

# When $t$ -intersecting hypergraphs admit bounded $c$ -strong colourings

Kevin Hendrey\*    Freddie Illingworth<sup>†</sup>  
 Nina Kamčev<sup>‡</sup>    Jane Tan<sup>§</sup>

June 21, 2024

## Abstract

The  $c$ -strong chromatic number of a hypergraph is the smallest number of colours needed to colour its vertices so that every edge sees at least  $c$  colours or is rainbow. We show that every  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph has bounded  $(t + 1)$ -strong chromatic number, resolving a problem of Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida. In fact, we characterise when a  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph has large  $c$ -strong chromatic number for  $c \geq t + 2$ . Our characterisation also applies to hypergraphs which exclude sunflowers with specified parameters.

## 1 Introduction

The study of hypergraph colourings has long been extensive and fruitful, encompassing not only some fundamental results within combinatorics but also many results that have far-reaching theoretical and practical applications. Part of this richness comes from the fact that there are a multitude of ways in which one can generalise the notion of proper vertex-colourings of graphs to hypergraphs across different settings. Some classical variants of hypergraph colourings are discussed in [Ber89, Chapter 4], although numerous others have also garnered interest (for instance [BT10, GKŽ21, PT09]). Among all of these, there are two predominant definitions in the literature: a *weak* colouring of a hypergraph is one for which there are no monochromatic edges so that each edge see at least two different colours, and a *strong* colouring is one for which every edge is *rainbow* meaning no two vertices in an edge have the same colour.

Interpolating between weak and strong colourings, a  *$c$ -strong* colouring of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  is an assignment of colours to the vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that every edge  $e \in E(\mathcal{H})$

---

2020 MSC: 05C15 (Colouring of graphs and hypergraphs)

\*Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science, Daejeon, South Korea ([kevinhendrey@ibs.re.kr](mailto:kevinhendrey@ibs.re.kr)). Supported by the Institute for Basic Science (IBS-R029-C1)

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, University College London, UK ([f.illingworth@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:f.illingworth@ucl.ac.uk)). Research supported by EPSRC grant EP/V521917/1 and the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia ([nina.kamcev@math.hr](mailto:nina.kamcev@math.hr)). Supported by the Croatian Science Foundation, project number HRZZ-IP-2022-10-5116 (FANAP).

<sup>§</sup>All Souls College, University of Oxford, UK ([jane.tan@maths.ox.ac.uk](mailto:jane.tan@maths.ox.ac.uk)).

contains vertices with at least  $\min\{c, |e|\}$  distinct colours. When  $c = 2$  this recovers the notion of a weak colouring, whilst a strong colouring corresponds to being  $\infty$ -strong (or  $c$ -strong for  $c = \max_{e \in E(\mathcal{H})} |e|$ ). The  *$c$ -strong chromatic number of  $\mathcal{H}$* , denoted  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c)$ , is the smallest number of colours needed in a  $c$ -strong colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Despite being a particularly natural third variant, results concerning  $c$ -strong colourings are surprisingly recent and few. These exist in the context of generalised chromatic polynomials [DB06, DBL07], random uniform hypergraphs [Sha21], and intersecting hypergraphs, the last of which has received the most attention and is also our starting point.

A hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  is  *$t$ -intersecting* if for every pair of edges  $e, f \in E(\mathcal{H})$  we have  $|e \cap f| \geq t$ . In 2012, Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida [BWY14] defined the parameter  $\chi(t, c)$  to be the minimum number of colours that suffice to  $c$ -strong colour every  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph (write  $\chi(t, c) = \infty$  if this is unbounded), and posed the problem of determining this value for all combinations of  $t$  and  $c$ . Classical work of Erdős and Lovász [EL75] solves the weak colouring case (that is,  $c = 2$ ) as they showed that  $\chi(0, 2) = \infty$ ,  $\chi(1, 2) = 3$ , and  $\chi(t, 2) = 2$  for every  $t \geq 2$ .

Extending these results, Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida showed that  $\chi(t, c)$  is finite when  $t \geq c$  or  $(t, c) = (1, 2)$  and unbounded when  $t \leq c - 2$ . This leaves a conspicuous boundary case, when  $t = c - 1$ .

**Problem 1.1** ([BWY14]). *Determine whether  $\chi(c - 1, c)$  is finite or not for every  $c > 2$ .*

Since being posed, only the  $c = 3$  case of this problem has been resolved. Chung [Chu13] showed that  $\chi(2, 3) \leq 21$ , and Colucci and Gyárfás [CG13] independently established finiteness with the precise value  $\chi(2, 3) = 5$ .

Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida's proof that  $\chi(c, c)$  is finite used a random colouring. However, Alon [Alo13] showed that for every integer  $N$  there are  $(c - 1)$ -intersecting hypergraphs such that the probability that a random  $N$ -colouring is  $c$ -strong is arbitrarily small. Thus, uniformly random colourings cannot be used to solve [Problem 1.1](#) and a new approach is needed. In this paper, we answer the problem fully.

**Theorem 1.2.**  *$\chi(c - 1, c)$  is finite for all  $c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .*

This theorem completes the characterisation initiated in [BWY14]:  $\chi(t, c)$  is finite if and only if  $t \geq c - 1$ . The bound on  $\chi(c - 1, c)$  yielded by our proof is superexponential and we have made no attempt to optimise it.

[Theorem 1.2](#) will be a consequence of our stronger main theorem, which is more general in two ways and motivated as follows. One reason that  $\chi(t, t + \ell) = \infty$  for  $\ell \geq 2$  is that one may take a hypergraph with large  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number (e.g. a graph with large chromatic number) and add a fixed set  $S$  of  $t$  vertices to each hyperedge. We show that this is the *only* reason that a  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph can have large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number. To this end, for a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ , define the *link* of a subset of vertices  $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  to be the hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}_S$  with vertex set  $V(\mathcal{H}_S) = V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus S$  and edge set  $\{e \setminus S : S \subseteq e \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . The preceding construction relied on the simple fact that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \geq \max_{|S|=t} \chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell)$ . Our main theorem, [Theorem 1.3](#), gives a converse: if  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $t$ -intersecting and  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell)$  is bounded for all sets  $S$  of size  $t$ , then  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  is bounded. Now  $\chi(\mathcal{H}', 1) = 1$  for every hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  and so [Theorem 1.2](#) follows immediately.

