JOURNAL OF COMBINATORIAL THEORY, Series A **79**, 118–132 (1997)
ARTICLE NO. TA962778

Intersection Statements for Systems of Sets

W. A. Deuber

Bielefeld, Germany

P. Erdős

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

D. S. Gunderson

Bielefeld, Germany

A. V. Kostochka*

Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia

and

A. G. Meyer

Bielefeld, Germany

Communicated by the Managing Editors

Received January 8, 1996

A family of r sets is called a *Δ-system* if any two sets have the same intersection. Denote by $F(n, r)$ the most number of subsets of an n-element set which do not contain a Δ-system consisting of r sets. Constructive new lower bounds for $F(n, r)$ are given which improve known probabilistic results, and a new upper bound is given by employing an argument due to Erdős and Szemerédi. Another construction is given which shows that for certain n, $F(n, 3) \geqslant 1.551^{n-2}$. We also show a relationship between the upper bound for $F(n, 3)$ and the Erdős–Rado conjecture on the largest uniform family of sets not containing a Δ-system.

1. INTRODUCTION

A family $\mathscr{F}$ of sets is called *k-uniform* if for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$, $|F| = k$ holds. A family of sets is called a *Δ-system* if any two sets have the same intersection.

* This work was partially supported by the Network DIMANET/PECO of the European Union (ERBCIPDCT 940623) and Grant RPY300 of the International Science Foundation and the Russian Government.

0097-3165/97 $25.00

Define $f(k, r)$ to be the least integer so that any k-uniform family of $f(k, r)$ sets contains a Δ-system consisting of r sets. Erdős and Rado [8] proved that

$$(r-1)^k < f(k, r) < k!(r-1)^k \tag{1}$$

and conjectured that for each r, there exists a constant C_r so that $f(k, r) < C_r^k$. Erdős (see [6]) has offered 1000 dollars for the proof or disproof of this for $r=3$. Several authors (Abbott, Hanson, and Sauer [3], Abbott and Hanson [4], Spencer [14], and Kostochka [12, 13]) have slightly improved the bounds in (1) but a proof or disproof of the conjecture is nowhere in sight. Currently, the best known upper bound [13] is

$$f(k, r) < Ck! \left(\frac{(\log \log \log k)^2}{\alpha \log \log k} \right)^k, \tag{2}$$

where α is any positive constant and k is large enough. As far as the lower bounds are concerned, limited progress seems to have been made since 1974 (see [1], [2], [4]). Infinite versions have also been studied in, for example, [7] and [9].

What appeals to us here is the similar problem for families having a fixed ground set. Define $F(n, r)$ to be the largest integer so that there exists a family $\mathscr{F}$ of subsets of an n-element set which does not contain a Δ-system of r sets. In [10], Erdős and Szemerédi showed

$$F(n, 3) < 2^{n - \sqrt{n}/10} \tag{3}$$

and stated that the probabilistic method implies that for each $r \geqslant 3$, there exists a constant $c_r > 0$, so that

$$F(n, r) > (1 + c_r)^n$$

where $c_r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$. Let

$$\beta_r = \lim_{n \to \infty} F(n, r)^{1/n}.$$

Abbott and Hanson [5] observed that β_r exists and that the probabilistic method mentioned above gives $\beta_r \geqslant 2(r+2)^{-1/r}$. They also presented a construction implying

$$\beta_r \geqslant \binom{2r-2}{r}^{1/(2r-2)} \sim 2^{(1 - \log(2r)/4r)}. \tag{4}$$

The Erdős–Szemerédi proof [10] of (3) reveals relations between bounds for $f(k, r)$ and $F(n, r)$. It shows that good upper bounds for $f(k, r)$ yield satisfactory upper bounds for $F(n, r)$ and strong lower bounds (if found) for $F(n, r)$ might imply lower bounds for $f(k, r)$. In Section 2, we repeat the Erdős–Szemerédi argument, however giving a more general outcome (Theorem 2.1) which yields the following two propositions.

PROPOSITION 1.1. *For each r and sufficiently large n,*

$$F(n, r) < 2^{n - \sqrt{n \log\log n / \log\log\log n}}.$$

The second consequence of Theorem 2.1 is the next proposition showing that if the Erdős–Rado conjecture is true, then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ so that for large n, $F(n, 3) < (2 - \varepsilon)^n$.

PROPOSITION 1.2. *If there exists a constant C so that $f(k, 3) < C^k$, then for n sufficiently large,*

$$F(n, 3) < 2^{n(1 - 0.65/C)}.$$

In particular, $\beta_r \leqslant 2^{(1 - 1/2C)}$.

A *weak* Δ-system is a family of sets where all pairs of sets have the same intersection size. Frankl and Rödl [11] proved that an upper bound of the form $(2 - \varepsilon)^n$ holds for the size of any family of subsets of an n element set not containing a weak Δ-system of 3 sets. This together with Proposition 1.2 motivates obtaining lower bounds on $F(n, r)$ and β_r. In Section 3 we give a bound for general r, improving (4).

THEOREM 1.3. *For every $r \geqslant 3$ and every n of the form $n = 2pr\lfloor \log r \rfloor$,*

$$F(n, r) \geqslant 2^{n(1 - \log\log r/2r - O(1/r))},$$

(*and there are uniform families which witness this bound*). *In particular,*

$$\beta_r \geqslant 2^{(1 - \log\log r/2r - O(1/r))}.$$

In Section 4, we concentrate on $r = 3$ and derive the following.

