arXiv:1811.04902v5 [math.CO] 1 Apr 2019

The Erdős–Ko–Rado property of trees of depth two

Carl Feghali
Department of Informatics,
University of Bergen,
Bergen, Norway
carl.feghali@uib.no

Abstract

A family of sets is intersecting if any two sets in the family intersect. Given a graph G and an integer $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ denote the family of independent sets of size r of G. For a vertex v of G, let $\mathcal{I}_v^{(r)}(G)$ denote the family of independent sets of size r that contain v. This family is called an r-star. Then G is said to be r-EKR if no intersecting subfamily of $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ is bigger than the largest r-star.

Let $k, n, r \geq 1$, and let $T(n, k)$ be the tree of depth two in which the root has degree n and every neighbour of the root has the same number $k + 1$ of neighbours. For each $k \geq 2$, we show that $T(n, k)$ is r-EKR if $2r \leq n$, extending results of Borg and of Feghali, Johnson and Thomas who considered the case $k = 1$.

1 Introduction

A family $\mathcal{A}$ of sets is said to be *intersecting* if $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$ whenever $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $[n] = \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. For a set $S \subseteq [n]$ and a positive integer k, let $\binom{S}{k}$ denote the family of all k-subsets of S.

One of the oldest and most fundamental results in extremal set theory is the Erdős-Ko-Rado (EKR) theorem [10], which states that if $1 \leq r \leq n/2$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is an intersecting family of r-element subsets of $[n]$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{r-1}$. This bound can be achieved by taking the family of r-sets containing a particular element.

Given $r \geq 1$ and a graph G, let $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ denote the family of independent sets of size r of G. For a vertex v of G, let $\mathcal{I}_v^{(r)}(G)$ denote the family of independent sets of size r that

contain v. This family is called an r-star and v is its centre. Then G is said to be r-EKR if no intersecting family of $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ is bigger than the largest r-star. There exist EKR results for several graph classes; the reader is referred to [5] and the references therein.

Let $n, k \geq 1$. In this paper, we consider the *k-uniform tree* $T(n,k)$ – a tree of depth two in which the root has degree n and every neighbour of the root has exactly $k+1$ neighbours (see Figure 1 for an illustration of $T(5,2)$). Feghali, Johnson and Thomas obtained an EKR result for 1-uniform trees.

Theorem 1 ([11])**.** *Let $r, n \geq 1$. Then $T(n,1)$ is r-EKR if $r \leq (n+1)/2$.*

Theorem 1 was recently generalised by Borg, resolving a conjecture in [11].

Theorem 2 ([7])**.** *Let $r, n \geq 1$. Then $T(n,1)$ is r-EKR unless $r = n$.*

Both theorems confirm the following conjecture of Holroyd and Talbot for 1-uniform trees. Let $\mu(G)$ denote the minimum size of a maximal independent set of G.

Conjecture 1 ([15])**.** *Let r be a positive integer and let G be a graph. Then G is r-EKR if $\mu(G) \geq 2r$.*

The conjecture appears difficult to prove or disprove. The most important breakthrough is a result of Borg [4] that addresses a uniform version of Chvátal's conjecture [9] and confirms Conjecture 1 for every graph G satisfying $\mu(G) \geq \frac{3}{2}(r-1)^2(3r-4)+r$. The conjecture is also known to be true for many graph classes; see [8, 14, 15, 16] for some examples.

Theorems 1 and 2 are the only results addressing Conjecture 1 for trees (other than for paths [14]). It is worth mentioning that Hurlbert and Kamat [16] had conjectured that the largest star in a tree is centred at leaf – they proved the conjecture for $1 \leq r \leq 4$ [16], but the conjecture does not hold for any $r \geq 5$ as shown in [2, 6, 11].

In this paper, we extend Theorems 1 and 2 by proving the following result for each other uniform tree.

Theorem 3. *Let $r, n \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$. Then $T(n,k)$ is r-EKR if $2r \leq n$.*

Thus Theorems 2 and 3 combined confirm Conjecture 1 for each uniform tree.

