#### and related questions

Andrey Kupavskii

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology https://mipt.ru/english/

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

## Definitions

Denote  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ : the set of all k-element subsets of [n]. A subset  $\mathcal{F} \subset \binom{[n]}{k}$  is called a *family*.

A matching of size s in  $\mathcal{F}$ : s pairwise disjoint sets  $F_1, \ldots, F_s \in \mathcal{F}$ . The matching number  $\nu(\mathcal{F})$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ : the size of the largest matching in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

If  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  is *intersecting*: any two sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  intersect.

## The extremal quantity

Define

$${oldsymbol e_k(n,s)}:= \max\Bigl\{|\mathcal{F}|: \mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}, \ 
u(\mathcal{F}) < s \Bigr\}.$$

#### Theorem (Erdős-Ko-Rado, 1938-1961)

$$e_k(n,2) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$
 for  $n \ge 2k$ .

The theorem is tight. Consider the family  $\left\{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in A\right\}$ .

For 
$$n=2k$$
 the family  $inom{[2k-1]}{k}$  has the same cardinality.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 ○のへ⊙

### The extremal quantity

Define

$${oldsymbol e_k(n,s)}:= \max\Bigl\{|\mathcal{F}|: \mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}, \ 
u(\mathcal{F}) < s \Bigr\}.$$

#### Theorem (Erdős-Ko-Rado, 1938-1961)

$$e_k(n,2) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$
 for  $n \ge 2k$ .

The theorem is tight. Consider the family  $\Big\{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in A\Big\}.$ 

For 
$$n = 2k$$
 the family  $\binom{[2k-1]}{k}$  has the same cardinality.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 ○のへ⊙

### The extremal quantity

Define

$${oldsymbol e_k(n,s)}:= \max\Bigl\{|\mathcal{F}|: \mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}, \ 
u(\mathcal{F}) < s \Bigr\}.$$

#### Theorem (Erdős-Ko-Rado, 1938-1961)

$$e_k(n,2) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$
 for  $n \ge 2k$ .

The theorem is tight. Consider the family  $\left\{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in A\right\}$ .

For 
$$n=2k$$
 the family  $\binom{[2k-1]}{k}$  has the same cardinality.

▲□▶▲□▶▲≡▶▲≡▶ ≡ めぬぐ

How to construct a large family  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$ , satisfying  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) < s$ ?

$$\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) := \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : A \cap [s-1] \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s) := \binom{[sk-1]}{k}.$$

We have  $|\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) = {n \choose k} - {n-s+1 \choose k}$ ,  $|\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)| = {sk-1 \choose k}$ .

The Erdős Matching Conjecture, 1965 For  $n \ge sk$  we have

$$e_k(n,s) = \max\left\{ |\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s)|, |\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)| \right\}$$

Put x := s/n. If k is fixed and  $s \to \infty$ :  $|\mathcal{A}|/\binom{n}{k} \to 1 - (1-x)^k$ ,  $|\mathcal{B}|/\binom{n}{k} \to (kx)^k$ .

#### ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ ●□ ● ●

How to construct a large family  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$ , satisfying  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) < s$ ?

$$\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) := \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : A \cap [s-1] \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s) := \binom{[sk-1]}{k}.$$

We have  $|\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) = {n \choose k} - {n-s+1 \choose k}$ ,  $|\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)| = {sk-1 \choose k}$ .

### The Erdős Matching Conjecture, 1965 For $n \ge sk$ we have

$$e_k(n,s) = \max\{|\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s)|, |\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)|\}.$$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Put } x:=s/n. \text{ If } k \text{ is fixed and } s \to \infty: & |\mathcal{A}|/\binom{n}{k} \to 1-(1-x)^k, \\ & |\mathcal{B}|/\binom{n}{k} \to (kx)^k. \end{array}$ 

#### ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ ●□ ● ●

How to construct a large family  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$ , satisfying  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) < s$ ?

$$\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) := \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : A \cap [s-1] \neq \emptyset \right\}, \quad \mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s) := \binom{[sk-1]}{k}.$$

We have  $|\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s) = {n \choose k} - {n-s+1 \choose k}$ ,  $|\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)| = {sk-1 \choose k}$ .

