

## Note

### On $r$ -Cover-free Families

ZOLTÁN FÜREDI

*Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,  
Urbana, Illinois 61801 and Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,  
P.O.B. 127, Budapest, 1364 Hungary*

*Communicated by the Managing Editors*

Received January 12, 1995

A very short proof is presented for the almost best upper bound for the size of an  $r$ -cover-free family over  $n$  elements. © 1996 Academic Press, Inc.

A family of sets  $\mathcal{F}$  is called  $r$ -cover-free if  $A_0 \not\subseteq A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_r$  holds for all distinct  $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $T(n, r)$  denote the maximum cardinality of such an  $\mathcal{F}$  over an  $n$ -element underlying set. This notion was introduced by Kautz and Singleton [4] in 1964 concerning binary codes. They proved  $\Omega(1/r^2) \leq \log T(n, r)/n \leq O(1/r)$  (log is always of base 2). This result was rediscovered several times in information theory, in combinatorics [2], and in group testing [3]. A recent account and related problems can be found in Körner [5]. Dyachkov and Rykov [1] obtained with a rather involved proof that  $\log T(n, r)/n \leq O(\log r/r^2)$ . Recently, Ruszinkó [6] gave a purely combinatorial proof. Our aim is to present an even simpler argument to show that

$$\frac{\log T(n, r)}{n} \leq \frac{4 \log r + O(1)}{r^2}. \quad (1)$$

This upper bound is twice as good as that of [6], but about half as good as that obtained from the inductive proof of [1]. Our argument is implicitly contained in Erdős, Frankl, and Füredi [2].

**THEOREM.** *If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of subsets of an  $n$ -element underlying set  $V$  such that no set  $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  is contained in the union of  $r$  other members of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq r + \binom{n}{(n-r)/\binom{r+1}{2}}. \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* Fix an integer  $t$  with  $n/2 \geq t > 0$ . Define  $\mathcal{F}_t \subset \mathcal{F}$  as the family of members having its own  $t$ -subset, i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_t := \{F \in \mathcal{F} : \text{there exists a } t\text{-element set } A \subseteq F \text{ such that } A \not\subseteq F' \text{ holds for every other } F' \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the family of these  $t$ -subsets. Let  $\mathcal{F}_0 := \{F \in \mathcal{F} : |F| < t\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the family of  $t$ -sets containing a member of  $\mathcal{F}_0$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{B} := \{T : T \subset V, |T| = t, \text{ and there exists some } F \in \mathcal{F}_0 \text{ with } T \supset F\}$ . The set-system  $\mathcal{F}$  is an *antichain*; no two members contain each other. This implies that  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are disjoint. A lemma of Sperner [7] states that  $|\mathcal{F}_0| \leq |\mathcal{B}|$ . We obtain that  $|\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_t| \leq |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}| \leq \binom{n}{t}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F} \setminus (\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_t)$ . We claim that  $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ ,  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_i \in \mathcal{F}$  imply

$$\left| F \setminus \bigcup_{j \leq i} F_j \right| > t(r-i). \quad (3)$$

Indeed, if  $F \setminus (F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_i)$  can be written as the union of the  $t$ -element sets  $A_{i+1}, A_{i+2}, \dots, A_r$ , then by the choice of  $F$  there are members  $F \neq F_j \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $A_j \subseteq F_j$ . Therefore  $F \subset (F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_r)$ , a contradiction.

Inequality (3) implies that for  $F_0, F_1, \dots, F_r \in \mathcal{F}'$  one has  $|\bigcup_{i \leq r} F_i| = |F_0| + |F_1 \setminus F_0| + |F_2 \setminus (F_1 \cup F_0)| + \dots + |F_r \setminus (F_0 \cup F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_{r-1})| \geq r + 1 + t \binom{r+1}{2}$ . Here the right-hand side exceeds  $n$  for  $t := \lceil (n-r) / \binom{r+1}{2} \rceil$ , implying  $|\mathcal{F}'| \leq r$ . ■

Finally, the upper bound (1) easily follows from (2) using  $\binom{n}{t} \leq n^t/t! < (en/t)^t$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by grants OTKA 4269 and OTKA 016389 from the Hungarian National Science Foundation and by a National Security Agency grant No. MDA 904-95-H-1045.

#### REFERENCES

1. A. G. DYACHKOV AND V. V. RYKOV, Bounds on the length of disjunctive codes, *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* **18**, No. 3 (1982), 7–13. [Russian]
2. P. ERDŐS, P. FRANKL, AND Z. FÜREDI, Families of finite sets in which no set is covered by the union of  $r$  others, *Israel J. Math.* **51** (1985), 79–89.
3. F. K. HWANG AND V. T. SÓS, Non-adaptive hypergeometric group testing, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **22** (1987), 257–263.
4. W. H. KAUTZ AND R. C. SINGLETON, Nonrandom binary superimposed codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **10** (1964), 363–377.
5. J. KÖRNER, On the extremal combinatorics of the Hamming space, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **71** (1995), 112–126.
6. M. RUSZINKÓ, On the upper bound of the size of the  $r$ -cover-free families, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **66** (1994), 302–310.
7. E. SPERNER, Ein Satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menge, *Math. Z.* **27** (1928), 544–548.