

Kruskal-Katona's function and a variation of cross-intersecting antichains

W.H.W. Wong*, E.G. Tay

National Institute of Education
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Abstract

We prove some properties of the Kruskal-Katona function, and apply to the following variation of cross-intersecting antichains. Let $n \geq 4$ be an even integer and \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two cross-intersecting antichains of \mathbb{N}_n with at most k disjoint pairs, i.e. for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ only if $i = j \leq k$. We prove a best possible upper bound on $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$. Furthermore, we show that the extremal families contain only $\frac{n}{2}$ and $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{N}_n := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $2^{\mathbb{N}_n}$ denote its power set for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For any integer k , $0 \leq k \leq n$, $\binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$ denotes the collection of all k -sets of \mathbb{N}_n . For any family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}_n}$, $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}$ denotes the collection of k -sets in \mathcal{A} , i.e. $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} = \mathcal{A} \cap \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$. \mathcal{A} is said to be *intersecting* if $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$. Two families $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}_n}$ are said to be *cross t -intersecting* if $|A \cap B| \geq t$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. If $t = 1$, we simply say that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are cross-intersecting.

A notion closely related to the intersection of sets is the containment of sets. Two subsets X and Y of \mathbb{N}_n are said to be *independent* if $X \not\subseteq Y$ and $Y \not\subseteq X$. If X and Y are independent, we may say that X is independent of Y . An *antichain* or *Sperner family* \mathcal{A} of \mathbb{N}_n is a collection of pairwise independent subsets of \mathbb{N}_n , i.e. for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, $X \not\subseteq Y$.

The Erdős-Ko-Rado's Theorem is central to the study of intersecting family of sets. It was later extended by Hilton and Milner to cross-intersecting families of sets.

Theorem 1.1 (Erdős, Ko and Rado [4]) *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$ be an intersecting family for some integer $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Then, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}$.*

Theorem 1.2 (Hilton and Milner [7]) *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$ be nonempty cross-intersecting families for some integer $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Then, $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} + 1$.*

The above results saw extensions in various forms; Milner obtained what has now become a well-known analogue for an intersecting antichain. Frankl and Wong [6] and Ou [17] independently obtained analogues on cross t -intersecting antichains.

Theorem 1.3 (Milner [15]) *Let $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and \mathcal{A} be an intersecting antichain of \mathbb{N}_n , where $|X \cap Y| \geq k$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n+k+1}{2} \rfloor}$.*

*Corresponding author. Email: williewong088@gmail.com.

Theorem 1.4 (Frankl and Wong [6], Ou [17]) Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two cross t -intersecting antichains of \mathbb{N}_n . Then,

$$|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq \max_{t \leq i \leq \frac{n+t}{2}} \left\{ \binom{n}{i} + \binom{n}{n+t-i} \right\}.$$

with equality if and only if $\{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\} = \left\{ \binom{X}{i^*}, \binom{X}{n+t-i^*} \right\}$ for some integer $t \leq i^* \leq \frac{n+t}{2}$.

In this paper, we consider antichains of \mathbb{N}_n , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , with at most k disjoint pairs. Before introducing our results formally, we need to mention some classical results.

Theorem 1.5 (Sperner [18]) For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if \mathcal{A} is an antichain of \mathbb{N}_n , then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if all members in \mathcal{A} have the same size, $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ or $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

For a family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$, the *shadow* and *shade* of \mathcal{A} are defined as

$$\Delta\mathcal{A} := \{X \subseteq \mathbb{N}_n \mid |X| = k-1, X \subset Y \text{ for some } Y \in \mathcal{A}\}, \text{ if } k > 0, \text{ and}$$

$$\nabla\mathcal{A} := \{X \subseteq \mathbb{N}_n \mid |X| = k+1, Y \subset X \text{ for some } Y \in \mathcal{A}\}, \text{ if } k < n$$

respectively.

We recall the following elementary inequalities due to Sperner,

Lemma 1.6 [18] Let \mathcal{A} be a collection of k -sets of \mathbb{N}_n . Then,

$$|\nabla\mathcal{A}|/|\mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{n-k}{k+1}, \text{ if } k < n, \text{ and} \tag{1.1}$$

$$|\Delta\mathcal{A}|/|\mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{k}{n-k+1}, \text{ if } k > 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{A} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$.

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_n$. Define the top and bottom sizes $t(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $b(\mathcal{F}) = \min\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Following Sperner, let us define two new families obtained from \mathcal{A} .

$$\mathcal{F}_\circ = \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}^{(t(\mathcal{F}))} \cup \Delta(\mathcal{F}^{(t(\mathcal{F}))}),$$

$$\mathcal{F}^\circ = \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}^{(b(\mathcal{F}))} \cup \nabla(\mathcal{F}^{(b(\mathcal{F}))}).$$

The next lemma is well-known.

Lemma 1.7 If \mathcal{F} is a nonempty antichain ($\mathcal{F} \neq \{\emptyset\}$ or \mathbb{N}_n), then both \mathcal{F}_\circ and \mathcal{F}° are antichains and $t(\mathcal{F}_\circ) = t(\mathcal{F}) - 1$, $b(\mathcal{F}^\circ) = b(\mathcal{F}) + 1$.

The above bounds for the shadow $\Delta\mathcal{A}$ and shade $\nabla\mathcal{A}$ are not tight except for $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{A} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$. A tight lower bound is given by the celebrated Kruskal-Katona's Theorem (KKT). KKT is closely related to the *squashed order* of the k -sets. The squash relations \leq_s and $<_s$ are defined as follows. For $A, B \in \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{k}$, $A \leq_s B$ if the largest element of the symmetric difference $A + B := (A - B) \cup (B - A)$ is in B . Furthermore, denote $A <_s B$ if $A \leq_s B$ and $A \neq B$. For e.g., the 3-subsets of \mathbb{N}_5 in squashed order are:

123 $<_s$ **124** $<_s$ **134** $<_s$ **234** $<_s$ **125** $<_s$ **135** $<_s$ **235** $<_s$ **145** $<_s$ **245** $<_s$ **345**. Here, we omit the braces and write **abc** to represent the set $\{abc\}$, if there is no ambiguity. It can be easily shown that $<_s$ is anti-symmetric and transitive.

We shall denote the collections of the first m and last m k -subsets of \mathbb{N}_n in squashed order by $F_{n,k}(m)$ and $L_{n,k}(m)$ respectively. We use $C_{n,k}(m)$ to denote some collection of consecutive k -subsets of \mathbb{N}_n in squashed order. We denote by $N_{n,k}^r(m)$, the collection $C_{n,k}(m)$ that follows $F_{n,k}(r)$ in squashed order. Then, KKT says that the shadow of a family \mathcal{A} of k -sets is at least the size of the shadow of the first $|\mathcal{A}|$ k -sets in squashed order.

