

# On $k$ -wise intersecting families of vertex sets in perfect matchings

Vikram Kamat\*

Department of Computer Science & Automation  
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore – 560 012, India.

April 17, 2019

## Abstract

We consider the following generalization of the seminal Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem, due to Frankl. For some  $k \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $k$ -wise intersecting family of  $r$ -subsets of an  $n$  element set  $X$ , i.e. for any  $F_1, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k F_i \neq \emptyset$ . If  $r \leq \frac{(k-1)n}{k}$ , then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ . We extend Frankl's theorem in a graph-theoretic direction. For a graph  $G$ , and  $r \geq 1$ , let  $\mathcal{P}^r(G)$  be the family of all  $r$ -subsets of the vertex set of  $G$  such that every  $r$ -subset is either an independent set or contains a maximum independent set. We will consider  $k$ -wise intersecting subfamilies of this family for the graph  $M_n$ , where  $M_n$  is the perfect matching on  $2n$  vertices, and prove an analog of Frankl's theorem. This result can also be considered as an extension of a theorem of Bollobás and Leader for intersecting families of independent vertex sets in  $M_n$ .

**Key words.** intersecting families, independent sets, perfect matchings.

## 1 Introduction

For a positive integer  $n$ , let  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For positive integers  $i$  and  $j$  with  $i \leq j$ , let  $[i, j] = \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$  ( $[i, j] = \emptyset$  if  $i > j$ ). Similarly let  $(i, j] = \{i+1, \dots, j\}$ , which is empty if  $i+1 > j$ . The notations  $(i, j)$  and  $[i, j)$  are similarly defined. Let  $\binom{[n]}{r}$  be the family of all  $r$ -subsets of  $[n]$ . For  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$  and  $v \in [n]$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_v = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : v \in F\}$ , called a *star* in  $\mathcal{F}$ , centered at  $v$ . A family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$  is said to be  $k$ -wise intersecting if for any  $F_1, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^k F_i \neq \emptyset$ . If  $k = 2$ , we say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is intersecting. It is trivial to note that for any  $k \geq 2$ , if  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $k$ -wise intersecting, then it is also intersecting. Frankl [3] proved the following theorem for  $k$ -wise intersecting families.

**Theorem 1.1** (Frankl). *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$  be  $k$ -wise intersecting. If  $r \leq \frac{(k-1)n}{k}$ , then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ .*

It can be easily observed that the  $k = 2$  case of Theorem 1.1 is the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem [2].

**Theorem 1.2** (Erdős-Ko-Rado). *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$  be intersecting. If  $r \leq n/2$ , then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ .*

### 1.1 Perfect matchings

We consider a graph-theoretic generalization of Theorem 1.1. For a graph  $G$  (with vertex set and edge set denoted by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  respectively), let  $\alpha = \alpha(G)$  be the independence number of  $G$ , i.e. the size of

---

\*vkamat@csa.iisc.ernet.in

a maximum independent set in  $G$ . We define two families of vertex sets of  $G$  as follows. Let  $\mathcal{I}(G)$  be the family of all independent sets in  $G$ . Similarly, let  $\mathcal{M}(G)$  be the family of all sets containing an independent set of size  $\alpha$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}(G) = \mathcal{M}(G) \cup \mathcal{I}(G)$ . For any positive integer  $r$ , let  $\mathcal{P}^r(G) = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(G) : |A| = r\}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{P}^r(G)$  is the  $r$ -uniform subfamily of  $\mathcal{P}(G)$ . Define the families  $\mathcal{M}^r(G)$  and  $\mathcal{I}^r(G)$  analogously. Also, for any vertex  $x \in V(G)$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_x^r(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_x^r(G)$  and  $\mathcal{I}_x^r(G)$  be the stars centered at  $x$ , in the families  $\mathcal{P}^r(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^r(G)$  and  $\mathcal{I}^r(G)$  respectively.

