# The Density of $B_h[g]$ Sequences and the Minimum of Dense Cosine Sums

Mihail N. Kolountzakis
Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
E-mail: kolount@math.stanford.edu

APRIL 1993; REVISED MAY 1994

#### Abstract

A set E of integers is called a  $B_h[g]$  set if every integer can be written in at most g different ways as a sum of h elements of E. We give an upper bound for the size of a  $B_h[1]$  subset  $\{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$  of  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$  whenever h = 2m is an even integer:

$$k \le (m(m!)^2)^{1/h} n^{1/h} + O(n^{1/2h}).$$

For the case h=2 (h=4) this has already been proved by Erdős and Turán (by Lindström). It has been independently proved for all even h by Jia [9] who used an elementary combinatorial argument. Our method uses a result, which we prove, related to the minimum of dense cosine sums which roughly states that if  $1 \le \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_N \le (2-\epsilon)N$  are N different integers then

$$\left| \min_{x} \sum_{1}^{N} \cos \lambda_{j} x \right| \ge C \epsilon^{2} N.$$

Finally we exhibit some dense finite and infinite  $B_2[2]$  sequences.

Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 11B13, 42A05

#### 1 Introduction

Let E be a set of integers. For any integer x we denote by  $r_E(x;h)$  the number of ways x can be written as a sum of h (not necessarily distinct) elements of E. Two sums  $a_1 + \cdots + a_h$  and  $b_1 + \cdots + b_h$  are considered the same if the  $a_j$ 's are a permutation of the  $b_j$ 's. A set E of integers is called a  $B_h[g]$  set if  $r_E(x;h) \leq g$  for all x. A  $B_h[1]$  set is also called a  $B_h$  set and  $B_2$  sets are sometimes called Sidon sets (the term "Sidon set" appears with a different meaning in harmonic analysis). The letter C stands for an arbitrary positive constant in this paper.

We are interested here in the density of  $B_h[g]$  sets. Considerably more is known about  $B_2$  sets than general  $B_h[g]$  sets ([8, Ch. 2] is the principal reference). The main reason for this is that a set E is  $B_2$  if and only if all differences x - y, for  $x, y \in E$ ,  $x \neq y$ , are distinct. Nothing similar is true for  $B_2[g]$  sets, for example.

Let  $F_h(n)$  be the maximum size of a  $B_h$  set contained in  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ .

It is obvious that  $F_h(n) \leq A_h n^{1/h}$  and it is the size of the constant  $A_h$  that we care about in this paper. For h=2 Erdős and Turán [5], using a counting method, have proved  $F_2(n) \leq \sqrt{n} + O(n^{1/4})$ . (The constant one obtains by just counting differences is  $\sqrt{2}$ .) For h=4 Lindström [14], using van der Corput's lemma, has proved  $F_4(n) \leq (8n)^{1/4} + O(n^{1/8})$ . In the other direction it has been shown by Chowla and by Erdős (see references in [8, Ch. 2]) using a theorem of Singer [15] that  $F_2(n) \geq \sqrt{n} - o(\sqrt{n})$  and more generally it has been proved by Bose and Chowla [1] that  $F_h(n) \geq n^{1/h} - o(n^{1/h})$ .

The Cosine Problem: Chowla [4] has conjectured that for any distinct positive integers  $n_1 < \cdots < n_N$ 

$$\left| \min_{x} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \cos n_{j} x \right| \ge C \sqrt{N}. \tag{1}$$

This conjecture has remained unproved and the best result known to date is due to Bourgain [2]:  $\left|\min_{x}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\cos n_{j}x\right| \geq 2^{\log^{\epsilon}N}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ .

It is easy to see that there are sequences  $\{n_j\}$  for which the left hand side of (1) is bounded above by  $C\sqrt{N}$ . The author proved in [11] using a probabilistic method that there are very dense such sequences: we can have  $n_N \leq 2N$ . (This can also be proved using the lower bound on  $F_2(n)$  mentioned above.) In Section 2 we prove that the above density is best possible (Theorem 2).