The second way that [Theorem 1.3](#) generalises [Theorem 1.2](#) is by weakening the as-

assumption that the hypergraph is  $t$ -intersecting; we will instead require that it does not contain a sunflower of a certain size. Recall that a *sunflower* is a hypergraph with edges  $e_1, \dots, e_m$  such that if  $v \in e_i \cap e_j$  for distinct  $i, j \in [m]$ , then  $v$  is contained in all of the edges. The common intersection  $\bigcap_{i \in [m]} e_i$  is the *kernel* of the sunflower, and the *petals* are the pairwise disjoint sets  $e_j \setminus \bigcap_{i \in [m]} e_i$  for  $j \in [m]$ . Note that a hypergraph is  $t$ -intersecting if and only if it does not contain a sunflower with two petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ . [Theorem 1.3](#) replaces ‘two petals’ with ‘ $p$  petals’. That is, we prove:

**Theorem 1.3.** *For all non-negative integers  $t, \ell, p$  and  $\chi$  with  $p \geq 2$  there is some  $K$  such that the following holds. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a hypergraph such that*

- $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ ;
- for all sets  $S$  of  $t$  vertices,  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq \chi$ .

Then  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \leq K$ .

We will prove [Theorem 1.3](#) in [Section 3](#) after first introducing the key objects and ideas in [Section 2](#). As remarked above, the second hypothesis is necessary. The first hypothesis is also necessary in the sense that  $t - 1$  cannot be replaced by  $t - 2$ . Indeed, let  $G$  be a graph of large chromatic number,  $T$  a set of  $t - 1$  new vertices, and  $\mathcal{H}$  the  $(t + 1)$ -uniform hypergraph whose edges are  $T \cup e$  for  $e \in E(G)$ . Then  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + 1) \geq \chi(G)$ , the link of each set of  $t$  vertices is an independent set, and every sunflower has kernel of size at least  $t - 1$ .

[Theorem 1.3](#) gives a qualitative characterisation of when a  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph has large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number: when some set of  $t$  vertices has a link whose  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number is large. Defining  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)$  to be the largest  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number of a link of  $t$  vertices, we have  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell) \leq \chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \leq f_{t, \ell}(\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell))$  for some function  $f_{t, \ell}$ . In [Section 4](#) we strengthen this quantitatively by giving both lower and upper bounds for  $f_{t, \ell}$ . In particular, we show that  $f_{t, \ell}(x) = x^{\Theta(t^{\ell-2})}$  for fixed  $\ell$  and growing  $t$ .

## 2 Proof outline and definitions

In this section, we introduce the key objects used in the proof of [Theorem 1.3](#) and end with a proof sketch.

Throughout this paper, we use the term *colouring* to mean vertex-colouring. Explicitly, a colouring of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  is a function  $c: V(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . On the few occasions we wish to colour edges of a graph or hypergraph, we will use the term *edge-colouring*.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a hypergraph as in the statement of the theorem and that it has very large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number. We will consider various colourings of the vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  and will need to be able to combine them. We do this with product colourings.

Given colourings  $c_1, \dots, c_m: V(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , their *product colouring*  $c^\times: V(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^m$  is the colouring given by

$$c^\times(v) = (c_1(v), \dots, c_m(v)).$$

Observe that  $|c^\times(V(\mathcal{H}))| \leq \prod_{i=1}^m |c_i(V(\mathcal{H}))|$ .

The next idea is that any sequence of edges  $e_1, \dots, e_L \in \mathcal{H}$  split  $V(\mathcal{H})$  into regions as follows.

**Definition 2.1.** For edges  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_L$  of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ , the set of *regions formed by  $e_1, \dots, e_L$* , denoted  $\mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ , is the set of non-empty intersections  $\bigcap_{i \in I} e_i \cap \bigcap_{i \in [L] \setminus I} (V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus e_i)$  where  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, L\}$ .

Note that regions form a partition of the vertex-set  $V(\mathcal{H})$  into non-empty sets.

Consider the following ‘regional’ colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$ : we colour the vertices so that each region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  receives  $t + \ell$  colours (if the region has size less than  $t + \ell$ , then it is given a rainbow colouring) and we use different colour palettes on each region. The number of colours used in this colouring is bounded (at most  $(t + \ell)2^L$ ). This colouring may give some edges  $t + \ell$  colours (these edges have now been coloured appropriately and can be subsequently ignored). However, since  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  is very large, the sub-hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  consisting of those edges receiving fewer than  $t + \ell$  colours must still have large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number. Which edges are in  $\mathcal{H}'$ ? Every such edge must intersect fewer than  $t + \ell$  different regions. Furthermore, every such edge cannot entirely contain a region (we use induction and the properties of  $\mathcal{H}$  to deal with edges that entirely contain regions of size less than  $t + \ell$ ). Motivated by this we make the following definition.


**Definition 2.2.** A sequence of edges  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell$  is *k-split-degenerate* if for each  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ :

- The edge  $e_j$  intersects at most  $k$  regions in  $\mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$ ;
- The edge  $e_j$  does not contain any region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$

**Remark 2.3.** Every subsequence of a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence is  $k$ -split-degenerate.

By iterating the argument of the previous paragraph we show (Lemma 3.1) that, provided  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  is sufficiently large,  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a long  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate sequence.

While split-degenerate sequences are quite structured we clean them up further, using Ramsey’s theorem, to show (Lemma 3.2) that they contain the following key structure.



**Figure 1.** A  $b$ -bromeliad  $(C_1, C_2 \sqcup P_2, \dots, C_b \sqcup P_b)$  witnessed by  $(\{C_1, \emptyset\}, \{C_2, P_2\}, \dots, \{C_b, P_b\})$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Given a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ , a sequence of edges  $\mathcal{B} = (e_1, \dots, e_b)$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  is a *b-bromeliad* if there are sets  $P_i$  (*petals*) and  $C_i$  (*cores*) such that

- for each  $i$ ,  $C_i$  and  $P_i$  partition  $e_i$ ;
- $e_1 = C_1 \supseteq C_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq C_b \neq \emptyset$ ;
- $P_1, \dots, P_b, C_1$  are pairwise disjoint.

We say that the sequence of partitions  $(\{C_1, P_1\}, \dots, \{C_b, P_b\})$  witnesses that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a *b-bromeliad*.

**Remark 2.5.** Note that, for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq b$ ,  $C_j = e_i \cap e_j$  and  $P_j = e_j \setminus e_i$ . Furthermore,  $C_1 = e_1$  and  $P_1 = \emptyset$ . In particular, there is a unique witness for each bromeliad.

