

Towards a Baranyai theorem with additional condition

Gyula O.H. Katona*

Rényi Institute, HUN-REN
Budapest Pf 127, 1364 Hungary
ohkatona@renyi.hu

Gyula Y. Katona†

Department of Computer Science
Budapest University of Technology and Economics
Budapest, Magyar tudósok krt. 2., 1117 Hungary
katona.gyula@vik.bme.hu

Abstract

A (k, ℓ) partial partition of an n -element set is a collection of ℓ pairwise disjoint k -element subsets. It is proved that, if n is large enough, one can find $\lfloor \binom{n}{k} / \ell \rfloor$ such partial partitions in such a way that if A_1 and A_2 are distinct classes in one of the partial partitions, B_1 and B_2 are distinct classes in another one, then one of the intersections $A_1 \cap B_1, A_2 \cap B_2$ has size at most $\frac{k}{2}$.

Key Words: Baranyai theorem, partial partition

*The work of this author was supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office NKFIH under grant numbers SSN135643 and K132696.

†The research of this author is supported by the BME-Artificial Intelligence FIKP grant of EMMI (BME FIKP-MI/SC), and the research project K-132696 by the Ministry of Innovation and Technology of Hungary from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.

1 Introduction

Let $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be an n -element set. Let us start with the classic theorem of Baranyai.

Theorem 1.1. ([1]) *If k divides m then there is a set of partitions of $[m]$ into k -element classes such that each element of $\binom{[m]}{k}$ is contained in exactly one such partition.*

But what do we know about the relationship between two such partitions? Can we impose some restrictions of this kind? This question seems to be very difficult but becomes attackable if partitions are replaced by the following weaker concept. A (k, ℓ) partial partition or (k, ℓ) -*papartition* is a family of ℓ pairwise disjoint k -element sets. Our restriction will be the following. We say that two (k, ℓ) -papartitions are *too close* if they contain two distinct members A_1, B_1 in the first papartition and two distinct members A_2, B_2 in the second papartition satisfying

$$|A_1 \cap A_2| > \frac{k}{2}, \quad |B_1 \cap B_2| > \frac{k}{2}.$$

Our condition will be that no two papartitions are too close.

In Section 2, we will state our main theorem and its generalization for graphs. Section 3 contains the proofs, while Section 4 adds some remarks on related problems.

2 Results

Theorem 2.1. *Let k and ℓ be positive integers. If n is large enough then one can find*

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\ell} \right\rfloor$$

(k, ℓ) -papartitions in such a way that no k -element set appears in two of them and they are not too close to each other.

Now let us see the general theorem for graphs. We have two graphs on the same vertex set: $G_1 = (V, E_1), G_2 = (V, E_2)$. The edges of G_1 and G_2 are called *blue* and *red*, respectively. Denote the minimum degree in G_1 by δ_1 , the

maximum degree in G_2 by Δ_2 . An *alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag* consists of two vertex-disjoint copies of K_ℓ in G_1 (i.e. all blue edges) and two vertex-disjoint edges in G_2 (i.e. two red edges) both connecting vertices in different copies of K_ℓ .

Theorem 2.2. *Let $G_1 = (V, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V, E_2)$ be two graphs where $|V| = m$ and $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$, $\ell \geq 2$ is a given integer. Let the minimum degree in G_1 be δ_1 , and the maximum degree in G_2 be Δ_2 . If*

$$m \left(\frac{\ell^2 - 1}{\ell^2} + \alpha \right) \leq \delta_1 \quad \text{where} \quad 0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{\ell^2} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\Delta_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{m\alpha - \ell}{3}} \quad (2.2)$$

hold, $m \geq m(\ell)$ is large enough, then there are $\lfloor m/\ell \rfloor$ vertex-disjoint copies of K_ℓ in G_1 so that no two of these copies span an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag.

3 Proofs

First we prove Theorem 2.2 by a series of Lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = m$. Suppose that $0 < \alpha < 1/\ell^2$ and the minimum degree in G is at least*

$$m \left(\frac{\ell^2 - 1}{\ell^2} + \alpha \right). \quad (3.1)$$

If m is large enough then G contains $\lfloor m/\ell \rfloor$ vertex-disjoint copies of K_ℓ .

