

An Improved Pseudopolynomial Time Algorithm for Subset Sum

Lin Chen* Jiayi Lian† Yuchen Mao‡ Guochuan Zhang§

February 23, 2024

Abstract

We investigate pseudo-polynomial time algorithms for Subset Sum. Given a multi-set X of n positive integers and a target t , Subset Sum asks whether some subset of X sums to t . Bringmann proposes an $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time algorithm [Bringmann SODA'17], and an open question has naturally arisen: can Subset Sum be solved in $O(n+w)$ time? Here w is the maximum integer in X . We make a progress towards resolving the open question by proposing an $\tilde{O}(n+\sqrt{wt})$ -time algorithm.

1 Introduction

Given a multi-set X of n positive integers and a target t , Subset Sum asks whether some subset of X sums to t . Subset Sum is among Karp's 21 NP-complete problems [Kar72], and is a hard special case of many other problems, e.g. Knapsack, Integer Programming, and Constrained Shortest Path.

It is well known that Subset Sum admits pseudo-polynomial time algorithms: the textbook dynamic programming [Bel57] solves Subset Sum in $O(nt)$ time. In recent years, there has been growing interest in searching for more efficient pseudo-polynomial time algorithms. Pisinger presented an $O(nt/\log t)$ -time algorithm [Pis03], as well as an $O(nw)$ -time algorithm [Pis99], where w refers to the largest input integer. Koiliaris and Xu [KX17] showed a deterministic $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nt})$ -time algorithm, which has been simplified by the same authors [KX18]. Bringmann [Bri17] proposed an $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time randomized algorithm that solves Subset Sum with high probability. Later Jin and Wu [JW19] presented an alternative $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time randomized algorithm. In the meantime, there is a conditional lower bound of $(n+w)^{1-o(1)}$ implied by the Set Cover Hypothesis [Bri17] and Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis [ABHS22]. An important open question that has been repeatedly mentioned in a series of papers [ABJ⁺19, BW21, PRW21, BC22, Jin23] is whether Subset Sum can be solved in $O(n+w)$ time. There are a few attempts in resolving the open problem. Polak, Rohwedder and Węgrzycki [PRW21] showed an $\tilde{O}(n+w^{5/3})$ -time algorithm, which was later improved to an $\tilde{O}(n+w^{3/2})$ -time algorithm by Chen, Lian, Mao and Zhang [CLMZ24b]. These algorithms outperform the $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time algorithm only when w is significantly smaller than t .

We remark that the complexity of Subset Sum can be fairly complicated when we further take into consideration of the relationship among the parameters n, t, w (see, e.g. [Cha99, CFG89a, GM91, BW21]). In particular, Bringmann and Wellnitz [BW21] showed that if all x_i 's are distinct, then an $\tilde{O}(n)$ -time algorithm exists if $w \sum_i x_i/n^2 \ll t \leq \sum_i x_i/2$, where \ll hides a polylogarithmic

*chenlin198662@gmail.com. Zhejiang University.

†jiayilian@zju.edu.cn. Zhejiang University.

‡maoyc@zju.edu.cn. Zhejiang University.

§zgc@zju.edu.cn. Zhejiang University.

factor. Note that n can be significantly smaller than w , but the condition $w \sum_i x_i/n^2 \ll \sum_i x_i/2$ enforces a nontrivial region of the parameters, and thus the algorithm does not contradict the lower bound.

Very recently, Chen, Lian, Mao and Zhang [CLMZ24a] obtained an $\tilde{O}(n + 1/\varepsilon)$ -time FPTAS (fully polynomial time approximation scheme) that weakly approximates Subset Sum. A crucial ingredient in their algorithm is an additive combinatorics theorem by Szemerédi and Vu [SV05] (see Theorem B.1). Roughly speaking, this theorem states that given some sets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_ℓ of positive integers, if their total size $\sum_i |A_i|$ is large compared to the largest integer in these sets, then there must exist a long arithmetic progression in the sumset $A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_\ell$. Our paper is inspired by their work, and in particular, the above-mentioned additive combinatorics theorem.

1.1 Our Result

Our main contribution is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Subset Sum can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ time by a randomized, one-sided-error algorithm with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$.*

Note that w is always smaller than t . This is the first improvement upon the $\tilde{O}(n + t)$ -time algorithm [Bri17]. We remark that, although the algorithm we present in this paper only solves the decision version Subset Sum, it can be modified to return a solution (that is, a subset that sums to t if exists) using a technique similar to that in [CLMZ24a].

Combining our algorithm with the result for dense subset sum [BW21], we can show that, when the input is a set (rather than a multi-set), Subset Sum can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.25})$ time.

Corollary 1.2. *When the input is a set, Subset Sum can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.25})$ time by a randomized, one-sided-error algorithm with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$.*

When $n = O(\sqrt{w})$, since $t \leq nw \leq O(w^{1.5})$, the $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ -time algorithm will run in $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.25})$ time. Now suppose that $n = \Omega(\sqrt{w})$. If $t = O(w^2/n)$, again, the $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ -time algorithm will run in $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.25})$ time. It remains to consider the case that $n = \Omega(\sqrt{w})$ and $t = \Omega(w^2/n)$. This case can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time according to the dense subset sum result [BW21]. Note that this argument only holds when the input is a set.

1.2 Technical Overview

Our algorithm builds upon the dense-or-sparse framework developed by Chen, Lian, Mao and Zhang [CLMZ24a] on approximation algorithms for Subset Sum (see Algorithm 1 for a sketch of the framework).

Basically, the framework performs a tree-like computation. In every iteration, it constructs a new level of the tree by computing the sumset of every two sets in the previous level. Before it computes a new level, it estimates the total size of sets in this new level: if this total size is small, then the new level can be computed efficiently using sparse convolution algorithm; otherwise, the additive combinatorics theorem by Szemerédi and Vu [SV05] guarantees the existence of a long arithmetic progression, which can be used to approximately solve Subset Sum directly (without continuing the tree-like computation). However, their algorithmic framework is highly tailored to approximation algorithms. When applied to exact algorithms, it will encounter several technical challenges as we elaborate below.

Algorithm 1 Dense-or-Sparse Framework (A Sketch)

Input: a multi-set X of nonnegative integers

- 1: $S_i^0 = \{x_i, 0\}$ for $x_i \in X$
- 2: **for** $j := 1, \dots, \log n$ **do**
- 3: Define $S_i^j := S_{2i-1}^j + S_{2i}^j$
- 4: **if** $\sum_i |S_i^j|$ is small **then** ▷
- 5: sparse case: compute all sets S_i^j using sparse convolution
- 6: **else**
- 7: dense case: stop the computation and apply additive combinatorics tools.
- 8: **return** $S_1^{\log n}$

- Maintaining a small threshold for being dense. To apply the additive combinatorics theorem by Szemerédi and Vu [SV05], the total size of sets in a tree level should exceed the maximum integer in these sets, and the overall running time of the dense-or-sparse framework is almost linear in this threshold. Clearly this threshold grows as we construct new levels, it becomes $\Theta(nw)$ at the end. In approximation algorithms, one can force this threshold to be $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ by scaling. Scaling is, however, not allowed in exact algorithms. To address this issue, we utilize the technique of random permutation. The crucial observation is that, when we randomly permute the input integers and feed them to the dense-or-sparse framework, the contribution of each set S_i^j to t is close to its expectation. Therefore, for each S_i^j , there is no need to consider the entire set; it suffices to consider the part within a small interval of length roughly $O(\sqrt{wt})$. This method of random permutation (partition) has been used in several recent pseudo-polynomial time algorithms for knapsack (see, e.g. [BC23, HX24]). It is interesting that this method complements well the additive combinatorics theorem.
- Utilizing a long arithmetic progression. For approximation algorithms, the existence of a long arithmetic progression, say, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k already implies that every integer within $[a_1, a_k]$ can be approximately hit provided that the common difference is $O(\varepsilon t)$. For exact algorithms, such an error is not allowed. In other word, we need an arithmetic progression with unit common difference. We handle this issue by using the idea from the dense Subset Sum algorithms [BW21, GM91]. Roughly, we will strategically select a subset of integers to form a “residue set” R , and apply the dense-or-sparse framework to the remaining integers. If the framework ends with a dense case, then we can get an arithmetic progression a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k , and we shall use this progression together with R to produce a new arithmetic progression with unit common difference. Here it is important to ensure the followings. First, $|R|$ should be small, so that, without knowing the contribution of R to t , it is still possible to carry out the random permutation argument on the remaining integers. Second, $|R|$ cannot not be too small. Its subset sums should span the whole residue class of any small prime. It is an interesting coincidence that the probabilistic and number theoretic arguments meet at $|R| = \tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{t/w})$.