2 Union of paths of length 2

This section is devoted to the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $r, n \geq 1$, and let G be the disjoint union of n copies of a path of length 2. Then G is r-EKR if $2r \leq n$.*




Figure 1: $T(5,2)$

It is worth mentioning that Hilton and Spencer have obtained related results when the graph consists of the disjoint union of powers of cycles [13]; see also [12]. We were, however, unable to adapt their approach but instead devised a probabilistic approach that, at least to us, appears to be new in the setting of graphs.

Before proving this result, we require some definitions, notation and lemmas.

Let G be the union of n copies of paths $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ each of length 2 such that each P_i has vertices x_i, y_i, z_i and edges (x_i, y_i), (y_i, z_i). From now on, let $X = \{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, $Y = \{y_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $Z = \{z_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Define $\phi_i : V(G) \to V(G)$ such that

$$\phi(y_i) = x_i,$$
$$\phi(v) = v \quad \text{(otherwise)}.$$

The *shifting* operator $\Phi_i : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ is given by

$$\Phi_i(\mathcal{F}) = \{\phi_i(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{A : A, \phi_i(A) \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Let $\Phi(\mathcal{F}) = \Phi_1(\mathcal{F}) \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_n(\mathcal{F})$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is *shifted* if $\Phi(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\Phi_i(\mathcal{F})$ is intersecting.*

Proof. Let $A, B \in \Phi_i(\mathcal{F})$. If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathcal{F}$ is intersecting. If $A, B \in \Phi_i(\mathcal{F}) - \mathcal{F}$, then by definition $x_i \in A \cap B$. So we can assume that $A \in \Phi_i(\mathcal{F}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ and $B \in \Phi_i(\mathcal{F}) - \mathcal{F}$. Then $B = (C - \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}$ for some $C \in \mathcal{F}$ and either $y_i \notin A$ or $D = (A - \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}$ for some $D \in \mathcal{F}$. If $y_i \notin A$, then $A \cap B = A \cap ((C - \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}) \supseteq A \cap C \neq \emptyset$ since $A, C \in \mathcal{F}$. Finally, if $D \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\emptyset \neq C \cap D = ((B - \{x_i\}) \cup \{y_i\}) \cap ((A - \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_i\}) = A \cap B$. ■

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. Then $|\Phi(\mathcal{F})| = |\mathcal{F}|$ and $A \cap B \cap (X \cup Z) \neq \emptyset$ for all $A, B \in \Phi(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. By definition, $|\Phi(\mathcal{F})| = |\mathcal{F}|$. By Lemma 2, $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ is intersecting. We are left to show that $A \cap B \cap (X \cup Z) \neq \emptyset$ for all $A, B \in \Phi(\mathcal{F})$. Suppose that $A \cap B = \{y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_t}\} \subseteq G - (X \cup Z)$ for some $1 \leq t \leq n$. By definition, $A' = A - \{y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_t}\} + \{x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_t}\}$ is a member of $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$. But then $A' \cap B = \emptyset$, contradicting that $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ is intersecting. ■

Lemma 4. *For each y_i and each $w_i \in \{x_i, z_i\}$,*

$$|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{w_i}(G)| = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s} \binom{2n-2s-1}{r-s-1}$$

$$|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{y_i}(G)| = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s} \binom{2n-2s-2}{r-s-1}.$$

Proof. In the first equation, each summand counts the total number of independent sets of size r containing w_i and exactly s vertices of Y. In the second, each summand counts the total number of independent sets of size r containing y_i and exactly s vertices of $Y - \{y_i\}$. ■

Our proof is connected to [3] but has its own features and is much more than just a variation.

Proof of Lemma 1. We will combine the shifting technique [10] with Katona's cyclic averaging method [18].

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. Note that, by Lemma 4, $\max_{v \in V(G)}\{|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_v(G)|\} = |\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{x_1}(G)|$. To prove the lemma, we must show that $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{x_1}(G)|$.

