

# The maximum sum of the sizes of all intersections within $m$ -size families

Sumin Huang<sup>\*a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, P.R. China*

## Abstract

For a family of sets  $\mathcal{F}$ , let  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) := \sum_{\{A,B\} \subset \mathcal{F}} |A \cap B|$ . In this paper, we prove that provided  $n$  is sufficiently large, for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ ,  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  is maximized by the family consisting of the first  $m$  sets in the lexicographical ordering on  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ . Compared to the maximum number of adjacent pairs in families, determined by Das, Gan and Subakov in 2016,  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  distinguishes the contributions of intersections of different sizes. Then our results is a extension of Ahlswede and Katona's results in 1978, which determine the maximum number of adjacent edges in graphs. Besides, since  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in [n]} |\{F \in \mathcal{F} : x \in F\}|^2 - km \right)$  for  $k$ -uniform family with size  $m$ , our results also give a sharp upper bound of the sum of squares of degrees in a hypergraph.

**Keywords:** intersection, squares of degree, family, lexicographic ordering

## 1 Introduction

Let  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\binom{X}{k}$  be the family of all  $k$ -subsets of a set  $X$  for  $|X| \geq k \geq 0$ . We say a family of sets  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $k$ -uniform if  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$ . A family  $\mathcal{F}$  is *intersecting* if there exists no disjoint pair  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ . As one of the most fundamental theorems in extremal set theory, Erdős, Ko and Rado[8] determined the largest size of  $k$ -uniform intersecting families. Obviously, when the size of a family is sufficiently large, there must exists disjoint pairs. It is natural to ask how many disjoint pairs must appear in a family  $\mathcal{F}$  with size  $m$ ?

---

\*Email: sumin2019@sina.com

Actually, this problem is the *Erdős-Rademacher problem* or *supersaturation* with respect to intersecting families, which asks how many copies of the forbidden configuration must appear in a structure larger than the extremal bound. The Erdős-Rademacher problem with respect to intersecting families was first investigated by Frankl[9] and Ahlswede[2] independently. They considered the minimum number of disjoint pairs in a non-uniform family  $\mathcal{F}$  with size  $m$ . Then, in [2], Ahlswede asked the corresponding problem to  $k$ -uniform family.

Before proposing this problem, Ahlswede and Katona [1] had already solved the case  $k = 2$ . They determined the maximum number of adjacent edges in a graph with size  $m$ . Let  $C_n^m$  be the graph with vertex set  $[n]$  and edge set  $\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq a\} \cup \{(i, a+1) : 1 \leq i \leq b\}$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are determined by the unique representation  $m = \binom{a}{2} + \binom{b}{1}$  with  $0 \leq b < a$ . Also, let  $S_n^m$  be the complement of  $C_n^m$ .

**Theorem 1** ([1]). *Let  $n$  and  $m$  be positive integers. Then either  $C_n^m$  or  $S_n^m$  maximizes the number of adjacent pairs among all  $n$ -vertex graphs with size  $m$ .*

In 2003, Bollobás and Leader [4] gave a new proof to the special case  $m = \sum_{i \geq k} \binom{n}{i}$  for Frankl and Ahlswede's result. They also conjectured that for  $k$ -uniform families with small size, the initial segment of the lexicographical ordering on  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  minimize the number of disjoint pairs. This conjecture was confirmed by Das, Gan and Sudakov [7] in 2016. The *lexicographical ordering* of sets is defined by  $A$  being smaller than  $B$  if and only if the minimum element in  $A \setminus B$  is smaller than that in  $B \setminus A$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  the family consisting of the first  $m$  sets in the lexicographical ordering on  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ .

**Theorem 2** ([7]). *Provided  $n > 108k^2l(k+l)$  and  $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n-l}{k}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  minimizes the number of disjoint pairs among all families in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m$ .*

Note that Theorem 2 shows that  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  maximizes the number of adjacent edges in hypergraphs. In this statement, a adjacent pair  $(F_1, F_2)$  with  $|F_1 \cap F_2| = 1$  and another adjacent pair  $(F'_1, F'_2)$  with  $|F'_1 \cap F'_2| = k - 1$  have same contribution to enumerate the number of adjacent edges. Distinguishing their contributions is a natural extension of Theorem 2. For a family  $\mathcal{F}$ , denote the sum of sizes of all intersections by

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}) := \sum_{\{A,B\} \subset \mathcal{F}} |A \cap B|.$$

Then  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  is a function which distinguishes the contribution of intersections with different sizes.

For  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  and  $x \in [n]$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(x) := \{F \in \mathcal{F} : x \in F\}$ . Also, for  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m$ , it can be confirmed that  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{x \in [n]} \binom{|\mathcal{F}(x)|}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 - \frac{1}{2}km$ .