Note that the above discussion is based on several simplifications and requires that $t = \Theta(\sum_i x_i)$. When t is significantly smaller than $\sum_i x_i$, we need to further incorporate the color coding technique from Bringmann [Bri17]. And random permutation technique has to be adjusted so as to work well with color coding.

1.3 Further related works

A more general problem, Bounded Subset Sum, has also been studied in the literature. In Bounded Subset Sum, each input integer x_i can be used up to u_i times. Polak, Rohwedder and Węgrzycki [PRW21] showed an $\tilde{O}(n + w^{5/3})$ -time algorithm, which was later improved to an $\tilde{O}(\min\{n + w^{3/2}, nw\})$ -time algorithm by Chen, Lian, Mao and Zhang [CLMZ24b].

Another closely related problem is Unbounded Subset Sum where each input integer can be used arbitrary many times. Bringmann [Bri17] showed an $\tilde{O}(n + t)$ -time algorithm, followed by an $\tilde{O}(n + w)$ -time algorithm by Jansen and Rohwedder [JR23]. It is worth mentioning that Unbounded Subset Sum also admits an $w_{\min}^2 / 2^{\Omega(\log w_{\min})^{1/2}}$ -time algorithm by Klein [Kle22], where w_{\min} refers to the smallest integer in the input.

In addition to pseudo-polynomial time algorithms for Subset Sum, there is also a line of research on approximation algorithms [IK75, Kar75, KPS97, BN21b, MWW19, DJM23, WC22, CLMZ24a].

Pseudo-polynomial time algorithms for Knapsack have also been studied extensively in the literature [Bel57, Pis99, Tam09, BHSS18, AT19, BHSS18, PRW21, BC22, BC23, CLMZ24b, Jin23, Bri23].

Our algorithm leverages sparse Fast Fourier Transform, see, e.g., [CH02, AR15, CL15, Nak20, BFN21, BN21a, BFN22]. It also utilizes some additive combinatorics results [Alo87, Sár89, Sár94, SV05, SV06]. It is worth mentioning that a long line of research works used these additive combinatorics results to design algorithms for dense cases of Subset Sum [Cha99, CFG89b, GM91, BW21]. Notably, most research works assume that the input is a set, and only recently this work has been generalized to multi-sets [BW21], and adopted to obtain faster algorithms for Subset Sum and Knapsack [MWW19, BN20, BW21, WC22, DJM23, CLMZ24b, Jin23, Bri23].

1.4 Paper Outline

In Section 2, we introduce all the necessary terminologies and known facts. In Section 3, we present a lemma that is key to proving our main theorem. Section 4 tackles the dense part of the key lemma using additive combinatorics tools, while Section 5 tackles the sparse part using color-coding, random permutation, and sparse convolution.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, we distinguish multi-sets from sets. Only when we explicitly use the term multi-sets do we allow duplicate elements. The subset of a multi-set is always a multi-set, unless otherwise stated. All logarithms in this paper are base 2.

2.1 Notation

Let Z be a multi-set of non-negative integers. We use $\max(Z)$ and $\min(Z)$ to denote the maximum and minimum elements of Z . The diameter of Z is defined to be $\text{dm}(Z) = \max(Z) - \min(Z)$. We write $\sum_{z \in Z} z$ as $\sigma(Z)$. We define $\mathcal{S}(Z)$ to be the set of all subset sums of Z . That is, $\mathcal{S}(Z) = \{\sigma(Y) : Y \subseteq Z\}$.

For any integer a , we define the multi-set $aZ = \{az : z \in Z\}$. If every integer in Z is divisible by some integer d , we define the multi-set $Z/d = \{z/d : z \in Z\}$. Similarly, we define the multi-set $Z \bmod b = \{z \bmod b : z \in Z\}$.

Given any two integers a and b , we use $[a, b]$ to denote the set of integers between a and b , i.e., $[a, b] = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq z \leq b\}$.

2.2 Subset Sum

Given a (multi-)set X of n non-negative integers and a target t , Subset Sum asks whether there is a subset of X that sums to t . We always assume $t \leq \sigma(X)/2$. This is without loss of generality: when $t > \sigma(X)/2$, we can let $t' = \sigma(X) - t$ and solve the instance (X, t') . Let w be the maximum element of X . We assume that n, t, w are greater than any constant appearing in this paper since otherwise the instance can be solved in $O(n)$ time by known algorithms. We further assume that $t \geq 10\sqrt{wt} \log w$, since otherwise, the instance can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ by Bringmann's $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time algorithm [Bri17].

Subset Sum can be reduced to a more general problem of computing $\mathcal{S}(X)$: a Subset Sum instance (X, t) can be solved by simply checking whether $t \in \mathcal{S}(X)$.

2.3 Sumsets and Sparse Convolution

Let A and B be two sets of integers. Their sumset $A + B$ is defined as follows.

$$A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$$

It is well-known that the computing sum set is equivalent to computing the convolution of two vectors, which can be solved by Fast Fourier Transformation.

Lemma 2.1. *Let A and B be two non-empty sets of integers. We can compute their sumset $A + B$ in $O(u \log u)$ time where $u = \max\{\text{dm}(A), \text{dm}(B)\}$.*

There are also sparse convolution algorithms that are efficient when the output (that is, the sumset) has small size. The state-of-art is due to Bringmann, Fisher, and Nakos [BFN22]. They proposed a deterministic algorithm whose running time is almost linear in the size of the sumset.

Lemma 2.2 ([BFN22]). *Let A and B be two non-empty sets of integers. We can compute their sumset $A + B$ in $O(|A + B| \text{polylog } u)$ time where $u = \max\{\text{dm}(A), \text{dm}(B)\}$.*

Due to the sparse convolution algorithm, if we have some sumset to compute, we can either compute them quickly or tell that they have a large total size.

Lemma 2.3. *Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be non-empty sets of integers. Let u be the maximum diameter of all sets A_i . Given any positive integer k , in $O((k + u) \text{polylog } u)$ time, we can either*

- (i) compute $\{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell/2}\}$, or
- (ii) tell that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell/2} |B_i| \geq k$,

where $B_i = A_{2i-1} + A_{2i}$ for $i \in [1, \ell/2]$.

Proof. If $k \leq \ell/2$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell/2} |B_i| \geq k$. Assume $k > \ell/2$. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell/2$, we compute B_i via Lemma 2.2. If, at some point, we find that the total size of all sets B_i already exceeds k , then we stop immediately. See Algorithm 2 for details. Let B_{i^*} be the last B_i that is computed by the algorithm. Since the diameter of B_{i^*} is at most $2u$, its size $|B_{i^*}| \leq 2u + 1$. Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^{i^*} |B_i| \leq k + 2u + 1$. Therefore, the running time of the algorithm is $O((k + u) \text{polylog } u)$. \square

Algorithm 2 Sum-If-Sparse(A_1, \dots, A_ℓ)

Input: non-empty subsets A_1, \dots, A_ℓ of integers.

Output: $\{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell/2}\}$ or tells that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell/2} |B_i| \geq k$, where $B_i = A_{2i-1} + A_{2i}$

1: totalSize := 0

2: **for** $i := 1, \dots, \ell/2$ **do**

3: $B_i := A_{2i-1} + A_{2i}$

▷ compute via Lemma 2.2

4: totalSize := totalSize + $|B_i|$

5: **if** totalSize $\geq k$ **then**

6: We know $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell/2} |B_i| \geq k$. Stop immediately

7: **return** $\{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell/2}\}$

3 A Key Lemma

Recall that Subset Sum can be reduced to computing the set $\mathcal{S}(X)$ of all subset sums of X . Instead of computing the entire $\mathcal{S}(X)$, we compute a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(X)$ such that, if there is any $Z \subseteq X$ with $\sigma(Z) = t$, then with high probability, $\sigma(Z) \in S$. This allows us to solve Subset Sum with high probability.

We first partition X via the following lemma. The lemma is implied by the results for dense subset sum [BW21]. We defer its proof to Appendix A.

Lemma 3.1. [Preprocessing Lemma] *Given a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$ and a positive integer t , in time $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we can compute an integer $d \geq 1$ and partition X into $G \cup R \cup D$ such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $\sigma(G) \leq \sqrt{wt} \log w$ and $\sigma(R) \leq 4\sqrt{wt} \log w$.
- (ii) Every integer in $R \cup D$ is divisible by d .
- (iii) $\mathcal{S}(R/d) \bmod b = [0, b - 1]$ for any $b \in [1, \sqrt{t/w}]$. That is, for any $b \in [1, \sqrt{t/w}]$, the set R/d can generate all the reminders modulo b .