THEOREM 1.4. *For every n of the form $n = 14q$,*

$$F(n, 3) \geqslant 1.53^n.$$

Refining the argument, we also obtain

THEOREM 1.5. *For every n of the form $n = 48q + 2$,*

$$F(n, 3) \geqslant 1.551^{n-2}.$$

In particular, $\beta_3 \geqslant 1.551$.

In our proofs, it will be convenient to use the shorthand *r-free* family of sets to denote a family which contains no Δ-system consisting of r sets.

2. ANALYZING THE ERDŐS–SZEMERÉDI PROOF

Repeating the Erdős–Szemerédi argument, we show that it indeed proves more than was originally claimed.

THEOREM 2.1 ([10]). *Let r be fixed. Suppose that for $k > k_0$, $\alpha = \alpha(k)$ satisfies $f(k, r) \leqslant \alpha^k$. For n sufficiently large, if $k > n^{0,1}$ and*

$$2k\alpha < 1.31n, \tag{5}$$

then

$$F(n, r) < 2^{n-k}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathscr{A} = \{A_i \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant t\}$ be the largest r-free family of subsets of an n-element set S, and for each $l = 1, ..., n$, $\mathscr{A}_l$ be the subfamily of $\mathscr{A}$ with members of cardinality l. Obviously, there is an l so that $s = |\mathscr{A}_l| \geqslant t/n$. For each $A_i \in \mathscr{A}_l$, consider all its subsets of size $l-k$. The total number of such subsets is easily bounded from above by $s\binom{l}{k}$. The total number of subsets of S of size $l-k$ is clearly $\binom{n}{l-k}$, and so, some set B of size $l-k$ occurs in at least u members of $\mathscr{A}_l$, where

$$u \geqslant \frac{s\binom{l}{k}}{\binom{n}{l-k}} = \frac{s\binom{n+k}{k}}{\binom{n+k}{l}} > s\binom{n+k}{k} 2^{-n-k}.$$

Let $\mathscr{A}_{l,B} = \{A_i \in \mathscr{A}_l \mid A_i \supset B\}$. Then $\mathscr{A}_{l,B} - B = \{A_i \backslash B \mid A_i \in \mathscr{A}_{l,B}\}$ is a k-uniform r-free family. Thus, $u < f(k, r)$ and so,

$$t \leqslant ns < n \cdot f(k, r)\, 2^{n+k} \binom{n+k}{k}^{-1} < n^2 \cdot 2^n \left(\frac{2k\alpha}{ne}\right)^k.$$

By (5), the last expression does not exceed $n^2 \cdot 2^n (1.31/e)^k < 2^{n-k}$.

This correlation between $f(k, r)$ and $F(n, r)$ enables easy proofs of Propositions 1.1 and 1.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. By (2), for large k,

$$f(k, r) < \left(\frac{k(\log\log\log k)^2}{10 \log\log k}\right)^k.$$

Thus, for n sufficiently large and $k = \sqrt{n \cdot \log\log n}/\log\log\log n$, the conditions of Theorem 2.1 hold. Hence $F(n, r) < 2^{n-k}$.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Let k, n be large, $f(k, 3) < C^k$, then for $k = \lceil 0.65n/C \rceil$, (5) holds, and by Theorem 2.1, we get what was promised.

3. A LOWER BOUND FOR LARGE r

Let $V_1, V_2, ..., V_p$ be pairwise disjoint finite sets and for each $i = 1, ..., p$, let $\mathscr{F}_i$ be a family of subsets on V_i. Define $\prod_{i=1}^p \mathscr{F}_i$ to be the family of subsets A of $\bigcup_{i=1}^p V_i$ such that $A \cap V_i \in \mathscr{F}_i$ holds for each $i = 1, ..., p$. Clearly,

$$\left|\prod_{i=1}^p \mathscr{F}_i\right| = \prod_{i=1}^p |\mathscr{F}_i|. \tag{6}$$

If all pairs $(V_i, \mathscr{F}_i)$ are copies of one pair $(V, \mathscr{F})$, we shall denote $\prod_{i=1}^p \mathscr{F}_i$ by $\mathscr{F}^p$. A family of sets is said to be *Sperner* (or "has the Sperner property") if none of the sets contains another one.

The following lemma is a relative of Theorem 1 in [1].

LEMMA 3.1. *If $\mathscr{F}_1$ and $\mathscr{F}_2$ are Sperner r-free families on disjoint ground sets V_1 and V_2 then $\prod_{i=1}^2 \mathscr{F}_i$ is also a Sperner r-free family.*

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let $A, B \in \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathscr{F}_i$. For some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $A \cap V_i \neq B \cap V_i$. Then by the Sperner property of $\mathscr{F}_i$, both $(A \cap V_i) \setminus (B \cap V_i)$ and $(B \cap V_i) \setminus (A \cap V_i)$ are non-empty. It follows that $\prod_{i=1}^2 \mathscr{F}_i$ is Sperner.