By Lemma 3, we can assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is shifted. For $0 \leq s \leq r$, define $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G, s) = \{A \in \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G) : |A \cap Y| = s\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_s = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : |F \cap Y| = s\}$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is shifted, $\mathcal{F}_r = \emptyset$ and so $|\mathcal{F}| = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} |\mathcal{F}_s|$. Let us now try to bound the size of each $\mathcal{F}_s$.

Before proceeding with the proof, we need to define a number of terms.

From now on, label the vertices in X as $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ and the vertices in Z as $\{n, \ldots, 2n-1\}$. Then a permutation σ of $[2n]$ is said to be *good* if $\sigma(n+i) = \sigma(i) + n \mod 2n$ for each $i \in [n]$. (In other words, a permutation of $X \cup Z$ is good if, when considered on the circle, for each pair (x_i, z_i), the vertices x_i and z_i are separated by a gap of exactly n.)

An element a of M is said to *represent* an element b of Y if a is adjacent to b in G. An independent set A of G is *symmetric* if $x_i \in A$ if and only if $z_i \in A$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Equivalently, A is symmetric if $i \in A$ if and only if $n + i \mod 2n \in A$.

From hereon, addition is taken modulo $2n$ unless otherwise specified. Two cases arise.

Case 1 $r - s$ is odd. Let $S = \{0, \ldots, r-s-1, n, \ldots, n+r-s-1\}$, and let p be a probability distribution on $\binom{S}{r-s}$ that will be determined later on.

Let A be a random member of $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$ that is chosen as follows. We randomly and independently choose, first from the set of good permutations of $[2n]$, a permutation σ uniformly, then an index $i \in [2n]$ uniformly, and finally a member $g(A) = \{g_1, \ldots, g_{r-s}\}$ of $\binom{S}{r-s}$ with probability $p(g(A))$ and set

$$A = \{a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+s-1}, \sigma(i+s+g_1), \sigma(i+s+g_2), \ldots, \sigma(i+s+g_{r-s})\},$$

where, for $i \leq j \leq i+s-1$, a_j is represented by the element $\sigma(j)$ (and $\sigma(j+n)$). Thus, the first s elements of A are members of Y and the other $r-s$ elements are members of $X \cup Z$ and no element of $A \cap Y$ is represented by some element of $A \cap (X \cup Z)$. Hence $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$.

Claim 1. *The probability distribution p may be chosen so that*

$$\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}_s) = \frac{|\mathcal{F}_s|}{|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)|}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}_s \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$, the claim states that p may be chosen so that A is generated uniformly at random from the set $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$. In other words, we must show that p may be chosen so that any two sets of $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$ are generated with equal probability.

(It might be initially tempting to let p be given, as usual, by the uniform distribution on $\binom{S}{r-s}$. However, with a little more thought, it is not difficult to see that some members of $\binom{S}{r-s}$ are more frequently contained than others in some good permutation and hence some sets in $\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$ are also more frequently contained than others in some good permutation. To balance things out, we must more carefully define p.)

Note that for each $H \in \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)$, there exists at least one good permutation σ, an index $i \in [2n]$ and a member $g(H) = \{g_1, \ldots, g_{r-s}\}$ of $\binom{S}{r-s}$ such that

$$H = \{h_i, h_{i+1}, \ldots, h_{i+s-1}, \sigma(i+s+g_1), \sigma(i+s+g_2), \ldots, \sigma(i+s+g_{r-s})\},$$

where, for $i \leq j \leq i+s-1$, h_j is represented by the element $\sigma(j)$ (and $\sigma(j+n)$). In this case, H, $H' = \{h_i, h_{i+1}, \ldots, h_{i+s-1}\}$ and $g(H)$ are said to be *contained* in σ.