Thus, in order to maximize  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$ , it is sufficient to maximize  $\sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2$ , that is the sum of squares of degrees in a hypergraph. For a graph  $G$  with size  $m$ , de Caen [5] gave an upper bound  $\frac{2m^2}{n-1} + (n-1)m$  of the sum of squares of degrees and then this bound was improved by Das [6]. In 2003, Bey [3] generalized de Caen's upper bound to hypergraph. We state Bey's results using the notation of families of sets and the fact  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 - \frac{1}{2}km$ .

**Theorem 3** ([3]). *Let  $n, k, m$  be positive integers. If  $0 < m \leq \binom{n}{k}$ , then for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ ,*

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \frac{k(k-1)}{2(n-1)}m^2 + \frac{1}{2}\binom{n-2}{k-1}m - \frac{1}{2}km,$$

where the equality holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is one of  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ ,  $\{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F\}$ ,  $\{F \in \binom{[k+1]}{k} : [r] \subset F\}$  for  $r = 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$ , or one of the complement of these families.

Note that Theorem 3 gives a sharp upper bound if and only if one of the following statements holds:

- (i)  $m \in \{\binom{n}{k}, \binom{n-1}{k-1}, \binom{n-1}{k}\}$ ;
- (ii)  $n = k + 1$  and  $m \in \{2, 3, \dots, k-2, k-1\}$ .

In this paper, we determine an extremal family of  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  for some special  $m$ . To state our result, we should introduce  $k$ -cascade form of  $m$ :

$$m = \binom{a_1}{k} + \binom{a_2}{k-1} + \dots + \binom{a_s}{k-s+1}, \quad a_1 > a_2 > \dots > a_s \geq 1.$$

Note that every positive integer has a unique  $k$ -cascade representation. Now for given  $n$  and  $k$ , we write  $\binom{n}{k} - m$  in its  $k$ -cascade form and replace  $a_i$  by  $n - r_i$ :

$$\binom{n}{k} - m = \binom{n-r_1}{k} + \binom{n-r_2}{k-1} + \dots + \binom{n-r_s}{k-s+1}, \quad 1 \leq r_1 < \dots < r_s \leq n-1. \quad (1)$$

We call  $r_s$  the  $(n, k)$ -cascade end of  $m$ . Based on the definition, we give an extremal family maximizing  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  in the follows, and we will prove Theorem 4 in Section 3.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $n, r, k$  be positive integers with  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r)r$ . If the  $(n, k)$ -cascade end of  $m$  is at most  $r$ , then  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$  for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ .*

The following theorem holds immediately by Theorem 4 and Lemma 2, which will be introduced at the end of Section 2. We omit its proof in this paper.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $n, r, k$  be positive integers with  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r)r$ . If the  $(n, k)$ -cascade end of  $m$  is at most  $r$ , then  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\binom{[n]}{k} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$  for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = \binom{n}{k} - m$ .*

Theorem 4 and 5 give a natural extension of Theorem 1. Besides, they determine the sharp upper bound of  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  for some special  $m$  and Theorem 3 can be regarded as a corollary of Theorem 4 and 5 provided  $n$  is sufficiently large.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some necessary notations and lemmas used in our proof.

For families  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ , let  $\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}) := \sum_{(A,B) \in (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})} |A \cap B|$ . For a set  $F$ , we use  $\omega(F, \mathcal{F})$  to represent  $\omega(\{F\}, \mathcal{F})$ . Given  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  and  $x \in [n]$ , recall that  $\mathcal{F}(x) = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : x \in F\}$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{F}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ . We call  $\mathcal{F}(x)$  a *full star* if  $\mathcal{F}(x) = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : x \in F\}$ . For a subset  $X \subseteq [n]$ , we say  $X$  is a *cover* of  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $F \cap X \neq \emptyset$  for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Also, we denote  $\mathcal{F}_x = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : x \text{ is the minimum element in } F\}$ . The following proposition can be directly derived from the definition.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m$ . Then we have*

- (i)  $\sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)| = km$ .
- (ii)  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{x \in [n]} \binom{|\mathcal{F}(x)|}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 - km \right)$ .
- (iii) *If  $X$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then  $\cup_{x \in X} \mathcal{F}(x) = \mathcal{F}$ . Moreover, if  $[r]$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then  $\cup_{x \in [r]} \mathcal{F}_x = \mathcal{F}$  and  $\sum_{x \in [r]} |\mathcal{F}_x| = |\mathcal{F}| = m$ .*
- (iv) *If  $F$  is an arbitrary set in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ , then  $\omega(F, \mathcal{F}) = \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}(x)|$ .*
- (v)  $\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) = 2\omega(\mathcal{F}) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} |F \cap F| = 2\omega(\mathcal{F}) + km$ .

