, then $|A \cap B \cap [r + s - t]| \geq t$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

For $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$, if $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ holds for any $i, j \in X_l$ with $i < j$, we say \mathcal{F} is *l -shifted*. Similar to the single-part case, one gains an l -shifted family by doing the shifting operation repeatedly on \mathcal{F} . Notice that Lemma 2.1(i) still holds for $\mathcal{A} \subset \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{s_1, \dots, s_p}$.

For $l \in [p]$ and a positive integer $s \leq n_l$, denote the collection of the first s elements of X_l by $Q_l(s)$. The next lemma is an extension of Lemma 2.1(ii).

Lemma 2.2. Suppose $n_i > r_i + s_i - 1$ for any $i \in [p]$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{s_1, \dots, s_p}$ be cross t -intersecting families. If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are l -shifted for any $l \in [p]$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^p |A \cap B \cap Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1)| \geq t$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. For each $i \in [p]$, write

$$D_i := Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1) \setminus (A \cup B), \quad E_i := (A \cap B \cap X_i) \setminus Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1).$$

Note that

$$r_i + s_i = |A \cap X_i| + |B \cap X_i| \geq 2|E_i| + |(A \cup B) \cap Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1)|, \quad (2)$$

$$|D_i| = r_i + s_i - 1 - |(A \cup B) \cap Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1)|. \quad (3)$$

If $|E_i| \neq \emptyset$, then $|D_i| \geq |E_i|$ from (2) and (3).

Let G_i be an $|E_i|$ -subset of D_i . Write

$$C := \left(B \setminus \bigcup_{i \in [p]} E_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [p]} G_i \right).$$

Observe that, for each $i \in [p]$,

$$C \cap A \cap X_i = ((B \setminus E_i) \cup G_i) \cap A \cap X_i = A \cap B \cap Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1).$$

When $E_i \neq \emptyset$, notice that $\max G_i < \min E_i$ and $|E_i| = |G_i|$. Thus C can be obtained by doing a series of shifting operations on B . Since \mathcal{B} is l -shifted for any $l \in [p]$, we have $C \in \mathcal{B}$. So $|A \cap C| \geq t$. Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^p |A \cap B \cap Q_i(r_i + s_i - 1)| = \sum_{i=1}^p |A \cap C \cap X_i| = |A \cap C| \geq t,$$

as desired. \square

Given positive integers g, h with $g \geq 2h$, it is well-known that the *Kneser graph* $KG(g, h)$ is the graph on the vertex set $\binom{[g]}{h}$, with an edge between two vertices if and only if they are disjoint. To characterize extremal structures in Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, we need a property of Kneser graphs which is derived from Theorem 1 in [5].

Lemma 2.3. *For Kneser graphs $KG(g_1, h_1), \dots, KG(g_w, h_w)$ with $g_i > 2h_i$ for any $i \in [w]$, their direct product $\prod_{i \in [w]} KG(g_i, h_i)$ is connected.*

For $\mathcal{H} \subset 2^X$, we say $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}$ is a *full t -star* in \mathcal{H} if \mathcal{F} is the collection of all sets in \mathcal{H} containing a fixed t -subset of X . For each $i \in [p]$, let b_i be the maximum number appearing in the i -th coordinate of some elements of \mathcal{B} .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ be a t -intersecting family. Suppose $n_m > 2(t+1)b_m$ for any $m \in [p]$. For $l \in [p]$ and $i, j \in X_l$, if $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F})$ is a full t -star in \mathcal{H}_2 , then \mathcal{F} is also a full t -star in \mathcal{H}_2 .*

Proof. For $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}$ denote $\mathcal{F} \cap \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p}$ in the rest of the paper. Write

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l) := \{F \setminus X_l : F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}\}.$$

For each $R \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)$, let

$$\mathcal{G}_R := \left\{ R' \in \binom{X_l}{r_l} : R \cup R' \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}} \right\}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}} = \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)} \{R \cup R' : R' \in \mathcal{G}_R\}, \quad \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}) = \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)} \{R \cup R'' : R'' \in \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{G}_R)\}. \quad (4)$$

By assumption, there exists $T_0 \in \binom{X}{t}$ such that $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) = \{F \in \mathcal{H}_2 : T_0 \subset F\}$, which implies that

$$\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}) = \left\{ F \in \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p} : T_0 \subset F \right\}. \quad (5)$$

We have $|\mathcal{G}_R| = |\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{G}_R)| = \binom{n_l - t_l}{r_l - t_l}$, where $t_l := |T_0 \cap X_l|$.

