## NOTE

# THE SIZE OF 3-CROSS-FREE FAMILIES\*

# TAMÁS FLEINER

Received July 1, 1998

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  $A \cap B, A \setminus B, B \setminus A$  and  $V \setminus (A \cup B)$  is empty.

It was conjectured by Karzanov and Lomonosov that  $|\mathcal{F}| = O(kn)$  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  $b \in V \setminus \{a\}$  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 10n.

0209-9683/101/\$6.00 ©2001 János Bolyai Mathematical Society and Springer-Verlag

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 05D05, 06A07

<sup>\*</sup> Research supported by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the OTKA T 029772 project.

### TAMÁS FLEINER

As far as we know, the conjecture of Karzanov and Lomonosov is still open for k > 3 and the best known bound is  $|\mathcal{F}| = O(kn \log n)$  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  $V \setminus X$  equals the minimum size of the edge-cuts of G separating X from  $V \setminus X$ . 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  $W \setminus V$  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  $V \setminus X$ .

#### 2. Weakly 3-cross-free families

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

$$\mathcal{F}/v := \{X \setminus \{v\} : X \in \mathcal{F}\}$$
$$\mathcal{F}(v) := \{X : v \in X \in \mathcal{F} \ni X \setminus \{v\}\}$$

**Theorem 1.** Let  $|V| = n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^V$  be a weakly 3-cross-free family. Then  $|\mathcal{F}| \leq 10n$ .

**Proof.** Assume to the contrary that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a counterexample with |V| minimal, that is,  $|\mathcal{F}| > 10n$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is weakly 3-cross-free with respect to a. Let us define  $\mathcal{F}' := \{X \in \mathcal{F} : a \notin X\} \cup \{V \setminus X : a \in X \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Clearly,  $|\mathcal{F}'| > 5n$  with the property that

(1) if  $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{F}'$  with  $X \cap Y \cap Z \neq \emptyset$  then X, Y, Z cannot pairwise cross. Next we prove:

(2) For each  $x \in V \setminus a$ , there exist  $A_x, B_x \in \mathcal{F}'(x)$  such that  $B_x \neq A_x \subset B_x$  and  $|A_x| \geq 3$ .

If  $\{x\} \neq P \subset Q \subset R$  is a chain of three different elements from  $\mathcal{F}'(x)$ , then  $A_x = Q$ ,  $B_x = R$  suffices. Otherwise each element of  $\mathcal{F}'(x) \setminus \{x\}$  is either inclusionwise minimal or maximal. By (1), we see that  $\mathcal{F}'(x) \setminus \{x\}$  contains at most two maxima and at most two minima, hence altogether  $|\mathcal{F}'(x)| \leq 5$ . As  $|\mathcal{F}(x)| \leq 2|\mathcal{F}'(x)|$ , we get that  $|\mathcal{F}/x| = |\mathcal{F}| - |\mathcal{F}(x)| > 10|V| - 2|\mathcal{F}'(x)| \geq 10|V \setminus \{x\}|$ . 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  $x \in V \setminus a$ , such that  $|B_x|$  is as small as possible. Let  $y, z \in A_x \setminus \{x\}$  be different elements. Observe that  $y \in A_x \cap (B_x \setminus \{x\}) \cap B_y$  and that  $A_x$  crosses  $B_x \setminus \{x\}$ . By the choice of x,  $|B_y| \ge |B_x|$ , hence  $B_y$  must contain  $A_x$  or  $B_x \setminus \{x\}$  by (1). In particular,  $z \in A_x \setminus \{x\} \subset B_y$  holds. Then  $z \in A_x \cap (B_x \setminus \{x\}) \cap (B_y \setminus \{y\})$ , and these three sets of  $\mathcal{F}'$  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  $\mathcal{F}^i := \{X \in \mathcal{F}' : |X| = i\}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ , where  $\mathcal{F}'$  is defined as in the proof of Theorem 1. Clearly, for every  $v \in V \setminus a$  there are less than k sets in  $\mathcal{F}^i$  covering v, hence  $|\mathcal{F}| \le 2|\mathcal{F}'| = 2\sum_{i=0}^n |\mathcal{F}^i| < 2\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{kn}{i}\right) = O(kn \log n).$ 

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  $\mathcal{F}([n], k) := \{\{X \in {\binom{[n]}{k}} : i \in X\} : i \in [n]\} \subset 2^{\binom{[n]}{k}}$ . 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  $\mathcal{F}[n,k] := \{i + [j], [i] + j, [n] \setminus (i + [j]), [n] \setminus ([i] + j) : i + 1 \in [k], j \in [n-i]\} \subset 2^{[n]}$  (where  $a + [b] := [a+b] \setminus [a]$ ) 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 8n members.

Acknowledgment. I am grateful to Lex Schrijver for asking me about the conjecture of Karzanov and Lomonosov and to Bert Gerards for his remarks that simplified the proof.

#### References

- [1] A. DRESS, J. KOOLEN, V. MOULTON: 4n 10, preprint(1999), submitted.
- [2] A. DRESS, M. KLUCZNIK, J. KOOLEN, V. MOULTON:  $2nk \binom{k+1}{2}$ , preprint(1999), submitted.
- [3] A.V. KARZANOV: A generalized MFMC property and multicommodity cut problems, in: *Finite and Infinite Sets II*. [Proceedings of the Sixth Hungarian Combinatorial Colloquium, held at Eger in 1981], (A. Hajnal, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, eds.) [Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai, 37], North-Holland, Amsterdam-Oxford-New York, 1984, 443-486.
- [4] A. V. KARZANOV, M. V. LOMONOSOV: Flow systems in undirected networks, in: Mathematical Programming, (O. I. Larichev, ed.) Institute for System Studies, Moscow, 1978, 59-66 (in Russian).
- [5] MICHAEL V. LOMONOSOV: Combinatorial approaches to multiflow problems, Discrete Appl. Math., 11(1) (1985), 1-93.
- [6] A. FRANK, A. V. KARZANOV, A. SEBŐ: On integer multiflow maximization, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 10 (1997), 158-170.
- [7] P. A. PEVZNER: Lineĭnost' moshchnosti 3-nezatseplennykh semeĭstv mnozhestv [Linearity of the cardinality of 3-cross-free families of sets], in: Zadachi Diskretnoĭ Optimizatsii i Metody ikh Resheniya [Problems of Discrete Optimization and Methods for their Solution], (A. A. Fridman, ed.), Moscow, 1987, 136-142; [English translation: Non-3-crossing families and multicommodity flows, in: Selected Topics in Discrete Mathematics [Proceedings of the Moscow Discrete Mathematics Seminar 1972-1990] (A. K. Kelmans, ed.), [American Mathematical Society Translations Series 2 Volume 158], 201-206].

Tamás Fleiner

CWI, Postbus 94079, 1090 GB, Amsterdam, The Netherlands and Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics Hungarian Academy of Sciences H-1364, P.O.Box 127, Hungary fleiner@renyi.hu

448