Suppose now that $A_1, ..., A_r \in \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathscr{F}_i$ form a Δ-system of r sets. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ be such that not all the sets $A'_j = A_j \cap V_i$ coincide. Without loss of generality, we assume that for $K = A'_1 \cap A'_2$, $K \neq A'_1$. By the Sperner property of $\mathscr{F}$ then $K \neq A'_2$. Since $A_1, ..., A_r$ form a Δ-system, $K \subset A'_j$, for each $j = 1, ..., r$ and no element in $V_i \setminus K$ belongs to more than one of the A'_j-s. It follows that all A'_j-s are distinct and form a Δ-system of r sets. This is a contradiction.

We use the notation $[n]^k = \{S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\} : |S| = k\}$. The next lemma is very similar to that in [5] (the consequence of which is mentioned in the introduction).

LEMMA 3.2. *For any $k \geqslant r+2$, the family $[2r]^k$ is r-free.*

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Suppose that $A_1, ..., A_r \in [2r]^k$ form a Δ-system of r sets. Let m be the size of their common intersection M. Then all the sets $A_i \backslash M$ are disjoint and so counting the elements used in the Δ-system, we have

$$m + r(k-m) \geqslant m + r(r+2-m) \geqslant r(r+2) - (r-1)(r+1) = 2r+1,$$

which is impossible.

For $t, r \geqslant 1$, let $V_1, ..., V_t$ be pairwise disjoint sets of cardinality $2r$ and $W = \bigcup_{i=1}^t V_i$. Define $\mathscr{F}(r, t)$ to be the collection of all subsets A of W satisfying

$$|A \cap V_i| \in \{r+2, r+2+t, ..., r+2+t\lfloor (r-2)/t \rfloor\} \tag{7}$$

for each $i = 1, ..., t$.

LEMMA 3.3. *For any r and t, the family $\mathscr{F}(r, t)$ is r-free and contains a uniform (and hence Sperner) subfamily $\mathscr{F}'(r, t)$ of cardinality at least $|\mathscr{F}(r, t)|/r$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $A_1, ..., A_r \in \mathscr{F}(r, t)$ form a Δ-system of r sets. For each $i = 1, ..., t$ and $j = 1, ..., r$ set $A_j(i) = A_j \cap V_i$.

Let $B(i) = A_1(i) \cap A_2(i)$. Since $A_1, ..., A_r$ form a Δ-system, $B(i) \subseteq A_j(i)$ for each j, and each element of $V_i \backslash B(i)$ belongs to at most one of the A_j-s. Like in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we observe that it is impossible to have all $A_j(i)$-s distinct from the corresponding $B(i)$, so let $A_{l(i)}(i) = B(i)$. By (7), each $A_j(i)$ is distinct from $A_{l(i)}(i)$ and has at least t elements in $A_j(i) \backslash A_{l(i)}(i)$ which should coincide with $A_j(i) \backslash \bigcup_{l \neq j} A_l(i)$. Hence the number of such sets is at most $(2r - (r+2))/t$. Consequently, for at least 2 members of $\{A_1, ..., A_r\}$, their intersections with V_i are equal to $B(i)$ for each i. This is a contradiction.

Observe that the size of any member of $\mathscr{F}(r, t)$ belongs to the set $\{t(r+2), t(r+3), ..., t(r+r-2)\}$. It follows that for some i, the size of $\{A \in \mathscr{F}(r, t) : |A| = t(r+i)\}$ is at least $|\mathscr{F}(r, t)|/r$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Because of the $O(1/r)$ in the statement of Theorem 1.3, we may assume that r is large enough. Put $t = \lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor$, and let $n = p \cdot 2rt$.

Let $\mathcal{F}'(r, t)$ be the family provided by Lemma 3.3. By Lemma 3.1, the family $(\mathcal{F}'(r, t))^p$ does not contain any Δ-system of r sets. The number of subsets A of a V_i satisfying (7) is at least $(1 - O(1/\sqrt{r})) \cdot 2^{2r-1}/t$. Consequently, for large r,

$$|\mathcal{F}'(r, t)| \geqslant |\mathcal{F}(r, t)|/r \geqslant (2^{2r-1}(1 - O(1/\sqrt{r}))/t)^t/r \geqslant \frac{2^{2tr-t}}{t^t 2r} \geqslant \frac{2^{2tr}}{t^t 2r^2}.$$

Thus,

$$|(\mathcal{F}'(r, t))^p| \geqslant \left[\frac{1}{2r^2}\left(\frac{2^{2r}}{t}\right)^t\right]^{n/(2rt)}$$
$$= 2^{n(1 - \log\log r/2r - O(1/r))}.$$

4. A LOWER BOUND FOR $r = 3$

4.1. *Outline of the Construction*

To arrive at Theorem 1.5 we first present a Sperner 3-free family $\mathcal{F}$ comprised of subsets of a 14-element “brick”. With $\mathcal{F}$ and Lemma 3.1 we then prove Theorem 1.4. On another 14-element brick we construct another Sperner 3-free family $\mathcal{L}$. We then give another product lemma, and apply it to combine $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{L}$, yielding a family $\mathcal{Q}$ on a ground set of 26 elements. Applying the product lemma again to two disjoint copies of $\mathcal{Q}$ produces a family $\mathcal{R}$ on a ground set of 50 vertices. Finally, we take the product of $\mathcal{R}$ with itself, producing $\mathcal{R}^2$ on 98 vertices, then by successively taking the product of the result with $\mathcal{R}$ again, each time increase the existing ground set by 48 until we reach n.

