

# MINIMUM DEGREE IN SIMPLICIAL COMPLEXES

CHRISTIAN REIHER AND BJARNE SCHÜLKE

ABSTRACT. Given  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\alpha(d)$  be the largest real number such that every abstract simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $0 < |\mathcal{S}| \leq \alpha(d)|V(\mathcal{S})|$  has a vertex of degree at most  $d$ . We extend previous results by Frankl, Frankl and Watanabe, and Piga and Schülke by proving that for all integers  $d$  and  $m$  with  $d \geq m \geq 1$ , we have  $\alpha(2^d - m) = \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1}$ . Similar results were obtained independently by Li, Ma, and Rong.

## §1 INTRODUCTION

A (finite, abstract) *simplicial complex* is a non-empty finite set  $\mathcal{S}$  of finite sets that is closed under taking subsets, meaning that for all  $S' \subseteq S \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have  $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ . According to this convention, the empty set  $\emptyset$  is an element of every simplicial complex. We call  $V(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S$  the *vertex set* of  $\mathcal{S}$  and the members of  $\mathcal{S}$  *edges*. The *degree*  $d(x)$  of a vertex  $x \in V(\mathcal{S})$  is the number of edges containing  $x$ , that is,  $d(x) = |\{e \in \mathcal{S} : x \in e\}|$ . The *minimum degree* of  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined as  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = \min\{d(x) : x \in V(\mathcal{S})\}$ . The minimum degree of the *trivial complex*  $\mathcal{S} = \{\emptyset\}$  is  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = \infty$ .

For  $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , let  $\alpha(d)$  be the largest real number such that every simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \alpha(d)|V(\mathcal{S})|$  satisfies  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) \leq d$ . In other words,  $\alpha(d)$  is the largest constant for which the lower bound  $|\mathcal{S}| > \alpha(d)|V(\mathcal{S})|$  can be inferred from  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) > d$ . (For the existence of this maximum we refer to Section 2). Currently, no explicit formula for  $\alpha(d)$  is in sight. In this work, we determine  $\alpha(2^d - m)$  for all integers  $d$  and  $m$  with  $d \geq m \geq 1$ . As we shall see, this means that we solve this problem for the first natural regime of parameters.

Historically, the investigation of  $\alpha(d)$  began in the context of traces of families of finite sets. Frankl [1] reduced a certain problem on traces to the minimum degree problem for simplicial complexes and obtained the first general result, namely that for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\alpha(2^d - 1) = \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1}. \quad (1.1)$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05D05, 05E45, 55U10.

*Key words and phrases.* Extremal set theory, simplicial complexes.

The second author was partially supported by the Young Scientist Fellowship IBS-R029-Y7.

In addition, Frankl and Watanabe [2] proved that for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\alpha(2^d - 2) = \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d + 1} \quad (1.2)$$

and  $\alpha(2^d) = \frac{2^{d+1}-1}{d+1} + \frac{1}{2}$ . Piga and Schülke [7] extended these results to values further away from powers of two by showing that for all  $d, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $d \geq 4c$ , we have  $\alpha(2^d - c) = \frac{2^{d+1}-c}{d+1}$ . We refer the reader to the introduction of [7] and the references therein for further early results. Our main contribution is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $d$  and  $m$  be integers with  $d \geq m \geq 1$ . Then  $\alpha(2^d - m) = \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$ .*

As we will see in Section 2, this formula is not correct for  $m > d$ . However, we illustrate that our methods can be used to push past this natural barrier by showing the following result, which solves a conjecture by Frankl and Watanabe [2].

**Theorem 1.2.** *We have  $\alpha(11) = \frac{53}{10}$ .*

All other values of  $\alpha(d)$  for  $d \leq 16$  have been known before and for the reader's convenience we include a complete table.

$d =$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$\alpha(d) =$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	2	$\frac{7}{3}$	$\frac{17}{6}$	$\frac{13}{4}$	$\frac{7}{2}$	$\frac{15}{4}$	$\frac{17}{4}$	$\frac{65}{14}$	5	$\frac{53}{10}$	$\frac{28}{5}$	$\frac{29}{5}$	6	$\frac{31}{5}$	$\frac{67}{10}$

Similar results were obtained independently by Li, Ma, and Rong [6]. Our methods are also applicable to cases where  $d$  is slightly larger than a power of two. For instance, we checked that  $\alpha(17) = \frac{50}{7}$  and  $\alpha(20) = 8$ , and hope to return to this topic in the near future.

**Overview.** In Section 2 we establish the existence of  $\alpha(d)$  and discuss upper bound constructions. The main part of this work concerns the lower bound: Given a simplicial complex with a certain minimum degree, we need to show that it has many edges. Very roughly speaking, our proof follows the strategy developed in [7], which has a local and a global part. Instead of counting the edges directly, it is convenient to instead consider weights of vertices, which are terms similar to  $\sum_{x \in F \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{|F|}$ . The minimum degree condition gives some lower bound for these weights. However, this lower bound is too small to finish directly. For this, we group vertices together into “conglomerates” (which are similar to “clusters” in [7]) with the intention that the average weight in each conglomerate is sufficiently large. To bound the average weight in each conglomerate, we need local results about simplicial complexes on a constant number of vertices with a certain number of edges.

The improvements over [7] come from several places. One is that the local considerations here are much more precise; we will discuss these in Section 4. Another improvement

comes from the fact that conglomerates are more flexible than clusters—for instance, two conglomerates might intersect, albeit in at most one vertex. Further, we introduce an auxiliary function on the vertices and a more general setting with potentially several simplicial complexes on the same vertex set. Together, this allows us to perform an induction on the number of edges of one of the simplicial complexes, which normally would disturb the minimum degree condition. The global part of our argument is given in Section 5. There we prove a more general result (Theorem 5.1) and deduce Theorem 1.1 from it. In Section 6 we prove Theorem 1.2. Section 3 serves as a collection of several tools, starting with inequalities, continuing with a weighted version of the Kruskal-Katona theorem, which is at the core of the local considerations in Section 4, and culminating in a first illustration of our method (see Lemma 3.13).

## §2 UPPER BOUNDS

Let us first check that for every  $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$  the maximum  $\alpha(d)$  does indeed exist. Given  $d$  we consider the set

$$M = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}: \text{Every simplicial complex } \mathcal{S} \text{ with } |\mathcal{S}| \leq \alpha|V(\mathcal{S})| \text{ satisfies } \delta(\mathcal{S}) \leq d\},$$

which is bounded from above, as there are non-trivial complexes  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) > d$ . Thus the supremum  $\alpha_\star = \sup(M)$  exists and it remains to show  $\alpha_\star \in M$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be any simplicial complex with  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \alpha_\star|V(\mathcal{S})|$ , take an isomorphic copy  $\mathcal{S}'$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $V(\mathcal{S}) \cap V(\mathcal{S}') = \emptyset$ , and observe that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}'$  yields  $|\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'| < \alpha_\star|V(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}')|$ . Hence, there is some  $\alpha' \in M$  such that  $|\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'| \leq \alpha'|V(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}')|$ . Since  $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}'$  is a simplicial complex, the definition of  $M$  leads us to  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = \delta(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}') \leq d$ , which proves  $\alpha_\star \in M$ .

It follows straight from the definition of  $\alpha(d)$  that every non-trivial simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) > d$  gives rise to an upper bound  $\alpha(d) \leq |\mathcal{S}|/|V(\mathcal{S})|$ . We can again improve upon this by working with many disjoint copies of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  denotes a non-trivial simplicial complex with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) > d$ , then*

$$\alpha(d) \leq \frac{|\mathcal{S}| - 1}{|V(\mathcal{S})|}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  be pairwise vertex-disjoint copies of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Their union  $\mathcal{S}_\star = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_n$  is a simplicial complex with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}_\star) > d$ , whence

$$\alpha(d) \leq \frac{|\mathcal{S}_\star|}{|V(\mathcal{S}_\star)|} = \frac{n(|\mathcal{S}| - 1) + 1}{n|V(\mathcal{S})|}.$$

The result follows by letting  $n$  go to infinity. □

Now we can easily generate some (well-known) upper bounds on  $\alpha(\cdot)$ .

**Construction 1.** For  $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the power set  $\mathcal{S} = \wp([d+1])$  is a simplicial complex with  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^{d+1}$ ,  $|V(\mathcal{S})| = d+1$ , and  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = 2^d$ . Thus, Lemma 2.1 yields  $\alpha(2^d - 1) \leq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1}$ .

This can be generalised by omitting some ‘large’ sets.

**Construction 2.** For integers  $d$  and  $m$  with  $d \geq m \geq 2$ , the set system

$$\mathcal{S} = \wp([d+1]) \setminus \left( \{[d+1]\} \cup \{[d+1] \setminus \{i\} : i \in [m-2]\} \right)$$

is a simplicial complex with  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^{d+1} - m + 1$ ,  $|V(\mathcal{S})| = d+1$ , and  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = 2^d - m + 1$ . Using Lemma 2.1, we get  $\alpha(2^d - m) \leq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1}$ .

**Construction 3.** For  $d \geq 2$ , the simplicial complex

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} = & \{A \subseteq [d+1] : |A| \leq d-1\} \\ & \cup \{A \subseteq [d+2, 2d+2] : |A| \leq d-1\} \\ & \cup \{\{1, d+2\}, [2, d+1], [d+3, 2d+2]\} \end{aligned}$$

satisfies  $|V(\mathcal{S})| = 2(d+1)$ ,  $|\mathcal{S}| = 2(2^{d+1} - d - 1)$ , and  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) = 2^d - d$ , whence

$$\alpha(2^d - d - 1) \leq \frac{2^{d+1} - d - 3/2}{d+1}. \quad (2.1)$$

This means that for  $m = d+1$ , the formula in Theorem 1.1 does not hold. Let us also note that we have already shown all upper bounds promised in the introduction (as the case  $d = 4$  of (2.1) reads  $\alpha(11) \leq \frac{53}{10}$ ), so that it remains to establish the corresponding lower bounds in the remainder of this article.

### §3 PRELIMINARIES

**3.1. Inequalities.** In this subsection we collect four estimates, which will be required later.

**Fact 3.1.** Given integers  $d \geq 3$  and  $t \geq 1$ , let  $n_1, \dots, n_t \in \mathbb{N}_0$  be such that  $\sum_{\tau \in [t]} n_\tau \leq d$ . If  $\sum_{\tau \in [t]} (2^{n_\tau} - 1) \geq 2^d - d$ , then there is an index  $\tau^* \in [t]$  such that  $n_{\tau^*} = d$  and  $n_\tau = 0$  for all  $\tau \in [t] \setminus \{\tau^*\}$ .

*Proof.* For all  $a, b \geq 0$ , we have  $(2^a - 1)(2^b - 1) \geq 0$  and, thereby,  $(2^a - 1) + (2^b - 1) \leq 2^{a+b} - 1$ . By an induction on the number of summands this yields

$$(2^{a_1} - 1) + \dots + (2^{a_m} - 1) \leq 2^{a_1 + \dots + a_m} - 1$$

for all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \geq 0$ .