Then we introduce our main lemma, which implies  $\mathcal{F}$  must have a cover with small size.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an extremal family with size  $m$  and  $r$  be a positive integer such that  $\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r+1}{k} < m \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r}{k}$ . Assume that  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r)r$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no full star, then  $\mathcal{F}$  has a cover with  $r$  elements.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $|\mathcal{F}(1)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(2)| \geq \dots \geq |\mathcal{F}(n)|$ . Let  $X_0 := \{x \in [n] : |\mathcal{F}(x)| \geq \frac{m}{3kr}\}$ . Our main idea is similar to Das, Gan and Sudakov's [7], which is to first prove that there are sufficiently many elements in  $\mathcal{F}(1)$ , and then show  $X_0$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ , and finally to confirm that  $|X_0| \leq r$ .

**Claim 1.**  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \geq \frac{m^2}{2r} - \frac{1}{2}km$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is an extremal family, we have  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \geq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$ . By Proposition 1(ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathcal{L}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{L}(x)|^2 - km \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in [r]} |\mathcal{L}(x)|^2 - km \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{x \in [r]} |\mathcal{L}_x|^2 - km \right) \geq \frac{r}{2} \left( \frac{\sum_{x \in [r]} |\mathcal{L}_x|}{r} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} km. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r+1}{k} < m \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r}{k}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  consists of all sets covered by  $[r-1]$  and the first  $m - \binom{n}{k} + \binom{n-r+1}{k}$  sets with minimum element  $r$  in the lexicographic ordering on  $\binom{[n] \setminus [r-1]}{k}$ . This implies that  $[r]$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$ . By Proposition 1(iii), we have  $\sum_{x \in [r]} |\mathcal{L}_x| = |\mathcal{L}| = |\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m| = m$ . Then

$$\omega(\mathcal{L}) \geq \frac{r}{2} \left( \frac{m}{r} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} km = \frac{m^2}{2r} - \frac{1}{2} km.$$

Thus,  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \geq \frac{m^2}{2r} - \frac{1}{2} km$ , as desired.  $\square$

In the following, (2) and Claim 2 is given by Das, Gan and Sudakov [7]. For the sake of completeness, we restate their proof. Since  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  contains all sets covered by  $[r-1]$ , we have

$$m = |\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m| \geq (r-1) \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{r-1}{2} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \geq \frac{rn}{3k} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \quad (2)$$

**Claim 2.**  $|X_0| < 6kr$ .

*Proof of Claim 2.* Suppose  $|X_0| \geq 6kr$  and  $X$  be a subset of  $X_0$  with  $|X| = 6kr$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} m = |\mathcal{F}| &\geq |\cup_{x \in X} \mathcal{F}(x)| \\ &\geq \sum_{x \in X} |\mathcal{F}(x)| - \sum_{\{x,y\} \subset X} |\mathcal{F}(x) \cap \mathcal{F}(y)| \\ &\geq |X| \frac{m}{3kr} - \binom{|X|}{2} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \\ &> 2m - 18k^2 r^2 \frac{3k}{nr} m \\ &= \left( 2 - \frac{54k^3 r}{n} \right) m, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2). Since  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r)r > 54k^3 r$ ,  $\left( 2 - \frac{54k^3 r}{n} \right) m > m$ , which leads to a contradiction. Thus,  $|X_0| < 6kr$ .  $\square$

**Claim 3.**  $|\mathcal{F}(1)| > \frac{m}{3r}$ .

*Proof of Claim 3.* By Claim 1,  $\sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 \geq \frac{m^2}{r}$ . This implies

$$\frac{m^2}{r} = \sum_{x \in X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 + \sum_{x \notin X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 \leq |\mathcal{F}(1)| \sum_{x \in X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)| + \frac{m}{3kr} \sum_{x \notin X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)|. \quad (3)$$

By Claim 2 and (2), we can note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)| &\leq |\cup_{x \in X_0} \mathcal{F}(x)| + \sum_{\{x,y\} \subset X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x) \cap \mathcal{F}(y)| \\ &\leq m + \binom{|X_0|}{2} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{54k^3r}{n}\right) m \\ &< 2m. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Proposition 1(i),  $\sum_{x \notin X_0} |\mathcal{F}(x)| \leq \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)| = km$ . Combining with (3), we have  $2m|\mathcal{F}(1)| + \frac{m^2}{3r} > \frac{m^2}{r}$ , that is  $|\mathcal{F}(1)| > \frac{m}{3r}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 4.**  $X_0$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof of Claim 4.* Suppose that there exists a set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $F \cap X_0 = \emptyset$ . Then  $|\mathcal{F}(x)| < \frac{m}{3kr}$  for any  $x \in F$ . By Proposition 1(iv),  $\omega(F, \mathcal{F}) = \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}(x)| < k \frac{m}{3kr} = \frac{m}{3r}$ . Thus

$$\omega(F, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) = \omega(F, \mathcal{F}) - |F \cap F| < \frac{m}{3r} - k. \quad (4)$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no full star, there exists a set  $F_1 \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  such that  $1 \in F_1$  but  $F_1 \notin \mathcal{F}(1)$ . It is clear that

$$\omega(F_1, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) = \sum_{x \in F_1} |\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}(x)| \geq |\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}(1)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(1)| - 1 > \frac{m}{3r} - 1. \quad (5)$$

According to (4) and (5), it can be calculated that

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\}) - \omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) + 2\omega(F_1, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) + |F_1 \cap F_1|) \\ &\quad - (\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) + 2\omega(F, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) + |F \cap F|) \\ &= 2\omega(F_1, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) - 2\omega(F, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\}) \\ &> 2\left(\frac{m}{3r} - 1\right) - 2\left(\frac{m}{3r} - k\right) \end{aligned}$$

$\geq 0$ .