4.2. *The Family $\mathcal{F}$ on a 14 Element Brick*

To begin the construction, let $W = \{w_1, ..., w_5, y\}$ and define four families $\mathcal{H}_0, ..., \mathcal{H}_3$ of subsets of W as follows. Put $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{\varnothing\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{A \subset W: |A| = 5\}$. The family $\mathcal{H}_2$ will be the following family of triples of elements of W:

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{5} \{\{y, w_i, w_{i+1}\}, \{w_i, w_{i-2}, w_{i+2}\}\},$$

where the indices are taken modulo 5. Finally, let $\mathcal{H}_3 = \{W \backslash A : A \in \mathcal{H}_2\}$. The following known fact (see [2], [3]) can be verified directly.

LEMMA 4.1. *The family $\mathscr{H}_2$ is intersecting, Sperner, and 3-free. Moreover, $\mathscr{H}_3$ is isomorphic to $\mathscr{H}_2$.*

The ground set X for our desired family $\mathscr{F}$ consists of two copies W_1 and W_2 of W and two additional elements x_1 and x_2 (in total, $|X| = 14$). Subfamilies of $\mathscr{F}$ shall be described by quadruples of the type $\langle i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \rangle$, where i_1 and i_2 will take values from $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and j_1, j_2 from $\{0, 1\}$. Now we are ready to indicate $\mathscr{F}$ on X. We define $\mathscr{F} = \bigcup_{t=1}^{8} \mathscr{F}_t$, where $\mathscr{F}_t = \langle i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \rangle$ consists of exactly those subsets A of X with the following property for $q = 1, 2$: $A \cap W_q \in \mathscr{H}_{i_q}$ and A contains exactly j_s elements of the set $\{x_s\}$, $s = 1, 2$. Let

$$\mathscr{F}_1 = \langle 1, 1, 0, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_2 = \langle 2, 2, 1, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_3 = \langle 1, 0, 1, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_4 = \langle 0, 1, 1, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_5 = \langle 1, 2, 1, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_6 = \langle 3, 1, 1, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_7 = \langle 1, 3, 0, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{F}_8 = \langle 2, 1, 0, 1 \rangle.$$

It will be of some help that for $t = 3, 5, 7$, $\mathscr{F}_t$ and $\mathscr{F}_{t+1}$ are symmetric with respect to W_1 and W_2, and for $t = 5, 6$, $\mathscr{F}_t$ and $\mathscr{F}_{t+2}$ are symmetric with respect to x_1 and x_2.

LEMMA 4.2. *The family $\mathscr{F}$ defined above is Sperner, 3-free, and satisfies $|\mathscr{F}| = 388$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.2. By definition, $|\mathscr{F}_1| = |\mathscr{H}_1|^2 = 36$, $|\mathscr{F}_2| = |\mathscr{H}_2|^2 = 100$, $|\mathscr{F}_3| = |\mathscr{F}_4| = 6$, $|\mathscr{F}_5| = \cdots = |\mathscr{F}_8| = 60$. Thus, $|\mathscr{F}| = 388$.

To derive the Sperner property, observe first that each member of $\mathscr{F}_t$ has cardinality k_t, where $k_1 = 10, k_2 = 8, k_3 = k_4 = 7, k_5 = \cdots = k_8 = 9$. Notice that only the members of $\mathscr{F}_1$ do not meet $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and hence none of them contains any other member of $\mathscr{F}$. The members of $\mathscr{F}_5 \cup \cdots \cup \mathscr{F}_8$ have smaller intersection size with $\{x_1, x_2\}$ than those of $\mathscr{F}_2 \cup \mathscr{F}_3 \cup \mathscr{F}_4$. The members of $\mathscr{F}_2$ have smaller intersection size with W_1 than those of $\mathscr{F}_3$ and have smaller intersection size with W_2 than those of $\mathscr{F}_4$. Thus, $\mathscr{F}$ is Sperner.

Suppose that some members A, B and C of $\mathscr{F}$ form a Δ-system. We have to consider several cases. For $0 \leqslant p, q \leqslant 3$ we denote by case $[p, q]$ the case when x_1 belongs to exactly p many of A, B and C, and x_2 belongs to q of them. Since A, B and C form a Δ-system, the value 2 is forbidden for p and q. We also take into account the symmetry between p and q. In each case we shall find an element which belongs to exactly two of A, B and C, yielding a contradiction.

Case $[3, 3]$. Then A, B and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_2 \cup \mathscr{F}_3 \cup \mathscr{F}_4$. By Lemmas 4.1 and 3.1, not all three of A, B, and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_2$. We may assume $A \in \mathscr{F}_3$. If another one, say B also belongs to $\mathscr{F}_3$, then no other member of $\mathscr{F}_2 \cup \mathscr{F}_3 \cup \mathscr{F}_4$ covers their intersection (of size 4) which is a contradiction. If both B and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_2$ then their common element in W_2 (which exists by Lemma 4.1) is what we are after. The last possibility is that $B \in \mathscr{F}_2$ and $C \in \mathscr{F}_4$. Then each element of $W_1 \cap A \cap B$ belongs to exactly two of the sets A, B and C.

