Nearly subadditive sequences

Zoltán Füredi^{*}

Imre Z. Ruzsa[†]

October 30, 2018

Abstract

We show that the de Bruijn-Erdős condition for the error term in their improvement of Fekete's Lemma is not only sufficient but also necessary in the following strong sense. Suppose that given a sequence $0 \le f(1) \le f(2) \le f(3) \le \ldots$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)/n^2 = \infty.$$
 (1)

Then, there exists a sequence $\{b(n)\}_{n=1,2,...}$ satisfying

$$b(n+m) \le b(n) + b(m) + f(n+m) \tag{2}$$

such that the sequence of slopes $\{b(n)/n\}_{n=1,2,...}$ takes every rational number.

When the series (1) is bounded we improve their result as follows. If there exist N and real $\mu > 1$ such that (2) holds for all pairs (n, m) with $N \le n \le m \le \mu n$, then $\lim_{n \to \infty} b(n)/n$ exists.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 40A05, 11K65, 05A16. Keywords: Fekete's lemma, Convergence and divergence of nearly subadditive sequences.

1 Fekete's lemma on subadditive sequences

An infinite sequence of reals $a(1), a(2), \ldots, a(n), \ldots$ is called *subadditive* if

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) \tag{3}$$

holds for all integers $n, m \ge 1$.

Every (reasonable) calculus textbook contains Fekete's [8] Lemma as a theorem (or as an exercise, see, e.g., Polya and Szego [12]). It says that if the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is subadditive, then the sequence $\{a(n)/n\}$ has a limit (possible negative infinity). Moreover, that limit is equal to the infimum,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a(n)}{n} = \inf_{k \ge 1} \frac{a(k)}{k}.$$
(4)

^{*}Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Hungary E-mail: furedi.zoltan@renyi.mta.hu. Research supported in part by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office NKFIH, K116769, and by the Simons Foundation Collaboration Grant 317487.

[†]Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Hungary E-mail: ruzsa.imre@renyi.mta.hu. Research is supported in part by ERCAdG Grant No.321104 and Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research Grant NK104183.

The standard proof of Fekete's Subadditive Lemma

Using the subadditivity we get by induction (from n - k to n) that

$$a(n) \le a(k) + a(n-k) \le 2a(k) + a(n-2k) \le \dots \le \lfloor n/k \rfloor a(k) + a(\beta)$$

where $0 \le \beta \le k - 1$. (We may define a(0) = 0). This implies that for all $n \ge k \ge 1$

$$\frac{a(n)}{n} \le \frac{a(k)}{k} + \frac{\max\{|a(1)|, \dots, |a(k-1)|\}}{n}.$$
(5)

Therefore

$$\limsup \frac{a(n)}{n} \le \frac{a(k)}{k}.$$
(6)

This holds for every k, so

$$\limsup \le \inf,\tag{7}$$

implying $\limsup = \inf$, so the limit exists.

A remark on large values of (n,m)

Note that the above proof yields that if the subadditivity (3) only holds for $n, m \ge N$, then the limit still exists. We have $a(n)/n \le a(k)/k$ for all $n \ge k \ge N$ whenever n/k is an integer. In general, we use induction only if both k and n - k is at least N, i.e., we choose $\beta \in [k + 1, 2k - 1]$. Instead of (5) we obtain that for all $n \ge 2k, k \ge N$

$$\frac{a(n)}{n} \le \frac{a(k)}{k} + \frac{\max\left\{|a(k+1)|, \dots, |a(2k-1)|\right\}}{n}.$$
(8)

This implies (6) and (7) for $k \ge N$. We obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a(n)}{n} = \inf_{k \ge N} \frac{a(k)}{k}. \qquad \Box$$
(9)

Having the threshold N is a true (and nontrivial) extension

One might be tempted to think that (9) can be easily obtained from the original Fekete's lemma (4). Maybe so, but let us consider the following sequence. Suppose that $2 \le N \le n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \ldots$ are integers such that $n_i - N \le n_{i+1}$. Define for all $i \ge 1$ and positive integer n

$$a(n) := \begin{cases} 1 & n \le n_1 \\ 1 & n_{i+1} - N \le n \le n_{i+1} - 2, \\ n/n_i & n_i \le n < n_{i+1} \text{ (but } |n - n_{i+1}| \notin [2, N]). \end{cases}$$