If $T_0 \cap X_l = \emptyset$, we get $\mathcal{G}_R = \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{G}_R)$ from $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{G}_R) = \binom{X_l}{r_l}$. By (4), $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}} = \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}})$. Hence $\mathcal{F} = \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F})$, as desired.

Now suppose $T_0 \cap X_l \neq \emptyset$. By (5), we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l) = \{G \subset X \setminus X_l : T_0 \setminus X_l \subset G, |G \cap X_m| = r_m, m \in [p] \setminus \{l\}\}.$$

Note that $n_m > 2(t+1)r_m$ for any $m \in [p]$. Then given $R_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)$, there exists $S_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)$ such that $R_0 \cap S_0 = T_0 \setminus X_l$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}$ is t -intersecting, \mathcal{G}_{R_0} and \mathcal{G}_{S_0} are cross t_l -intersecting families with $|\mathcal{G}_{R_0}| |\mathcal{G}_{S_0}| = \binom{n_l - t_l}{r_l - t_l}^2$. By Theorem 1 in [19], we get

$$\mathcal{G}_{R_0} = \mathcal{G}_{S_0} = \left\{ G \in \binom{X_l}{r_l} : T'_l \subset G \right\}$$

for some $T'_l \in \binom{X_l}{t_l}$. Next we prove $\mathcal{G}_S = \mathcal{G}_{R_0}$ for any $S \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l) \setminus \{R_0\}$.

For each $S \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)$, we have $|(S \setminus T_0) \cap X_m| = r_m - t_m$, $m \in [p] \setminus \{l\}$. Thus the set $\{R \setminus T_0 : R \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)\}$ can be seen as the vertex set of the graph $\prod_{m \in [p] \setminus \{l\}} KG(n_m - t_m, r_m - t_m)$. Notice that $n_m - t_m > 2(r_m - t_m)$. Suppose $S \neq R_0$. By Lemma 2.3, this graph contains a walk

$$R_0 \setminus T_0, A_1, \dots, A_z = S \setminus T_0.$$

Let $B_0 = R_0$, $B_1 = A_1 \cup (T_0 \setminus X_l)$, \dots , $B_z = S \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}(l)$. Then $B_q \cap B_{q+1} = T_0 \setminus X_l$ for $q = 0, 1, \dots, z-1$. Consequently $\mathcal{G}_{R_0} = \mathcal{G}_{B_1} = \dots = \mathcal{G}_S$.

For any $R \in \mathcal{F}_r(l)$, \mathcal{G}_R is the collection of all r_l -subsets of X_l containing T'_l . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_r &= \left\{ R \cup R' : R \in \mathcal{F}_r(l), T'_l \subset R' \in \binom{X_l}{r_l} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ F \in \binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{r_1, \dots, r_p} : T_1 \subset F \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $T_1 := (T_0 \setminus X_l) \cup T'_l$.

For $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_p) \in \mathcal{R}$, by (6), there exists $T_2 \in \binom{X}{t}$ such that \mathcal{F}_s is the collection of all sets in $\binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{s_1, \dots, s_p}$ containing T_2 . Since $n_m > 2(t+1)b_m$ for any $m \in [p]$, there are $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_r$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_s$ such that $(F_1 \setminus T_1) \cap (F_2 \setminus T_2) = \emptyset$. Then $t \leq |F_1 \cap F_2| = |T_1 \cap T_2| \leq t$, which implies that $T_1 = T_2$. Thus for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{R}$, \mathcal{F}_s is the collection of all sets in $\binom{X_1, \dots, X_p}{s_1, \dots, s_p}$ containing T_1 , which implies that the desired result follows. \square

3 Proof of main results

In this section, we shall prove our main results.

Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ be a t -intersecting family. If $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$, there is nothing to prove. So suppose that $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$. Besides, according to Lemma 2.4, we may assume that \mathcal{F} is l -shifted for any $l \in [p]$.