Now assume for the sake of contradiction that there is a partition  $[t] = A \cup B$  such that both sums  $a = \sum_{i \in A} n_i$  and  $b = \sum_{i \in B} n_i$  are positive integers. Using the condition in the statement and the above observation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2^d - d &\leq \sum_{i \in [t]} (2^{n_i} - 1) \leq (2^a - 1) + (2^b - 1) \\ &= 2((2^{a-1} - 1) + (2^{b-1} - 1)) + 2 \leq 2(2^{a+b-2} - 1) + 2 \\ &= 2^{a+b-1} \leq 2^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

But this gives  $d \geq 2^{d-1}$ , contrary to  $d \geq 3$ .

We have thereby shown that there is some  $\tau^* \in [t]$  with  $n_{\tau^*} = 0$  for all  $\tau \in [t] \setminus \{\tau^*\}$ . Finally,  $2^{d-1} < 2^d - d \leq 2^{n_{\tau^*}} - 1$  yields  $n_{\tau^*} = d$ .  $\square$

**Fact 3.2.** *For all integers  $d \geq 4$ , we have*

$$\frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{2(d+1)} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2d-2}{3} + \frac{(d-2)(d-3)}{4}.$$

*Proof.* First note that

$$2^{d+1} \geq 1 + \binom{d+1}{1} + \binom{d+1}{2} + \binom{d+1}{3} + \binom{d+1}{4}$$

yields

$$\frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{2(d+1)} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{6} \binom{d}{2} + \frac{1}{8} \binom{d}{3}.$$

Together with

$$\binom{d}{2} = \binom{d-2}{2} + 2 \binom{d-2}{1} + 1$$

and

$$\binom{d}{3} = \binom{d-3}{3} + 3 \binom{d-3}{2} + 3 \binom{d-3}{1} + 1 \geq 3 \binom{d-2}{2} + 1$$

this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{2(d+1)} &\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{6} \binom{d-2}{2} + \frac{2d-3}{6} + \frac{3}{8} \binom{d-2}{2} + \frac{1}{8} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \binom{d-2}{2} + \frac{1}{24} \left( \binom{d-2}{2} + 14d - 9 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again using

$$\binom{d-2}{2} = \binom{d-4}{2} + 2 \binom{d-4}{1} + 1 \geq 2(d-4) + 1 = 2d - 7$$

leaves us with

$$\frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{2(d+1)} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(d-2)(d-3)}{4} + \frac{2d-2}{3}. \quad \square$$

**Fact 3.3.** *If  $d$ ,  $m$ , and  $s$  are integers with  $d \geq m \geq 3$  and  $m - 2 \geq s \geq 0$ , then the numbers  $r'$ ,  $r$  defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} r' &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a \leq s \text{ and } 2^a \leq m - 1\}, \\ r &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a \leq s + 1 \text{ and } 2^a \leq m\} \end{aligned}$$

satisfy

$$\frac{m - 1 - s}{d + 1 - r} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r'}$$

and

$$(s + 1) \left( \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r'} \right) + (d - s) \left( \frac{s + 1}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq m - 2.$$

*Proof.* Setting  $x = m - 2 - s$  and  $y = d + 1 - r$ , we have  $x \geq 0$  and

$$y - x = (d - m) + (s + 1 - r) + 2 \geq 2.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x + 1}{y} &= \frac{x}{y + 1} + \frac{x}{y(y + 1)} + \frac{1}{y} \leq \frac{x}{y + 1} + \frac{x}{2y} + \frac{1}{y} \\ &= \frac{x}{y + 1} + \frac{x + 2}{2y} \leq \frac{x}{y + 1} + \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and together with  $r \leq r' + 1$  we obtain

$$\frac{m - 1 - s}{d + 1 - r} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 2 - r} \leq \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r'},$$

which proves the first estimate.

Because of

$$\frac{(s + 1)s}{d} + \frac{(d - s)(s + 1)}{d} = s + 1,$$

the second one reduces to

$$(m - 2 - s) \left( \frac{s + 1}{d + 1 - r'} + \frac{d - s}{d + 1 - r} \right) \leq m - s - 3 + \frac{d - s}{2}.$$

Due to  $d \geq m$ , the right side is at least  $\frac{3}{2}(m - 2 - s)$  and, thus, it is sufficient to show

$$\frac{s + 1}{d + 1 - r'} + \frac{d - s}{d + 1 - r} \leq \frac{3}{2}. \quad (3.1)$$

Suppose first that  $(d, r) = (4, 2)$ . Now  $2^r \leq m \leq d$  yields  $m = 4$ , while  $r \leq s + 1$  and  $2^{r'} \leq m - 1$  give  $r' \leq 1 \leq s$ . Hence, we have indeed

$$\frac{s + 1}{d + 1 - r'} + \frac{d - s}{d + 1 - r} \leq \frac{s + 1}{4} + \frac{4 - s}{3} = \frac{19 - s}{12} \leq \frac{18}{12} = \frac{3}{2}.$$

Now let  $(d, r) \neq (4, 2)$ . Clearly,  $\frac{s+1}{d+1-r'} + \frac{d-s}{d+1-r} \leq \frac{d+1}{d+1-r}$ , and so to prove (3.1) it is enough to show  $r \leq \frac{d+1}{3}$ , i.e.,  $d \geq 3r - 1$ . If  $r \neq 2$ , then  $d \geq 2^r \geq 3r - 1$ . Otherwise,  $r = 2$  holds, and so  $d \neq 4$  and  $d \geq 2^r$  show  $d \geq 3r - 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $d, m, r$ , and  $s$  be nonnegative integers. If  $d \geq m \geq 3$ ,  $m-1 \geq s+1 \geq r$ , and  $m \geq 2^r$ , then*

$$\frac{s+1}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{m-2}{d+1}.$$

*Proof.* For reasons of monotonicity, we can assume that  $r$  is the number defined in Fact 3.3. In particular, we have  $r \geq 1$  and the first estimate from that result yields

$$\frac{s+1}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m-1-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r'},$$

for  $r'$  defined as in Fact 3.3. Combined with the second part of Fact 3.3 this proves our claim.  $\square$

**3.2. Variants of Katona's theorem.** We shall often need a weighted version of the classical Kruskal-Katona theorem applicable to generalised complexes (see Lemma 3.8 below). Let us first fix some notation. For two finite subsets  $A, B$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ , we write  $A \prec B$  if  $\max(A \triangle B) \in B$ , or, equivalently, if  $\sum_{i \in A} 2^{i-1} < \sum_{i \in B} 2^{i-1}$ . The latter description of  $\prec$  shows that the linear orders  $(\bigcup_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \prec)$  and  $(\mathbb{N}, <)$  are isomorphic.

**Definition 3.5.** *Given  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ , let  $\mathcal{R}_M(\ell)$  denote the set consisting of the first  $\ell$  elements of  $(\bigcup_{m \in M} \mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \prec)$ . In the special case  $M = \mathbb{N}_0$  we drop the subscript and if  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we write  $\mathcal{R}_m(\ell)$  instead of  $\mathcal{R}_{\{m\}}(\ell)$ .*

Next, for a collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of finite sets and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $\ell$ -shadow of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined by

$$\partial_\ell \mathcal{F} = \{F' \subseteq F : F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } |F'| = \ell\}.$$

Let us recall that Kruskal [5] and Katona [3] proved independently that if  $m \geq \ell$  are nonnegative integers and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0^{(m)}$  is finite, then  $|\partial_\ell(\mathcal{F})| \geq |\partial_\ell(\mathcal{R}_m(|\mathcal{F}|))|$ . The following concept generalises simplicial complexes.

**Definition 3.6.** *Given  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ , an  $M$ -complex is a non-empty finite collection of sets  $\mathcal{K}$  such that*

- (1)  $|x| \in M$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{K}$ ,
- (2) and for all  $x \subseteq y \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $|x| \in M$ , we have  $x \in \mathcal{K}$ .

For instance,  $\mathbb{N}_0$ -complexes are the same as simplicial complexes.

**Remark 3.7.** If  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in M} \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  is an  $M$ -complex, then, by the aforementioned Kruskal-Katona theorem, so is  $\bigcup_{m \in M} \mathcal{R}_m(|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|)$ . Indeed, for any  $\ell, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\ell \leq m$  this result yields  $|\partial_\ell(\mathcal{R}_m(|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|))| \leq |\partial_\ell(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)})| \leq |\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(\ell)}|$ . As  $\partial_\ell(\mathcal{R}_m(|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|))$  is an initial segment of  $(\mathbb{N}^{(\ell)}, \prec)$ , it is thus a subset of  $\mathcal{R}_\ell(|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(\ell)}|)$ .

The following lemma is essentially due to Katona [4], but we will prove it for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 3.8.** *If  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in M} \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  is an  $M$ -complex, then for every family of reals  $(w_m)_{m \in M}$  satisfying  $w_m \geq w_{m'}$  whenever  $m \leq m'$ , we have*

$$\sum_{m \in M} w_m |\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}| \geq \sum_{m \in M} w_m |\mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|) \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|. \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* By Remark 3.7,  $\mathcal{F}' = \bigcup_{m \in M} \mathcal{R}_m(|\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|)$  is an  $M$ -complex and, therefore, we can assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}'$ , i.e., that for every  $m \in M$  the set  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  is an initial segment of  $(\mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \preceq)$ . Setting  $f_m = |\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|$  and  $r_m = |\mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|) \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}|$ , we of course have

$$\sum_{m \in M} f_m = \sum_{m \in M} r_m. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence, unless  $f_m = r_m$  holds for all  $m$  (in which case we would be done), there has to be some maximal  $m^* \in M$  such that  $f_{m^*} > r_{m^*}$ .

**Claim 3.9.** *For all  $m \in M$  with  $m \leq m^*$ , we have  $f_m \geq r_m$ .*

*Proof.* Since both  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|) \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  are initial segments of  $(\mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \preceq)$ , it suffices to find an element  $y \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$  such that for the successor  $y^+$  of  $y$  in  $(\mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \preceq)$ , we have  $y^+ \notin \mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|)$ .