Proof. We will call such a system of vertex-disjoint copies of K_ℓ an *almost- ℓ -decomposition* of the graph G . If $G = K_m$ then the statement is obviously true. Suppose that G is a counter-example and add edges one by one until the statement is true. Let G' be this graph and e be the last edge added. Then $G' - e$ is also a counter-example, G' contains an almost- ℓ -decomposition, $\lfloor m/\ell \rfloor$ vertex-disjoint copies of K_ℓ . The same can be said about $G' - e$, except that e is missing from one copy of K_ℓ . Let A denote its vertex set.

Claim. *There is another copy of K_ℓ among the ones above, its vertex set denoted by B , such that $G' - e$ contains a complete bipartite $K_{\ell, \ell}$ spanned by A and B .*

Proof. In order to prove the claim suppose the contrary: none of the copies of K_ℓ can be chosen as B . If the total number of edges starting from A and ending at a fixed copy is ℓ^2 then we found a $K_{\ell,\ell}$. Hence, it can be supposed that this number of edges is at most $\ell^2 - 1$. The number of edges starting in A and ending in any copy of K_ℓ is at most $(\lfloor m/\ell \rfloor - 1)(\ell^2 - 1)$. But there are at most $\ell - 1$ vertices not included in the K_ℓ copies. Therefore, the total number of edges having exactly one end in A is at most

$$\left(\left\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) (\ell^2 - 1) + \ell(\ell - 1).$$

Each vertex of A is also connected to the $\ell - 1$ other vertices of A . These imply that A has a vertex of degree at most

$$\frac{(\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \rfloor - 1)(\ell^2 - 1)}{\ell} + (\ell - 1) + (\ell - 1).$$

This can be upper-bounded by

$$m \frac{\ell^2 - 1}{\ell^2} + 2(\ell - 1).$$

If $m > \frac{2(\ell-1)}{\alpha}$ then this is smaller than the minimum degree condition (3.1). This contradiction proves the claim. \square

The Claim implies that $A \cup B$ spans a complete graph minus one edge e . It is obvious that this contains two vertex disjoint copies of K_ℓ . Replacing A and B by them, an almost- ℓ -decomposition of $G' - e$ is obtained, contradicting our assumption. \square

The vertex sets of the complete graphs K_ℓ will be called *classes* and will be denoted by upper case letters.

Lemma 3.2. *Under the conditions of Lemma 3.1, for each copy of K_ℓ with vertex set C , there are at least*

$$m\alpha - \ell(\ell - 1) \tag{3.2}$$

other copies with vertex sets D_1, D_2, \dots such that $C \cup D_i$ spans a complete graph on 2ℓ vertices.

Proof. Let $r = r(C)$ be the number of proper D s for the given C . The number of edges having one end in C is at most

$$r\ell^2 + \left(\left\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \right\rfloor - 1 - r \right) (\ell^2 - 1) + \ell(\ell - 1) \leq r + \frac{m}{\ell}(\ell^2 - 1) + \ell(\ell - 1). \quad (3.3)$$

However, (2.1) gives a lower bound on this quantity:

$$m\ell \left(\frac{\ell^2 - 1}{\ell^2} + \alpha \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Comparing (3.3) and (3.4) the desired inequality (3.2) is obtained. \square

Two classes spanning a $K_{2\ell}$ will be called a *compound pair*.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2.2. Suppose that m is large enough and let A and B be the vertex sets of two classes in the almost- ℓ -decomposition of G_1 . Let $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ where $\{a, b\}$ is not an edge in $G_1 \cup G_2$ (i.e. it is neither blue nor red).*

If G_1 and G_2 do not form an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag then there exist a class C and an element $c \in C$ such that A and C form a compound pair, furthermore $A - a + c, C - c + a$ and the other classes form an almost- ℓ -decomposition without an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag, even if the edge $\{a, b\}$ is added to G_2 (i.e. becomes red).

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 there are at least $m\ell\alpha - \ell(\ell - 1)$ classes C forming a double pair with A . Interchanging a and c in them keeps this property, therefore they cannot form an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag. We will see that the number of classes C not satisfying the other properties in Lemma 3.3 is less than $m\ell\alpha - \ell(\ell - 1)$.