Let $n(g(H))$ denote the number of good permutations containing $g(H)$ and define

$$q(g(H)) := \prod_{E \in \binom{S}{r-s}, E \neq g(H)} n(E), \tag{1}$$

then $p(g(H))$ is determined by

$$p(g(H)) = q(g(H)) \Big/ \sum_{E \in \binom{S}{r-s}} q(E), \tag{2}$$

so that $\sum_{E \in \binom{S}{r-s}} p(E) = 1$. To complete the proof, if H' is contained in some good permutation, then its members occur, by definition, consecutively on the permutation. Hence if $F \in \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G, s)$ is distinct from H, and F' is defined analogously, then F' is contained in as many good permutations as H'. By considering (1) and (2), $n(g(F))p(g(F)) = n(g(H))p(g(H))$. Using these two observations, it is not difficult to check that F and H are generated with equal probability, thereby proving the claim. ■

Claim 2. *For $0 \leq q \leq n-1$, for $1 \leq r' \leq n/2$, fix $\{t_1, \ldots, t_{r'}\} \subseteq \{0, \ldots, r'-1, n, \ldots, n+r'-1\}$ and set $A_q = \{t_1+q, t_2+q, \ldots, t_{r'}+q\}$ where addition is taken modulo $2n$. Then an intersecting family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{[2n]}{r'}$ contains at most r' sets A_q.*

Proof of Claim 2. Fix some $A_q \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $A'_q = A_q \cap \{q, \ldots, r'+q-1\}$ and $A^*_q = A_q \cap \{n+q, \ldots, r'+n+q-1\}$. Notice that $A_q = A'_q \cup A^*_q$.

Consider the following (not necessarily disjoint) families of sets:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{A_p : A_p \cap \{q, \ldots, r'+q-1\} \neq \emptyset, p \neq q\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{A_p : A_p \cap \{n+q, \ldots, r'+n+q-1\} \neq \emptyset, p \neq q\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is intersecting and $A_q \in \mathcal{A}$, every set in $\mathcal{A}$ is either a member of $\mathcal{A}_1$ or $\mathcal{A}_2$.

If $A_p \in \mathcal{A}_1$, then we claim that $p \in \{q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+q-1\} \cup \{n+q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+n+q-1\}$. If $p < q-r'+1$, then the fact that $t_j + p \in \{q, \ldots, r'+q-1\}$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r'\}$ implies that $t_j \geq q-p > r'-1$ and hence $t_j \in \{n, \ldots, n+r'-1\}$. Now suppose furthermore that, when considered on the circle, $p > r'+n+q-1$. Then $p+t_j > r'+n-q-1+n \equiv r'+q-1$ a contradiction. In all other cases, when considered on the circle, $n+q-r'+1 > p > r'+q-1$. Once again using the fact that $t_j + p \in \{q, \ldots, r'+q-1\}$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r'\}$ gives us $t_j \geq q-p \geq r'-n \equiv r'+n$ a contradiction.

We have thus shown that if $A_p \in \mathcal{A}_1$, then $p \in \{q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+q-1\} \cup \{n+q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+n+q-1\}$. Similarly, if $A_p \in \mathcal{A}_2$, then $p \in \{q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+q-1\} \cup \{n+q-r'+1, \ldots, r'+n+q-1\}$ as well. So we can partition the sets in $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ into pairs $(A_{q-i}, A_{q+r'-i})$ and $(A_{q+n-i}, A_{q+r'+n-i})$ for $1 \leq i \leq r'-1$. Now fix $i \in \{1, \ldots, r'-1\}$. Since $r' \leq n/2$, then, considering the pair $(A_{q-i}, A_{q+r'-i})$ and the pair $(A_{q+n-i}, A_{q+r'+n-i})$, the sets $A_{q-i}, A_{q+r'-i}, A_{q+n-i}, A_{q+r'+n-i}$ have pairwise empty intersection. Therefore, since $\mathcal{A}$ is intersecting, it follows that

- $\mathcal{A}$ can contain at most one member from each pair,
- if $\mathcal{A}$ contains a member of $(A_{q-i}, A_{q+r'-i})$ then it can contain neither member of $(A_{q+n-i}, A_{q+r'+n-i})$, and
- if $\mathcal{A}$ contains a member of $(A_{q+n-i}, A_{q+r'+n-i})$ then it can contain neither member of $(A_{q-i}, A_{q+r'-i})$.