Theorem 1.8 (Kruskal [9], Katona [8], and Clements and Lindström [3])

Let \mathcal{A} be a collection of k -sets of \mathbb{N}_n and suppose the k -binomial representation of $|\mathcal{A}|$ is

$$|\mathcal{A}| = \binom{a_k}{k} + \binom{a_{k-1}}{k-1} + \dots + \binom{a_t}{t},$$

where $a_k > a_{k-1} > \dots > a_t \geq t \geq 1$. Then,

$$|\Delta\mathcal{A}| \geq |\Delta F_{n,k}(|\mathcal{A}|)| = \binom{a_k}{k-1} + \binom{a_{k-1}}{k-2} + \dots + \binom{a_t}{t-1}.$$

Lieby [13] proved that the shadow of the first m k -sets of \mathbb{N}_n in squashed order has the same cardinality as the shade of the last m $(n-k)$ -subsets of \mathbb{N}_n in squashed order.

Lemma 1.9 (Lieby [13]) For any integer $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{k}$, $|\Delta F_{n,k}(m)| = |\nabla L_{n,n-k}(m)|$.

Let S be a k -subset of \mathbb{N}_n . The *new-shadow* and *new-shade* of S are defined as $\Delta_N S := \{X \mid X \in \Delta S, X \notin \Delta T \text{ for all } T <_s S\}$ and $\nabla_N S := \{X \mid X \in \nabla S, X \notin \nabla T \text{ for all } T >_s S\}$. Furthermore, if \mathcal{A} is a collection of k -sets of \mathbb{N}_n , then the *new-shadow* and *new-shade* of \mathcal{A} are defined as $\Delta_N \mathcal{A} := \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{A}} \Delta_N S$ and $\nabla_N \mathcal{A} := \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{A}} \nabla_N S$ respectively. We refer the interested readers to [1] and [13] for more details.

It was shown by Clements [2] that the size of the new shadow of any consecutive m k -sets is at least that of the new shadow of the last m k -sets in squashed order and its corresponding dual follows.

Theorem 1.10 (Clements [2]) For any integer $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{k}$,

$$|\Delta_N C_{n,k}(m)| \geq |\Delta_N L_{n,k}(m)| \text{ and } |\nabla_N C_{n,k}(m)| \geq |\nabla_N F_{n,k}(m)|.$$

2. Main results and motivation

Acknowledging the contribution of KKT, we define the following functions $\kappa_{n,r}(\cdot)$ and $\kappa_{n,r}^*(\cdot)$.

Definition 2.1 Let n, r be integers. Define

$$\kappa_{n,r}(i) := |\Delta F_{n,r}(i)| - i \text{ and } \kappa_{n,r}^*(i) := \min_{0 \leq j \leq i} \kappa_{n,r}(j).$$

This definition is due to $F_{n,r}(i)$ having the smallest possible shade, as shown by KKT. $\kappa_{n,r}(\cdot)$ is also known as the Kruskal-Katona function (KKF), which was studied by Frankl et al. [5], and Minabutdinov and Manaev [14]. For any integer n , $\kappa_{n,r}(i)$ and $\kappa_{n,r}^*(i)$ can be computed using the r -binomial representation of i and KKT. However, significant complexity resides in its computations due to its dependence on binomial representations. Despite so, we derive some useful properties of the KKF. We shall omit the subscript n when there is no ambiguity.

Proposition 2.2 $\kappa_r(m) < 0$ if and only if $m \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Theorem 2.3 $\kappa_r(m) = \kappa_r^*(m)$ if and only if $m = \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i}$ with $a_i \geq 2i - 1$ for all $i = t, t+1, \dots, r$.

Proposition 2.4 Let n , a and k be integers such that $0 \leq a, k \leq \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Then,

$$\kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} \left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \right) + \kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}^*(k) \leq \kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}(a) + \kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}^*(k + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a).$$

We apply the above results to the following variation of cross-intersecting antichains. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be antichains of \mathbb{N}_n with at most k disjoint pairs, i.e., for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ only if $i = j \leq k$. What is the maximum possible $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$?

If n is odd, it trivially follows from Sperner's Theorem that $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq 2 \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$, with equality if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Hence, we consider even integers n and determine the following sharp bound.

Theorem 2.5 Let $n \geq 4$ be an even integer and \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two antichains of \mathbb{N}_n . Suppose for some integer $k \leq \min\{|\mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{B}|\}$, and for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ only if $i = j \leq k$ (i.e. there are at most k non-intersecting $A - B$ pairs). Then,

$$|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k),$$

where $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k) = 0$ if $k < 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$ and $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k) < 0$ otherwise. Furthermore, equality holds if

- (i) $k < 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$, $\mathcal{A} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}$, or
- (ii) $k \geq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$, $\mathcal{A} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ and $\mathcal{B} = L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m) \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m)$, where $m \leq k$ is an integer such that $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(m)$.

We further prove that all pairs of extremal families contain only $\frac{n}{2}$ and $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets.

Theorem 2.6 Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} and k be as given in Theorem 2.5. If $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| = \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k)$, then for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$,

- (i) $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)} \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}$, and
- (iii) $|\nabla \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}| = |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}|)|$.

Closely akin to this variation is the one with *exactly* k disjoint pairs, for which Theorem 2.5 also provides an upper bound. Moreover, it is tight if $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(k) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k)$ since $\mathcal{A} = \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{n/2}$ and $\mathcal{B} = L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(k) \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(k)$ make a pair of extremal antichains. Note that Theorem 2.3 gives the values of k satisfying $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(k) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k)$. Hence, it is easy to see Corollary 2.7 follow from the last two theorems.

Corollary 2.7 *Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} and k be as given in Theorem 2.5, except now $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ if and only if $i = j \leq k$ now. If $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(k)$, then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(k). \quad (2.1)$$

Furthermore, if equality holds, then for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$,

- (i) $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{n/2} \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)} \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}$, and
- (iii) $|\nabla \mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}| = |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{X}^{(n/2)}|)|$.

The primary motivation of investigating these variations is their intricate connection with optimal orientations of a special family of graphs, known as the G vertex-multiplications. In 2000, Koh and Tay [11] introduced G vertex-multiplications and extended the results on complete n -partite graphs. Koh and Tay [12] further studied tree vertex-multiplications and Ng and Koh [16] investigated cycle vertex-multiplications. Moreover, Wong and Tay [20, 21] use the main results in this paper to derive conditions for vertex-multiplications in \mathcal{C}_0 and \mathcal{C}_1 for all trees of diameter 4.

3. Properties of the Kruskal-Katona function

In [19], Wong and Tay defined the following notion $D(n, r)$ and proved some useful results; we list them as Lemmas 3.2(a) and 3.4 and further prove some properties.

