Homework Set 5

1) Let k = 50, $L = \{0, 26, 27\}$, and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be an *L*-intersecting *k*-uniform family. Prove, using the uniform RW Theorem, that $m = |\mathcal{F}| \leq {n \choose 2}$.

Hint: For $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, let $A \sim B$ if $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Prove that this is an equivalence relation. You may also use the easy fact that if $\sum_i n_i = n$, then $\sum_i \binom{n_i}{2} \leq \binom{n}{2}$.

2) Prove that in Nagy's coloring given in class, if $t \equiv 2 \text{ or } 3 \pmod{4}$, then there is no blue K_r for r > t - 2. Recall that in the coloring, the vertex set of K_n is $\binom{[t]}{3}$, and an edge is blue iff the endpoints intersect in a set of size zero or two.

3) We gave superpolynomial lower bounds in class for the Ramsey number R(t,t) for infinitely many t. Prove the same lower bound for all t, namely, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, there is a t_0 such that for $t > t_0$ we have $R(t,t) > t^{(1-\epsilon)\omega(t)}$, where $\omega(t) = \ln t/(4 \ln \ln t)$.

Hint: As in class, let $n = p^3$. Now let p be the largest prime such that $2\binom{n}{p-1} < t$. You may use the following consequence of the Prime Number Theorem: for any $\delta > 0$, there is a q_0 such that, if $q > q_0$ is a prime, then the next largest prime q' > q has the property that $q' < (1 + \delta)q$. Use this to prove that for any $\delta' > 0$,

$$\frac{(1-\delta')\ln t}{2\ln\ln t}$$

for sufficiently large t. Then use the estimates for binomial coefficients we have proved to complete the proof.

4) Let $K = \{k_1, k_2\}$ and $L = \{l_1, \ldots, l_s\}$ be two sets of nonnegative integers with $k_i > s - 2$ for i = 1, 2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ be an *L*-intersecting family with $|S| \in K$ for each $S \in \mathcal{F}$. Prove that

$$m = |\mathcal{F}| \le {\binom{n}{s}} + {\binom{n}{s-1}}.$$

Hint: Proceed as in the proof of the uniform RW Theorem presented in class. Instead of the function $(\sum_i x_i - k)$, use a similar function, and slightly change the condition $|I| \leq s - 1$,

Remark: This can be easily generalized to $K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_r\}$ (no need to do it), and then it provides a common proof of both the uniform and nonuniform RW Theorems (Alon-Babai-Suzuki 1991).