Pacific Journal of Mathematics

EXTREMAL PROBLEMS ON NONAVERAGING AND NONDIVIDING SETS

Harvey Leslie Abbott

Vol. 91, No. 1 November 1980

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 91, No. 1, 1980

EXTREMAL PROBLEMS ON NON-AVERAGING AND NON-DIVIDING SETS

H. L. ABBOTT

A set A of integers is said to be non-averaging if the arithmetic mean of two or more members of A is not in A. A is said to be non-dividing if no member divides the sum of two or more others. In this paper we investigate some of the many extremal problems which arise in connection with non-averaging and non-dividing sets.

1. Introduction. In [1] the author showed that a modification of an old argument of F. A. Behrend [3] could be used to disprove a conjecture of Erdös and Straus ([4] and [11]) on non-averaging sets. In the present paper the method of Behrend is put in a more general setting and we use it, together with a number of other devices, to derive several new results on non-averaging and non-dividing sets. In all of the questions we consider, however, the results obtained are far from being definitive.

2. The main theorem. The following theorem is a generalization of a result of Behrend on arithmetic progressions. In fact, Behrend's theorem is given as Corollary 3 below.

THEOREM 1. *Let l, B and t be positive integers exceeding* 1, *and suppose* $(l, B) = 1$. *Let*

$$s = tl^t(B-1)^2 \tag{1}$$

and let

$$n = B^t - 1\,. \tag{2}$$

Then there exists a partition of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ *into s sets* $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_s$ *such that for each m,* $2 \leqq m \leqq l$, *and each i,* $1 \leqq i \leqq s$, *no m members of A_i have arithmetic mean in A_i*

Proof. Write the numbers $1, 2, \cdots, n$ in base B so that if $1 \leqq a \leqq n$, we have

$$a = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} d_i(a)B^i\,, \quad 0 \leqq d_i(a) \leqq B - 1\,.$$

Let $r = t(B-1)^2$ and partition $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ into r sets $S_1, S_2, \cdots, S_r$ where

$$S_j = \left\{a\colon \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} d_i(a)^2 = j\right\} .$$

It will be useful to associate with a the lattice point $(d_0(a), d_1(a), \cdots, d_{t-1}(a))$ in E^t. Note that the lattice points corresponding to numbers in S_j lie on a sphere of radius $\sqrt{j}$.

Next partition S_j into $k = l^t$ sets, two numbers a and b in S_j being placed in the same set if $d_i(a) \equiv d_i(b) \pmod{l}$ for $i = 0, 1, \cdots, t-1$. Thus $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ has been partitioned into $kr = tl^t(B-1)^2 = s$ sets $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_s$.

Suppose that for some m, $2 \leqq m \leqq l$, and some i, $1 \leqq i \leqq s$, there are distinct numbers $y_0, y_1, \cdots, y_m$ in A_i such that

$$y_0 + y_1 + \cdots + y_{m-1} = my_m . \tag{3}$$

Define x_j for $j = 0, 1, \cdots, l$ by

$$x_j = \begin{cases} y_j & \text{if} \quad 0 \leqq j \leqq m \\ y_m & \text{if} \quad m \leqq j \leqq l . \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

It follows from (3) and (4) that

$$x_0 + x_1 + \cdots + x_{l-1} = lx_l . \tag{5}$$

From (5) it follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} d_0(x_j) = h + \mu B$$

and

$$ld_0(x_l) = h + \nu B$$

where $0 \leqq h \leqq B-1$ and $0 \leqq \mu, \nu \leqq l-1$. Thus

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} d_0(x_j) = (\mu - \nu)B + ld_0(x_l) . \tag{6}$$

Now $d_0(x_0), d_0(x_1), \cdots, d_0(x_{l-1})$ belong to the same residue class modulo l and consequently l divides the left side of (6). Since $(l, B) = 1$, we must have $l \mid \mu - \nu$. However, since $|\mu - \nu| < l$, this gives $\mu = \nu$ and hence

