Non-trivial t-intersection in the function lattice *

Péter L. Erdős

A. Rényi Institute of Mathematics

Hungarian Academy of Sciences,

Budapest, P.O. Box 127, H-1364 Hungary

`elp@renyi.hu`

Ákos Seress

Department of Mathematics

The Ohio State University

Columbus, OH 43210

`akos@math.ohio-state.edu`

László A. Székely

Department of Mathematics

University of South Carolina

Columbia, SC 29208

`szekely@math.sc.edu`

Abstract

The function lattice, or generalized Boolean algebra, is the set of ℓ-tuples with the ith coordinate an integer between 0 and a bound n_i. Two ℓ-tuples t-intersect if they have at least t common nonzero coordinates. We prove a Hilton–Milner type theorem for systems of t-intersecting ℓ-tuples.

1

1   Introduction

Let t, ℓ, and $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots \leq n_\ell$ be positive integers. Denote by $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ the set of all ℓ-tuples

$$\{\mathbf{k} = (k_1, ..., k_\ell) : 0 \leq k_i \leq n_i \quad 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}.$$

The *support* of an ℓ-tuple $\mathbf{k}$ is the set of the non-zero coordinates: $\mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{k}) = \{i : k_i \neq 0\}$. We can define a partial ordering on $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ by $\mathbf{j} \leq \mathbf{k}$ if $\mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{j}) \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{k})$ and for all $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{j})$ we have $j_i = k_i$. This partially ordered set is called the *function lattice* (see for example [5]). Another frequently used name is *generalized Boolean algebra*, because the case $n_1 = n_\ell = 1$, i.e., when all n_i are equal to 1, is just the case of (characteristic vectors of) set systems on an ℓ-element underlying set.

We say that two ℓ-tuples $\mathbf{j}$ and $\mathbf{k}$ are *t-intersecting* if there are at least t different integers $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{j}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{k})$ such that $j_i = k_i$, or, with other words, if there is an ℓ-tuple $\mathbf{t}$ with support of size t such that $\mathbf{t} \leq \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{t} \leq \mathbf{j}$. Denote by $m_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ the maximum cardinality of t-intersecting ℓ-tuples in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ and by $M_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ the set of all t-intersecting families with this cardinality. The problems to determine the value $m_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ and to describe the structures of the families in $M_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$, have a very long and notable history even in the case $n_\ell > 1$, and this is the case we are concentrating on in this note.

We start with the history of the case $t = 1$. C. Berge (1974, [4]) determined $m_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ and $M_t(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ when all ℓ-tuples have ℓ-element supports. Different proofs of Berge's result were given by Hsieh (1975, [19]), by Livingston (1979, [21]) in the case when $n_1 = n_\ell$. The first result for set systems with uniform support size different from ℓ, but with $n_1 = n_\ell$, is due to Frankl (published in 1983, [9]). Moreover, Engel (1984, [10]) handled the case with $n_1 = n_\ell$, when the supports of the ℓ-tuples are arbitrary. In fact, Engel proved a Bollobás-type inequality (in the spirit of [8]) for the set of intersecting ℓ-tuples; a simpler proof of this last result is due to P. L. Erdős, U. Faigle and W. Kern (1992, [12]). In 2001 C. Bey gave a complete solution to the $t = 1$ case, for arbitrary n_i's and any uniform support size (2001, [6]), using his general weighted intersection theorem. This case shows interesting connections to the complete intersection theorem of R. Ahlswede and L. Khachatrian ([2]).

For arbitrary values of t, the first result is due to D. Kleitman (1966 [20]) in the case when $n_1 = n_\ell = 2$, and all supports are of size ℓ. Then P. Frankl

2

and Z. Füredi handled the case $t \geq 15$, all supports are of size ℓ, and $n_1 = n_\ell$ (1980, [14]), using Frankl's version of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem (see [11]). Later A. Moon generalized this result for cross t-intersecting families (1982, [22]). The paper by Deza and Frankl (1983, [9]) also contains the solution for the case when all supports are of the same size k and $n_1 = n_\ell$, for ℓ large enough as a function of k and t. H-D. Gronau proved the first result for t-intersecting families with ℓ-element supports in the case of non-equal n_i's (1983, [16]). R. Ahlswede and L. Khachatrian (1998, [3]), and independently P. Frankl and N. Tokushige (1998, [15]), solved the t-intersecting problem for arbitrary t for ℓ-tuples with full support, applying Ahlswede and Khachatrian's seminal complete intersection theorem for set systems (1997, [2]). Finally C. Bey (1999, [5]) determined all parameters ℓ, k, t, n, for which "fixing t coordinates" yields the solution to the intersection problem.