Our key lemma is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, t) be a Subset Sum instance. Let d and $G \cup R \cup D$ be as in Lemma 3.1. In $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ time, we can obtain one of the following results.*

- *Sparse case: we can obtain a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ containing any $s \in \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$, or*
- *Dense case: we can tell that $\mathcal{S}(R \cup D)$ contains every multiple of d within the interval $[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$.*

The proof of our main theorem follows straightforwardly by the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let (X, t) be a Subset Sum instance. Let w be the maximum integer of X . We first partition X via the preprocessing lemma (Lemma 3.1). Let d and $G \cup R \cup D$ be the resulting integer and partition, respectively. Then we apply Lemma 3.2. The time cost so far is $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$.

Suppose that we are in the sparse case of Lemma 3.2. Let S_D be the set we obtain. For any $Z \subseteq X$ with $\sigma(Z) = t$, the set S_D contains $\sigma(Z \cap D)$ with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$ since

$$t \geq \sigma(Z \cap D) \geq \sigma(Z) - \sigma(G) - \sigma(R) \geq t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w.$$

Recall that $\sigma(G) \leq \sqrt{wt} \log w$. Using Bringmann's $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ -time algorithm [Bri17], in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ time, we can compute a set $S_G \subseteq \mathcal{S}(G)$ containing any $s \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ with probability $1 - (n+t)^{-\Omega(1)}$. Similar, in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ time, we can compute a set $S_R \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R)$ containing any $s \in \mathcal{S}(R)$ with probability $1 - (n+t)^{-\Omega(1)}$.

Now consider $S = S_G + S_R + S_D$. The set S has a diameter of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$ and can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$ time via Lemma 2.1 since the diameters of S_G , S_R , and S_D are all $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$. One can see that $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(X)$, and for any $Z \subseteq X$ with $\sigma(Z) = t$, the set S contains $\sigma(Z)$ with probability $1 - (n+t)^{-\Omega(1)}$. We solve the instance by checking whether $t \in S$. These steps cost $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$ time since S has a diameter of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$.

Suppose that we are in the dense case of Lemma 3.2. Recall that every integer in R and D is divisible by d . Therefore, $\mathcal{S}(R \cup D) \cap [t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ consists of exactly the multiples of d within this interval. Let $S_{RD} = [t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t] \cap d\mathbb{N}$. Similar to the sparse case, we can solve the instance by computing $S = S_G + S_{RD}$ and checking whether $t \in S$. \square

Section 4 and Section 5 are devoted to proving Lemma 3.2.

4 The Dense Case

In this section, we use additive combinatorics tools to characterize the condition under which $\mathcal{S}(R \cup D)$ contains every multiple of d within the interval $[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. This section is completely structural, and hence, does not depend on the algorithm.

Definition 4.1. Let (X, t) be a Subset Sum instance with w being the maximum integer of X . Let $D \subseteq X$ be as in Lemma 3.1. We say D is **dense** if there exist a positive integer ρ , a partition D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D , a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i , and a weight function $f : \{S_i\}_{i=1}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the followings are true.

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^\ell |S_i| \geq \ell + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$ for some $u' \geq 1 + u + 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$, where u is the maximum diameter of the sets S_i and C_{ap} is the constant in Lemma 4.2.
- (ii) $\max(S_i) \leq f(S_i) \leq \sigma(D_i)$ for all $i \in [1, \ell]$.
- (iii) $\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^\ell f(S_i) \leq \frac{\rho t}{2}$.

We shall prove that, if D is dense, then $\mathcal{S}(R \cup D)$ contains every multiple of d within the interval $[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. We first show that $\mathcal{S}(D)$ has a long arithmetic progression. The following lemma simplifies and generalizes a similar result in [CLMZ24a]. We defer its proof to Appendix B.

Lemma 4.2. There exists some constant C_{ap} such that the following is true. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be non-empty subsets of integers. Let u be the maximum diameter of all the A_i 's. If $\sum_{i=1}^\ell |A_i| \geq \ell + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$ for some $u' \geq u + 1$ and some $\rho \geq 1$, then we can select a collection of sets A_i such that the sumset of the selected sets contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . Let I be the set of the indices of the selected sets A_i . If we are also given a weight function $f : \{A_i\}_{i=1}^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\sum_{i \in I} f(A_i) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^\ell f(A_i).$$

Lemma 4.3. Let $D \subseteq X$ be as in Lemma 3.1. If D is dense, then D has a subset P such that the followings hold.

- (i) The set $\mathcal{S}(P)$ contains an arithmetic progression (a_1, \dots, a_k) with $k \geq 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$ and $a_k \leq t/2$.
- (ii) $\sigma(D) - \sigma(P) \geq t$.

Proof. Let D_1, \dots, D_ℓ and S_1, \dots, S_ℓ be as in Definition 4.1. Due to property (i) of Definition 4.1, the sets S_i satisfy the condition of Lemma 4.2, and hence we can select a collection of sets S_i such that the sumset of the selected sets contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . Let I be the set of the indices of the selected sets S_i . Let (a_1, \dots, a_k) be the arithmetic progression. We already have $k \geq u' \geq 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$. Let f be defined as in Definition 4.1. Lemma 4.2 also guarantees that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \max(S_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I} f(S_i) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(S_i) \leq \frac{t}{2}.$$

The first inequality is due to property (ii) of Definition 4.1 while the last inequality is due to property (iii) of Definition 4.1. Since $a_k \in \sum_{i \in I} S_i$, we have $a_k \leq \sum_{i \in I} \max(S_i) \leq t/2$.

Let $P = \bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$. Clearly, $\mathcal{S}(P)$ contains (a_1, \dots, a_k) . By Definition 4.1, we also have

$$\sigma(D) - \sigma(P) = \sum_{i \notin I} \sigma(D_i) \geq \sum_{i \notin I} f(S_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(S_i) - \sum_{i \in I} f(S_i) \geq \frac{3t}{2} - \frac{t}{2} = t.$$

□

Next we will show that we can use R and D (in particular, the arithmetic progression in $\mathcal{S}(D)$) to generate all the multiples of d within the interval $[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. Recall that every integer in R and D is divisible by d (due to Lemma 3.1). Let $R' = R/d$ and $D' = D/d$, it suffices to show that the entire interval $[\frac{t}{d} - \frac{1}{d}\sqrt{wt} \log w, \frac{t}{d}] \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R' \cup D')$. The following lemma is implied by the results of dense subset sum [BW21]. Its proof is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 4.4. *Let R, D be two multi-sets of non-negative integers from $[1, u]$. Suppose that for some subset $P \subseteq D$, the set $\mathcal{S}(P)$ contains an arithmetic progression with common difference Δ and that $\mathcal{S}(R) \bmod \Delta = [0, \Delta - 1]$. If we further have the length of the arithmetic progression at least $u + \sigma(R) + 1$, then*

$$[\sigma(R) + \varphi, \sigma(D) - \sigma(P)] \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R \cup D),$$

where φ is the largest term of the arithmetic progression.

Theorem 4.5. *Let (X, t) be a subset sum instance. Let d and $G \cup R \cup D$ be as in Lemma 3.1. If D is dense, then $\mathcal{S}(R \cup D)$ contains every multiple of d within the interval $[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$.*

Proof. Recall that every integer in R and D is divisible by d . Let $R' = R/d$ and $D' = D/d$. The preprocessing lemma (Lemma 3.1) guarantees that $\sigma(R') \leq \frac{4\sqrt{wt} \log w}{d}$ and that $\mathcal{S}(R') \bmod b = [0, b - 1]$ for any $b \leq \sqrt{t/w}$. Since D is dense, Lemma 4.3 implies that D' has a subset P' such that $\mathcal{S}(P')$ contains an arithmetic progression (a_1, \dots, a_k) . Moreover, the common difference $\Delta \leq \sqrt{t/w}$, as $k \geq 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$ and $a_k \leq \frac{t}{2d}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{S}(R') \bmod \Delta = [0, \Delta - 1]$. One can verify that R' and D' satisfy the condition of Lemma 4.4. We have

$$[\sigma(R') + a_k, \sigma(D') - \sigma(P')] \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R' \cup D'). \quad (1)$$

Recall that

$$\sigma(R') + a_k \leq \frac{4\sqrt{wt} \log w}{d} + \frac{t}{2d} \leq \frac{t - \sqrt{wt} \log w}{d}.$$

The last inequality is due to our assumption that $t \geq 10\sqrt{wt} \log w$. Lemma 4.3 also guarantees that $\sigma(D') - \sigma(P') \geq \frac{2t}{d}$. Therefore, (1) implies that

$$\left[\frac{t - \sqrt{wt} \log w}{d}, \frac{t}{d}\right] \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R' \cup D'),$$

or equivalently,

$$[t - \sqrt{wt} \log w, t] \cap d\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R \cup D).$$

□

5 The Sparse Case

This section is devoted to proving the following theorem. Throughout the section, we denote $|D|$ as m .