Definition 3.1 (Wong and Tay [19])

For any positive integers r and n , define

$$D(n, r) := \begin{cases} \binom{n}{r-1} - \binom{n}{r}, & \text{if } r \leq n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.2 For any positive integers r, m and n ,

- (a) $D(n, r) \stackrel{\geq}{\leq} 0 \iff r \stackrel{\geq}{\leq} \frac{n+1}{2}$.
- (b) $D(n-1, r-1) + D(n-1, r) = D(n, r)$ for $1 \leq r \leq n$.
- (c) $D(n+1, r) < D(n, r)$ for $n \geq 2r-1$.
- (d) If $n \geq 2r-1$ and $n > m$, then $D(n, r) < D(m, r)$.
- (e) If $r \geq 2$, then $D(m, 1) \leq D(1, 1)$ and $D(m, r) \leq D(2r-2, r)$.

Proof:

- (a) This follows from $D(n, r) = \binom{n}{r-1} - \binom{n}{r} = \binom{n}{r-1} \left(1 - \frac{n+1-r}{r}\right) = \binom{n}{r-1} \left(\frac{2r-1-n}{r}\right)$.
- (b) $D(n-1, r-1) + D(n-1, r) = \left[\binom{n-1}{r-2} - \binom{n-1}{r-1}\right] + \left[\binom{n-1}{r-1} - \binom{n-1}{r}\right] = \left[\binom{n-1}{r-2} + \binom{n-1}{r-1}\right] - \left[\binom{n-1}{r-1} + \binom{n-1}{r}\right] = \binom{n}{r-1} - \binom{n}{r} = D(n, r)$.
- (c) $D(n+1, r) - D(n, r) = D(n, r-1) < 0$ by (b) and (a).
- (d) If $m < 2r-1$, then $D(m, r) > 0 \geq D(n, r)$. If $m \geq 2r-1$, then $D(n, r) < D(m, r)$

by (c).

(e) It is easy to see $D(m, 1) \leq 0 = D(1, 1)$. If $m \geq 2r - 1$, then $D(m, r) \leq 0 < D(2r - 2, r)$ by (a). If $m \leq 2r - 2$, then by (b) and (a) respectively, $D(m, r) - D(m - 1, r) = D(m - 1, r - 1) \geq 0$.

□

An identity we will use often in our proofs is Chu Shih-Chieh's Identity (CSC), which is also known as "Hockey Stick Identity". (See [10] for more details.)

Lemma 3.3 (*Chu Shih-Chieh's Identity*) For any $r, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\binom{r}{0} + \binom{r+1}{1} + \dots + \binom{r+k}{k} = \binom{r+k+1}{k}$.

The next lemma is an analogue of CSC in $D(n, r)$.

Lemma 3.4 (*Wong and Tay [19]*) For any positive integer $j \geq 2$, $\sum_{r=1}^j D(j - 2 + r, r) = 1$.

We shall further derive properties of $D(n, r)$. Lemma 3.5 shows that the sum of the smallest (in absolute sense) negative term in r -th column, namely $D(2r, r)$, and each largest term, namely $D(2i - 2, i)$, in the i -th column for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r - 1$ is negative.

Lemma 3.5 For all positive integers r , $D(2r, r) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} D(2i - 2, i) < 0$.

Proof: We use induction on r . It is easy to verify for $r = 1, 2, 3$.

Assume $D(2r, r) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} D(2i - 2, i) < 0$ for some positive integer $r \geq 3$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & D(2r + 2, r + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^r D(2i - 2, i) \\ &= D(2r + 2, r + 1) + D(2r - 2, r) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} D(2i - 2, i) \\ &< D(2r + 2, r + 1) + D(2r - 2, r) - D(2r, r) && \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\ &= \binom{2r - 2}{r - 3} + \binom{2r - 2}{r - 4} - 2 \binom{2r - 2}{r} && \text{(after rearranging)} \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next well-known lemma will be found useful.

Lemma 3.6 $f(x) = \binom{x}{y}$ is an increasing function for $x \geq y$.

Proof of Proposition 2.2: Let the r -binomial representation of m be $m = \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i}$, where

$a_r > a_{r-1} > \dots > a_t \geq t \geq 1$. Also, denote $p = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

(\Leftarrow) Since $m \geq p$, we have $a_r \geq 2r - 1$. Otherwise,

$$m = \sum_{r=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r-t} \binom{2r - 2 - i}{r - i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \binom{2r - 2 - i}{r - i} = \binom{2r - 1}{r} - 1 < p, \quad (3.1)$$

where the first inequality is due to $a_{r-i} \leq 2r - 2 - i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r - t$, and Lemma 3.6, and the second equality due to CSC. However, this contradicts $m \geq p$.

Case 1. $a_r = 2r - 1$.

If $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, r$, then $\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(2i - 1, i) = 0$ by Lemma 3.2(a) (with equality if and only if $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, r$). Hence, assume there exists some integer i , $t \leq i \leq r - 1$ such that $a_i \neq 2i - 1$, and let l be the largest such integer.

Claim 1: $a_l \geq 2l$.

Suppose $a_l < 2l - 1$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{l-t} \binom{2l - 2 - i}{l - i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{2l - 2 - i}{l - i} = \binom{2l - 1}{l} - 1, \quad (3.2)$$

where the first inequality is due to $a_{l-i} \leq 2l - 2 - i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, l - t$, and Lemma 3.6, and the equality due to CSC. Consequently,

$$m - (p - 1) = \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i} - \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i - 1}{i} = \sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i} - \sum_{i=1}^l \binom{2i - 1}{i} \leq - \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \binom{2i - 1}{i},$$

where the second equality follows from $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = l + 1, l + 2, \dots, r$, the inequality due to (3.2). This contradicts $m \geq p$.

Therefore,

$$\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) \leq D(2l, l) + \sum_{i=t}^{l-1} D(2i - 2, i) \leq D(2l, l) + \sum_{r=1}^{l-1} D(2i - 2, i) < 0,$$

where the first equality follows from $D(a_i, i) = D(2i - 1, i) = 0$ for $i = l, l + 1, \dots, r$, by Lemma 3.2(a), the first inequality due to Lemma 3.2(d) and (e), the second inequality due to $D(2i - 2, i) > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$, by Lemma 3.2(a), and the last inequality by Lemma 3.5.

Case 2. $a_r \geq 2r$.

By a deduction similar to above, we have

$$\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) \leq D(2r, r) + \sum_{i=t}^{r-1} D(2i - 2, i) \leq D(2r, r) + \sum_{r=1}^{r-1} D(2i - 2, i) < 0.$$

(\Rightarrow) We consider two cases of a_r .

Case 1. $a_r \geq 2r - 1$.

If $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, r$, then $\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(2i - 1, i) = 0$ by Lemma 3.2(a). This contradicts $\kappa_r(m) > 0$. Hence, there exists some integer i , $t \leq i \leq r$ such that $a_i \neq 2i - 1$, and let l be the largest such integer.