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} d_0(x_j) = ld_0(x_l) .$$

This argument may now be repeated to show that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} d_i(x_j) = ld_i(x_l) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 0, 1, \cdots, t-1 . \tag{7}$$

If $P_0, P_1, \cdots, P_l$ are the points of E^t corresponding to $x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_l$

then (7) is just the statement that P_l is the centroid of $P_0, P_1, \cdots, P_{l-1}$. Since the points lie on a sphere, we must have $P_0 = P_1 = \cdots = P_l$ and hence $x_0 = x_1 = \cdots = x_l$. It follows that $y_0 = y_1 = \cdots = y_m$ contrary to hypothesis. This completes the proof of the theorem.

3. Some consequences of the main theorem.

COROLLARY 1. *Denote by $f(n)$ the size of a maximal non-averaging subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Then $f(n) > cn^{1/10}$.*

Proof. In Theorem 1 take $t = 5$, $B = l^2 + 1$, so that, by (1) and (2), $s = 5l^9$ and $n = B^5 - 1 \sim l^{10}$. One of the sets, say A_1, contains at least $[n/s] \sim l/5 \sim (1/5)n^{1/10}$ numbers. If $|A_1| \geqq l$, let A be any l-subset of A_1 and if $|A_1| < l$, let $A = A_1$. In both cases A is non-averaging and $|A| > cn^{1/10}$, as required.

REMARK 1. Corollary 1 appears in [1]. We point out that Straus [11] proved $f(n) > \exp(c\sqrt{\log n})$ and Erdös and Straus [4] proved $f(n) < cn^{2/3}$. It had been conjectured by Erdös and Straus that $f(n) < \exp(c\sqrt{\log n})$. Corollary 1, of course, shows that this conjecture is false. However, the following interesting question now arises: Does there exist a number α such that $f(n) = n^{\alpha + o(1)}$? It seems certain that such an α exists, but we have not been able to make any progress towards proving it.

COROLLARY 2. *Denote by $f_m(n)$ the size of a maximal subset A of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ with the property that no m members of A have arithmetic mean in A. Then, for each fixed $m \geqq 2$,*

$$f_m(n) > n \exp(-(2 + o(1))(2 \log m \log n)^{1/2}) .$$

Proof. In Theorem 1 take $l = m$ and put $B = m^{t/2} + 1$. (We suppose, without loss of generality, that t is even.) Then, by (1) and (2), $s = tm^{2t}$ and $n \sim m^{t^2/2}$. One of the sets contains at least $[n/s] \sim (1/t)m^{(1/2)t^2 - 2t}$ numbers and a simple calculation shows that

$$\frac{1}{t} m^{(1/2)t^2 - 2t} > n \exp(-(2 + o(1))(2 \log m \log n)^{1/2}) .$$

COROLLARY 3. (Behrend). *Denote by $r_3(n)$ the size of a maximal subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ not containing a three term arithmetic progression. Then*

$$r_3(n) > n \exp(-(2 + o(1))(2 \log 2 \log n)^{1/2}) .$$

Proof. Since $r_3(n) = f_2(n)$, the result follows from Corollary 2.

COROLLARY 4. (Moser [6]). *For positive integral k, let $W(k)$ denote the least integer such that if $\{1, 2, \cdots, W(k) + 1\}$ is partitioned arbitrarily into k sets, one of the sets contains an arithmetic progression of length 3. Then*

$$W(k) > k^{c \log k} .$$

Proof. In Theorem 1 put $l = m = 2$ and determine t by

$$t \cdot 2^{3t} \leqq k < (t + 1)2^{3t+3} . \tag{8}$$

By (1), $s = t \cdot 2^{3t}$ and if we put $B = 2^t + 1$ we get, by (2), $n \sim 2^{t^2}$. Then, by a simple calculation using (8), we get $W(k) \geqq W(s) \geqq n \sim 2^{t^2} > k^{c \log k}$.