We consider the perfect matching graph on  $2n$  vertices (and  $n$  edges) and denote it by  $M_n$ . We will consider  $k$ -wise intersecting families in  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n)$ , and prove the following analog of Frankl's theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For  $k \geq 2$ , let  $r \leq \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ , and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^r(M_n)$  be  $k$ -wise intersecting. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \begin{cases} 2^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{r-1} & \text{if } r \leq n \\ 2^{2n-r} \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1} + 2^{2n-r-1} \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If  $r < \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ , then equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{P}_x^r(M_n)^1$  for some  $x \in V(M_n)$ .

It is not hard to observe that the  $k = 2$  case of Theorem 1.3 is the following theorem of Bollobás and Leader [1].

**Theorem 1.4** (Bollobás-Leader). *Let  $1 \leq r \leq n$ , and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^r(M_n)$  be an intersecting family. Then,  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{r-1}$ . If  $r < n$ , equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{I}_x^r(M_n)$  for some  $x \in V(M_n)$ .*

Note that if  $r < n$ , then  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{I}^r(M_n)$  and  $\mathcal{M}^r(M_n) = \emptyset$ . Similarly if  $r > n$ ,  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{M}^r(M_n)$  and  $\mathcal{I}^r(M_n) = \emptyset$ . In the case  $r = n$ , we have  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{I}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{M}^r(M_n)$ . The main interest of our theorem is in the case  $r > n$  for the bound, and  $r \geq n$  for the characterization of the extremal structures. For the other cases, Theorem 1.4 suffices.

## 2 Proof of main theorem

The technique we use to prove Theorem 1.3 is a generalization of Katona's *circle* method, first employed by Frankl to give a proof of Theorem 1.1. In particular, we use the strategies from [4] for characterizing the extremal structures.

We first present two general lemmas about *cyclic orders* on any  $n$ -element set. The first of these lemmas is due to Frankl [3], while the second one is due to the author [4]. The proofs of both these lemmas also appear in [4], but as we will build on these ideas in the rest of the proof, we reproduce them here. We introduce some notation first.

Consider a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  as a sequence  $(\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n))$ . We say that two permutations  $\mu$  and  $\pi$  are *equivalent* if there is some  $i \in [n]$  such that  $\pi(x) = \mu(x+i)$  for all  $x \in [n]$ .<sup>2</sup> Let  $P_n$  be the set of equivalence classes, called *cyclic orders* on  $[n]$ . For a cyclic order  $\sigma$  and some  $x \in [n]$ , call the set  $\{\sigma(x), \dots, \sigma(x+r-1)\}$  a  $\sigma$ -interval of length  $r$  that *begins* at  $x$ , *ends* in  $x+r-1$ , and *contains* the indices  $\{x, x+1, \dots, x+r-1\}$  (addition again mod  $n$ ).

**Lemma 2.1** (Frankl). *Let  $\sigma \in P_n$  be a cyclic order on  $[n]$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $k$ -wise intersecting family of  $\sigma$ -intervals of length  $r \leq (k-1)n/k$ . Then,  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq r$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{F}^c = \{[n] \setminus F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Let  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}^c| = m$ . We will prove that  $m \leq r$ . Since  $r \leq (k-1)n/k$ , we have  $n \leq k(n-r)$ . Suppose  $G_1, \dots, G_k \in \mathcal{F}^c$ . Clearly  $\cup_{i=1}^k G_i \neq [n]$ ; otherwise  $\cap_{i=1}^k ([n] \setminus G_i) = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Let  $G \in \mathcal{F}^c$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $G$  ends in  $n$ . We now assign indices from  $[1, k(n-r)]$  to sets in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ . For every set  $G' \in \mathcal{F}^c \setminus \{G\}$ , assign the index  $x$  to  $G'$  if  $G'$  ends in  $x$ . Assign all indices in  $[n, k(n-r)]$  to  $G$ . Consider the set of indices  $[k(n-r)]$  and partition them into equivalence classes mod  $n-r$ . Suppose there is an equivalence class such that all  $k$  indices in that class are assigned.