Recall that $b_i = \max_{(r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}} r_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Write

$$K := \bigcup_{i=1}^p Q_i(2b_i - 1), \quad \alpha(\mathcal{F}) := \min_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |F \cap K|.$$

We have $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \geq t$. Indeed, since two non-empty subfamilies \mathcal{F}_r and \mathcal{F}_s are cross t -intersecting and l -shifted for any $l \in [p]$, by Lemma 2.2 we get

$$|F \cap K| \geq \sum_{i=1}^p |F \cap G \cap Q_i(2b_i - 1)| \geq t, \quad (7)$$

where $F \in \mathcal{F}_r$ and $G \in \mathcal{F}_s$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ is a t -intersecting family. If $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) = t$ and \mathcal{F} is l -shifted for any $l \in [p]$, then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \max_{\substack{t_1 + \dots + t_p = t \\ t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathbb{N}}} \sum_{(r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}} \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - t_i}{r_i - t_i}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, when the equality holds, \mathcal{F} is a full t -star in \mathcal{H}_2 .

Proof. By assumption, there exists $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $|F_0 \cap K| = t$. By (7), for any $G \in \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$F_0 \cap K = \bigcup_{i \in [p]} (F_0 \cap G \cap Q_i(2b_i - 1)) \subset G. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, for any $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}| \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - |F_0 \cap Q_i(2b_i - 1)|}{r_i - |F_0 \cap Q_i(2b_i - 1)|}.$$

Then (8) follows from $|\mathcal{F}| = \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}} |\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}|$.

By (9), \mathcal{F} is a collection of some sets in \mathcal{H}_2 containing $F_0 \cap K$. So when the equality in (8) holds, \mathcal{F} is a full t -star in \mathcal{H}_2 . \square

For positive integers $t, p, n_1, \dots, n_p, k_1, \dots, k_p$ with $n_i > k_i$ and $k_1 + \dots + k_p \geq t$, write

$$g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p) = \max_{\substack{t_1 + \dots + t_p = t \\ t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathbb{N}}} \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - t_i}{k_i - t_i}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Notice that \mathcal{H}_1 is a special case of \mathcal{H}_2 . In view of Lemma 3.1, we show that

$$|\mathcal{F}| < g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p)$$

when $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \geq t + 1$. For convenience, if there is no confusion, we replace $\alpha(\mathcal{F})$ with α in the following.

By assumption, there exists $A_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $|A_0 \cap K| = \alpha$. Then for $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $|F \cap K| \geq \alpha$ and $|F \cap K \cap A_0| \geq t$ by (7). Thus

$$\mathcal{F} \subset \bigcup_{J \in \binom{K}{\alpha}, |J \cap A_0| \geq t} \{F \in \mathcal{H}_1 : J \subset F\}. \quad (10)$$

Let N be the collection of all non-negative integer solutions of the equation $x_1 + \dots + x_p = \alpha - t$. For each $H \in \binom{K \cap A_0}{t}$ and $\beta = (c_1, \dots, c_p) \in N$, let $\mathcal{J}(H, \beta)$ be the set of all $J \in \binom{K}{\alpha}$ with $H \subset J$ and $|(J \setminus H) \cap X_i| = c_i$. Denote the number of $F \in \mathcal{H}_1$ containing at least one element of $\mathcal{J}(H, \beta)$ by $f(H, \beta)$. For each $J \in \binom{K}{\alpha}$ satisfying $|J \cap A_0| \geq t$, observe that J is an element of some $\mathcal{J}(H, \beta)$. Then by (10), we have

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \sum_{H \in \binom{K \cap A_0}{t}} \sum_{\beta \in N} f(H, \beta).$$

Observe that

$$|\mathcal{J}(H, \beta)| \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{2k_i - 1}{c_i} \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} (2k_i)^{c_i}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{f(H, \beta)}{g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p)} \leq \frac{\left(\prod_{i \in [p]} (2k_i)^{c_i} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - |H \cap X_i| - c_i}{k_i - |H \cap X_i| - c_i} \right)}{\prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - |H \cap X_i|}{k_i - |H \cap X_i|}} \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2k_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{z_i},$$

where $(z_1, \dots, z_p) \in N$ such that

$$\prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2k_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{z_i} = \max_{(c_1, \dots, c_p) \in N} \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2k_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{c_i}.$$

Note that $|N| = \binom{\alpha - t + p - 1}{p - 1}$ and

$$\binom{x}{y} = \prod_{i=y+1}^x \left(1 + \frac{y}{i-y} \right) \leq (y+1)^{x-y}$$

for any positive integers x, y with $x \geq y + 1$. By above discussion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p)} &\leq \binom{\alpha}{t} \binom{\alpha - t + p - 1}{p - 1} \cdot \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2k_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{z_i} \\ &\leq ((t+1)p)^{\alpha-t} \cdot \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2k_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{z_i} \\ &= \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2(t+1)pk_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{z_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n_i > 2(t+1)pk_i^2$ for any $i \in [p]$, we have $|\mathcal{F}| < g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p)$, as desired.