This sequence satisfies subadditivity for $m, n \ge N$. Suppose that $\limsup n_{i+1}/n_i = \infty$. Then the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ does not seem to be easily transformed to a true subadditive one, because there are infinitely many (x, y) pairs with $1 \le x < N$ and $x + y = n_{i+1} - 1$ such that $a(x+y) - a(y) - a(x) = (n_{i+1} - 1)/n_i - 2$ is arbitrarily large.

(If one prefers an integer sequence, then can observe that $\{[a(n)]\}\$ has the same properties).

2 Sub-2 sequences by de Bruijn and Erdős

A sequence $\{a(n)\}\$ is called μ -subadditive with a threshold N ((μ , N)-subadditive, for short) if

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) \tag{10}$$

holds for all integers n, m such that

$$N \le n \le m \le \mu n. \tag{11}$$

Theorem 1 (de Bruijn and Erdős, Theorem 22. in [4]). Suppose that the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ satisfies (10) for all integers $N \leq n \leq m \leq 2n$. Then the sequence of slopes $\{a(n)/n\}$ has a limit (possible negative infinity). Moreover, that limit is equal to the infimum,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a(n)}{n} = \inf_{k \ge N} \frac{a(k)}{k}$$

Actually, they considered the case N = 1 only. Here we present a greatly simplified proof.

A new proof for Theorem 1

Fix a $k, k \ge N$. Write n as $n = (\lfloor n/k \rfloor - 1)k + \beta$ where $k \le \beta \le 2k - 1$. We will show that

$$a(n) \le \left(\lfloor n/k \rfloor - 1\right) a(k) + a(\beta). \tag{12}$$

This implies that for all $n \ge 2k$, $k \ge N$ inequality (8) holds, implying (9) as in earlier proofs, and we are done.

To prove (12) we need a definition. A sequence of (positive) integers $X := \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t\}$ (here $t \ge 1$) is called 2-good if $1/2 \le x_i/x_j \le 2$ holds for all $1 \le i, j \le t$. If X is a 2-good sequence of length t and we take two minimal members, $x_i, x_j \in X$, delete them from X but join $x_{new} := x_i + x_j$, then the new sequence $X' := X \setminus \{x_i, x_j\} \cup \{x_{new}\}$ is 2-good as well. Note that the sum of the members of X is the same as in X'. If the sequence of $\{a(x)\}$ is 2-subadditive then $a(x_{new}) \le a(x_i) + a(x_j)$ implies that

$$\sum_{x \in X'} a(x) \le \sum_{x \in X} a(x).$$
(13)

Define the set $X_{\lfloor n/k \rfloor}$ of length $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ as $\{k, k, k, \ldots, k, \beta\}$. It is obviously a 2-good sequence with sum *n*. Define the sets X_t of length *t* for $\lfloor n/k \rfloor \ge t \ge 1$ by the above rule, $X_{t-1} := X'_t$. We obtain $X_{\lfloor n/k \rfloor} \longrightarrow \ldots X_t \longrightarrow X_{t-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow X_1 = \{n\}$. Then (13) gives

$$a(n) = \sum_{x \in X_1} a(x) \le \dots \le \sum_{x \in X_t} a(x) \le \dots \le \sum_{x \in X_{\lfloor n/k \rfloor}} a(x) = \left(\lfloor n/k \rfloor - 1\right) a(k) + a(\beta). \qquad \Box$$

3 Sub- μ sequences with $\mu < 2$

Concerning their result (Theorem 1 above) de Bruijn and Erdős [4] state, maybe somewhat carelessly, that 'It may be remarked that the inequality in (7.1) cannot be replaced by $\mu^{-1}n \leq m \leq \mu n$ for any $\mu < 2$ '. In their papers [3, 4] they deal with many conditions and sequences, we could not really know what was in their minds, but our first new result is a strengthening of Theorem 1 for all $\mu > 1$. We show that their condition can be weakened such that the limit exists if (10) holds only for the pairs (n, m) with $n \le m \le \mu n$ for some fixed $\mu > 1$.