All these results can be summarized in the following structural way: under some conditions for the parameter values, the (often unique) optimal t-intersecting family consists of all ℓ-tuples that are greater or equal than a fixed ℓ-tuple **t** with support size t. In the literature such set systems are called *trivially* t-intersecting families. As it is well known in the theory of t-intersecting set systems, there is a long-standing effort to solve the *nontrivial* t-intersection problem: what is the size and the structure of the maximum t-intersecting families where the total intersection of the sets has less then t elements. The first such result is due to A. J. H. Hilton and E. C. Milner (1967, [18]). The complete solution is again due to R. Ahlswede and L. Khachatrian (1996, [1]).

As far as these authors are aware, the only t-intersection result known for the function lattice $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ is due to C. Bey and K. Engel (2000, [7]) [Example 10, 11 and Lemma 18]: this is the complete solution to the non-trivial t-intersection problem in the case of equal n_i's.

The goal of this paper is to prove a more general non-trivial t-intersection result for the subset of the function lattice $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ consisting of ℓ-tuples with a fixed size k of the support, for some parameter values $t < k < \ell$ and $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots \leq n_\ell$. The result is based on a Hilton–Milner type theorem for poset series, proved by the authors (2000, [13]). The proof of this latter uses the so-called *kernel method*, introduced by A. Hajnal and B. Rothschild (1973, [17]), therefore all of our results are valid only from a threshold for the parameters. We note that, perhaps surprisingly, the

3

application of [13] is *not* for the natural partial order of $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$. We shall investigate families of intersecting chains in the natural partial order of $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ in a forthcoming paper. Of course, a direct application of the kernel method may yield similar results, but citing [13] saves a lot of work. We admit that the methods of [7] are likely to allow generalization to the case of different n_i's.

In Section 2 we recall the necessary details from [13], while in Section 3 we reformulate the t-intersection problem of the function lattice and apply for it the method described in Section 2.

2 Non-trivial t-intersection results for posets

A *t-chain* $\mathcal{L}$ in a poset P is a strict chain of elements $\mathcal{L} = (x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_t)$. For a given t-chain $\mathcal{L} = (x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_t)$, let $\mathcal{T}_{P,k}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t)$ denote the set of k-chains in P which contain $\mathcal{L}$ as a subset. Define $T_{P,k}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t) = |\mathcal{T}_{P,k}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t)|$. Sometimes we write T instead of $T_{P,k}$, when it does not cause ambiguity. Also define $r_t(P, k) = \max T_{P,k}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t)$, where the maximum is taken for t-chains $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_t$ in P. It follows from the definition that

$$r_i(P, k) \geq r_{i+1}(P, k). \tag{1}$$

For a t-chain $\mathcal{X} \subset P$ and $y \notin \mathcal{X}$, let $T(\mathcal{X}, y)$ denote the number of k-chains which contain X and y. For a t-chain $\mathcal{X}$ and a k-chain $\mathcal{L}$ in P, such that $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L}| = k + 1$, let $y_\mathcal{L}^* \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ such that $T(\mathcal{X}, y_\mathcal{L}^*)$ minimize $T(\mathcal{X}, y)$ for the elements $y \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, and set

$$\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}, \ y \neq y_\mathcal{L}^*} T(\mathcal{X}, y). \tag{2}$$

Also define

$$M_\tau(P, k) = \max_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}} \ \tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}), \tag{3}$$

and

$$M_\tau^*(P, k) = \max_{\substack{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}: \\ \tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = M_\tau(P, k)}} T(\mathcal{X}, y_\mathcal{L}^*). \tag{4}$$

Now the following Hilton-Milner type theorem holds:

Theorem 1 *For fixed $1 \leq t < k$, and a sequence of posets P_n, let us be given a maximum sized family $\mathcal{F}_n$ of non-trivially t-intersecting k-chains in P_n. Assume further that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} r_{t+2}(P_n, k)/M_\tau^*(P_n, k) = 0. \qquad (5)$$

Then, for n sufficiently large, $\mathcal{F}_n$ has one of the following two descriptions:

(i) there exists a t-chain $\mathcal{X}$ and a $(k+1-t)$-chain $\mathcal{Y}$, such that $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$; and $\mathcal{F}_n$ is the following set of k-chains:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \;=\; & \{\mathcal{L}: \; \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset\} \cup \\
& \cup \; \{\mathcal{L}: \; \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{L} \text{ and } |\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{X}| = t - 1\}, \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second set of chains is non-empty;

(ii) there exists a $(t+2)$-chain $\mathcal{Z}$, and $\mathcal{F}_n$ is the following set of k-chains:

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Z}) = \{\mathcal{L}: \; |\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{Z}| \geq t + 1\}, \qquad (7)$$

and $|\bigcap_{\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}_n} \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{Z}| \leq t - 1$.

