

Chromatic number of spacetime

James Davies¹

¹University of Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Abstract

We observe that an old theorem of Graham implies that for any positive integer r , there exists some positive integer $T(r)$ such that every r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y), (x', y')$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = T(r)$. By scaling, this implies that every finite colouring of \mathbb{R}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y), (x', y')$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 1$, which answer a problem of Kosheleva and Kreinovich on a pseudo-Euclidean analogue of the Hadwiger-Nelson problem.

The proof of Graham's theorem relies on repeated applications of van der Waerden's theorem, and so the resulting function $T(r)$ grows extremely quickly. We give an alternative proof in the weaker setting of having a second spacial dimension that results in a significantly improved bound. To be more precise, we prove that for every positive integer r with $r \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, every r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ such that $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (5^{(r-2)/4} (8 \cdot 5^{(r-2)/2})!)^2$. By scaling, this implies that every finite colouring of \mathbb{Q}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = 1$, and we further conjecture that every finite colouring of \mathbb{Q}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y), (x', y')$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 1$.

1 Introduction

The Hadwiger-Nelson problem asks for the minimum number of colours required to colour \mathbb{R}^2 so as to avoid any monochromatic pair of points at unit distance apart. The upper bound of 7 was observed by Isbell in 1950 (see [10]), and the lower bound of 5 is a recent breakthrough of de Grey [3] and independently Exoo and Ismailescu [4]. For more on the history of the Hadwiger-Nelson problem and many of its relatives, see [10].

In 2009, Kosheleva and Kreinovich [7], proposed the study of the analogue of the Hadwiger-Nelson problem for pseudo-Euclidean spaces. For positive integers p, q , they define $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{p,q})$ to be equal to the minimum number of colours required to colour $\mathbb{R}^{p,q}$ so that there is no monochromatic pair of points $(a_1, \dots, a_{p+q}), (b_1, \dots, b_{p+q})$ with $\sum_{j=1}^p (a_j - b_j)^2 - \sum_{j=p+1}^{p+q} (a_j - b_j)^2 = 1$. They asked to determine the value of $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{p,q})$, and in particular, whether or not $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{p,q})$ is finite. We observe that one can use an old theorem of Graham [6] to show that $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{1,1}) = \infty$. Thus, $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{p,q}) = \infty$ for all pairs $p, q \geq 1$. Graham [6] proved that every finite colouring of the plane contains a monochromatic triple of points forming a triangle of unit area. We require a strengthening proven by Graham [6].

Theorem 1 (Graham [6, Theorem 1]). *For any positive integer r , there exists a positive integer $T(r)$ so that in any r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^2 , there is always a monochromatic triple $(x, y), (x + a, y), (x, y + b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $ab = T(r)$.*

Theorem 2. *For any positive integer r , there exists a positive integer $T(r)$ so that in any r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^2 , there is always a monochromatic pair $(x, y), (x', y') \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 4T(r)$.*

Proof. Consider some r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^2 . By Theorem 1, there exists a monochromatic triple of points $(s, t), (s, t) + a(1, 1), (s, t) + b(-1, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}[(1, 1), (-1, 1)] \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $ab = T(r)$. Then, observe that $(a + b)^2 - (a - b)^2 = 4ab = 4T(r)$. Therefore, $(x, y) = (s, t) + a(1, 1), (x', y') = (s, t) + b(-1, 1)$ is a monochromatic pair of points in \mathbb{Z}^2 with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 4T(r)$, as desired. \square

By scaling, Theorem 2 then implies the following, which answers Kosheleva and Kreinovich's [7] problem.

Theorem 3. *Every finite colouring of \mathbb{R}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y), (x', y')$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 1$. In particular, $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{1,1}) = \infty$.*

For every positive integer d , there is a finite colouring of \mathbb{R}^d avoiding monochromatic pairs of points at unit distance apart [8]. So, Theorem 3 highlights a subtle but significant difference between the geometry of Euclidean spaces and certain pseudo-Euclidean spaces. This also answers a question of Geelen [5], who independently asked whether or not $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{2,2})$ is finite.

Graham's [6] proof of Theorem 1 relies on repeated applications of van der Waerden's theorem [11], and thus the value of $T(r)$ in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 grows extremely fast. We give an alternative proof of a weakening of Theorem 2 where there is a second spacial dimension. Although this theorem is in a weaker setting, we obtain significantly improved bounds.