Theorem 1 may also be used to show that various sets of integers, which arise in a natural way, contain large non-averaging subsets. We mention two examples.

COROLLARY 5. *Let $P = \{p: p \leqq n,\ p \text{ prime}\}$. Then P contains a non-averaging subset of size at least $cn^{1/10}/\log n$.*

Proof. In Theorem 1 take $t = 5$ and $B = l^2 + 1$, as in Corollary 1. One of the s sets contains at least $[\pi(n)/s] \sim n^{1/10}/5 \log n$ primes and the result follows.

COROLLARY 6. *Let Q_k denote the set of the kth powers not exceeding n. Then Q_k contains a non-averaging subset of size at least $c_k n^{1/8k^2+2k}$, where c_k is a constant depending only on k.*

Proof. In Theorem 1 take $t = 4k + 1$, $B = l^{2k} + 1$ and note that one of the s sets contains at least $[n^{1/k}/s] \sim l/(4k + 1) \sim (1/4k + 1)n^{1/8k^2+2k}$ kth powers. The result follows.

REMARK 2. Corollary 6 includes Corollary 1 as the special case $k = 1$.

4. Additional results on finite non-averaging sets. It would be of interest to know whether there exists a number $\beta > 0$ such that every set of n integers contains a non-averaging subset of size at least n^β. We cannot answer this question, but we obtain a partial result in this direction as follows:

THEOREM 2. *Let $m \geqq n$. Then almost all n-subsets of* $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ *contain a non-averaging subset of size at least* $c(f(n) \log \log n)^{1/2}/\log n$, *where f has the same meaning as in Corollary* 1 *and where almost all means all but* $o\left(\binom{m}{n}\right)$.

In order to prove the theorem we shall need the following lemma:

LEMMA 1. *There exists a partition of* $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ *into* $k < 2n \log n/f(n)$ *non-averaging sets.*

Proof. Let A be a maximal non-averaging subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\} = N$, so that $|A| = f(n)$. For integral λ let $A + \lambda = \{a + \lambda : a \in A\}$ and let $A_\lambda = (A + \lambda) \cap N$. It is clear that A_λ is non-averaging. Let $\lambda_0 = 0$ and suppose we have defined numbers $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_j$. Let $D_j = \{d : d \in N,\ d \notin A_{\lambda_i} \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, j\}$. If $D_j \neq \emptyset$, then for every $d \in D_j$ and every $a \in A$, there exists an integer λ such that $\lambda + a = d$ and $0 < |\lambda| \leqq n$. Thus for some λ^*, $0 < |\lambda^*| \leqq n$, the equation $\lambda^* + a = d$ has at least $|D_j| f(n)/2n$ solutions $a \in A$, $d \in D_j$. Let $\lambda_{j+1} = \lambda^*$ and let $D_{j+1} = \{d : d \in N,\ d \notin A_{\lambda_i} \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \cdots, j + 1\}$. We have

$$|D_{j+1}| \leqq |D_j| - \frac{|D_j| f(n)}{2n} = |D_j|\left(1 - \frac{f(n)}{2n}\right).$$

Since $|D_0| = n - f(n) < n(1 - f(n)/2n)$ we get

$$|D_j| \leqq n\left(1 - \frac{f(n)}{2n}\right)^{j+1}.$$

Now choose $k = [(2n \log n)/f(n)]$. Then

$$|D_k| \leqq n\left(1 - \frac{f(n)}{2n}\right)^{k+1} < 1.$$

Thus $|D_k| = 0$ and the sets $A_{\lambda_0}, A_{\lambda_1}, \cdots, A_{\lambda_k}$ are non-averaging sets whose union is N. This implies the lemma.

