

On the construction of a family of sets of positive integers closed under taking subsets

Shoichi Kamada

University of Tsukuba
1-1-1, Tennodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan
kamada.shoichi.ft@u.tsukuba.ac.jp

Abstract

In the several contexts such as combinatorial number theory, families of sets of positive integers closed under taking subsets have been investigated. Then it is sometimes useful to give bijections between the set of the one-sided infinite sequences on the alphabet set $\{0, 1\}$ and such a family of sets. The most typical example is the family of sum-free sets. Although such a kind of families covers a large class of families of sets, there are only a few considerations on bijections for the case where the sum-free property is replaced by another property.

In this paper, we explicitly give a bijection and its inverse between the set of one-sided infinite sequences on the alphabet set $\{0, 1\}$ and a family of sets which may be contained in a class of families closed under taking subsets. Moreover, we show that some extremal property in a particular family of sets is characterized by a discrete dynamical system based on this kind of bijections.

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{A} be a family of sets of positive integers and let $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of one-sided infinite sequences on the alphabet set $\{0, 1\}$, where $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Throughout this paper, we are interested in the following condition for \mathcal{A} .

(I) If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \subseteq A$, then $B \in \mathcal{A}$,

i.e. \mathcal{A} is closed under taking subsets. Especially, we will discuss on bijections between $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and \mathcal{A} , where \mathcal{A} may be contained in a class of families satisfying (I). With a bijection from $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{A} , we shall say that the bijection constructs a family \mathcal{A} . In Cameron and Erdős's paper [5], several examples for families satisfying (I) are found and include mainly three parts: additive properties, multiplicative properties and the others.

For several families of sets with additive properties such as sum-free sets and 3-AP free sets, it is sufficient for the condition (I) to avoid a solution of a single linear equation over \mathbb{Z} . For some general additive properties, if a single linear equation is replaced by a system of linear equations, then the family of sets satisfying the condition (I) are obtained. Notice that the avoidance of a solution of a system of linear equations means the avoidance of a solution of some single linear equation. As another direction, one can consider the avoidance of a solution of all single linear equations in a finite set of equations. Then the obtained family of sets also satisfies the condition (I).

For one multiplicative property, we can consider the pairwise coprimality. Then the obtained family of sets satisfies the condition (I).

As a typical example to investigate a bijection that constructs a family of sets, the family of sum-free sets are investigated rather than the other properties. In this case, it plays some role in several literatures such as [2, 3, 4, 8, 1] to give at least one of a bijection from $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{A} and its inverse, explicitly. In particular, the Cayley graph on the group \mathbb{Z} whose generating set is a sum-free set is related to its cyclic automorphisms [2].

As a complementary case of the condition (I), we may consider $2^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ or its subfamily. For a statement that a system of linear equations over \mathbb{Z} has a solution in $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, assume that $\mathcal{R} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a family of sets that satisfy this statement. Then such a kind of families \mathcal{R} involves Schur's theorem [10], van der Waerden's theorem [11], and Rado's theorem [9]. In this case, it is matched with Ramsey Theory and the theory of ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} (e.g. see [6]).

We have the following three purposes in this paper. The first one aims to give a method for the construction of a family \mathcal{A} satisfying (I). The second one is that a bijection that constructs the family of sets satisfying the pairwise coprimality includes the sieve of Eratosthenes. The last one is to introduce and investigate a new notion of ultimately completeness in our framework for a special class of families \mathcal{A} through the inverse of a bijection that constructs \mathcal{A} .

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 3, we review the previous works due to Cameron [2] and due to Calkin and Finch [1] on bijections between the set of one-sided infinite sequences $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and the family of sum-free sets on positive integers. In Section 4, we introduce a general framework to describe bijections between $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and a family of sets of positive integers that may be contained in a class of families under taking subsets. In Section 5, we describe examples of families closed under taking subsets and their bijections. Some extremal property appears from a basic viewpoint of dynamical systems that from some parametrization of bijections in Subsection 5.1. Moreover, it is shown that a bijection that constructs the family of sets satisfying the pairwise coprimality in our framework includes the sieve of Eratosthenes in Subsection 5.2.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the set of one-sided infinite sequences on the alphabet set $\{0, 1\}$. In other words, let $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} := \{\sigma = (\sigma_a)_{a \in \mathbb{N}} : \sigma_a \in \{0, 1\}\}$. Notice that we can describe each of elements in $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ not only as a sequence $\sigma = (\sigma_a)_{a \in \mathbb{N}}$ but also as a function $\sigma : a \mapsto \sigma_a$.