In Section 3 we use this result to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** Let h = 2m > 2 be an even integer. Then

$$F_h(n) \le (m(m!)^2)^{1/h} n^{1/h} + O(n^{1/2h}).$$
 (2)

Theorem 1 contains the results of Erdős and Turán and of Lindström as special cases. It has recently been proved independently by Jia [9] who used an elementary combinatorial argument.

In Sections 4 and 5 we show that allowing g > 1 indeed helps. We exhibit a  $B_2[2]$  subset of  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$  with  $\sqrt{2n} + o(\sqrt{n})$  elements and an infinite  $B_2[2]$  sequence  $1 \le n_1 < \cdots < n_j < \cdots$  for which

$$\lim_{j} \inf \frac{n_j}{j^2} = 1.$$

Jia [10] has improved the method of Section 4 giving a  $B_2[2]$  subset of  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$  with  $\sqrt{3n} + o(\sqrt{n})$  elements, and has generalized the results of Sections 4 and 5 to  $B_2[g]$  sequences for g > 2.

Results for the case of odd h ( $B_{2m-1}$  sequences) have been obtained by Li [13] (for  $B_3$  sets), Chen [3] and Graham [7]. Chen and Graham proved that

$$F_{2m-1}(n) \le (m!)^{2/(2m-1)} n^{1/(2m-1)} + O(n^{1/(4m-2)}).$$

#### 2 Dense Cosine Sums

It was proved in [11] that for every positive integer N there are positive integers  $1 \le \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_N \le 2N$  such that  $\left| \min_x \sum_{1}^{N} \cos \lambda_j x \right| \le C\sqrt{N}$ . We now prove that we cannot have more dense cosine sums whose minimum is small in absolute value.

**Theorem 2** Let  $0 \le f(x) = M + \sum_{1}^{N} \cos \lambda_{j} x$ , with  $1 \le \lambda_{1} < \dots < \lambda_{N} \le (2 - \epsilon)N$ , for some  $\epsilon > 3/N$ . Then

$$M > C\epsilon^2 N. (3)$$

**Proof:** We use the following theorem of Fejér [6]:

Let p(x) be a nonnegative trigonometric polynomial of degree n and constant term  $\widehat{p}(0) = 1$ . Then  $p(0) \le n + 1$ .

The obvious inequality above is  $p(0) \leq 2n + 1$ . We note that Fejér's theorem is a corollary of the well known theorem of Fejér and Riesz which states that every nonnegative trigonometric polynomial can be written as the square of the modulus of a polynomial of the same degree.

To use Fejér's theorem we first need to "smooth"  $\hat{f}$ . Define  $p(x) = f(x)K_a(x) \ge 0$ , where

$$K_a(x) = \sum_{j=-a}^{a} \left(1 - \frac{|j|}{(a+1)}\right) e^{ijx} \ge 0$$

is the Fejér kernel of degree a (the parameter a will be determined later). Then

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \deg \, p & \leq & (2-\epsilon)N + a, \\ \\ \widehat{p}(0) & = & M + \frac{1}{a+1} \sum_{\lambda_j \leq a} (a+1-\lambda_j), \\ \\ p(0) & = & (M+N)(a+1). \end{array}$$

Observe that  $\widehat{p}(0) \leq M + a/2$  (the worst case clearly being  $\lambda_j = j$ ) and apply Fejér's theorem in the form  $\widehat{p}(0) \geq p(0)/(1 + \deg p)$  to get

$$M + \frac{a}{2} \ge \frac{(M+N)a}{(2-\epsilon)N + a + 1} \ge \frac{Na}{(2-\epsilon)N + a + 1} \ge \frac{1}{2-\epsilon + (a+1)/N}a.$$

Move a/2 to the right hand side and let  $a = \epsilon N/2$  to get

$$M \ge \left(\frac{1}{4 - \epsilon + 2/N} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \epsilon N \ge \frac{(\epsilon - 2/N)\epsilon}{16 - 4\epsilon + 8/N} N \ge \frac{(\epsilon - 2/N)\epsilon}{16} N \ge \frac{\epsilon^2}{3 \cdot 16} N,$$

since  $\epsilon > 3/N$  implies  $4\epsilon > 8/N$  and  $\epsilon - 2/N > \epsilon/3$ .  $\square$ 

## 3 An Upper Bound for $F_h(n)$ , h Even

Let  $h = 2m \ge 2$  be a fixed even integer. We shall give an upper bound for the density of  $B_h$  sets contained in  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ . Theorem 2 is the main tool. In this section C denotes an arbitrary positive constant which may depend on h only.

