EXACT ADDITIVE COMPLEMENTS

IMRE Z. RUZSA

Abstract. Let A, B be sets of positive integers such that $A+B$ contains all but finitely many positive integers. Sárközy and Szemerédi proved that if $A(x)B(x)/x \to 1$, then $A(x)B(x)-x \to \infty$. Chen and Fang considerably improved Sárközy and Szemerédi's bound. We further improve their estimate and show by an example that our result is nearly best possible.

1. Introduction

Two sets A, B of positive integers are called *additive complements* if their sumset $A+B$ contains all but finitely many positive integers. The counting functions of additive complements clearly satisfy

$$A(x)B(x) \geq x-r, \tag{1.1}$$

where r is the number of positive integers not represented as a sum. It is easy to construct sets, separating odd and even places in a digital representation, for which equality holds for infinitely many values of x. These sets have the property that

$$\limsup A(x)B(x)/x > 1.$$

Hanani asked whether this is always the case for infinite additive complements. This was answered by Danzer[2], who first constructed infinite additive complements such that

$$A(x)B(x)/x \to 1. \tag{1.2}$$

We shall call such additive complements *exact*. This property is less exotic than it seems; powers of a fixed integer do have an exact complement, as do all sufficiently thin sets [5, 7].

Narkiewicz[4] proved an important property of exact complements. He considered a wider class.

Theorem 1.1 (Narkiewicz's dichotomy)**.** *Let A, B be infitite sets of positive integers such that the number $r(x)$ of integers up to x not contained in their sumset $A+B$ satisfies $r(x)=o(x)$. Under condition* (1.2) *we have*

$$A(2x)/A(x) \to 1, \ B(2x)/B(x) \to 2, \tag{1.3}$$

or this holds with the roles of A, B exchanged. If (1.3) *holds, then for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x > x_0(\varepsilon)$ we have*

$$A(x) < x^{\varepsilon}, \ B(x) > x^{1-\varepsilon}. \tag{1.4}$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11B13, 11B34.

Author was supported by ERC–AdG Grant No.321104 and Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research (OTKA), Grants No.109789 , and NK104183.

This shows that polynomial sequences do not have an exact complement. The set of primes does not have either, for less obvious reasons [6].

For the sequel we will assume that (1.3) holds, that is, A is small and B is large.

For exact complements Sárközy and Szemerédi[1] proved that if (1.2) holds, then $A(x)B(x) - x \to \infty$. (While this paper actually appeared in 1994, the result was already announced in the 1966 edition of Halberstam and Roth's book Sequences[3].) They remark that their proof shows that

$$A(x)B(x) - x = o\bigl(A(x)\bigr)$$

cannot hold, and they conjecture that

$$A(x)B(x) - x = O\bigl(A(x)\bigr)$$

may be possible.

Chen and Fang[8] disproved this conjecture and considerably improved Sárközy and Szemerédi's bound. Their result shows that even

$$A(x)B(x) - x = O\bigl(A(x)^c\bigr) \tag{1.5}$$

cannot hold for any constant c.

The aim of this paper is to improve Chen and Fang's result and to show by means of an example that there is precious little room for further improvement.

Write

$$a^*(x) = \max\{a \in A, a \le x.\}$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let A, B be infinite sets of positive integers such that the number $r(x)$ of integers up to x not contained in their sumset $A+B$ satisfies $r(x) = o(x)$. Suppose they satisfy* (1.2) *and the notation corresponds to* (1.3). *If $r(x) = o\bigl(a^*(x)\bigr)$, then we have*

$$A(x)B(x) - x > \bigl(1 - o(1)\bigr)\frac{a^*(x)}{A(x)}. \tag{1.6}$$

The reason that this excludes (1.5) is that Narkiewicz's dichotomy (1.4) implies that

$$A(x) = A\bigl(a^*(x)\bigr) < a^*(x)^\varepsilon$$

hence $a^*(x)$ is larger than any power of $A(x)$. Chen and Fang's result, though stated in quite different terms, is equivalent to the lower bound

$$\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{a^*(x)}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on their argument, with some parts improved.

Clearly the bound in (1.6) cannot be improved to $a^*(x)$, since for $x \in A$ we have $a^*(x) = x$, and this would contradict (1.2). However, it is possible that such an improvement holds whenever $a^*(x)$ is small compared to x. It is also a natural question, also formulated by Chen and Fang, whether one can give an *absolute* lower bound, say $A(x)B(x) - x > \log x$. We show this is not the case.

Theorem 1.3. *Let ω be a function tending to infinity arbitrarily slowly. There are additive complements satisfying* (1.2) *such that for infinitely many values of x we have*

$$A(x)B(x) - x < \min\bigl(\omega(x), ca^*(x)\bigr) \tag{1.7}$$

with some constant c.