If $a_l \geq 2l$, then

$$\sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i} \geq \binom{a_l}{l} \geq \binom{2l}{l} > \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{2l - 1 - i}{l - i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^l \binom{2i - 1}{i}, \quad (3.3)$$

where the second and last inequalities follow from Lemma 3.6 and the third inequality by CSC. So,

$$m - (p - 1) = \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i} - \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i} = \sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i} - \sum_{i=1}^l \binom{2i-1}{i} > 0,$$

where the second equality follows from $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = l + 1, l + 2, \dots, r$, and the last inequality by (3.3). That is, $m \geq p$.

Now, suppose $a_l \leq 2l - 2$. By Lemma 3.2(a), $D(a_l, l) > 0$. If $D(a_i, i) \geq 0$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, l - 1$, then

$$\sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) > 0. \quad (3.4)$$

With $D(a_i, i) = 0$ for $i = l, l + 1, \dots, r$, we have $\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) + \sum_{i=l+1}^r D(a_i, i) > 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $D(a_i, i) < 0$ for some $t \leq i \leq l - 1$. Let s be the smallest integer such that $D(a_i, i) > 0$ for all $i = s, s + 1, \dots, l$.

Claim 2. $a_s = 2s - 2$.

Since $D(a_s, s) > 0$, it follows from Lemma 3.2(a) that $a_s < 2s - 1$. Suppose $a_s \leq 2s - 3$. Then, $a_{s-1} \leq a_s - 1 \leq 2(s - 1) - 2$. By Lemma 3.2(a), $D(a_{s-1}, s - 1) > 0$, which contradicts the minimality of s . So, $a_s = 2s - 2$.

Now,

$$\sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) \geq \sum_{i=t}^s D(a_i, i) \geq \sum_{i=t}^s D(s - 2 + i, i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^s D(s - 2 + i, i) = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

The first inequality is due to $D(a_i, i) > 0$ for all $i = s + 1, s + 2, \dots, l$ (equality holds if $s = l$). The second inequality is due to $a_i \leq s - 2 + i$ for $i = t, t + 1, \dots, s$, and Lemma 3.2(d). If $t = 1$, the third inequality follows immediately. And, if $t > 1$, the third inequality follows from $D(s - 2 + i, i) \leq 0$ for $r = 1, 2, \dots, t - 1$, by Lemma 3.2(a). Invoking Lemma 3.4, we obtain the last equality. It follows that

$$\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) \geq 1,$$

a contradiction.

Case 2. $a_r \leq 2r - 2$.

By Lemma 3.2(a), $D(a_r, r) > 0$. If $D(a_i, i) \geq 0$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, r - 1$, then $\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) > 0$, a contradiction.

So, there exists some integer i , $t \leq i \leq r - 1$ such that $D(a_i, i) < 0$. Let s be the smallest integer such that $D(a_i, i) > 0$ for all $i = s, s + 1, \dots, r$. As in Claim 2, it can be shown that $a_s = 2s - 2$. Similarly, we have $a_i \leq s - 2 + i$ for all $i = t, t + 1, \dots, s$.

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_r(m) &= \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) \geq D(2s-2, s) + \sum_{i=t}^{s-1} D(a_i, i) \geq D(2s-2, s) + \sum_{i=t}^{s-1} D(s-2+i, i) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^s D(s-2+i, i) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is due to $D(a_i, i) > 0$ for $i = s+1, s+2, \dots, r$ (equality holds if $s = l$). The second inequality is due to $a_i \leq s-2+i$ for $i = t, t+1, \dots, s$, and Lemma 3.2(d). If $t = 1$, the third inequality follows immediately. And, if $t > 1$, the third inequality follows from $D(s-2+i, i) < 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$, by Lemma 3.2(a). Invoking Lemma 3.4 obtains the last equality. This contradicts $\kappa_r(m) < 0$. □

By being more careful in the previous proof, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.7 $\kappa_r(m) = 0$ if and only if $m = \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$ for some integer $t \leq r$.

Proof of Theorem 2.3:

Case 1. $m \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Since $\kappa_r(0) = 0$ and by Proposition 2.2, $\kappa_r^*(m) \geq 0$, we have $\kappa_r^*(m) = 0$. The statement now follows from Corollary 3.7.

Case 2. $m > \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

(\Rightarrow) As shown in (3.1), $m > \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{2i-1}{i}$ implies $a_r \geq 2r-1$. Suppose $a_i \geq 2i-1$ for all $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, r$ and $a_l \leq 2l-2$ for some integer l , where $t \leq l < r$. Now, proceed as we did in Case 1 of Proposition 2.2 to conclude $\sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) > 0$ (see (3.4) and (3.5)).

Hence, noting also that $\sum_{i=l+1}^r \binom{a_i}{i} < m$,

$$\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) + \sum_{i=l+1}^r D(a_i, i) > \kappa_r\left(\sum_{i=l+1}^r \binom{a_i}{i}\right) \geq \kappa_r^*(m),$$

which contradicts $\kappa_r(m) = \kappa_r^*(m)$.

(\Leftarrow) Let $m^* < m$ with the r -binomial representation be $m^* = \sum_{i=t^*}^r \binom{b_i}{i}$. It suffices to show that

$$\kappa_r(m) \leq \kappa_r(m^*). \tag{3.6}$$

Let $q = \max\{t, t^*\}$. If $a_i = b_i$ for all $i = q, q+1, \dots, r$, then $m^* < m$ implies $t^* > t$. So,

$$\kappa_r(m) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) \leq \sum_{i=t^*}^r D(b_i, i) = \kappa_r(m^*),$$

since $D(a_i, i) \leq 0$ for $i = t, t+1, \dots, t^* - 1$, by Lemma 3.2(a). That is, (3.6) holds.

Suppose there exists some integer $i = q, q+1, \dots, r$ such that $a_i \neq b_i$ and let l be the largest such integer.

Claim. $a_l > b_l$.

Suppose $a_l < b_l$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=t^*}^l \binom{b_i}{i} \geq \binom{b_l}{l} \geq \binom{a_l+1}{l} > \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{a_l-i}{l-i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^l \binom{a_i}{i} \geq \sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i}, \quad (3.7)$$

where the second and second last inequalities follow from Lemma 3.6 and the third inequality by CSC. So,

$$m^* - m = \sum_{i=t^*}^r \binom{b_i}{i} - \sum_{i=t}^r \binom{a_i}{i} = \sum_{i=t^*}^l \binom{b_i}{i} - \sum_{i=t}^l \binom{a_i}{i} > 0,$$

where the second equality follows from $a_i = 2i - 1$ for all $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, r$, and the last inequality by (3.7). This contradicts $m^* < m$. Hence, the claim follows.

Now, we consider two cases of b_l .

Case 1. $b_l \geq 2l - 1$.