Then by Proposition 1(v),  $\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\}) - \omega(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{2}\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\}) - \frac{1}{2}\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) > 0$ . However, according to our assumption,  $\mathcal{F}$  is an extremal family, which implies  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \geq \omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \{F_1\})$ . This leads to a contradiction. Hence  $X_0$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ , as desired.  $\square$

Recall that  $|\mathcal{F}(1)| \geq |\mathcal{F}(2)| \geq \dots \geq |\mathcal{F}(n)|$  and  $X_0 = \{x \in [n] : |\mathcal{F}(x)| \geq \frac{m}{3kr}\}$ . So for any  $i > j$ ,  $i \in X_0$  implies that  $j \in X_0$ . Assume that  $|X_0| = t$ . Then we have  $X_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, t\} = [t]$  and by Claim 2,  $t < 6kr$ . Besides, it should be noted that  $|\mathcal{F}_1| = |\mathcal{F}(1)| \geq |\mathcal{F}_i|$  for any  $i \in [n]$ .

**Claim 5.** For any  $i, j \in [t]$ ,  $|\mathcal{F}_i| > |\mathcal{F}_j| - \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m$ .

*Proof of Claim 5.* First we show that there exists an  $F_i \in \mathcal{F}(i)$  such that  $F_i \cap [t] = \{i\}$ . Otherwise, suppose each set in  $\mathcal{F}(i)$  contains at least one element from  $[t]$  except for  $i$ . Then by (2),  $|\mathcal{F}(i)| \leq (t-1)\binom{n-2}{k-2} < \frac{3tk}{rn}m \leq \frac{18k^2}{n}m < \frac{m}{3kr}$ . However,  $i \in X_0$  and then  $|\mathcal{F}(i)| \geq \frac{m}{3kr}$ , which leads to a contradiction. Let  $F_i$  be such a set.

Then we have

$$\omega(F_i, \mathcal{F}) = \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \omega(F_i, \mathcal{F}_j) + \omega(F_i, \mathcal{F}_i) = \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \left( \sum_{x \in F_i} |\mathcal{F}_j(x)| \right) + \sum_{x \in F_i} |\mathcal{F}_i(x)|.$$

According to the definition of  $F_i$ , for any  $x \in F_i$ ,  $x \neq j$ . So for each  $F \in \mathcal{F}_j(x)$ ,  $\{x, j\} \subset F$  and then  $|\mathcal{F}_j(x)| \leq \binom{n-2}{k-2}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(F_i, \mathcal{F}) &\leq \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \left( \sum_{x \in F_i} \binom{n-2}{k-2} \right) + \sum_{\substack{x \in F_i \\ x \neq i}} |\mathcal{F}_i(x)| + |\mathcal{F}_i(i)| \\ &\leq (t-1)k \binom{n-2}{k-2} + (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_i| \\ &= |\mathcal{F}_i| + (tk-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no full star, there exists a set  $F_j \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  such that  $j \in F_j$  but  $F_j \notin \mathcal{F}(j)$ . It is clear that

$$\omega(F_j, \mathcal{F}) \geq \omega(F_j, \mathcal{F}_j) = \sum_{x \in F_j} |\mathcal{F}_j(x)| \geq |\mathcal{F}_j(j)| = |\mathcal{F}_j|.$$

Now by direct calculation,

$$\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}) - \omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2\omega(F_j, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\}) - 2\omega(F_i, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\}) \\
&= 2(\omega(F_j, \mathcal{F}) - |F_i \cap F_j|) - 2(\omega(F_i, \mathcal{F}) - |F_i \cap F_i|) \\
&\geq 2|\mathcal{F}_j| - 2|F_i \cap F_j| - 2|\mathcal{F}_i| - 2(tk - 1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + 2k \\
&> 2|\mathcal{F}_j| - 2|\mathcal{F}_i| - 2tk \binom{n-2}{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Proposition 1(v),  $\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}) - \omega(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{2}\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}, \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}) - \frac{1}{2}\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) > |\mathcal{F}_j| - |\mathcal{F}_i| - tk \binom{n-2}{k-2}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is an extremal family,  $\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F_i\} \cup \{F_j\}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{F})$ , which implies  $|\mathcal{F}_i| > |\mathcal{F}_j| - tk \binom{n-2}{k-2} > |\mathcal{F}_j| - \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Claim 6.**  $t < 12r$ .