Theorem 4. *Let r be a positive integer with $r \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$. Then, every r -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (5^{(r-2)/4} (8 \cdot 5^{(r-2)/2})!)^2$.*

By scaling we obtain the following from Theorem 4.

Theorem 5. *Every finite colouring of \mathbb{Q}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = 1$.*

We remark that \mathbb{R}^2 cannot be replaced with \mathbb{Z}^2 in Theorem 3, since one can avoid such monochromatic pairs by 2-colouring the points $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ according to whether $x + y$ is odd or even. However, it seems likely that \mathbb{R}^2 could be replaced with \mathbb{Q}^2 in Theorem 3. This would be a common generalization of both Theorem 3 and Theorem 5.

Conjecture 6. *Every finite colouring of \mathbb{Q}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y), (x', y')$ with $(x - x')^2 - (y - y')^2 = 1$.*

Our proof of Theorem 4 uses the method recently introduced by the author [1] to show that every finite colouring of \mathbb{R}^2 contains a monochromatic pair of points whose distance is an odd integer. With McCarty and Pilipczuk [2], we also very recently extended these methods to prove that every finite colouring of \mathbb{R}^2 contains monochromatic prime and polynomial distances. This method is applied to subgraphs that are Cayley graphs of \mathbb{Z}^d . Given a set $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, its *upper density* is

$$\delta(I) = \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|I \cap [-R, R]^d|}{(2R + 1)^d}.$$

For a positive integer r , we let $D_r = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x^2 + y^2 = r^2\}$. In other words, D_r is the set of points contained in both the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 and the circle of radius r and centre $(0, 0)$. We prove the following.

Theorem 7. *Let r be a positive integer. If $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^3$ has upper density greater than $\frac{1}{1 + |D_r|/2}$, then there is a pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z') \in I$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (r(8r^2)!)^2$.*

As a consequence, every $(|D_r|/2)$ -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (r(8r^2)!)^2$.

If r has prime factorisation $r = 2^a \prod p_i^{b_i} \prod q_i^{c_i}$ where $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and $q_i \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $|D_r| = 0$ if some c_i is odd, otherwise $|D_r| = 4 \prod (2b_i + 1)$. Therefore, by Theorem 7 with $r = 5^b$, every $(4b + 2)$ -colouring of \mathbb{Z}^3 contains a monochromatic pair of points $(x, y, z), (x', y', z')$ with $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (5^b (8 \cdot 5^{2b})!)^2$. Theorem 4 then follows from this. We remark that one could of course obtain slightly stronger bounds in Theorem 4, but we choose to provide a simple explicit bound.

In Section 2 we introduce some preliminaries for proving Theorem 7. This includes an analogue of the Lovász theta bound [9] for Cayley graphs of \mathbb{Z}^d [1], which shall be our main tool. Then, in Section 3, we prove Theorem 7 (and thus Theorem 4).

2 Preliminaries

The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of a graph G is equal to the minimum number of colours required to assign each vertex a colour so that no two adjacent vertices receive the same colour. An *independent set* in a graph G is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices.

We say that a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is *centrally symmetric* if $C = -C$. Similarly, a function $w : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is centrally symmetric if $w(x) = w(-x)$ for all $x \in C$. For a centrally symmetric set $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we let $G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)$ be the Cayley graph of \mathbb{Z}^d with generating set C . In other words, $G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)$ is the graph with vertex set \mathbb{Z}^d where two vertices $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are adjacent if $u - v \in C$. For a Cayley graph $G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)$, we let

$$\bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)) = \sup\{\delta(I) : I \text{ is an independent set of } G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)\}.$$

Notice that $\chi(G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)) \geq 1/\bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C))$. To see this inequality, note that if $V(G)$ can be partitioned into k independent sets I_1, \dots, I_k , then $k\bar{\alpha}(G) \geq \delta(I_1) + \dots + \delta(I_k) \geq \delta(V(G)) = 1$.

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we let $e(\alpha) = e^{2\pi i \alpha}$. Since $e(\alpha) = e(\alpha + 1)$, for $a \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ we can also define $e(a)$ to be equal to $e(b)$, where $0 \leq b < 1$ is such that $b \equiv a \pmod{1}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $x \cdot y$ for the dot product.

The following is a slightly simplified version of the ratio bound given in [1, Theorem 3], which was used to show that the odd distance graph has unbounded chromatic number. This is our main tool and is essentially an analogue of the Lovász theta bound [9] for Cayley graphs of \mathbb{Z}^d .