Theorem 5.1. *Let (X, t) be a Subset Sum instance with w being the maximum integer of X . Let d and $G \cup R \cup D$ be given as in Lemma 3.1. Let $m = |D|$. In $\tilde{O}(m + \sqrt{wt})$ time, we can either*

- (i) *compute a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ containing any $s \in \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$, or*
- (ii) *tell that D is dense (see Definition 4.1).*

Our algorithm has two phases. In the first phase, it computes a partition D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i using color coding technique and sparse convolution. In the second phase, it computes (a subset of) $S = \sum_i S_i$ using random permutation technique and sparse convolution.

5.1 Sparse Convolution with Color Coding

The intuition of standard color-coding is simple: if we randomly throw k balls into k^2 bins, then with probability at least $1/4$, every bin contains at most one ball. In context of Subset Sum, it can be summarized as the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let D be a multi-set of integers. Let D_1, \dots, D_{k^2} be a random partition of D . For any $Z \subseteq D$ with $|Z| = k$, with probability at least $1/4$, every D_i contains at most one element from Z . In other words, for any $Z \subseteq D$ with $|Z| = k$, with probability at least $1/4$, we have*

$$\sigma(Z) \in \sum_{i=1}^{k^2} S_i^0,$$

where S_i^0 is a set obtained from D_i by removing duplicate elements and adding 0.

The probability in the above lemma can be boosted to arbitrary $q < 1$ if we repeat the process for $\log_{4/3}(1/q)$ times and take the union of the resulting sets S .

On a high level, we follow the two-stage coloring coding schemes proposed by Bringmann [Bri17]. In the first stage, we throw k balls into k bins, then with high probability, every bin contains roughly a logarithmic number of balls. In the second stage, we apply the standard color coding to each bin. Since each bin has only a logarithmic number of balls, so the standard color coding needs only a small number of bins. The difference is that we combine the second stage with the dense-or-sparse framework.

Algorithm 3 First-Stage-Color-Coding(D)

Input: a multi-set D of integers

Global Parameters: the Subset Sum target t and $w := \max(X)$

Output: A partition of D

```
1:  $m := |D|$ 
2:  $D^j := \{x \in D : 2^j \leq x < 2^{j+1}\}$  for  $j \in [0, \log w]$ 
3:  $\alpha_j := \min\{\frac{t}{2^{j-1}}, |D^j|\}$  for  $j \in [0, \log w]$ 
4: for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, \log w$  do
5:   if  $\alpha_j := |D^j|$  then
6:     Partition  $D^j$  into  $\alpha_j$  subsets  $D_1^j, \dots, D_{\alpha_j}^j$  of size 1
7:   else
8:     Randomly partition  $D^j$  into  $\alpha_j$  subsets  $D_1^j, \dots, D_{\alpha_j}^j$ 
9:     while  $D_i^j = \emptyset$  and  $|D_{i'}^j| \geq 2$  for some  $i$  and  $i'$  do
10:      Move an element from  $D_{i'}^j$  to  $D_i^j$ 
11: return the collection of all subsets  $D_i^j$  we have obtained.
```

The first stage In the context of Subset Sum, the first stage of color coding is as follows. We first partition D into $1 + \log w$ subsets $D^0, D^1, \dots, D^{\log w}$ where

$$D^j = \{x \in D : 2^j \leq x < 2^{j+1}\}.$$

Define $\alpha_j := \min\{\frac{t}{2^{j-1}}, |D^j|\}$. Let Z be an arbitrary subset of D with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$. We immediately have $|Z \cap D^j| \leq \alpha_j$. We further partition each D^j randomly into α_j subsets. We can show that each subset has only a logarithmic number of elements from Z . For technical reasons, we require each subset to be non-empty, and this can be done by rearranging elements to empty subsets. See Algorithm 3 for details.

Lemma 5.3. *Let D be as in Lemma 3.1. Let $m = |D|$. In $O(m)$ time, Algorithm 3 partitions D into non-empty subsets $\{D_1, \dots, D_\ell\}$ such that the followings are true.*

- (i) $\ell \leq m$.
- (ii) for each $j \in [0, \log w]$, at most $\frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$ sets D_i have $2^j \leq \max(D_i) < 2^{j+1}$.
- (iii) $\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \max(D_i) \leq 5t \log w$.
- (iv) For any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$, for any $0 < q < 1$,

$$\Pr [|Z \cap D_i| \leq 6 \log(m/q) \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. Let α_j, D^j, D_i^j be defined as in Algorithm 3. Property (i) is straightforward since

$$\ell = \sum_j \alpha_j \leq \sum_j |D^j| \leq m.$$

Property (i) also implies the $O(m)$ running time since j th iteration of the for loop costs $O(\alpha_j)$ time. Property (ii) is also straightforward since each D^j is partitioned into α_j subsets and $\alpha_j \leq \frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$.

Consider property (iii). We first show that every D_i^j is non-empty. If $\alpha_j = |D^j|$, then each D_i^j contains exactly one element and hence is non-empty. Suppose that $\alpha_j = \frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$. Note that $\alpha_j < |D^j|$

in this case. Therefore, although D_i^j may be empty after the random partition (in line 8), it is guaranteed to get an element in line 10. The non-emptiness of D_i^j implies $\max(D_i^j) \geq 2^j$. Now we are ready to prove (iii). The upper bound is easy as

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log w} \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_j} \max(D_i^j) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\log w} 2^{j+1} \cdot \alpha_j = \sum_{j=0}^{\log w} (4t) \leq 5t \log w.$$

For the lower bound, it is either the case that $\alpha_j = \frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$ for some $j = j^*$ or $\alpha_j = |D^j|$ for all j . In the former case,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log w} \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_j} \max(D_i^j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_{j^*}} \max(D_i^{j^*}) \geq 2^{j^*} \cdot \alpha_{j^*} = 2t.$$

In the latter case, every D_i^j contains exactly one element from D , so

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log w} \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_j} \max(D_i^j) = \sigma(D) \geq \sigma(X) - \sigma(G) - \sigma(R) \geq \sigma(X) - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w \geq \frac{3t}{2}.$$

The last inequality is due to the assumption that $\sigma(X)/2 \geq t \geq 10\sqrt{wt} \log w$.

We complete the proof by proving property (iv). Consider an arbitrary D_i^j . If $\alpha_j = |D^j|$, then the stated probability bound holds since $|D_i^j| = 1$ in this case. Suppose $\alpha_j = \frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$. Fix an arbitrary $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$. Let $k = |Z \cap D^j|$. We have that $k \leq \frac{t}{2^j} < \alpha_j$. Consider the D_i^j immediately after the random partition (in line 8). The set D_i^j is among the α_j subsets that forms a random partition of D . Therefore, $|Z \cap D_i^j|$ can be viewed as the sum of k independent Bernoulli random variables with success probability $1/\alpha_j$. Since $\mathbf{E}[|Z \cap D_i^j|] = k/\alpha_j < 1 \leq \log \frac{m}{q}$, a standard Chernoff bound gives that

$$\Pr[|Z \cap D_i^j| > 6 \log(m/q)] \leq q/m.$$

Lines 9 and 10 of the algorithm only increase the size of empty sets D_i^j , and hence do not affect the probability bound. Recall that the numbers of subsets D_i^j is at most $\sum_j \alpha_j \leq m$. By union bound, we have

$$\Pr[|Z \cap D_i| \leq 6 \log(m/q) \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - \Pr[|Z \cap D_i| > 6 \log(m/q) \text{ for some } i] \geq 1 - q.$$

□

The second stage Let D_1, \dots, D_ℓ be the partition of D given by Lemma 5.3. For any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$, we have $|Z \cap D_i| \leq 6 \log m/q$ (with probability at least $1 - q$). Let $k = 6 \log m/q$. One can tackle each D_i using standard color coding: partition D_i into k^2 subsets, add 0 to each subset, and compute the sumset S_i of these subsets in a tree-like manner. In order to fully utilize the dense-or-sparse framework, we shall tackle all subsets D_i in parallel. More precisely, instead of computing each S_i independently, we compute all sumsets S_i simultaneously in a forest-like manner. If all levels of the forest have a small total size, then we can compute efficiently using sparse convolution. If some level of the forest has a large total size, then we can show that D is dense. See Algorithm 4 for details.