REMARK 3. The idea used in the above proof seems to have been first used by G. G. Lorentz [6]. Subsequently it has been used by a number of other authors in many different situations. See, for example, [9] or [10] for a general discussion of the method and further references to the literature. We point out also that, with careful attention to detail the bound $k \leqq (n/f(n))(1 + \log f(n))$ can be obtained.

Proof of Theorem 2. The argument is similar to that used in

[8] and [2], but is somewhat more complicated. Let $w = m/n$ and partition $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ into intervals $I_1, I_2, \cdots, I_n$ where

$$I_\alpha = \{a: (\alpha - 1)w < a \leqq \alpha w\} .$$

The first part of the argument involves showing that the elements of almost all n-subsets of $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ are fairly well distributed among the intervals I_α. More precisely, we shall prove that if

$$\mu = \left[\frac{n \log\log n}{2 \log n}\right] \tag{9}$$

and if T denotes the number of n-subsets of $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ which have elements in fewer than μ of the intervals I_α then

$$T = o\left(\binom{m}{n}\right) .$$

We may clearly suppose $m \geqq 2n$, since otherwise $T = 0$. We have

$$T \leqq \sum_{j=1}^{\mu-1} \binom{n}{j} \sum_{b_1+b_2+\cdots+b_j=n} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \binom{[w+1]}{b_i} \tag{10}$$

where, in the inner sum, the summation is over all compositions of n into j parts. In fact, (10) can be established as follows: $\binom{n}{j}$ is the number of ways of selecting j of the intervals I_α, say $I_{\alpha_1}, I_{\alpha_2}, \cdots, I_{\alpha_j}$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{j}\binom{[w+1]}{b_i}$ is the number of ways of selecting n integers, b_i of which are in I_{α_i}. From (10) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
T &\leqq \sum_{j=1}^{\mu-1} n^j \sum_{b_1+b_2+\cdots+b_j=n} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(w+1)^{b_i}}{b_i!} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{\mu-1} \frac{n^j(w+1)^n}{n!} \sum_{b_1+b_2+\cdots+b_j=n} \frac{n!}{b_1!\, b_2! \cdots b_j!} \\
&= \frac{(w+1)^n}{n!} \sum_{j=1}^{\mu-1} n^j j^n , \quad \text{by the multinomial theorem} \\
&\leqq \frac{(w+1)^n}{n!} n^{\mu-1}(\mu-1)^{n+1} \\
&\leqq \frac{(2w)^n}{n!} n^\mu \mu^n \\
&\leqq \frac{1}{n!}\left(\frac{2m}{n}\right)^n n^{(n \log\log n)/(2 \log n)} \left(\frac{n \log\log n}{2 \log n}\right)^n , \quad \text{by (9)} \\
&= \frac{m^n}{n!}\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right)^n = o\left(\frac{m^n}{n!\, 2^n}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= o\left(\frac{m^n}{n!}\left(1 - \frac{n}{m}\right)^n\right), \quad \text{as} \quad m \geqq 2n$$

$$= o\left(\binom{m}{n}\right), \quad \text{as required.}$$

Let N be an n-subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ which has elements in at least μ of the intervals I_α and let $A = \{\alpha: I_\alpha \cap N \neq \varnothing\}$. For each $\alpha \in A$ choose $a_\alpha \in I_\alpha \cap N$ and let $A' = \{a_\alpha: \alpha \in A\}$. We now show that A' contains a non-averaging subset of size at least $c(f(n) \log\log n)^{1/2}/\log n$. Since $A' \subseteqq N$, the theorem will then follow.