2. The lower estimate

Lemma 2.1. *Let U, V be finite sets of integers. Put*

$$\sigma(n) = \#\{(u,v) : u \in U, v \in V, u+v=n\}, \ \delta(n) = \#\{(u,v) : u \in U, v \in V, v-u=n\}.$$

We have

$$\sum_{\sigma(n)>1} (\sigma(n)-1) \geq \frac{1}{|U|} \sum_{\delta(n)>1} (\delta(n)-1).$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum \sigma(n) = \sum \delta(n) = |U||V|,$$
$$\sum \sigma(n)^2 = \sum \delta(n)^2$$

by double-counting the quadruples satisfying $u+v=u'+v'$, which can be rearranged as $v-u'=v'-u$, and $\sigma(n) \leq |U|$ for all n. Hence

$$\sum_{\delta(n)>1} (\delta(n)-1) \leq \sum \bigl(\delta(n)^2 - \delta(n)\bigr) = \sum \bigl(\sigma(n)^2 - \sigma(n)\bigr) \leq |U| \sum_{\sigma(n)>1} (\sigma(n)-1).$$

□

This estimate can be doubled, as $\delta(n)-1 \leq \bigl(\delta(n)^2 - \delta(n)\bigr)/2$ whenever $\delta(n)>1$, but we cannot utilize this improvement.

There are sets U, V for which this estimate is correct up to a constant factor. It is likely that the sets for which we shall apply this lemma are not of this kind, but I do not see any way to show this.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that the sets A, B satisfy* (1.2) *and* (1.3)*. Then*

$$A(cx)/A(x) \to 1 \tag{2.1}$$

uniformly in any range $c_1 < c < c_2$ with $0 < c_1 < c_2$;

$$B(cx)/B(x) \to c \tag{2.2}$$

uniformly in any range $c < c_2$ with $0 < c_2$. Furthermore

$$\sum_{a \in A, a \leq x} a = o(xA(x)). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. For $c = 2^k$ with a (positive or negative) integer k the claim (2.1) follows from an iterated application of (1.3). For general c the claim for A follows from the monotonicity of $A(x)$. For B from (1.2) we get (2.2) for the same range; the range can be extended down to 0 by the monotonicity of $B(x)$.

To see (2.3) note that the sum with $a \leq \varepsilon x$ contributes at most $\varepsilon x A(x)$, and the sum with $a > \varepsilon x$ contributes at most

$$x\bigl(A(x) - A(\varepsilon x)\bigr) = o(xA(x))$$

by (2.1). □

Proof of the Theorem. Fix an integer x and put $U = A \cap [1,x]$, $V = B \cap [1,x]$. We use the notations σ, δ as in Lemma 2.1. We have

$$A(x)B(x) - x = |U||V| - x = y + z - r,$$

where

$$y=\sum_{\sigma(n)>1}(\sigma(n)-1)$$

counts the excess multiplicities,

$$z=\#\{n:n>x,n\in U+V\}$$

counts the unnecessarily large sums, and $r=r(x)$ is the number of integers not in $A+B$.

Let $t=a^*(x)$. Adding t to any $b\in B, b>x-t$ we get a sum $>x$, so

$$z\geq B(x)-B(x-t).$$

If $t\geq x/2$, we use only this and (1.3) with $c=(x-t)/x$ to conclude

$$z\geq\left(1-\frac{x-t}{x}-o(1)\right)B(x)\sim\frac{t}{x}B(x)\sim\frac{t}{A(x)}.$$

(This argument works for $t>cx$ with any fixed $c>0$, but fails for very small t, which is the typical situation.)

Assume now $t<x/2$. We are going to estimate y. Put $V'=B\cap[1,x-t]$. We will consider the sets $V'+U$, $V'-U$, and use σ', δ' to denote the corresponding representation functions.

We have

$$\sum\delta'(n)=|U||V'|=A(x)B(x-t).$$

As $U\subset[1,t]$ and $V'\subset[1,x-t]$, we have $V'-U\subset[1-t,x-t-1]$. We show that few sums lie in $[1-t,t]$. Indeed, if $b-a\leq t$ with $a\in U, b\in V'$, then $b\leq a+t$, so for an $a\in A$ there are at most $B(a+t)$ possible choices of b, This gives altogether

$$\sum_{a\in U}B(a+t)<(1+o(1))\sum_{a\in U}\frac{a+t}{A(a+t)}$$

by (1.2). As $A(a+t)=A(t)=A(x)=|U|$ in this range, the sum is equal to

$$t+\frac{1}{|U|}\sum_{a\in U}a=(1+o(1))t$$

by Lemma 2.2. Hence

$$\sum_{a\in U}B(a+t)<(1+\varepsilon)t.$$

This means that at least $A(x)B(x-t)-(1+\varepsilon)t$ pairs give a difference in the interval $[t+1,x-t-1]$, which contains less than $x-2t$ integers. Consequently

$$\sum_{\delta'n)>1}(\delta'(n)-1)>\big(A(x)B(x-t)-(1+\varepsilon)t\big)-(x-2t)=A(x)B(x-t)-x+(1-\varepsilon)t.$$

