

## SIMULTANEOUS SYSTEMS OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR FAMILIES OF FINITE SETS

MELVYN B. NATHANSON

(Communicated by Andrew Odlyzko)

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Then there exists a real number  $\lambda = \lambda(h, k) \in (0, 1)$  such that, if  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^t$  are families of nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets with  $|S_i| \leq h$  and  $|T_j| \leq k$  and  $S_i \not\subseteq T_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ , then  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^s \lambda^t$ , where  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  is the number of sets  $X$  such that  $X$  is a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $X$  is simultaneously a system of representatives for  $\mathcal{T}$ . A conjecture about the best possible value of the constant  $\lambda(h, k)$  is proved in the case  $h > k$ . The necessity of the disjointness conditions for the families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is also demonstrated.

Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^t$  be two families of nonempty sets. The set  $X$  is a *system of representatives* for  $\mathcal{S}$  if  $X \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$  for all  $i \in I$ . If  $X$  is a system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$  but no proper subset of  $X$  is a system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a *minimal system of representatives* for  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Let  $M(\mathcal{S})$  denote the number of minimal systems of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$ . If the sets  $S_i$  are pairwise disjoint, and if  $|S_i| \leq h$ , where  $|S|$  denotes the cardinality of the set  $S$ , then  $M(\mathcal{S}) = \prod_{i=1}^s |S_i| \leq h^s$ .

Let  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  denote the number of sets  $X$  such that  $X$  is a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $X$  is simultaneously a system of representatives for  $\mathcal{T}$ . At the Third International Conference on Combinatorial Mathematics in New York in June, 1985, the author stated the following two conjectures about the number  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  in the case of two finite families of pairwise disjoint finite sets.

**CONJECTURE 1.** Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . There exists a real number  $\lambda = \lambda(h, k) \in (0, 1)$  with the following property:

(i) Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  be a family of  $s$  nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets  $S_i$  with  $|S_i| \leq h$  for all  $i$ .

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^t$  be a family of  $t$  nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets  $T_j$  with  $|T_j| \leq k$  for all  $j$ .

(iii) Suppose  $S_i \not\subseteq T_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Then

$$(1) \quad N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^s \lambda^t.$$

**CONJECTURE 2.** Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $k = q(h-1) + r$ , where  $0 \leq r \leq h-2$ . Define  $\lambda^*(h, k) \in (0, 1)$  by

$$\lambda^*(h, k) = 1 - (h-r)/h^{q+1}.$$

---

Received by the editors October 23, 1986 and, in revised form, June 15, 1987.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 Revision). Primary 05A05, 11B13, 11B75.

*Key words and phrases.* Systems of representatives, additive bases.

©1988 American Mathematical Society  
 0002-9939/88 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

Then  $\lambda^*(h, k)$  is the smallest value of  $\lambda$  that satisfies inequality (1) of Conjecture 1.

Note that Conjectures 1 and 2 imply that

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^{s-2t}(h^2 - h + 1)^t$$

if  $h = k$ , and that

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^{s-t}k^t$$

if  $h > k$ .

Erdős and Nathanson [1] proved Conjectures 1 and 2 in the special case  $h = k = 2$ , and they applied this result in additive number theory to obtain a sufficient condition for an asymptotic basis of order 2 to contain a minimal asymptotic basis of order 2. Conjectures 1 and 2 should have important applications to the study of additive bases of orders greater than 2.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . If  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^s \lambda^t$  for all families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  that satisfy conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of Conjecture 1, then  $\lambda \geq \lambda^*(h, k)$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $d_1, \dots, d_s$  be positive integers such that  $d_i \leq h - 1$  for all  $i$  and  $d_1 + \dots + d_s \leq k$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_s$  be pairwise disjoint sets with  $|S_i| = h$  for all  $i$ . Let  $T$  be a set such that  $|T| = k$  and  $|T \cap S_i| = d_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ . Then

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = h^s - \prod_{i=1}^s (h - d_i) = h^s \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^s \left( 1 - \frac{d_i}{h} \right) \right)$$

and so

$$(2) \quad \lambda \geq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^s \left( 1 - \frac{d_i}{h} \right).$$

Let  $k = q(h - 1) + r$ , where  $q = [k/(h - 1)]$  and  $0 \leq r \leq h - 2$ . Let  $s = q + 1$ . Let  $d_i = h - 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s - 1$  and  $d_s = r$ . Then the right side of inequality (2) is  $\lambda^*(h, k)$ . This proves the theorem.

