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#### Abstract

Let $q$ be a prime power. It is shown that for any hypergraph $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{1}, \ldots, F_{d(q-1)+1}\right\}$ whose maximal degree is $d$, there exists $\varnothing \neq \mathscr{F}_{0} \subset \mathscr{F}$, such that $\left|\bigcup_{F \in \mathscr{F}} F\right| \equiv 0(\bmod q)$.


For integers $d, m \geq 1$ let $f_{d}(m)$ denote the minimal $t$ such that for any hypergraph $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{1}, \ldots, F_{t}\right\}$ whose maximal degree is $d$, there exists $\varnothing \neq \mathscr{F}_{0} \subset \mathscr{F}$, such that $\| \bigcup_{F \in \mathscr{F}_{0}} F \mid \equiv 0(\bmod m)$.

Here we determine $f_{d}(m)$ when $m$ is a prime power, and remark on the general case.

Example. Let $A_{i j} 1 \leq i \leq m-1,1 \leq j \leq d$, be pairwise disjoint sets, each of cardinality $m$, and let $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{m-1}\right\}$ be disjoint from all the $A_{i j}$ 's. Now $\mathscr{F}=\left\{A_{i j} \cup\left\{v_{i}\right\}\right.$ : $1 \leq i \leq m-1,1 \leq j \leq d\}$ satisfies $|\mathscr{F}|=d(m-1)$ but $\left|\bigcup_{F \in \mathscr{F _ { 0 }}}\right| \neq 0(\bmod m)$ for any $\varnothing \neq \mathscr{F}_{0} \subset \mathscr{F}$. Hence $f_{d}(m) \geq d(m-1)+1$.

Theorem 1. If $q$ is a prime power than $f_{d}(q)=d(q-1)+1$.
Proof. Let $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{1}, \ldots, F_{t}\right\}, t=d(q-1)+1$, be a hypergraph of degree $\leq d$, and consider the polynomial:

$$
p\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right)=\sum_{\varnothing \neq I \subset[t]}(-1)^{|I|+1} \cdot\left|\bigcap_{i \in I} F_{i}\right| \cdot \prod_{i \in I} x_{i} .
$$

We shall need the following result of Baker and Schmidt [2]. We sketch a short proof based on a method of Alon, Friedland and Kalai [1]:

Theorem 2 (Baker-Schmidt [2]). Let $q=p^{r}, p$ prime. If $t \geq d(q-1)+1$ and $h\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right) \in Z\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ satisfies $h(0)=0$, and $\operatorname{deg} h \leq d$, then there exists an $0 \neq \varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$ such that $h(\varepsilon) \equiv 0(\bmod q)$.

Proof. Suppose $h(\varepsilon) \not \equiv 0(\bmod q)$ for all $0 \neq \varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$, and let $u(x)=\prod_{i=1}^{q-1}(h(x)-i)$. Denote by $s$ the smallest power of $p$ that does not divide $(q-1)$ !, i.e., $s=$ $p \cdot \max \left\{p^{r} ; p^{r} \mid(q-1)!\right\}$.

The proof of the following simple fact is omitted:
Lemma 1. For every integer $a, \prod_{i=1}^{q-1}(a-i) \equiv 0(\bmod s) i f f a \neq 0(\bmod q)$.
By Lemma $1 u(\varepsilon) \equiv 0(\bmod s)$ for all $0 \neq \varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$, and $u(0) \neq 0(\bmod s)$. Let $\bar{u}(x)$ denote the multilinear polynomial obtained from $u(x)$ by replacing each monomial $x_{i_{1}}{ }^{\alpha_{1}} \ldots x_{i_{j}}{ }^{\alpha_{j}}, \alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{j} \geq 1$, by $x_{i_{1}} \ldots x_{i_{j}}$.

The following Lemma can be easily proved by induction on $t$ :
Lemma 2 [1]. If $g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right)$ is a multilinear polynomial in $Z\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ and $g(\varepsilon) \equiv 0$ $(\bmod s)$ for all $\varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$, then $g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod s)$

Now $g(x)=\bar{u}(x)-u(0) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{t}\left(1-x_{i}\right)$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2, hence $\bar{u}(x) \equiv u(0) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{t}\left(1-x_{i}\right)(\bmod s)$, and so $\operatorname{deg} \bar{u} \geq t$. But $\operatorname{deg} \bar{u} \leq \operatorname{deg} u=(\operatorname{deg}$ $h)^{q-1} \leq d(q-1)<t$, a contradiction.