We call  $e_1$  the *outer edge* of the bromeliad, and  $C_2 = e_2 \cap e_1$  the *crown* of the bromeliad. A crucial ingredient at the end of our argument is the poset consisting of the family of *b-bromeliads* in a fixed hypergraph with partial order given by

$$(e_1, \dots, e_b) \prec (e'_1, \dots, e'_b) \quad \text{if} \quad |e_2 \cap e_1| < |e'_2 \cap e'_1|.$$

**Lemmas 3.1** and **3.2** combine to show (**Corollary 3.3**) that a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  as in the statement of **Theorem 1.3** contains a large Bromeliad. Iterating **Corollary 3.3** allows us to construct a nested sequence of subhypergraphs  $\mathcal{H}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{H}_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{H}_m$  and a sequence of  $(t + \ell)$ -bromeliads  $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_m$  where, for each  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  is minimum with respect to the partial order for  $\mathcal{H}_i$ . These bromeliads will have additional properties (guaranteed by **Lemma 3.4**) which allow us to find a ‘diagonal’ bromeliad (consisting of at most one edge from each of the  $\mathcal{B}_i$ ) which, for some  $i$ , precedes  $\mathcal{B}_i$  in the partial order given by  $\mathcal{H}_i$ . This contradicts the minimality of  $\mathcal{B}_i$  and so shows that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  is bounded.

### 3 The proof of Theorem 1.3

We first show that the assumptions in **Theorem 1.3** guarantee the existence of a long split-degenerate sequence.

**Lemma 3.1** (Finding long split-degenerate sequences). *Let  $t, \ell, p, \chi, L$  be positive integers, and assume that **Theorem 1.3** holds for  $t_{1.3} = t - 1$  and the given values of  $\ell, p, \chi$ . Then there is a positive integer  $K_{3.1}$  such that the following holds. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a hypergraph and  $e_1, \dots, e_L$  are edges of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that*

- $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ ;
- for all sets  $S$  of  $t$  vertices,  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq \chi$ ;
- the sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  is  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate;
- $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \geq K_{3.1}$ .

*Then there is an edge  $e_{L+1} \in \mathcal{H}$  such that the sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_{L+1})$  is  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate.*

*Proof.* Let  $K := K(t - 1, \ell, p, \chi)$  be the constant obtained by applying **Theorem 1.3** with the specified parameters, and take  $K_{3.1} = (t + \ell) \cdot 2^L K^{(t+\ell-1)2^L} + 1$ .

We begin by defining some colourings of  $\mathcal{H}$ . The edges that have fewer than  $t + \ell$  colours with respect to the product of these colourings will extend the  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate sequence.

Let  $c_{\mathcal{R}}$  be a  $(t + \ell)$ -regional colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to  $e_1, \dots, e_L$ , defined as follows:

- for each region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  of size less than  $t + \ell$ , assign each vertex in  $R$  a new colour;
- for each region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  of size at least  $t + \ell$ , take an arbitrary partition of  $R$  into  $t + \ell$  non-empty parts, and for each part assign one new colour to all the vertices of that part.

Let us call a region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  *small* if  $|R| \leq t + \ell - 1$ , and *large* otherwise. Note that each small region is rainbow-coloured by  $c_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $t + \ell$  colours appear on each large region. The colouring  $c_{\mathcal{R}}$  uses at most  $(t + \ell) \cdot 2^L$  colours.

We now also define a colouring  $c_v$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  for each vertex  $v$  in a small region  $S \in \mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ . We will apply the induction hypothesis to the link hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}_v$ .<sup>1</sup> To this end, note that  $\mathcal{H}_v$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size  $t - 2$ . Moreover, for every  $S' \subseteq V(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{v\}$  with  $|S'| = t - 1$ , the link graph of  $S'$  in  $\mathcal{H}_v$  is  $\mathcal{H}_{\{v\} \cup S'}$ , which satisfies  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_{\{v\} \cup S'}, \ell) \leq \chi$  by assumption. Thus  $\mathcal{H}_v$  satisfies the hypothesis of [Theorem 1.3](#) with  $t_{1.3} = t - 1$ , and so  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_v, (t - 1) + \ell) \leq K$ . Let  $c_v$  be a  $K$ -colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$  whose restriction to  $\mathcal{H}_v$  is a  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -strong colouring.

Let  $c^\times$  be the product colouring of all of the colourings  $c_v$  (over vertices  $v$  in small regions) together with the regional colouring  $c_{\mathcal{R}}$ . There are at most  $(t + \ell - 1)2^L$  vertices  $v$  in small regions and each colouring  $c_v$  uses at most  $K$  colours, so  $c^\times$  uses at most  $(t + \ell)2^L K^{(t + \ell - 1)2^L}$  colours. Since  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) > (t + \ell)2^L K^{(t + \ell - 1)2^L}$ ,  $c^\times$  is not a  $(t + \ell)$ -strong colouring and so there is an edge  $e'$  which sees at most  $t + \ell - 1$  colours.

First note that  $e'$  intersects at most  $t + \ell - 1$  regions of  $\mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  since it picks up at least one new colour in the regional colouring from each region that it intersects. In addition, since all large regions have  $t + \ell$  different colours in the regional colouring,  $e'$  cannot contain any large region. Finally, suppose that  $e'$  contains some vertex  $v$  of a small region. Then  $c_v$  ensures that  $c^\times$  assigns at least  $t + \ell - 1$  colours to  $e' \setminus \{v\}$ , and  $c_{\mathcal{R}}$  ensures that each of those colours are distinct from  $c^\times(v)$ . Hence,  $e'$  receives at least  $t + \ell$  colours from  $c^\times$ , a contradiction.

Thus  $e'$  intersects at most  $t + \ell - 1$  regions from  $\mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  and does not contain any region of  $\mathcal{R}(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ . Hence  $e_{L+1} := e'$  extends the  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ .  $\square$

We now show that sufficiently long split-degenerate sequences contain long bromeliads as subsequences.