3 New results

Let $t < k < \ell$ and $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_\ell$ be positive integers. We define two families $\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ of non-trivially t-intersecting families in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ with support size k as follows.

(i) Let $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{k+1}$ be integers satisfying $1 \leq j_i \leq n_i$ for $i \in [1, k+1]$. We define $\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ as the set of ℓ-tuples $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, ..., k_\ell)$ with support size k which belong to the set

$\{\mathbf{k}: k_i = j_i \text{ for all } i \in [1, t] \text{ and for at least one } i \in [t+1, k+1]\} \cup$

$\{\mathbf{k}: k_i = j_i \text{ for all } i \in [t+1, k+1] \text{ and for } t-1 \text{ values } i \in [1, t]\}. \quad (8)$

(ii) Let $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{t+2}$ be integers satisfying $1 \leq j_i \leq n_i$ for $i \in [1, t+2]$. We define $\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ as the set of ℓ-tuples $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, ..., k_\ell)$ with support size k which belong to the set

$$\{\mathbf{k}: k_i = j_i \text{ for at least } t+1 \text{ values } i \in [1, t+2]\}. \qquad (9)$$

Note that $|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$ do not depend on the particular choices of the j_i. Our goal is to give sufficient conditions for the parameter values $t, k, \ell, n_1, \ldots, n_\ell$ which ensure that either $\mathcal{F}_1$ or $\mathcal{F}_2$ is of maximum size among the non-trivially t-intersecting families of ℓ-tuples with support size k.

Given $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_\ell$, we define a partially ordered set $(\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$ as follows. The underlying set is $\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell) := \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq \ell, \ 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$, and $(i_1, j_1) \prec (i_2, j_2)$ if and only if $i_1 < i_2$. The map $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, ..., k_\ell) \mapsto \{(i, k_i) \in \mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell) : k_i \neq 0\}$ is obviously a bijection between $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ and the chains in the poset $(\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$, and ℓ-tuples with support size k are mapped to k-chains. Therefore, t-intersecting families of ℓ-tuples in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ with support size k correspond to t-intersecting k-chains in $(\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. For a subset $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$, we define the *support* of $\mathcal{Y}$ as the set of first coordinates of the elements of $\mathcal{Y}$; namely, $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}) = \{i \leq \ell : \exists j \leq n_i \ (i, j) \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. We start with the determination of the quantities r_{t+2}, M_τ, and M_τ^* defined in Section 2. Note that for any m-chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$, we have

$$T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L}) = \sum_{\substack{A \subset [1,\ell] \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L}): \\ |A| = k - m}} \prod_{i \in A} n_i. \tag{10}$$

Proposition 2 *Let* $t < k < \ell$, *let* $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$ *and let* $\mathcal{L}$ *be an m-chain in* $\mathcal{P}$. *Suppose that* $(i, k_i) \in \mathcal{L}$ *and* $j \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L})$ *with* $j < i$, *and let* $\mathcal{L}^* = (\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i, k_i)\}) \cup \{(j, k_j)\}$ *for some* $k_j \leq n_j$. *Then* $T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L}^*) \geq T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L})$, *with equality if and only if* $n_j = n_{j+1} = \cdots = n_i$.

Proof. We obtain $T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L}^*)$ from $T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L})$ by replacing each occurrence of n_j by n_i in the sum in (10). Hence the inequalities $n_j \leq n_{j+1} \leq \cdots \leq n_i$ imply both assertions of the proposition. $\square$

Let $\sigma_i(x_1, x_2, ..., x_m)$ denote the ith elementary symmetric polynomial in variables $x_1, x_2, ..., x_m$. We define $\sigma_0(x_1, x_2, ..., x_m) = 1$.