Case $[3, 1]$. Then two of the sets A, B and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_5 \cup \mathscr{F}_6$. First assume that $A \in \mathscr{F}_5, B \in \mathscr{F}_5 \cup \mathscr{F}_6$ and $C \in \mathscr{F}_2 \cup \mathscr{F}_3 \cup \mathscr{F}_4$. If $B \cap W_1 \neq C \cap W_1$, then the symmetric difference between $B \cap W_1$ and $C \cap W_1$ has size at least two, and hence meets $A \cap W_1$. This gives an element which belongs to A and moreover to exactly one of B and C. Secondly, suppose $B \cap W_1 = C \cap W_1$. Then $C \in \mathscr{F}_3$ and $B \in \mathscr{F}_5$. In this case, A and B have a common element in W_2 which does not intersect C. Thirdly, let both A and B be in $\mathscr{F}_6$. In order that C covers $A \cap B \cap W_2$, we need $C \in \mathscr{F}_4$. As in the second subcase a common element of A and B in W_2 does not intersect C.

Case $[3, 0]$. We may assume that A and B are in $\mathscr{F}_5$, and $C \in \mathscr{F}_5 \cup \mathscr{F}_6$. We can also assume that $|A \cap B \cap W_1| \geqslant |A \cap B \cap W_2|$. If not all of A, B and C coincide on W_1, then the intersection $|A \cap B \cap W_1|$ is not contained in C. So, let A, B and C coincide on W_1. Then their corresponding intersections with W_2 form a subfamily of $\mathscr{H}_3$, which contradicts Lemma 4.1.

Case $[1, 1]$. If two of A, B and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_1$, then the intersection of these two has at least eight elements in common with $W_1 \cup W_2$. But any member of $\mathscr{F}_2 \cup \mathscr{F}_3 \cup \mathscr{F}_4$ has at most six elements in $W_1 \cup W_2$. So, we may assume $A \in \mathscr{F}_1, B \in \mathscr{F}_5 \cup \mathscr{F}_6$ and $C \in \mathscr{F}_7 \cup \mathscr{F}_8$. Moreover, we can assume $B \in \mathscr{F}_5$. If $|A \cap B \cap W_1| = 4$ then for any 3-tuple or 5-tuple $C \cap W_1$ there is an element in W_1 belonging to exactly two of A, B and C. Thus, $A \cap W_1 = B \cap W_1$ and necessarily $A \cap W_1 = C \cap W_1$. It follows, $C \in \mathscr{F}_7$ and furthermore $B \cap W_2$ and $C \cap W_2$ are distinct triangles, since $B \cap W_2 \in \mathscr{H}_2$ and $C \cap W_2 \in \mathscr{H}_3$. Then their symmetric difference has a common element with $A \cap W_2$ which is a contradiction.

Case $[1, 0]$. We may assume that A and B are in $\mathscr{F}_1$ and $C \in \mathscr{F}_5$. Then the triple $C \cap W_2$ does not cover $A \cap B \cap W_2$.

Case $[0, 0]$. A, B and C belong to $\mathscr{F}_1$ and by Lemma 3.2 do not form a Δ-system.

This concludes the proof of the fact that $\mathscr{F}$ is 3-free, and so the proof of Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Applying Lemma 3.1 with q sets instead of 2, the above construction gives for each n of the form $n = 14q$ a 3-free Sperner family showing $F(n, 3) \geqslant (388^{1/14})^n > 1.53^n$.

4.3. *The Family* $\mathscr{L}$ *on* 14 *Elements*

We now define another Sperner 3-free family $\mathscr{L}$ of subsets of the 14-element set $W_1 \cup W_2 \cup \{x_1, x_2\}$. (Note: we will later take $\mathscr{L}$ to be on a ground set disjoint from that of $\mathscr{F}$.) As in Section 4.2, we shall use for $\mathscr{L}$ the same meaning for quadruples of the type $\langle i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \rangle$, where i_1 and i_2 will take values from $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and j_1, j_2 from $\{0, 1\}$.

We put $\mathscr{L} = \bigcup_{t=1}^{8} \mathscr{L}_t$, which are defined by the following quadruples:

$$\mathscr{L}_1 = \langle 1, 2, 0, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_2 = \langle 2, 1, 0, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_3 = \langle 2, 3, 1, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_4 = \langle 3, 2, 0, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_5 = \langle 1, 0, 1, 0 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_6 = \langle 0, 1, 0, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_7 = \langle 3, 0, 1, 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathscr{L}_8 = \langle 0, 3, 1, 1 \rangle.$$

LEMMA 4.3. *The family* $\mathscr{L}$ *is Sperner*, 3-*free*, *and satisfies* $|\mathscr{L}| = 352$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We prove the lemma along the lines of the proof of Lemma 4.2.

One can check that $|\mathscr{L}_1| = |\mathscr{L}_2| = 60$, $|\mathscr{L}_3| = |\mathscr{L}_4| = 100$, $|\mathscr{L}_5| = |\mathscr{L}_6| = 6$, and $|\mathscr{L}_7| = |\mathscr{L}_8| = 10$, giving 352 in all.