Theorem 8 (Davies [1, Theorem 3]). *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $w : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be centrally symmetric with $\sum_{x \in C} w(x)$ positive. Then*

$$\bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^d, C)) \leq \frac{-\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d} \widehat{w}(u)}{\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d} \widehat{w}(u) - \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d} \widehat{w}(u)},$$

where

$$\widehat{w}(u) = \sum_{x \in C} w(x) e(u \cdot x).$$

Note that $\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d} \widehat{w}(u) = \inf_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{w}(u)$, and $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d} \widehat{w}(u) = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{w}(u)$.

To apply Theorem 8 effectively, we need good estimates for the exponential sums that shall appear. The supremum will be straightforward to estimate, while the infimum is trickier. The rest of this section is dedicated to proving three lemmas that will be used to estimate the infimum (which is done in Lemma 14).

The first two straightforward lemmas shall allow us to estimate two simpler exponential sums that will appear in our proof. Similar statements appear in [1].

Lemma 9. *Let $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}, (b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequences in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$. Then,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} (e(a_n + j b_n) + e(-a_n - j b_n)) \geq 0.$$

Proof. By the identity $e(\theta) + e(-\theta) = 2 \cos(2\pi\theta)$, it is enough to show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} \cos(2\pi(a_n + j b_n)) \geq 0.$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$, we have that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} \cos(2\pi(a_n + j b_n)) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} \cos(2\pi j b_n).$$

For each $n \geq 1$, let $0 \leq \theta_n < 1$ be such that $\theta_n \equiv b_n \pmod{1}$. If $\theta_n = 0$, then observe that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} \cos(2\pi j \theta_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} = \frac{1}{2} > 0.$$

So, we may assume that $\theta_n \neq 0$.

Observe that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} \cos(2\pi j \theta_n) - \frac{1}{n \theta_n} \int_0^{n \theta_n} \left(1 - \frac{t}{n \theta_n}\right) \cos(2\pi t) dt \right] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} (e(a_n + jb_n) + e(-a_n - jb_n)) = \frac{1}{n\theta_n} \int_0^{n\theta_n} \left(1 - \frac{t}{n\theta_n}\right) \cos(2\pi t) dt.$$

So, let us evaluate the above integral.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n\theta_n} \int_0^{n\theta_n} \left(1 - \frac{t}{n\theta_n}\right) \cos(2\pi t) dt &= \frac{1}{2\pi n\theta_n} \int_0^{2\pi n\theta_n} \left(1 - \frac{t}{2\pi n\theta_n}\right) \cos(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi n\theta_n} \int_0^{2\pi n\theta_n} \cos(t) dt - \frac{1}{4\pi^2 n^2 \theta_n^2} \int_0^{2\pi n\theta_n} t \cos(t) dt \\ &= \frac{\sin(2\pi n\theta_n)}{2\pi n\theta_n} - \frac{\sin(2\pi n\theta_n)}{2\pi n\theta_n} + \frac{1}{4\pi^2 n^2 \theta_n^2} \int_0^{2\pi n\theta_n} \sin(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1 - \cos(2\pi n\theta_n)}{4\pi^2 n^2 \theta_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma now follows since $\frac{1 - \cos(2\pi n\theta_n)}{4\pi^2 n^2 \theta_n^2} \geq 0$ for all $\theta_n \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 10. Let $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty, (b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be sequences in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \equiv a \pmod{1}$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \equiv b \not\equiv 0 \pmod{1}$. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(a_n + jb_n) = 0.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(jb_n) \right| &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} \sum_{j=m\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor + 1}^{(m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor} \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(jb_n) + \sum_{j=\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor^2 + 1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(jb_n) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} \sum_{j=m\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor + 1}^{(m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor} \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(jb_n) \right| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} \frac{n - (m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor}{n+1} \sum_{j=m\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor + 1}^{(m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor} e(jb_n) \right| + \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor \frac{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor}{n(n+1)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} \frac{n - (m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor}{n+1} \left| \sum_{j=m\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor + 1}^{(m+1)\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor} e(jb_n) \right| + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor - 1} e(jb_n) \right| + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor \left| \frac{1 - e(\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor b_n)}{1 - e(b_n)} \right| + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n} |1 - e(b_n)|} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{|1 - e(b_n)|} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n \equiv b \not\equiv 0 \pmod{1}$, we have that $|1 - e(b_n)|$ is eventually bounded away from 0. So then, $\frac{1}{|1 - e(b_n)|} + 1$ is bounded. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(a_n + j b_n) \right| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n+1} e(j b_n) \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{|1 - e(b_n)|} + 1 \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

The exponential sums that we must examine to prove Theorem 7 are more complicated than those given Lemma 9 and Lemma 10. However, the following key lemma will allow us to reduce the examination of these more complicated exponential to those given in Lemma 9 and Lemma 10.

