Pacific Journal of Mathematics

A REFINEMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM ON THE DENSITY OF THE SUM OF TWO SETS OF INTEGERS

HENRY B. MANN

Vol. 10, No. 3 November 1960

A REFINEMENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM ON THE DENSITY OF THE SUM OF TWO SETS OF INTEGERS

H. B. MANN

Let $A = \{a_0 < a_1 < \cdots\}$ be a set of integers and let $A(n)$ be the number of integers in A not exceeding n. If A, B are two such sets, we put $A + B = \{a + b\}$, where a denotes generically an element of A, b an element of B. It should be noted that A and B may contain negative numbers or zero and that these are counted in $A(n)$ and $B(n)$.

Erdoes in an unpublished paper proved:

If $\lim_{m\to\infty}(A(m)/m) = \lim_{m\to\infty}(B(m)/m) = 0$, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there are infinitely many x such that if $C = A + B$ then

$$C(x) \geq A(x)(1 - \varepsilon) + B(x) .$$

Clearly there are then also infinitely many y such that

$$C(y) \geq A(y) + B(y)(1 - \varepsilon) .$$

Erdoes conjectured that it is possible to choose infinitely many $x = y$.

At the Number Theory Conference in Boulder, Colorado, Erdoes proposed this problem to the author. It is clear that the Fundamental Theorem [3] is inadequate to deal with this problem, because it fails if $1 \notin C$. The search for a stronger theorem finally led the author to Theorem 2. Theorem 3 is a consequence of Theorem 2 and is considerably stronger than Erdoes conjecture.

THEOREM 1. *Let $a_0 = b_0 = 0$. If $n \geq 0$, $n \notin C$ then there is an $m \notin C$, $m = n$ or $m < (n/2)$, such that*

(1)
$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} \geq \frac{A(m) + B(m) - 1}{m+1} + \left(C(n - m - 1) - \frac{C(n)}{n+1}(n - m)\right)\frac{1}{m+1} .$$

For the proof of Theorem 1, we consider the following transformation: Let $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_r = n$ be the gaps in C. Form $d_i = n - n_i$. Choose, if possible, a fixed number $e \in B$ such that an equation

$$a + e + d_i = n_j \tag{2}$$

holds for some i. Let the set B' consist of all numbers $e + d_s$ for which

Received July 20, 1959.

an equation $a + e + d_s = n_t$ holds with some value of a. Form $B^* = B^*(e) = B \cup B'$, $C^* = A + B^*$. The following propositions are easily seen to hold.

PROPOSITION 1. $n \notin C^*$.

Proof. The equation $a + e + d_s = n$ implies $a + e = n_s$, which is impossible since $e \in B$.

PROPOSITION 2. $B' \cap B$ is empty.

Proof. The equation $a + e + d_s = n_t$ shows that $e + d_s \notin B$.

PROPOSITION 3. $C^*(n) - C(n) = B^*(n) - B(n)$.

Proof. The equation $a + e + d_s = n_t$ implies $a + e + d_t = n_s$. Hence if $n_s \in C^*$ then $e + d_s \in B^1$ and vice versa.

PROPOSITION 4. All numbers of B' are larger than e.

Proof. B' consists of numbers of the form $e + d_s$, $d_s > 0$.

$B^*(e)$ is called the fundamental e transform of B.

We now construct numbers $e_1, \cdots, e_k$ and sets $B = B_0, B_1, \cdots, B_k$, $C = C_0, C_1, \cdots, C_k$ by the following rules:

Rule 1. B_j is the fundamental e_j transform of B_{j-1}.

Rule 2. $A + B_j = C_j$.

Rule 3. e_j is the smallest number in B_{j-1} such that an equation

$$a+e_j+d_s=n_t\,,\quad a \in A,\ n_s,\ n_t \notin C_{j-1}$$

holds.

Rule 4. $a + e + d_s \neq n_t$ for any $a \in A, e \in B_k, n_s, n_t \notin C_k$.

We then have

PROPOSITION 5. $e_1 < e_2 < \cdots < e_k$.