<sup>1</sup> $|\mathcal{P}_x^r(M_n)| = 2^{2n-r} \binom{n-1}{2n-r} + 2^{2n-r-1} \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1}$ , when  $r > n$ .

<sup>2</sup>Addition is carried out mod  $n$ , so  $x+i$  is either  $x+i$  or  $x+i-n$ , depending on which lies in  $[n]$ .

Let  $\{H_i\}_{i \in [k]}$  be the  $k$  sets in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  which end in the  $k$  indices in this equivalence class. It is easy to note that  $\cup_{i=1}^k H_i = [n]$ , which is a contradiction. So for every equivalence class, there exists an index which has not been assigned to any set in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ . This implies that there are at least  $n - r$  indices in  $[k(n - r)]$  which are unassigned. Each set in  $\mathcal{F}^c \setminus \{G\}$  has one index assigned to it, and  $G$  has  $k(n - r) - n + 1$  indices assigned to it. This gives us  $m - 1 + k(n - r) - n + 1 + n - r \leq k(n - r)$ , which simplifies to  $m \leq r$ , completing the proof.  $\diamond$

We will now characterize the case when  $|\mathcal{F}| = r$ , in the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\sigma \in P_n$  be a cyclic order on  $[n]$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $k$ -wise intersecting family of  $\sigma$ -intervals of length  $r < (k - 1)n/k$ . If  $|\mathcal{F}| = r$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of all intervals which contain an index  $x$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $\sigma$  be the cyclic order given by the identity permutation and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $k$ -wise intersecting family of  $\sigma$ -intervals (henceforth, we drop the  $\sigma$ ). As in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we consider  $\mathcal{F}^c$  and assume (without loss of generality) that  $F = \{r + 1, r + 2, \dots, n\} \in \mathcal{F}^c$ . It is clear from the proof of Lemma 2.1 that if  $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}^c| = r$ , then there are exactly  $n - r$  indices in  $[k(n - r)]$ , one from each equivalence class (modulo  $n - r$ ), which are not assigned to any set in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ . In other words, no interval in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  ends in any of these  $n - r$  indices. Since  $F$  ends in  $n$ , all indices in  $[n, k(n - r)]$  (and there will be at least 2, since  $r < (k - 1)n/k$ ) will be assigned. It will be sufficient to show that the set of unassigned indices is  $[x, x + n - r - 1]$  for some  $x \in [r]$ . This would mean that no interval in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  ends in any of the indices from  $[x, x + n - r - 1]$  and also that for every index  $i \in [1, x - 1] \cup [x + n - r, n]$ , the interval ending in  $i$  is a member of  $\mathcal{F}^c$ . This would imply that for every  $i \in [n]$ , there is an interval in  $\mathcal{F}$  that *begins* at index  $i$  if and only if  $i \in [1, x] \cup [x + n - r + 1, n]$ . This would mean that every interval in  $\mathcal{F}$  contains  $x$ , as required.

Let  $x$  be the smallest unassigned index in  $[n - 1]$ . We will show that  $[x, x + n - r - 1]$  is the required set containing all the  $n - r$  unassigned indices. Clearly  $x \leq r$ . Let  $x \equiv j \pmod{n - r}$ . We will show that  $x + i$  is unassigned for each  $0 \leq i \leq n - r - 1$ . We argue by induction on  $i$ , with the base case being  $i = 0$ . Let  $y = x + i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n - r - 1$ . Suppose  $y$  is assigned, i.e. suppose there is a set  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  that ends in the index  $y$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $y - 1$  is unassigned. Let  $E_{y-1}$  be the equivalence class containing  $y - 1$ ; since  $n < k(n - r)$ , we have  $|E_{y-1}| \leq k$ . As mentioned earlier, since  $|\mathcal{F}^c| = r$ , there are  $n - r$  unassigned indices, exactly one from each equivalence class modulo  $n - r$ . In conjunction with the induction hypothesis, this means that every index in  $E_{y-1} \setminus \{y - 1\}$  is assigned to some interval in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ .

Let  $I_1 = E_{y-1} \cap (y - 1, n]$ . By the previous observation, each index in  $I_1$  is assigned. Similarly, let  $I_2 = E_{y-1} \cap [1, y - 1)$ . Let  $I'_2 = \{j + 1 : j \in I_2\}$ .  $I'_2$  contains indices in the same equivalence class as  $y$ , and are assigned. This is true because all indices in  $I'_2$  are smaller than  $x$  and  $x$  is the smallest unassigned index.<sup>3</sup> Clearly,  $E_{y-1} = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \{y - 1\}$  and consequently,  $|E_{y-1}| = |I_1| + |I_2| + 1$ , giving  $|I_1| + |I'_2| = |I_1| + |I_2| = |E_{y-1}| - 1 \leq k - 1$ . Let  $J = I_1 \cup I'_2$ , so  $|J| \leq k - 1$  and all indices in  $J$  are assigned. So let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the subfamily of intervals in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  which end in indices from  $J$ ; we have  $|\mathcal{H}| \leq k - 1$  and hence the family  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H} \cup \{Y\}$  has at most  $k$  sets. We will show that  $\bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} G = [n]$ .

Let  $p$  be the largest index in  $I_1$  and let  $q$  be the smallest index in  $I'_2$ . Now  $q$  lies in the same equivalence class as  $y$  and  $p$  lies in the same equivalence class as  $y - 1$ . If  $n = k(n - r)$ , it is easy to see that the set which ends in  $q$  begins at the largest index from the same equivalence class as  $y + 1$ , in other words,  $p + 2$ . However, we have  $n < k(n - r)$ , so the set which ends in  $q$  must contain  $p + 1$ . This proves that the union of all sets in  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $[n]$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $y$  is unassigned.  $\diamond$

We now return to the graph  $M_n$ . Let  $V(M_n) = [2n]$ , and  $E(M_n) = \{\{1, n + 1\}, \{2, n + 2\}, \dots, \{n, 2n\}\}$ . Call two vertices which share an edge as *partners*. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.4 by Bollobás and Leader, we only consider cyclic orderings of the set  $V(M_n)$  with certain additional properties. In particular, call a cyclic ordering of  $V(M_n)$  *good* if all partners are exactly  $n$  apart in the cyclic order. More formally, if  $c$  is a bijection from  $V(M_n)$  to  $[2n]$ ,  $c$  is a good cyclic ordering if for any  $i \in [n]$ ,  $c(i + n) = c(i) + n$  (modulo  $2n$ , so if  $c(i) > n$ , we require  $c(i + n) = c(i) - n$ ). It is fairly simple to note that the total number of good cyclic orderings, regarding cyclically equivalent orderings as identical, is  $2^{n-1}(n - 1)!$ . Every interval in a

<sup>3</sup>This is not true when  $i > n - r - 1$  and thus makes the induction “stop” at  $i = n - r - 1$ .