Lemma 5.4. *Let k be a positive number. Let D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D be given as in Lemma 5.3. Let $m = |D|$. In $\tilde{O}(k^2 m + k^4 w + k^2 \sqrt{wt})$ time, Algorithm 4 either*

Algorithm 4 Second-Stage-Color-Coding(D_1, \dots, D_ℓ, k)

Input: a partition D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D and a positive integer k

Global Parameters: the Subset Sum target t and $w := \max(X)$

Output: a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i

```

1:  $m := |D|$ 
2:  $g := k^2$  rounded up to the next power of 2
3: for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  do
4:   Randomly partition  $D_i$  into  $g$  subsets  $D_{i,1}, \dots, D_{i,g}$ 
5:    $D_{i,j}^0 := D_{i,j}$  for each  $j \in [1, g]$  ▷ kept only for analysis
6:    $S_{i,j}^0 := D_{i,j} \cup \{0\}$  (removing duplicate elements) for each  $j \in [1, g]$ .
7:    $u' := 1 + \max\{gw, 5\sqrt{wt} \log w\}$ 
8:    $\rho := 10g \log w$ 
9:   for  $h = 1, \dots, \log g$  do
10:    Define  $S_{i,j}^h := S_{i,2j-1}^{h-1} + S_{i,2j}^{h-1}$  for all  $i \in [1, \ell]$  and  $j \in [1, \frac{g}{2^h}]$ 
11:     $D_{i,j}^h := D_{i,2j-1}^{h-1} \cup D_{i,2j}^{h-1}$  for all  $i \in [1, \ell]$  and  $j \in [1, \frac{g}{2^h}]$  ▷ kept only for analysis
12:    if  $\sum_{i,j} |S_{i,j}^h| \geq \frac{\ell g}{2^h} + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$  then ▷ Via Lemma 2.3
13:      Stop immediately. ▷  $D$  is dense
14:    else
15:      compute  $S_{i,j}^h$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ 
16:    $S_i := S_{i,1}^{\log g}$  for  $i \in [1, \ell]$ 
17: return  $S_1, \dots, S_\ell$ 

```

(i) tells that D is dense, or

(ii) computes a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i such that the followings hold.

(a) $\max(S_i) \leq 2k^2 \max(D_i)$ for any i

(b) For any $Z \subseteq D_i$ with $|Z| \leq k$, for any S_i ,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S_i] \geq 1/4.$$

Proof. Let all the variables be defined as in Algorithm 4. Recall that $\ell \leq m$. The first for loop costs $O(\ell g) = O(k^2 m)$ time. Note that the diameter of every $S_{i,j}^h$ is at most gw . The second for loop has $\log g$ iterations, and each iteration costs $\tilde{O}(gw + \frac{\ell g}{2^h} + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u')$ time. One can verify that the total running time is $\tilde{O}(k^2 m + k^4 w + k^2 \sqrt{wt})$.

If the algorithm returns S_1, \dots, S_ℓ , then by Lemma 5.2, for any $Z \subseteq D_i$ with $|Z| \leq k$, for any S_i , $\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S_i] \geq 1/4$. Moreover, $S_i = \sum_{j=1}^g S_{i,j}^0$ and $\max(S_{i,j}^0) \leq \max(D_i)$. It follows that $\max(S_i) \leq g \max(D_i) \leq 2k^2 \max(D_i)$.

Suppose that the algorithm stops at line 15. That is, $\sum_{i,j} |S_{i,j}^h| \geq \frac{\ell g}{2^h} + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$ for some h . We shall show that D is dense. Note that $\{D_{i,j}^h\}_{i,j}$ form a partition of D and that $S_{i,j}^h \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_{i,j}^h)$. Condition (i) of Definition 4.1 is satisfied. Let $f(S_{i,j}^h) = \max(S_{i,j}^h)$. We immediately have that, for all i and j ,

$$\max(S_{i,j}^h) \leq f(S_{i,j}^h) \leq \sigma(D_{i,j}^h).$$

The second inequality is due to that $S_{i,j}^h \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_{i,j}^h)$. Therefore, condition (ii) of Definition 4.1 is

Algorithm 5 Color-Coding-With-Sparse-Convolution(D)

Input: a multi-set D of integers and an error probability q

Global Parameters: the Subset Sum target t and $w := \max(X)$

Output: A partition D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D and a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i

- 1: $m := |D|$
 - 2: $D_1, \dots, D_\ell := \text{First-Stage-Color-Coding}(D)$
 - 3: $S_i = \emptyset$ for $i \in [1, \ell]$
 - 4: $k := 6 \log \frac{2m}{q}$
 - 5: **for** $r = 1, \dots, \log_{4/3} \frac{2m}{q}$ **do**
 - 6: run **Second-Stage-Color-Coding**(D_1, \dots, D_ℓ, k)
 - 7: **if** It returns a result S'_1, \dots, S'_ℓ **then**
 - 8: $S_i := S_i \cup S'_i$ for $i \in \ell$
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: D is dense; Stop immediately
 - 11: **return** (D_1, \dots, D_ℓ) and (S_1, \dots, S_ℓ).
-

also satisfied. It remains to verify condition (iii). That is,

$$\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_{i,j} \max(S_{i,j}^h) \leq \frac{\rho t}{2} = 5gt \log w.$$

We prove by induction on h . When $h = 0$, we have $\max(S_{i,j}^0) = \max(D_{i,j})$. Since $\{D_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$ are obtained by randomly partition each D_i into g subsets, we have

$$\sum_i \max(D_i) \leq \sum_{i,j} \max(D_{i,j}) \leq g \sum_i \max(D_i).$$

Recall that D_1, \dots, D_ℓ are given by Lemma 5.3. So $\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_i \max(D_i) \leq 5t \log w$, which implies

$$\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_{i,j} \max(D_{i,j}) \leq 5gt \log w.$$

Hence, the stated inequalities hold for $h = 0$.

Suppose that the inequalities hold for h . It is easy to prove that it also holds for $h + 1$ since one can observe that

$$\sum_{i,j} \max(S_{i,j}^{h+1}) = \sum_{i,j} \max(S_{i,j}^h).$$

□

Combining the two stages We summarize this subsection by combining the two stages of color coding. We partition D using Algorithm 3 and then process the subsets we obtained using Algorithm 4. Moreover, Algorithm 4 will be repeated for logarithmic times to reduce the error probability. See Algorithm 5 for details.

Lemma 5.5. *Let q be as $0 < q < 1$. Let D be as in Lemma 3.1. Let $m = |D|$. Let $g = 72 \log^2 \frac{2m}{q}$. In $O((m + \sqrt{wt}) \text{polylog}(m, t, \frac{1}{q}))$ time, Algorithm 5 either tells that D is dense or computes a partition $\{D_1, \dots, D_\ell\}$ of D and a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $\ell \leq m$
- (ii) for each $j \in [0, \log w]$, at most $\frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$ sets D_i have $2^j \leq \max(D_i) < 2^{j+1}$.
- (iii) $\max(S_i) \leq g \max(D_i)$ for any i
- (iv) $\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \max(S_i) \leq 5gt \log w$
- (v) For any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \in S_i \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - q.$$

Proof. The running time and properties (i) – (iv) simply follow by Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4. Consider property (v). Let $k = 6 \log \frac{2m}{q}$. Let Z be an arbitrary subset of D with $\sigma(Z) \leq t$. Lemma 5.3 guarantees that

$$\Pr[|Z \cap D_i| \leq k \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - \frac{q}{2}.$$

Since the second state is repeated for $\log_{4/3} \frac{2m}{q}$ time, by Lemma 5.4,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S_i : |Z \cap D_i| \leq k] \geq 1 - \frac{q}{2m}$$

Recall that $\ell \leq m$. By union bound,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S_i \text{ for all } i : |Z \cap D_i| \leq k \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - \frac{q}{2}$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \in S_i \text{ for all } i] \geq 1 - q.$$

□

5.2 Sparse Convolution with Random Permutation

Let (D_1, \dots, D_ℓ) and (S_1, \dots, S_ℓ) be obtained as in the previous subsection. The task in this subsection is to compute (a subset of) $S = \sum_i S_i$. There is, however, a trouble with the dense-or-sparse framework. As the sets S_i are merged, their diameters (and the size threshold for them to be dense) can be as large as $\Theta(mw)$. As a consequence, we need $\Theta(mw)$ time per level in the tree-like computation, which is too much for our target running time.

We shall use a random permutation technique, which is inspired by a similar random partition technique for knapsack [BC23, HX24]. The intuition is the following. If we randomly permute all the sets S_i (and their associated sets D_i), then with high probability, the contribution of D_i to any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ is around the mean value. This property holds even when the sets S_i are merged. As a result, in the tree-like computation, we can cap each intermediate node (i.e., sumset) with an short interval around the mean value, and hence reduce the diameters of the nodes.

Some probability bounds We first formalize the above intuition. The following lemma is an application of Bernstein’s inequality. (Although the original Bernstein’s inequality is only for sum of independent random variables, a result in Hoeffding’s seminal paper [Hoe63, Theorem 4] implies that it also works for sampling without replacement.) We defer the proof of the lemma to Appendix C.