Lemma 11. *Let r be a positive integer, let $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3) \in D_r$ be distinct, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $(x_1, y_1) \cdot (a, b) \equiv (x_2, y_2) \cdot (a, b) \equiv (x_3, y_3) \cdot (a, b) \pmod{1}$. Then, there exists integers p_a, q_a, p_b, q_b such that $a = \frac{p_a}{q_a}$, $b = \frac{p_b}{q_b}$, and $1 \leq q_a, q_b \leq 8r^2$.*

Proof. We will argue that there exists such integers p_a, q_a since the existence of such integers p_b, q_b follows similarly.

Since $(x_1, y_1) \cdot (a, b) \equiv (x_2, y_2) \cdot (a, b) \equiv (x_3, y_3) \cdot (a, b) \pmod{1}$, we have that $((x_2, y_2) - (x_1, y_1)) \cdot (a, b) \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$, and $((x_3, y_3) - (x_1, y_1)) \cdot (a, b) \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$. So, both $((x_2, y_2) - (x_1, y_1)) \cdot (a, b) = a(x_2 - x_1) + b(y_2 - y_1)$ and $((x_3, y_3) - (x_1, y_1)) \cdot (a, b) = a(x_3 - x_1) + b(y_3 - y_1)$ are integers. Therefore, $(y_3 - y_1)(a(x_2 - x_1) + b(y_2 - y_1)) - (y_2 - y_1)(a(x_3 - x_1) + b(y_3 - y_1)) = a((x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1))$ is also an integer.

Since $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3)$ are all distinct, and all lie on a circle, we have that $(x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1)$ and $(x_3 - x_1, y_3 - y_1)$ are independent in \mathbb{Z}^2 . Additionally, y_1, y_2, y_3 are not all equal, so at most one of $y_3 - y_1$ and $y_2 - y_1$ is zero. Therefore, $(y_3 - y_1)(x_2 - x_1, y_2 - y_1) - (y_2 - y_1)(x_3 - x_1, y_3 - y_1) = ((x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1), 0)$ is non-zero. So, $(x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1)$ is non-zero. Note that, since $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3) \in D_r$, we have that $|x_1|, |x_2|, |x_3|, |y_1|, |y_2|, |y_3| \leq r$. So, we further have that

$$|(x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1)| \leq (|x_2| + |x_1|)(|y_3| + |y_1|) + (|x_3| + |x_1|)(|y_2| + |y_1|) \leq 8r^2.$$

As $a((x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1))$ is an integer, and $(x_2 - x_1)(y_3 - y_1) - (x_3 - x_1)(y_2 - y_1)$ is a non-zero integer, it now follows that there exists integers p_a, q_a such that $a = \frac{p_a}{q_a}$, and $1 \leq q_a \leq 8r^2$. We can argue that there exists integers p_b, q_b such that $b = \frac{p_b}{q_b}$, and $1 \leq q_b \leq 8r^2$ similarly. \square

3 Proof

In this section we prove Theorem 7, and thus Theorem 4.

For $d \in D_r$, we let \tilde{d} be the element of D_r , such that the clockwise angle from \tilde{d} to d is equal to $\pi/2$. In other words, if $d = (x, y)$, then $\tilde{d} = (-y, x)$. For each positive integer r , we define the following subset of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, which shall be the generating set of our Cayley graph;

$$C_r = \{\pm((8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}, jr) : d \in D_r, j \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Now we show that $G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)$ is a suitable distance graph in \mathbb{Z}^3 .