Lemma 3 *Let* $t < k < \ell$ *and let* $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. *Then*

$$r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}, k) = \sum_{\substack{A \subset [t+3,\ell]: \\ |A| = k - t - 2}} \prod_{i \in A} n_i \quad = \sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+3}, ..., n_\ell). \tag{11}$$

6

Proof. Proposition 2 implies that for $(t+2)$-chains $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathcal{P}$, the quantity $T_{\mathcal{P},k}(\mathcal{L})$ is maximized when $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L}) = [1, t+2]$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 4 *Let $t < k < \ell$ and let $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. Then for any t-chain $\mathcal{X}$ and k-chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathcal{P}$ with $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L}| = k+1$, we have $M_\tau(\mathcal{P}, k) = \tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ if and only if the multiset relations $\{n_i : i \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X})\} = \{n_i : 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ and $\{n_i : i \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L})\} \supseteq \{n_i : t+1 \leq i \leq k\}$ hold.*

Proof. We first note that the condition $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L}| = k+1$ implies that $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ have $t-1$ common elements and $|\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}| = k-t+1$. Moreover, since $\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is the sum of only $k-t$ values $T(\mathcal{X}, y)$ with $y \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, it is possible that for a fixed t-chain $\mathcal{X}$, $\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is maximized for some $\mathcal{L}$ even though $T(\mathcal{X}, y) = 0$ for some $y \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$.

For a fixed t-chain $\mathcal{X}$, Proposition 2 implies that $\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ is maximized for a k-chain $\mathcal{L}$ whose support contains the $k-t$ smallest elements of $[1, \ell] \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, another application of Proposition 2 shows that if $\mathcal{X}'$ is obtained by replacing an element $(i_1, j_1) \in \mathcal{X}$ with some (i_2, j_2) satisfying $i_2 < i_1$ and i_2 the smallest number not in $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X})$ then $\tau(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}') \geq \tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for an optimal $\mathcal{L}'$ constructed in the way described in the previous sentence. Hence $M_\tau(\mathcal{P}, k) = \tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ for $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{L}$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X}) = [1, t]$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L}) \supseteq [t+1, k]$. Finally, Proposition 2 also implies that if $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X}') \neq [1, t]$ or $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L}') \not\supseteq [t+1, k]$ then $\tau(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{L}') < M_\tau(\mathcal{P}, k)$, unless the condition about the multiset of n_i values described in the statement of the lemma holds. $\quad\square$

Lemma 5 *Let $t < k < \ell$ and let $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. Then*

$$M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}, k) = \sum_{\substack{A \subset [t+1, \ell] \setminus \{k+1\}: \\ |A| = k-t-1}} \prod_{i \in A} n_i \quad = \sigma_{k-t-1}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell). \quad (12)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a t-chain and $\mathcal{L}$ be a k-chain with $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L}| = k+1$ and $\tau(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = M_\tau(\mathcal{P}, k)$. Then, by Lemma 4, we have the multiset relations $\{n_i : i \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X})\} = \{n_i : 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ and $\{n_i : i \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L})\} \supseteq \{n_i : t+1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Also, we have $k \leq |\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L})| \leq k+1$. If $|\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L})| = k$ then there exists $y_{\mathcal{L}}^* = (i, k_i) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ with $i \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X})$ and so $T(\mathcal{X}, y_{\mathcal{L}}^*) = 0$. If $|\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{L})| = k+1$ then Proposition 2 implies that $T(\mathcal{X}, y)$ is minimized in $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ for the $y_{\mathcal{L}}^* = (i, k_i) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}$ with $i = \max \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X})$ and, in order to maximize $T(\mathcal{X}, y_{\mathcal{L}}^*)$, we have to choose $\max \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X})$ as small as possible.

7

Combining these observations, we obtain that $\max T(\mathcal{X}, y_{\mathcal{L}}^*)$ is achieved in the case $\text{supp}(\mathcal{X}) = [1, t]$, $\text{supp}(\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{X}) = [t+1, k+1]$, and $\text{supp}(y_{\mathcal{L}}^*) = \{k+1\}$, leading to (12). □

The following two lemmas will be useful at the comparison of r_{t+2} and M_τ^*.

Lemma 6 *Let* t, k, ℓ *satisfy* $k \geq t+2$ *and* $\ell \geq 2k - t - 1$, *and let* $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. *Then*

$$r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}, k) \leq \left(1 + \frac{k-t-2}{\ell - 2k + t + 2}\right)\sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell).$$

Proof. On one hand, if $A \subseteq [t+1, \ell]$ satisfies $|A| = k - t - 2$ and $k + 1 \in A$ then

$$\prod_{i \in A} n_i \leq \frac{\sum_{s \in [k+2, \ell] \setminus A} n_s}{(\ell - k - 1) - (k - t - 3)} \prod_{i \in A \setminus \{k+1\}} n_i.$$