good cyclic ordering will be either an independent set in  $M_n$  (if  $r \leq n$ ) or contain a maximum independent set (if  $r > n$ ). Now let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^r(M_n)$  be  $k$ -wise intersecting for  $r \leq \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ . Using Lemma 2.1, we can conclude that for any good cyclic ordering  $c$ , there can be at most  $r$  sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  that are intervals in  $c$ . For a given set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , in how many good cyclic orderings is it an interval? The answer depends on the value of  $r$ . Suppose  $r \leq n$ . In this case,  $F$  is an interval in  $r!(n-r)!2^{n-r}$  good cyclic orderings. Thus we have  $|\mathcal{F}|r!(n-r)!2^{n-r} \leq r(n-1)!2^{n-1}$ , giving  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}2^{r-1}$ . Note that this bound also follows directly from Theorem 1.4, since  $r \leq n$  implies that  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{I}^r(M_n)$ . Now suppose  $r > n$ . Then  $\mathcal{I}^r(M_n) = \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{P}^r(M_n) = \mathcal{M}^r(M_n)$ . We can think of each set in  $\mathcal{F}$  as containing some set of  $r-n$  edges, i.e. both vertices from each of the  $r-n$  edges, and exactly 1 vertex each from the remaining  $2n-r$  edges. Hence the number of good cyclic orders in which a set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  is an interval is  $(2n-r)!(r-n)!2^{r-n}$ . This gives us the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}| &\leq \frac{r(n-1)!2^{n-1}}{(2n-r)!(r-n)!2^{r-n}} \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)!2^{2n-r-1}}{(2n-r)!(r-n)!} + \frac{(r-n)(n-1)!2^{2n-r-1}}{(2n-r)!(r-n)!} \\
&= \binom{n}{2n-r}2^{2n-r-1} + \binom{n-1}{2n-r}2^{2n-r-1} \\
&= \binom{n-1}{2n-r}2^{2n-r-1} + \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1}2^{2n-r-1} + \binom{n-1}{2n-r}2^{2n-r-1} \\
&= 2^{2n-r} \binom{n-1}{2n-r} + 2^{2n-r-1} \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the bound. We will now prove that the extremal families are essentially unique. To simplify the argument, and because Theorem 1.4 suffices when  $r < n$ , we henceforth assume  $n \leq r < \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ , which implies  $k \geq 3$  and  $2n-r \leq n$ . Suppose that  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2^{2n-r} \binom{n-1}{2n-r} + 2^{2n-r-1} \binom{n-1}{2n-r-1}$ . Then for any good cyclic ordering  $c$ , there are exactly  $r$  sets from  $\mathcal{F}$  that are intervals in  $c$ . We say that  $c$  is *saturated* (with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$ ) if it has this property. Using Lemma 2.2, we can then conclude that every set in  $\mathcal{F}$  that is an interval in  $c$  contains a common index  $x$ . Call  $c$   $x$ -saturated to identify this common index.

Consider the good cyclic ordering  $\pi$  defined by  $\pi(i) = i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n$  and assume without loss of generality that it is  $2n$ -saturated. Since the number of good cyclic orderings is  $2^{n-1}(n-1)!$ , we will identify all good cyclic orderings with bijections  $\sigma$  from  $[2n]$  to itself that satisfy  $\sigma(n) = n$  and  $\sigma(2n) = 2n$ .

For each permutation  $p \in S_{n-1}$ , define the following good cyclic ordering  $\sigma$  on  $[2n]$ : for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = p(i)$  and for  $n+1 \leq i \leq 2n-1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = p(i-n) + n$ . Also let  $\sigma(i) = i$  if  $i \in \{n, 2n\}$ . Denote the set of good cyclic orders obtained from permutations in  $S_{n-1}$  in this manner by  $C_{n-1}$ . Now for  $1 \leq i \leq n-2$ , define an adjacent transposition  $T_i$  for any good cyclic ordering  $\sigma$  as an operation that swaps the elements in positions  $i$  and  $i+1$  and also the elements in positions  $i+n$  and  $i+n+1$  of  $\sigma$ , so the resulting cyclic ordering, say  $\mu$ , is also a good cyclic ordering. Note also that if  $\sigma \in C_{n-1}$ , then  $\mu \in C_{n-1}$ . We now prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** *For a  $k$ -wise intersecting family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^r(M_n)$ , with  $n \leq r < \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ , let  $\sigma$  be a  $2n$ -saturated good cyclic ordering. Let  $\mu$  be the good cyclic order obtained from  $\sigma$  by an adjacent transposition  $T_i$ ,  $i \in [n-2]$ . If  $\mu$  is saturated, then it is  $2n$ -saturated.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume that  $\sigma = (1, \dots, 2n)$  is  $2n$ -saturated, and let  $\mu = (1, \dots, i-1, i+1, i, i+2, \dots, n, \dots, i+n-1, i+n+1, i+n, i+n+2, \dots, 2n)$ , obtained from  $\sigma$  by the transposition  $T_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n-2$ , be saturated. As in the proofs of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we consider the family of complements  $\mathcal{F}^c$  and consider sets in this family which are intervals in the two cyclic orders. Note that  $\mathcal{F}^c$  is a  $(2n-r)$ -uniform family. From Lemma 2.2, we know that the set of unassigned indices in  $\sigma$  is  $\{2n, 1, \dots, 2n-r-1\}$ . It will be sufficient to show that the set of unassigned indices in  $\mu$  is also the same.