Proof. We have $a+e_j+d_s = n_t$; $a \in A$, n_s, $n_t \notin C_{j-1}$, $e_j \in B_{j-1}$. If $e_j \notin B_{j-2}$ then $e_j > e_{j-1}$(Prop. 4). If $e_j \in B_{j-2}$ then since $C_{j-1} \supset C_{j-2}$ the inequality $e_j < e_{j-1}$ contradicts rule 3, while $e_j = e_{j-1}$ implies $n_s, n_t \in C_{j-1}$.

For any set A put

$$A(m, n) = A(n) - A(m - 1)\,. \tag{3}$$

LEMMA 1. *Let n_s be the least gap in C_k, then*

$$\begin{aligned} B_k(n_s) - B(n_s) &= C_k(d_s, n) - C(d_s, n) \\ &= n_s - C(d_s, n)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Proof. Let $d_{r-1}, \cdots, d_{r-q}, \leq n_s, d_{r-q-1} > n_s$ where we formally set $d_0 = n + 1$. If $d_j \leq n_s$ then $n_s - d_j \in C_k$, $n_s - d_j = a + b^*$, $b^* \in B_k$. Hence by rule 4 we have $n_j \in C_k$. But $d_j \leq n_s$ implies $d_s \leq n_j$ hence

$$C_k(d_s, n) - C(d_s, n) = q . \tag{5}$$

Moreover C_k contains all numbers x for which $d_s \leq x < n$, but does not contain n so that $C_k(d_s, n) = n - (d_s - 1) - 1 = n_s$.

On the other hand if $n_j \in C_\alpha$, $n_j \notin C_{\alpha-1}$ then $e_\alpha + d_j \in B_\alpha$, $e_\alpha + d_j \notin B_{\alpha-1}$, (Prop. 2). If $d_j \leq n_s$ and $e_\alpha + d_j > n_s$ then

$$e_\alpha > n_s - d_j = a + b^*, b^* \in B_k .$$

By Prop. 4 and 5, $b^* \in B_{\alpha-1}$ and $e_\alpha > b^*$ contradicts rule 3. Hence

$$B_k(n_s) - B(n_s) = q . \tag{6}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

We are now prepared for the proof of Theorem 1. Since n_s is not in C_k no number of the form $n_s - a$ is in B_k and therefore

$$n_s + 1 \geq A(n_s) + B_k(n_s) . \tag{7}$$

Subtracting 4 from 7 we get

$$C(n) \geq C(d_s - 1) + A(n_s) + B(n_s) - 1$$

which after some simple algebra gives

$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} \geq \frac{A(n_s) + B(n_s) - 1}{n_s + 1} + \left(C(d_s - 1) - \frac{C(n)}{n+1} d_s\right)\frac{1}{n_s + 1} .$$

Finally if $n_s < n$ then because of rule 4 we must have $n_s < d_s = n - n_s$, $n_s < n/2$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

THEOREM II. *Let $A + B = C$, $a_0 = b_0 = 0$, $n \geq 0$. Then either $C(n) = n + 1$ or there exist numbers m, m_1 satisfying the conditions*

$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} \geq \frac{A(m) + B(m) - 1}{m + 1} + \left| \frac{C(n)}{n+1} - \frac{C(m_1)}{m_1 + 1} \right|$$

$$m \notin C, m \leq n, m_1 \notin C, m_1 \leq \max(m, n - m - 1) .$$

Proof. The theorem is true if $n = 0$. Hence we can apply induction on n. If for any $m \notin C$, $m < n$ we have $C(n)/(n+1) \geq C(m)/(m+1)$ then by induction

$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} = \left|\frac{C(n)}{n+1} - \frac{C(m)}{m+1}\right| + \frac{C(m)}{m+1}$$

$$\geq \left|\frac{C(n)}{n+1} - \frac{C(m)}{m+1}\right| + \frac{A(m_1) + B(m_1) - 1}{m_1 + 1}$$

$$+ \left|\frac{C(m)}{m+1} - \frac{C(m_2)}{m_2+1}\right|$$

$$\geq \left|\frac{C(n)}{n+1} - \frac{C(m_2)}{m_2+1}\right| + \frac{A(m_1) + B(m_1) - 1}{m_1 + 1},$$

where $m_2 \notin C$, $m_1 \notin C$, $m_2 \leq \max(m_1, m - m_1 - 1) \leq \max(m_1, n - m_1 - 1)$.