Partition $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ into $k < 2n \log n/f(n)$ non-averaging sets via Lemma 1. One of these sets, say C, must be such that

$$q = |C \cap A| \geqq \left\lceil \frac{\mu}{k} \right\rceil > \frac{f(n) \log\log n}{(\log n)^2} . \tag{11}$$

Let $h = [\sqrt{q}\,]$ and for $\alpha \in C \cap A$ let

$$I_\alpha = I_\alpha^{(1)} \cup I_\alpha^{(2)} \cup \cdots \cup I_\alpha^{(h)}$$

where

$$I_\alpha^{(\nu)} = \left\{a: \left(\alpha - \frac{\nu}{h}\right) w < a \leqq \left(\alpha - \frac{\nu - 1}{h}\right) w\right\} .$$

Then, by the pigeon hole principle, there exists an integer ν_0 and a set $A^* \subset C \cap A$, $|A^*| = h$, such that $a_\alpha \in I_\alpha^{(\nu_0)}$ for each $\alpha \in A^*$. Let $A_1 = \{a_\alpha: \alpha \in A^*\}$. We claim that A_1 is non-averaging.

Suppose that $a_{\alpha_0}, a_{\alpha_1}, \cdots, a_{\alpha_p}$ $(p \leqq h - 1)$ are distinct members of A_1 satisfying

$$a_{\alpha_0} + a_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + a_{\alpha_{p-1}} = p a_{\alpha_p} . \tag{12}$$

We have

$$a_{\alpha_i} = \left(\alpha_i - \frac{\nu_0}{h}\right) w + b_i , \quad 0 < b_i \leqq \frac{w}{h} .$$

Thus (12) can be written as

$$w\left(p\alpha_p - \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \alpha_i\right) = -pb_p + \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} b_i . \tag{13}$$

The conditions $0 < b_i \leqq w/h$ and $2 \leqq p \leqq h - 1$ imply that the right side of (13) lies strictly between $-w$ and w and must thererfore be 0. It follows that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \alpha_i = p\alpha_p .$$

However, the numbers $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_p$ are in C and C is non-averaging. This is a contradiction. It follows that A_1 is non-averaging. Moreover, by (11),

$$|A_1| = h = [\sqrt{q}\,] > c(f(n) \log \log n)^{1/2}/\log n \ .$$

This completes the proof.

We conclude this section with an additional application of Lemma 1, which complements Corollary 5.

THEOREM 3. *Let $P = \{p\colon p \leqq n,\ p$ prime$\}$. Then p contains a non-averaging subset of size at least $cf(n)/(\log n)^2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1, $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ can be partitioned into $k < 2n \log n/f(n)$ non-averaging sets. One of these must contain at least $[\pi(n)/k] > cf(n)/(\log n)^2$ primes and the result follows.

5. Infinite non-averaging sets. In all of what follows α and β are numbers such that $n^\alpha \ll f(n) \ll n^\beta$. We prove first the following result, a weaker version of which was announced in [1].

THEOREM 4. *There exists an infinite non-averaging set A of positive integers whose counting function satisfies*

$$A(x) \gg x^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2} \ .$$

Proof. Let $m > 1$ be a positive integer. Let $n_1 = m$ and let $n_k = [mn_{k-1}^{1+\beta} + 1]$ for $k = 2, 3, \cdots$. Let A_1 be a maximal non-averaging subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n_1\}$ and, for $k \geqq 2$, let A_k be a maximal non-averaging subset of $\{n_k + 1, n_k + 2, \cdots, n_k + n_{k-1}\}$. Let $A = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty A_k$. Suppose now that m is chosen so that $|A_k| < (m/2)n_{k-1}^\beta$.

We now show that A is a non-averaging set. Suppose there are distinct numbers $a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_t \in A$ such that

$$a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{t-1} = ta_t \ . \tag{14}$$

We may assume $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_{t-1}$. Let $a_{t-1} \in A_k$. Suppose first that $k \geqq 3$. It is clear that not all of $a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{t-1}$ are in A_k. Thus we may determine r, $1 \leqq r \leqq t - 1$, such that $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_{r-1} \leqq n_{k-1} + n_{k-2} < n_k + 1 \leqq a_r < \cdots < a_{t-1} \leqq n_k + n_{k-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(t - r)n_k &< a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{t-1} \\ &< ra_{r-1} + (t - r)a_{t-1} \\ &< 2rn_{k-1} + (t - r)(n_k + n_{k-1}) \\ &= (t - r)n_k + (t + r)n_{k-1} \qquad (14)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< (t-r)n_k + 2tn_{k-1} \\
&< (t-r)n_k + mn_{k-1}^{1+\beta}\,, \quad \text{as} \quad t \leqq |A_{k-1}| < \frac{m}{2}n_{k-1}^{\beta} \\
&< (t-r+1)n_k \\
&\leqq tn_k\,.
\end{aligned}$$