To this end, let  $x = \{x_1, \dots, x_{m^*}\} \in (\mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m^*)}) \setminus \mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|)$ , where  $x_1 < \dots < x_{m^*}$ , and consider  $y = \{x_{m^*-m+1}, \dots, x_{m^*}\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is an  $M$ -complex, we know that  $y \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(m)}$ . Let  $y^+$  be the successor of  $y$  in  $(\mathbb{N}^{(m)}, \preceq)$ . Then  $\max(y^+ \triangle x) = \max(y^+ \triangle y) \in y^+$  and, thus,  $x \preceq y^+$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|)$  is an initial segment of  $(\bigcup_{\mu \in M} \mathbb{N}^{(\mu)}, \preceq)$  and  $x \notin \mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|)$ , this entails  $y^+ \notin \mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{F}|)$ , and so  $y$  is as desired.  $\square$

The claim and the maximality of  $m^*$  mean that we have  $f_m \geq r_m$  for all  $m \in M$  with  $m \leq m^*$ , while  $f_m \leq r_m$  for all  $m \in M$  with  $m > m^*$ . So when we rewrite (3.3) in the form

$$\sum_{m \in M \cap [0, m^*]} (f_m - r_m) = \sum_{m \in M \cap (m^*, \infty)} (r_m - f_m),$$

then both sides involve nonnegative summands only. Owing to the monotonicity of  $(w_m)_{m \in M}$  we can conclude

$$\sum_{m \in M \cap [0, m^*]} w_m (f_m - r_m) \geq \sum_{m \in M \cap (m^*, \infty)} w_m (r_m - f_m),$$

which implies the desired estimate  $\sum_{m \in M} w_m f_m \geq \sum_{m \in M} w_m r_m$ .  $\square$

To explain how this lemma is going to be utilised, we recapitulate an elegant argument of Frankl [1], which provides a lower bound on  $\alpha(m)$  in terms of the function

$$\beta(m) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{R}(m+1)} \frac{1}{|F| + 1}.$$



**Lemma 3.10** (Frankl). *For every  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we have  $\alpha(m) \geq \beta(m)$ .*

*Proof.* Given a simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) \geq m + 1$ , we need to show  $|\mathcal{S}| > \beta(m)|V|$ , where  $V = V(\mathcal{S})$ . To this end, we consider for every vertex  $x \in V$  the sum  $q(x) = \sum_{x \in F \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{|F|}$ . Lemma 3.8 applied to  $M = \mathbb{N}_0$ , the simplicial complex

$$\mathcal{A} = \{F \setminus \{x\} : x \in F \in \mathcal{S}\},$$

and the weights  $w_j = \frac{1}{j+1}$ , discloses  $q(x) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|A|+1} \geq \beta(|\mathcal{A}|-1) \geq \beta(m)$  for every  $x \in V$ . By double counting this leads to

$$|\mathcal{S}| = 1 + \sum_{x \in V} q(x) > \beta(m)|V|. \quad \square$$

**Example 3.11.** For any nonnegative integer  $d$ , we have  $\mathcal{R}(2^d) = \wp([d])$ , whence

$$\beta(2^d - 1) = \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{d}{i} \frac{1}{i+1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1}.$$

Using Construction 1 and the previous lemma, we obtain  $\alpha(2^d - 1) = \frac{2^{d+1}-1}{d+1}$ .

**Example 3.12.** For every positive integer  $d$ , we have  $\mathcal{R}(2^d - 1) = \wp([d]) \setminus \{[d]\}$  and

$$\beta(2^d - 2) = \beta(2^d - 1) - \frac{1}{d+1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d+1}.$$

In view of Construction 2 and Lemma 3.10, this yields  $\alpha(2^d - 2) = \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1}$ .

**3.3. A special case.** We now turn to an illustration of our method and establish a slight generalisation of the well-known lower bound  $\alpha(5) \geq \frac{13}{4}$ , which corresponds to the case  $(d, m) = (3, 3)$  of Theorem 1.1. For the sake of comparison, we point out that a direct application of Lemma 3.10 only gives the inferior bound  $\alpha(5) \geq \frac{19}{6}$ , so that some additional averaging argument is needed. An analogue of the following statement addressing the case  $d \geq 4$  of Theorem 1.1 will be formulated as Theorem 5.1 below.

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a simplicial complex with vertex set  $V(\mathcal{S}) = V$  and let  $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  be a map. If for all  $x \in V$ , we have  $f(x) + d(x) \geq 6$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in V} f(x) + |\mathcal{S}| > \frac{13}{4}|V|.$$

*Proof.* Assume that the assertion does not hold, and for a fixed vertex set  $V$  let  $(\mathcal{S}, f)$  be a counterexample which minimises  $|\mathcal{S}|$ . We commence by observing that  $\mathcal{S}$  cannot contain sets with more than 3 elements. Indeed, if  $\mathcal{S}$  would contain such sets, let  $F \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $|F| = m \geq 4$  be maximal. By deleting  $F$  from  $\mathcal{S}$ , we obtain a simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}'$  such that  $f(x) + d_{\mathcal{S}'}(x) \geq 6$  for all  $x \in V \setminus F$  and  $d_{\mathcal{S}'}(x) \geq 2^{m-1} - 1 > 6$  for all  $x \in F$ . Hence,  $(\mathcal{S}', f)$  would be a counterexample with  $|\mathcal{S}'| < |\mathcal{S}|$ , a contradiction.

Similarly, one can argue that

$$\text{if a vertex } x \text{ belongs to a 3-set of } \mathcal{S}, \text{ then } d(x) \leq 6. \quad (3.4)$$

Assume contrariwise that  $d(x) \geq 7$  but there is some  $xyz \in \mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S} \setminus \{xyz\}$  and define  $f': V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  by setting  $f'(y) = f(y) + 1$ ,  $f'(z) = f(z) + 1$ , and  $f'(v) = f(v)$  for all  $v \in V \setminus \{y, z\}$ . Clearly, we then still have  $f'(v) + d_{\mathcal{S}'}(v) \geq 6$  for all  $v \in V$  and our minimal choice of  $\mathcal{S}$  entails

$$\frac{13}{4}|V| < \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V} f'(v) + |\mathcal{S}'| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V} f(v) + |\mathcal{S}|,$$

which is absurd.

Having thus proved (3.4), we observe that any two 3-sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  cannot intersect in a single vertex (because this vertex then had degree at least 7), and that no vertex can be in three or more 3-sets of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

For  $x \in V$ , we set  $k(x) = \frac{1}{2}f(x) + \sum_{x \in F \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{|F|}$ . Note that this is the ‘contribution of  $x$ ’ to the term we want to find a lower bound for, which can be rewritten as  $1 + \sum_{x \in V} k(x)$ .

Define a *quartette* to be a quadruple  $Q \in V^{(4)}$  such that  $|Q^{(3)} \cap \mathcal{S}| \geq 2$ . We contend that every vertex  $x$  which is not contained in any quartette satisfies  $k(x) > \frac{13}{4}$ . Our discussion of triples in  $\mathcal{S}$  shows that  $x$  can belong to at most one triple. Let us view  $k(x)$  as a sum of  $f(x)$  terms equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $d(x)$  terms of the form  $\frac{1}{|F|}$ , so that there are altogether at least 6 summands. Among them there are 1, at least four equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and a sixth one that is at least  $\frac{1}{3}$ . For this reason, we have indeed  $k(x) \geq 1 + \frac{4}{2} + \frac{1}{3} = \frac{10}{3} > \frac{13}{4}$ .

Next we consider any quartette  $Q$ . Again by our discussion of triples in  $\mathcal{S}$ , there are two vertices in  $Q$ , say  $u$  and  $v$ , which belong to exactly two triples, while the two other ones, say  $x$  and  $y$ , are in exactly one triple. Consequently,  $Q$  is disjoint to all other quartettes. Moreover, the argument from the previous paragraph discloses  $k(x), k(y) \geq \frac{10}{3}$ . Similarly, we obtain  $k(u), k(v) \geq 1 + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3} = \frac{19}{6}$ , and a simple addition leads to  $\sum_{z \in Q} k(z) \geq 13$ .

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of all quartettes, and let  $H$  be the set of vertices which are not contained in any quartette. Recalling that the quartettes are disjoint, we obtain

$$\sum_{v \in V} k(v) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \sum_{v \in Q} k(v) + \sum_{v \in H} k(v) \geq 13|\mathcal{Q}| + \frac{13}{4}|H| = \frac{13}{4}|V|,$$

whence

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V} f(v) + |\mathcal{S}| = 1 + \sum_{v \in V} k(v) > \frac{13}{4}|V|.$$

But this contradicts the fact that  $(\mathcal{S}, f)$  is a counterexample.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.14.** *We have  $\alpha(5) = \frac{13}{4}$ .*

*Proof.* The upper bound  $\alpha(5) \leq \frac{13}{4}$  can be seen by plugging  $d = m = 3$  into Construction 2. Now suppose conversely that  $\mathcal{S}$  is a simplicial complex with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) \geq 6$ . Lemma 3.13, applied to  $\mathcal{S}$  and the constant function  $f: V(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \{0\}$ , yields the desired bound  $|\mathcal{S}| > \frac{13}{4}|V|$ .  $\square$

#### §4 LOCAL LEMMATA

In order to adapt Frankl's Lemma 3.10 to the situation considered in Theorem 1.1, we need lower bounds on  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1}$  for simplicial complexes  $\mathcal{A}$  of size  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d - m + 1$ , where  $d \geq m \geq 3$  are given. We commence with the case that the ground set  $V(\mathcal{A})$  has size  $d$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $d, m, s$  be nonnegative integers such that  $d \geq \max\{s, 2\}$  and  $m \geq s + 2$ . Further, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a simplicial complex with  $|V(\mathcal{A})| = d$  and  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d - m + 1$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  contains exactly  $d - s$  sets of size  $d - 1$ , then*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d+1} - \left( \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r} \right) \quad (4.1)$$

holds for some nonnegative integer  $r$  such that  $2^r \leq m - 1$  and  $r \leq s$ .

*Proof.* We can assume that the vertex set  $V = V(\mathcal{A})$  is not in  $\mathcal{A}$ , because removing  $V$  from  $\mathcal{A} = \wp(V)$  would keep the assumptions valid and decrease the left side of our estimate.

Now we consider the simplicial complex  $\mathcal{B} = \{F \subseteq V: |F| \leq d - 2 \text{ or } F \in \mathcal{A}\}$ , which arises from  $\wp(V)$  by removing  $V$  itself and  $s$  sets of size  $d - 1$ . As in Example 3.12 we see that

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d+1} - \frac{s}{d}.$$

So due to  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , it remains to show that  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \leq \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r}$  for some nonnegative integer  $r$  with  $2^r \leq m - 1$  and  $r \leq s$ .