Claim. *The number of C s such that $C - c + a$ forms an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag with some class D is less than*

$$\ell\Delta_2^2. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. In order to prove the claim, let us first notice that there are no two red edges between C and D therefore, if there are two red edges between $C - c + a$ and D then one of the red edges must start at a . Let $d \in D$ be the other end of this edge, moreover let the other red edge be $\{f, g\}$ where $f \in D, g \in C, g \neq c$. Give an upper estimate on the number of paths

$\{a, d, f, g\}$. Starting from a we have at most Δ_2 choices for d . Since both d and f are in Z , f can be chosen in $\ell - 1 < \ell$ ways. Finally, the last red edge from f to g can be chosen in at most Δ_2 ways. Their product, $\ell\Delta_2^2$ is a strict upper estimate on the number of these paths, but this must be also an upper estimate on the number of possible C s, proving the claim. \square

It is also possible that C is such that there is a class D for every choice of $c \in C$ which forms an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag with $A - a + c$. Then there is a red edge between $s \in A, s \neq a$ and $t \in D$ and another red edge between $u \in D$ and c . We have a red-blue-red path from s to c . The number of these paths is less than $\ell^2\Delta_2^2$. But C is a bad choice here only if there is such a path to its every element $c \in C$. Therefore the above estimate can be divided by ℓ . The number of bad C s is in this case is less than $\ell\Delta_2^2$, again.

Finally, we give an upper estimate on the number of possible C s creating an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag when $\{a, b\}$ turns red. This edge is connecting B and $C - c + a$, therefore there must be another red edge between B and C . The number of choices is less than

$$\ell\Delta_2. \tag{3.6}$$

By (3.5) and (3.6) the total number of bad C s is less than

$$2\ell\Delta_2^2 + \ell\Delta_2 < 3\ell\Delta_2^2.$$

There is a good C if (3.4) is not smaller:

$$m\ell\alpha - \ell(\ell - 1) \geq \ell\Delta_2^2.$$

But this is a consequence of (2.2). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Suppose that the conditions of the theorem hold for the graphs G_1 and G_2 . If G_2 is replaced by the empty graph then Lemma 3.1 ensures the existence of an almost- ℓ -decomposition of G_2 without an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag. Add edges of G_2 one by one until we cannot find such an almost- ℓ -decomposition of G_1 . That is, adding the red edge $\{a, b\} (a \in A, b \in B)$ there is no proper solution, but without it there is one. Take this latter almost- ℓ -decomposition of G_1 and apply Lemma 3.3 for it. An almost- ℓ -decomposition is obtained without $A_1 \cap B_1$, although $\{a, b\}$ is included. This contradiction proves the statement. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The result of Theorem 2.2 is used. Let the vertex set be $V = \binom{[n]}{k}$, the family of all k -element subsets of $[n]$. Two vertices are adjacent in G_1 if the corresponding k -element subsets are disjoint. Then a (k, ℓ) -papatition corresponds to a copy of K_ℓ in G_1 . Two vertices in G_2 are adjacent if the intersection of the corresponding k -element subsets has a size more than $k/2$. Two such papartitions are too close if and only if the corresponding copies of K_ℓ form an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag. Therefore we only have to check the validity of the inequalities (2.1) and (2.2) for this graph.

G_1 is regular of degree $\binom{n-k}{k}$, therefore if we choose $\alpha = \frac{1}{2\ell^2}$ then (2.1) becomes

$$\binom{n}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\ell^2}\right) \leq \binom{n-k}{k}.$$

The ratio of the two binomial coefficients tends to 1 with n , hence the inequality holds for large ns .

G_2 is also regular, its degree is

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < \frac{k}{2}} \binom{k}{i} \binom{n-k}{i} \leq O(n^{\frac{k-1}{2}}).$$

But the right hand side of (2.2) in this case is asymptotically a constant times $n^{\frac{k}{2}}$, proving the inequality and the theorem. \square

4 Remarks, problems

The story has started with the following theorem of Dirac.