Let  $E = \{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$ ,  $1 \le n_1 < \cdots < n_k \le n$ , be a  $B_h$  set. This means that all sums  $a_1 + \cdots + a_h$  with  $a_j \le a_{j+1}$  and  $a_j \in E$  are distinct. Consequently the sums of the form

$$a_1 + \cdots + a_m - b_1 - \cdots - b_m$$

with

$$a_j, b_j \in E, \ a_j < a_{j+1}, \ b_j < b_{j+1} \ \text{and} \ a_i \neq b_j$$
 (4)

are all different. Indeed, if  $\sum a_j - \sum b_j = \sum a'_j - \sum b'_j$  we have  $\sum a_j + \sum b'_j = \sum a'_j + \sum b_j$  and, since E is a  $B_h$  sequence, the collection of terms in the left hand side is the same as that in the right hand side. But the  $a_j$ 's have been assumed different from the  $b_j$ 's, so we must have  $a_j = a'_j$  and similarly  $b_j = b'_j$ .

Define the nonnegative polynomial

$$f(x) = \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{in_j x} \right|^h = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{in_j x} \right)^m \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{-in_j x} \right)^m$$
$$= r(x) + 2(m!)^2 \left( \sum_{a_j, b_j \text{ satisfy } (4)} \cos\left( \sum a_j - \sum b_j \right) x \right).$$

The polynomial r(x) consists of  $O(k^{h-1})$  terms with coefficient 1 and thus, for some C > 0,

$$Ck^{h-1} + \sum_{a_j, b_j \text{ satisfy (4)}} \cos(\sum_{j=1}^m a_j - \sum_{j=1}^m b_j)x \ge 0.$$

Write  $\lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_N$ ,  $N = k^h/(2(m!)^2) - O(k^{h-1})$ , for the positive sums of the form  $\sum a_j - \sum b_j$  (they are all different). Using Theorem 2 we conclude that

$$mn \ge \lambda_N \ge \left(2 - Ck^{-1/2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2(m!)^2}k^h - O(k^{h-1})\right).$$
 (5)

This implies

$$k \le (m(m!)^2)^{1/h} n^{1/h} + o(n^{1/h}).$$

The error term can also be bounded as follows. Write  $k = C_1 n^{1/h} + R$ , where  $R \ge 0$  and  $C_1 = (m(m!)^2)^{1/h}$ . Then  $n = ((k-R)/C_1)^h$ , and substituting this in (5) and matching the second largest terms we get  $R = O(k^{1/2}) = O(n^{1/2h})$ , which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 improves the estimate one gets by just counting the  $\lambda_j$ 's. Indeed, there are  $N = k^h/(2(m!)^2) - O(k^{h-1})$  different  $\lambda_j$ 's in  $\{1, \ldots, mn\}$  so we only get  $k \leq \left(2m(m!)^2\right)^{1/h} n^{1/h} + o(n^{1/h})$ .

## 4 Dense Finite $B_2[2]$ Sequences

As mentioned in Section 1, for each n there is a  $B_2$  sequence  $1 \le n_1 < \cdots < n_k \le n$  with  $k = \sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n})$ . In this Section we show that if one allows up to 2 sums to coincide we can have denser sequences. We do this by interleaving two dense  $B_2$  sequences.

**Theorem 3** For each n there is a  $B_2[2]$  set  $B \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}$  with  $|B| = \sqrt{2n} + o(\sqrt{n})$ .