Then, $b_{l-i} \leq b_l - i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l - t^*$. Consequently, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, $b_l - i \geq 2(l - i) - 1$ and

$$D(b_l - i, l - i) \leq 0 \quad (3.8)$$

by Lemma 3.2(a). Furthermore, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, l - t^*$,

$$D(b_{l-i}, l - i) \geq D(b_l - i, l - i) \quad (3.9)$$

by Lemma 3.2(d). So,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{l-t^*} D(b_{l-i}, l - i) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{l-t^*} D(b_l - i, l - i) \geq \sum_{i=0}^l D(b_l - i, l - i) = D(b_l + 1, l) + 1,$$

where the first and second inequalities follow from (3.9) and (3.8) respectively. The equality is due to CSC. Now, invoking Lemma 3.2(d) on $b_l < a_l$ and $a_l \geq 2l - 1$ gives

$$\sum_{i=t^*}^l D(b_i, r) \geq D(b_l + 1, 1) + 1 > D(a_l, l) + 1. \quad (3.10)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_r(m) - \kappa_r(m^*) &= \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^r D(b_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^l D(b_i, i) - \sum_{r=l+1}^r D(b_i, i) \\ &< \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - D(a_l, l) - 1 - \sum_{r=l+1}^r D(b_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^{l-1} D(a_i, i) - 1 \\ &\leq -1. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from (3.10) and the last equality due to $a_i = b_i$ for $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, r$. The last inequality is due to $D(a_i, i) \leq 0$ for all $i = t, t+1, \dots, l-1$, by Lemma 3.2(b) since $a_i \geq 2i-1$ for $i = t, t+1, \dots, r$.

Case 2. $b_l < 2l-1$.

If $D(b_i, i) \geq 0$ for all $i = t^*, t^*+1, \dots, l$, then

$$\kappa_r(m) - \kappa_r(m^*) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^r D(b_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^l D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^l D(b_i, i) \leq 0,$$

where the second equality is due to $a_i = b_i$ for $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}$, and the inequality due to $D(a_i, i) \leq 0$ by Lemma 3.2(a). So, we have (3.6) as required.

Hence, we assume $D(b_i, i) < 0$ for some $i = t^*, t^*+1, \dots, l-1$. Let s be the smallest integer such that $D(b_i, i) > 0$ for all $i = s, s+1, \dots, l$. As in Claim 2 of Proposition 2.2, we can prove that $b_s = 2s-2$.

Note for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$, we have $s-2+i \geq 2i-1$ implying $D(s-2+i, i) \leq 0$ by Lemma 3.2(a). Furthermore, with $b_i \leq s-2+i$ for all $i = t^*, t^*+1, \dots, s$, it follows by Lemma 3.2(d) that $D(b_i, i) \geq D(s-2+i, i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{i=t^*}^s D(b_i, i) \geq \sum_{i=t^*}^s D(s-2+i, i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^s D(s-2+i, i) = 1. \quad (3.11)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_r(m) - \kappa_r(m^*) &= \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^r D(b_i, i) = \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - \sum_{i=t^*}^s D(b_i, i) - \sum_{r=s+1}^r D(b_i, i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=t}^r D(a_i, i) - 1 - \sum_{r=s+1}^r D(b_i, i) \leq \sum_{i=t}^s D(a_i, i) - 1 \\ &\leq -1. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is due (3.11) and the second inequality due to $D(b_i, i) > 0 \geq D(a_i, i)$ for $i = s+1, s+2, \dots, l$, and $D(b_i, i) = D(a_i, i)$ for $i = l+1, l+2, \dots, r$. We remark that $\sum_{i=t}^s D(a_i, i) = 0$ if $s < t$. Hence, (3.6) follows as desired. □

Lemma 3.8 *Let m be an integer, where $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Then, $\kappa_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}(m) \geq \kappa_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil})$. Furthermore, equality holds if and only if $m = \binom{n}{n/2}$.*

Proof: Suppose n is odd. By Proposition 2.2, $\kappa_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}(m) \geq 0 = \kappa_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil})$ for all $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} < 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Suppose n is even. Noting that $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(\binom{n}{n/2}) = \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \binom{n}{n/2}$,

$$\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(m) = |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m)| - m \geq \left[\frac{n}{n+2} - 1 \right] \cdot m \geq \left[\frac{n}{n+2} - 1 \right] \binom{n}{n/2} = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{n/2}\right).$$

where the first inequality follows from (1.2).

Trivially, if $m = \binom{n}{n/2}$, then $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(m) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(\binom{n}{n/2})$. If $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(m) = \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(\binom{n}{n/2})$, then equality must hold throughout, particularly the first inequality. By (1.2), this implies $m = \binom{n}{n/2}$ or $m = 0$. If $m = 0$, then $\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(m) - \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(\binom{n}{n/2}) = \binom{n}{n/2} - \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} > 0$. So, it remains that $m = \binom{n}{n/2}$.

□

Proof of Proposition 2.4: In this proof, we denote $\kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$ (and $\kappa_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}^*$) with κ (and κ^* resp.) for brevity. We apply induction on k . Consider $k = 0$.

Case B1. $a \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \binom{2i-1}{i}$ and $\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

By Proposition 2.2, $\kappa(a) \geq 0$ and $\kappa^*(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) = 0 = \kappa^*(0)$. So, $\kappa(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}) + \kappa^*(0) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) \leq \kappa(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}) \leq 0$.

We remark that Cases B2 and B3 do not apply to odd integers n since $\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} < \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Case B2. $a > \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Since $\sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i} > \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n/2}$, it follows that $\binom{n}{n/2} - a < \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n/2} < \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$ and $\kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2} - a) = 0 = \kappa^*(0)$ by Proposition 2.2. Furthermore, $\kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) + \kappa^*(0) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2} - a) = \kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) - \kappa(a) \leq 0$ by Lemma 3.8.

Case B3. $\binom{n}{n/2} - a > \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$.

Since $\sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i} > \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n/2}$, it follows that $a < \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{n/2} < \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \binom{2i-1}{i}$ and $\kappa(a) \geq 0$ by Proposition 2.2. Furthermore, $\kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) + \kappa^*(0) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2} - a) \leq \kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) - \kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2} - a) = \kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2}) - \kappa^*(\binom{n}{n/2} - a) \leq 0$ by Lemma 3.8.

For the induction case, assume $\kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) + \kappa^*(k) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k + \binom{n}{n/2} - a) \leq 0$ for some integer $k \geq 0$. We want to show $\kappa(\binom{n}{n/2}) + \kappa^*(k+1) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{n/2} - a) \geq 0$.

Let m be the largest integer satisfying $m \leq k+1$ and $\kappa^*(k+1) = \kappa(m)$, and let b be an integer satisfying $b \leq k+1 + \binom{n}{n/2} - a$ and $\kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{n/2} - a) = \kappa(b)$.

Case I1. $b < k+1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$.