For each $S \in \binom{X}{t}$, write

$$\mathcal{P}(S) := \{(i, j(i)) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \in [p], 0 \leq j(i) < |S \cap X_i|\}.$$

Observe that

$$e(S) := \frac{\prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - |S \cap X_i|}{k_i - |S \cap X_i|}}{\prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i}{k_i}} = \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{P}(S)} \frac{k_i - j}{n_i - j}. \quad (11)$$

Let T be a t -subset of X . To finish the proof, it is sufficient to show that $e(T) = \max_{S \in \binom{X}{t}} e(S)$ if and only if (1) holds for any $i \in [p]$ whenever $|T \cap X_j| \geq 1$.

Suppose that (1) holds for any $i \in [p]$ whenever $|X \cap T_j| \geq 1$. For each $S \in \binom{X}{t} \setminus \{T\}$, from

$$\frac{k_i}{n_i} > \frac{k_i - 1}{n_i - 1} > \cdots > \frac{1}{n_i - k_i + 1},$$

we get

$$\min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{P}(T) \setminus \mathcal{P}(S)} \frac{k_i - j}{n_i - j} \geq \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{P}(S) \setminus \mathcal{P}(T)} \frac{k_i - j}{n_i - j}. \quad (12)$$

By (11) and (12), we have $e(T)/e(S) \geq 1$. On the other hand, suppose $e(T) = \max_{S \in \binom{X}{t}} e(S)$. For each i, j with $|T \cap X_j| \geq 1$, let $T' := (T \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\} \in \binom{X}{t}$, where $u \in T \cap X_j$ and $v \in X_i \setminus T$. By (11), we have

$$\frac{k_i - |T \cap X_i|}{n_i - |T \cap X_i|} = \frac{e(T')}{e(T)} \cdot \frac{k_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1}{n_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1} \leq \frac{k_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1}{n_j - |T \cap X_j| + 1}.$$

Hence the desired result holds. \square

It is not intuitive to find $T \in \binom{X}{t}$ such that the size of $\{F \in \mathcal{H}_1 : T \subset F\}$ is $g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; k_1, \dots, k_p)$. Thus we extract an algorithm about how to find all $|T \cap X_i|$ from the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Algorithm 1

- 1: **Input** $t, p, k_1, \dots, k_p, n_1, \dots, n_p$
- 2: Let A be the collection of $\frac{k_i - j}{n_i - j}$ for all i, j with $i \in [p], j = 0, \dots, k_i - 1$
- 3: Sort A in decreasing order a_1, a_2, \dots
- 4: Let $A(f)$ be the collection of (i, j) satisfying $\frac{k_i - j}{n_i - j} = f$ for $f \in A$
- 5: Put $i \leftarrow 1, c \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow 0, G \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 6: **while** $k < t$ **do**
- 7: $k \leftarrow k + |A(a_i)|$
- 8: **if** $k \leq t$ **then**
- 9: $G \leftarrow G \cup A(a_i)$
- 10: **else**
- 11: $c \leftarrow |A(a_i)| - k + t$
- 12: $H \leftarrow \binom{A(a_i)}{c}$
- 13: **end if**
- 14: $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 15: **end while**

```

16: if  $c = 0$  then
17:   for  $t_m$  do
18:      $t_m \leftarrow |\{(m, j) : (m, j) \in G\}|$ 
19:   end for
20:   Output     $t_1, \dots, t_p$ 
21: else
22:   for  $L \in H$  do
23:      $J \leftarrow G \cup L$ 
24:     for  $t_m$  do
25:        $t_m \leftarrow |\{(m, j) : (m, j) \in J\}|$ 
26:     end for
27:     Output     $t_1, \dots, t_p$ 
28:   end for
29: end if

```

Proof of Theorem 1.4. In consideration of Lemma 3.1, it is sufficient to show that

$$|\mathcal{F}| < \max_{\substack{t_1 + \dots + t_p = t \\ t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathbb{N}}} \sum_{(r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}} \prod_{i \in [p]} \binom{n_i - t_i}{r_i - t_i}$$

when $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \geq t + 1$. W.o.l.g., suppose that $n_1 = \min_{i \in [p]} n_i$.