If $a_t \in A_l$ and $l \geqq k$ then $ta_t > tn_k > a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{t-1}$, by (14) while if $l \leqq k-1$ we have $ta_t \leqq t(n_{k-1} + n_{k-2}) \leqq 2tn_{k-1} < mn_{k-1}^{1+\beta} < n_k \leqq (t-r)n_k < a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{t-1}$, by (14). This is a contradiction. The above argument does not apply verbatim to the case $k \leqq 2$, but the same method works. Thus A is non-averaging.

Let x be given and let k be determined by $n_k < x \leqq n_{k+1}$. We may suppose that x is so large that $k \geqq 3$. Then, if $n_k < x \leqq n_k + n_{k-1}$ we get $A(x) \geqq A(n_k) \geqq |A_{k-1}| \gg n_{k-2}^{\alpha} \gg n_k^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2} \gg x^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2}$, while if $n_k + n_{k-1} < x \leqq n_{k+1}$, we get $A(x) \geqq |A_k| \gg n_{k-1}^{\alpha} \gg x^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2}$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

We consider next the problem of establishing the existence of an infinite non-averaging set of primes whose counting function grows at least as fast as x^c for some $c > 0$. In order to achieve this we shall need to make use of the following deep result on the distribution of the primes, which we state as a lemma.

LEMMA 2. *If $\theta \geqq 7/12$, the interval $[x, x + x^{\theta}]$ contains at least $cx^{\theta}/\log x$ primes for all sufficiently large x.*

REMARK 4. The bound $\theta \geqq 7/12$ in Lemma 2 is due to Huxley [5] who improved earlier results of Hoheisel, Ingham and Montgomery. See [5] for an account of the history of the problem. In the applications, we can actually get by with the bound $\theta \geqq 3/5$ of Montgomery.

THEOREM 5. *There exists an infinite non-averaging set P of primes whose counting function satisfies*

$$P(x) \gg x^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2}/(\log x)^2\,.$$

Proof. Note first that since $n_{k-1} \sim (1/m)n_k^{1/(1+\beta)}$ and since $1/(1+\beta) \geqq 3/5$ $(\beta \leqq 2/3)$, the number of primes in the interval $\{n_k + 1, \cdots, n_k + n_{k-1}\}$ is, by Lemma 2, at least $cn_k^{1/(1+\beta)}/\log n_k$. By Lemma 1, $\{n_k + 1, \cdots, n_k + n_{k-1}\}$ can be partitioned into fewer than $2n_{k-1}\log n_{k-1}/f(n_{k-1})$ non-averaging sets. One of these sets must therefore contain at least $cf(n_{k-1})/(\log n_{k-1})^2$ primes. Let P_k be this set of primes and let $P = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} P_k$. The argument used in Theorem 4 shows that P is non-averaging and that $P(x) \gg x^{\alpha/(1+\beta)^2}/(\log x)^2$.

6. Non-dividing sets. Denote by $g(n)$ the size of a maximal non-dividing subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Straus [11] proved that if $\{a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_k\}$ is a non-averaging subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, [n/k]\}$, then $\{n - a_1, n - a_2, \cdots, n - a_k\}$ is a non-dividing set. Thus if $k \leqq f([n/k])$ we have $g(n) \geqq k$. It follows that the following theorem holds:

THEOREM 6. $g(n) \gg n^{\alpha/(1+\alpha)}$.