Let $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the power set of \mathbb{N} . Then by abuse of notation, we denote by A the characteristic function of $A \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, i.e.

$$A(a) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in A, \\ 0 & \text{if } a \notin A. \end{cases}$$

To justify this, we may check that the power set $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ has one-to-one correspondence to the set $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of one-sided infinite sequences.

Here, we define a metric ρ on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\rho(A, B) = \begin{cases} 2^{-N_0+1} & \text{if } A \neq B, \\ 0 & \text{if } A = B, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where N_0 is the smallest integer such that

$$A \cap [N_0] \neq B \cap [N_0].$$

i.e.

$$N_0 := \min\{a \in \mathbb{N} : A \cap [a] \neq B \cap [a]\}. \quad (2.2)$$

For the characteristic functions A and B , the definition of N_0 in (2.2) is replaced by

$$N_0 := \min\{a \in \mathbb{N} : A(a) \neq B(a)\}.$$

Throughout this paper, we use this metric to describe some topological properties related to bijections and families of sets.

3 Sum-Free Sets

In this section, we review the works due to Cameron [2] and due to Calkin and Finch [1]. A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is sum-free if it holds that

$$A \cap (A + A) = \emptyset, \quad (3.1)$$

where $A + A = \{a + b : a, b \in A\}$. Clearly, the condition (3.1) is useful for a forbidden structure that taking sum is not closed in A .

From $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{A} Here we give a bijection from $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{A} , say \mathcal{F} . For an arbitrary $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we can give a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with an auxiliary set $B \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ given by the following recursive procedure. First, we put $A_0 = \emptyset$ and $B_0 = \emptyset$. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, if a_n is the smallest integer which is not in

$$A_{n-1} \cup (A_{n-1} + A_{n-1}) \cup B_{n-1},$$

then

$$A_n = \begin{cases} A_{n-1} \cup \{a_n\} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 1, \\ A_{n-1} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$B_n = \begin{cases} B_{n-1} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 1, \\ B_{n-1} \cup \{a_n\} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Putting $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ and $B = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$, we obtain $A = \mathcal{F}\sigma$.

From \mathcal{A} to $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ Next, we give the inverse of F , say \mathcal{G} . Let $\mathcal{G}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$; $A \mapsto \sigma$ denote a mapping given by the following procedure. First, we calculate the following ternary sequence $\sigma' = \{\sigma'_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{0, 1, *\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

$$\sigma'_a = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in A, \\ * & \text{if } a \in A + A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Deleting $*$'s in σ' , we obtain $\sigma = \mathcal{G}(A) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Here, we review the ultimately completeness of sum-free sets for short. A sum-free set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is ultimately complete if for any sufficiently large $c \in \mathbb{N} \setminus A$, there exists $a, b \in A$ such that $c = a + b$, i.e. $c \in A + A$.

Proposition 3.1 ([1]). *A sum-free set A is ultimately complete if and only if the sequence $\mathcal{G}(A) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ contains only finitely many zeros.*

In the next section, we also consider a generalization of ultimately completeness.

4 General Framework

In this section, we consider a generalization of the condition (3.1). Intuitively, we replace $A + A$ in (3.1) by another operation. Let \mathcal{J} denote an operator on the power set $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ to describe a forbidden structure, where $\mathcal{J}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. Then in order to describe a forbidden structure with respect to \mathcal{J} , one may directly consider the following condition.

$$A \cap \mathcal{J}(A) = \emptyset.$$

However, this fails since there is some possibility such that

$$A \subseteq \mathcal{J}(A)$$

for any $A \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$. To avoid this case, we need to describe a forbidden structure.

Now, we regard a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ as an increasing sequence $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\}$. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots$, we introduce an operator \mathcal{J}_i on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{J}_i(A) := \{a \in \mathbb{N}: a_i < a < a_{i+1} \text{ and } a \in \mathcal{J}(\{a_1, \dots, a_i\})\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where if A is finite, then for $i \geq |A|$, it is defined by

$$\mathcal{J}_i(A) := \{a \in \mathbb{N}: a_{|A|} < a < \infty \text{ and } a \in \mathcal{J}(\{a_1, \dots, a_i\})\}.$$

Then we can give the following condition.

$$A \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_i(A) \right) = \emptyset. \quad (4.2)$$

It is easy to see that the condition (4.2) generalizes the condition (3.1). Indeed, in the case of $\mathcal{J}(A) = A + A$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{J} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_i$$

as the equality of operators. Hence, the condition (4.2) can be considered as defining a forbidden structure with respect to \mathcal{J} .