This implies the claim. ■

Conditioning on any choice of σ and $g(A)$, there are $2n$ ways to choose A given that $\mathcal{F}_s$ does not contain a symmetric independent set as $r-s$ is odd. For any two sets $A, B \in \mathcal{F}_s$, $A \cap B \cap (X \cup Z) \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathcal{F}$ is shifted and hence, by Claim 2 with $r' = r-s$, at most $r-s$ such ways can be members of $\mathcal{F}_s$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}_s \mid \sigma, g(A)) \leq \dfrac{r-s}{2n}$. Since our choice of σ and $g(A)$ was arbitrary, $\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}_s) \leq \dfrac{r-s}{2n}$. Combining this with Claim 1 and the fact that $|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)| = \binom{n}{s}\binom{2n-2s}{r-s}$, we obtain

$$\frac{|\mathcal{F}_s|}{\binom{n}{s}\binom{2n-2s}{r-s}} = \mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}_s) \leq \frac{r-s}{2n},$$

so that rearranging and simplifying gives us

$$|\mathcal{F}_s| \leq \frac{r-s}{2n}\binom{n}{s}\binom{2n-2s}{r-s} = \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{2n-2s-1}{r-s-1},$$

giving $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{x_1}(G)|$ by Lemma 4, as required.

Case 2 $r-s$ is even.

Let us define

$$\mathcal{F}^*_s = \{F \in \mathcal{F}_s : F \text{ is a symmetric set}\}.$$

Set $\mathcal{F}'_s = \mathcal{F}_s - \mathcal{F}^*_s$. Then $|\mathcal{F}_s| = |\mathcal{F}'_s| + |\mathcal{F}^*_s|$. We bound the size of $\mathcal{F}'_s$ and $\mathcal{F}^*_s$ separately.

To bound the size of $\mathcal{F}^*_s$, note that it suffices to bound the size of the family $\mathcal{G}_s = \{F \setminus Z : F \in \mathcal{F}^*_s\}$ since $|\mathcal{G}_s| = |\mathcal{F}^*_s|$ as $\mathcal{F}^*_s$ consists of symmetric sets

In order to do so, let $r' = s + (r-s)/2$, let $H = G - Z$ and let $\mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s) = \{F \in \mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H) : |F \cap Y| = s\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{G}_s \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)$. Let A be a random member of $\mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)$ that is chosen as follows. We randomly, uniformly and independently choose an

(arbitrary) permutation σ of $[n]$ and an index $i \in [n]$ and set (taking addition modulo n)

$$A = \{a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+s-1}, \sigma(i+s), \ldots, \sigma(i+s+(r-s)/2-1)\},$$

where, for $i \leq j \leq i+s-1$, a_j is represented by $\sigma(j)$. Hence $A \in \mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)$.

Claim 3. *For $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, $1 \leq k' \leq n/2$, set $A_j = \{j, j+1, \ldots, j+k'-1\}$ where addition is taken modulo n. Then an intersecting family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k'}$ can contain at most k' sets A_j.*

Proof of Claim 3. See [1, 18]. ■

Conditioning on any choice of σ, there are n ways to choose A. Since $\mathcal{F}_s^*$ consists of symmetric sets, it follows by Lemma 3 that $B \cap C \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for each $B, C \in \mathcal{F}_s^*$. Thus $B' \cap C' \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for each $B', C' \in \mathcal{G}_s$. It follows, by Claim 3 with $k' = (r-s)/2$, that there are at most $(r-s)/2$ ways to choose A as a member of $\mathcal{G}_s$. So $\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{G}_s \mid \sigma) \leq \dfrac{r-s}{2n}$. Since our choice of σ was arbitrary, $\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{G}_s) \leq \dfrac{r-s}{2n}$.