## The Erdős Matching Conjecture, 1965 For $n \ge sk$ we have

$$e_k(n,s) = \max\{|\mathcal{A}^{(k)}(n,s)|, |\mathcal{B}^{(k)}(n,s)|\}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ● ●

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Put } x := s/n. \text{ If } k \text{ is fixed and } s \to \infty: & |\mathcal{A}|/\binom{n}{k} \to 1 - (1-x)^k, \\ & |\mathcal{B}|/\binom{n}{k} \to (kx)^k. \end{array}$ 

### Asymptotic fractional version of the EMC.

A fractional matching for  $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[n]}$ : a function  $w : \mathcal{F} \to [0,1]$ , such that

$$\sum_{F\in \mathcal{F}: i\in F} w(F) \leqslant 1 \quad \ \text{for every element } i\in [n].$$

Fractional matching number  $\nu^*(\mathcal{F})$ : the size of the

the size of the largest fractional matching in  $\ensuremath{\mathcal{F}}.$ 

Conjecture A (Alon et. al., 2012) Let  $x \in [0, 1/k]$  be fixed and let  $\mathcal{F}_n \subset {[n] \choose k}$  be a sequence of families such that  $\nu^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq xn$ . Then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{\binom{n}{k}} \leq \max\left\{1 - (1 - x)^k, (kx)^k\right\}.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ ▲□ ◆ ��や

### Asymptotic fractional version of the EMC.

A fractional matching for  $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{[n]}$ : a function  $w : \mathcal{F} \to [0,1]$ , such that

$$\sum_{F\in \mathcal{F}: i\in F} w(F) \leqslant 1 \quad \ \text{for every element } i\in [n].$$

Fractional matching number  $\nu^*(\mathcal{F})$ :

the size of the largest fractional matching in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

#### Conjecture A (Alon et. al., 2012)

Let  $x \in [0, 1/k]$  be fixed and let  $\mathcal{F}_n \subset {[n] \choose k}$  be a sequence of families such that  $\nu^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq xn$ . Then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{\binom{n}{k}} \leq \max\left\{1 - (1 - x)^k, (kx)^k\right\}.$$

### Deviation of sums of random variables

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{X} &:= (X_1, \dots, X_k): \ X_i \geqslant 0 \text{ are i.i.d. random variables, } \mathbf{E}[X_i] = x. \\ & m_k(x) := \sup_{\mathbf{X}} \Pr[X_1 + \ldots + X_k \geqslant 1]. \end{split}$$

Note:  $m_k(x) = 1$  for  $x \ge 1/k$ .

Conjecture B (Łuczak, Mieczkowska, Šileikis, 2017)

$$m_k(x) = \max\left\{1 - (1 - x)^k, (kx)^k\right\}.$$

Case k = 2 was resolved by Hoeffding and Shrikhande (1955).

Related conjectures of Samuels (1966) and Feige (2006) speak about random variables that are not necessarily identically distributed. Results of Samuels (1966, 1968) imply Conjecture B for k = 3, 4.

#### (ロ)、

### Deviation of sums of random variables

 $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_k)$ :  $X_i \ge 0$  are i.i.d. random variables,  $\mathbf{E}[X_i] = x$ .

$$m_k(x) := \sup_{\mathbf{X}} \Pr[X_1 + \ldots + X_k \ge 1].$$

Note:  $m_k(x) = 1$  for  $x \ge 1/k$ .

Conjecture B (Łuczak, Mieczkowska, Šileikis, 2017)

$$m_k(x) = \max\left\{1 - (1 - x)^k, (kx)^k\right\}.$$

Case k = 2 was resolved by Hoeffding and Shrikhande (1955). Related conjectures of Samuels (1966) and Feige (2006) speak about random variables that are not necessarily identically distributed. Results of Samuels (1966, 1968) imply Conjecture B for k = 3, 4.

#### Conjectures A and B are equivalent

(Alon, Frankl, Huang, Rödl, Ruciński, Sudakov, 2012)

**Conjecture B**  $\Rightarrow$  **Conjecture A.** Take the largest  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\nu^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq xn$ . By LP-duality:  $(\nu^* = \tau^*)$  there exists  $w : [n] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that

$$\sum_{i\in [n]} w(i) = xn, \quad ext{and} \quad \sum_{i\in F} w(i) \geqslant 1 ext{ for every } F\in \mathcal{F}.$$

Define a random variable: w(t) for a randomly chosen  $t \in [n]$ . Form  $\mathbf{v} := (w(t_1), \dots, w(t_k))$ . Then

$$m_k(x) \ge \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^k w(t_i) \ge 1\right] \gtrsim \Pr[\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}] = \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