**Lemma 3.2** (split-degenerate sequence to bromeliad). *For all positive integers  $b, k$  and  $p$  there is a positive integer  $f_{3.2}(b, k, p)$  such that the following holds. If  $e_1, \dots, e_{f_{3.2}(b, k, p)}$  is a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence that does not contain a matching of size  $p$ , then there are integers  $1 \leq a(1) < a(2) < \dots < a(b) \leq f_{3.2}(b, k, p)$  such that  $e_{a(1)}, e_{a(2)}, \dots, e_{a(b)}$  is a  $b$ -bromeliad.*

<sup>1</sup> $\mathcal{H}_v$  denotes the link  $\mathcal{H}_S$  where  $S = \{v\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be the graph with vertex-set  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{f_{3.2}(b,k,p)}\}$  and with an edge between  $e_i$  and  $e_j$  if  $e_i \cap e_j \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $e_1, \dots, e_{f_{3.2}(b,k,p)}$  does not contain a matching with  $p$  edges,  $G$  does not contain an independent set of size  $p$ . By the Erdős-Szekeres bound for Ramsey's theorem,  $G$  contains a clique of size at least  $f(b,k) := f_{3.2}(b,k,p)^{1/p}$ . The subsequence of  $e_i$  in this clique is  $k$ -split-degenerate (by Remark 2.3) and is intersecting (i.e.  $e_i \cap e_j \neq \emptyset$  for all  $i, j$ ). By relabelling, we may assume that  $e_1, \dots, e_{f(b,k)}$  is an intersecting  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence.

Consider the complete 3-uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{K}^{(3)}$  on vertex set  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{f(b,k)}\}$ , and define an edge-colouring of this hypergraph using 2 colours as follows. For  $i_1 < i_2 < i_3$ , the edge  $e_{i_1}e_{i_2}e_{i_3}$  is

- blue if  $(e_{i_1} \Delta e_{i_2}) \cap e_{i_3} \neq \emptyset$ ;
- red if  $(e_{i_1} \Delta e_{i_2}) \cap e_{i_3} = \emptyset$ ;

where  $\Delta$  denotes the symmetric difference.

Suppose that there is a large blue clique on vertices  $e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_\ell}$  where  $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_\ell \leq f(b,k)$ . We will show that such a clique cannot occur. To derive a contradiction, take an edge-colouring of the complete graph  $\mathcal{K}^{(2)}$  on vertex set  $\{j_1, \dots, j_{\ell-1}\}$  as follows. First, fix  $1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq \ell - 1$ . Then  $e_{j_\alpha} \Delta e_{j_\beta}$  is the union of some regions in  $\mathcal{R}(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_{\ell-1}})$ . Since  $e_{j_\alpha}e_{j_\beta}e_{j_\ell}$  is a blue edge,  $e_{j_\ell}$  intersects  $e_{j_\alpha} \Delta e_{j_\beta}$  and so there is some region  $R \in \mathcal{R}(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_{\ell-1}})$  such that  $R \subseteq e_{j_\alpha} \Delta e_{j_\beta}$  and  $e_{j_\ell}$  intersects  $R$ . Colour edge  $j_\alpha j_\beta$  with colour  $R$  (if there is more than one such region pick one arbitrarily).

By Remark 2.3, the sequence  $e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_\ell}$  is  $k$ -split-degenerate, and hence there are at most  $k$  regions in  $\mathcal{R}(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \dots, e_{j_{\ell-1}})$  that  $e_{j_\ell}$  intersects. Thus there are at most  $k$  choices for  $R$ , so the colouring of the  $\mathcal{K}^{(2)}$  uses at most  $k$  colours. By Ramsey's theorem, provided that  $\ell$  is sufficiently large, there is a monochromatic triangle  $j_\alpha j_\beta j_\gamma$ . That is, there is a region  $R$  such that  $R \subseteq e_{j_\alpha} \Delta e_{j_\beta}$ ,  $R \subseteq e_{j_\beta} \Delta e_{j_\gamma}$ ,  $R \subseteq e_{j_\gamma} \Delta e_{j_\alpha}$ , and  $e_{j_\ell}$  intersects  $R$ . However,  $(e_{j_\alpha} \Delta e_{j_\beta}) \cap (e_{j_\beta} \Delta e_{j_\gamma}) \cap (e_{j_\gamma} \Delta e_{j_\alpha}) = \emptyset$  (this is true for any three sets), so  $R$  is empty, which is a contradiction. Thus there is no large blue clique in the colouring of  $\mathcal{K}^{(3)}$ .

Hence, by Ramsey's theorem, if  $f(b,k)$  is sufficiently large then there must be a red clique  $e_{a(1)}, e_{a(2)}, \dots, e_{a(b)}$  in  $\mathcal{K}^{(3)}$  where  $1 \leq a(1) < a(2) < \dots < a(b) \leq f(b,k)$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} C_i &= e_{a(i)} \cap e_{a(1)}, \\ P_i &= e_{a(i)} \setminus e_{a(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We now show that  $(\{C_1, P_1\}, \dots, \{C_b, P_b\})$  witnesses that  $e_{a(1)}, e_{a(2)}, \dots, e_{a(b)}$  is a  $b$ -bromeliad. Firstly, since  $e_1, \dots, e_{f(b,k)}$  is intersecting,  $C_b \neq \emptyset$ . Secondly,  $C_1 = e_{a(1)}$  by definition. Thirdly,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{i+1} \setminus C_i &= (e_{a(i+1)} \cap e_{a(1)}) \setminus (e_{a(i)} \cap e_{a(1)}) = (e_{a(i+1)} \cap e_{a(1)}) \setminus e_{a(i)} \\ &= (e_{a(1)} \setminus e_{a(i)}) \cap e_{a(i+1)} \subseteq (e_{a(1)} \Delta e_{a(i)}) \cap e_{a(i+1)} = \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality is automatic for  $i = 1$  and uses that the edge  $e_{a(1)}e_{a(i)}e_{a(i+1)}$  is red for  $i \geq 2$ . Thus  $C_{i+1} \subseteq C_i$  for each  $i$ . Next note that  $C_i = e_{a(i)} \cap e_{a(1)}$  is the union of some

regions in  $\mathcal{R}(e_{a(1)}, \dots, e_{a(i)})$ . Choose one such region  $R \subseteq C_i$ . Since  $e_{a(1)}, e_{a(2)}, \dots, e_{a(i+1)}$  is  $k$ -split-degenerate by [Remark 2.3](#), the edge  $e_{a(i+1)}$  does not contain  $R$ . It follows that  $R \not\subseteq C_{i+1}$ , and so  $C_i \neq C_{i+1}$ . Thus  $C_{i+1} \subsetneq C_i$  for each  $i$ .