**Proof:** By the lower bound on  $F_2(n)$  there is a  $B_2$  set  $A \subseteq \{1, \ldots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1\}$ , with  $|A| = \sqrt{n/2} + o(\sqrt{n})$ . We shall show that the subset  $B = 2A \cup (2A + 1)$  of  $\{1, \ldots, n\}$  is  $B_2[2]$  which proves the theorem.

The proof is by contradiction. Assume that we have the non-trivial relations

$$x_1 + y_1 = x_2 + y_2 = x_3 + y_3, (6)$$

with  $x_j, y_j \in B$  and let  $z = x_1 + y_1$ . Look at  $x_j + y_j \mod 2$ . There are three possible patterns: 0 + 0, 1 + 1 and 0 + 1.

If z is even then only 0+0 and 1+1 may appear in (6) and we have either a relation of the pattern 0+0=0+0 or a relation of the pattern 1+1=1+1. Both cases contradict the fact that A is  $B_2$ , the first after just dividing by 2, the second after cancelling the remainders and then dividing by 2.

If z is odd then only the pattern 0+1 appears in (6) which can be rewritten as

$$2a_1 + (2a_1' + 1) = 2a_2 + (2a_2' + 1) = 2a_3 + (2a_3' + 1)$$
(7)

with  $a_j, a'_j \in A$ . By canceling 1 and dividing by 2 we have

$$a_1 + a_1' = a_2 + a_2' = a_3 + a_3'$$

But A is  $B_2$  so for at least one of the above relations, say the first one, we have  $a_1 = a_2$  and  $a'_1 = a'_2$  which contradicts the fact that the first relation in (7) is non-trivial.  $\square$ 

Jia [10] has improved and generalized Theorem 3. He has proved the existence of a  $B_h[g]$  set  $B \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$  such that

$$|B| = (m(h,g))^{1-1/h} n^{1/h} + o(n^{1/h}),$$
(8)

where m(h, g) is the largest integer m for which the equation  $a = x_1 + \cdots + x_h$  has at most g solutions in  $\mathbf{Z}_m$  (up to rearrangement) for each  $a \in \mathbf{Z}_m$ . For h = g = 2 the coefficient of the major term in (8) becomes  $\sqrt{3}$ , thus improving our result.

# 5 Infinite $B_2[2]$ Sequences with Large Upper Density

The situation is rather different for infinite  $B_2[g]$  sequences. Erdős [16] has proved that there is no infinite  $B_2$  sequence  $\{n_j\}$  with  $n_j = O(j^2)$ . Infinity is not the problem here but the fact

that we require  $n_j \leq Cj^2$  for all j and not just for the last one, as we did with finite sequences.

For the upper density of the sequence  $\{n_j\}$  Erdős [16] proved that it is possible to have  $\liminf_j n_j/j^2 \leq 4$  and Krückeberg [12] later improved this to  $\liminf_j n_j/j^2 \leq 2$ . It is still unknown whether the number 2 in the right hand side above can be reduced (it cannot be less than 1 by the upper bound on  $F_2(n)$  of Erdős and Turán).

We now show that for a  $B_2[2]$  infinite sequence this is possible.

**Theorem 4** There is a  $B_2[2]$  sequence  $\{n_j\}$  with  $\liminf_i n_i/j^2 = 1$ .

**Proof:** The theorem will be proved if we show that any  $B_2[2]$  sequence  $1 \le n_1 < \cdots < n_k$  can be extended to a sequence  $1 \le n_1 < \cdots < n_k < n_{k+1} < \cdots < n_l$ , such that  $n_l = l^2 + o(l^2)$ .

Write  $A = \{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$  and  $x = n_k$ . Take  $B \subseteq \{2x + 1, \ldots, x^4\}$  to be a  $B_2$  set with  $|B| = x^2 + o(x^2)$ . In what follows  $a_j \in A$ ,  $b_j \in B$  and  $d_j \in D$  (to be defined below).