#### What do we know about EMC?

True for k = 2 (Erdős and Gallai, 1959) True for k = 3 (Luczak and Mieczkowska, 2014, for large s; Frankl, 2017, for all s). True for  $n > n_0(s, k)$ (Erdős, 1965) True for  $n > 2k^3s$ (Bollobás, Daykin, Erdős, 1976) True for  $n > 100 ks^2$ (Frankl, Füredi, 1987) True for  $n > 3k^2s$ (Huang, Loh, Sudakov, 2012) True for  $n \ge (2s-1)k - s$  (Frankl, 2013) Connections to large deviation bounds, frac versions (Alon et. al. 2012)

Equivalence of Conjectures A, B (Łuczak, Mieczkowska, Šileikis, 2017)  $e_k(n,s) \leq (s-1) \binom{n-1}{k-1}$  (Frankl, 1987)

#### What do we know about EMC?

True for k = 2 (Erdős and Gallai, 1959) True for k = 3 (Luczak and Mieczkowska, 2014, for large s; Frankl, 2017, for all s). True for  $n > n_0(s, k)$ (Erdős, 1965) True for  $n > 2k^3s$ (Bollobás, Daykin, Erdős, 1976) True for  $n > 100 ks^2$ (Frankl, Füredi, 1987) True for  $n > 3k^2s$ (Huang, Loh, Sudakov, 2012) True for  $n \ge (2s-1)k - s$  (Frankl, 2013) Connections to large deviation bounds, frac versions (Alon et. al. 2012) Equivalence of Conjectures A, B (Łuczak, Mieczkowska, Šileikis, 2017)

 $e_k(n,s) \leq (s-1)\binom{n-1}{k-1}$  (Frankl, 1987)

# **New results**

#### Theorem (AK, Frankl, 2018+)

There exists  $s_0$  such that the EMC is true for  $s \ge s_0$ , any k and  $n \ge \frac{5}{3}sk - \frac{2}{3}s$ .

Consequently, Conjectures A and B hold for  $x < \frac{3}{5k-2}$ . Previous best due to the equivalence and the result of Frankl:  $x < \frac{1}{2k-1}$ .

We also get a bound  $e_k(n,s) \leq c(s-1)\binom{n-1}{k-1}$ , where c < 1 and depends on sk/n.

# **Dirac-type thresholds**

 $m_k^d(n)$   $(f_k^d(n))$ : minimum *d*-degree in  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$  that guarantees the existence of a perfect (fractional) matching.

Theorem (Alon et. al., 2012; Treglown and Zhao, 2016) If  $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f_k^d(n)/\binom{n-d}{k-d}=c^*$ , then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} m_k^d(n) / \binom{n-d}{k-d} = \max\{\boldsymbol{c^*}, 1/2\}.$$

If  $c^* < 1/2$ , then we know  $m_k^d(n)$  exactly for large n. Also,

$$f_k^d(n) \leqslant e_{k-d}(n, n/k) + 1.$$

#### Corollary (Kupavskii, Frankl, 2018+)

Determination of  $c^*$  for  $d \ge 2k/5$ ; exact values of  $m_k^d(n)$  for  $d \ge 3k/8$ .

Previous best: for  $d \ge k/2$ : Pikhurko (2008) for  $d \le k-2$ ; Rödl, Ruciński, Szemerédi (2006) for d = k - 1.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

# Dirac-type thresholds

 $m_k^d(n)$   $(f_k^d(n))$ : minimum *d*-degree in  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$  that guarantees the existence of a perfect (fractional) matching.

Theorem (Alon et. al., 2012; Treglown and Zhao, 2016) If  $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f_k^d(n)/\binom{n-d}{k-d}=c^*$ , then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} m_k^d(n) / \binom{n-d}{k-d} = \max\{\boldsymbol{c^*}, 1/2\}.$$

If  $c^* < 1/2$ , then we know  $m_k^d(n)$  exactly for large n. Also,

$$f_k^d(n) \leqslant e_{k-d}(n, n/k) + 1.$$

#### Corollary (Kupavskii, Frankl, 2018+)

Determination of  $c^*$  for  $d \ge 2k/5$ ; exact values of  $m_k^d(n)$  for  $d \ge 3k/8$ .