We will give examples of \mathcal{J} in Section 5. In this section, we shall suppose that a subfamily $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (I).

From $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathcal{A} Let $\mathcal{F}: \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}; \sigma \mapsto A$ denote a mapping given by the following recursive procedure. First, we put $A_0 = \emptyset$, $B_0 = \emptyset$. If a_n is the smallest integer which is not in

$$A_{n-1} \cup \mathcal{J}(A_{n-1}) \cup B_{n-1},$$

then for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$A_n = \begin{cases} A_{n-1} \cup \{a_n\} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 1, \\ A_{n-1} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$B_n = \begin{cases} B_{n-1} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 1, \\ B_{n-1} \cup \{a_n\} & \text{if } \sigma_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

Putting $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ and $B = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$, we obtain $A = \mathcal{F}\sigma$.

From \mathcal{A} to $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ In this subsection, we consider the inverse direction of $\mathcal{F}: \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. Although the inverse of $\mathcal{F}: \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is formally given by $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}$ as a mapping from \mathcal{A} to $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ in Section 3, we shall give a mapping $\mathcal{G}: 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that the restriction of domain of \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{A} coincides \mathcal{F}^{-1} for convenience.

Let $\mathcal{G}: 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}; A \mapsto \sigma$ denote a mapping constructed by the following procedure.

First, we calculate the following ternary sequence $\sigma' = \{\sigma'_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{0, 1, *\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

$$\sigma'_a = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in A, \\ * & \text{if } a \in \mathcal{J}_i(A) \text{ for some } i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Deleting $*$'s in σ' , we obtain $\sigma = \mathcal{G}(A) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Notice that (4.2) always holds. The following theorems are direct consequences.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that A is a perfect set. Then the following statements hold.*

- *A mapping $\mathcal{F}: \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a continuous bijection.*
- *A mapping $\mathcal{G}: 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a continuous surjection.*
- *The restriction of the domain of \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{A} is a continuous bijection. Consequently, \mathcal{F} is a homeomorphism.*

Here, we introduce a kind of ultimately completeness. A set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is ultimately complete with respect to \mathcal{J} if for any $a \in \mathbb{N} \setminus A$, it holds that $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_i(A)$.

5 Examples

As described in Introduction, logical conjunction/disjunction in a finite set of linear equations give rise to the condition (I).

For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, the set $\text{FS}(A)$ of finite sums of A is defined by

$$\text{FS}(A) := \left\{ \sum_{a \in S} a : S \subseteq A \text{ is nonempty and finite.} \right\}.$$

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is ultimately complete if all of sufficiently large elements in $\mathbb{N} \setminus A$ are representable as elements in $\text{FS}(A)$.

Remark 5.1. There may exist an operator \mathcal{J} such that a family \mathcal{A} constructed by the bijection \mathcal{F} does not satisfy the condition (I). One of possibilities is the case where $\mathcal{J} = \text{FS}$.

5.1 Norm k mappings

Let $a, k \in \mathbb{N}$. To introduce an operator parameterized by k , we give the following condition for $\{y_b\}_{b \in A \cup \{a\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{A \cup \{a\}}$:

$$\sum_{b \in A \cup \{a\}} y_b^2 < k, \quad \sum_{b \in A \cup \{a\}} y_b b = 0, \quad y_a \neq 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Then we define an operator $\mathcal{J}^{(k)}$ on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\mathcal{J}^{(k)}(A) := \{a \in \mathbb{N} : \exists (y_b)_{b \in A \cup \{a\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{A \cup \{a\}} \text{ s.t. (5.1) holds}\}$$

and define an operator $\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}$ by

$$\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}(A) := \{a \in \mathbb{N} : a_i < a < a_{i+1} \text{ and } a \in \mathcal{J}^{(k)}(\{a_1, \dots, a_i\})\}$$

for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$. To parameterize mappings \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , we can give $\mathcal{F}_k : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_k$ and $\mathcal{G}_k : \mathcal{A}_k \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$. To describe forbidden structures, we can give the following conditions for all k .

$$A \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}(A) \right) = \emptyset. \quad (5.2)$$

We say that a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ has norm at least k if the condition (5.2) holds. Thus, we define $\mathcal{A}_k := \{A \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} : A \text{ has norm at least } k\}$. Clearly, we have $\mathcal{A}_k \supseteq \mathcal{A}_{k+1}$ for any k .

