

NOTE

COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE FRANKL–PACH CONJECTURE FOR
UNIFORM, DENSE FAMILIES

R. AHLWEDE and L. H. KHACHATRIAN

Received January 15, 1996

\mathbb{N} denotes the set of positive integers and for $\ell, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \leq n$ we set

$$2^{[n]} = \{F : F \subset [1, n]\}, \quad \binom{[n]}{\ell} = \{F \in 2^{[n]} : |F| = \ell\}.$$

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[n]}$ is called ℓ -dense, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, if there exists an ℓ -element subset $D \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ with $\mathcal{F}(D) = \{F \cap D : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ satisfying

$$(1) \quad |\mathcal{F}(D)| = 2^\ell.$$

A well-known result of Sauer [1], Shelah–Perles [2], and Vapnik–Červonenkis [3] says that any $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[n]}$ is ℓ -dense, if

$$(2) \quad |\mathcal{F}| > \sum_{i < \ell} \binom{n}{i}.$$

Frankl–Pach [4] proved that any ℓ -uniform \mathcal{F} , that is $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, is ℓ -dense, if

$$(3) \quad |\mathcal{F}| > \binom{n}{\ell - 1},$$

and they conjectured that for every ℓ -uniform, but not ℓ -dense, \mathcal{F} with $n > 2\ell$ necessarily

$$(4) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n - 1}{\ell - 1}.$$

It was pointed out in [4], [5], and also by Erdős [6] that the truth of this conjecture would mean a sharpening of the Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem [7]. While (4) holds for $\ell=2$, it is unfortunately false for $\ell \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2\ell$.

Example. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_2 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_3 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_4 \subset \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{\ell} : 1 \in F, 2 \notin F \right\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_2 = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{\ell} : 1, 2, 3 \in F \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_3 = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{\ell} : 1, 2, 4 \in F, 3 \notin F \right\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_4 = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{\ell} : 1 \notin F, 2, 3 \in F \right\}.$$

It remains to be seen that for no $D \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ (1) holds.

Obviously, a candidate $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_\ell\}$ must satisfy $D \in \mathcal{F}$.

It is convenient to use also the sequence representation (f_1, \dots, f_ℓ) for $D \cap F$, where

$$f_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_t \in D \cap F \\ 0 & \text{if } d_t \notin D \cap F. \end{cases}$$

Now let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1^1 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_1^2$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_1^1 = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_1 : 3 \in F\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_1^2 = \mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_1^1.$$

Notice that $D \notin \mathcal{F}_1^1$, because $(0, 0, \dots, 0) \notin \mathcal{F}(D)$.

Also, $D \notin \mathcal{F}_1^2$, because $(0, 1, 1, \dots, 1) \notin \mathcal{F}(D)$. Hence $D \notin \mathcal{F}_1$.

Furthermore, $D \notin \mathcal{F}_2 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_3$, because $(0, 0, \dots, 0) \notin \mathcal{F}(D)$.

Finally, let $\mathcal{F}_4 = \mathcal{F}_4^1 \dot{\cup} \mathcal{F}_4^2$, where $\mathcal{F}_4^1 = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_4 : 4 \in F\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_4^2 = \mathcal{F}_4 \setminus \mathcal{F}_4^1$.

Now we have $D \notin \mathcal{F}_4^1$, because $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \notin \mathcal{F}(D)$, and $D \notin \mathcal{F}_4^2$, because $(1, 0, 1, 1, \dots, 1) \notin \mathcal{F}(D)$. Thus \mathcal{F} is not ℓ -dense, however,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}| &= |\mathcal{F}_1| + |\mathcal{F}_2| + |\mathcal{F}_3| + |\mathcal{F}_4| = \\ &= \binom{n-2}{\ell-1} + \binom{n-3}{\ell-3} + \binom{n-4}{\ell-3} + \binom{n-3}{\ell-2} = \binom{n-1}{\ell-1} + \binom{n-4}{\ell-3} > \binom{n-1}{\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark. Frankl-Watanabe [5] even conjectured that for every k -uniform, but not ℓ -dense, \mathcal{F} for $k > \ell > 2$ necessarily

$$(5) \quad |\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-k+\ell-1}{\ell-1} \quad \text{for} \quad n > n_0(k).$$

Of course, our example can be used to disprove this for every $k, \ell, n; n > k > \ell > 2$.

References

- [1] N. SAUER: On the density of families of sets, *J. Comb. Th. (A)* **13** (1972), 145–147.
- [2] S. SHELAH: A combinatorial problem, *Pacific J. Math.* **41** (1972), 247–261.
- [3] V. N. VAPNIK, and A. J. ČERVONENKIS: The uniform convergence of frequencies of the appearance of events to their probabilities, (in Russian), *Teor. Veroyatn. Primen.*, **16** (1971), 267–279.
- [4] P. FRANKL, and J. PACH: On disjointly representable sets, *Combinatorica* **4** (1984), 39–45.
- [5] P. FRANKL, and M. WATANABE: Density results for uniform families, *Combinatorica* **14** (1) (1994), 115–119.
- [6] P. ERDŐS: On some problems in graph theory, combinatorial analysis and combinatorial number theory, in: *Graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1983)*, 1–17. B. Bollobás ed., Academic Press, London, 1984.
- [7] P. ERDŐS, C. KO, and R. RADO: Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2)* **12** (1961), 313–320.

R. Ahlswede

Fakultät Mathematik

Universität Bielefeld

POB 100 131

33 501 Bielefeld, Germany

`hollmann@mathematik.uni-bielefeld.de`

L. H. Khachatarian

Fakultät Mathematik

Universität Bielefeld

POB 100 131

33 501 Bielefeld, Germany