Previous best: for  $d \ge k/2$ : Pikhurko (2008) for  $d \le k-2$ ; Rödl, Ruciński, Szemerédi (2006) for d = k - 1.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ● ●

# **Proof ingredients**

Take the approach of Frankl as a base. The original approach uses:

- 1. Shifting.
- 2. Shadows of families with small matching numbers.
- 3. Inequality on the sum of sizes of cross-dependent families.

We add the following ingredients:

- 4. Better bounds on shadows.
- 5. Concentration inequalities for intersections of families and matchings.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

6. Induction

# **Proof ingredients**

Take the approach of Frankl as a base. The original approach uses:

- 1. Shifting.
- 2. Shadows of families with small matching numbers.
- 3. Inequality on the sum of sizes of cross-dependent families.

We add the following ingredients:

- 4. Better bounds on shadows.
- 5. Concentration inequalities for intersections of families and matchings.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

6. Induction

# **Proof ingredients**

Take the approach of Frankl as a base. The original approach uses:

- 1. Shifting.
- 2. Shadows of families with small matching numbers.
- 3. Inequality on the sum of sizes of cross-dependent families.

We add the following ingredients:

- 4. Better bounds on shadows.
- 5. Concentration inequalities for intersections of families and matchings.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

6. Induction.

## A concentration inequality

Consider a family  $\mathcal{F} \subset {\binom{[n]}{k}}$  for n = kt of *density*  $\alpha := |\mathcal{F}|/{\binom{n}{k}}$ . Take a *t*-matching  $\mathcal{M} \subset {\binom{[n]}{k}}$  uniformly at random. Define a random variable  $\eta := |\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{F}|$ . Then  $E[\eta] = \alpha t$ .

Theorem (AK, Frankl, 2018+) For any  $\beta > 0$ , we have  $\Pr\left[|\eta - \alpha t| \ge 2\beta\sqrt{t}\right] \le 2e^{-\beta^2/2}$ .

# **Proof outline**

Assume  $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_t\}$ . We have  $\eta = \eta_1 + \ldots + \eta_t$ , where  $\eta_i$  indicates if  $M_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Define a martingale  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$ , where  $X_i := E[\eta \mid \eta_i, \ldots, \eta_1]$ .

Note that  $X_0 = E[X_0]$  and  $X_t = \eta$ .

Assume  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any *i*.

Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (1963, 1967)

If  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$  is a martingale and  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any  $i \in [t]$ , then  $\Pr\left[|X_t - X_0| \ge 2\beta\sqrt{t}\right] \leq 2e^{-\beta^2/2}$ .

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

# **Proof outline**

Assume  $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_t\}$ . We have  $\eta = \eta_1 + \ldots + \eta_t$ , where  $\eta_i$  indicates if  $M_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Define a martingale  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$ , where  $X_i := E[\eta \mid \eta_i, \ldots, \eta_1]$ .

Note that  $X_0 = E[X_0]$  and  $X_t = \eta$ .

Assume  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any *i*.

#### Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (1963, 1967)

If  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$  is a martingale and  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any  $i \in [t]$ , then  $\Pr\left[|X_t - X_0| \ge 2\beta\sqrt{t}\right] \leq 2e^{-\beta^2/2}$ .

# **Proof outline**

Assume  $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_t\}$ . We have  $\eta = \eta_1 + \ldots + \eta_t$ , where  $\eta_i$  indicates if  $M_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Define a martingale  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$ , where  $X_i := \mathbb{E}[\eta \mid \eta_i, \ldots, \eta_1]$ .

Note that  $X_0 = \mathbb{E}[X_0]$  and  $X_t = \eta$ .

Assume  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any *i*. Why?

#### Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (1963, 1967)

If  $X_0, \ldots, X_t$  is a martingale and  $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$  for any  $i \in [t]$ , then  $\Pr\left[|X_t - X_0| \ge 2\beta\sqrt{t}\right] \le 2e^{-\beta^2/2}$ .

## **Proof of** $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$ for any *i*

$$\begin{split} Y_{i-1} &:= \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i := \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid \eta_i, M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}]. \\ \text{It is sufficient to show } |Y_i - Y_{i-1}| \leqslant 2. \end{split}$$

Fix  $M_1, \ldots, M_{i-1}$ , put  $S := [n] \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j)$  and consider  $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F} \cap {S \choose k}$ .