Lemma 5.6. Let A be a multi-set of k non-negative integers. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be a partition of A . Let B be a multi-set of s integers randomly sampled from A without replacement. For any $c \geq 1$,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A) \right| > 4c \cdot \log \ell \cdot \sum_i \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \leq \exp(-c).$$

Lemma 5.7. Let (D_1, \dots, D_ℓ) , (S_1, \dots, S_ℓ) , and q be as in Lemma 5.5. Let $m = |D|$. Let D' be the union of s sets D_i that are randomly sampled from $\{D_1, \dots, D_\ell\}$ without replacement. For any $Z \subseteq D$ such that $\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \in S_i$ for every i , we have

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sigma(Z \cap D') - \frac{s}{\ell} \sigma(Z) \right| > 2304 \sqrt{wt} \cdot \log^2 w \cdot \log^3 \frac{2m}{q} \right] \leq \frac{q}{2m}.$$

Proof. Let Z be an arbitrary subset of D such that $\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \in S_i$ for every i . Define a multi-set $A = \{\sigma(Z \cap D_i) : i \in [1, \ell]\}$. Let B be a multi-set of s numbers randomly sampled from A without replacement. One can see that $\sigma(Z) = \sigma(A)$ and that $\sigma(B)$ shares the distribution with $\sigma(D' \cap Z)$. It suffices to prove the stated probability bound with $\sigma(Z \cap D')$ and $\sigma(Z)$ replaced by $\sigma(B)$ and $\sigma(A)$, respectively. We partition A into $1 + \log w$ subsets $A_0, \dots, A_{\log w}$ where

$$A_j = \{\sigma(Z \cap D_i) : 2^j \leq \max(D_i) < 2^{j+1}\}.$$

By property (ii) of Lemma 5.5, we have $|A_j| \leq \frac{t}{2^{j-1}}$. Let $g = 72 \log^2 \frac{2m}{q}$. By property (iii) of Lemma 5.5, we have $\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \leq g \max(D_i)$, which implies $\max(A_j) < g \cdot 2^{j+1}$. Therefore, for any j ,

$$\sqrt{|A_j|} \max(A_j) \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2^{j-1}}} \cdot g 2^{j+1} \leq 4g \sqrt{2^{j-1} t} \leq 4g \sqrt{wt}.$$

By Lemma 5.6,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{\ell} \sigma(A) \right| > 4c \cdot \log(1 + \log w) \cdot \sum_i \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \leq \exp(-c).$$

Note that $\sum_i \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \leq 4(1 + \log w)g \sqrt{wt} \leq 8g \sqrt{wt} \log w$. Let $c = \log \frac{2m}{q}$. We have

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{\ell} \sigma(A) \right| > 32g \cdot \sqrt{wt} \cdot \log^2 w \cdot \log \frac{2m}{q} \right) \leq \frac{q}{2m}.$$

Recall that $g = 72 \log^2 \frac{2m}{q}$. This completes the proof. \square

The algorithm Recall that we only care about $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. Lemma 5.7 implies that for an intermediate node (sumset), we can cap it using an interval of length roughly $\widehat{O}(\sqrt{wt})$. After capping, each intermediate node (sumset) has small diameter, and we can use the dense-or-sparse framework. See Algorithm 6 for details.

We first analyze the running time of Algorithm 6.

Lemma 5.8. Algorithm 6 runs in $O((m + \sqrt{wt}) \text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$ time.

Proof. Let the variables be as in Algorithm 6. The first 5 lines cost $O(m)$ time. The running time of the rest is dominated by the $\log \ell \leq \log m$ iterations of the for loop, and each iteration costs $O(\eta + \ell_j + \rho u' \log u')$ time. One can verify that the total running time is $O((m + \sqrt{wt}) \text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$. \square

Algorithm 6 Random-Permutation-and-Sparse-Convolution

Input: S_1, \dots, S_ℓ and D_1, \dots, D_ℓ and q be as in Lemma 5.5

Global parameters: $w = \max(X)$, $m = |D|$, and the Subset Sum target t

Output: a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D)$

- 1: Randomly permute $\{S_1, \dots, S_\ell\}$ (and the associated D_1, \dots, D_ℓ)
 - 2: $S_i^0 := S_i$ and $D_i^0 := D_i$ for each $i \in [1, \ell]$
 - 3: $\eta := 2304\sqrt{wt} \cdot \log^2 w \cdot \log^3 \frac{2m}{q} + 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$
 - 4: $u' := 4\eta + 1$
 - 5: $g := 72 \log^2 \frac{2m}{q}$
 - 6: $\rho := 10g \log w$
 - 7: **for** $j := 1, \dots, \log \ell$ **do**
 - 8: $\ell_j := \frac{\ell}{2^j}$
 - 9: Define $S_i^j := S_{2i-1}^{j-1} + S_{2i}^{j-1}$ for $i \in [1, \ell_j]$
 - 10: $D_i^j := D_{2i-1}^{j-1} \cup D_{2i}^{j-1}$ for $i \in [1, \ell_j]$ ▷ only for analysis
 - 11: **if** $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_j} |S_i^j| \geq \ell_j + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$ **then**
 - 12: D is dense. Stop immediately.
 - 13: **else**
 - 14: compute $S_1^j, \dots, S_{\ell_j}^j$.
 - 15: $S_i^j := S_i^j \cap [\frac{t}{\ell_j} - \eta, \frac{t}{\ell_j} + \eta]$ for each $i \in [1, \ell_j]$
 - 16: **return** $S_1^{\log m}$
-

Next we prove the correctness of Algorithm 6.

Lemma 5.9. *If Algorithm 6 returns a set S , then $|S| = O(\sqrt{wt} \text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$ and for any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$,*

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S] \geq 1 - 2q.$$

Proof. Let the variables be defined as in Algorithm 6. Let Z be an arbitrary subset of D with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. Assume that $\sigma(Z \cap D_i) \in S_i$ for all i . Lemma 5.5 guarantees that the error probability of this assumption is at most q . Now consider an arbitrary D_i^j . Due to the random permutation of $\{S_1, \dots, S_\ell\}$ (and the associated D_1, \dots, D_ℓ), the set D_i^j can be view as the union of the 2^j sets D_i that are randomly sampled from D_1, \dots, D_ℓ . By Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sigma(Z \cap D_i^j) - \frac{1}{\ell_j} \sigma(Z) \right| > 32g \cdot \sqrt{wt} \cdot \log^2 w \cdot \log \frac{2m}{q} \right] \leq \frac{q}{2m}.$$

Since $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$, for $\eta = 2304\sqrt{wt} \cdot \log^2 w \cdot \log^3 \frac{2m}{q} + 5\sqrt{wt} \log w$, we have

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sigma(Z \cap D_i^j) - \frac{t}{\ell_j} \right| > \eta \right] \leq \frac{q}{2m}.$$

Note that there are at most $2\ell \leq 2m$ sets D_i^j . We assume that $\sigma(Z \cap D_i^j) \in [\frac{t}{\ell_j} - \eta, \frac{t}{\ell_j} + \eta]$ for all D_i^j . The error probability of this assumption is at most $\frac{q}{2m} \cdot 2m = q$. Since the cap operation in line 14 of the algorithm does not lose $\sigma(Z \cap D_i^j)$, we have $\sigma(Z) \in S_1^{\log \ell}$. The total error probability is $2q$.

Moreover, $|S_1^{\log \ell}| \leq 2\eta = O(\sqrt{wt} \text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$. □

Lemma 5.10. *If Algorithm 6 stops in line 11, then D is dense.*

Proof. Suppose that the algorithm stops when $j = j^*$. Then $D_1^{j^*}, \dots, D_{\ell_j}^{j^*}$ and $S_1^{j^*}, \dots, S_{\ell_j}^{j^*}$ already satisfy the condition (i) of Definition 4.1. We still need to show that there is a function f satisfying condition (ii) and (iii) of Definition 4.1. We define the a function f recursively as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} f(S_i^0) &= \max(S_i) \\ f(S_i^{j+1}) &= f(S_{2i-1}^j) + f(S_{2i}^j) \end{aligned}$$

To satisfy condition (ii) and (iii) of Definition 4.1, it suffices to show that $\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_i f(S_i^j) \leq 5gt \log w$ and $\sigma(D_i^j) \geq f(S_i^j)$ for any j . We prove by induction on j . When $j = 0$, we have $f(S_i^0) = \max(S_i)$. Since S_1, \dots, S_ℓ is given by Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_i \max(S_i) \leq 5gt \log w.$$

Moreover, $\max(S_i) \leq \sigma(D_i)$ since $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$. So the two inequalities hold for $j = 0$. Suppose that the two inequalities hold for j . We show that it holds for $j + 1$. By the definition of f , we have $\sum_i f(S_i^{j+1}) = \sum_i f(S_i^j)$. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\frac{3t}{2} \leq \sum_i f(S_i^{j+1}) \leq 5gt \log w.$$

Moreover, $D_i^{j+1} = D_{2i-1}^j \cup D_{2i}^j$ and $f(S_i^{j+1}) = f(S_{2i-1}^j) + f(S_{2i}^j)$. By the inductive hypothesis, we also have

$$f(S_i^{j+1}) \leq \sigma(D_i^{j+1}).$$

□

We summarize this subsection by the following lemma, which simply follows by Lemma 5.8, Lemma 5.9, and Lemma 5.10.