Our next result is the analogue of Theorem 3 for non-dividing sets.

THEOREM 7. *Let $P = \{p\colon p \leqq n,\ p \text{ prime}\}$. Then P contains a non-dividing set of size at least $cn^{\alpha/(1+\alpha)}/(\log n)^2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1 it is possible to partition $\{1, 2, \cdots, [n^{1/(1+\alpha)}]\}$ into fewer than $n^{(1-\alpha)/(1+\alpha)} \log n$ non-averaging sets $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k$. By the result of Straus, the sets $B_i = \{n - a_j\colon a_j \in A_i\}$ are non-dividing. By Lemma 2, the set $\{n - [n^{1/(1+\alpha)}], \cdots, n\}$ contains at least $cn^{1(1+\alpha)}/\log n$ primes. Thus one of the B's must contain at least $cn^{\alpha/(1+\alpha)}/(\log n)^2$ primes, as required.

A simple argument shows that there exist no infinite non-dividing sets of integers. Call a set A quasi-non-dividing if no member of A divides the sum of two or more smaller members of A. We investigate infinite quasi-non-dividing sets. Our first result is the following theorem:

THEOREM 8. *There exists an infinite quasi-non-dividing set A whose counting function satisfies $A(x) \gg x^{1/6}$.*

Proof. It is a simple matter to verify that if $n > 1$ is a positive integer and k is determined by $\binom{k-1}{2} < n \leqq \binom{k}{2}$ then $\{n - k + 1, \cdots, n - 1, n\}$ is a quasi-non-dividing set. Thus, if $h(n)$ denotes the size of a maximal quasi-non-dividing subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, then $h(n) \geqq cn^{1/2}$. Also it is an easy consequence of a result of Szemeredi [12] that $h(n) \leqq cn^{1/2}$.

Let $m > 1$ be a positive integer and let A_1 be a maximal quasi-non-dividing subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$. Suppose we have defined sets $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_r$. Let $t_r = \sum_{a \in \cup A_i} a$, and let p_r be the least prime exceeding t_r. Let A^*_{r+1} be a maximal quasi-non-dividing subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots, t_r\}$ and let $A_{r+1} = \{p_r a\colon a \in A^*_{r+1}\}$. Put $A = \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty} A_k$. It is now a simple matter to verify that A is quasi-non-dividing. Moreover, the observation made in the first paragraph together with the fact that, for large r, $p_r \sim t_r$, enables one to show in a straightforward way that $A(x) \gg x^{1/6}$. We suppress these details.

Our final theorem establishes the existence of a reasonably dense quasi-non-dividing set of primes.

THEOREM 9. *There exists an infinite quasi-non-dividing set P of primes whose counting function satisfies $P(x) \gg x^{\alpha^2/8(1+\alpha)^2}/(\log x)^2$.*

Proof. Let m be a large positive integer and let $n_1 = m$. For $k \geqq 2$, let $n_k = [n_{k-1}^{4(1+1/\alpha)}]$. Let P_1 be a maximal non-dividing set of primes in $\{1, 2, \cdots, n_1\}$. Suppose that we have defined $P_1, P_2, \cdots, P_{k-1}$. By Lemma 1, it is possible to partition $\{1, 2, \cdots, [n_k^{1/(1+\alpha)}]\}$ into $s_k \ll n_k^{(1-\alpha)/(1+\alpha)} \log n_k$ non-averaging sets $A_1^{(k)}, \cdots, A_{s_k}^{(k)}$. The sets $B_j^{(k)} = \{n_k - a_i : a_i \in A_j^{(k)}\}$ are then non-dividing sets which cover $\{n_k - [n_k^{1/(1+\alpha)}], \cdots, n_k - 2, n_k - 1\} = I_k$. The primes in I_k, of which, by Lemma 2, there are $t_k \gg n_k^{1/(1+\alpha)}/\log n_k$ in number, are distributed over the $\phi(n_{k-1}^2)$ reduced residue classes mod n_{k-1}^2. Thus one of the B's must contain a set P_k of primes of size at least $[t_k/s_k\phi(n_{k-1}^2)] \gg n_k^{(\alpha/(\alpha+1))/2}/(\log n_k)^2$, and which all belong to the some residue class modulo n_{k-1}^2. Let $P = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} P_k$.

