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We give a short and simple proof for the theorem that the size of a 3-cross-free family is linear in the size of the groundset. A family is 3 -cross-free if it has no 3 pairwise crossing members.

## 1. Introduction

We shall prove that if $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{V}$ is a 3 -cross-free family then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 10|V|$. We call $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{V}$ to be $k$-cross-free if $\mathcal{F}$ has no $k$ pairwise crossing members. Sets $A, B \subset V$ are crossing if none of $A \cap B, A \backslash B, B \backslash A$ and $V \backslash(A \cup B)$ is empty.

It was conjectured by Karzanov and Lomonosov that $|\mathcal{F}|=O(k n)$ if $\mathcal{F}$ is $k$-cross-free and $|V|=n$. For $k=2$, this is trivial from the well-known tree representation of laminar families. In [7], Pevzner gave a quite complicated and lengthy proof for the case $k=3$. In Section 2, we present a direct and easy proof for this result. Actually, we prove a slightly more general theorem than the one indicated above. We call a family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{V}$ weakly $k$-cross-free with respect to $a \in V$, if for every $b \in V \backslash\{a\}$ there are no $k$ pairwise crossing members of $\mathcal{F}$ separating $a$ from $b$. We say that $X$ separates $a$ from $b$ if it contains exactly one of them. We call a family weakly $k$-cross-free if it is weakly $k$-cross-free with respect to some element $a$ of $V$. In Section 2, we will show that the size of a weakly 3 -cross-free family is at most $10 n$.

[^0]As far as we know, the conjecture of Karzanov and Lomonosov is still open for $k>3$ and the best known bound is $|\mathcal{F}|=O(k n \log n)$ due to Lomonosov. However, recently there has been some new results obtained by Dress et al. [2,1], where all maximum-size 3 -cross-free families are described and the conjecture is proved for so-called cyclic 4 -cross-free families. There, cyclic means that there is a cyclic order on $V$ such that any element of $\mathcal{F}$ is an interval in it. They also show that contrary to some naive expectations, maximum-size $k$-cross-free families are not cyclic for $k=4$.

The background of the investigation of 3 -cross-free families is the so called locking theorem of Karzanov and Lomonosov [4,5] (see also [3]): a family $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{V}$ is lockable if and only if $\mathcal{F}$ is 3 -cross-free. Family $\mathcal{F}$ is called lockable if whenever $G=(W, E)$ is an undirected graph with $V \subset W$ then there exists a fractional path-packing (i.e. a multiflow) $f$ in $G$ such that every $X \in \mathcal{F}$ is locked in $G$ by $f$. Subset $X$ of $V$ is locked in $G$ by $f$ if the total $f$-value of paths between $X$ and $V \backslash X$ equals the minimum size of the edge-cuts of $G$ separating $X$ from $V \backslash X$. The following stronger version was also proved in [4,5] (for a shorter proof see [6]): $\mathcal{F}$ is 3-cross-free if and only if for any $G=(W, E)$ inner Eulerian graph (that is, $V \subseteq W$ and the degrees of all vertices of $W \backslash V$ are even) there is a collection $\mathcal{P}$ of edge-disjoint paths of $G$ in such a way that for any $X \in \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}$ contains maximum number of paths connecting $X$ to $V \backslash X$.

## 2. Weakly 3-cross-free families

In this section we prove our result. Throughout we use the following notation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F} / v & :=\{X \backslash\{v\}: X \in \mathcal{F}\} \\
\mathcal{F}(v) & :=\{X: v \in X \in \mathcal{F} \ni X \backslash\{v\}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 1. Let $|V|=n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{V}$ be a weakly 3-cross-free family. Then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 10 n$.
Proof. Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{F}$ is a counterexample with $|V|$ minimal, that is, $|\mathcal{F}|>10 n$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is weakly 3 -cross-free with respect to $a$. Let us define $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}:=\{X \in \mathcal{F}: a \notin X\} \cup\{V \backslash X: a \in X \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Clearly, $\left|\mathcal{F}^{\prime}\right|>5 n$ with the property that
(1) if $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{F}^{\prime}$ with $X \cap Y \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ then $X, Y, Z$ cannot pairwise cross.

Next we prove:
(2) For each $x \in V \backslash a$, there exist $A_{x}, B_{x} \in \mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x)$ such that $B_{x} \neq A_{x} \subset B_{x}$ and $\left|A_{x}\right| \geq 3$.