It just remains to verify pairwise disjointness of the petals and  $C_1$ . Since  $C_1 = e_{a(1)}$ , it is clear that this is disjoint from each  $P_i$  by their definition. For  $1 \leq i < j \leq b$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_i \cap P_j &= (e_{a(i)} \setminus e_{a(1)}) \cap (e_{a(j)} \setminus e_{a(1)}) \\ &= (e_{a(i)} \setminus e_{a(1)}) \cap e_{a(j)} \subseteq (e_{a(1)} \Delta e_{a(i)}) \cap e_{a(j)} = \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality again uses the fact that the edge  $e_{a(1)}e_{a(i)}e_{a(j)}$  is red. This completes the verification that  $e_{a(1)}, e_{a(2)}, \dots, e_{a(b)}$  is a  $b$ -bromeliad, as required.  $\square$

Let  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  be a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence on  $V(\mathcal{H})$ . We say that a set of edges  $\mathcal{H}'$  is  *$k$ -compatible* (or simply *compatible* when  $k$  is clear from context) with a sequence of edges  $e_1, \dots, e_L$  if  $e_1, \dots, e_L, e'$  is a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence for every  $e' \in \mathcal{H}'$ . This definition is usually applied in a situation where  $\mathcal{H}'$  is the edge set of a bromeliad.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $t, \ell, p, \chi, L, b$  be positive integers, and assume that [Theorem 1.3](#) holds for all  $t_{1.3} < t$  and the given values of  $\ell, p, \chi$ . Then there is some positive integer  $K_{3.3}$  such that the following holds. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a hypergraph and  $e_1, \dots, e_L$  are edges of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that*

- $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ ;
- for all sets  $S$  of  $t$  vertices,  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq \chi$ ;
- the sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$  is  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -split-degenerate;
- $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \geq K_{3.3}$ .

Then  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a  $b$ -bromeliad which is  $(t + \ell - 1)$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ .

*Proof.* Set  $k = t + \ell - 1$  and let  $M := f_{3.2}(b, k, p)$  be the integer guaranteed by [Lemma 3.2](#).

Provided  $K_{3.3}$  is sufficiently large, we may repeatedly apply [Lemma 3.1](#) to find edges  $e_{L+1}, \dots, e_{L+M}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $(e_1, \dots, e_{L+M})$  is  $k$ -split-degenerate. The hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ , so it does not contain a matching of size  $p$ . Thus, by the definition of  $M$ , the  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence  $(e_{L+1}, \dots, e_{L+M})$  contains a  $b$ -bromeliad as a subsequence. This  $b$ -bromeliad is  $k$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_L)$ .  $\square$

Now that we can find a  $b$ -bromeliad  $\mathcal{B}$  in  $\mathcal{H}$  by [Corollary 3.3](#), our next lemma shows that there is a sub-hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  that has large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number and whose edges have the additional property that they are disjoint from one of the petals of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Lemma 3.4** (Pruning to good intersection pattern). *For all  $b$  and  $r$  there is some integer  $K_{3.4}$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a hypergraph with  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, b - 1) \geq K_{3.4}$ , and let  $\mathcal{B} = (e_1, \dots, e_b)$  be a  $b$ -bromeliad in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then there is a sub-hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  and an edge  $e_j$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $j \geq 2$  such that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}', b - 1) \geq r$  and every edge of  $\mathcal{H}'$  is disjoint from the petal of  $e_j$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $K_{3.4} = b(r - 1)^{b-1} + 1$ . For each  $j \in \{2, \dots, b\}$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_j$  denote the sub-hypergraph of  $\mathcal{H}$  consisting of edges in  $\mathcal{H}$  that are disjoint from the petal  $P_j$  of  $e_j$ . If there is a  $j$  such that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_j, b - 1) \geq r$ , then we may take  $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}_j$ . So suppose not,



and for each  $j$  choose a  $(b - 1)$ -strong colouring of  $\mathcal{H}_j$  using at most  $r - 1$  colours, and extend it arbitrarily to an  $(r - 1)$ -colouring  $c^j$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $c_P$  be the  $b$ -colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that for each  $j \in \{2, \dots, b\}$  every vertex of  $P_j$  gets colour  $j$  and all vertices not in petals of  $\mathcal{B}$  get colour 1.

Let  $c^\times$  denote the product of  $c_P$  and all of the  $c^j$ . This uses less than  $K_{3.4}$  colours and so there is some edge  $e$  that sees less than  $b - 1$  colours. Now if  $e$  intersects all of  $P_2, \dots, P_b$ , then it receives at least  $b - 1$  colours from  $c_P$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $e$  must be disjoint from some  $P_j$  where  $j \in \{2, \dots, b\}$ . But then  $e \in \mathcal{H}_j$ , and so  $e$  received at least  $b - 1$  colours from  $c^j$ , a contradiction. Hence, there is some  $j \in \{2, \dots, b\}$  with  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_j, b - 1) \geq r$ , as required.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For all non-negative integers  $t, \ell, p$  and  $\chi$  with  $p \geq 2$  there is some  $K$  such that the following holds. Suppose that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a hypergraph such that*

- $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel of size at most  $t - 1$ ;
- for all sets  $S$  of  $t$  vertices,  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq \chi$ .

Then  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \leq K$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $t$ . When  $t = 0$ , the theorem holds with  $K = \chi$  since the second bullet point just becomes  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, \ell) \leq \chi$ .

So let  $t \geq 1$ , and assume that the theorem holds for all  $t' < t$ . Let  $k := t + \ell - 1$ , let  $b := t + \ell + 1$ , and let  $\Phi := f_{3.2}(b + 1, k, p)$  be the integer guaranteed by [Lemma 3.2](#). Choose integers  $1 \ll \chi_\Phi \ll \dots \ll \chi_0$  (we will see how large these should be later). Suppose for a contradiction that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) > \chi_0$ . Note that the first bullet point of the theorem statement implies that no subhypergraph of  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a matching of size  $p$ .

We will inductively construct a sequence of hypergraphs  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{H}_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{H}_\Phi$ , a sequence of  $b$ -bromeliads  $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\Phi$ , a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence of edges  $(e_1, \dots, e_\Phi)$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that the following hold for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, \Phi\}$ :

- (1)  $e_j \in \mathcal{B}_j \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  and  $e_j$  is not the outer edge of  $\mathcal{B}_j$ ;
- (2)  $\mathcal{B}_j$  is a  $b$ -bromeliad in  $\mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  that is  $k$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$ ;
- (3) subject to (2),  $\mathcal{B}_j$  is  $\prec$ -minimal (see [Definition 2.4](#));
- (4) every edge of  $\mathcal{H}_j$  is disjoint from the petal of  $e_j$  in  $\mathcal{B}_j$ ;
- (5)  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_j, b - 1) > \chi_j$ .