Now assume $C(n) \neq n + 1$ and

$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} < \frac{C(m)}{m+1} \tag{9}$$

for all $m < n$, $m \notin C$. If $n \in C$ then $C(n)/(n+1) > C(n-1)/n$ hence (9) implies $n \notin C$. We apply Theorem 1. If in Theorem 1 $m = n$ then Theorem 2 holds with $n=m=m_1$. If $m<n/2$ in Theorem 1, then $n-m-1 \geq m$, hence there is a largest $m_1 \leq n - m - 1$, $m_1 \notin C$. We then have

$$\frac{C(n-m-1)}{n-m} \geq \frac{C(m_1)}{m_1+1}.$$

Moreover since $(n - m)/(m + 1) \geq 1$ we get from Theorem 1

$$\frac{C(n)}{n+1} \geq \frac{C(m_1)}{m_1+1} - \frac{C(n)}{n+1} + \frac{A(m) + B(m) - 1}{m+1}$$

$$= \left|\frac{C(n)}{n+1} - \frac{C(m_1)}{m_1+1}\right| + \frac{A(m) + B(m) - 1}{m+1}$$

and Theorem 2 is proved.

Theorems 1 and 2 can easily be generalized for arbitrary a_0, b_0. One simply applies the two theorems to the set $A' = (A - a_0)$, $B' = (B - b_0)$. If $a_0+b_0=c_0$ then $C'(n) = C(n + c_0)$, $A'(m)=A(m+a_0)$, $B'(m) = B(m + b_0)$. After some fairly obvious transformation Theorem 2 then reads

THEOREM 2*a*. *Let* $A = \{a_0 < a_1 < \cdots\}$, $B = \{b_0 < b_1 < \cdots\}$, $A+B= C = \{c_0 < c_1 < \cdots\}$. *Let* $n \geq c_0$. *Either* $C(n) = n - c_0 + 1$ *or there exist* m, m_1 *satisfying the conditions*:

$$\frac{C(n)}{n-c_0+1} \geq \frac{A(m-b_0) + B(m-a_0) - 1}{m - c_0 + 1}$$

$$+ \left|\frac{C(n)}{n-c_0+1} - \frac{C(m_1)}{m_1 - c_0 + 1}\right|,$$

$c_0 < m \le n$, $m \notin C$, $m_1 \notin C$, $c_0 < m_1 \le \max(m, n - m + c_0 - 1)$.

It is worth noting that Theorem 2 implies the Fundamental theorem proved in [3]. We shall prove the following

COROLLARY TO THEOREM 2. *Let* $a_0 = b_0 = 0$, $n \notin C$, $\gamma(n) = C(n) - 1$, $\sigma(m) = A(m) + B(m) - 2$. *Then either* $\gamma(n) \ge \sigma(n)$ *or* $\gamma(n)/n > \sigma(m)/m$ *for some* $m \notin C$, $0 < m < n$.

Proof. Let m be the integer of Theorem 2. *If* $n = m$ then Theorem 2 reads $\gamma(n) \ge \sigma(n)$. If $\gamma(n) < \sigma(n)$ then Theorem 2 yields

$$\gamma(n)m + \gamma(n) + m \ge \sigma(m)n + \sigma(m) + n .$$

If $\gamma(n)m \le \sigma(m)n$ then we obtain from this $\gamma(n) + m \ge \sigma(m) + n$, $\sigma(m)n + m^2 \ge \sigma(m)m + nm$ and therefore $\sigma(m) \ge (m)$. Hence $C(n) \ge n+1$, which is impossible since $n \notin C$. This proves the corollary.

We shall now prove Theorem 3. If $\underline{\lim}\,((A(m) + B(m))/m = 0$, then there are infinitely many m such that

$$C(m) \ge A(m - b_0) + B(m - a_0) - 1 . \tag{10}$$

If C has only finitely many gaps above c_0, then Theorem 3 is obvious. There is an infinite sequence of m_i such that

$$\frac{A(m_i - b_0) + B(m_i - a_0) - 1}{m_i - c_0 + 1} < \frac{A(m - b_0) + B(m - a_0) - 1}{m - c_0 + 1}$$

for $c_0 \le m < m_i$. It follows from Theorem 2a that

$$C(m_i) \ge A(m_i - b_0) + B(m_i - a_0) - 1 .$$

(If $m_i \notin C$ this follows directly from Theorem 2a. If $m_i \in C$ take the next gap in C below m_i.)