Then, $\kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) = \kappa(b) = \kappa^*(k + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a)$. Note that $\kappa^*(k+1) \leq \kappa^*(k)$ by definition. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa^*(k+1) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) \\
& \leq \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa^*(k) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) \\
& \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by induction hypothesis.

Case I2. $b = k + 1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$.

Since $m \leq k + 1$, we have $b - m \geq \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$.

Subcase I2.1. $m = k + 1$, i.e. $b - m = \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa^*(k+1) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) \\
& = \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa(m) - \kappa(a) - \kappa(b) \\
& = (b - m) - \left[\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a\right] + \left[|\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right)| - |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(a)|\right] - \left[|\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(b)| - |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m)|\right] \\
& = |\Delta_N L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a\right)| - |\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(b - m)| \\
& = |\Delta_N L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(b - m)| - |\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(b - m)| \\
& \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 1.10.

Subcase I2.2. $m < k + 1$, i.e. $b - m > \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$.

Note that $m < k + 1$ implies

$$|\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(k + 1 - m)| > k + 1 - m. \quad (3.12)$$

For if $|\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(k + 1 - m)| \leq k + 1 - m$, then $\kappa(k + 1) = |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(k + 1)| - (k + 1) = |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m)| - m + |\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(k + 1 - m)| - (k + 1 - m) \leq \kappa(m)$, which contradicts the maximality of m .

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa^*(k+1) - \kappa(a) - \kappa^*(k+1 + \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a) \\
& = \kappa\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right) + \kappa(m) - \kappa(a) - \kappa(b) \\
& = - \left[\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a - b\right] - m + \left[|\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}\right)| - |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(a)|\right] - \left[|\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(b)| - |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(m)|\right] \\
& = (k + 1 - m) + |\Delta_N L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a\right)| - |\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^{k+1}(b - (k + 1))| - |\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^m(k + 1 - m)| \\
& < 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to $b - (k + 1) = \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a$ and thus, $|\Delta_N N_{n, \frac{n}{2}}^{k+1}(b - (k + 1))| \geq |\Delta_N L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - a)|$ by Theorem 1.10 and (3.12). □

4. Proofs of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6

To prove Theorem 2.5, we shall employ Sperner's operations in a manner similar to that used by Sperner himself to prove Sperner's Theorem [18].

Proof of Theorem 2.5: In view of (1.1), we may replace any element, A_i (B_i resp.), of size $< \frac{n}{2}$ in \mathcal{A} (\mathcal{B} resp.) with an equal number of $\frac{n}{2}$ -sets, say A_i^\uparrow (B_i^\uparrow resp.), from $\nabla \mathcal{A}$ ($\nabla \mathcal{B}$ resp.). If $|A_i| = \frac{n}{2}$ ($|B_i| = \frac{n}{2}$ resp.), then $A_i^\uparrow := A_i$ ($B_i^\uparrow := B_i$) simply. Similarly, by (1.2), we may replace those A_i 's (B_i 's resp.) of size $> \frac{n}{2} + 1$ by an equal number of $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets, say A_i^\downarrow (B_i^\downarrow resp.) from their shadow. If $|A_i| = \frac{n}{2} + 1$ ($|B_i| = \frac{n}{2} + 1$ resp.), then $A_i^\downarrow := A_i$ ($B_i^\downarrow := B_i$) simply. By Lemma 1.7, the replaced sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are still antichains. Furthermore, $A_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset \implies A_i^\uparrow \cap B_j^\uparrow \neq \emptyset$ since $A_i \subseteq A_i^\uparrow$ and $B_j \subseteq B_j^\uparrow$.

Consequently, we may assume $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)} \cup \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$. So, $|T| \leq k$, where $T := \{i | A_i^\uparrow \cap B_i^\uparrow = \emptyset\}$. Partition \mathcal{X} into $\mathcal{X}_1 := X \cap \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)}$ and $\mathcal{X}_2 := \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{X}_1$. Then, $|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_1| \leq |T| + \binom{n}{n/2} \leq k + \binom{n}{n/2}$, which implies

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_1| \leq k + \binom{n}{n/2}. \quad (4.1)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \quad (4.2) \\ &= |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_2| + |\mathcal{B}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_2| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{A}_1| + \left| \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla \mathcal{A}_1 \right| + |\mathcal{B}_1| + \left| \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1} - \nabla \mathcal{B}_1 \right| \\ &\leq 2 \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} + |\mathcal{A}_1| - |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{A}_1|)| + |\mathcal{B}_1| - |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{B}_1|)| \\ &= 2 \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa(|\mathcal{A}_1|) - \kappa(|\mathcal{B}_1|) \\ &\leq 2 \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa(|\mathcal{A}_1|) - \kappa^*(k + \binom{n}{n/2}) - |\mathcal{A}_1| \\ &\leq 2 \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa\left(\binom{n}{(n/2)}\right) - \kappa^*(k) \\ &= \binom{n}{(n/2)} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa^*(k). \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to $|\nabla \mathcal{X}_1| \geq |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{X}_1|)| = |\Delta F_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{X}_1|)|$ for both $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$, by KKT and Lemma 1.9. The fourth and fifth inequalities follow from (4.1) and Proposition 2.4 respectively. □

Proof of Theorem 2.6: In this proof, \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$ denote the antichain before and after Sperner operations respectively for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$. Since $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| = \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} + \kappa^*(k)$, equality must hold through in (4.2). Particularly, we must have

$$\kappa(|\mathcal{A}_1|) + \kappa^*(k + \binom{n}{n/2} - |\mathcal{A}_1|) = \kappa\left(\binom{n}{n/2}\right) + \kappa^*(k), \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \left(\binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}\right) - \nabla \mathcal{A}_1, \quad \mathcal{B}_2 = \left(\binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}\right) - \nabla \mathcal{B}_1, \quad (4.4)$$

$$|\nabla \mathcal{A}_1| = |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{A}_1|)|, \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla \mathcal{B}_1| = |\nabla L_{n, \frac{n}{2}}(|\mathcal{B}_1|)|. \quad (4.5)$$

From

$$|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| = \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - \kappa^*(k) \geq \binom{n}{n/2} + \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} \quad (4.6)$$

and by Sperner's Theorem, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{n/2}$ and $|\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n}{n/2}$, it follows that $|\mathcal{A}| > 0$ and $|\mathcal{B}| > 0$.

We first show $t(\mathcal{X}) \leq \frac{n}{2} + 1$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}^{(s)} \neq \emptyset$ for some $s > \frac{n}{2} + 1$. For simplicity, we may assume that the Sperner's operations have been done to replace all i -sets for $i > \frac{n}{2} + 2$ and consider $s = \frac{n}{2} + 2$. Specifically, at the stage of replacing $(\frac{n}{2} + 2)$ -sets in Sperner's operations, we chose $\mathcal{A}^\downarrow \subseteq (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}) \cup \Delta \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}^\downarrow| = |\mathcal{A}|$. For ease of argument, let $\mathcal{A}^\downarrow = (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}) \cup S$, where $S \subset \Delta \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}$ and $|S| = |\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}|$. That is, S is the set of $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets in $\Delta \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}$ selected as replacements of $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}$ in Sperner's operations, and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+1)} \cup S$ (see Figure 1).