We may assume that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}} \neq \emptyset$ for some $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_p) \in \mathcal{R}$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Observe that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}$ is t -intersecting and $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}) \geq \alpha(\mathcal{F}) \geq t + 1$. From the proof of Theorem 1.2, we get

$$\frac{|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}|}{g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; r_1, \dots, r_p)} \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2(t+1)pr_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{w_i} \leq \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2(t+1)pb_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{q_i}, \quad (13)$$

where $w_1 + \dots + w_p = \alpha(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}) - t$ and $q_1 + \dots + q_p = \alpha(\mathcal{F}) - t$. Notice that there exist non-negative integers d_1, \dots, d_p with $d_1 + \dots + d_p = t$ such that

$$\frac{g_{t,p}(n_1, \dots, n_p; r_1, \dots, r_p)}{\binom{n_1-t}{r_1-t} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^p \binom{n_i}{r_i}} = \left(\prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{d_i-1} \frac{r_i - j}{n_i - j} \right) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{n_1 - j}{r_1 - j} \right) \leq b^t. \quad (14)$$

Combining (13) and (14), we derive

$$\frac{|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{r}}|}{\binom{n_1-t}{r_1-t} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^p \binom{n_i}{r_i}} \leq b^t \cdot \prod_{i \in [p]} \left(\frac{2(t+1)pb_i^2}{n_i} \right)^{q_i} \leq \left(\frac{2(t+1)pb^{t+2}}{n_1} \right)^{\alpha-t} < 1$$

from $n_1 > 2(t+1)pb^{t+2}$. Therefore, $|\mathcal{F}|$ is smaller than the number of sets in \mathcal{H}_2 containing $[t]$, which implies that the desired result follows. \square

Acknowledgement

This research is supported by NSFC (11671043) and NSF of Hebei Province (A2019205092).

References

- [1] R. Ahlswede, H. Aydinian and L.H. Khachatrian, The intersection theorem for direct products, *European J. Combin.* 19 (6) (1998) 649–661.
- [2] R. Ahlswede and L.H. Khachatrian, The complete intersection theorem for systems of finite sets, *European J. Combin.* 18 (1997) 125–136.
- [3] P. Borg, Intersecting and cross intersecting families of labeled sets, *Electron. J. Combin.* 15 (2008) #N9.
- [4] P. Borg, The maximum product of sizes of cross t -intersecting uniform families, *Australas. J. Combin.* 60 (1) (2014) 69–78.
- [5] B. Brešar and S. Špacapan, On the connectivity of the direct product of graphs, *Australas. J. Combin.* 41 (2008) 45–56.
- [6] D. Ellis, E. Friedgut and H. Pilpel, Intersecting families of permutations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 24 (2011) 649–682.
- [7] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 2* (12) (1961) 313–320.
- [8] P. Frankl, The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem is true for $n = ckt$, in: *Combinatorics, vol. I, Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976*, in: *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, vol. 18, North-Holland, 1978, pp. 365–375.
- [9] P. Frankl, An Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for direct products, *European J. Combin.* 17(8) (1996) 727–730.
- [10] P. Frankl, J. Han, H. Huang and Y. Zhao, A degree version of the Hilton-Milner theorem, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 155 (2018) 493–502.
- [11] W.N. Hsieh, Intersection theorems for systems of finite vector spaces, *Discrete Math.* 12(1) (1975) 1–16.
- [12] T. Huang, An analogue of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for the distance-regular graphs of bilinear forms, *Discrete Math.* 64 (1987) 191–198.

- [13] M. Karen, S. Pablo and T. Pham Huu, An Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for finite 2-transitive groups, *European J. Combin.* 55 (2016) 100–118.
- [14] G.O.H. Katona, A general 2-part Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *Opuscula Math.* 37 (4) (2017) 577–588.
- [15] X. Kong, Y. Xi and G. Ge, Multi-part cross intersecting families, arXiv:1809.08756v1.
- [16] C.Y. Ku and D. Renshaw, Erdős-Ko-Rado theorems for permutations and set partitions, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 115 (2008) 1008–1020.
- [17] M. Kwan, B. Sudakov and P. Vieira, Non-trivially intersecting multi-part families, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 156 (2018) 44–60.
- [18] H. Tanaka, Classification of subsets with minimal width and dual width in Grassmann, bilinear forms and dual polar graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 113(5) (2006) 903–910.
- [19] N. Tokushige, The eigenvalue method for cross t -intersecting families, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 38 (2013) 653–662.
- [20] R.M. Wilson, The exact bound in the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, *Combinatorica* 4 (1984) 247–257.