Returning to the proof of Theorem 1, we note that $\operatorname{deg} p \leq d$ and $p(0)=0$. Hence by Theorem $2 p(\varepsilon) \equiv 0(\bmod q)$ for some $0 \neq \varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$. Now by Inclusion-Exclusion $p(\varepsilon)=\left|\bigcup_{\left\{i: \varepsilon_{i}=1\right\}} F_{i}\right|$, and so $\left|\bigcup_{\left\{i: \varepsilon_{i}=1\right\}} F_{i}\right| \equiv 0(\bmod q)$.
Following [2] let $g_{d}(m)$ denote the minimal $t$ such that for any $h \in Z\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ which satisfies $h(0)=0$, and $\operatorname{deg} h \leq d$, there exists an $0 \neq \varepsilon \in\{0,1\}^{t}$ such that $h(\varepsilon) \equiv 0(\bmod m)$. The proof of Theorem 1 shows that $f_{d}(m) \leq g_{d}(m)$. Hence Theorem 6 in [2], implies that for any $m, f_{d}(m) \leq C(d) \cdot m^{2^{d} d!}$.

We next prove the following proposition that shows that the number theoretic problem of determining $g_{d}(m)$ is equivalent to the combinatorial problem of determining $f_{d}(m)$.

Proposition. $f_{d}(m)=g_{d}(m)$.
Proof. It suffices to show that for any multilinear polynomial $h \in Z_{m}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ of degree $\leq d$ which satisfies $h(0)=0$, there exists a hypergraph $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{1}, \ldots, F_{t}\right\}$ of degree $\leq d$ such that $h$ is realized by $\mathscr{F}$, i.e.,

$$
h\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right)=\sum_{\varnothing \neq I \subset[t]}(-1)^{|I|+1} \cdot\left|\bigcap_{i \in I} F_{i}\right| \cdot \prod_{i \in I} x_{i}(\bmod m) .
$$

For any $\varnothing \neq J \subset[t]$, the polynomial

$$
u_{J}(x)=1-\prod_{j \in J}\left(1-x_{j}\right)=\sum_{\nexists \neq I \subset J}(-1)^{|I|+1} \cdot \prod_{i \in I} x_{i}
$$

can clearly be realized by a hypergraph with maximal degree $|J|$. (Simply take $|J|$ pairwise disjoint sets of size $m$ each and add a common point to all of them). To complete the proof it suffices to show that if $h$ and $g$ are realized by hypergraphs of degree $\leq d$, then so is $h+g$, and that any multilinear polynomial of degree $\leq d$ in $Z_{m}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ that vanishes at 0 can be written as a linear combination (with $Z_{m}$ coefficients) of $u_{J}$ 's with $J \subset[t]$ and $0<|J| \leq d$.

If $h$ is realized by the hypergraph $\mathscr{H}=\left\{H_{1}, \ldots, H_{t_{1}}\right\}$ and $g$ is realized by $\mathscr{G}=\left\{G_{1}, \ldots, G_{t_{2}}\right\}$ and the degrees of both hypergraphs are at most $d$ we first observe that we may assume that $t_{1}=t_{2}$ since otherwise we can add sufficiently many empty edges to one of the hypergraphs. Put $t=t_{1}=t_{2}$, assume the hypergraphs are realized on pairwise disjoint sets of vertices, and consider the hypergraph $\mathscr{F}=$ $\left\{H_{1} \cup G_{1}, \ldots, H_{t} \cup G_{t}\right\}$. It is easy to check that this hypergraph realizes the polynomial $h+g$.

It remains to show that any multilinear polynomial of degree $\leq d$ in $Z_{m}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right]$ that vanishes at 0 can be written as a linear combination (with $Z_{m}$ coefficients) of $u_{J}$ 's with $J \subset[t]$ and $0<|J| \leq d$. Each such polynomial can obviously be written as a linear combination of the above polynomials $u_{J}$ and 1 . However, the coefficient of 1 must be 0 since our polynomial, as well as all the polynomials $u_{J}$ vanish when all the variables are 0 .

It is worth mentioning that some (very weak) upper bounds for $f_{a}(m)$ can be obtained by applying Ramsey Theory. By the last proposition the same bounds follow for $g_{d}(m)$. Although these estimates are (much) weaker than the best known bounds for $g_{d}(m)$ this shows that it is conceivable that the number theoretic function $g_{d}(m)$ can be studied be purely combinatorial methods.

We conclude the note mentioning that by considering the dual of our Theorem 1 (or by applying a similar proof) we can prove the following result, whose detailed proof is left to the reader.

Theorem 3. If $q$ is a prime power then any hypergraph with $n>(q-1) d$ vertices and with e edges, each of size at most d, contains an induced sub-hypergraph on less than $n$ vertices whose number of edges is congruent to e modulo $q$.
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