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, \Phi\}$ , our construction proceeds as follows. Provided  $\chi_{j-1}$  is sufficiently large, applying [Corollary 3.3](#) to  $\mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  and  $(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$  (this sequence of edges will be empty for  $j = 1$ ) gives the existence of a  $b$ -bromeliad in  $\mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  that is  $k$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}_j$  be a  $\prec$ -minimal one. Then, provided  $\chi_{j-1}$  is also sufficiently large compared to  $\chi_j$ , applying [Lemma 3.4](#) to  $\mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_j$  gives an edge  $e_j$  of  $\mathcal{B}_j$  (that is not the outer edge) and a subhypergraph  $\mathcal{H}_j$  of  $\mathcal{H}_{j-1}$  that satisfy properties (4) and (5).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>At this point, we have covered all of the steps that will ultimately affect the bound on  $\chi(c - 1, c)$  given by this proof. Note that the number of times we need to apply [Lemma 3.4](#) comes from [Lemma 3.1](#) which uses multiple applications of Ramsey's Theorem. Using known bounds for the Ramsey functions involved, it follows that our bound is of order  $2^{2^{2^{\text{poly}(c)}}}$ .

Now, for each  $j$  the bromeliad  $\mathcal{B}_j$  is  $k$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_{j-1})$  and  $e_j \in \mathcal{B}_j$ , so  $(e_1, \dots, e_\Phi)$  is a  $k$ -split-degenerate sequence. Recall that  $\mathcal{H}$  does not contain a matching of size  $p$ , so from the definition of  $\Phi$  we have that  $(e_1, \dots, e_\Phi)$  contains a  $(b+1)$ -bromeliad  $\mathcal{B} = (e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_{b+1}})$  witnessed by  $(\{C_{i_1}, P_{i_1}\}, \dots, \{C_{i_{b+1}}, P_{i_{b+1}}\})$ . Let us note the following set inclusion for future use:

$$e_{i_2} \cap e_{i_3} = C_{i_3} \subsetneq C_{i_2} = e_{i_1} \cap e_{i_2}. \quad (\dagger)$$

By removing the first edge of  $\mathcal{B}$ , we get another  $b$ -bromeliad  $\mathcal{B}' := (e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_{b+1}})$  witnessed by  $(\{e_{i_2}, \emptyset\}, \{C_{i_3}, P_{i_3}\}, \dots, \{C_{i_{b+1}}, P_{i_{b+1}}\})$ . Moreover, for  $2 \leq j \leq b+1$ , we have  $i_j > i_1$  and so  $\mathcal{B}'$  is a  $b$ -bromeliad in  $\mathcal{H}_{i_1-1}$  and is  $k$ -compatible with  $(e_1, \dots, e_{i_1-1})$ . That is, all of the edges in  $\mathcal{B}'$  were available at the time  $\mathcal{B}_{i_1}$  was chosen. To complete the proof, we will show that  $\mathcal{B}' \prec \mathcal{B}_{i_1}$ , thereby contradicting the  $\prec$ -minimality of  $\mathcal{B}_{i_1}$ .

Firstly, let  $C'_{i_1}$  and  $P'_{i_1}$  be the petal and core of  $e_{i_1}$  in  $\mathcal{B}_{i_1}$  respectively. Since  $e_{i_1}$  is not the outer edge of  $\mathcal{B}_{i_1}$ , we can be sure that  $C'_{i_1}$  is a proper subset of the crown of  $\mathcal{B}_{i_1}$ . The crown of  $\mathcal{B}'$  is  $e_{i_2} \cap e_{i_3}$ . Thus, by  $(\dagger)$ , to prove that  $\mathcal{B}' \prec \mathcal{B}_{i_1}$  it suffices to show that  $e_{i_1} \cap e_{i_2} \subseteq C'_{i_1}$ .

Now  $e_{i_1} = C'_{i_1} \sqcup P'_{i_1}$  and each edge of  $\mathcal{H}_{i_1}$  is disjoint from  $P'_{i_1}$ . But  $e_{i_2} \in \mathcal{H}_{i_2-1} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{i_1}$  which implies that

$$e_{i_2} \cap (e_{i_1} \setminus C'_{i_1}) = e_{i_2} \cap P'_{i_1} = \emptyset,$$

so  $e_{i_1} \cap e_{i_2} \subseteq C'_{i_1}$ , which gives the desired contradiction. This establishes that in fact  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) = \chi(\mathcal{H}, b - 1) \leq \chi_0$ , so taking  $K = \chi_0$  gives the result.  $\square$

## 4 The $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number of $t$ -intersecting hypergraphs

[Theorem 1.3](#) demonstrates that the only obstacle to finding a  $(t + \ell)$ -strong colouring of a  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph with a bounded number of colours is that there may exist a set of  $t$  vertices whose link has a high  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number. This motivates the definition of a parameter  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)$  of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$ , where

$$\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell) := \max \left( \{1\} \cup \left\{ \chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) : S \in \binom{V(\mathcal{H})}{t} \right\} \right).$$

Since we now know that there is a relationship between  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  and  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)$ , the natural problem arises of determining the nature of this relationship. As a start, the following statement is a refinement of [Theorem 1.2](#) for  $(c - 2)$ -intersecting hypergraphs with large  $c$ -strong chromatic number.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For every integer  $c \geq 2$ , there is a constant  $x_c$  such that if  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $(c - 2)$ -intersecting hypergraph with  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \geq x_c$ , then  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) = \chi(\mathcal{H}, c - 2, 2) + c - 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be the value given by applying [Theorem 1.3](#) with  $t = c - 2$ ,  $\ell = 2$ ,  $p = 2$ , and  $\chi = 2c - 1$ . We claim that we may set  $x_c$  to be  $K + 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $(c - 2)$ -intersecting and  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \geq x_c > K$ , there is some set  $S$  of  $c - 2$  vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, 2) \geq 2c$ . Let  $S$  be the set of  $c - 2$  vertices for which  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, 2)$  is largest. Note that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S) = \chi(\mathcal{H}_S, 2) = \chi(\mathcal{H}, c - 2, 2)$ .