On the other hand, any $(k - t - 2)$-element subset B of $[t + 1, \ell] \setminus \{k + 1\}$ can be obtained at most $k - t - 2$ ways by replacing $k + 1$ by an element $j \geq k + 2$ of B. Hence Lemma 3 implies

$$r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}, k) = \sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+3}, ..., n_\ell) \leq \sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., n_\ell) \leq$$
$$\left(1 + \frac{k-t-2}{\ell - 2k + t + 2}\right)\sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell).$$

□

Lemma 7 *Let* t, k, ℓ *satisfy* $k \geq t+2$ *and let* $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. *Then*

$$M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}, k) \geq n_{t+1} \frac{\ell - k + 1}{k - t - 1} \sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell). \qquad (13)$$

Proof. Using that any $(k - t - 2)$-element subset B of $[t + 1, \ell] \setminus \{k + 1\}$ can be obtained $(\ell - t - 1) - (k - t - 2) = \ell - k + 1$ ways by deleting an element different from $k + 1$ from a $(k - t - 1)$-element subset of $[t + 1, \ell] \setminus \{k + 1\}$, we have

$$(k - t - 1)\sigma_{k-t-1}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell) =$$
$$\sum_{\substack{s=t+1 \\ s \neq k+1}}^{\ell} n_s \sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_s}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell) \geq$$
$$n_{t+1}(\ell - k + 1)\sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+1}, ..., \widehat{n_{k+1}}, ..., n_\ell).$$

Hence Lemma 5 implies (13).   □

Lemma 8 *Let $t < k < \ell$ and let $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. If $\mathcal{X}$ is a t-chain and $\mathcal{Y}$ is a $k+1-t$-chain with $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$ then $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$ for the families of chains defined in (6) and (8), respectively.*

Proof. First note that $|\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y})| \leq 1$, because otherwise there is no k-chain containing $\mathcal{Y}$ and $t-1$ elements of $\mathcal{X}$ as required in (6). If $|\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y})| = 1$, say $(i, f_i) \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(i, g_i) \in \mathcal{Y}$ for some $f_i \neq g_i$, then there exists exactly one k-chain in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ which contains (i, g_i), namely, $(\mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{X}) \setminus \{(i, f_i)\}$. Hence, if we define $\mathcal{Y}_1 = (\mathcal{Y} \setminus \{(i, g_i)\}) \cup \{(j, 1)\}$ for some $j \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y})$ then $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1)|$, because $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1)$ contains all but one chain from $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ and it contains t chains not in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ (the chains obtained by deleting an element of $\mathcal{X}$ from $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$). Therefore, it is enough to prove that $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$ for chains $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ with $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}) = \emptyset$.

Suppose now that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}) = \emptyset$. There are exactly t chains in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ containing $\mathcal{Y}$ and there are t chains in $\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ with support containing $[t+1, k+1]$; hence it is enough to show that for the set of chains

$$\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \{\mathcal{L}: \ \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_1^*(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell) = \{\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell) : \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L}) \supseteq [1, t]\}$$

we have $|\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}_1^*(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$. If $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \neq [1, t]$ then we define a new set of chains by the following shifting operation. Let $i_1 \in [1, t]$ be the smallest number not in $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X})$ and let $i_2 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X})$ with $i_2 > i_1$, say $(i_2, k_{i_2}) \in \mathcal{X}$. For a k-chain $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, let

$$f(\mathcal{L}) = \begin{cases} (\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i_2, k_{i_2})\}) \cup \{(i_1, 1)\} & \text{if } i_1 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L}), \\ (\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i_1, k_{i_1}), (i_2, k_{i_2})\}) \cup \{(i_1, 1), (i_2, k_{i_1})\} & \\ & \text{if } (i_1, k_{i_1}) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ for some } k_{i_1} \leq n_{i_1}. \end{cases}$$
$$(14)$$

Moreover, define $\mathcal{X}' = (\mathcal{X} \setminus \{(i_2, k_{i_2})\}) \cup \{(i_1, 1)\}$ and

$$\mathcal{Y}' = \begin{cases} \mathcal{Y} & \text{if } i_1 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}), \\ (\mathcal{Y} \setminus \{(i_1, k_{i_1})\}) \cup \{(i_2, k_{i_1})\} & \text{if } (i_1, k_{i_1}) \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ for some } k_{i_1} \leq n_{i_1}. \end{cases}$$
$$(15)$$

9

Then it is clear that f is an injection from $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ into $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')$, and so $|\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')|$ and $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')|$. Repeating this procedure, we arrive to some t-chain $\mathcal{X}''$ and $(k+1-t)$-chain $\mathcal{Y}''$ such that $|\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})| \leq |\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')|$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{X}'') = [1, t]$ and $\mathrm{supp}(X'') \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}'') = \emptyset$. It is enough to show that $|\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')| \leq |\mathcal{F}_1^*(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$.