Theorem 2. Suppose $\mu > 1$ and $N \ge 1$ are given. If the sequence $\{a(1), a(2), \ldots\}$ is (μ, N) -subadditive, i.e.,

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) \quad \forall n \le m \le \mu n, \ n, m \ge N,$$

then the $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n}$ exists and is equal to $\inf_{k\geq N} \frac{a(k)}{k}$. (It may be $-\infty$).

For the proof we investigate sequences $\{a(n)\}$ where the subadditivity holds only for a very few pairs (n, m).

Sub-1⁺ sequences

Given $N \ge 1$ a sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is called $(1^+, N)$ subadditive if the following two inequalities hold for all $n \ge N$.

$$a(2n) \leq a(n) + a(n)$$

$$a(2n+1) \leq a(n) + a(n+1).$$

Given a sequence $\{a(n)\}\$ let $q(n) := \max\left\{\frac{a(n)}{n}, \dots, \frac{a(2n-1)}{2n-1}, \frac{a(2n)}{2n}\right\}.$

Lemma 3. Suppose that $N \ge 1$ and the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is $(1^+, N)$ subadditive. Then for $n \ge N$ the sequence $\{q(n)\}$ is non-increasing, $q(n) \ge q(n+1)$.

We only have to show that q(n) is at least as large as a(2n+1)/(2n+1) and a(2n+2)/(2n+2). The 1⁺ subadditivity implies

$$q(n) \ge \begin{cases} \frac{a(n+1)}{n+1} \ge \frac{a(2n+2)}{2n+2}, \\ \max\left\{\frac{a(n)}{n}, \frac{a(n+1)}{n+1}\right\} \ge \frac{n}{2n+1} \frac{a(n)}{n} + \frac{n+1}{2n+1} \frac{a(n+1)}{n+1} \ge \frac{a(2n+1)}{2n+1}. \end{cases} \square$$

Proof of Theorem 2

Since the case $\mu \ge 2$ is covered by Theorem 1, we may suppose that $1 < \mu < 2$. Define the positive integer k by

$$(1+\mu)^{k-1} \le 2^{k+1} < (1+\mu)^k.$$

Given any n define the sequences u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_k and v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k as follows.

$$u_0 = v_0 := n, \quad u_{i+1} := 2u_i, \quad v_{i+1} := v_i + \lfloor \mu v_i \rfloor, \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1).$$

We have $u_k = 2^k n$ and $v_k > (1 + \mu)^k n - (1 + \mu)^k / \mu$. So there exists an N_1 (depending only from μ) such that $2u_k \leq v_k$ holds in the above process for every integer $n \geq N_1$.

Let $N_2 := \max\{N, 1/(\mu - 1)\}$. Then the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is $(1^+, N_2)$ subadditive. Lemma 3 implies

that $L = \lim_{n \to \infty} q(n)$ exists. If $L = -\infty$ then $\lim_{n \to \infty} a(n)/n = -\infty$ as well, and we are done. Since $L < \infty$, from now on, we may suppose that L is a real number.

Choose an (arbitrarily small) $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an N_3 (depending on ε , μ , N, and $\{a(n)\}$) such that $q(n) < L + \varepsilon$ for every $n \ge N_3$. By the definition of q we get

$$a(n)/n < L + \varepsilon \tag{14}$$

for every $n \ge N_3$. We are going to show that for $n \ge \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$

$$a(n)/n > L + \varepsilon - \varepsilon \left(1 + \mu\right)^k.$$
(15)

Since this holds for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the limit a(n)/n exists and is equal to L.

To prove (15) we need the following claim which holds for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$.

Claim 4. If $a(w)/w \leq L + \varepsilon - \eta$ for every $w \in [u_i, v_i]$, then $a(z)/z < L + \varepsilon - \frac{\eta}{1+\mu}$ for every $z \in [u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}]$.