First, we show that  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \geq \chi(\mathcal{H}_S) + c - 2$ . Consider the subhypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  consisting of all hyperedges containing  $S$ . Suppose for contradiction that  $\mathcal{H}'$  admits a  $c$ -strong colouring with  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S) + c - 3$  colours. At most  $c - 2$  colours appear on  $S$ , so there is some colour  $z$  that appears on  $V(\mathcal{H}')$  but not on  $S$ . We may assume that the colours used on  $S$  are distinct from the colours used on  $V(\mathcal{H}') \setminus S$ : if  $v \in V(\mathcal{H}') \setminus S$  receives a colour that appears on  $S$ , then changing the colour of  $v$  to  $z$  results in a  $c$ -strong colouring of  $\mathcal{H}'$  using the same number of colours. Thus, the number of colours used by vertices not in  $S$  is at most  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S) - 1$ . However, by the definition of  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S)$ , there is a hyperedge with at most  $|S| + 1 = c - 1$  distinct colours, a contradiction. Thus  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \geq \chi(\mathcal{H}', c) \geq \chi(\mathcal{H}_S) + c - 2$ .

Now consider a  $(\chi(\mathcal{H}_S) + c - 2)$ -colouring  $\theta$  which extends an optimal colouring of  $\mathcal{H}_S$  by assigning a unique colour to every vertex in  $S$ . Note that every hyperedge containing  $S$  sees at least  $c$  colours. Consider a hyperedge  $e$  which does not contain  $S$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $(c - 2)$ -intersecting, this edge  $e$  intersects each edge containing  $S$  in at least one vertex not in  $S$ . Let  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{2c}$  be distinct colours assigned by  $\theta$  to vertices not in  $S$ . Since the restriction of  $\theta$  to  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is an optimal colouring, for each  $i \in [c]$  there must be an edge  $e_i$  of  $\mathcal{H}_S$  which sees only the colours  $z_{2i-1}$  and  $z_{2i}$ , otherwise these colours could be merged into a single colour. But the edge  $e$  intersects each such  $e_i$ , and so  $e$  sees at least  $c$  colours. Thus  $\theta$  is a  $c$ -strong colouring, and so  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \leq \chi(\mathcal{H}_S) + c - 2$ , as required.  $\square$

In light of the preceding result, one might be tempted to conjecture that, for positive integers  $t$  and  $\ell$ , every  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  of sufficiently large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number satisfies  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) = \chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell) + t$ . The following result demonstrates that this is not the case.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Given positive integers  $t, \ell$  and  $K$  with  $K, \ell \geq 2$ , there is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  with the following properties:*

- $\mathcal{H}$  is  $t$ -intersecting,
- $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) = K^{\binom{t+2\ell-4}{\ell-2}} + t + 2\ell - 4$ , and
- $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell) \leq K^{\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}} + 2\ell - 4$ .

*Proof.* To construct such a hypergraph, let  $\tau = \binom{t+2\ell-4}{\ell-2}$ , and let  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint sets of vertices with  $|A| = t + 2\ell - 4$  and  $|B| = K^\tau$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_\tau$  be the subsets of  $A$  of size  $t + \ell - 2$ , and index the elements of  $B$  by writing  $B := \{b_\sigma : \sigma \in [K]^\tau\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the hypergraph whose edge set consists of all sets of the form  $S_i \cup \{b_\sigma, b_{\sigma'}\}$  such that  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  differ in their  $i$ -th coordinate. Then  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $(t + \ell)$ -uniform and every edge contains  $t + \ell - 2$  vertices of  $A$ , so  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $t$ -intersecting. Note that every pair of vertices occur together in some hyperedge of size exactly  $t + \ell$ , and must therefore receive distinct colours in any  $(t + \ell)$ -strong colouring. Thus  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) = |V(\mathcal{H})| = K^\tau + t + 2\ell - 4$ .

We now turn to colouring the links. Let  $S \subseteq V(\mathcal{H})$  have size  $t$ . If  $|B \cap S| \geq 3$ , then  $\mathcal{H}_S$  has no edges and so  $\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) = 1$ . Next, suppose that  $|B \cap S| \in \{1, 2\}$ . Rainbow colour  $A \setminus S$  and give one further colour to all of  $B \setminus S$ . Every edge in  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is rainbow-coloured, so

$$\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq 1 + |A \setminus S| = 1 + |A| - |S| + |B \cap S| \leq 2\ell - 1.$$

The last possibility is that  $|B \cap S| = 0$ , meaning  $S \subseteq A$ . Note that the set  $I_S \subseteq [\tau]$  of indices  $i$  such that  $S \subseteq S_i$  has size exactly  $\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}$ . The equivalence relation  $\sim_S$  on  $B$ ,

defined by  $b_\sigma \sim_S b_{\sigma'}$  if and only if  $b_\sigma$  and  $b_{\sigma'}$  agree on  $I_S$ , has  $K^{\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}}$  equivalence classes. Rainbow colour  $A \setminus S$ , and for each equivalence class of  $\sim_S$  assign one new colour to all vertices in that class. Now every edge in  $\mathcal{H}_S$  is rainbow-coloured, so

$$\chi(\mathcal{H}_S, \ell) \leq |A \setminus S| + K^{\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}} = K^{\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}} + 2\ell - 4.$$

Overall, this gives the claimed bound of  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell) \leq K^{\binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2}} + 2\ell - 4$ .  $\square$

We do not know whether the above construction is optimal. However, we now work toward an upper bound for  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell)$  in terms of  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)$  that will show that it is in some sense close to optimal when  $t$  is much larger than  $\ell$ . For this, we need the following immediate corollary of [Theorem 1.3](#).

**Corollary 4.3.** *For every pair of integers  $p, c \geq 2$ , there exists a positive integer  $K_{4.3}$  such that every hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  either contains a sunflower with  $p$  petals and kernel size at most  $c - 2$ , or  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, c) \leq K_{4.3}$ .*

*Proof.* Apply [Theorem 1.3](#) with  $t = c - 1$ ,  $\ell = 1$  and  $\chi = 1$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** *For every pair of positive integers  $t$  and  $\ell$ , there is a natural number  $K_{4.4}$  such that for any  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  we have*

$$\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) \leq \max\{K_{4.4}, (t + \ell) \cdot \chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)^{\binom{t+\ell-2}{\ell-2}} + t + \ell - 2\}.$$