In the special case  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$ , this is clear, so we can take a set  $A_\star \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}$  such that  $|A_\star|$  is minimal. Write  $|A_\star| = d - r$  with  $r \geq 2$  and notice that  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}|}{d-r+1}$ . Further, one readily computes

$$|\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{B}| - |\mathcal{A}| \leq (2^d - s - 1) - (2^d - m + 1) = m - s - 2. \quad (4.2)$$

Thus, we can finish the proof by showing  $r \leq s$  and  $2^r \leq m - 1$ . To this aim, we analyse the sets in  $\wp(V)$  which must be missing from  $\mathcal{A}$  because they are supersets of  $A_\star$ . First, each of the  $r$  elements  $x \in V \setminus A_\star$  gives a  $(d - 1)$ -set  $V \setminus \{x\}$  containing  $A_\star$ ; together with the hypothesis  $|V^{(d-1)} \setminus \mathcal{A}| = s$  this proves  $r \leq s$ . The second part is shown by

$$2^r = |\{F: A_\star \subseteq F \subseteq V\}| \leq |\wp(V) \setminus \mathcal{A}| \leq m - 1. \quad \square$$

The following lemma will later be used to argue that if a simplicial complex uses a ground set larger than necessary, then its weight is sufficiently large.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Given integers  $d \geq m \geq 3$ , let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a simplicial complex with  $|V(\mathcal{A})| \geq d + 1$  and  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d - m + 1$ .*

(a) *We have  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$ .*

(b) *If  $\mathcal{A}$  contains exactly  $d - s - 1$  sets of size  $d - 1$  for some  $s \in [0, m - 2]$ , then there is an integer  $r$  with  $0 \leq r \leq s + 1$ ,  $2^r \leq m$ , and*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1} - \left( \frac{s+1}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

*Proof.* Arguing for fixed  $d, m$  by induction on  $|\mathcal{A}| + |V(\mathcal{A})|$ , we suppose that both statements hold for all simplicial complexes  $\mathcal{A}'$  satisfying  $|V(\mathcal{A}')| \geq d + 1$ ,  $|\mathcal{A}'| \geq 2^d - m + 1$ , and  $|\mathcal{A}'| + |V(\mathcal{A}')| < |\mathcal{A}| + |V(\mathcal{A})|$ . If some set  $F \in \mathcal{A}$  has size at least  $d$ , then  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d$ , so that we can simply delete a maximal such set and apply induction. Therefore, we can assume  $|F| < d$  for all  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ . Remark 3.7 allows us to suppose further, that

$$\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(\mu)} = \mathcal{R}_\mu(|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(\mu)}|) \quad (4.3)$$

for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Define the integer  $s \leq d - 1$  by  $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(d-1)}| = d - s - 1$ . Let us first look at the special case  $s < 0$ , where (b) is not applicable and we only have to deal with (a). The case  $\mu = d - 1$  of (4.3) yields  $([d] \setminus \{i\}) \in \mathcal{A}$  for all  $i \in [d]$ , whence  $\wp([d]) \setminus \{[d]\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . As we saw in Example 3.12, this entails  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1}$ , which is stronger than necessary.

It remains to study the case  $s \geq 0$ , where (4.3) reveals

$$\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(d-1)} = \{[d] \setminus \{i\} : s + 2 \leq i \leq d\}.$$

Moreover, when applied to  $\mu = 1$  (4.3) tells us  $V(\mathcal{A}) = [D]$  for some  $D > d$ . Now we set

$$M = \{2, \dots, d - 2\} \quad \text{as well as} \quad \mathfrak{M} = \bigcup_{\mu \in M} \mathbb{N}^{(\mu)},$$

and try to ‘simplify’  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{M}$ . To this end, we set  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{R}_M(|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{M}|)$  and consider the set system

$$\mathcal{B} = \{F \in \mathcal{A} : |F| \in \{0, 1, d - 1\}\} \cup \mathcal{T}.$$

We contend that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a simplicial complex. Since  $\wp([D]) \cap \mathfrak{M}$  is an initial segment of  $(\mathfrak{M}, \supseteq)$  which contains  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{M}$ , it contains  $\mathcal{T}$  as well, and therefore we have  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \wp([D])$ . Due to the choice of  $\mathcal{T}$ , it is only left to argue that for all  $F' \subseteq F \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(d-1)}$  with  $|F'| \geq 2$ , it follows that  $F' \in \mathcal{T}$ . For this, observe that also  $\mathcal{Q} = \{F \in \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M} : [s + 2, d] \not\subseteq F\}$  is an initial segment of  $(\mathfrak{M}, \supseteq)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  implies  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , which completes the proof

that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a simplicial complex. As Lemma 3.8 tells us  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{1}{|F|+1}$ , we can henceforth assume that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$ . The main gain of this transformation is that now the set  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{M}$  satisfies the trichotomy

$$\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{T} = \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{T} \supsetneq \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M},$$

which due to  $|\wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M}| = 2^d - 2d - 2$  suggests the following case distinction.

$$\textit{First case: } |\mathcal{T}| \geq 2^d - 2d - 2 \text{ and } |\mathcal{T}| + D \geq 2^d - d.$$

Assume first that  $|\mathcal{A}| > 2^d - m + 1$ . If  $|\mathcal{T}| > 2^d - 2d - 2$ , then  $\mathcal{T} \setminus (\wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M})$  is non-empty and we can simply delete an inclusion-maximal element of this set and apply induction. On the other hand, if  $|\mathcal{T}| = 2^d - 2d - 2$ , or in other words  $\mathcal{T} = \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M}$ , then  $D \geq (2^d - d) - |\mathcal{T}| = d + 2$ , so that we can delete  $\{D\}$  and apply induction.

Thus it remains to consider the case  $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^d - m + 1$ . As

$$\begin{aligned} d - s - 1 &= |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(d-1)}| = |\mathcal{A}| - (|\mathcal{T}| + D + 1) \\ &\leq (2^d - m + 1) - (2^d - d + 1) = d - m \end{aligned}$$

yields  $s \geq m - 1$ , part (b) is mute and we only need to establish part (a).

To this end, we observe that  $\mathcal{E} = \{F \subseteq [d] : |F| \leq d - 2\}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{A}$  and the calculation in Example 3.12 shows

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d+1} - 1.$$

As the set system  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{E}$  contains  $\{d+1\}$  and  $d - m + 1$  further sets, each of which has size at most  $d$ , we infer

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d+1} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d - m + 1}{d+1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{d+1}.$$

Because of  $d \geq 3$ , this implies the desired estimate.

$$\textit{Second case: } |\mathcal{T}| \leq 2^d - 2d - 3 \text{ or } |\mathcal{T}| + D \leq 2^d - d - 1.$$

Suppose first that  $D > d + 1$ . Now  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq 2^d - 2d - 3$  is surely true, which in turn implies  $\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M}$ . Thus, we can remove the set  $\{D\}$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  and add an inclusion-minimal set from  $(\wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M}) \setminus \mathcal{T}$  instead, to get a new simplicial complex  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $V(\mathcal{C}) = [D - 1]$ . Since  $|\mathcal{C}| = |\mathcal{A}|$  and  $|V(\mathcal{C})| < |V(\mathcal{A})|$ , the induction hypothesis applies to  $\mathcal{C}$ , and due to  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} \geq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{|F|+1}$ , we are done.

It remains to study the case  $D = d + 1$ . Now  $|\mathcal{T}| \leq 2^d - 2d - 2$ , whence  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \wp([d]) \cap \mathfrak{M}$  and  $|\mathcal{T}| + D \leq 2^d - d - 1$ . Due to

$$\begin{aligned} d - s - 1 &= |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{N}^{(d-1)}| = |\mathcal{A}| - (|\mathcal{T}| + D + 1) \\ &\geq (2^d - m + 1) - (2^d - d) = d - m + 1 \end{aligned}$$

we have  $s \leq m - 2$ . Thus part (b) follows from Lemma 4.1 applied to the numbers  $m + 1$ ,  $s + 1$ , and the simplicial complex  $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\{d + 1\}\}$  here in place of  $m$ ,  $s$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  there. Moreover, Corollary 3.4 yields part (a).  $\square$

On some occasions the following very weak estimate will suffice.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $d \geq 4$  be an integer and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a simplicial complex. If  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d - 2d + 2$ , then*

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F| + 1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1} - \frac{2d - 2}{3}.$$

*Proof.* The case  $M = \mathbb{N}_0$  of Lemma 3.8 allows us to assume that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{R}(2^d - 2d + 2)$ . As  $d \geq 4$  yields  $2^d - 2d + 2 \in (2^{d-1}, 2^d)$ , we then have  $V(\mathcal{A}) = [d]$ . It remains to recall  $\sum_{F \subseteq [d]} \frac{1}{|F| + 1} = \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1}$  and to observe that each of the at most  $2d - 2$  sets in  $\wp([d]) \setminus \mathcal{A}$  has size at least 2.  $\square$

## §5 MOUNTAINS

We call  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ -complexes (cf. Definition 3.6) *mountains*. The following result on mountains generalises Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Given integers  $d$  and  $m$  with  $d \geq 4$  and  $d \geq m \geq 3$ , let*

- $V$  be a set of vertices,
- $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t \subseteq \wp(V)$  be mountains,
- and let  $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  be a map.

*If for all  $x \in V$ , we have*

$$f(x) + \sum_{\tau=1}^t d_{\mathfrak{B}_\tau}(x) \geq 2^d - m,$$

*and for all  $F \in \bigcup_{\tau \in [2, t]} \mathfrak{B}_\tau$ , we have  $|F| < d$ , then*

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t |\mathfrak{B}_\tau| + \sum_{x \in V} \left( \frac{f(x)}{2} + 1 \right) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d + 1} |V|.$$

Let us first derive Theorem 1.1 from this result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 assuming Theorem 5.1.* Let integers  $d \geq m \geq 1$  be given. Recall that Construction 2 provides the upper bound, so it remains to show  $\alpha(2^d - m) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1}$ . Further note that due to Examples 3.11 and 3.12, we may assume  $d \geq m \geq 3$ , and because of Corollary 3.14, we can even restrict ourselves to  $d \geq 4$ .

Now let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a simplicial complex with  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) \geq 2^d - m + 1$ . We are to prove the lower bound  $|\mathcal{S}| > \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} |V(\mathcal{S})|$ . Theorem 5.1 applied to

- $V = V(\mathcal{S})$ ,
- $t = 1$  and the mountain  $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \{F \in \mathcal{S} : |F| \geq 2\}$ ,
- and the zero function  $f: V \rightarrow \{0\}$

yields

$$|\mathfrak{B}_1| + |V| \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} |V|.$$

Since  $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathfrak{B}_1| + |V| + 1$ , we are done.  $\square$

The rest of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 5.1. Fix  $d, m$ , and  $V$  as there and assume that the theorem does not hold. Choose a counterexample consisting of mountains  $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t \subseteq \wp(V)$  and a map  $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $|\mathfrak{B}_1|$  is minimal. The argument which gave (3.4) generalises as follows.

**Claim 5.2.** *If  $M \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  is inclusion-maximal, then there are at least three vertices  $x \in M$  with  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \leq 2^d - m$ . In particular,  $|F| \leq d$  for all  $F \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M' = \{x \in M : d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \leq 2^d - m\}$  and define  $\mathfrak{B}'_1 = \mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \{M\}$  and

$$f'(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) + 1 & \text{if } x \in M' \\ f(x) & \text{if } x \in V \setminus M'. \end{cases}$$

Now  $\mathfrak{B}'_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t$  satisfy the conditions in the statement of the theorem. Since we chose the counterexample such that  $|\mathfrak{B}_1|$  is minimal and  $|\mathfrak{B}'_1| < |\mathfrak{B}_1|$ , we infer that

$$\left(\frac{|M'|}{2} - 1\right) + \sum_{\tau=1}^t |\mathfrak{B}_\tau| + \sum_{x \in V} \left(\frac{f(x)}{2} + 1\right) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} |V|.$$

Thus, if  $|M'| \leq 2$ , then the desired inequality would hold for  $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t$  and  $f$ , contradicting that these form a counterexample.  $\square$

For every  $x \in V$ , set

$$\mu(x) = f(x) + |\{(y, \tau) \in V \times [t] : xy \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau\}|$$

and

$$k(x) = 1 + \frac{f(x)}{2} + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{x \in F \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau} \frac{1}{|F|}.$$

The left side of the inequality we are dealing with rewrites as  $\sum_{x \in V} k(x)$ . Following the basic strategy of §3.3, we analyse how the individual summands  $k(x)$  compare to the alleged average of  $\frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$ .