Lemma 5.11. *Let S_1, \dots, S_ℓ and D_1, \dots, D_ℓ and q be as in Lemma 5.5. Algorithm 6 runs in $O((m + \sqrt{wt})\text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$ time, and it either*

- (i) *tells that D is dense, or*
- (ii) *computes a set S of size $O(\sqrt{wt}\text{polylog}(n, t, \frac{1}{q}))$ such that for any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$,*

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S] \geq 1 - 2q.$$

We are now able to prove the main theorem for the sparse case.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (X, t) be a Subset Sum instance with w being the maximum integer of X . Let d and $G \cup R \cup D$ be given as in Lemma 3.1. Let $m = |D|$. In $\tilde{O}(m + \sqrt{wt})$ time, we can either*

- (i) *compute a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ containing any $s \in \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$, or*
- (ii) *tell that D is dense (see Definition 4.1).*

Proof. Set $q = (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$. We first process D via Lemma 5.5. If it tells that D is dense, we are done. Suppose that Lemma 5.5 gives a partition D_1, \dots, D_ℓ of D and a set $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D_i)$ for each D_i . We process via Lemma 5.11. It either tells that D is dense or returns a set S of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$ size such that for any $Z \subseteq D$ with $\sigma(Z) \in [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$,

$$\Pr[\sigma(Z) \in S] \geq 1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}.$$

Then we can cap S as $S := S \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$. We have that $S \subseteq \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ and that S contains any $s \in \mathcal{S}(D) \cap [t - 5\sqrt{wt} \log w, t]$ with probability $1 - (n + t)^{-\Omega(1)}$

Both Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.11 cost $\tilde{O}(m + \sqrt{wt})$ time. Capping S costs $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$ time as $|S| = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{wt})$. The total running time is $\tilde{O}(m + \sqrt{wt})$. \square

Our key lemma (Lemma 3.2) simply follows by Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 5.1.

6 Conclusion

We obtain an $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{wt})$ -time algorithm for Subset Sum, which gives the first improvement upon the $\tilde{O}(n + t)$ -time algorithm by Bringmann [Bri17]. It remains open whether Subset Sum can be solved in $\tilde{O}(n + w)$ -time. It is worth mentioning that when the input is a set, we can obtain an $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.25})$ -time algorithm. However, when the input is a multi-set, in the regime of $t \gg w^2$ the $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.5})$ -time algorithm by Chen, Lian, Mao and Zhang [CLMZ24b] remains the best so far. It is interesting if one can get an algorithm for Subset Sum in $\tilde{O}(n + w^{1.5-\epsilon})$ -time for a fixed constant $\epsilon > 0$.

A Some Results Implied by Dense Subset Sum

Almost all the results in this section are implied by [BW21], although some definitions — almost divisor, for example — are slightly changed and some lemmas have additional requirements. For completeness, we provide proofs for some of them.

Definition A.1. *Let X be a multi-set of positive integers. Let $X(d)$ be the multi-set of all integers in X that are divisible by d . Let $\overline{X(d)} = X \setminus X(d)$ be the multi-set of all integers in X that are not divisible by d . We say an integer $d > 1$ is an α -almost divisor of X if $|\overline{X(d)}| \leq \alpha$.*

Lemma A.2 ([BW21, Theorem 3.8]). *The prime factorization of n given numbers in $[1, w]$ can be computed in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time.*

Lemma A.3 ([BW21, Theorem 4.12]). *Given $\alpha > 0$ and a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$, in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we can decide whether X has an α -almost divisor, and compute an α -almost divisor if it exists.*

Lemma A.4 (implied by [BW21, Theorem 4.1]). *Given $\alpha > 0$ and a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$, in time $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we can compute a divisor $d \geq 1$ such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $X(d)/d$ has no α -almost divisor.
- (ii) $|\overline{X(d)}| \leq \alpha \log w$.

Proof. We can check whether X has an α -almost divisor in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time via Lemma A.3. If X has no almost divisor, we let $d = 1$.

Suppose that X has an almost divisor. Starting with $X_1 = X$, we iteratively find and remove almost divisors via Lemma A.3. That is, if X_i has an almost divisor d_i , we continue with $X_{i+1} := X_i(d_i)/d_i$. We stop when the multi-set X_k has no almost divisor, and let $d := d_1 \cdots d_{k-1}$.

It is easy to see that $X(d)/d = X_k$, so it has no almost divisor. Since $d = d_1 \cdots d_{k-1} \leq w$ and $d_i \geq 2$ for all i , the number of iteration is bounded by $\log w$. Then

$$|\overline{X(d)}| = \sum_{i=1}^k |\overline{X_{i-1}(d_i)}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha \leq \alpha \log w.$$

Since there are at most $\log w$ iterations and each costs $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, the total running time is $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time. \square

Lemma A.5 (implied by [BW21, Theorem 4.20]). *Given $\alpha > 0$ and a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$, if X has no α -almost divisor, in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we can extract a subset $R \subseteq X$ such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $|R| \leq 4\alpha \log w$.
- (ii) for any $1 < d \leq \alpha$, the multi-set R contains at least d integers not divisible by d . That is, $|\overline{R(d)}| \geq d$.

Proof. Pick an arbitrary subset $R' \subseteq X$ of size 2α . Let P be the set of primes p with $p \leq \alpha$ and $|\overline{R'(p)}| \leq \alpha$.

Claim A.6 ([BW21, Claim 4.21]). $|P| \leq 2 \log w$.

P can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\alpha + \sqrt{w})$ by Lemma A.2. For any $p \in P$, let $R_p \subseteq \overline{X(p)}$ be an arbitrary subset of size α . Since X has no almost divisor, R_p always exists and it can be found in $O(n)$ time.

Let $R = R' \cup \bigcup_{p \in P} R_p$. For the first property, note that

$$|R| \leq |R'| + \sum_{p \in P} |R_p| \leq 2\alpha + |P| \cdot \alpha \leq 4\alpha \log w.$$

For any integer $1 < d \leq \alpha$, we have $|\overline{R(d)}| \geq |\overline{R(p)}| \geq 2$, where p is an arbitrary prime factor of d . So R satisfies the second property. \square

Lemma A.7 ([BW21, Theorem 4.22]). *Given $\alpha > 0$ and a multi-set R , if $|\overline{R(d)}| \geq d$ for any $1 < d \leq \alpha$, then $\mathcal{S}_R \bmod d = [1, d]$ for any $1 < d \leq \alpha$.*

The following corollary follows by Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.7.

Corollary A.8. *Given $\alpha > 0$ and a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$, if X has no α -almost divisor, in $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we extract a set $R \subseteq X$ such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $|R| \leq 4\alpha \log w$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{S}_R \bmod d = [1, d]$ for any $1 < d \leq \alpha$.

Lemma 3.1. [Preprocessing Lemma] *Given a multi-set X of n positive integers from $[1, w]$ and a positive integer t , in time $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$ time, we can compute an integer $d \geq 1$ and partition X into $G \cup R \cup D$ such that the followings hold.*

- (i) $\sigma(G) \leq \sqrt{wt} \log w$ and $\sigma(R) \leq 4\sqrt{wt} \log w$.
- (ii) Every integer in $R \cup D$ is divisible by d .
- (iii) $\mathcal{S}(R/d) \bmod b = [0, b - 1]$ for any $b \in [1, \sqrt{t/w}]$. That is, for any $b \in [1, \sqrt{t/w}]$, the set R/d can generate all the remainders modulo b .

Proof. Let $\alpha = \sqrt{t/w}$. We first compute d via Lemma A.4. Let $G = \overline{X(d)}$ and $X' = X(d)/d$. Since X' has no α -almost divisor, we can extract a set R' from X' via Corollary A.8. Let $R = dR'$ and $D = d(X' \setminus R')$. The total time cost is $\tilde{O}(n + \sqrt{w})$. All the stated properties can be easily verified. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let R, D be two multi-sets of non-negative integers from $[1, u]$. Suppose that for some subset $P \subseteq D$, the set $\mathcal{S}(P)$ contains an arithmetic progression with common difference Δ and that $\mathcal{S}(R) \bmod \Delta = [0, \Delta - 1]$. If we further have the length of the arithmetic progression at least $u + \sigma(R) + 1$, then*

$$[\sigma(R) + \varphi, \sigma(D) - \sigma(P)] \subseteq \mathcal{S}(R \cup D),$$

where φ is the largest term of the arithmetic progression.