Indeed, every $z \in [u_{i+1}, v_{i+1}]$ can be written in the form z = x + y where $x \in [u_i, v_i]$, $x \le y \le \mu x$. Apply subadditivity for (x, y) and the upper bound $L + \varepsilon - \eta$ for a(x)/x and the upper bound $L + \varepsilon$ for a(y)/y. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a(z)}{z} &= \frac{a(x+y)}{x+y} \le \frac{a(x)+a(y)}{x+y} \\ &= \frac{a(x)}{x}\frac{x}{x+y} + \frac{a(y)}{y}\frac{y}{x+y} < (L+\varepsilon-\eta)\frac{x}{x+y} + (L+\varepsilon)\frac{y}{x+y} \\ &= L+\varepsilon-\eta\frac{x}{x+y} \le L+\varepsilon-\eta\frac{1}{1+\mu}. \quad \Box \end{aligned}$$

The end of the proof of Theorem 2. Consider any n with $n \ge \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$. By (14) we have $a(n)/n = L + \varepsilon - h$ for some h > 0. Consider the intervals $[u_i, v_i]$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, where $[u_0, v_0]$ consists of a single element, namely n. Using Claim 4 we get that $a(x) < L + \varepsilon - h/(1 + \mu)^i$ for each $x \in [u_i, v_i]$ for $1 \le i \le k$. Especially, $a(x)/x < L + \varepsilon - h/(1 + \mu)^k$ for each $x \in [u_k, v_k]$. Since $2u_k \le v_k$ we obtain $q(u_k) < L + \varepsilon - h/(1 + \mu)^k$. But $q(u_k) \ge L$. This implies $h < \varepsilon(1 + \mu)^k$. We obtained that $a(n)/n = L + \varepsilon - h > L + \varepsilon - \varepsilon(1 + \mu)^k$ as claimed in (15). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4 Nearly subadditive sequences, an error term by de Bruijn and Erdős

Let f(n) be a non-negative, non-decreasing sequence. deBruijn and Erdős [4] called the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ subadditive with an error term f (or nearly f-subadditive, or f-subadditive for short) if

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) + f(n+m)$$
 (16)

holds for all positive integers $n, m \ge 1$. The case f(x) = 0 corresponds to the cases discussed above.

They showed that if the error term f is small,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)/n^2 \quad \text{is finite,} \tag{17}$$

and (16) holds for all $n \le m \le 2n$, then the limit of $\{a(n)/n\}$ still exists.

Let us call a sequence $\{a(n)\}\ (\mu, N, f)$ -subadditive if (16) holds for all $N \leq n \leq m \leq \mu n$. We usually suppose that f is a non-negative monotone increasing real function but we will discuss more general cases as well. Our Theorem 2 yields the following corollary.

Theorem 5. Suppose $\mu > 1$ and $N \ge 1$ are given and f is a non-negative monotone increasing real function. If the sequence $\{a(1), a(2), \ldots\}$ is (μ, N, f) -subadditive, i.e.,

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) + f(n+m) \quad \forall m \le n \le \mu m, \ m, n \ge N,$$

then the $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n}$ exists. (It may be $-\infty$).

Near subadditivity is *really* important

Subadditivity is important, it appears in all parts of mathematics. We all have our favorite examples and applications. But nearly subadditivity is even more applicable, here we mention a few areas.

In the beginning of the Bollobás-Riordan book [2] the de Bruijn-Erdős theorem is listed (as Lemma 2.1 on page 37) among the important useful tools in Percolation Theory. The de Bruijn-Erdős theorem is widely used in investigating sparse random structures, e.g., Bayati, Gamarnik, and Tetali [1] (Proposition 5 on page 4011), Turova [15], or Kulczycki, Kwietniak, and Jian Li [11] concerning entropy of shift spaces.

Also, recurrence relations of type (16) are often encountered in the analysis of divide and conquer algorithms,

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) + \text{cost of cutting.}$$

see, e.g., Hsien-Kuei Hwang and Tsung-Hsi Tsai [10]. In Economics it is an essential property of some *cost* functions that $COST(X+Y) \leq COST(X)+COST(Y)$. Similar relations appear in Physics and in Combinatorial optimization (see, e.g., Steele [14]).

Also see, e.g., Capobianco [5] concerning cellular automatas, Ceccherini-Silberstein, Coornaert, and F. Krieger[6] for an analogue on cancellative *amenable semigroups*.