*Proof of Claim 6.* By Claim 3 and 5, for each  $i \in [t]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}_i| &> |\mathcal{F}_1| - \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m = |\mathcal{F}(1)| - \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m \\
&> \frac{m}{3r} - \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m > \frac{m}{3r} - \frac{18k^3}{n}m \\
&> \frac{m}{3r} - \frac{m}{4r} = \frac{m}{12r},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality holds because  $t < 6kr$  and the last inequality holds because  $n > 72k^3r$ . Then  $m = |\mathcal{F}| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i| > t \frac{m}{12r}$ . Thus,  $t < 12r$ .  $\square$

Note that  $\sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i| = |\mathcal{F}| = m$ . Then there exists an  $\mathcal{F}_i$  such that  $|\mathcal{F}_i| \leq \frac{m}{t}$ . By Claim 5,

$$|\mathcal{F}_1| < |\mathcal{F}_i| + \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m < \frac{m}{t} + \frac{3tk^2}{rn}m. \quad (6)$$

**Claim 7.**  $t \leq r$ .

*Proof.* It can be directly calculated that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) &= \sum_{i \in [t]} \left( \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \omega(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_j) \right) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \omega(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i \in [t]} \left( \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \omega(F, \mathcal{F}_j) \right) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \omega(F, \mathcal{F}_i) \\
&= \sum_{i \in [t]} \left( \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}_j(x)| \right) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}_i(x)|
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \notin F}} \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}_j(x)| + \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \in F}} \left( \sum_{\substack{x \in F \\ x \neq j}} |\mathcal{F}_j(x)| + |\mathcal{F}_j(j)| \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \left( \sum_{\substack{x \in F \\ x \neq i}} |\mathcal{F}_i(x)| + |\mathcal{F}_i(i)| \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \left( \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \notin F}} k \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \in F}} \left( (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_j| \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \left( (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_i| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because each set in  $\mathcal{F}_j(x)$  contains at least two elements  $j$  and  $x$  provided  $x \neq j$ . It is clear that

$$\sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \notin F}} k \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \in F}} (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} \leq \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} k \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Also, recall that  $\sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i| = m$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) &\leq \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} \left( \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} k \binom{n-2}{k-2} + \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{F}_i \\ j \in F}} |\mathcal{F}_j| \right) + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_i} \left( (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_i| \right) \\
&= \sum_{i \in [t]} (t-1) k \binom{n-2}{k-2} |\mathcal{F}_i| + \sum_{i \in [t]} \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ j \neq i}} |\mathcal{F}_j| |\mathcal{F}_i(j)| + \sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i| \left( (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_i| \right) \\
&= (t-1) k \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + \sum_{\substack{j \in [t] \\ i \in [t] \\ i \neq j}} |\mathcal{F}_j| |\mathcal{F}_i(j)| + (k-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + \sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i|^2 \\
&\leq (tk-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + \sum_{j \in [t]} (t-1) |\mathcal{F}_j| \binom{n-2}{k-2} + |\mathcal{F}_1| \sum_{i \in [t]} |\mathcal{F}_i| \\
&= (tk-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + (t-1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + |\mathcal{F}_1| m \\
&< t(k+1) \binom{n-2}{k-2} m + |\mathcal{F}_1| m.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, according to (2) and (6), we can obtain that

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) < \frac{3tk(k+1)}{rn} m^2 + \left( \frac{m}{t} + \frac{3tk^2}{rn} \right) m = \left( \frac{1}{t} + \frac{3tk(2k+1)}{rn} \right) m^2.$$

By Claim 6,  $t < 12r$  and then

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) < \left( \frac{1}{t} + \frac{36k(2k+1)}{n} \right) m^2.$$

Now, according to Proposition 1(v) and Claim 1, we provide a lower bound for  $\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})$ , that is  $\omega(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}) = 2\omega(\mathcal{F}) + km \geq \frac{1}{r}m^2$ .

Therefore,  $\frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{t} + \frac{36k(2k+1)}{n}$ . Note that  $n > 36k(2k+1)(1+r)r$ . This implies that  $\frac{36k(2k+1)}{n} < \frac{1}{r(r+1)} = \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r+1}$  and then  $\frac{1}{r} < \frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r+1}$ . So  $t < r+1$ , as desired.  $\square$

Since  $\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r+1}{k} < m = |\mathcal{F}|$ , any cover of  $\mathcal{F}$  has size at least  $r$ . By Claim 7,  $t = r$  and then  $\mathcal{F}$  has a cover with  $r$  elements. Now we have finished the proof of Lemma 1.  $\square$