Figure 1: Sketch of Hasse diagram of \mathbb{N}_n ; to show $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)} = \emptyset$

Since $|\Delta\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}| \geq (1 + \frac{6}{n-2})|\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)}| > |S|$ by (1.2), it follows that $\Delta\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)} - S \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, \mathcal{A} is an antichain implies $(\Delta\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)} - S) \cap (\nabla\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+1)}) = \emptyset$. Consequently, $\Delta\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)} - S$, \mathcal{A}_2 and $\nabla\mathcal{A}_1$ are pairwise disjoint families of $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets. It follows that $(\Delta\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}+2)} - S) \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \nabla\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \binom{N_n}{(\frac{n}{2}+1)}$. Hence, $|\mathcal{A}_2| < \binom{n}{(\frac{n}{2}+1)} - |\nabla\mathcal{A}_1|$, a contradiction to (4.4). A similar argument holds for \mathcal{B} .

Next, we show $b(\mathcal{X}) \geq \frac{n}{2}$ for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$. WLOG, suppose $|\mathcal{A}_1| = \binom{n}{n/2}$. Then, $\mathcal{A} = \binom{N_n}{n/2}$ by Sperner's Theorem. It follows that $\mathcal{B}^{(i)} = \emptyset$ for all $i < \frac{n}{2}$. Otherwise, there exist two sets in \mathcal{A} that are each disjoint with any i -set in \mathcal{B} with $i < \frac{n}{2}$. By (4.6), $\mathcal{B} = \binom{N_n}{(\frac{n}{2}+1)}$ and we are done.

Hence, we may assume $0 < |\mathcal{X}| < \binom{n}{n/2}$ for all $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}^{(s)} \neq \emptyset$ for some $s < \frac{n}{2}$. For simplicity, we may assume that the Sperner's operations have been done to replace all i -sets for $i > \frac{n}{2} - 2$ and consider $s = \frac{n}{2} - 1$.

Case 1. $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} = \binom{N_n}{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$.

\mathcal{A} is a antichain implies $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$. Then, (4.6) and Sperner's Theorem imply $\mathcal{B} = \binom{N_n}{n/2}$ (and $\kappa^*(k) = 0$). Now, every element X of \mathcal{A} is disjoint with $\binom{[X]}{n/2} = \binom{(n/2)+1}{n/2} = \frac{n}{2} + 1 \geq 3$ elements of \mathcal{B} , a contradiction.

Case 2. $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} \subset \binom{N_n}{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$.

Recall that at the stage of replacing $(\frac{n}{2} - 1)$ -sets in Sperner's operations, we chose $\mathcal{A}^\uparrow \subseteq (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}) \cup \nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}^\uparrow| = |\mathcal{A}|$. For ease of argument, let $\mathcal{A}^\uparrow = (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}) \cup S$, where $S \subset \nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$ and $|S| = |\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| < |\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}|$; the strict inequality follows from (1.1). In other words, $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup S$.

Subcase 2.1. $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} = \emptyset$.

Note that $\nabla\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \nabla(\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$. Suppose $\nabla\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \nabla(\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$ (see Figure 2). Since \mathcal{A} is a antichain, $\nabla\mathcal{A}_1$, $\nabla(\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}) - \nabla\mathcal{A}_1$, and \mathcal{A}_2 are disjoint families of $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -sets. It follows that $\nabla\mathcal{A}_1 \cup (\nabla(\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}) - \nabla\mathcal{A}_1) \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \subseteq \binom{N_n}{(\frac{n}{2}+1)}$. Hence, $|\mathcal{A}_2| < \binom{n}{(\frac{n}{2}+1)} - |\nabla\mathcal{A}_1|$, a contradiction to (4.4).




Figure 2: Sketch of Hasse diagram of \mathbb{N}_n ;
Subcase 2.1 with $\nabla \mathcal{A}_1 \subset \nabla(\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$.

Since \mathcal{A} is an antichain,

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| - |\nabla \mathcal{A}_1| = \kappa(|\mathcal{A}_1|) = \kappa^*(k) + \kappa\left(\binom{n}{(n/2)}\right) - \kappa^*\left(k + \binom{n}{n/2}\right) - |\mathcal{A}_1| \geq 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where we used (4.5), (4.3), and Lemma 3.8 and $\kappa^*(k) \geq 0$ respectively.

Now, suppose $\nabla \mathcal{A}_1 = \nabla(\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$. Recall that the replacements in Sperner's operations are one-to-one and therefore $|\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| = |\mathcal{A}_1|$. So, by (1.1) and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} \subset \binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)-1}$

$$|\nabla \mathcal{A}_1| = |\nabla(\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})| \geq \frac{n}{n+2} |\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| > \frac{n}{n+2} \cdot \frac{n+2}{n} \cdot |\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| = |\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| = |\mathcal{A}_1|,$$

which contradicts (4.7).

Subcase 2.2. $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \neq \emptyset$.

Claim 1: $\nabla \mathcal{A}_1 = \nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$.

Since $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup S \subset \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$, we have $\nabla \mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})$. Now, if $|\nabla \mathcal{A}_1| < |\nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})|$, then $|\mathcal{A}_2| \leq |\binom{\mathbb{N}_n}{(n/2)+1}| - |\nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)})| < \binom{n}{(n/2)+1} - |\nabla \mathcal{A}_1| = |\mathcal{A}_2|$, a contradiction to (4.4). Hence, the claim follows.

Since $\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup S = \mathcal{A}_1$, it follows from Claim 1 that $\nabla(\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} - S) \subseteq \nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup S)$. Note that $|\nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| > |\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}| = |S|$ by (1.1). Let $A_0 \in \nabla \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} - S$, where $A_{i^*} \subset A_0$ for some $A_{i^*} \in \mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)}$ (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: Sketch of Hasse diagram of \mathbb{N}_n ; Subcase 2.2.

Claim 2: $|T| = k$, (recall $T := \{i | A_i^\uparrow \cap B_i^\uparrow = \emptyset\}$), i.e. there are exactly k disjoint pairs $(A_i^\uparrow, B_i^\uparrow)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where $A_i^\uparrow \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $B_i^\uparrow \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

Suppose $|T| < k$. Observe that $\nabla(\nabla\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2}-1)} - S) \subseteq \nabla(\mathcal{A}^{(\frac{n}{2})} \cup S)$ implies $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \{A_0\}$ is an antichain. Furthermore, $|A_0| = \frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{n}{2} \leq |B| \leq \frac{n}{2} + 1$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ implies $A_0 \cap B \neq \emptyset$ except for at most one element (if $B = \bar{A}_0 \in \mathcal{B}_1$) of \mathcal{B}_1 . In other words, $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \{A_0\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ are cross-intersecting antichains with at most k disjoint pairs $(A_i^\uparrow, B_i^\uparrow)$ and size more than $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$, a contradiction to the optimality of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Hence, this claim follows.