Proof of Theorem 5 using Theorem 2

We utilize the proof from [4] (bottom of page 163). For $n \ge N$ define

$$G(n) := a(n) + 3n\left(\sum_{x \ge n} f(x)/x^2\right).$$

Then the monotonicity of f, the relation $n \leq m \leq 2n$, and an easy calculation imply that

$$G(n+m) \le G(n) + G(m)$$

whenever (16) holds for (n, m).

Theorem 2 can be applied to $\{G(n)\}$, so we have that the limit

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{G(n)}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{a(n)}{n} + \left(\sum_{x \ge n} \frac{f(x)}{x^2} \right) \right)$$

exists. Here the last term tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$ by (17) and we are done.

5 How large the error term f(x) could be?

It is very natural to ask how more one can extend the de Bruijn-Erdős theorem concerning f-nearly subadditive sequences (the case $\mu = 2, N = 1$). Especially, how large the error term could be?

$$f(x) = o(x)$$
 is necessary

Suppose that f(n) is non-negative and $\limsup f(n)/n > L > 0$. We can easily construct a sequence $\{a(n)\}$ satisfying (16) for all pairs $m, n \ge 1$ such that $\lim a(n)/n$ does not exist. We do not even use that f is monotone or not.

Given such an f one can find a sequence of integers $1 \le n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \ldots$ such that $f(n_i)/n_i > L/2$, and $n_{i+1} \ge n_i + 2$ for all $i \ge 1$. Define $a(n) = f(n_i)$ if $n = n_i$ and 0 otherwise.

f(x) = o(x) is not sufficient

Condition (17) allows $f(x) = O(x^{1-c})$ (c > 0 fixed) or even $f(x) = O(x/(\log x)^{1+c})$. The first author observed that f(x) could not be $\Omega(x/\log x)$. In 2016 he [9] proposed the following problem for Schweitzer competition for university students (in Hungary). "Prove that there exists a sequence $a(1), a(2), \ldots, a(n), \ldots$ of real numbers such that

$$a(n+m) \le a(n) + a(m) + \frac{n+m}{\log(n+m)}$$

for all integers $m, n \ge 1$, and the set $\{a(n)/n : n \ge 1\}$ is everywhere dense on the real line." (There were two correct solutions: by Nóra Frankl, and Kada Williams and two partial solutions by Balázs Maga, and János Nagy).

deBruijn and Erdős got the best result

We show that the de Bruijn-Erdős condition (17) for the error term is not only sufficient but also necessary in the following strong sense.

Theorem 6. Let f(n) be a non-negative, non-decreasing sequence and suppose

$$\sum_{1 \le n < \infty} f(n)/n^2 = \infty.$$
(18)

Then there exists a nearly f-subadditive sequence $b(1), b(2), b(3), \ldots$ of rational numbers, i.e., for all integers $m, n \ge 1$

$$b(n+m) \le b(n) + b(m) + f(n+m)$$

such that the set of slopes takes all rationals exactly once, $\{b(n)/n : n \ge 1\} = \mathbf{Q}$.

The proof is constructive and presented in the next section.

6 Proof of Theorem 6, a construction

A typical subadditive function is concave like, e.g., for $a(x) = \sqrt{x}$ we have $\sqrt{x+y} \le \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}$ (for $x, y \ge 0$). The main idea of the construction for Theorem 6 is that a nearly *f*-subadditive sequence $\{a(n)\}$ could be (strictly) convex with $\lim_{n\to\infty} a(n)/n = \infty$.

A convex *f*-subadditive function

Claim 7. Suppose that f(n) is a non-negative, non-decreasing sequence, $0 \le f(2) \le f(3) \le ...$ Define f(1) = a(1) = 0 and in general let

$$a(n) := n\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right).$$
(19)

Then the sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is nearly f-subadditive, it satisfies (16).