Since $\mathcal{A}_k \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is identified with $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, both of $\mathcal{F}_k : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_k$ and $\mathcal{G}_k : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ can be regarded as discrete dynamical systems.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $k \geq 7$ and let $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\} \in \mathcal{A}_k$. Assume that*

$$\mathcal{F}_k(A) = A,$$

i.e. A is a fixed point of \mathcal{F}_k . Then A is a finite set. Moreover, $\max A < 2a_1$.

Proof. If A is a singleton, then the statement holds. Especially, it is maximal for $A = \{1\}$ and $A = \{2\}$ to hold the statement. If $|A| \geq 2$, then the relations $a_i - 2a_1 = 0$ does not always hold for all $i \geq 2$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{F}_k(\{a_1, 2a_1\}) = \{a_1, 2a_1 + 1\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Consequently, a necessary condition for $\mathcal{F}_k A = A$ is that A does not contain integers greater than or equal to $2a_1$. This concludes the statement. \square

Here, we introduce a kind of ultimately completeness. Let k be fixed. Then a set $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$ is ultimately complete if for all sufficiently large $a \in \mathbb{N} \setminus A$, it holds that $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}(A)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $k \geq 7$ and $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\} \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ be infinite. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *A limit $A_{\infty} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}_k^n(A) \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ always exists.*
- (2) *There exists a partition $A_{\infty} = A_{\text{fixed}} \cup A_{\text{residual}}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_k(A_{\text{fixed}}) = A_{\text{fixed}}$, i.e. A_{fixed} is a fixed point of \mathcal{G}_k . Moreover, we can take A_{fixed} such that $A_{\text{fixed}} \cap \{1, \dots, 2a_1 - 1\}$ is a fixed point of \mathcal{F}_k .*

Proof. (1) Consider a dynamics $\{\mathcal{G}_k^n(A)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. For convinience, put $\mathcal{G}_k^n(A) = \{a_1^{(n)} < a_2^{(n)} < \dots\}$. For any fixed i , a sequence of differences $\{a_{i+1}^{(n)} - a_i^{(n)}\}_n$

monotonically decreases as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in a wide sense and appears the same difference ultimately. Hence, a limit always exists.

(2) From the fact of Proposition 5.2, we take a look at elements in $\mathcal{G}_k^{(n)}(A)$ less than $2a_1^{(n)}$. For a mapping \mathcal{G}_k , we can also give a similar description of (5.3), i.e. for $a \geq 3$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}_k(\{a, 2a + 1, \dots\}) = \{a, 2a, \dots\},$$

where “ \dots ” in the above means elements other than the first and second smallest positive integers in each set. Indeed, the number of *’s between a and $2a + 1$ is

$$|\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\{a, 2a + 1, \dots\})| = |\{2a\}| = 1.$$

In this case, we have $A_{fixed} = \{a, 2a\}$ and $A_{residual} := A_\infty \setminus A_{fixed}$ with $\min A_{residual} \geq 2a_1$. Consider a general $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\} \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$. This means that $a_{i_0} < 2a_1$ for some $i_0 \geq 3$. In this case, we can similarly take A_{fixed} of cardinality ≥ 3 and take $\max A_{fixed} \leq 2a_1$, and $A_{residual} := A_\infty \setminus A_{fixed}$. \square

Proposition 5.4. *A sufficient condition for the ultimately completeness of a set $\mathcal{F}_k(A_\infty)$ is that all of the following conditions hold.*

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$.
- (2) $A \cup \{1\} \notin \mathcal{A}_{k-1}$.
- (3) For some $\{y_a\}_{a \in A \cup \{1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{A \cup \{1\}}$,

$$\sum_{a \in A \cup \{1\}} y_a^2 \leq k - 2, \quad \sum_{a \in A \cup \{1\}} y_a a = 0, \quad y_1 = 1.$$