The following lemma shows if  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is an extremal family with size  $m$ , then the complement of  $\mathcal{F}$  is also an extremal family with size  $\binom{n}{k} - m$ . Hence, Theorem 4 and Lemma 2 derive Theorem 5.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m$ . Assume that  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{F}_0)$  for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m$ . Then for any  $\mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $\binom{n}{k} - m$ ,  $\omega(\mathcal{G}) \leq \omega(\binom{[n]}{k} \setminus \mathcal{F}_0)$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $\mathcal{G} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $\binom{n}{k} - m$ , let  $\mathcal{F} = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : F \notin \mathcal{G}\}$ . Note that  $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ . We have  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{F}_0)$  and then  $\sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 \leq \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}_0(x)|^2$ . Since each element  $x \in [n]$  is in exact  $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$  sets in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ , by Proposition 1(i) and (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} 2\omega(\mathcal{G}) &= \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{G}(x)|^2 - k \left( \binom{n}{k} - m \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in [n]} \left( \binom{n-1}{k-1} - |\mathcal{F}(x)| \right)^2 - k \left( \binom{n}{k} - m \right) \\ &= n \binom{n-1}{k-1}^2 - 2km \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}(x)|^2 - k \left( \binom{n}{k} - m \right) \\ &\leq n \binom{n-1}{k-1}^2 - 2km \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \sum_{x \in [n]} |\mathcal{F}_0(x)|^2 - k \left( \binom{n}{k} - m \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in [n]} \left( \binom{n-1}{k-1} - |\mathcal{F}_0(x)| \right)^2 - k \left( \binom{n}{k} - m \right) \\ &= 2\omega(\binom{[n]}{k} \setminus \mathcal{F}_0). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 4

In our proof, we will use induction on  $n, k$  and  $m$ . Before considering the base case of the induction, we first show how the induction works.

Our goal is to prove Theorem 4 holds for  $(n, k, m)$ , that is

**Theorem 4A.** *Let  $r_s$  be the  $(n, k)$ -cascade end of  $m$ . If  $n > 36k(2k + 1)(k + r_s)r_s$ , then  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$  holds for any  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ .*

Now assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is an extremal family with size  $m$ . By (1), it is clear that that  $\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1+1}{k} < m \leq \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k}$  and  $n > 36k(2k + 1)(k + r_s)r_s \geq 36k(2k + 1)(k + r_1)r_1$ . We divide our discussion into two cases.

**Case 1.**  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a full star. Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{F}(1)$  is a full star. Then  $\mathcal{F}(1) = \mathcal{F}_1 = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F\}$ . First we consider the case  $r_1 = 1$ . In this case,  $m \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}$  and then  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(1) = \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$ , as desired. Now assume that  $r_1 \geq 2$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\mathcal{F}) &= \omega(\mathcal{F}_1) + \omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1) + \omega(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1) \\ &= \omega(\mathcal{F}_1) + \omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1} \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}_1(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is a family independent of the structure of  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\omega(\mathcal{F}_1)$  depends only on  $n$  and  $k$ . Also, for any  $x \in F$ , because  $F \notin \mathcal{F}_1$ ,  $x \neq 1$  and then  $|\mathcal{F}_1(x)| = \binom{n-2}{k-2}$ . Thus,  $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1} \sum_{x \in F} |\mathcal{F}_1(x)| = |\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1| k \binom{n-2}{k-2} = (m - \binom{n-1}{k-1}) k \binom{n-2}{k-2}$ .

If we want to maximize  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$ , it is sufficient to maximize  $\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1)$ . It should be noted that  $\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1$  is a family in  $\binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k}$  with size  $m' := m - \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ . Suppose that we have already proven Theorem 4A for  $(n-1, k, m')$ . Then  $\omega(\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_1) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n-1,k}^{m'})$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{n-1,k}^{m'}$  is isomorphic to the family consisting of the first  $m'$  sets in lexicographical ordering in  $\binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k}$ , we have  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$ , as desired.

Hence, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 4A for  $(n-1, k, m')$ . We also need to verify that  $(n-1, k, m')$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4A. By (1), it can be calculated that

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n-1}{k} - m' &= \binom{n-1}{k} - m + \binom{n-1}{k-1} \\ &= \binom{n}{k} - m \\ &= \binom{n-r_1}{k} + \binom{n-r_2}{k-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-r_s}{k-s+1} \\ &= \binom{n-1-(r_1-1)}{k} + \binom{n-1-(r_2-1)}{k-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1-(r_s-1)}{k-s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $r_1 \geq 2$ ,  $r_s - 1$  is the  $(n - 1, k)$ -cascade end of  $m'$ . Combining with the fact  $n > 36k(2k + 1)(k + r_s)r_s$ , we have  $n - 1 > 36k(2k + 1)(k + r_s - 1)(r_s - 1)$ .