Since the elements of A are contained consecutively in a permutation, A is uniformly chosen from from the set $\mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)$. Given that $|\mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)| = \binom{n}{s}\binom{n-s}{(r-s)/2}$, we obtain

$$\frac{|\mathcal{G}_s|}{\binom{n}{s}\binom{n-s}{(r-s)/2}} = \mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{G}_s) \leq \frac{r-s}{2n},$$

so that rearranging and simplifying gives us

$$|\mathcal{F}_s^*| = |\mathcal{G}_s| \;\leq\; \frac{r-s}{2n}\binom{n}{s}\binom{n-s}{(r-s)/2} = \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{n-s-1}{(r-s)/2-1}. \tag{3}$$

We now bound the size of $\mathcal{F}_s'$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{0, \ldots, r-s-1, n, \ldots, n+r-s-1\}$. With slight abuse of terminology, a subset $M \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ of size $r-s$ is said to be *symmetric* if $j \in M$ if and only if $j+n \in M$ for $0 \leq j \leq r-s-1$. Let us define

$$\mathcal{N} = \{N \in \binom{\mathcal{M}}{r-s} : N \text{ is not symmetric }\},$$

and let p be a probability distribution on $\mathcal{N}$ that will be determined later on.

Let $\mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s) = \{F \in \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s) : F - Y \text{ is not symmetric}\}$ and notice that $\mathcal{F}_s' \subseteq \mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s)$. Let A be a random member of $\mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s)$ that is chosen as follows. We randomly and independently choose, first from the set of good permutations of $[2n]$, a permutation σ uniformly, then an index $i \in [2n]$ uniformly, and finally a member $g(A) = \{g_1, \ldots, g_{r-s}\}$ of

$\mathcal{N}$ with probability $p(g(A))$ and set

$$A = \{a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+s-1}, \sigma(i+s+g_1), \sigma(i+s+g_2), \ldots, \sigma(i+s+g_{r-s})\},$$

where, for $i \leq j \leq i+s-1$, a_j is represented by the element $\sigma(j)$ (and $\sigma(j+n)$). Thus, the first s elements of A are members of Y, the other $r-s$ elements are members of $X \cup Z$, $A \cap (X \cup Z)$ is not symmetric and no element of $A \cap Y$ is represented by some element of $A \cap (X \cup Z)$. Hence $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s)$.

Claim 4. *The probability distribution p may be chosen so that*

$$\mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}'_s) = \frac{|\mathcal{F}'_s|}{|\mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s)|}.$$

Proof. Identical to the proof of Claim 1. ■

Arguing entirely as in Case 1 with an application of Claim 4 instead of Claim 1, we obtain

$$\frac{|\mathcal{F}'_s|}{|\mathcal{J}^{(r)}(G,s)|} = \frac{|\mathcal{F}'_s|}{|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G,s)| - |\mathcal{I}^{(r')}(H,s)|} = \mathbb{P}(A \in \mathcal{F}'_s) \leq \frac{r-s}{2n}$$

so that rearranging and simplifying gives us

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}'_s| &\leq \frac{r-s}{2n}\left[\binom{n}{s}\binom{2n-2s}{r-s} - \binom{n}{s}\binom{n-s}{(r-s)/2}\right] \\ &= \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{2n-2s-1}{r-s-1} - \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{n-s-1}{(r-s)/2-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Combining (3) and (4) gives us

$$|\mathcal{F}_s| = |\mathcal{F}'_s| + |\mathcal{F}^*_s| \leq \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{2n-2s-1}{r-s-1},$$

giving $|\mathcal{F}| \leq |\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{x_1}(G)|$ by Lemma 4. This completes the proof. ■

Let us remark that, in contrast to Katona's proof [18] which can be interpreted as both a double counting and a probabilistic argument [1], we do not see how to translate our probabilistic approach into a combinatorial one.

3 Union of claws

This section is devoted to the proof of the following lemma. For $k \geq 1$, a *k-claw* is a tree on $k+1$ vertices in which the root has degree k and the other vertices each have degree 1.