We now apply Lemma 2.1 to the sets U,V' to conclude

$$\sum_{\sigma'(n)>1}(\sigma'(n)-1)\geq\frac{1}{|U|}\big(A(x)B(x-t)-x+(1-\varepsilon)t\big)=B(x-t)-\frac{x-(1-\varepsilon)t}{A(x)}.$$

Clearly $\sigma(n)\geq\sigma'(n)$ for all n, so

$$y=\sum_{\sigma(n)>1}(\sigma(n)-1)\geq\sum_{\sigma'(n)>1}(\sigma'(n)-1).$$

Adding the estimates we obtain

$$A(x)B(x) - x + r = y + z \geq B(x) - \frac{x - (1-\varepsilon)t}{A(x)} = \frac{A(x)B(x) - x}{A(x)} + \frac{(1-\varepsilon)t}{A(x)},$$

which can be rearranged as

$$A(x)B(x) - x \geq \frac{(1-\varepsilon)t}{A(x)-1} - \frac{rA(x)}{A(x)-1}.$$

□

3. The construction

We prove Theorem 1.3.

Take an increasing sequence $p_1, p_2, \dots$ of primes such that $k^3 < p_k < (k+1)^3$, possibly with finitely many exceptions. We shall construct a sequence of integers u_k such that $u_k > ku_{k-1}$, $p_k | u_k$ and finite sets A_i of integers such that

$$A_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, p_1\}, \ A_k \subset (u_k, 2u_k) \text{ for } k \geq 2,$$

$$|A_1| = p_1, \ |A_k| = p_k - p_{k-1} \text{ for } k \geq 2,$$

hence

$$|A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_k| = p_k,$$

and the set $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_k$ is a complete set of residues modulo p_k. One of the complements will be

$$A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k.$$

To specify the other set we put

$$B_k = \{n : p_k | n, \ ku_k < n < (k+3)u_{k+1}\}$$

and

$$B = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k.$$

First we prove that such sets A_k exist, provided the sequence u_k increases sufficiently fast.

Lemma 3.1. *There are integers v_k, depending only on the primes p_j, such that sets A_k with the above described properties can be found whenever $u_k > v_k$ for all k.*

Proof. Write

$$\delta = \prod_{i=k}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{p_k - 1}{p_j}\right)$$

and choose r so that

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_i} < \frac{\delta}{4p_k}.$$

The positivity of δ and the existence of r follows from the convergence of the series $\sum 1/p_i$. Write $q = p_k p_{k+1} \dots p_r$. We show that suitable sets can be found if $u_k > v_k = 2q/\delta$.

We will construct the sets A_k recursively. Given $A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}$, a necessary condition for the existence of A_k is that the elements of $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_{k-1}$ be all incongruent modulo p_k. Hence the property which we shall preserve during the induction is:

"the elements of $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_k$ are all incongruent modulo p_j for every $j \geq k$." We assume this holds for $k-1$ and we build $A_k = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{p_k - p_{k-1}}\}$.

Suppose $a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}$ are already found. We want to find a_t so that $m = p_k - p_{k-1} + t - 1$ residue classes are forbidden for each p_j, $j \geq k$. In each interval of length q there are

$$q \prod_{i=k}^{r} \left(1 - \frac{m}{p_j}\right) > \delta q$$

integers which avoid the m forbidden residue classes modulo all p_j, $k \leq j \leq r$. In the interval $(u_k, 2u_k)$ this means at least $\delta u_k - q$ candidates.

Next we count the numbers in forbidden residue classes modulo p_j, $j > r$. The number of integers in a residue class $a \pmod{p}$ in the interval $(u_k, 2u_k)$ is exactly

$$\left[\frac{2u_k - a - 1}{p}\right] - \left[\frac{u_k - a}{p}\right] \leq \frac{2u_k}{p},$$

assuming that $p < 2u_k$. We use this estimate for $p_j < 2u_k$. This excludes less than

$$p_k \sum_{i=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{2u_k}{p_i} < (\delta/2) u_k$$

integers.