*Proof.* Set  $K_{4.4}$  to be the constant obtained by taking  $c = p = t + \ell$  in [Corollary 4.3](#). By [Corollary 4.3](#), we may assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  contains a sunflower with  $t + \ell$  petals and kernel size at most  $t + \ell - 2$ . Let  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{t+\ell}$  be the petals of such a sunflower and let  $\hat{S}$  be its kernel. Consider a  $(t + \ell)$ -colouring  $c_0$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that for each petal  $P_i$ , all vertices in  $P_i$  are assigned colour  $i$  (the colours of vertices not in any petal can be chosen arbitrarily). Note that if a hyperedge intersects every petal, it receives  $t + \ell$  colours under this colouring. If a hyperedge does not intersect every petal, then, as  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $t$ -intersecting, it must contain at least  $t$  vertices of  $\hat{S}$ . For each  $S' \in \binom{\hat{S}}{t}$ , let  $c_{S'}$  be a  $\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)$ -colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$  whose restriction to  $\mathcal{H}_{S'}$  is  $\ell$ -strong. To obtain a  $(t + \ell)$ -strong colouring of  $\mathcal{H}$ , we colour the vertices not in  $\hat{S}$  according to the product colouring of all colourings considered thus far, and then assign  $|\hat{S}|$  new colours to the vertices of  $\hat{S}$ . Thus, the total number of colours used is at most  $(t + \ell) \cdot \chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)^{\binom{t+\ell-2}{\ell-2}} + t + \ell - 2$ .  $\square$

## 5 Open problems

[Theorem 1.2](#) completes the characterisation of when  $\chi(t, c)$  is finite. Nonetheless, the precise value of  $\chi(t, c)$  remains open for  $t \geq c - 1 \geq 3$ . The best lower bound for  $\chi(c - 1, c)$  is  $2c - 1$ , which is attained by the complete  $(2c - 2)$ -uniform hypergraph on  $3c - 3$  vertices [BWY14]. This lower bound is tight for  $c \leq 3$ , and Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida asked whether it is the correct value for all  $c$  [BWY14, Problem 1.4]. The bound given by our proof is superexponential. It would be interesting to prove a small upper bound.

**Problem 5.1.** *Improve the upper bound on  $\chi(c - 1, c)$ . Can it be bounded by an exponential/polynomial/linear function of  $c$ ?*

When  $t \geq c$ , the upper and lower bounds for  $\chi(t, c)$  are much closer (since random colourings work) although still not tight. See Blais, Weinstein and Yoshida [BWY14] and Alon [Alo13] for the current state of the art bounds and interesting open problems in this regime. We remark that the current best upper bound for  $\chi(c, c)$  is  $c^{1/2}e^c$ , and so sufficient progress on [Problem 5.1](#) would lead to an improvement on this as well.

[Theorem 1.3](#) gives a qualitative characterisation of when a  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph has large  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number: when there is a set of  $t$  vertices whose link has large  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number. [Theorems 4.1](#) and [4.4](#) strengthen this quantitatively by giving bounds on the  $(t + \ell)$ -strong chromatic number of  $\mathcal{H}$  in terms of the largest  $\ell$ -strong chromatic number of the link of a set of  $t$  vertices. It would be very interesting to refine this bound further.

**Problem 5.2.** For fixed positive integers  $t$  and  $\ell$ , what is the smallest integer  $x_{t,\ell}$  such that every  $t$ -intersecting hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies

$$\chi(\mathcal{H}, t + \ell) = \mathcal{O}_{t,\ell}(\chi(\mathcal{H}, t, \ell)^{x_{t,\ell}})?$$

[Theorems 4.2](#) and [4.4](#) show that  $\binom{t+2\ell-4}{\ell-2} / \binom{2\ell-4}{\ell-2} \leq x_{t,\ell} \leq \binom{t+\ell-2}{\ell-2}$ . Thus, if we fix the value of  $\ell$  and allow  $t$  to grow we have  $x_{t,\ell} = \Theta(t^{\ell-2})$ . There is a more significant gap if we instead fix the value of  $t$ , where we see that  $x_{t,\ell}$  is  $\Omega(1)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\ell^t)$ .

**Acknowledgements.** This project was initiated at the Graph Theory Workshop held at the Bellairs Research Institute in March 2024. We thank the organisers Sergey Norin, Paul Seymour and David Wood.

## References

- [Alo13] NOGA ALON (2013). [Paul Erdős and probabilistic reasoning](#), *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, vol. 25, 11–33 (János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest). [↑2, 13](#)
- [Ber89] CLAUDE BERGE (1989). *Hypergraphs: Combinatorics of finite sets*, *North-Holland Mathematical Library*, vol. 45 (North-Holland). [↑1](#)
- [BT10] CSILLA BUJTÁS and ZSOLT TUZA (2010). [Color-bounded hypergraphs, IV: Stable colorings of hypertrees](#). *Discrete Mathematics* **310**(9), 1463–1474. [↑1](#)
- [BWY14] ERIC BLAIS, AMIT WEINSTEIN, and YUICHI YOSHIDA (2014). [Semi-strong colouring of intersecting hypergraphs](#). *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **23**(1), 1–7. [↑2, 12, 13](#)
- [CG13] LUCAS COLUCCI and ANDRÁS GYÁRFÁS (2013). [Coloring 2-intersecting hypergraphs](#). *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **20**(3), P37. [↑2](#)
- [Chu13] PING NGAI CHUNG (2013). [On the  \$c\$ -strong chromatic number of  \$t\$ -intersecting hypergraphs](#). *Discrete Mathematics* **313**(10), 1063–1069. [↑2](#)
- [DB06] EWA DRGAS-BURCHARDT (2006). [On  \$k\$ -chromatically unique and  \$k\$ -chromatically equivalent hypergraphs](#). *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* **24**, 57–60. [↑2](#)
- [DBŁ07] EWA DRGAS-BURCHARDT and EWA ŁAZUKA (2007). [Chromatic polynomials of hypergraphs](#). *Applied Mathematics Letters* **20**(12), 1250–1254. [↑2](#)
- [EL75] P. ERDŐS and L. LOVÁSZ (1975). Problems and results on 3-chromatic hypergraphs and some related questions. *Infinite and Finite Sets, Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai* **10**, 609–627. [↑2](#)
- [GKŽ21] RAGNAR GROOT KOERKAMP and STANISLAV ŽIVNÝ (2021). [On rainbow-free colourings of uniform hypergraphs](#). *Theoretical Computer Science* **885**, 69–76. [↑1](#)
- [PT09] JÁNOS PACH and GÁBOR TARDOS (2009). [Conflict-free colourings of graphs and hypergraphs](#). *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **18**(5), 819–834. [↑1](#)
- [Sha21] D. A. SHABANOV (2021). [On the  \$s\$ -colorful number of a random hypergraph](#). *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* **254**(4), 582–587. [↑2](#)