Lemma 5. *Let $r, n \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$ and let G be the disjoint union of n copies of a k-claw. Then G is r-EKR if $2r \leq n$.*

It is not difficult to prove this result using the same approach as in the proof of Lemma 1. Let G be the union of n k-claws $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n$ such that each C_i has root y_i and leaves $i_1, \ldots, i_k$. Define

$$X_j = \{i_j : 1 \leq i \leq n\}, (1 \leq j \leq k)$$
$$Y = \{y_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\},$$
$$X = \bigcup X_j.$$

We have the following lemmas, whose proofs we omit as they are identical to their analogues in Section 2.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. Then there is a family $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ such that $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{F}'|$ and, for any $A, B \in \mathcal{F}'$, $A \cap B \cap X \neq \emptyset$.*

Lemma 7.

$$|\mathcal{I}^{(r)}_{1_1}(G)| = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s} \binom{kn-ks-1}{r-s-1}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. By Lemma 6, we may assume that $A \cap B \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$. For $0 \leq s \leq r$, define $\mathcal{F}_s = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : |F \cap Y| = s\}$. By Lemma 6, $\mathcal{F}_r = \emptyset$ and so $|\mathcal{F}| = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} |\mathcal{F}_s|$. Let us now try to bound the size of each $\mathcal{F}_s$.

A permutation of X is *good* if, when considered on the circle, there is a gap of n between i_j and i_{j+1}. More formally, a permutation σ of X is good if $\sigma(i_{j+1}) = \sigma(i_j) + n \mod kn$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$. A subset A of X is *symmetric* if $i_j \in A$ if and only if $i_m \in A$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and each $1 \leq j, m \leq k$.

We now proceed just as in the proof of Lemma 1 but distinguish instead the case $r - s = 0 \mod k$ from the case $r - s \neq 0 \mod k$. The standard (but rather tedious) details are left to the reader. ■

4 Uniform trees

For a family $\mathcal{A}$ of sets and a non-negative integer s, the s-shadow of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted $\partial_s\mathcal{A}$, is the family $\partial_s\mathcal{A} = \{S : |S| = s, \exists A \in \mathcal{A}, S \subseteq A\}$.

Lemma 8 ([17])**.** *Let a and b be non-negative integers and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of sets of size a such that $|A \cap A'| \geq b \geq 0$ for all $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\partial_{a-b}\mathcal{A}|$.*

The proof of Theorem 3 is now simply an adaptation of the proof of [11, Theorem 1.2].

Proof of Theorem 3. Let c be the root of G and let kn be the number of leaves of G. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq I^{(r)}(G)$ be an intersecting family. Define a partition $\mathcal{B} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} : c \notin A\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} : c \in A\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{B}$ is a family of r-independent sets of $G' = G - \{c\}$, a graph that consists of n copies of a k-claw. Let Y be the set of roots of the k-claws in G', and define $\mathcal{B}_s = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : |B \cap Y| = s\}$ $(0 \leq s \leq r)$.

By the proof of Lemma 5,

$$|\mathcal{B}| = \sum_{s=0}^{r} |\mathcal{B}_s| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{kn-ks-1}{r-s-1}. \tag{5}$$

For $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$, let N_B be the set of $kn - r$ leaves that are not members of B. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{N_B : B \in \mathcal{B}_0\}$. For any pair $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0$, B_1 and B_2 intersect so $|B_1 \cup B_2| \leq 2r - 1$. The leaves not in this union are members of both N_{B_1} and N_{B_2} and there are at least $kn - (2r-1) \geq 0$ of them. We apply Lemma 8 to $\mathcal{N}$ with $a = kn - r$, $b = kn - (2r-1)$:

$$|\mathcal{N}| = |\mathcal{B}_0| \leq |\partial_{r-1}\mathcal{N}|. \tag{6}$$

On the other hand, each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ contains a distinct set of $r-1$ leaves. This set must intersect every member of $\mathcal{B}$ so it cannot be a member $\partial_{r-1}\mathcal{N}$. Thus we find