If $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}'') \neq [t+1, k+1]$ then let $i_1 \in [t+1, k+1]$ be the smallest number not in $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}'')$ and let $i_2 \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Y}'')$ with $i_2 > i_1$, say $(i_2, k_{i_2}) \in \mathcal{Y}''$. By renumbering the i_2th coordinate, we may assume that $k_{i_2} \leq n_{i_1}$. We apply the following modification of the shifting operation described in the previous paragraph. For a k-chain $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')$, let

$$
g(\mathcal{L}) = \begin{cases}
(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i_2, j_2)\}) \cup \{(i_1, j_2)\} \\
\qquad \text{if } i_1 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L}) \text{ and } (i_2, j_2) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ with } j_2 \leq n_1, \\
(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i_1, j_1)\}) \cup \{(i_2, j_1)\} \\
\qquad \text{if } i_2 \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{L}) \text{ and } (i_1, j_1) \in \mathcal{L}, \\
(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}) \cup \{(i_1, j_2), (i_2, j_1)\} \\
\qquad \text{if } (i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } j_2 \leq n_1, \\
\mathcal{L} \qquad \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\tag{16}
$$

Moreover, define $\mathcal{Y}''' = (\mathcal{Y}'' \setminus \{(i_2, k_{i_2})\}) \cup \{(i_1, k_{i_2})\}$. Then g is an injection from $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')$ into $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}''', \mathcal{Y}''')$, and so $|\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')| \leq |\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{X}''', \mathcal{Y}''')|$ and $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'')| \leq |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}''', \mathcal{Y}''')|$. Repeating this procedure, we arrive to a member of the family $\mathcal{F}_1^*(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 9 *Let $t < k < \ell$ and let $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. If $\mathcal{Z}$ is a $(t+2)$-chain then $|\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Z})| \leq |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|$ for the families of chains defined in (7) and (9), respectively.*

Proof. Given $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Z})$, if $\mathrm{supp}(\mathcal{Z}) \neq [1, t+2]$ then we can apply the shifting procedure described in (16), not decreasing the size of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Z})$, and eventually arriving to a set of chains in the family $\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 10 *For $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ from (8) and (9),*

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}_1| &= \sigma_{k-t}(n_{t+1}, ..., n_\ell) - \sigma_{k-t}(n_{t+1} - 1, ..., n_{k+1} - 1, n_{k+2}, ..., n_\ell) + t \\
|\mathcal{F}_2| &= \sum_{i=1}^{t+2} \sigma_{k-t-1}(n_i, n_{t+3}, ..., n_\ell) - (t+1)\sigma_{k-t-2}(n_{t+3}, ..., n_\ell).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Explanation for $|\mathcal{F}_1|$. The second line of (8) yields the term t, and the cardinality arising from the first line of (8) is obtained as a difference, counting all functions $\mathbf{k}$ with $k_i = j_i$ for all $i \in [1, t]$, and subtracting the number of functions $\mathbf{k}$ with $k_i = j_i$ for all $i \in [1, t]$ that have no $i \in [t + 1, k + 1]$ with $k_i = j_i$.

Explanation for $|\mathcal{F}_2|$. Fix a $(t + 2)$-chain $\mathcal{Z}$ with support $[1, t + 2]$. For $i \in [1, t+2]$, the number of k-chains intersecting $\mathcal{Z}$ in coordinates $1, 2, \ldots, i - 1, i + 1, \ldots, t + 2$ is $\sigma_{k-t-1}(n_i, n_{t+3}, ..., n_\ell)$. Adding these expressions for all $i \in [1, t + 2]$, the k-chains intersecting $\mathcal{Z}$ in exactly $t + 1$ coordinates are counted once, and the k-chains intersecting $\mathcal{Z}$ in $t+2$ coordinates are counted $t + 2$ times. The negative term reduces the multiplicity of the latter ones to one. $\qquad\square$

In order to apply Theorem 1, we have to find values of the parameters $t, k, \ell, n_1, ..., n_\ell$ such that the hypothesis of the theorem is satisfied.