We now show that P is quasi-non-dividing. Suppose there are primes $p_0, p_1, \cdots, p_t \in P$ such that $p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_t$ and $p_0 + p_1 + \cdots + p_{t-1} = mp_t$. Let $p_t \in P_k$. If $p_{t-1} \notin P_k$ we get $p_0 + p_1 + \cdots + p_{t-1} < tp_{t-1} < tn_{k-1} \leqq n_{k-1}^2 < n_k - [n_k^{1/(1+\alpha)}] \leqq p_t$, which is a contradiction. Thus $p_{t-1} \in P_k$. Determine r, $1 \leqq r \leqq t-1$ such that $p_r, p_{r+1}, \cdots, p_{t-1} \in P_k$ and $p_0, p_1, \cdots, p_{r-1} \notin P_k$. It then follows easily that $m = t - r$ and hence that

$$(15) \qquad p_0 + p_1 + \cdots + p_{r-1} = (t-r)p_t - (p_r + p_{r+1} + \cdots + p_{t-1}) .$$

Since $p_r, p_{r+1}, \cdots, p_t$ all belong to the same residue class modulo n_{k-1}^2, the right side of (15) is divisible by n_{k-1}^2. However, $p_0 + \cdots + p_{r-1} < rn_{k-1} < n_{k-1}^2$ and this is a contradiction. Thus P is quasi-non-dividing. Furthermore, one may easily check that $P(x) \gg x^{\alpha^2/8(1+\alpha)^2}/(\log x)^2$. The details we suppress. This completes the proof of the theorem.

REFERENCES

1. H. L. Abbott, *On a conjecture of Erdös and Straus on non-averaging sets of integers,* Proceedings of the Fifth British Combinatorial Conference, (to appear).

2. H. L. Abbott, A. C. Liu and J. Riddell, *On sets of integers not containing arithmetic progressions of prescribed length,* J. Australian Math. Soc., **28** (1974), 188-193.

3. F. A. Behrend, *On sets of integers which contain no three terms in arithmetical progression,* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **32** (1946), 331-332.

4. P. Erdös and E. G. Straus, *Non-averaging sets II,* Combinatorial Theory and its Applications, Vol. II, Colloquia Mathematica Societatis Janos Bolyai, **4** (1970), 405-411.
5. M. N. Huxley, *The Distribution of Prime Numbers,* Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Part IV.
6. G. G. Lorentz, *On a problem in additive number theory,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **5** (1954), 838-841.
7. L. Moser, *On a theorem of van der Waerden,* Canad. Math. Bull., **3** (1960), 23-25.
8. J. Riddell, *On sets of integers containing no l terms in arithmetic progression,* Neiuw. Arch. voor Wisk., (3), **17** (1969), 204-209.
9. J. Spencer, *Puncture sets,* J. Combinatorial Theory, **A17** (1974), 329-336.
10. S. K. Stein, *Two combinatorial covering theorems,* J. Combinatorial Theory, **A16** (1974), 391-397.
11. E. G. Straus, *Non-averaging sets,* Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. XIX, American Mathematical Society, (1971), 215-222.
12. E. Szemerédi, *On a conjecture of Erdös and Heilbronn,* Acta Arithmetica, **17** (1970), 227-229.

Received April 14, 1976.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
CANADA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)
University of Galifornia
Los Angeles, California 90024

HUGO ROSSI
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE AND ANDREW OGG
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

J. DUGUNDJI
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. FINN AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH B. H. NEUMANN F. WOLF K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFONIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 91, No. 1 November, 1980