Theorem 4.1. [2] *If the minimum degree in a graph of m vertices is at least $\frac{m}{2}$ then the graph contains a Hamiltonian cycle (going through every vertex exactly once).*

Actually, our Lemma 3.1 is a very weak form of Dirac's theorem if $\ell = 2$. The condition is more than $\frac{3}{4}m$ rather than $\frac{m}{2}$ and we obtained only every second edges of the Hamiltonian cycle. But there is a Dirac type theorem for larger ℓ . The p th power H^p of a Hamiltonian cycle H is obtained by joining every pair of vertices not farther than p along the cycle. Seymour [7] conjectured, Komlós, G. Sárközy and Szemerédi [6] proved that if the minimum degree in a graph is at least $m^{\frac{p-1}{p}}$ and m is large enough, then

the graph contains H^p as a subgraph. Our Lemma 3.1 is a weakening of this theorem ($p = \ell - 1$). We proved here this weaker version because its proof is much easier than the really deep proof in [6]. Also, it does not need such a very large value of m .

This comparison opens a new problem: find an extension of Theorem 2.2 in this direction.

Problem 1. *Under what degree conditions can we say that G_1 contains an $H^{\ell-1}$ such that it does not form an alternating- $(\ell, 2, \ell, 2)$ -bag with two red edges?*

Problem 2. *Improve the constants in our theorems, decreasing the thresholds in m and n .*

We are sure that our results do not reach the boundaries of the method. Define the *size* of a (k, ℓ) -papartition as $k\ell$.

Problem 3. *For given n maximize the size of the papartitions satisfying the condition in Theorem 2.2. Can it be constant times n ?*

Can it be n ? Even if the answer is yes, the present method is not strong enough to prove it. If this is too hard to prove, there might be other similar conditions instead of our concept “too close”.

Problem 4. *(Baranyai theorem with an additional condition.) Suppose $k|n$. Find a non-trivial relation R between two partitions of an n -element set into k -element subsets in such a way that the family of all k -element subsets can be decomposed into such partitions in such a way that no two of them are in relation with respect to R .*

There are many open problems related to the Baranyai theorem. Let us popularize an old and difficult one. First a *wreath* is defined as follows. Take a cyclic permutation of the elements of $[n]$ and consider only intervals along the cyclic permutation. Choose one interval, then take the interval starting immediately after the end of the first interval. The third one starts after the end of the second interval, and so on. If $k|n$ then this ends after choosing n/k intervals and in this case the wreath consists of these n/k intervals. In general we do not stop after the first round, only when our interval fits to the initial interval. That is if $\text{lcm}(n, k)$ is the least common multiple then we stop after $\text{lcm}(n, k)/k$ intervals and go around $\text{lcm}(n, k)/n$ times.

Conjecture (The wreath conjecture.). *The family of all k -element subsets of $[n]$ can be decomposed into disjoint wreaths.*

This was jointly conjectured by Zsolt Baranyai and the first author. Baranyai tragically passed away in 1976, the conjecture appeared in print only in 1991 [4]. Later, independently, Bailey and Stevens posed related conjectures, see paper [3] for the relevant references.

Finally let us mention that paper [5] contains some related earlier results and open problems.

References

- [1] ZS. BARANYAI, On the factorization of the complete uniform hypergraph. In: Hajnal, A., Rado, R., Sós, V.T., (Eds.), *Infinite and Finite Sets*, Vol. I, Colloq. Keszthely, 1973, North Holland, Amsterdam, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, **10** 91–108.
- [2] G. A. DIRAC, Some theorems on abstract graphs. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, Ser. 3. **2** (1952), 69–81.
- [3] FELIX JOOS, STEFAN GLOCK AND DERYK OSTHUS, Euler tours in hypergraphs *Combinatorica* **40** (2020), 679–690.
- [4] G.O.H. KATONA, Rényi and the combinatorial search problems, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **26** (1991) 363–378.
- [5] G.O.H. KATONA, Constructions via Hamiltonian theorems, *Discrete Math.*, **303**(2005) 087–103.
- [6] J. KOMLÓS, G. SÁRKÖZY AND E. SZEMERÉDI, On a conjecture of Seymour, *Ann. Combin.* **2**(1998) 4–60.
- [7] P. SEYMOUR, *Problem section, Combinatorics: Proceedings of the British Combinatorial Conference, 197*, ed. T.P. McDonough and V.C. Mavron, Cambridge University., London/New York (1974) pp. 201–202.