**Case 2.**  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no full star.

In this case, by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{F}$  has a cover with  $r_1$  elements. Without loss of generality, assume that  $[r_1]$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $m = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k}$ , then  $\mathcal{F} = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : F \cap [r_1] \neq \emptyset\}$ , which contains a full star. Thus in the following we assume that  $m < \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : A \cap [r_1] \neq \emptyset\}$  and  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{F}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(\mathcal{A}) &= \omega(\mathcal{F}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= \omega(\mathcal{F}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A}) - \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}) \\ &= \omega(\mathcal{F}) - \omega(\mathcal{G}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A}) - k|\mathcal{G}|,\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \omega(\mathcal{A}) + \omega(\mathcal{G}) - \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A}) + k|\mathcal{G}|.$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is a family independent of the structure of  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\omega(\mathcal{A})$  depends only on  $n, k$  and  $r_1$ . Also, we have  $|\mathcal{G}| = \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m$ . Thus, if we want to maximize  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$ , it is sufficient to maximize  $\omega(\mathcal{G}) - \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A})$ .

By direct calculation,

$$\omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \omega(G, \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \left( \sum_{x \in G \cap [r_1]} |\mathcal{A}(x)| + \sum_{x \in G \setminus [r_1]} |\mathcal{A}(x)| \right).$$

Note that  $|\mathcal{A}(x)| = |\mathcal{A}(1)| = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$  if  $x \in [r_1]$  and  $|\mathcal{A}(x)| = |\mathcal{A}(r_1 + 1)| = \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-r_1-1}{k-1}$  if  $x \notin [r_1]$ . Combining with the fact  $|\mathcal{A}(1)| > |\mathcal{A}(r_1 + 1)|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A}) &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} (|G \cap [r_1]| |\mathcal{A}(1)| + |G \setminus [r_1]| |\mathcal{A}(r_1 + 1)|) \\ &\geq |\mathcal{G}| (|\mathcal{A}(1)| + (k-1) |\mathcal{A}(r_1 + 1)|) \\ &= \left( \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m \right) (|\mathcal{A}(1)| + (k-1) |\mathcal{A}(r_1 + 1)|) \\ &= \left( \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m \right) \left( k \binom{n-1}{k-1} - (k-1) \binom{n-r_1-1}{k-1} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because  $|G \cap [r_1]| \geq 1$ . This implies that when  $|G \cap [r_1]| = 1$  for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A})$  reaches its minimum value.

Now, we consider the maximum value of  $\omega(\mathcal{G})$ . Actually,  $\mathcal{G}$  is a family in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  with size  $m' := \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m$ . Let  $m'' := \binom{n-1}{k-1} - m'$  and  $\mathcal{L}' := \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F \text{ and } F \notin \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''}\}$ .

Suppose we have already proven Theorem 4A for  $(n-1, k-1, m'')$ . In the following, we claim that  $\omega(\mathcal{G}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}')$ .

Since  $m'' < \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ ,  $\{1\}$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''}$ . Thus  $\mathcal{L}' \cup \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''} = \{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in F\}$  and  $|\mathcal{L}'| = m'$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}' - 1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''} - 1$  be the families of sets obtained by removing 1 from each set in  $\mathcal{L}'$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''}$  respectively. Then  $\mathcal{L}' - 1$  is the complement of  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''} - 1$  in  $\binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}$ . By induction,  $\omega(\mathcal{F}') \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''} - 1)$  for any family  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}$  with size  $m''$ . By Lemma 2,  $\omega(\mathcal{G}') \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}' - 1)$  for any family  $\mathcal{G}' \subset \binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}$  with size  $m'$ .

Also, since  $m' < \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  has a cover with size 1 and assume that  $\{1\}$  is a cover of  $\mathcal{G}$  without loss of generality. Let  $\mathcal{G} - 1$  be the family by removing 1 from each set in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then  $\mathcal{G} - 1$  is a family in  $\binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{k-1}$  with size  $m'$  and we have

$$\omega(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus \{1\}} \binom{|\mathcal{G}(x)|}{2} + \binom{|\mathcal{G}(1)|}{2} = \omega(\mathcal{G} - 1) + \binom{m'}{2} \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}' - 1) + \binom{m'}{2} = \omega(\mathcal{L}').$$

Moreover, since  $m'' = \binom{n-1}{k-1} - m' > \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \left( \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m \right) > \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-r_1}{k-1}$ , the minimum element in the  $m''$ -th set in  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^{m''} - 1$  must be larger than  $r_1$ . Then each set in  $\mathcal{L}' - 1$  has no element in  $[r_1]$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1$  be the family of sets obtained by adding  $r_1$  to each set in  $\mathcal{L}' - 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}'$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1$ , which implies  $\omega(\mathcal{G}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1)$ .

Note that for any set  $G \in \mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1$ ,  $G \cap [r_1] = \{r_1\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1$  minimizes  $\omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A})$ . Thus,  $\omega(\mathcal{G}) - \omega(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{A})$  reaches its maximum value provided  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1$ . So  $\omega(\mathcal{F})$  reaches its maximum value provided  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{L}' - 1 + r_1) = \mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$ , as desired.