$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq \binom{kn}{r-1} - |\partial_{r-1}\mathcal{N}|. \tag{7}$$

We apply (6) to (7) to obtain

$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq \binom{kn}{r-1} - |\mathcal{B}_0|. \tag{8}$$

The fact that each summand of the RHS of (5) is an upper bound on the corresponding

summand of the LHS of (5) combined with (8) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}| &= |\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{C}| \\
&\leq \sum_{s=0}^{r} |\mathcal{B}_s| + \binom{kn}{r-1} - |\mathcal{B}_0| \\
&= \sum_{s=1}^{r} |\mathcal{B}_s| + \binom{kn}{r-1} \qquad (9) \\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{kn-ks-1}{r-s-1} + \binom{kn}{r-1} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{kn-ks-1}{r-s-1} + \binom{kn}{r-1} - \binom{kn-1}{r-1} \qquad (10) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{s}\binom{kn-ks-1}{r-s-1} + \binom{kn-1}{r-2} = |\mathcal{I}_{x_1}^{(r)}(G)|,
\end{aligned}$$

where x_1 is a leaf of G. The theorem is proved. ■

5 Closing remark

Let us finally remark that the bound on r in Theorem 3 is probably far from optimal. It would be interesting to obtain a best possible bound or even some bound on r that is a function of k and n. In view of the EKR theorem, we conjecture the following.

Conjecture 2. *Let $r, n \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$. Then $T(n,k)$ is r-EKR if $2r \leq kn$.*

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Jan Arne Telle for helpful discussions. This research was supported by the Research Council of Norway via the project CLASSIS.

References

[1] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer. *The probabilistic method*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.

[2] R. Baber. *Some results in extremal combinatorics*. PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics, UCL, 2011.

[3] B. Bollobás and I. Leader. An Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for signed sets. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 34(11):9–13, 1997.

[4] P. Borg. Extremal t-intersecting sub-families of hereditary families. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 79(1):167–185, 2009.

[5] P. Borg. Strongly intersecting integer partitions. *Discrete Mathematics*, 336(0):80 – 84, 2014.

[6] P. Borg. Stars on trees. *Discrete Mathematics*, 340(5):1046 – 1049, 2017.

[7] P. Borg. Intersecting families, cross-intersecting families, and a proof of a conjecture of Feghali, Johnson and Thomas. *Discrete Mathematics*, 341(5):1331 – 1335, 2018.

[8] P. Borg and F. Holroyd. The Erdős-Ko-Rado properties of various graphs containing singletons. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(9):2877 – 2885, 2009.

[9] V. Chvátal. Unsolved problem no. 7. In *Hypergraph Seminar, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, volume 411, 1974.

[10] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 12(1):313–320, 1961.

[11] C. Feghali, M. Johnson, and D. Thomas. Erdős-Ko-Rado theorems for a family of trees. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 236:464–471, 2018.

[12] A. J. W. Hilton, F. C. Holroyd, and C. L. Spencer. King Arthur and his knights with two round tables. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 18(1):369–384, 2010.

[13] A. J. W. Hilton and C. L. Spencer. A generalization of Talbot's theorem about King Arthur and his knights of the round table. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 116(5):1023 – 1033, 2009.

[14] F. Holroyd, C. Spencer, and J. Talbot. Compression and Erdős-Ko-Rado graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 293(13):155 – 164, 2005.

[15] F. Holroyd and J. Talbot. Graphs with the Erdős-Ko-Rado property. *Discrete Mathematics*, 293(13):165 – 176, 2005.

[16] G. Hurlbert and V. Kamat. Erdős-Ko-Rado theorems for chordal graphs and trees. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 118(3):829 – 841, 2011.

[17] G. Katona. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 15(3-4):329–337, 1964.

[18] G. O. Katona. A simple proof of the Erdös-Chao Ko-Rado theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 13(2):183–184, 1972.