**DEFINITION.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  be families of sets. Then  $\mathcal{T}$  is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$  if to each set  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  there is at most one set  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$ .

**LEMMA.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfy conditions (i) and (ii) of Conjecture 1. If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{T}$  that is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ , and if  $t' = |\mathcal{T}'|$ , then  $t' \geq t/((h - 1)k + 1)$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^{t'}$  be a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{T}$ . For each  $j \in [1, t']$ , there is a set  $I(j) \subseteq [1, s]$  such that  $|I(j)| \leq k$  and  $S_i \cap T_j \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $i \in I(j)$ .

There are  $t - t'$  sets belonging to  $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}'$ . Each of these sets must intersect some set  $S_i$ , where  $i \in I(j)$  for some  $j = 1, \dots, t'$ . Since each of these sets  $S_i$  also

intersects some set  $T_j$  belonging to the family  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and since the sets in  $\mathcal{T}$  are pairwise disjoint, it follows that

$$t - t' \leq \sum_{j=1}^{t'} \sum_{i \in I(j)} (|S_i| - 1) \leq (h - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{t'} |I(j)| \leq (h - 1)kt'.$$

This proves the Lemma.

The following result implies Conjecture 1.

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . There exists a real number  $\lambda = \lambda(h, k) \in (0, 1)$  with the following property:*

- (i) *Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  be a family of  $s$  nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets  $S_i$  with  $|S_i| \leq h$  for all  $i$ .*
- (ii) *Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^t$  be a family of  $t$  nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets  $T_j$  with  $|T_j| \leq k$  for all  $j$ .*
- (iii) *Suppose  $S_i \not\subseteq T_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Then*

(3) 
$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq M(\mathcal{S})\lambda^t.$$

**PROOF.** Define  $\mu = 1 - 1/h^k$  and  $\lambda \equiv \mu^{1/((h-1)k+1)}$ . Then  $\mu < \lambda$ . It suffices to prove that if  $\mathcal{T}$  is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq M(\mathcal{S})\mu^t$ . The reason is as follows: Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{T}$  that is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $t' = |\mathcal{T}'|$ . Then the Lemma implies that

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}') \leq M(\mathcal{S})\mu^{t'} \leq M(\mathcal{S})\lambda^t.$$

Now assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ . Note that the result is trivial if  $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ , that is, if  $t = 0$ . Suppose that  $t = 1$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ . Let  $d_i = |S_i \cap T|$ . Since  $S_i \not\subseteq T$ , it follows that  $d_i \leq |S_i| - 1$ . Reorder the sets  $S_i$  so that  $d_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s'$  and  $d_i = 0$  for  $i = s' + 1, \dots, s$ . Then  $s' \leq |T| \leq k$  and

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) &= \prod_{i=1}^s |S_i| - \prod_{i=s'+1}^s |S_i| \prod_{i=1}^{s'} (|S_i| - d_i) \\ &= M(\mathcal{S}) \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{s'} \left( 1 - \frac{d_i}{|S_i|} \right) \right) \\ &\leq M(\mathcal{S}) \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{s'} \left( \frac{1}{|S_i|} \right) \right) \\ &\leq M(\mathcal{S})(1 - h^{-k}) = M(\mathcal{S})\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $\mathcal{T}$  be any family that is independent with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ . Since each set  $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$  intersects at most one set  $T_j \in \mathcal{T}$ , we can partition the family  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $t$  families  $\mathcal{S}_j$  such that if  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  and if  $S \cap T_j \neq \emptyset$ , then  $S \in \mathcal{S}_j$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_j = \{T_j\}$ . Then

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = N(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}_1) \cdots N(\mathcal{S}_t, \mathcal{T}_t) \leq M(\mathcal{S}_1) \cdots M(\mathcal{S}_t)\mu^t = M(\mathcal{S})\mu^t.$$

This completes the proof of the Theorem.

The following result proves Conjecture 2 in the case  $h > k$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $h > k \geq 1$ . Let the families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfy conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of Theorem 2. Then  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq h^{s-t}k^t$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $X'$  be a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{T}$ , and let  $L(X')$  denote the number of minimal systems of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$  that contain  $X'$ . If the elements of  $X'$  do not belong to distinct sets  $S_i$  in the family  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $L(X') = 0$ . If the  $t$  elements of  $X'$  do belong to  $t$  distinct sets in  $\mathcal{S}$ , then there are at most  $h^{s-t}$  ways to choose a set  $X''$  of representatives from the remaining  $s - t$  sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  so that  $X = X' \cup X''$  will be a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$ . Moreover, there are at most  $k^t$  minimal systems  $X'$  of representatives for  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since every set  $X$  counted in  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  contains some set  $X'$ , it follows that

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) \leq \sum_{x'} L(X') \leq h^{s-t}k^t.$$

This proves the theorem.