Proof. Write down the definition of a(n), simplify, use the monotonicity of f, finally the estimate $\left(\sum_{u < i \leq v} 1/i^2\right) < (1/u) - (1/v)$ (for integers $1 \leq u < v$). We obtain

$$a(n+m) - a(n) - a(m)$$

$$= n\left(\sum_{i \le n+m} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) + m\left(\sum_{i \le n+m} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) - n\left(\sum_{i \le n} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) - m\left(\sum_{i \le m} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right)$$

$$= n\left(\sum_{n < i \le n+m} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) + m\left(\sum_{m < i \le n+m} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right)$$

$$\leq nf(n+m)\left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+m}\right) + mf(n+m)\left(\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{n+m}\right) = f(n+m). \quad \Box$$

Claim 8. The above sequence $\{a(n)\}$ defined by (19) is non-negative and convex, i.e., for $n \ge 2$ we have

$$a(n) \le \frac{a(n-1) + a(n+1)}{2}$$
.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} a(n-1) + a(n+1) - 2a(n) &= (n-1)\left(\sum_{i \le n-1} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) + (n+1)\left(\sum_{i \le n+1} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) - 2n\left(\sum_{i \le n} \frac{f(i)}{i^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{f(n+1)}{(n+1)} - (n-1)\frac{f(n)}{n^2} \ge \frac{f(n+1)}{(n+1)n^2} \ge 0. \quad \Box \end{aligned}$$

The end of the proof of Theorem 6

In this section $\{f(n)\}$ is given by Theorem 6, and $\{a(n)\}$ is the well-defined nearly f-subadditive, convex sequence obtained by (19) in Claim 8. Then (18) implies $\lim_{n\to\infty} a(n)/n = \infty$.

For the rest of the proof the main observation is the following: If $c(1) \le c(2) \le c(3) \le \ldots$ is a monotone sequence, and $\{a(n)\}$ is *f*-subadditive, then

$$b(n) := a(n) - c(n)n$$
 is f subadditive as well.

Indeed,

$$b(n+m) - b(n) - b(m) - f(n+m)$$

= $[a(n+m) - c(n+m)(n+m)] - [a(n) - c(n)n] - [a(m) - c(m)m] - f(n+m)$
= $[a(n+m) - a(n) - a(m) - f(n+m)] + (c(n) - c(n+m))n + (c(m) - c(n+m))m \le 0.$

Let r_1, r_2, r_3, \ldots be an enumeration of **Q**. We will define a sequence $1 \le n_0 \le n_1 \le n_2 \le \ldots$ and simultaneously $\{c(n)\}$ (and thus $\{b(n)\}$ as well) such that

- (D) the slopes $\{b(n)/n : 1 \le n \le n_i\}$ are all distinct and rational, and
- (R) $r_i \in \{b(n)/n : 1 \le n \le n_i\}, (i \ge 1).$

We proceed by induction on *i*. Let n_0 be the smallest $x \ge 1$ such that f(x) > 0. Equation (18) implies that $1 \le n_0 < \infty$. Choose $c(1) \le \cdots \le c(n_0)$ arbitrarily such that the fractions b(x)/x = (a(x) - c(x)x)/x are all rationals and they are all distinct. Since these are finitely many constraints of the form

$$\frac{a(x)}{x} - c(x) \neq \frac{a(y)}{y} - c(y) \quad 1 \le x \neq y \le n_0$$

and the set **Q** is everywhere dense on **R**, one can easily choose appropriate c(x)'s.

If n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_i has been already defined (satisfying properties (D) and (R)) then proceed as follows. If $r_{i+1} \in \{b(x)/x : 1 \le x \le n_i\}$, then let $n_{i+1} := n_i$.

If $r_{i+1} \notin \{b(x)/x : 1 \le x \le n_i\}$ then define n_{i+1} as the smallest integer x satisfying

$$x > n_i, \quad \frac{a(x)}{x} - c(n_i) > r_{i+1}.$$

Such x exists. Let $c(n_{i+1}) := \frac{a(n_{i+1})}{n_{i+1}} - r_{i+1}$. It follows that $c(n_i) < c(n_{i+1})$. Then select c(x) for integers x with $n_i < x < n_{i+1}$ such that the values of a(x)/x - c(x) are all rationals, distinct from each other, have no common values with $\{b(n)/n : 1 \le n \le n_i\} \cup \{r_{i+1}\}$ and also $c(n_i) \le c(n_i+1) \le \cdots \le c(n_{i+1})$. These are finitely many conditions but $c(n_i) < c(n_{i+1})$ and \mathbf{Q} is everywhere dense, so the induction step can be done. This completes the construction.