**Claim 5.3.** *For  $x \in V$ , the following statements hold.*

(1) *We have  $\mu(x) \geq d$ .*

(2) *If  $\mu(x) = d$ , then*

(a)  $f(x) = d_{\mathfrak{B}_2}(x) = \dots = d_{\mathfrak{B}_t}(x) = 0$ ,  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \geq 2^d - m$ ,

(b) *and there are integers  $r$  and  $s$  with  $0 \leq r \leq s \leq m - 2$  and  $2^r \leq m - 1$  such that*

$$k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d + 1} - \left( \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r} \right) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d + 1} - \frac{(d - 2)(d - 3)}{4d}$$

*and the number of  $d$ -sets in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  containing  $x$  is exactly  $d - s$ .*

(3) *If  $\mu(x) \geq d + 1$ , then*

(a)  $k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$ ,

(b) *and if there is some  $s \in [0, m - 2]$  such that the number of  $d$ -sets in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  containing  $x$  is exactly  $d - s - 1$ , then there is an integer  $r$  with  $0 \leq r \leq s + 1$  and  $2^r \leq m$  satisfying*

$$k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 2}{d + 1} - \left( \frac{s + 1}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r} - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

*Proof.* We commence by defining vertex-disjoint simplicial complexes  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_{t+f(x)}$  such that

- $\mathcal{A}_\tau \cong \{\emptyset\} \cup \{F \setminus \{x\} : x \in F \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau\}$  for  $\tau \in [t]$ ,
- $\mathcal{A}_{t+i} \cong \wp([1])$  for  $i \in [f(x)]$ .

Then  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{t+f(x)}$  is a simplicial complex with  $|V(\mathcal{A})| = \mu(x)$ ,

$$|\mathcal{A}| = 1 + f(x) + \sum_{\tau \in [t]} d_{\mathfrak{B}_\tau}(x) \geq 2^d - m + 1,$$

and  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F|+1} = k(x)$ . Due to  $|F| < d$  for all  $F \in \bigcup_{\tau \in [2,t]} \mathfrak{B}_\tau$  and Claim 5.2, we have

$$|\mathcal{A} \cap V^{(d-1)}| = |\{F \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap V^{(d)} : x \in F\}| \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A} \cap V^{(d)} = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, Lemma 4.2 implies clause (3) and we can assume  $\mu(x) \leq d$  throughout the remainder of the argument.

Set  $n_i = |V(\mathcal{A}_i)|$  for  $i \in [t + f(x)]$ . Owing to  $\sum_{i \in [t+f(x)]} n_i = \mu(x) \leq d$  and

$$\sum_{i \in [t+f(x)]} (2^{n_i} - 1) \geq \sum_{i \in [t+f(x)]} (|\mathcal{A}_i| - 1) = |\mathcal{A}| - 1 \geq 2^d - m \geq 2^d - d,$$



Fact 3.1 guarantees that there is an index  $i \in [t + f(x)]$  such that  $n_i = d$  and  $n_j = 0$  for all  $j \in [t + f(x)] \setminus \{i\}$ . This immediately implies  $f(x) = 0$  and  $\mu(x) = d$ ; so (1) is proved and for (2a) it suffices to show  $i = 1$ , which is what we shall do next.

Define  $s$  such that

$$d - s = |\{F \in \mathfrak{B}_i : x \in F \text{ and } |F| = d\}|.$$

In other words,  $d - s$  is the number of  $(d - 1)$ -sets in  $\mathcal{A}$ , whence  $d - s \leq \binom{|V(\mathcal{A})|}{d-1} = \binom{d}{d-1} = d$  and  $s \geq 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{A} \cap V^{(d)} = \emptyset$  yields

$$2^d - m + 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \binom{d}{j} + (d - s) = 2^d - s - 1,$$

whence  $m \geq s + 2$  and  $d - s \geq d - m + 2 \geq 2$ . In particular,  $\mathfrak{B}_i$  contains a  $d$ -set, which proves  $i = 1$ .

Furthermore, we have now shown that  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies all the conditions to apply Lemma 4.1, which in turn implies (2b) apart from the second inequality. To confirm this final part, we observe that  $2^r \leq m - 1 \leq d - 1 < 2^{d-2}$  gives  $r \leq d - 3$ , wherefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r} &\leq \frac{s}{4} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{4} = \frac{m - 2}{4} = \frac{m - 2}{d + 1} + \frac{(m - 2)(d - 3)}{4(d + 1)} \\ &\leq \frac{m - 2}{d + 1} + \frac{(d - 2)(d - 3)}{4d}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

In particular, all ‘problematic vertices’  $x$  with  $k(x) < \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$  satisfy  $\mu(x) = d$ . This allows us to study their ‘neighbourhoods’, which are completely contained in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ . We are thereby led to the notion of a conglomerate, which can be thought of as an adaptation of quartettes from §3.3 to the present circumstances.

**Definition 5.4.** A conglomerate is a set  $K \in V^{(d+1)}$  for which there is a vertex  $x \in K$  with

$$|\{A : x \in A \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq m.$$

Roughly speaking, ‘most’ subsets of a conglomerate are in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ . This can be made precise as follows.

**Claim 5.5.** If  $K$  denotes a conglomerate, then

- (1)  $|K^{(d)} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq d - m + 2 \geq 2$ ,
- (2)  $|\mathcal{P}(K) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq d + 2m$ ,
- (3) for every  $z \in K$ , we have  $|\{A : z \in A \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq 2m - 1$ ,
- (4) and  $K^{(2)} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_1$ .

*Proof.* Pick  $x \in K$  such that setting  $\mathcal{A} = \{A: x \in A \subseteq K\}$  we have  $|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq m$  (which is possible by Definition 5.4). Using that  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  does not contain any set of size  $d + 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2^d - m &\leq |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1| = \sum_{i=2}^d |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap K^{(i)}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=2}^{d-1} \binom{d}{i-1} + |\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap K^{(d)}| \\ &= 2^d - d - 2 + |\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap K^{(d)}|, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (1).

Now we consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \wp(K) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1 &= \{A \subseteq K: |A| \leq 1\} \cup \{A \subseteq K: |A| \geq 2 \text{ and } x \in A \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\} \\ &\quad \cup \{A \subseteq K: |A| \geq 2 \text{ and } x \notin A \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first set on the right side contains  $d + 2$  elements, and the second one at most  $m - 1$  (by the choice of  $x$ ). Moreover, since  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  is a mountain, the map  $A \mapsto A \cup \{x\}$  is an injection from the third set into the second. Therefore, also the third set contains at most  $m - 1$  elements. Combining these bounds we infer  $|\wp(K) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq (d + 2) + 2(m - 1) = d + 2m$ , which proves (2).

Given any  $z \in K$ , among the at most  $d + 2m$  sets in  $\wp(K) \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1$  there are at least  $d + 1$  not containing  $z$ , namely  $\emptyset$  and the  $d$  sets  $\{y\}$  with  $y \in K \setminus \{z\}$ . Thus, we indeed have  $|\{A: z \in A \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \leq (d + 2m) - (d + 1) = 2m - 1$ , which proves (3).

Finally, assume that contrary to (4) there is some pair  $yz \in K^{(2)} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1$ . Since none of the  $2^{d-1}$  sets  $A$  with  $yz \subseteq A \subseteq K$  can belong to  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ , we then obtain

$$|\{A: z \in A \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq 2^{d-1} > 2d - 1 \geq 2m - 1,$$

which contradicts (3). □

**Claim 5.6.** *If a vertex  $x \in V$  satisfies  $\mu(x) = d$ , then there is a unique conglomerate containing  $x$ , namely the set  $K = \{x\} \cup \{y \in V: xy \in \mathfrak{B}_1\}$ .*

*Proof.* Claim 5.3(2a) discloses  $|K| = d + 1$ . As every set  $A \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  with  $x \in A$  needs to be a subset of  $K$ , we also have  $|\{A: x \in A \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| = 2^d - d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \leq m$ , which proves that  $K$  is indeed a conglomerate. The uniqueness of  $K$  is immediate from Claim 5.5(4). □

**Claim 5.7.** *Let  $K$  be a conglomerate and  $D \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap V^{(d)}$ . If  $D \not\subseteq K$ , then  $|D \setminus K| \geq 3$  and every  $x \in D \cap K$  satisfies  $k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-1}{d+1} + \frac{1}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume for the sake of contradiction that  $|D \setminus K| \in \{1, 2\}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  contains no sets of size  $d + 1$ , we know that  $D$  is inclusion-maximal in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  and Claim 5.2 guarantees that some  $x \in D \cap K$  satisfies  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \leq 2^d - m$ . On the other hand, Claim 5.5(3) informs us that there are at least  $2^d - (2m - 1)$  sets in  $\wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  containing  $x$ . Therefore, the set

$$Q = \{A \subseteq D : x \in A \text{ and } |A| \geq 2 \text{ and } A \not\subseteq K\}$$

satisfies  $|Q| \leq m - 1$ . But if  $|D \setminus K| = 1$ , then  $|Q| = 2^{d-2} \geq d \geq m$ , while  $|D \setminus K| = 2$  would imply  $|Q| = 3 \cdot 2^{d-3} \geq 2^{d-2} \geq m$ . This contradiction concludes the proof of  $|D \setminus K| \geq 3$ .

Now let  $x \in D \cap K$  be arbitrary. Using again that Claim 5.5(3) states

$$|\{A : x \in A \subseteq K\} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq 2^d - 2m + 1,$$

we learn that the simplicial complex

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{A \setminus \{x\} : x \in A \in (\mathfrak{B}_1 \cap \wp(K))\}$$

satisfies  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^d - 2d + 2$ , whence by Lemma 4.3

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1} - \frac{2d - 2}{3}.$$

Due to  $|D \setminus K| \geq 3$ , the set system

$$\mathcal{A}' = \{A \setminus \{x\} : x \in A \subseteq D \text{ and } A \not\subseteq K\}$$

contains at least three 1-sets. Moreover, the number of 2-sets in  $\mathcal{A}'$  is

$$\binom{|D| - 1}{2} - \binom{|D \cap K| - 1}{2} \geq \binom{d - 1}{2} - \binom{d - 4}{2} = 3d - 9 \geq 2d - 5.$$

For these reasons, we have indeed

$$\begin{aligned} k(x) &\geq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|A| + 1} + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}'} \frac{1}{|A| + 1} \\ &\geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1} - \frac{2d - 2}{3} + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{2d - 5}{3} \\ &= \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d + 1} + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Claim 5.8.** *If a conglomerate  $K$  is disjoint to all other conglomerates, then*

$$\sum_{x \in K} k(x) \geq 2^{d+1} - m.$$

*Proof.* Set

$$Q = \{x \in K : K \setminus \{x\} \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\}$$

and suppose first that some vertex  $x \in K \setminus Q$  satisfies  $\mu(x) = d$ . Due to Claim 5.6, we know  $K = \{x\} \cup \{y \in V : xy \in \mathfrak{B}_1\}$  and, therefore, Claim 5.3(2a) tells us that at least  $2^d - m$

sets in  $\wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  contain  $x$ . Further,  $K \setminus \{x\} \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  being a mountain means that  $\wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  contains  $2^d - d - 1$  sets which do not contain  $x$ . We infer that

$$|\wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq 2^{d+1} - d - m - 1.$$

Since  $k(z) \geq 1 + \sum_{z \in F \in \wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1} \frac{1}{|F|}$  for every  $z \in K$ , we have

$$\sum_{z \in K} k(z) \geq |K| + |\wp(K) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq 2^{d+1} - m,$$

as desired. So from now on we may focus on the case that  $\mu(x) \geq d + 1$  for all  $x \in K \setminus Q$ .