Finally, if $p_j > 2u_k$, then there are no new excluded integers. Indeed, the only integer satisfying $n \equiv a \pmod{p_j}$ with some $a \in A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_{k-1} \cup \{a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}\}$ is a itself, which was already excluded (even several times) by previous congruences.

This leaves us at least $(\delta/2)u_k - q$ integers to choose from, which is positive if $u_k > 2q/\delta$. □

Now we show that A, B are additive complements, then estimate $A(x)B(x) - x$.

To prove the first claim, take an arbitrary $n > 3u_1$. It satisfies

$$(k+2)u_k < n \leq (k+3)u_{k+1}$$

with some k. Select $a \in A$ so that

$$a \in A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_k, \ a \equiv n \pmod{p_k}.$$

As $1 \leq a < 2u_k$, the integer $b = n - a$ satisfies $ku_k < b < (k+3)u_{k+1}$ and $p_k | b$, so $b \in B_k$.

Now we estimate $B(x)$ for a typical x. This number satisfies $ku_k < x \leq (k+1)u_{k+1}$ for some k. All blocks $B_j, j > k$ lie above x. An initial segment of B_k gives

$$B_k(x) \leq \frac{x - ku_k}{p_k}$$

elements. To estimate the contribution of smaller blocks note that

$$|B_j| \leq \frac{(j+3)u_{j+1} - ju_j}{p_j},$$

hence

$$B(x) \leq B_k(x) + |B_{k-1}| + |B_{k-2}| + \dots + |B_1|$$

$$\le \frac{x}{p_k} + \sum_{j=2}^{k} \left(\frac{j+2}{p_{j-1}} - \frac{j}{p_j} \right) u_j.$$

This estimate is not quite exact, since possibly only a segment of B_{k-1} is contained in our interval, and the sets B_j are not disjoint; takint these into account would not substantially improve our result.

By our assumption about the rate of growth of the sequence p_j the coefficient of u_j in the above formula is $O(j^{-3})$, that is,

$$B(x) \le \frac{x}{p_k} + c_1 \sum_{j=2}^{k} \frac{u_j}{j^3} < \frac{x}{p_k} + c_2 \frac{u_k}{k^3}$$

by our assumption about the rate of growth of the sequence u_j.

Since A_{k+2} consists already of elements $> u_{k+2} > (k+1)u_{k+1}$, we have $A(x) \le p_{k+1}$, consequently

$$A(x)B(x) - x < \frac{p_{k+1} - p_k}{p_k} x + c_2 \frac{u_k p_{k+1}}{k^3} = O(x/k) = o(x),$$

which shows that these sets are indeed exact complements.

For $x = u_{k+1}$ we have $A(x) = p_k$ and $u_k < a^*(x) < 2u_k$, so

$$A(x)B(x) - x < c_2 \frac{u_k p_k}{k^3} < c_3 u_k < c_3 a^*(x),$$

and also

$$c_3 u_k < \omega(x),$$

provided the sequence u_j grows so fast that $\omega(u_{k+1}) > u_k$. These estimates show the bound (1.7).

4. Concluding remark

All known constructions of exact complements use a variant of this approach, namely combining a complete set of residues modulo some integers p_k (primes here, other sorts of integers in other papers, depending on the situation) and multiples of these p_k in an interval. The difficulty is that multiples of p_k are needed for a time after the appearance of the firts few multiples of p_{k+1}, which creates multiply represented sums. I see no way to eliminate or reduce this effect, nor a way to improve the lower estimate which would then vindicate this overkill.

References

1. E. Szemerédi A. Sárközy, *On a problem in additive number theory*, Acta Math. Hungar. **64** (1994), 237–245.
2. L. Danzer, *Über eine Frage von G. Hanani aus der additiven Zahlentheorie*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **214/215** (1964), 392–394.
3. H. Halberstam and K. F. Roth, *Sequences*, Clarendon, London, 1966, 2nd ed. Springer, 1983.
4. W. Narkiewicz, *Remarks on a conjecture of Hanani in additive number theory*, Colloq. Math. **7** (1959/60), 161–165.
5. I. Z. Ruzsa, *An asymptotically exact additive completion*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **32** (1996), 51–57.
6. ———, *On the additive completion of primes*, Acta Arithmetica **86** (1998), 269–275.
7. ———, *Additive completion of lacunary sequences*, Combinatorica **21** (2001), 279–291.
8. J.-H. Fang Y.-G., Chen, *On a conjecture of Sárközy and Szemerédi*, Acta Arithmetica (to appear).

Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Pf. 127, H-1364 Hungary
E-mail address: ruzsa@renyi.hu