To derive the Sperner property, observe first that each member of $\mathscr{L}_t$ has cardinality k_t, where $k_1 = k_2 = 8, k_3 = k_4 = 7, k_5 = k_6 = 6, k_7 = k_8 = 5$. Notice that only the members of $\mathscr{L}_1$ and $\mathscr{L}_2$ do not meet $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and hence none of them contains any other member of $\mathscr{L}$. The members of

$\mathcal{L}_3 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{L}_6$ have smaller intersection size with $\{x_1, x_2\}$ than those of $\mathcal{L}_7 \cup \mathcal{L}_8$. The members of $\mathcal{L}_3$ and $\mathcal{L}_4$ have smaller intersection size with W_1 than those of $\mathcal{L}_5$ and have smaller intersection size with W_2 than those of $\mathcal{L}_6$. Thus, $\mathcal{L}$ is Sperner.

Suppose that some members A, B and C of $\mathcal{L}$ form a Δ-system. As above, for $0 \leqslant p, q \leqslant 3$ we denote by case $[p, q]$ the case when x_1 belongs to exactly p many of A, B and C, and x_2 belongs to q of them. We also take into account the symmetry between p and q. In each case we shall find an element which belongs to exactly two of A, B and C, yielding a contradiction.

Case $[3, 3]$. Then A, B and C belong to $\mathcal{L}_7 \cup \mathcal{L}_8$. We may assume $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_7$. If C also belongs to $\mathcal{L}_7$, then the sets $A \cap W_1, B \cap W_1$ and $C \cap W_1$ form a Δ-system, a contradiction to Lemma 4.1. Let $C \in \mathcal{L}_8$. Then the elements of $W_1 \cap A \cap B$ do not belong to C.

Case $[3, 1]$. We may assume $A \in \mathcal{L}_7$. If both B and C belong to $\mathcal{L}_3$, then the set $W_2 \cap B \cap C$ is non-empty and disjoint from A. Let $B \in \mathcal{L}_5$. If C also belongs to $\mathcal{L}_5$, then $|W_1 \cap C \cap B| = 4$ and hence some element of this set is not in A. Finally, if $C \in \mathcal{L}_3$ then the symmetric difference between $B \cap W_1$ and $C \cap W_1$ has size at least two, and hence meets $A \cap W_1$.

Case $[3, 0]$. Assume first that A and B are in $\mathcal{L}_3$. Since the set $W_2 \cap B \cap A$ is non-empty, C also should be in $\mathcal{L}_3$. But by Lemma 3.1, $\mathcal{L}_3$ is Sperner and 3-free. Thus, we may assume that A and B are in $\mathcal{L}_5$. Then no other member of $\mathcal{L}_3 \cup \mathcal{L}_5$ covers $W_1 \cap A \cap B$.

Case $[1, 1]$. Assume first that A is in $\mathcal{L}_7 \cup \mathcal{L}_8$, for definiteness, in $\mathcal{L}_7$. Then both B and C are in $\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$, and hence the set $W_2 \cap B \cap C$ is non-empty and disjoint from A. Thus exactly one of A, B and C belongs to $\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$. We may assume that $A \in \mathcal{L}_1$, $B \in \mathcal{L}_3 \cup \mathcal{L}_5$, $C \in \mathcal{L}_4 \cup \mathcal{L}_6$. Note that in any case, the symmetric difference between $B \cap W_1$ and $C \cap W_1$ has size at least two, and hence meets $A \cap W_1$.

Case $[1, 0]$. We may assume that both B and C are in $\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2$. If $A \in \mathcal{L}_5$ then the set $W_2 \cap B \cap C$ is non-empty and disjoint from A. Let $A \in \mathcal{L}_3$. If, say, $B \in \mathcal{L}_2$, then the symmetric difference between $A \cap W_2$ and $C \cap W_2$ has size at least two, and hence meets $B \cap W_2$. If, finally, both B and C are in $\mathcal{L}_1$, then the set $B \cap C \cap W_1$ has size at least four, and hence is not covered by $A \cap W_1$.

Case $[0, 0]$. We may assume that A and B are in $\mathcal{L}_1$. If $C \in \mathcal{L}_2$, then the triple $C \cap W_1$ does not cover $A \cap B \cap W_1$, and so $C \in \mathcal{L}_1$. But by Lemma 3.1, $\mathcal{L}_1$ is Sperner and 3-free.

4.4. *Another Product Lemma*

The following lemma is a relative of Theorem 2 in [1].

LEMMA 4.4. *Let* $\mathscr{A}$ *and* $\mathscr{B}$ *be Sperner* 3*-free families on disjoint ground sets* A *and* B*, respectively. For* $a \in A$ *and* $b \in B$*, set* $\mathscr{A}_a = \{C \in \mathscr{A} : a \in C\}$, $\mathscr{B}_b = \{D \in \mathscr{B} : b \in D\}$, $\bar{\mathscr{A}}_a = \mathscr{A} \backslash \mathscr{A}_a$*, and* $\bar{\mathscr{B}}_b = \mathscr{B} \backslash \mathscr{B}_b$*. Let* $\mathscr{G}_1 = \{(C \backslash \{a\}) \cup D : C \in \mathscr{A}_a, D \in \bar{\mathscr{B}}_b\}$ *and* $\mathscr{G}_2 = \{C \cup (D \backslash \{b\}) : C \in \bar{\mathscr{A}}_a, D \in \mathscr{B}_b\}$*. Then for* $\mathscr{G} = \mathscr{G}(\mathscr{A}, a, \mathscr{B}, b) = \mathscr{G}_1 \cup \mathscr{G}_2$*, the following hold*:

(i) $\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2 = \emptyset$;

(ii) $\mathscr{G}$ *is Sperner*;

(iii) $\mathscr{G}$ *is a* 3*-free family on the ground set* $(A \cup B) \backslash \{a, b\}$.