Hence, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 4A for  $(n-1, k-1, m'')$ . We also need to verify that  $(n-1, k-1, m'')$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4A. By (1), it can be calculated that

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n-1}{k-1} - m'' &= \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-1}{k-1} + m' \\ &= \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - m \\ &= \binom{n-r_2}{k-1} + \binom{n-r_3}{k-2} + \cdots + \binom{n-r_s}{k-s+1} \\ &= \binom{n-1-(r_2-1)}{k-1} + \binom{n-1-(r_3-1)}{k-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1-(r_s-1)}{k-s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $r_2 \geq r_1 + 1 \geq 2$ ,  $r_s - 1$  is the  $(n-1, k-1)$ -cascade end of  $m''$ . Combining with the fact  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r_s)r_s$ , we have  $n-1 > 36(k-1)(2k-1)(k+r_s-2)(r_s-1)$ .

**Base case of the induction.** Based on the argument above, in each step of induction, we turn  $(n, k, m)$  into either  $(n-1, k, m')$  or  $(n-1, k-1, m'')$ . Because  $n$  is much larger than  $k$  and  $m' < m$  at each step, in our base case, we only need to consider Theorem 4A for  $(n, 1, m)$  or  $(n, k, 1)$ . Clearly, both of them are trivial cases. Hence, we have finished the proof of Theorem 4.  $\square$

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we determine that  $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega(\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m)$  for some special  $m$  provided  $n$  is large sufficiently. This result give a natural extension of the enumeration problem of the disjoint pairs in a family of sets, and also give an extremal hypergraph graph maximizing the sum of squares of degrees.

We also want to mention a combinatorial explanation of (1). Let  $\{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$  be the  $m$ -th set in lexicographic ordering on  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  with  $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_k \leq n$ . Then we claim that  $m$  and  $\{r_1, \dots, r_s\}$  satisfies (1), where  $r_s$  is the last element with  $n - r_s \geq k - s + 1$ . To prove this, we divide  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  into two families, one consisting of sets with some  $r < r_1$  as the minimum element, and the other consisting of sets with  $r_1$  as the minimum element. It is clear that the first family has size  $\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1+1}{k}$ . Further, we remove  $r_1$  from each set in the second family and divide the obtained family into two subfamilies, one consisting of sets with some  $r_1 < r < r_2$  as the minimum element, and the other consisting of sets with  $r_2$  as the minimum element. Again, it is clear that the first subfamily has size  $\binom{n-r_1}{k-1} - \binom{n-r_2+1}{k}$ . Continue this partitioning process until the reminding subfamily contains all sets in  $\binom{[n] \setminus [r_s-1]}{k-s+1}$ , which implies that  $(r_{s+1}, r_{s+2}, \dots, r_k) = (n - k + s + 1, n - k + s + 2, \dots, n)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1+1}{k} + \binom{n-r_1}{k-1} - \binom{n-r_2+1}{k} + \dots + \binom{n-r_s+1}{k-s+1} - \binom{n-r_s}{k-s} \\ &= \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-r_1}{k} - \binom{n-r_2}{k} - \dots - \binom{n-r_s}{k-s+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $m$  and  $\{r_1, \dots, r_s\}$  satisfies (1). In other words, if  $(r_1, \dots, r_s)$  is determined by (1), then the last set in  $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}^m$  is actually  $\{r_1, \dots, r_s, n - k + s + 1, n - k + s + 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Now let us focus on the condition  $n > 36k(2k+1)(k+r)r$  and  $r \geq r_s$ . Since  $r_s$  is the last element satisfies  $r_s \leq n - k + s - 1$ , the conditions implies  $m$  differs from those ‘good’ values within a small range.

## References

- [1] R. Ahlswede, G. O. H. Katona: Graphs with maximal number of adjacent pairs of edges, *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 32(1-2) (1978) 97-120.
- [2] R. Ahlswede: Simple hypergraphs with maximal number of adjacent pairs of edges, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 28(2) (1980) 164-167.
- [3] C. Bey: An upper bound on the sum of squares of degrees in a hypergraph, *Discrete Mathematics*, 269 (2003) 259-263.

- [4] B. Bollobás, I. Leader: Set systems with few disjoint pairs, *Combinatorica*, 23 (2003) 559-570.
- [5] D. de Caen: An upper bound on the sum of squares of degrees in a graph, *Discrete Mathematics*, 185 (1998) 245-248.
- [6] K. C. Das: Maximizing the sum of the squares of the degrees of a graph, *Discrete Mathematics*, 285 (2004) 57-66.
- [7] S. Das, W. Gan, B. Sudakov: The minimum number of disjoint pairs in set systems and related problems, *Combinatorica*, 36(6) (2016) 623-660.
- [8] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado: Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 12 (1) (1961) 313-320.
- [9] P. Frankl: On the minimum number of disjoint pairs in a family of finite sets, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 22 (1977) 249-251.