If $\{x\} \neq P \subset Q \subset R$ is a chain of three different elements from $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x)$, then $A_{x}=Q, B_{x}=R$ suffices. Otherwise each element of $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x) \backslash\{x\}$ is either inclusionwise minimal or maximal. By (1), we see that $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x) \backslash\{x\}$ contains
at most two maxima and at most two minima, hence altogether $\left|\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x)\right| \leq 5$. As $|\mathcal{F}(x)| \leq 2\left|\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x)\right|$, we get that $|\mathcal{F} / x|=|\mathcal{F}|-|\mathcal{F}(x)|>10|V|-2\left|\mathcal{F}^{\prime}(x)\right| \geq$ $10|V \backslash\{x\}|$. This contradicts to the minimality assumption as $\mathcal{F} / x$ is also a weakly 3 -cross-free family with respect to $a$. This proves (2).

Choose $x \in V \backslash a$, such that $\left|B_{x}\right|$ is as small as possible. Let $y, z \in A_{x} \backslash\{x\}$ be different elements. Observe that $y \in A_{x} \cap\left(B_{x} \backslash\{x\}\right) \cap B_{y}$ and that $A_{x}$ crosses $B_{x} \backslash\{x\}$. By the choice of $x,\left|B_{y}\right| \geq\left|B_{x}\right|$, hence $B_{y}$ must contain $A_{x}$ or $B_{x} \backslash\{x\}$ by (1). In particular, $z \in A_{x} \backslash\{x\} \subset B_{y}$ holds. Then $z \in A_{x} \cap\left(B_{x} \backslash\{x\}\right) \cap\left(B_{y} \backslash\{y\}\right)$, and these three sets of $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}$ pairwise cross, contradicting (1).

## 3. Conclusions

As indicated, Karzanov's conjecture about the linear size of $k$-cross-free families is still open for $k>3$. However Lomonosov's argument is also valid in our weakly $k$-cross-free setting. Indeed, let $\mathcal{F}^{i}:=\left\{X \in \mathcal{F}^{\prime}:|X|=i\right\}$ for $i=0,1, \ldots, n$, where $\mathcal{F}^{\prime}$ is defined as in the proof of Theorem 1. Clearly, for every $v \in V \backslash a$ there are less than $k$ sets in $\mathcal{F}^{i}$ covering $v$, hence $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2\left|\mathcal{F}^{\prime}\right|=$ $2 \sum_{i=0}^{n}\left|\mathcal{F}^{i}\right|<2\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{k n}{i}\right)=O(k n \log n)$.

Pevzner published a paper about the linear size of 3-cross-free families [7], in which he explores important properties of $k$-cross-free and 3 -cross-free families. Although the proof is not easy to read, he had some interesting remarks that are worth citing. In our terminology his question is the following:

Is it true that any $k$-cross-free family on $n$ elements can be decomposed into $r$ ( $k-1$ )-cross-free families ( $r$ is independent of $n, k>3$ )?
He also observes:
It is possible to show that for $k=3$ the answer to the above problem is negative (an example of an $r$-indecomposable 3 -cross-free family is a family of stars in a graph without triangles with a chromatic number exceeding $r$ ).
It is interesting to see that the answer to Pevzner's question is negative even for all $k$ if we ask it for families that are weakly $k$-cross-free with respect to a fixed point of the groundset: Let $[n]:=\{i \in \mathbb{N}: 1 \leq i \leq n\} ;\binom{[n]}{k}:=$ $\{X \subset[n]:|X|=k\}$ and define $\mathcal{F}([n], k):=\left\{\left\{X \in\binom{[n]}{k}: i \in X\right\}: i \in[n]\right\} \subset 2^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$. Although for $k \geq 2, n \geq 4$ and $X \in\binom{[n]}{k}$ family $\mathcal{F}([n], k)_{X}:=\{F \in \mathcal{F}([n], k)$ : $X \notin F\}$ consists of pairwise crossing sets, it is already weakly $(k+1)$-crossfree with respect to $X$. Moreover, any $k$ elements of $\mathcal{F}([n], k)_{X}$ separate $X$ from another element $Y$ of $\binom{[n]}{k}$, hence for $n \geq(c+1) \cdot k$ it is not possible to partition $\mathcal{F}([n], k)_{X}$ into $c$ families that are all weakly $k$-cross-free with respect to $X$.

Our last remark is that Theorem 1 is not very far from the best possible bound: notice that $\mathcal{F}[n, k]:=\{i+[j],[i]+j,[n] \backslash(i+[j]),[n] \backslash([i]+j)$ : $i+1 \in[k], j \in[n-i]\} \subset 2^{[n]}$ (where $a+[b]:=[a+b] \backslash[a]$ ) is a $k$-cross-free family with roughly $4(k-1) n$ members. In particular, there is a 3 -cross-free family $\mathcal{F}[n, 3]$ with roughly $8 n$ members.
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