Kneser graph  $KG_{S,k}$ : vertices —  $\binom{S}{k}$ , edges — pairwise disjoint sets.  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \binom{S}{k}$  gives an induced subgraph of  $KG_{S,k}$ .

Denote  $\alpha' := |\mathcal{F}'|/{\binom{|S|}{k}}$ ,  $e(\mathcal{F}')$ : proportion of edges of  $KG_{S,k}$  contained inside the subgraph induced on  $\mathcal{F}'$ .

## **Proof of** $|X_i - X_{i-1}| \leq 2$ for any *i*

$$\begin{split} Y_{i-1} &:= \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i := \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid \eta_i, M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}]. \\ \text{It is sufficient to show } |Y_i - Y_{i-1}| \leqslant 2. \end{split}$$

Fix  $M_1, \ldots, M_{i-1}$ , put  $S := [n] \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^{i-1} M_j)$  and consider  $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F} \cap {S \choose k}$ .

Kneser graph  $KG_{S,k}$ : vertices —  $\binom{S}{k}$ , edges — pairwise disjoint sets.  $\mathcal{F}' \subset \binom{S}{k}$  gives an induced subgraph of  $KG_{S,k}$ .

Denote  $\alpha' := |\mathcal{F}'|/{\binom{|S|}{k}}$ ,  $e(\mathcal{F}')$ : proportion of edges of  $KG_{S,k}$  contained inside the subgraph induced on  $\mathcal{F}'$ .

$$\begin{split} Y_{i-1} &:= \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i := \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid \eta_i, M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}].\\ \frac{Y_{i-1}}{t-i+1} &= \alpha' \quad (\text{``the density of } \mathcal{F}''') \end{split}$$

 $Y_i$ : random variable with two values.

If  $\eta_i = 1$ , then  $\frac{Y_i - 1}{t - i} = \frac{2e(\mathcal{F}')}{\alpha'}$  ("the average degree of  $\mathcal{F}''$ ")

 $\lambda'$ : the second largest absolute value of an eigenvalue of  $KG_{S,k}$ .

We use the Alon-Chung bound:

$$\left|\frac{2e(\mathcal{F}')}{\alpha'} - \alpha'\right| \leqslant \frac{\lambda(1-\alpha')}{d}.$$

In Kneser graphs:  $\frac{\lambda}{d} = \frac{1}{t-i}$ . Therefore,

$$|Y_i - Y_{i-1}| \leqslant 2.$$

Similar for  $\eta_i = 0$ 

$$\begin{split} Y_{i-1} &:= \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}] \quad \text{and} \quad Y_i := \mathrm{E}[\eta \mid \eta_i, M_1, \dots, M_{i-1}].\\ \frac{Y_{i-1}}{t-i\perp 1} &= \alpha' \quad (\text{``the density of } \mathcal{F}''') \end{split}$$

 $Y_i$ : random variable with two values.

If  $\eta_i = 1$ , then  $\frac{Y_i - 1}{t - i} = \frac{2e(\mathcal{F}')}{\alpha'}$  ("the average degree of  $\mathcal{F}''$ ")  $\lambda'$ : the second largest absolute value of an eigenvalue of  $KG_{S,k}$ . We use the Alon-Chung bound:

$$\left|\frac{2e(\mathcal{F}')}{\alpha'} - \alpha'\right| \leqslant \frac{\lambda(1-\alpha')}{d}.$$

In Kneser graphs:  $\frac{\lambda}{d} = \frac{1}{t-i}$ . Therefore,

$$|Y_i - Y_{i-1}| \leq 2.$$

Similar for  $\eta_i = 0$ 

#### Theorem (AK, Frankl, 2018+)

There exists  $s_0$  such that the following holds. Fix  $s \ge s_0$ , k and  $n \ge \frac{5}{3}sk - \frac{2}{3}s$ . Then any family  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$  with  $\nu(\mathcal{F}) < s$  satisfies

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leqslant \binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-s+1}{k}.$$

#### Theorem (AK, Frankl, 2018+)

Take  $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$  and n = kt. Fix  $\mathcal{F} \subset {[n] \choose k}$  of density  $\alpha$ . For any  $\beta > 0$  the random variable  $\eta := |\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{F}|$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  is randomly chosen *t*-matching, satisfies

$$\Pr\left[|\eta - \alpha t| \ge 2\beta\sqrt{t}\right] \le 2e^{-\beta^2/2}.$$