7 Conclusion, problems

Let $X \subseteq \mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{N}$, $f : \mathbf{N} \to \mathbf{R}$. The sequence $\{a(n)\}$ is (X, f)-subadditive if $a(m+n) \leq a(n) + a(m) + f(n+m)$ holds for $(n,m) \in X$. We have found conditions for X and f, strengthening the original Fekete's lemma and its de Bruijn-Erdős generalization, which ensure that $\lim a(n)/n$ exists. Certainly further thinning of X are possible. We mention two of these problems.

Is it possible to replace the constraint $n \le m \le \mu n$ in Theorem 2 by some condition like $n \le m \le n + r(n)$ where r(n) = o(n) some slow growing function? (Probably not).

What is the structure of 1^+ subadditive sequences? Can we tell more than Lemma 3?

Finally, it is well-known that if a(x) is a *measurable* subadditive function $a : (0, \infty) \to \mathbf{R}$, then the limit $\lim_{x\to\infty} a(x)/x$ exists. The non-measurable subadditive functions include the *Cauchyfunctions* which do not have limits, and are far from linear. This is a large field of analysis, and alos in number theory concerning additive functions. There are many results and questions, see, e.g., [7, 13, 16].

References

- [1] Mohsen Bayati, David Gamarnik, and Prasad Tetali: Combinatorial approach to the interpolation method and scaling limits in sparse random graphs. Ann. Probab. 41 (2013), 4080–4115.
- [2] Béla Bollobás, and Oliver Riordan: *Percolation*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2006. x+323 pp.
- [3] N. G. de Bruijn, and P. Erdős: Some linear and some quadratic recursion formulas, I. Indag. Math. 13 (1951), 374–382.
- [4] N. G. de Bruijn, and P. Erdős: Some linear and some quadratic recursion formulas, II. Indag. Math. 14 (1952), 152–163.
- [5] S. Capobianco: Multidimensional cellular automata and generalization of Fekete's lemma. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. 10 (2008), 95–104.
- [6] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, M. Coornaert, and F. Krieger: An analogue of Fekete's lemma for subadditive functions on cancellative amenable semigroups. J. Anal. Math. 124 (2014), 59–81.
- [7] P. Erdős: On the distribution function of additive functions. Ann. of Math. 47 (1946), 1–20.
- [8] M. Fekete: Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten. Mathematische Zeitschrift 17 (1923), 228–249. Also see, e.g., in [12].
- P. Frenkel: The 2016 Miklós Schweitzer Memorial Competition in Mathematics. October 24 November 2, 2016. (Organized by the Bolyai Society, Hungary). Problem 4 was proposed by Z. Füredi. See: http://www.bolyai.hu/SCHWEITZER/angol_2016.pdf
- [10] Hsien-Kuei Hwang, and Tsung-Hsi Tsai: An asymptotic theory for recurrence relations based on minimization and maximization. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 290 (2003), 1475–1501.
- [11] M. Kulczycki, D. Kwietniak, and Jian Li: Entropy of subordinate shift spaces. Amer. Math. Monthly 125 (2018), 141–148.
- [12] G. Pólya, and G. Szegő: Problems and theorems in analysis, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, New York (1976). (Originally: Aufgaben und Lehrsätze..., Springer, Berlin, 1925, vol. 1, p. 17.)
- [13] I. Z. Ruzsa: Additive functions with bounded difference. Period. Math. Hungar. 10 (1979), 67–70.
- [14] J. M. Steele: Probability theory and combinatorial optimization. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics 69, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1997. viii+159 pp.
- [15] Tatyana S. Turova: The largest component in subcritical inhomogeneous random graphs. Combin. Probab. Comput. 20 (2011), 131–154.
- [16] E. Wirsing: A characterization of log n as an additive arithmetic function. 1970 Symposia Mathematica, Vol. IV (INDAM, Rome, 1968/69) pp. 45–57. Academic Press, London