A key observation here is that out of the  $2n$  intervals of length  $2n-r$ , there are only 4 in which  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  differ. The intervals which end in indices  $i$  and  $i+n$  and the indices which begin at indices  $i+1$  and  $i+n+1$ .

In other words, only 4 indices,  $i, i + n, i + 2n - r$  and  $i + 3n - r$ , can potentially change from assigned to unassigned, or vice-versa after the transposition  $T_i$ . Also, if  $2n - r - 1$  is unassigned but  $2n - r$  is assigned in  $\mu$ , then by Lemma 2.2,  $\mu$  has the same set of unassigned indices as  $\sigma$ . Similarly, if  $2n$  is unassigned but  $2n - 1$  is assigned in  $\mu$ , then  $\mu$  has the same set of unassigned indices as  $\sigma$ .

We now consider three cases, depending on the value of  $i$ .

1. Let  $i \in [1, 2n - r - 1)$ . In this case, the intervals which end in the indices  $2n - r - 1$  and  $2n - r$  are the same in both  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ . This means that the index  $2n - r - 1$  is unassigned in  $\mu$ , while the index  $2n - r$  is assigned in  $\mu$ . By the previous observation,  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  have the same set of unassigned indices, as required.
2. Let  $i = 2n - r - 1$ . We know that the set  $A = \{1, \dots, 2n - r\} \in \mathcal{F}^c$ , as  $2n - r$  is assigned in  $\sigma$ . This clearly implies that  $2n - r$  is also assigned in  $\mu$ . So suppose  $2n - r - 1$  is also assigned in  $\mu$ . This implies that the index  $2n - 1$  is unassigned in  $\mu$ .<sup>4</sup> As  $i \leq n - 2$ , this is only possible if  $i + 3n - r = 2n - 1$ , which gives  $3n = 2r$  (and consequently,  $2n - r = n/2$ ). This means that  $k \geq 5$ . Now consider the following intervals in  $\sigma$ , all of which are sets in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ :  $\{1, \dots, n/2\}$ ,  $\{n/2 + 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\{n + 1, \dots, 3n/2\}$  and  $\{3n/2, \dots, 2n - 1\}$ . Finally, consider the interval  $\{2n, 1, \dots, 2n - r - 2, 2n - r\}$  in  $\mu$ , which is also a set in  $\mathcal{F}^c$  as we have assumed that the index  $2n - r - 1$  is assigned in  $\mu$ . The union of these 5 sets is clearly  $[2n]$ , a contradiction.
3. Let  $i \in (2n - r - 1, n - 1)$ . In this case, the interval ending in index  $2n - r - 1$  is the same in both  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ , so  $2n - r - 1$  is still unassigned in  $\mu$ . So suppose  $2n - r$  is unassigned in  $\mu$ . This implies that the index  $2n$  is assigned in  $\mu$ . Now, this is only possible if  $i = 2n - r$  and  $i + 3n - r = 2n$ , again giving  $3n = 2r$ ,  $2n - r = n/2$  and  $k \geq 5$ . Now consider the following four intervals in  $\sigma$ , each of length  $n/2$ , all of which are sets in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ :  $\{1, \dots, n/2\}$ ,  $\{n/2 + 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\{n + 1, \dots, 3n/2\}$  and  $\{3n/2, \dots, 2n - 1\}$ . Finally, consider the interval in  $\mu$  of length  $n/2$ , beginning at index  $3n/2 + 1$  and ending in index  $2n$ . Since  $2n$  is assigned in  $\mu$ , this interval is also a set in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ . Also, since  $\mu(2n) = 2n$ , the union of all the five intervals is  $[2n]$ , a contradiction.