Lemma 12. *For every positive integer r , $G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)$ is a subgraph of the graph on the same vertex set \mathbb{Z}^3 , where $(x, y, z), (x', y', z') \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ are adjacent if $(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 - (z - z')^2 = (r(8r^2)!)^2$.*

Proof. By transitivity, it is enough to show that if $(x, y, z) \in C_r$, then $x^2 + y^2 - z^2 = (r(8r^2)!)^2$. Observe that for each $(x, y, z) \in C_r$, there exists a triple $\sigma \in \{1, -1\}$, $d = (d_1, d_2) \in D_r$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(x, y, z) =$

$\sigma((8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}, jr) = (\sigma((8r^2)!d_1 - jd_2), \sigma((8r^2)!d_2 + jd_1), \sigma jr)$. Since $d = (d_1, d_2)$ and $\tilde{d} = (-d_2, d_1)$ are orthogonal, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma((8r^2)!d_1 - jd_2))^2 + (\sigma((8r^2)!d_2 + jd_1))^2 - (\sigma jr)^2 &= \|(8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}\|_2^2 - j^2r^2 \\ &= \|(8r^2)!d\|_2^2 + \|j\tilde{d}\|_2^2 - j^2r^2 \\ &= ((8r^2)!)^2\|d\|_2^2 + j^2\|\tilde{d}\|_2^2 - j^2r^2 \\ &= ((8r^2)!)^2r^2 + j^2r^2 - j^2r^2 \\ &= (r(8r^2)!)^2, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

To apply Theorem 8, it is convenient to consider finite subsets of C_r . For each pair of positive integers r, n , let

$$C_{r,n} = \{\pm((8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}, jr) : d \in D_r, 1 \leq j \leq n\},$$

and let $w_{r,n} : C_{r,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be such that for each $c \in C_{r,n}$ of the form $c = \pm(d + j\tilde{d}, jr)$, we have $w_{r,n}(c) = \frac{n+1-j}{n(n+1)}$. Then as in Theorem 8, for $u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3$ we have that

$$\hat{w}_{r,n}(u) = \sum_{d \in D_r} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n(n+1)} e(\sigma((8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}, jr) \cdot u).$$

To obtain good bounds from Theorem 8, we need good estimates for $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u)$ and $\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u)$. We begin by evaluating $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u)$.

Lemma 13. *For positive integer r, n , we have that $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u) = |D_r|$.*

Proof. Clearly $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u) = \hat{w}_{r,n}(0) = 2|D_r| \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{n+1-j}{n(n+1)} = |D_r|$. \square

Now, we bound $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u)$ using the three lemmas from Section 2.

Lemma 14. *For each positive integer r , we have that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u) \geq -2$.*

Proof. Since $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3$ is compact, for each positive integer n , there exists some $(a_n, b_n, c_n) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3$ such that $\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r,n}(u) = \hat{w}_{r,n}(a_n, b_n, c_n)$. By the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem, there is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers $(n_f)_{f=1}^\infty$ such that the sequence $((a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f}))_{f=1}^\infty$ converges to some point $(a, b, c) \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3$. Fix such $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. It is enough now to show that $\limsup_{f \rightarrow \infty} \hat{w}_{r,n}(a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f}) \geq -2$. Let D'_r be the elements of D_r such that $\tilde{d} \cdot (a, b) \equiv -rc \pmod{1}$. In other words, D'_r is the elements of D_r such that $(j\tilde{d}, jr) \cdot (a, b, c) \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$ for all integers j . Let $D_r^* = D_r \setminus D'_r$.

For $d \in D_r^*$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, observe that

$$((8r^2)!d + j\tilde{d}, jr) \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f}) = (8r^2)!d \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}) + j(\tilde{d} \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}) - rc_{n_f}).$$

Then, $\lim_{f \rightarrow \infty} (8r^2)!d \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}) \equiv a^* \pmod{1}$ for some $a^* \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Also, $\lim_{f \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{d} \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}) - rc_{n_f} \equiv b^* \pmod{1}$ for some $b^* \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $b^* \not\equiv 0 \pmod{1}$, (because $\tilde{d} \cdot (a, b) \not\equiv -rc \pmod{1}$ for $d \in D_r^*$). Since D_r^* is a finite set, by Lemma 10, it now follows that

$$\lim_{f \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{d \in D_r^*} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_f} \frac{n_f+1-j}{n_f(n_f+1)} e(\sigma(d + j\tilde{d}, jr) \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f})) = 0.$$

So, it remains to examine the summation over $D'_r = D_r \setminus D_r^*$.

If $|D'_r| \leq 2$, then the lemma now follows since $\sum_{j=1}^{n_f} \frac{n_f+1-j}{n_f(n_f+1)} = \frac{1}{2}$ for every positive integer f . So, we may now assume that $|D'_r| \geq 3$.