THEOREM 4. *If* $A + B = C$ *and* $\underline{\lim}\,(C(n)/n = 0$, *then*

$$\underline{\lim}_{m \in C} \frac{A(m) + B(m)}{m} = 0$$

and 10 *holds for infinitely many* $m \notin C$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $a_0 = b_0 = 0$. There is an infinite sequence $\{n_i\}$ such that $C(n_i)/(n_i+1) < C(m)/(m+1)$ for $m < n_i$. Clearly $n_i \notin C$. Let m_i be the value of m of Theorem 1 corresponding to n_i. From Theorem 1 we see that the values m_i also form an infinite sequence, since $A(m) + B(m) - 1$ cannot vanish and since by assumption $C(n_i - m - 1) - C(n_i)(n_i - m)/(m + 1) \geq 0$ for $m \leq n_i$. Now

$$\frac{C(m)}{m+1} > \frac{C(n_i)}{n_i+1}, \ \frac{C(n_i - m - 1)}{n_i - m} > \frac{C(n_i)}{n_i+1}$$

for $0 \leq m < n_i$ implies $C(m) + C(n_i - m - 1) \geq C(n_i)$ for $0 \leq m \leq n_i$ and this together with (1) implies

$$C(m_i) \geqq A(m_i) + B(m_i) - 1 \, .$$

Modifications analogous to those applied in the present paper to the proof of the authors Fundamental Theorem [3] can also be applied to Dyson's [1] proof of its generalization to more than two sets. The special case of Dyson's Theorem considered here then reads:

If $C = A_1 + \cdots + A_g$ and if c_0, a_{0i} are the smallest elements in C and A_i respectively, then for $n \geq c_0$, there is an m such that

$$\frac{C(n)}{n - c_0 + 1} \geq \frac{\sum A_i(m - c_0 + a_{0i}) - (g-1)}{m - c_0 + 1} \tag{11}$$

$$c_0 \leq m \leq n \, .$$

This inequality with $a_0 = b_0 = 0$ was first obtained by Kneser [**4**, Theorem VII]. Inequality (11) for $g = 2$ already known to van der Corput [**5**] is somewhat weaker than Theorem 2, because the minimum is not restricted to $m \notin C$. This weakening is necessary if $g > 2$. The relation (11) with $g \geq 3$ becomes false, if m is not restricted to elements not in C. It is not known to the author if $C(n)/(n + 1) \neq C(m)/(m + 1)$ for $c_0 \leq m < n$ and

$$C(n) < \sum_j A_j(n - c_0 + a_{0i}) - (g - 1)$$

implies strict inequality in (11) when $g \geq 3$.

Clearly on account of (11), Theorems 3 and 4, the latter without the condition $m \notin C$, carry over to the sum of an arbitrary number of sets.

The author takes the opportunity to refute Khintchine's [2] assertion that the methods used in his exposition are altogether different from those introduced in [3]. Anybody acquainted with the authors first proof must see that the basic ideas are exactly the same.

REFERENCES

1. F. J. Dyson, *A theorem on the densities of sets of integers*, J. London Math. Soc. **20**, (1945), 8–14.

2. A. Y. Khinchin, *Three pearls of number theory*, Graylock Press, Rochester, New York (1952).

3. H. B. Mann, *A proof of the fundamental theorem on the density of sums of sets of positive integers*, Ann. of Math. **43**, (1942), 523–527.
4. Kneser Martin *Abschaetzung der asymptotischen Dichte von Summen mengen*, Math. Zeitschrift. Bd. **58**, (1953), 459–484.
5. J. G. Van der Corput, *On sets of integers I II III*, Proc. Akad. Wet. Amsterdam **50**, (1947), 252–261, 340–350, 429–435.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, L. J. Paige at the University of California, Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. The price per volume (4 numbers) is $12.00; single issues, $3.50. Back numbers are available. Special price to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $4.00 per volume; single issues, $1.25.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 2120 Oxford Street, Berkeley 4, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 10, No. 3 November, 1960