◇

Now for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ , define a *swap* operation  $W_i$  on a good cyclic ordering  $\sigma$  as an operation that exchanges the elements in positions  $i$  and  $n + i$  of  $\sigma$ , so the resulting cyclic order is also good. We will now prove the following lemma about the swap operation.

**Lemma 2.4.** *For a  $k$ -wise intersecting family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^r(M_n)$  with  $n < r < \frac{(k-1)(2n)}{k}$ , let  $\sigma$  be a  $2n$ -saturated good cyclic ordering. Let  $\mu$  be the good cyclic order obtained from  $\sigma$  by the swap  $W_{n-1}$ . If  $\mu$  is saturated, then it is  $2n$ -saturated.*

*Proof.* As before, we assume without loss of generality that  $\sigma = (1, \dots, 2n)$  is the  $2n$ -saturated cyclic order, so  $\{2n, 1, \dots, 2n - r - 1\}$  is the set of all unassigned indices in  $\sigma$ . By the definition of the swap  $W_{n-1}$ , we have  $\mu = (1, \dots, n - 2, 2n - 1, n, \dots, 2n - 2, n - 1, 2n)$ . We also observe that  $n < r$  implies  $k \geq 3$ . We consider two cases.

1. Suppose  $r = n + 1$ , so  $2n - r = n - 1$ . This means that the interval ending in  $2n - r - 1$  is the same in both cyclic orders, so  $2n - r - 1 = n - 2$  is still unassigned in  $\mu$ . So suppose that  $2n - r = n - 1$  is also unassigned in  $\mu$ . Since  $\mu$  is saturated, we can use Lemma 2.2 to conclude that  $2n$  is assigned in  $\mu$ . Let the set of unassigned indices in  $\mu$  be  $[i, i + n - 2]$  for some  $i \leq n - 2$ . It is clear then that the index  $2n - 3$  will be assigned in  $\mu$ . Consider the following two intervals in  $\mu$ , each of length  $n - 1$ :  $\{2n - 1, n, \dots, 2n - 3\}$  and  $\{n + 2, \dots, 2n - 2, n - 1, 2n\}$ . Also consider the interval  $\{1, \dots, n - 2, n - 1\}$  in  $\sigma$ . All 3 sets lie in  $\mathcal{F}^c$ , and their union is  $[2n]$ , a contradiction.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup>The case where index  $2n$  is assigned is trivial. If  $2n - r \geq 3$ , then this contradicts Lemma 2.2, while the case  $2n - r - 1 = 1$  gives  $n = 3$ ,  $r = 4$  and  $k \geq 4$ , which can be settled by an easy ad-hoc argument.

<sup>5</sup>Strictly speaking, this argument requires  $n \geq 4$ . However, the case  $n \leq 3$  and  $r = n + 1$  gives  $k \geq 4$ , which can be settled by an easy ad hoc argument.

2. Suppose  $n - 1 > 2n - r$ . Now the intervals of length  $2n - r$  ending in the indices in  $[2n - r - 1, n - 1)$  (which has length at least 2) are the same in both  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ . In other words,  $2n - r - 1$  is unassigned in  $\mu$ , while all the other indices in  $[2n - r - 1, n - 1)$  are assigned. This means that the set of unassigned indices is the same in both  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ , as required.