Since $|D'_r| \geq 3$, there exists distinct $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in D_r$ such that $d_1 \cdot (a, b) \equiv d_2 \cdot (a, b) \equiv d_3 \cdot (a, b) \equiv -rc \pmod{1}$. Then by Lemma 11, there exists integers p_a, q_a, p_b, q_b such that $a = \frac{p_a}{q_a}$, $b = \frac{p_b}{q_b}$, and $1 \leq q_a, q_b \leq 8r^2$.

So, both $(8r^2)!/q_a$ and $(8r^2)!/q_b$ are integers. It follows that $(8r^2)!d \cdot (a, b) \equiv d \cdot (p_a(8r^2)/q_a, p_b(8r^2)/q_b) \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$ for each $d \in D_r$. In particular, for each $d \in D_r$, we have that $\lim_{f \rightarrow \infty} (8r^2)!d \cdot (a_f, b_f) \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$. For each $d \in D'_r$, we also have that $\lim_{f \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{d} \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}) - rc_{n_f} \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$. Since D'_r is a finite set, by Lemma 9, it now follows that

$$\limsup_{f \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{d \in D'_r} \sum_{\sigma = \pm 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_f} \frac{n_f + 1 - j}{n_f(n_f + 1)} e(\sigma(d + j\tilde{d}, jr) \cdot (a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f})) \geq 0.$$

Therefore, in the case that $|D'_r| \geq 3$, we have $\limsup_{f \rightarrow \infty} \hat{w}_{r, n_f}(a_{n_f}, b_{n_f}, c_{n_f}) \geq 0$, as desired. \square

We are now ready to show that the Cayley graphs $G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)$ have large chromatic number.

Proposition 15. *For each positive integer r , we have $\bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)) \leq \frac{1}{1 + |D_r|/2}$. As a consequence, $\chi(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)) \geq 1 + |D_r|/2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 13, we have that $\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u) = |D_r|$ for every positive integer n . By Lemma 14, we have that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u) \geq -2$. Observe that for every positive integer n , we have that $\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u) \leq 0$, since $\int_{[0,1]^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u) du = 0$. For every positive integer n , $G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_{r, n})$ is a subgraph of $G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)$. Therefore, by Theorem 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_{r, n})) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u)}{\sup_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u) - \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u)}, \\ &= \frac{-\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u)}{|D_r| - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^3} \hat{w}_{r, n}(u)}, \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 + |D_r|/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $\chi(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)) \geq 1/\bar{\alpha}(G(\mathbb{Z}^3, C_r)) \geq 1 + |D_r|/2$. \square

Theorem 7 (and thus Theorem 4) now follows from Lemma 12 and Proposition 15.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Jim Geelen for discussions on the problem of whether or not $\chi(\mathbb{R}^{2,2})$ is finite, which lead to this work.

References

- [1] James Davies, *Odd distances in colourings of the plane*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, **34** (2024) no. 1, 19–31.
- [2] James Davies, Rose McCarty, and Michał Pilipczuk, *Prime and polynomial distances in colourings of the plane*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02483 (2023).
- [3] Aubrey D. N. J. de Grey, *The chromatic number of the plane is at least 5*, Geombinatorics **28** (2018), no. 1, 18–31.
- [4] Geoffrey Exoo and Dan Ismailescu, *The chromatic number of the plane is at least 5: a new proof*, Discrete & Computational Geometry **64** (2020), no. 1, 216–226.
- [5] Jim Geelen, Personal communication (2022).
- [6] Ron Graham, *On partitions of E^n* , Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, **28** (1980) no. 1, 89–97.

- [7] Olga Kosheleva and Vladik Kreinovich, *On chromatic numbers of space-times: open problems*, Geombinatorics **19** (2009), no. 1, 14–17.
- [8] David G Larman and C Ambrose Rogers, *The realization of distances within sets in Euclidean space*, Mathematika **19** (1972), no. 1, 1–24.
- [9] László Lovász, *On the Shannon capacity of a graph*, IEEE Transactions on Information theory **25** (1979), no. 1, 1–7.
- [10] Alexander Soifer, *The mathematical coloring book: Mathematics of coloring and the colorful life of its creators*, Springer, 2009.
- [11] Bartel Leendert van der Waerden, *Beweis einer Baudetschen Vermutung*, Nieuw. Arch. Wisk, **15** (1927), 212–216.