Proof. From Conditions (1) and (2), we have $1 \notin A$. It is clear that Condition (3) implies Condition (2), but the converse is not always true since there is some possibility that y_1 takes another non-zero integer. To show the ultimately completeness of a set $\mathcal{F}_k(A_\infty)$, it is sufficient to prove that for all sufficiently large i , differences $a_{i+1}^{(n)} - a_i^{(n)}$ goes to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To do this, we show that $a_{i+1}^{(n+1)} - a_i^{(n+1)} < a_{i+1}^{(n)} - a_i^{(n)}$. From the second and last conditions in (3), we have

$$1 = - \sum_{a \in A} y_a a. \tag{5.4}$$

Put $i_0 = \max\{i: y_{a_i} \neq 0\}$. When $i > i_0$, we add a_i in both sides of (5.4). Hence, we have

$$a_i + 1 = a_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i_0} y_{a_j} a_j.$$

By introducing $y_{a_i} = 1$, we have

$$a_i + 1 = y_{a_i} a_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i_0} y_{a_j} a_j.$$

Also, by introducing $y_{a_{i+1}} = -1$, the above identity can be reduced to condition in (5.1). The right hand side tells us \square

5.2 A Family of Coprime Sets

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is coprime if the greatest common divisor of any two distinct $a, b \in A$ is 1. In this subsection, let \mathcal{A} be the family of coprime subsets of \mathbb{N} . Now we consider the two mappings \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} as in Section 4 how we construct the family of coprime sets of \mathbb{N} . Let \mathcal{P} denote the set of prime numbers and $\text{PF}(A)$ the union of sets of positive prime factors for every $a \in A$, i.e.

$$\text{PF}(A) := \bigcup_{a \in A} \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \mid a\} = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \mid a \text{ for some } a \in A\}.$$

To consider the mapping \mathcal{F} , we define an operator \mathcal{J} by

$$\mathcal{J}(A) := \{a \in \mathbb{N} : p \mid a \text{ for some } p \in \text{PF}(A)\}.$$

As in (4.1), we can also define $\mathcal{J}_i(A)$ for a sequence $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\}$. It is easy to see that the set \mathcal{P} is a coprime set. Moreover, we can show that $\mathcal{F}(0\|\mathbf{1}_\infty) = \mathcal{P}$, where $0\|\mathbf{1}_\infty = 011\dots$ is the concatenation of 0 and the all-one infinite sequence $\mathbf{1}_\infty$. By the way, we can also show that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{1}_\infty) = \{1\} \cup \mathcal{P}$. Hence, we conclude that the procedure $\mathcal{F}: 0\|\mathbf{1}_\infty \mapsto \mathcal{P}$ can be regarded as the sieve of Eratosthenes and the procedure $\mathcal{F}: \sigma \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ for any other $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ can be viewed as a generalization of the sieve of Eratosthenes (cf. [7]).

References

- [1] N. J. Calkin and S. R. Finch. “Conditions on periodicity for sum-free sets”. In: *Experimental Mathematics* 5.2 (1996), pp. 131–137.
- [2] P. J. Cameron. “Cyclic automorphisms of a countable graph and random sum-free sets”. In: *Graphs and Combinatorics* 1 (1985), pp. 129–135.
- [3] P. J. Cameron. “On the structure of a random sum-free set”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 76 (1987), 523–531.
- [4] P. J. Cameron. “Portrait of a typical sum-free set”. In: vol. 123. 1987. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987, pp. 13–42.
- [5] P. J. Cameron and P. Erdős. “On the Number of Sets of Integers With Various Properties”. In: *Number Theory* (1990), pp. 61–80.
- [6] R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, and J. H. Spencer. *Ramsey theory*. Wiley Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, 1991.

- [7] G. Greaves. *Sieves in Number Theory*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge / A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001.
- [8] T. Luczak. “On sum-free sets of natural numbers”. In: *Resenhas Do Instituto De Matemática E Estatística Da Universidade De São Paulo* 2.2 (1995), pp. 229–238.
- [9] R. Rado. “Studien zur Kombinatorik”. In: 36 (1933), 424—470.
- [10] I. Schur. “Über die Kongruenz $x^n + y^n = z^n \pmod{p}$.” In: *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung* 25 (1917), pp. 114–116.
- [11] B. L. Van der Waerden. “Beweis einer baudeischen vermutung”. In: *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde* 15 (1927), pp. 212–216.