Proof. Let $M_i \in \mathscr{G}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, $M_i \cap A = C_i$, $M_i \cap B = D_i$. Assume that $M_1 \supset M_2$. Then $C_1 \supset C_2$, which is impossible because, by definition, $C_1 \cup \{a\}$ and C_2 are members of the Sperner family $\mathscr{G}_1$, implying (i). Since $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ are Sperner, this implies (ii).

Now assume that some distinct members M_1, M_2 and M_3 of $\mathscr{G}$ (where $M_i \cap A = C_i$, $M_i \cap B = D_i$) form a Δ-system. Due to the symmetry between $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$, it is enough to consider the following cases.

Case 1. Each of M_1, M_2 and M_3 are members of $\mathscr{G}_1$. Then D_1, D_2 and D_3 should form a Δ-system, too (maybe with repetition of members). Since $\mathscr{G}_2$ is Sperner and 3-free, $D_1 = D_2 = D_3$ is necessary. Analogously, C_1, C_2 and C_3 (and hence also $C_1 \cup \{a\}$, $C_2 \cup \{a\}$ and $C_3 \cup \{a\}$) form a Δ-system, as well. Again, we get $C_1 = C_2 = C_3$. Thus, $M_1 = M_2 = M_3$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $M_1, M_2 \in \mathscr{G}_1$, $M_3 \in \mathscr{G}_2$. As in Case 1, D_1, D_2 and D_3 should form a Δ-system, too (maybe with repetition of members). Then D_1, D_2 and $D_3 \cup \{b\}$ are members of $\mathscr{G}_2$ and form a Δ-system, as well, but b belongs only to $D_3 \cup \{b\}$. This is impossible for the Sperner and 3-free $\mathscr{G}_2$.

4.5. *The Families* $\mathscr{Q}$ *and* $\mathscr{R}$

We first construct from $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{L}$ a new family $\mathscr{Q}$ on 26 vertices. Let $a \in W_1$ and $b \in W_2$ be some elements of our 14-element set X. It is routine to verify that, in terms of Lemma 4.4,

$$|\mathscr{F}_b \cap \mathscr{F}_a| = 150, \quad |\mathscr{F}_b \cap \bar{\mathscr{F}}_a| = |\bar{\mathscr{F}}_b \cap \mathscr{F}_a| = 95, \quad |\bar{\mathscr{F}}_b \cap \bar{\mathscr{F}}_a| = 48, \tag{8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathscr{L}_{x_1} \cap \mathscr{L}_{x_2}| = 20, \qquad &|\mathscr{L}_{x_1} \cap \bar{\mathscr{L}}_{x_2}| = 106, \\ &|\bar{\mathscr{L}}_{x_1} \cap \mathscr{L}_{x_2}| = 106, \qquad &|\bar{\mathscr{L}}_{x_1} \cap \bar{\mathscr{L}}_{x_2}| = 120. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Let $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{L}$ have disjoint 14-element ground sets $X(1)$ and $X(2)$, respectively, where now for each $i = 1, 2$, $W_1(i)$, $W_2(i)$, $x_1(i)$, $x_2(i)$, $a(i)$, and

$b(i)$ denote the corresponding copies of W_1, W_2, x_1, x_2, a, and b in $X(i)$. We define

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}, b(1), \mathcal{L}, x_1(2)).$$

By Lemma 4.4, $\mathcal{Q}$ is Sperner and 3-free. In anticipation of defining another family $\mathcal{R}$, we make some preliminary calculations. By (8) and (9),

$$|\mathcal{Q}| = 245 \cdot 226 + 143 \cdot 126 = 73388;$$

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{a(1)}| = 150 \cdot 226 + 95 \cdot 126 = 45870;$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{a(1)}| = 73388 - 45870 = 27518;$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{x_2(2)}| = 245 \cdot 120 + 143 \cdot 106 = 44558;$$

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{x_2(2)}| = 73388 - 44558 = 28830.$$

Moreover,

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{a(1)} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{x_2(2)}| = 150 \cdot 106 + 95 \cdot 20 = 17800;$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{a(1)} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{x_2(2)}| = 95 \cdot 106 + 48 \cdot 20 = 11030;$$

$$|\mathcal{Q}_{a(1)} \cup \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{x_2(2)}| = 150 \cdot 120 + 95 \cdot 106 = 28070;$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{a(1)} \cup \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{x_2(2)}| = 95 \cdot 120 + 48 \cdot 106 = 16488.$$

We now define the family $\mathcal{R}$ on a ground set of 50 vertices. Let $\mathcal{Q}(1)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(2)$ be two copies of $\mathcal{Q}$ on disjoint ground sets. We define

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Q}(1), a(1), \mathcal{Q}(2), x_2(2)).$$

By Lemma 4.4, $\mathcal{R}$ is Sperner and 3-free.