◇

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 1.3. We consider two cases,  $r = n$  and  $r > n$ , since the proofs are slightly different. Suppose first that  $r > n$ . Since we have assumed that  $\pi$  is  $2n$ -saturated, we can use Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 to infer that every good cyclic ordering is  $2n$ -saturated. To finish the proof of this case, we will show that each set in  $\mathcal{P}_{2n}^r(M_n)$  is an interval in some such good cyclic ordering. Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}^r(M_n)$ . Then  $A$  contains  $r - n$  edges (i.e. both vertices from each of the  $r - n$  edges) and  $2n - r$  other vertices, one each from the other  $2n - r$  edges. Suppose first that  $n \in A$ , so  $A$  contains the edge  $\{n, 2n\}$ . Let the other  $r - n - 1$  edges be  $\{\{x_1, y_1\}, \dots, \{x_{r-n-1}, y_{r-n-1}\}\}$ , with each  $x_i \in [n - 1]$  and each  $y_i \in [n + 1, 2n - 1]$ . Let  $L = \{l_1, \dots, l_{2n-r}\}$  be the set of the remaining  $2n - r$  vertices in  $A$ . We now construct a good cyclic ordering  $\sigma$  in which  $A$  is an interval. To define  $\sigma$ , it clearly suffices to define values of  $\sigma(i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ . So for  $1 \leq i \leq r - n - 1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = x_i$ , and for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n - r$ , let  $\sigma(i + r - n - 1) = l_i$ . Here the  $\sigma$ -interval of length  $r$ , starting at index  $2n$  and ending in index  $r - 1$ , is precisely  $A$ . Now suppose that  $n \notin A$ . Let the  $r - n$  edges be  $\{\{x_1, y_1\}, \dots, \{x_{r-n}, y_{r-n}\}\}$  and let  $L = \{l_1, \dots, l_{2n-r-1}\}$  be the other  $2n - r - 1$  vertices (excluding  $2n$ ). A good cyclic ordering  $\sigma$  in which  $A$  is an interval can be constructed as follows: for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n - r - 1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = l_i$  and for  $2n - r \leq i \leq n - 1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = x_{i-(2n-r-1)}$ . In this case, the  $\sigma$ -interval of length  $r$  ending in index  $n - 1$ , is  $A$ .

For  $r = n$ , we observe by Lemma 2.3 that every good cyclic ordering in  $C_{n-1}$  is  $2n$ -saturated. Again, we will show that every set in  $\mathcal{P}_{2n}^r(M_n)$  is an interval in some  $\sigma \in C_{n-1}$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}^r(M_n)$ . Note that  $A$  is a maximum independent set in  $M_n$  and contains no edges. Let  $V = A \cap [n - 1]$ ,  $|V| = s$ , for some  $s \leq r$  and let  $W = A \setminus \{V \cup \{2n\}\}$ . Let  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$  and  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_{r-s-1}\}$ . Construct a good cyclic ordering  $\sigma \in C_{n-1}$  as follows: for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , let  $\sigma(i) = v_i$ , and for  $s + 1 \leq i \leq r - 1$ , let  $\sigma(i) = w_{i-s} - n$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -interval of length  $r$ , ending in index  $s$ , is  $A$ . This completes the proof of the theorem. □

## References

- [1] B. Bollobás, I. Leader, An Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for signed sets, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 34(11) (1997) 9-13.
- [2] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* (2) 12(1961), 313-320.
- [3] P. Frankl, On Sperner systems satisfying an additional condition, *J. Combin. Th. A* 20 (1976), 1-11.
- [4] V. Kamat, Stability analysis for  $k$ -wise intersecting families, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 18 (2011), no. 1, Paper 115, 8 pp.