Consider the relations of the form

$$a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2. (9)$$

Such a relation may be written as  $a_1 - a_2 = b_2 - b_1$ . But B is a  $B_2$  set, so all differences  $b_2 - b_1$  are distinct, which implies that a pair  $a_1, a_2 \in A$  may appear in (9) only once. Thus there are  $O(k^2) = O(x)$  of these relations which may involve O(x) elements of B. Let then

$$D = \{ b \in B : b \text{ does not appear in any relation of the form (9)} \}$$
 (10)

and  $E = A \cup D$ . Obviously  $|E| = x^2 + o(x^2)$ . We show that E is a  $B_2[2]$  set.

First note that the relations of the form

$$a_1 + a_2 = a_3 + d_1$$
 or  $a_1 + a_2 = d_1 + d_2$ 

are not possible (the left hand side is too small) and A is itself  $B_2[2]$ . This proves  $r_E(a_1 + a_2; 2) \le 2$  for all  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ .

It remains to be checked that  $r_E(a_1 + d_1; 2) \le 2$  and  $r_E(d_1 + d_2; 2) \le 2$ . By passing from B to D we eliminated all relations of the form (9) and so the only remaining non-trivial relations that we have to check are of the form

$$a_1 + d_1 = d_2 + d_3. (11)$$

These are indeed possible. Assume  $y=a_1+d_1=d_2+d_3$ . We have to show that these are the only ways that y can be written as a sum of two elements of E. But this is obvious since  $y=d'_2+d'_3$  is impossible (this would mean  $d_2+d_3=d'_2+d'_3$  which contradicts D in  $B_2$ ),  $y=a'_1+a'_2$  is impossible because of size and  $y=a'_1+d'_1$  would mean that  $a'_1+d'_1=a_1+d_1$  which we took care to eliminate in (10).  $\square$ 

**Remark:** Because of the result of Section 4 the previous theorem is not necessarily best possible.

Jia [10] has generalized our result to any  $g \geq 2$  obtaining an infinite  $B_2[g]$  sequence  $\{n_j\}$  with  $\liminf_j n_j/j^2 = 1/\sqrt{2g-3}$ .

### References

- [1] R. C. Bose and S. Chowla, Theorems in the additive theory of numbers, Comment. Math. Helv., 37 (1962-63), 141-147.
- [2] J. Bourgain, Sur le minimum d'une somme de cosinus, Acta Arith., 45 (1986), 381-389.
- [3] S. Chen, On the size of finite Sidon sequences, preprint.
- [4] S. Chowla, Some applications of a method of A. Selberg, J. Reine Angew. Math., 217 (1965), 128-132.
- [5] P. Erdős and P. Turán, On a problem of Sidon in additive number theory and some related problems, J. London Math. Soc., 16 (1941), 212-215.
- [6] L. Fejér, Über trigonometrische Polynome, J. Reine Angew. Math., 146 (1915), 53-82.
- [7] S. W. Graham, Upper bounds for Sidon sequences, preprint.
- [8] H. Halberstam and K. F. Roth, Sequences, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [9] X.-D. Jia, On finite Sidon sequences, J. Number Th. 44 (1993), 84-92.
- [10] X.-D. Jia,  $B_h[g]$  sequences with large upper density, preprint.
- [11] M. N. Kolountzakis, On nonnegative cosine polynomials with nonnegative, integral coefficients, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 120 (1994), 157-163.
- [12] F. Krückeberg, B<sub>2</sub> Folgen und verwandte Zahlenfolgen, J. Reine Angew. Math., 106 (1961), 53-60.
- [13] A.-P. Li, On B<sub>3</sub> sequences, Acta Math. Sinica 34 (1991), 1, 67-71.
- [14] B. Lindström, A remark on B<sub>4</sub> sequences, J. Comb. Theory, 7 (1969), 276-277.
- [15] J. Singer, A theorem in finite projective geometry and some applications to number theory, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 43 (1938), 377-385.
- [16] A. Stöhr, Gelöste und ungelöste Fragen über Basen der natürlichen Zahlenreihe II, J. Reine Angew. Math., 194 (1955), 111-140.