The following two results show the necessity in Theorem 2 that the families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  consist of pairwise disjoint sets.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ . Then there is a family  $\mathcal{S}$  of nonempty, distinct sets  $S$  with  $|S| = h$ , and a set  $T$  with  $|T| = k$  and  $S \not\subseteq T$  such that, if  $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ , then  $N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) > M(\mathcal{S})\lambda$ .*

**PROOF.** Choose  $n > (h - 1)/(1 - \lambda)$ . Let  $S^*$  be a set with  $|S^*| = n$ , and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the family of all  $h$ -element subsets of  $S^*$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{S}| = s = \binom{n}{h} \quad \text{and} \quad M(\mathcal{S}) = \binom{n}{h-1}.$$

Let  $T$  be a set such that  $|T| = k$  and  $|T \cap S^*| = 1$ . Then

$$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = \binom{n-1}{h-1} = M(\mathcal{S}) \left(1 - \frac{h-1}{n}\right) > M(\mathcal{S})\lambda.$$

**THEOREM 5.** *Let  $h \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 2$ . For any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist families  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_j\}_{j=1}^t$  with the following properties:*

- (i) *The  $s$  sets  $S_i$  are pairwise disjoint and  $|S_i| = h$  for all  $i$ .*
- (ii) *The  $t$  sets  $T_j$  are distinct and  $|T_j| = k$  for all  $j$ .*
- (iii)  *$S_i \not\subseteq T_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ .*
- (iv)  *$t < \varepsilon s$ .*
- (v)  *$N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) > h^s \lambda^t$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $n = \min(h, k)$ . Then  $n \geq 2$  and

$$r \binom{r(h-1)}{n-1} - r > cr^n$$

for some  $c > 0$  and all  $r \geq r_0$ . Choose  $r$  sufficiently large so that  $r \geq r_0$  and  $h^r \lambda^{cr^n} < 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}' = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^r$  be a family of  $r$  pairwise disjoint sets  $S_i$  with  $|S_i| = h$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Choose  $x_i \in S_i$ . Then  $X' = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$  is a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}'$ .

Let  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^r S_i$ . Let  $V$  be a set such that  $V \cap S = \emptyset$  and  $|V| = k - n$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  consist of all sets  $T = \{x_i\} \cup T' \cup V$ , where  $x_i \in X'$  and  $T' \subseteq S \setminus X'$  satisfies

$|T'| = n - 1$  and  $T' \neq S_i \setminus \{x_i\}$ . Then  $S_i \not\subseteq T$  for all  $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Since  $|S \setminus X'| = r(h - 1)$ , the family  $\mathcal{T}$  consists of

$$t \geq r \binom{r(h-1)}{n-1} - r > cr^n$$

distinct sets of cardinality  $k$ .

Clearly,  $X'$  is a minimal system of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}'$  and a system of representatives for  $\mathcal{T}$ , but

$$h^r \lambda^t < h^r \lambda^{cr^n} < 1 \leq N(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{T}).$$

Choose  $s > r$  so large that  $t < \varepsilon s$ . Let  $S_{r+1}, \dots, S_s$  be pairwise disjoint sets of cardinality  $h$  that are also disjoint from the sets in  $\mathcal{S}'$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}' \cup \{S_i\}_{i=r+1}^s = \{S_i\}_{i=1}^s.$$

There are  $h^{s-r}$  minimal systems of representatives for  $\mathcal{S}$  that contain  $X'$ , and so

$$h^s \lambda^t = h^{s-r} h^r \lambda^t < h^{s-r} \leq N(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}).$$

The families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfy conditions (i)–(v) of the theorem.

REMARKS. Xing-De Jia has recently given complete proofs of Conjectures 1 and 2.

I wish to thank the referee for numerous comments that greatly improved this paper.

#### REFERENCES

1. P. Erdős and M. B. Nathanson, *Systems of distinct representatives and minimal bases in additive number theory* (M. B. Nathanson, ed.), *Number Theory* (Carbondale 1979), Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 751, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, pp. 89–107.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LEHMAN COLLEGE (CUNY), BRONX, NEW YORK 10468