Our claim is clear if  $k(z) \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$  holds for every  $z \in K$ , whence we may assume that  $k(z) < \frac{2^{d+1}-m}{d+1}$  holds for some  $z \in K$ . Claim 5.3(3a) yields  $\mu(z) = d$  and thus we have  $z \in Q$ . Summarising this paragraph,

$$\text{there is some } z \in Q \text{ with } \mu(z) = d. \quad (5.1)$$

In particular,  $Q$  is non-empty. Now Claim 5.5(1) informs us that the nonnegative integer  $s$  defined by

$$s + 1 = |Q| = |K^{(d)} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1|$$

can be bounded by  $s \leq (d + 1) - (d - m + 2) - 1 = m - 2$ .

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} r' &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a \leq s \text{ and } 2^a \leq m - 1\}, \\ r &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a \leq s + 1 \text{ and } 2^a \leq m\}, \end{aligned}$$

we contend that

$$k(x) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1} - \left(\frac{s}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r'}\right) & \text{if } x \in Q \\ \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1} - \left(\frac{s+1}{d} + \frac{m-2-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2}\right) & \text{if } x \in K \setminus Q. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

To see this, we first observe that if some  $d$ -set  $D \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  satisfies  $x \in D \not\subseteq K$ , then Claim 5.7 provides a stronger bound. So we may assume that such  $d$ -sets do not exist. Next, for  $x \in K \setminus Q$  we have  $\mu(x) \geq d + 1$  by the above discussion. Moreover, due to the definition of  $Q$ , all but one of the  $d - s$  sets in  $K^{(d)} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  contain  $x$  and, therefore, Claim 5.3(3b) leads to the desired estimate. If  $x \in Q$  and  $\mu(x) = d$ , we can argue similarly, but appealing to Claim 5.3(2b) instead. Lastly, if  $x \in Q$  and  $\mu(x) \geq d + 1$ , then (5.1) gives  $s \geq 1$ , and there are still  $d - s$  sets in  $K^{(d)} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  containing  $x$ . By Claim 5.3(3b) applied to  $s - 1$  in place of  $s$ , we obtain

$$k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1}-2}{d+1} - \left(\frac{s}{d} + \frac{m-1-s}{d+1-r} - \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Combined with the first part of Fact 3.3 this concludes the proof of (5.2).

Lastly, the second part of Fact 3.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in K} k(x) &\geq (2^{d+1} - 2) - (s + 1) \left( \frac{s}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r'} \right) \\ &\quad - (d - s) \left( \frac{s + 1}{d} + \frac{m - 2 - s}{d + 1 - r} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &\geq 2^{d+1} - m. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

If we could show that the conglomerates are mutually disjoint, then the proof of Theorem 5.1 could easily be completed as in §3.3. The route followed in the remaining pages of this section, however, is slightly different. Specifically, we shall only show that distinct conglomerates cannot intersect in two or more vertices (cf. Claim 5.11 below). It will then turn out that a slightly more subtle version of our argument can still be pushed through. Let us start with a special case.

**Claim 5.9.** *If  $d = 4$ , then any two conglomerates intersect in at most one vertex.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $K, K'$  are two distinct conglomerates whose intersection  $B = K \cap K'$  has size at least 2. Due to Claim 5.5(1) and Claim 5.7, we know that  $|B| = 2$ . The latter statement also implies that there is no quadruple  $D \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \cap V^{(4)}$  with  $B \subseteq D$ . Yet Claim 5.5(3) applied to either vertex  $z \in B$  yields a set  $M \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  with  $B \subsetneq M \subseteq K$ . The only possibility avoiding an immediate contradiction is that  $|M| = 3$  and, moreover,  $M$  is inclusion-maximal in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ .

Let  $x \in B$  be arbitrary and recall that Claim 5.2 implies  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \leq 2^4 - m < 16$ . However, Claim 5.5(3) states that the number of sets  $T \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  with  $x \in T \subseteq K$  is at least 9 and that there are at least 9 sets  $T \in \mathfrak{B}_1$  with  $x \in T \subseteq K'$ . The only set counted twice is  $B$  and thus,  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \geq 17$ , which is absurd.  $\square$

We prepare the general case by the following degree estimate.

**Claim 5.10.** *Suppose  $d \geq 5$  and that  $K, K'$  are distinct conglomerates. If a set  $A \subseteq K \cap K'$  satisfies  $\max\{2, |K \cap K'| - 1\} \leq |A| \leq d - 2$ , then the mountain*

$$\mathfrak{B}'_1 = \mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \{L \in \mathfrak{B}_1 : A \subseteq L \text{ and } |L \setminus A| \geq 2\}$$

*has the property that  $d_{\mathfrak{B}'_1}(x) \geq 2^d - m$  holds for all  $x \in A$ .*

*Proof.* It is plain that  $\mathfrak{B}'_1$  is indeed a mountain. Fix an arbitrary vertex  $x \in A$ . Claim 5.5(3) yields integers  $\delta, \delta' \in [0, 2m - 1]$  such that

$$|\{L \in \mathfrak{B}_1 : x \in L \subseteq K\}| = 2^d - \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |\{L \in \mathfrak{B}_1 : x \in L \subseteq K'\}| = 2^d - \delta'.$$

Due to  $|A| \geq |K \cap K'| - 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{L \in \mathfrak{B}_1 : x \in L \text{ and } (L \subseteq K \text{ or } L \subseteq K')\}| \\ & \geq (2^d - \delta) + (2^d - \delta') - 2^{|K \cap K'| - 1} \\ & \geq 2^{d+1} - (\delta + \delta') - 2^{|A|}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \geq 0$  be defined by

$$|\{F \subseteq K \setminus A : |F| \geq 2, A \cup F \in \mathfrak{B}_1\}| = 2^{d+1-|A|} - (d+2-|A|) - \varepsilon$$

and

$$|\{F \subseteq K' \setminus A : |F| \geq 2, A \cup F \in \mathfrak{B}_1\}| = 2^{d+1-|A|} - (d+2-|A|) - \varepsilon'.$$

Then we can bound the degree of  $x$  in  $\mathfrak{B}'_1$  by

$$d_{\mathfrak{B}'_1}(x) \geq 2^{d+1} - (2^{|A|} + 2^{d+2-|A|}) - (\delta + \delta') + (\varepsilon + \varepsilon') + 2(d+2-|A|). \quad (5.3)$$

*First case:*  $|A| \geq 3$

Since  $|A| \leq d-2$ , we get by the first observation in the proof of Fact 3.1 that

$$2^{|A|-3} + 2^{d-1-|A|} \leq 1 + 2^{d-4}$$

and thus,

$$2^{|A|} + 2^{d+2-|A|} \leq 8 + 2^{d-1}.$$

Using this as well as  $\delta + \delta' \leq 4m - 2$  and  $\varepsilon + \varepsilon' \geq 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathfrak{B}'_1}(x) & \geq 2^{d+1} - (2^{d-1} + 8) - (4m - 2) + 8 = 2^d + 2^{d-1} + 2 - 4m \\ & \geq 2^d - m + 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is stronger than claimed.

*Second case:*  $|A| = 2$

Recall that  $\delta$  counts the elements in the set  $\mathcal{Q} = \{L : x \in L \subseteq K \text{ and } L \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\}$ . Consider the partition

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_1 \cup \mathcal{Q}_2 \cup \mathcal{Q}_3$$

defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_1 & = \{L \in \mathcal{Q} : A \subseteq L \text{ and } |L| \geq 4\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_2 & = \{L \in \mathcal{Q} : A \subseteq L \text{ and } |L| \leq 3\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}_3 & = \{L \in \mathcal{Q} : A \not\subseteq L\}, \end{aligned}$$

and note that  $\varepsilon = |\mathcal{Q}_1|$ . Claim 5.5(4) entails  $|L| = 3$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{Q}_2$  and  $|L| \geq 3$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{Q}_3$ . We would also like to point out that the sets in  $\mathcal{Q}_3$  contain  $x$  but not the

other element of  $A$ . Since  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  is a mountain, this shows that  $L \mapsto L \cup A$  is an injection from  $\mathcal{Q}_3$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_1$ , whence  $|\mathcal{Q}_3| \leq \varepsilon$ .

Now suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $|\mathcal{Q}_2| \geq 2$ . As every subset of  $K$  that contains one or two of the sets in  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  must be missing in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ , this yields

$$|\{F: x \in F \subseteq K\} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_1| \geq 3 \cdot 2^{d-3} > 2d - 1 \geq 2m - 1,$$

contrary to Claim 5.5(3).

This proves  $|\mathcal{Q}_2| \leq 1$ , so that altogether  $\delta = |\mathcal{Q}| \leq \varepsilon + 1 + \varepsilon$  and  $\delta - \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}(\delta + 1) \leq m$ . Analogously, we also have  $\delta' - \varepsilon' \leq m$ . Plugging this into (5.3) we learn

$$d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \geq 2^d + 2d - 4 - (\delta + \delta') + (\varepsilon + \varepsilon') \geq 2^d + (d - 4) - m \geq 2^d - m + 1,$$

as desired.  $\square$

We can now continue our analysis of conglomerate intersections. Incidentally, the proof of our next claim is the only place in the entire section where our freedom to create a new mountain and increase  $t$  gets exploited. Accordingly, the argument that follows is the main reason why we switched from discussing simplicial complexes to talking about mountains.

**Claim 5.11.** *Any two conglomerates intersect in at most one vertex.*

*Proof.* Assume for the sake of contradiction that  $K$  and  $K'$  are two conglomerates whose intersection  $B = K \cap K'$  satisfies  $|B| \geq 2$ . Owing to Claim 5.9 we know  $d \geq 5$  and, as there, Claim 5.5(1) combined with Claim 5.7 yields  $|B| \leq d - 2$ .

We contend that there exists a set  $A \subseteq B$  such that  $|A| \geq \max\{2, |B| - 1\}$  and the set system

$$\mathfrak{B}_{t+1} = \{F \subseteq V \setminus A: |F| \geq 2 \text{ and } A \cup F \in \mathfrak{B}_1\}$$

is non-empty.