Theorem 11 *Let $t < k < \ell$ be fixed. Then there exists a bound $n(t, k, \ell)$ such that if $n > n(t, k, \ell)$ then for any non-trivially t-intersecting family $\mathcal{F}$ of ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n, ..., n)$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n, ..., n)|, |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n, ..., n)|\}.$$

Moreover, if $k > 2t + 1$ then for large enough n we have $|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n, ..., n)| > |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n, ..., n)|$ and if $t + 1 < k \leq 2t + 1$ then for large enough n we have $|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n, ..., n)| < |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n, ..., n)|$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}_n = (\mathcal{P}(n, ..., n), \prec)$. By Lemmas 3 and 5, we have $r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_n, k) = \binom{l-t-2}{k-t-2}n^{k-t-2}$ and $M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_n, k) = \binom{l-t-1}{k-t-1}n^{k-t-1}$. Hence

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_n, k)}{M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_n, k)} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{k - t - 1}{l - t - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{n} = 0 \tag{17}$$

and so Theorem 1, together with Lemmas 8 and 9, implies that for large enough n one of the maximum sized families of t-intersecting ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n, ..., n)$ is $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n, ..., n)$ or $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n, ..., n)$.

Our final task is to compare $|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n, ..., n)|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n, ..., n)|$. From Lemma 10 we have

$$|\mathcal{F}_1| = t + \binom{l - t}{k - t}n^{k-t} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-t} \binom{k + 1 - t}{i} \binom{l - k - 1}{k - t - i}(n - 1)^i n^{k-t-i} \tag{18}$$

11

and

$$|\mathcal{F}_2| = (t+2)\binom{l-t-1}{k-t-1}n^{k-t-1} - (t+1)\binom{l-t-2}{k-t-2}n^{k-t-2}. \qquad (19)$$

Suppose now that $t+2 \le k$. For fixed t, k, ℓ, as $n \to \infty$, we expand (18) and (19) as polynomials of n. There is nothing to do with (19), as it is already written in polynomial form. In (18), the coefficient of n^{k-t} in $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ is

$$\binom{l-t}{k-t} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-t}\binom{k+1-t}{i}\binom{l-k-1}{k-t-i} = 0,$$

the coefficient of n^{k-t-1} in $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-t} i\binom{k+1-t}{i}\binom{l-k-1}{k-t-i} =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-t}(k+1-t)\binom{k-t}{i-1}\binom{l-k-1}{k-t-i} = (k+1-t)\binom{l-t-1}{k-t-1},$$

and similarly the coefficient of n^{k-t-2} in $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ is

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{k-t}\binom{i}{2}\binom{k+1-t}{i}\binom{l-k-1}{k-t-i} = -\frac{(k+1-t)(k-t)}{2}\binom{l-t-2}{k-t-2}.$$

We compare $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ for large n. The leading term in both is n^{k-t-1}, with coefficients $(k+1-t)\binom{l-t-1}{k-t-1}$ and $(t+2)\binom{l-t-1}{k-t-1}$. Therefore, if $k+1-t > t+2$, i.e. $k > 2t+1$, then for large enough n we have $|\mathcal{F}_1| > |\mathcal{F}_2|$ and if $k < 2t+1$ then for large enough n we have $|\mathcal{F}_1| < |\mathcal{F}_2|$. If $k-t-1 = t+2$, i.e. $k = 2t+1$, then the main terms have equal coefficients. We compare the coefficients of the next term, $n^{k-t-2} = n^{t-1}$ in $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_2|$, which are $-\frac{(t+2)(t+1)}{2}\binom{l-t-2}{t-1}$ and $-(t+1)\binom{l-t-2}{t-1}$, respectively. We have $|\mathcal{F}_1| < |\mathcal{F}_2|$. $\square$

Theorem 12 *Let $t < k$ be fixed. Then there exists a bound $\ell(t,k)$ such that if $\ell > \ell(t,k)$ then for any non-trivially t-intersecting family $\mathcal{F}$ of ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \le \max\{|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|, |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|\}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}_\ell = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. If $k = t + 1$ then $r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k) = 0$ and $M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k) > 0$. If $k \geq t + 2$ then by Lemmas 6 and 7, for $\ell \geq 2k - t - 1$ we have

$$\frac{r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k)}{M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{k - t - 2}{\ell - 2k + t + 2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{n_{t+1}} \cdot \frac{k - t - 1}{\ell - k + 1} \tag{20}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k)}{M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_\ell, k)} = 0.$$

So Theorem 1, together with Lemmas 8 and 9, implies that for large enough ℓ one of the maximum sized families of t-intersecting ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ is $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ or $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$. $\square$