Let w be the copy of $a(1)$ on the ground set of $\mathcal{Q}(1)$ and x be the copy of $x_2(2)$ on the ground set of $\mathcal{Q}(2)$. By the above calculations,

$$|\mathcal{R}_w| = 28070 \cdot 45870 + 17800 \cdot 27518 = 1777391300,$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{R}}_w| = 16488 \cdot 45870 + 11030 \cdot 27518 = 1059828100,$$

$$|\mathcal{R}_x| = 17800 \cdot 44558 + 11030 \cdot 28830 = 1111127300,$$

$$|\overline{\mathcal{R}}_x| = 28070 \cdot 44558 + 16488 \cdot 28830 = 1726092100,$$

and so

$$|\mathcal{R}| = 1111127300 + 1726092100 = 2837219400.$$

We remark that, as in the proof of Theorem 1.4, the construction of $\mathscr{R}$ gives for each n of the form $n = 50q$ a 3-free Sperner family showing $F(n, 3) \geqslant (2837219400^{n/50}) > 1.545^n$, however, we can do somewhat better.

4.6. *The Proof of Theorem* 1.5

Proof of Theorem 1.5. For $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, we construct a Sperner and 3-free family $\mathscr{R}^j$ of cardinality at least 1.551^{48j} with the ground set D^j, $|D^j| = 48j + 2$. We put $\mathscr{R}^1 = \mathscr{R}$ and by above calculations, observe that $|\mathscr{R}^1| = 2837219400 > 1.551^{48}$.

Suppose that $\mathscr{R}^{j-1}$ has been constructed on the ground set D^{j-1}. Let z be any element of D^{j-1}, and fix a copy of $\mathscr{R}$ on a ground set disjoint from D^{j-1}. Using Lemma 4.4, we will take a certain product of $\mathscr{R}^{j-1}$ with the new copy of $\mathscr{R}$, depending on certain vertices.

Case 1. If $|\mathscr{R}_z^{j-1}| \geqslant 0.5\, |\mathscr{R}^{j-1}|$ then put $\mathscr{R}^j = \mathscr{G}(\mathscr{R}^{j-1}, z, \mathscr{R}, x)$. By construction and the induction assumption, $|D^j| = |D^{j-1}| + 48 = 48j + 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{R}^j| &= 1726092100 \cdot |\mathscr{R}_z^{j-1}| + 1111127300 \cdot |\bar{\mathscr{R}}_z^{j-1}| \\
&\geqslant |\mathscr{R}^{j-1}|(0.5 \cdot 1726092100 + 0.5 \cdot 1111127300) \\
&\geqslant 1.551^{48(j-1)} \cdot 0.5 \cdot 2837219400 > 1.551^{48j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. If $|\mathscr{R}_z^{j-1}| < 0.5\, |\mathscr{R}^{j-1}|$ then put $\mathscr{R}^j = \mathscr{G}(\mathscr{R}^{j-1}, z, \mathscr{R}, w)$. Similar to Case 1, $|D^j| = 48j + 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathscr{R}^j| &= 1059828100 \cdot |\mathscr{R}_z^{j-1}| + 1777391300 \cdot |\bar{\mathscr{R}}_z^{j-1}| \\
&\geqslant |\mathscr{R}^{j-1}|\, (0.5 \cdot 1059828100 + 0.5 \cdot 1777391300) \\
&\geqslant 1.551^{48(j-1)} \cdot 0.5 \cdot 2837219400 > 1.551^{48j}.
\end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

1. H. L. Abbott and G. Exoo, On set systems not containing delta systems, *Graphs and Combinatorics* **8** (1992), 1–9.
2. H. L. Abbott and B. Gardner, Remark on a combinatorial theorem of Erdős and Rado, *in* "Recent Progress in Combinatorics" (W. T. Tutte, Ed.), pp. 211–215, Academic Press, New York, 1969.
3. H. L. Abbott, D. Hanson, and N. Sauer, Intersection theorems for systems of sets, *J. Comb. Theor. Ser. A* **12** (1972), 381–389.
4. H. L. Abbott and D. Hanson, On finite Δ-systems, *Discrete Math.* **8** (1974), 1–12.
5. H. L. Abbott and D. Hanson, On finite Δ-systems II, *Discrete Math.* **17** (1977), 121–126.
6. P. Erdős, Problems and results on finite and infinite combinatorial analysis, *in* "Infinite and Finite Sets (Colloq. Keszthely 1973), Vol. I, Colloq. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai," Vol. 10, pp. 403–424, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.

7. P. Erdős, E. C. Milner, and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of sets (III), *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **18** (1974), 22–40.
8. P. Erdős and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of sets, *J. London Math. Soc.* **35** (1960), 85–90.
9. P. Erdős and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of sets (II), *J. London Math. Soc.* **44** (1969), 467–479.
10. P. Erdős and E. Szemerédi, Combinatorial properties of systems of sets, *J. Comb. Theor. Ser. A* **24** (1978), 308–313.
11. P. Frankl and V. Rödl, Forbidden intersections, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **300** (1987), 259–286.
12. A. V. Kostochka, A bound of the cardinality of families not containing Δ-systems, to appear in "The Mathematics of Paul Erdős" (R. L. Graham and J. Nešetřil, Eds.), Algorithms and Combinatorics **14**, 229–235, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
13. A. V. Kostochka, An intersection theorem for systems of sets, *Random Structures & Algorithms* **9** (1996) (Proceedings of RGA95, Emory University, 1995), 213–221.
14. J. Spencer, Intersection theorems for systems of sets, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **20** (1977), 249–254.