In the special case  $|B| = 2$ , this can be seen by taking  $A = B$ , for then Claim 5.5(2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\{F \subseteq K \setminus B: |F| \geq 2 \text{ and } F \cup B \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\}| &\leq |\{L \subseteq K: |L| \geq 2 \text{ and } L \notin \mathfrak{B}_1\}| \\ &\leq 2m - 2 < 2d - 1 < 2^{d-1} - d = |\{F \subseteq K \setminus B: |F| \geq 2\}|, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}$  is indeed non-empty.

If  $|B| > 2$ , we pick any  $D \in K^{(d)} \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  (the existence of which is ensured by Claim 5.5(1)), and set  $A = D \cap B$ . Clearly, we have  $|A| \geq \max\{2, |B| - 1\}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  is a mountain and  $|B| \leq d - 2$ , the set system  $\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}$  contains  $D \setminus A$  and is, in particular, non-empty.

Having thereby explained the choice of an appropriate set  $A$ , we stipulate

$$\mathfrak{B}'_1 = \mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \{L: A \subseteq L \text{ and } |L \setminus A| \geq 2\}.$$

Clearly, both  $\mathfrak{B}'_1$  and  $\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}$  are mountains with  $|\mathfrak{B}_1| = |\mathfrak{B}'_1| + |\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}|$  and for all  $u \in V \setminus A$ , we have  $d_{\mathfrak{B}'_1}(u) + d_{\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}}(u) = d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(u)$ . Moreover, the previous claim gives  $d_{\mathfrak{B}'_1}(x) \geq 2^d - m$  for all  $x \in A$ . So  $(\mathfrak{B}'_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_{t+1}, f)$  satisfies all assumptions of the theorem. But  $\mathfrak{B}_{t+1} \neq \emptyset$  yields  $|\mathfrak{B}'_1| < |\mathfrak{B}_1|$  and we reach a contradiction to the minimality of  $|\mathfrak{B}_1|$ .  $\square$

**Claim 5.12.** *If a vertex  $x$  belongs to  $\lambda \geq 2$  conglomerates, then*

$$k(x) - \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} \geq \frac{\lambda(d-2)(d-3)}{4}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be any conglomerate containing  $x$ . Since  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  is a mountain, the set system

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{F \setminus \{x\}: x \in F \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \text{ and } F \subseteq K\}$$

is a simplicial complex. Claim 5.5(3) tells us

$$|\mathcal{A}| \geq 1 + 2^d - (2m - 1) \geq 2^d - 2d + 2.$$

Now we can utilise Lemma 4.3 to derive

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|F| + 1} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1} - \frac{2d-2}{3},$$

and thereby,

$$\sum_{x \in F \subseteq K \text{ and } F \in \mathfrak{B}_1} \frac{1}{|F|} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1} - \frac{2d-2}{3} - 1.$$

Due to Claim 5.11, any two conglomerates that contain  $x$  intersect only in  $x$ , whence summing over all such conglomerates yields

$$\begin{aligned} k(x) &\geq 1 + \lambda \left( \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1} - \frac{2d-2}{3} - 1 \right) \\ &\geq 1 + \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) \left( \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1} - 1 \right) - \lambda \frac{2d-2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$k(x) - \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{d+1} \geq \lambda \left( \frac{2^{d+1} - 1}{2(d+1)} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2d-2}{3} \right)$$

and Fact 3.2 leads to the desired estimate.  $\square$

For every vertex  $x \in V$ , let  $\lambda(x)$  denote the number of conglomerates containing  $x$ .

**Claim 5.13.** *Every conglomerate  $K$  satisfies*

$$\sum_{x \in K} \frac{k(x)}{\lambda(x)} \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} \sum_{x \in K} \frac{1}{\lambda(x)}.$$



*Proof.* We consider the partition  $K = Q \cup R \cup U$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \{x \in K : \mu(x) = d\}, \\ R &= \{x \in K : \mu(x) > d \text{ and } \lambda(x) = 1\}, \\ \text{and } U &= \{x \in K : \mu(x) > d \text{ and } \lambda(x) > 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Summarising the lower bounds obtained in Claims 5.3(2b), 5.3(3a), and 5.12, we have

$$k(x) - \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} \geq \begin{cases} -\frac{(d-2)(d-3)}{4d} & \text{if } x \in Q \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in R \\ \frac{\lambda(x)(d-2)(d-3)}{4} & \text{if } x \in U. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, Claim 5.6 discloses  $\lambda(x) = 1$  for  $x \in Q$  and we can conclude

$$\sum_{x \in K} \frac{1}{\lambda(x)} \left( k(x) - \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} \right) \geq \frac{(d-2)(d-3)}{4} \left( -\frac{|Q|}{d} + |U| \right).$$

Provided that  $|U| \geq 1$ , this proves the claimed estimate. On the other hand, if  $U = \emptyset$ , then  $K$  is disjoint to all other conglomerates and we can invoke Claim 5.8.  $\square$

Now let  $V'$  be the union of all conglomerates. By summing Claim 5.13 over all conglomerates, we obtain  $\sum_{x \in V'} k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} |V'|$ . Vertices  $x \in V \setminus V'$  satisfy  $\mu(x) > d$  (by Claim 5.3(1) and Claim 5.6) and, hence,  $k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1}$  (by Claim 5.3(3a)). Summing everything we infer

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t |\mathfrak{B}_\tau| + \sum_{x \in V} \left( \frac{f(x)}{2} + 1 \right) = \sum_{x \in V} k(x) \geq \frac{2^{d+1} - m}{d+1} |V|,$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

## §6 NEW REGIMES

In this section we use the same approach to push beyond the regime  $m \leq d$ . First we deal with the special case  $m = d + 1$  and  $d = 4$ , proving a conjecture by Frankl and Watanabe [2].

**Theorem 6.1.** *For a set  $V$ , let  $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t \subseteq \wp(V)$  be mountains, and let  $f, g, h: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  be functions such that the following conditions hold.*

- (1) *If  $F \in \mathfrak{B}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{B}_t$ , then  $|F| \leq 3$ .*
- (2) *For all  $x \in V$ , we have*

$$f(x) + 7g(x) + 10h(x) + \sum_{\tau=1}^t d_{\mathfrak{B}_\tau}(x) \geq 11.$$

Then

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t |\mathfrak{B}_\tau| + \sum_{x \in V} \left( 1 + \frac{f(x)}{2} + \frac{51g(x)}{20} + \frac{19h(x)}{5} \right) \geq \frac{53}{10} |V|.$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2 assuming Theorem 6.1.* The upper bound is provided by Construction 3. Given a simplicial complex  $\mathcal{S}$  with vertex set  $V$  and  $\delta(\mathcal{S}) \geq 12$ , Theorem 6.1 applied to  $t = 1$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \{F \in \mathcal{S} : |F| \geq 2\}$ , and three zero functions  $f, g, h: V \rightarrow \{0\}$  yields

$$|\mathfrak{B}_1| + |V| \geq \frac{53}{10} |V|.$$

Since  $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathfrak{B}_1| + |V| + 1$ , this proves that we have indeed  $|\mathcal{S}| > \frac{53}{10} |V|$ .  $\square$

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6.1. Consider a counterexample  $(\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t, V, f, g, h)$  which lexicographically minimises the ordered triple

$$\left( |\mathfrak{B}_1|, \sum_{\tau \in [t]} |\mathfrak{B}_\tau|, \sum_{x \in V} (f(x) + g(x) + h(x)) \right).$$

Let

$$\Omega = \sum_{\tau=1}^t |\mathfrak{B}_\tau| + \sum_{x \in V} \left( 1 + \frac{f(x)}{2} + \frac{51g(x)}{20} + \frac{19h(x)}{5} \right)$$

be the left side of the inequality we seek to establish. For every  $x \in V$ , we set

$$d_\star(x) = f(x) + 7g(x) + 10h(x) + \sum_{\tau=1}^t d_{\mathfrak{B}_\tau}(x)$$

and  $k(x) = 1 + \frac{f(x)}{2} + \frac{51g(x)}{20} + \frac{19h(x)}{5} + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \sum_{x \in F \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau} \frac{1}{|F|}.$

So we are given that  $d_\star(x)$  is always at least 11 and, due to  $\Omega = \sum_{x \in V} k(x)$ , we need to show that  $k(x)$  is on average at least  $\frac{53}{10}$ . A straightforward adaptation of the proof of Claim 5.2 discloses that

*if  $\tau \in [t]$  and  $F \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau$  is inclusion-maximal, then there are at least three vertices  $x \in F$  such that  $d_\star(x) = 11$ .* (★)

In particular, we have  $|F| \leq 4$  for all  $F \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ . For brevity we will call the 4-sets in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  *quadruples*. We proceed by analysing the possible intersections of quadruples.

**Claim 6.2.** *Any two quadruples intersect in at most one vertex.*

*Proof.* First notice that if two quadruples intersect in exactly two vertices, say  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $d_\star(x) \geq d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) \geq 13 > 11$ , and, similarly,  $d_\star(y) > 11$ , which contradicts (★).

Hence, we are left to find a contradiction in the case that two quadruples intersect in three vertices. Assume that  $u, v, x, y, z \in V$  are such that  $uxyz, vxyz \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ .

Due to  $d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x), d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(y), d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(z) \geq 11$  and  $(\star)$ , we can suppose, without loss of generality, that  $d_\star(x) = d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) = 11$  and  $d_\star(y) = d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(y) = 11$ .

*First case:  $d_\star(z) = 11$ .*

In this case, the only edges in  $\bigcup_{\tau \in [t]} \mathfrak{B}_\tau$  containing at least one of  $x, y$ , and  $z$  are those contained in  $uxyz$  or  $vxyz$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the set of these 18 edges,

- set  $V' = V \setminus \{x, y, z\}$ ,
- define  $g': V' \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  by setting  $g'(u) = g(u) + 1$ ,  $g'(v) = g(v) + 1$ , and  $g'(w) = g(w)$  for all  $w \in V' \setminus \{u, v\}$ ,
- and let  $f'$  and  $h'$  be the restrictions of  $f$  and  $h$  to  $V'$ , respectively.

Since all assumptions of our theorem hold for  $(\mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t, V', f', g', h')$ , the minimality of  $|\mathfrak{B}_1|$  yields

$$\Omega - 18 - 3 + 2 \cdot \frac{51}{20} \geq \frac{53}{10}(|V| - 3),$$

which simplifies to  $\Omega \geq \frac{53}{10}|V|$ .