Theorem 13 *Let $t < k < \ell$ be fixed, satisfying $\ell \geq 2k - t - 1$. Then there exists a bound $n(t, k, \ell)$ such that if $n_{t+1} > n(t, k, \ell)$ then for any nontrivially t-intersecting family $\mathcal{F}$ of ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ we have $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|, |\mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)|\}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}} = (\mathcal{P}(n_1, ..., n_{t+1}, ..., n_\ell), \prec)$. If $k = t+1$ then $r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k) = 0$ and $M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k) > 0$. If $k \geq t + 2$ then, analogously to (20) in the proof of Theorem 12,

$$\frac{r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k)}{M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k)} \leq \left(1 + \frac{k - t - 2}{\ell - 2k + t + 2}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{n_{t+1}} \cdot \frac{k - t - 1}{\ell - k + 1} \tag{21}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{n_{t+1} \to \infty} \frac{r_{t+2}(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k)}{M_\tau^*(\mathcal{P}_{n_{t+1}}, k)} = 0.$$

So Theorem 1, together with Lemmas 8 and 9, implies that for large enough n_{t+1} one of the maximum sized families of t-intersecting ℓ-tuples with support k in $\mathbb{F}_\ell(n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ is $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$ or $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_2(t, k; n_1, ..., n_\ell)$. $\square$

References

1. R. Ahlswede - L. H. Khachatrian: The complete nontrivial-intersection theorem for systems of finite sets. *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **76** (1996), 121–138.

2. R. Ahlswede - L. H. Khachatrian: The complete intersection theorem for systems of finite sets. *Europ. J. Comb.* **18** (1997), 125–136.

3. R. Ahlswede - L. H. Khachatrian: The diametric theorem in Hamming spaces - Optimal anticodes. *Adv. Appl. Math.* **20** (1998), 429–449.

4. C. Berge: Nombres de coloration de l'hypergraphe *h*-parti complet, *Hypergraph Seminar*, Proceedings of the First Working Seminar on Hypergraphs, 1972. (Eds. C. Berge and D. Ray-Chaudhuri) Lect. Notes in Math. Vol. 411. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, (1974), 13–20.

5. C. Bey: The Erdős–Ko–Rado bound for the function lattice, *Discrete Appl. Math* **95** (1999), 115–125.

6. C. Bey: An intersection theorem for weighted sets. *Discrete Math.* **235** (2001), 145–150.

7. C. Bey - K. Engel: Old and new results for the weighted *t*-intersection problem via AK-methods. Althöfer, Ingo (ed.) et al., *Numbers, Information and Complexity.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (2000) 45–74.

8. B. Bollobás: Sperner systems consisting of pairs of complementary subsets. *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **15** (1973), 363–366.

9. M. Deza - P. Frankl: Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem – 22 years later. *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Methods* **4** (1983), 419–431.

10. K. Engel: An Erdős–Ko–Rado Theorem for the subcubes of a cube. *Combinatorica* **4** (1984), 133–140.

11. P. Erdős - C. Ko - R. Rado: Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* Ser. 2 **12** (1961), 313–320.

12. P. L. Erdős - U. Faigle - W. Kern: A group-theoretic setting for some intersecting Sperner families. *Comb. Prob.Comp.* **1** (1992), 323–334.

13. P. L. Erdős - Á. Seress - L. A. Székely: Erdős-Ko-Rado and Hilton-Milner type theorems for intersecting chains in posets. *Combinatorica* **20** (2000), 27–45.

14. P. Frankl - Z. Füredi, The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for integer sequences, *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Methods* **1** (1980), 376–381.

15. P. Frankl - N. Tokushige: The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for integer sequence, *Combinatorica* **19** (1999), 55–63.

16. H-D. O. F. Gronau: More on the EKR Theorem for integer sequences. *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **35** (1983), 279–288.

17. A. Hajnal - B. Rothschild: A generalization of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem on finite set systems. *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **15** (1973), 359–362.

18. A. J. W. Hilton - E. C. Milner: Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* (2) **18** (1967), 369–384.

19. W. N. Hsieh: Systems of finite vector spaces. *Discrete Math.* **12** (1975), 1–16.

20. D. Kleitman: On a combinatorial conjecture of Erdős. *J. Comb. Theory* **1** (1966), 209–214.

21. M. L. Livingston: An ordered version of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem. *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **26** (1979), 162–165.

22. A. Moon: An analogue of Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem for Hamming Schemes $H(n, q)$, *J. Comb. Theory* (A) **32** (1982), 386–390.