Since $|\bar{A}_{i^*}| = \frac{n}{2} + 1$ and by (4.4), either $\bar{A}_{i^*} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ or $\bar{A}_{i^*} \in \nabla\mathcal{B}_1$. Suppose $\bar{A}_{i^*} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ holds, i.e. A_{i^*} is disjoint with some $(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$ -set $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$, $\bar{A}_{i^*} = B$. However, the replaced pair $(A_{i^*}^\uparrow, B_{i^*}^\downarrow)$ of this disjoint pair (A_{i^*}, B) is intersecting since $|A_{i^*}^\uparrow| + |B_{i^*}^\downarrow| > n$. This contradicts the fact of having exactly k disjoint pairs before and after Sperner's operations by Claim 2. Hence, $\bar{A}_{i^*} \in \nabla\mathcal{B}_1$. Now, A_{i^*} is disjoint with at most one element of \mathcal{B} (and hence \mathcal{B}_1 too) implies $\mathcal{B}_1 \cap \Delta\{\bar{A}_{i^*}\} = \{B_{i^*}^\uparrow\}$, with $A_{i^*}^\uparrow = \bar{B}_{i^*}^\uparrow$.

Claim 3: $A_0 \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$.

Suppose not. Since $|A_0| = \frac{n}{2}$, A_0 is disjoint with some $B_j^\uparrow \in \mathcal{B}_1$ for some j . Furthermore, $A_0 \neq A_{i^*}^\uparrow = \bar{B}_{i^*}^\uparrow$ implies $j \neq i^*$. That is, $A_{i^*} \in \mathcal{A}$ is originally disjoint with two distinct sets in \mathcal{B} , namely B_{i^*} and B_j , a contradiction. Hence, this claim follows.

By Claim 3, $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \{A_0\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$ are cross-intersecting antichains with k disjoint pairs and size more than $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$, a contradiction to the maximality of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

A similar argument holds for \mathcal{B} .

□

5. Exactly k disjoint pairs

We end this paper by considering the variation closely related to Theorem 2.5. Let $n \geq 4$ be an even integer and \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two antichains of \mathbb{N}_n . Suppose for some integer $k \leq \min\{|\mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{B}|\}$, and for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ if and only if $i = j \leq k$, i.e. there are *exactly* k disjoint pairs. Determine the maximum $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$.

As mentioned, Corollary 2.7 provides a tight upper bound if $\kappa(k) = \kappa^*(k)$. We are interested to know if (2.1) holds in the case of $\kappa(k) < \kappa^*(k)$. We think this is true but do not have a proof.

We remark that we may choose A_i^\uparrow and B_i^\uparrow so that $|T| = k$ in the proof of Theorem 2.5. Indeed, if $i \neq j$, then $A_i^\uparrow \neq A_j^\uparrow$ (and $B_i^\uparrow \neq B_j^\uparrow$ resp.). Otherwise, $A_i^\uparrow = A_j^\uparrow = B_j^\uparrow$ implies $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

Hence, following the proof outline of Theorem 2.5, it seems that the Conjecture 5.1, which is analogous to our auxiliary Proposition 2.4, will be useful. We verified the conjecture for small even integers of n but a proof remains elusive.

Conjecture 5.1 *Let $n \geq 4$ be an even integer, and a and k be integers such that $0 \leq a, k \leq \binom{n}{n/2}$. Then,*

$$\kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}\left(\binom{n}{n/2}\right) + \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(k) \leq \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}(a) + \kappa_{\frac{n}{2}}^*(k + \binom{n}{n/2} - a).$$

Acknowledgement

The first author would like to thank the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University of Singapore, for the generous support of the Nanyang Technological University Research Scholarship.

References

- [1] Anderson I., *Combinatorics of Finite Sets*, Dover Publications, (1987), 112-130.
- [2] Clements G.F., *More on the Generalised Macauley Theorem - II*, Discrete Mathematics, 18, (1977), 253-264.
- [3] Clements G.F., Lindström B., *A generalization of a combinatorial theorem of Macaulay*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, 7, (1969), 230-238.
- [4] Erdős P., Ko C., Rado R., *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics, 12, (1961), 313-320.
- [5] Frankl P., Matsumoto M., Ruzsa I.Z, Tokushige N., *Minimum Shadows in Uniform Hypergraphs and a Generalization of the Takagi Function*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory A, 69, (1995), 125-148.
- [6] Frankl P. Wong W.H.W., *Analogues of Katona's and Milner's Theorems for two families*, arXiv:2006.12602v2 (2020).
- [7] Hilton A.J.W., Milner E.C., *Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics, 18, (1967), 369-384.
- [8] Katona G.O.H., *A theorem of finite sets*, Theory of graphs, Academia Kiado, Budapest, (1968), 187-207.

- [9] Kruskal J.B., *The extremal number of simplices in a complex*, Math. Optimization Tech., Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkeley, California, 1963, 251-268.
- [10] Koh K.M., Tay E.G., *Counting*, World Scientific, (2013), 91.
- [11] Koh K.M., Tay E.G., *On optimal orientations of G vertex-multiplications*, Discrete Mathematics, 219, (2000), 153-171.
- [12] Koh K.M., Tay E.G., *On optimal orientations of tree vertex-multiplications*, Australasian Journal of Combinatorics, 34, (2006), 69-87.
- [13] Lieby P., *Extremal Problems in Finite sets*, PhD thesis, Northern Territory University (1999), 1-43.
- [14] Minabutdinov A.R., Manaev I.E., *The Kruskal-Katona Function, Conway Sequence, Takagi Curve, and Pascal Adic*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences, 196, (2014), 192-198.
- [15] Milner E.C., *A Combinatorial Theorem On Systems of Sets*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society, 43, (1968), 204-206.
- [16] Ng K.L., Koh K.M. *On optimal orientation of cycle vertex multiplications*, Discrete Mathematics, 297, (2005), 104-118.
- [17] Ou Y., *Maximum size t -cross-intersecting and intersecting families with degree conditions*, PhD thesis, West Virginia University, Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports, 2263. (2005).
- [18] Sperner E., *Ein satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menge*, Math. Z., 27, (1928), 544-548.
- [19] Wong W.H.W., Tay E.G., *On Cross-intersecting Sperner Families*, arXiv:2001.01910v1 (2019).
- [20] Wong W.H.W., Tay E.G., *Vertex-multiplications of trees with diameter 4 (even case)*, to be submitted to arXiv.
- [21] Wong W.H.W., Tay E.G., *Vertex-multiplications of trees with diameter 4 (odd case)*, to be submitted to arXiv.