*Second case:  $d_\star(z) \geq 12$ .*

Due to the minimality of  $\sum_{w \in V} (f(w) + g(w) + h(w))$ , we have  $f(z) = g(z) = h(z) = 0$  and, thus, there are an index  $\tau \in [t]$  and a set  $M \in \mathfrak{B}_\tau$  such that  $z \in M$  but, if  $M \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ , then neither  $M \subseteq uxyz$  nor  $M \subseteq vxyz$ . Choosing  $M$  inclusion-maximal with these properties, we have  $|M| \geq 4$  due to  $(\star)$ . Therefore,  $\tau = 1$  and  $M$  is a quadruple distinct from  $uxyz$  and  $vxyz$ . Thus,

$$\mathfrak{B}_{t+1} = \{F \setminus \{z\} : z \in F \in \mathfrak{B}_1 \text{ and } |F| \geq 3 \text{ and } x, y \notin F\}$$

is a non-empty mountain. We contend that

$$\mathfrak{B}'_1 = \mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \{F : |F| \geq 3 \text{ and } z \in F \text{ and } x, y \notin F\},$$

is a mountain as well. To see this, we consider any two sets  $F, F'$  such that  $F \subsetneq F' \in \mathfrak{B}'_1$  and  $|F| \geq 2$ . If  $z \notin F$  or  $|F| = 2$ , we immediately get  $F \in \mathfrak{B}'_1$ . So we may assume that  $z \in F$ ,  $|F| = 3$ , and  $|F'| = 4$ . Then for  $F'$  to be in  $\mathfrak{B}'_1$ , we need to have  $x \in F'$  or  $y \in F'$ . But the only quadruples containing  $x$  or  $y$  are  $uxyz$  and  $vxyz$ . Hence,  $F$  contains  $x$  or  $y$ , whereby  $F \in \mathfrak{B}'_1$ . Altogether,  $\mathfrak{B}'_1$  is indeed a mountain.

Since

$$(\mathfrak{B}'_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t, \mathfrak{B}_{t+1}, V, f, g, h)$$

also satisfies the condition of the theorem,  $|\mathfrak{B}_1| = |\mathfrak{B}'_1| + |\mathfrak{B}_{t+1}|$  and the minimality of  $|\mathfrak{B}_1|$  yield the desired estimate  $\Omega \geq \frac{53}{10}|V|$ .  $\square$

Denote by  $\lambda(x)$  the number of quadruples containing a given vertex  $x$ .

**Claim 6.3.** *Let  $x \in V$ .*

- (1) *If  $\lambda(x) = 0$ , then  $k(x) \geq \frac{53}{10}$ .*
- (2) *If  $\lambda(x) = 1$  and  $k(x) < \frac{53}{10} + \frac{1}{12}$ , then  $k(x) = \frac{53}{10} - \frac{1}{20}$  and  $d_\star(x) = d_{\mathfrak{B}_1}(x) = 11$ .  
Moreover, there are distinct vertices  $y_1, \dots, y_4$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  contains all four edges  $xy_i$ , all six edges  $xy_iy_j$ , and the quadruple  $xy_1y_2y_3$ .*
- (3) *If  $\lambda(x) \geq 2$ , then  $k(x) \geq \frac{53}{10} + \frac{3}{5}\lambda(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Starting with (1) and (2) we first suppose  $\lambda(x) \leq 1$ . The construction we saw right at the beginning of the proof of Claim 5.3 yields a simplicial complex  $\mathcal{A}$  with

$$|\mathcal{A}| = 1 + f(x) + \sum_{\tau=1}^t d_{\mathfrak{B}_\tau}(x) \geq 12 - 7g(x) - 10h(x),$$

$$k(x) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|A|+1} + \frac{51g(x)}{20} + \frac{19h(x)}{5},$$

and  $\lambda(x) = |V(\mathcal{A})^{(3)} \cap \mathcal{A}|$ .

Let us observe that

if	then
$g(x) + h(x) \geq 2$	$k(x) \geq 1 + \frac{5}{2}(g(x) + h(x)) \geq 6$
$g(x) = 0$ and $h(x) = 1$	$ \mathcal{A}  \geq 2$ and $k(x) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{19}{5} + \frac{\lambda(x)}{4} = \frac{53}{10} + \frac{\lambda(x)}{4}$
$g(x) = 1$ and $h(x) = 0$	$ \mathcal{A}  \geq 5$ , whence $k(x) \geq 1 + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{51}{20} = \frac{53}{10} + \frac{1}{12}$ .

It remains to discuss the case that  $g(x) = h(x) = 0$  and  $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 12$ . Setting  $\mu = |V(\mathcal{A})|$  we have  $|V(\mathcal{A})^{(2)} \cap \mathcal{A}| \geq 11 - \mu - \lambda(x)$  and, therefore,

$$k(x) \geq 1 + \frac{\mu}{2} + \frac{11 - \mu - \lambda(x)}{3} + \frac{\lambda(x)}{4} = \frac{14}{3} + \frac{\mu}{6} - \frac{\lambda(x)}{12}.$$

If  $\mu \geq 5$ , this yields  $k(x) \geq \frac{14}{3} + \frac{5}{6} - \frac{1}{12} > \frac{53}{10} + \frac{1}{12}$  and we are done. So we can assume  $\mu \leq 4$  and  $6 \leq 7 - \lambda(x) \leq |V(\mathcal{A})^{(2)} \cap \mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{\mu}{2}$ , whence  $\mu = 4$  and  $\lambda(x) = 1$ . This means that  $\mathcal{A}$  has four vertices, all six possible 2-sets, and one 3-set. As  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot be expressed in a non-trivial way as a union of two smaller vertex-disjoint simplicial complexes, all its non-empty edges come from the same mountain. By assumption (1) of the theorem, this mountain can only be  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  and the ‘neighbourhood’ of  $x$  looks as described in clause (2). Finally, we have  $k(x) = \frac{14}{3} + \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{12} = \frac{53}{10} - \frac{1}{20}$ , which completes the proof of (1) and (2).

Turning to (3) we observe that every quadruple  $Q$  with  $x \in Q$  satisfies

$$\sum_{x \in A \subseteq Q} \frac{1}{|A|} = \frac{15}{4}.$$

Owing to Claim 6.2, this yields

$$k(x) \geq 1 + \sum_{x \in A \in \mathfrak{B}_1} \frac{1}{|A|} \geq 1 + \left(\frac{15}{4} - 1\right) \lambda(x) \geq 1 + \frac{43}{20} \lambda(x) + \frac{12}{20} \lambda(x) \geq \frac{53}{10} + \frac{3}{5} \lambda(x). \quad \square$$

**Claim 6.4.** *Every quadruple  $Q$  satisfies*

$$\sum_{x \in Q} \frac{k(x)}{\lambda(x)} \geq \frac{53}{10} \sum_{x \in Q} \frac{1}{\lambda(x)}.$$

*Proof.* Assume for the sake of contradiction that

$$\sum_{x \in Q} \frac{1}{\lambda(x)} \left( k(x) - \frac{53}{10} \right) < 0. \quad (6.1)$$

By Claim 6.3 each of the differences  $k(x) - \frac{53}{10}$  is at least  $-\frac{1}{20}$  and, therefore, we have  $k(x) < \frac{53}{10} + \frac{3}{20} \lambda(x)$  for every  $x \in Q$ . Because of Claim 6.3(3), this is only possible if  $\lambda(x) = 1$ , i.e., if  $Q$  is disjoint to all other quadruples. Now (6.1) simplifies to

$$\sum_{x \in Q} \left( k(x) - \frac{53}{10} \right) < 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Appealing again to Claim 6.3(2), we learn that each of these four differences is either equal to  $-\frac{1}{20}$  or at least  $\frac{1}{12}$ . Consequently, we can enumerate  $Q = \{x_1, \dots, x_4\}$  in such a way that  $k(x_1) = k(x_2) = k(x_3) = \frac{53}{10} - \frac{1}{20}$ . Once more by Claim 6.3(2) this leads to a vertex  $y$  such that all 2-sets  $x_i y$  with  $i \in [4]$  and all 3-sets  $x_i x_j y$  with  $ij \in [4]^{(2)}$  are in  $\mathfrak{B}_1$ . In particular, we thereby know four 2-sets, six 3-sets, and one quadruple containing  $x_4$ . Thus we have found the terms  $1 + \frac{4}{2} + \frac{6}{3} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{53}{10} - \frac{1}{20}$  contributing to  $k(x_4)$ . Any further contribution to  $k(x_4)$ , if there exists any, needs to be at least  $\frac{1}{4}$  and would therefore give  $\sum_{i=1}^4 (k(x_i) - \frac{53}{10}) \geq \frac{1}{4} - \frac{4}{20} > 0$ , contrary to (6.2).

It remains to discuss the case that all edges intersecting  $Q$  are in  $\mathcal{E} = \wp(Q \cup \{y\}) \cap \mathfrak{B}_1$  and none of them is in  $\bigcup_{\tau \in [2, t]} \mathfrak{B}_\tau$ . We observe that  $|\mathcal{E}| = 21$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{E}}(y) = 10$ ,

- set  $V' = V \setminus Q$ ,
- define  $h': V' \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  by  $h'(y) = h(y) + 1$  and  $h'(z) = h(z)$  for all  $z \in V' \setminus \{y\}$ ,
- and let  $f'$  and  $g'$  be the restrictions of  $f$  and  $g$  to  $V'$ , respectively.

Since  $(\mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \mathcal{E}, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_t, V', f', g', h')$  satisfies all assumptions of our theorem, the minimality of  $\mathfrak{B}_1$  discloses

$$\Omega - 21 - 4 + \frac{19}{5} \geq \frac{53}{10} (|V| - 4),$$

whence  $\Omega \geq \frac{53}{10} |V|$ . This contradiction concludes the proof of Claim 6.4.  $\square$

Summing this result over all quadruples, we learn that the union  $V'$  of all quadruples satisfies  $\sum_{x \in V'} k(x) \geq \frac{53}{10} |V'|$ . Together with the fact that  $k(x) \geq \frac{53}{10}$  holds for all  $x \in V \setminus V'$  (cf. Claim 6.3(1)), this proves  $\Omega = \sum_{x \in V} k(x) \geq \frac{53}{10} |V|$ . Thereby Theorem 6.1 is proved.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Frankl, *On the trace of finite sets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **34** (1983), no. 1, 41–45, DOI [10.1016/0097-3165\(83\)90038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165(83)90038-9). MR0685210 ↑1, 3.2
- [2] M. Watanabe and P. Frankl, *Some best possible bounds concerning the traces of finite sets*, Graphs Combin. **10** (1994), no. 3, 283–292, DOI [10.1007/BF02986678](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02986678). MR1304385 ↑1, 1, 6
- [3] G. Katona, *A theorem of finite sets*, Theory of graphs (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 187–207. MR0290982 ↑3.2
- [4] G. O. H. Katona, *Optimization for order ideals under a weight assignment*, Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976), Colloq. Internat. CNRS, vol. 260, CNRS, Paris, 1978, pp. 257–258. ↑3.2
- [5] J. B. Kruskal, *The number of simplices in a complex*, Mathematical optimization techniques, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1963, pp. 251–278. MR0154827 ↑3.2
- [6] M. Li, J. Ma, and M. Rong, *Exact results on traces of sets* (2024), available at [arXiv:2406.18870](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.18870). ↑1
- [7] S. Piga and B. Schülke, *On extremal problems concerning the traces of sets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **182** (2021), Paper No. 105447, 15, DOI [10.1016/j.jcta.2021.105447](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2021.105447). MR4238068 ↑1, 1

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG, HAMBURG, GERMANY

*Email address:* [Christian.Reiher@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:Christian.Reiher@uni-hamburg.de)

EXTREMAL COMBINATORICS AND PROBABILITY GROUP, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE, DAEJEON,  
SOUTH KOREA

*Email address:* [schuelke@ibs.re.kr](mailto:schuelke@ibs.re.kr)