Proof. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ be the arithmetic progression in $\mathcal{S}(P)$. Note that $\varphi = a_k$ and $k \geq \sigma(R) + u + 1$. Let y be an arbitrary integer in $[2\sigma(R) + a_k, \sigma(D) - \sigma(P)]$. We shall prove $y \in \mathcal{S}(R \cup D)$ by showing $y = \sigma(R') + \sigma(P') + \sigma(D')$ for some $R' \subseteq R$, $P' \subseteq P$, and $D' \subseteq D \setminus P$.

We determine D' first. Consider $y - a_k$. We have

$$0 \leq \sigma(R) + a_k - a_k \leq y - x_k \leq \sigma(D) - \sigma(P) = \sigma(D \setminus P).$$

Therefore, there is some $D' \subseteq D \setminus P$ such that $y - a_k \leq \sigma(D') \leq y - a_k + u$. Or equivalently,

$$a_1 + \sigma(R) \leq a_k - u \leq y - \sigma(D') \leq a_k.$$

The first inequality is due to that $a_k - u = a_1 + (k - 1)u\Delta - u \geq a_1 + \sigma(R)$.

Next, we determine R' . Let R' be a subset of R with $\sigma(R') \equiv y - \sigma(D') - a_1 \pmod{\Delta}$. R' must exist since $\mathcal{S}_R \pmod{\Delta} = [0, \Delta - 1]$. Now consider $y - \sigma(D') - \sigma(R')$. We have $y - \sigma(D') - \sigma(R') \equiv a_1 \pmod{\Delta}$ and

$$a_1 \leq a_1 + \sigma(R) - \sigma(R') \leq y - \sigma(D') - \sigma(R') \leq a_k.$$

Therefore, $y - \sigma(D') - \sigma(R')$ is a term in the arithmetic progression $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$; there must be a set $P' \subseteq P$ with $\sigma(P') = y - \sigma(D') - \sigma(R')$. \square

B Arithmetic Progressions

This section simplifies and extends the approach in [CLMZ24a].

Theorem B.1 (Corollary 5.2 [SV05]). *For any fixed integer d , there are positive constants c_1 and c_2 depending on d such that the following holds. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be subsets of $[1, u]$ of size $|A_i|$. If $\ell^d |A| \geq c_1 u$, then $A_1 + \dots + A_\ell$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least $c_2 \ell |A|^{1/d}$.*

The above theorem is directly taken from [SV05]. Although not explicit in the statement, the above theorem actually assume that $|A| \geq 2$.

Corollary B.2. *There exists a sufficiently large constant C_{ap} such that the following holds. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be subsets of $[1, u]$ of size at least $|A|$. If $|A| \geq 2$ and $\ell |A| \geq cu'$ for some $u' \geq u$, then $A_1 + \dots + A_\ell$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' .*

Proof. Let c_1 and c_2 are two constants for $d = 1$ in Lemma B.2. Assume that $C_{ap} \geq c_1$ and that $C_{ap} c_2 \geq 1$ since C_{ap} is sufficiently large. Since $\ell |A| \geq C_{ap} u' \geq c_1 u$, by Lemma B.1, $A_1 + \dots + A_\ell$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least $c_2 \ell |A| \geq c_2 C_{ap} u' \geq u'$. \square

Lemma B.3. *There exists some constant C_{ap} such that the following is true. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be non-empty subsets of $[1, u]$ for some positive integer u . If $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |A_i| \geq \ell + 4C_{ap} \rho u' \log u'$ for some $u' \geq u$ and some $\rho \geq 1$, then we select a collection $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} A_i$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . If we are also given a function f that maps each A_i to a non-negative integer, we can also guarantee that*

$$\sum_{i \in I} f(A_i) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i).$$

Proof. When $u = 1$, the proof is trivial. Assume that $u \geq 2$. Let c denote C_{ap} . We claim that for some $k \in [2, u]$, at least $\frac{2c\rho u'}{k}$ sets from $\{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$ have size at least k . Assume that the claim holds. We select $\lceil \frac{cu'}{k} \rceil$ such A_i 's greedily in the sense that we always prefer those with small $f(A_i)$. Let I be the index of the selected A_i 's. Clearly, $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies the condition of Corollary B.2, and hence, $\sum_{i \in I} A_i$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . Since we select $\lceil \frac{cu'}{k} \rceil$ out of $\frac{2c\rho u'}{k}$ sets A_i 's and we prefer those with small $f(A_i)$,

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in I} f(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i)} \leq \frac{\lceil \frac{cu'}{k} \rceil}{\frac{2c\rho u'}{k}} \leq \frac{\frac{2cu'}{k}}{\frac{2c\rho u'}{k}} \leq \frac{1}{\rho}.$$

The second inequality is due to that $\frac{cu'}{k} \geq \frac{cu}{k} \geq c \geq 1$.

We prove the claim by contradiction. Let ℓ_k be the the number of sets from $\{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$ that have size at least k . Suppose that $\ell_k < \frac{2c\rho u'}{k}$ for any $k \in [2, u]$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |A_i| = \sum_{k=1}^u k(\ell_k - \ell_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^u \ell_k < \ell_1 + \sum_{k=1}^u \frac{2c\rho u'}{k} \leq \ell + 2c\rho u'(1 + \log u) \leq \ell + 4c\rho u' \log u'.$$

Contradiction. (The last inequality is due to our assumption that $u \geq 2$.) \square

Lemma 4.2. *There exists some constant C_{ap} such that the following is true. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be non-empty subsets of integers. Let u be the maximum diameter of all the A_i 's. If $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |A_i| \geq \ell + 4C_{ap}\rho u' \log u'$ for some $u' \geq u + 1$ and some $\rho \geq 1$, then we can select a collection of sets A_i such that the sumset of the selected sets contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . Let I be the set of the indices of the selected sets A_i . If we are also given a weight function $f : \{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\sum_{i \in I} f(A_i) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i).$$

Proof. For each A_i , we define $A'_i = A_i - \min(A_i) + 1$. Then we have the each A'_i is a subset of $[1, u + 1]$. By Lemma B.3, we can a collection $\{A'_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} A'_i$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . This implies that $\sum_{i \in I} A_i$ contains an arithmetic progression of length at least u' . Moreover, if we define $f(A'_i) = f(A_i)$, then Lemma B.3 guarantees that

$$\sum_{i \in I} f(A_i) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(A_i).$$

\square

C Some Probability Results

Lemma C.1. *Let A be a multi-set of k non-negative integers. Let B a multi-set of s integers randomly sampled from A without replacement. Then for any $\eta > 0$,*

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A) \right| \geq \eta \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \min \left\{ \frac{\eta^2}{4\sigma(A) \max(A)}, \frac{\eta}{2 \max(A)} \right\} \right)$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{E}[\sigma(B)] = s\sigma(A)/k$. We shall use Bernstein's inequality to bound the probability. Although Bernstein's inequality was only for sum of independent random variables, a result in Hoeffding's seminal paper [Hoe63, Theorem 4] implies that it also works for sampling without replacement. Therefore, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A) \right| \geq \eta \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\eta^2}{2\mathbf{Var}[\sigma(B)] + \frac{2}{3}\eta \max(A)} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \min \left\{ \frac{\eta^2}{4\mathbf{Var}[\sigma(B)]}, \frac{\eta}{2 \max(A)} \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

It is known that

$$\mathbf{Var}[\sigma(B)] = \frac{s(k-s)}{k(k-1)} \cdot \sum_{a \in A} \left(a - \frac{\sigma(A)}{k} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{a \in A} \left(a - \frac{\sigma(A)}{k} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{a \in A} a^2 \leq \max(A) \sigma(A).$$

Replacing the $\mathbf{Var}[\sigma(B)]$ in (2) with $\max(A)\sigma(A)$, we obtain the target inequality. \square

Lemma C.2. *Let A be a multi-set of k non-negative integers. Let A^* be a subset of A . Let B be a multi-set of s integers randomly sampled from A without replacement. For any $c \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B \cap A^*) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A^*) \right| > 4c \sqrt{|A^*|} \max(A^*) \right) \leq \exp(-c).$$

Proof. When $A^* = \emptyset$, the target inequality trivially holds. Assume that A^* is non-empty. The integers not in A^* never contribute to $\sigma(B \cap A^*)$, so they can be view as 0. Let A' be the multi-set obtained from A by replacing each integer not in A^* with 0. Let B' be a set of k integers randomly sampled from A' . It is easy to see that $\sigma(B' \cap A^*)$ has the same distribute as $\sigma(B \cap A)$. It suffices to show that the target inequality holds for $\sigma(B' \cap A^*)$. By Lemma C.1, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B') - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A') \right| > \eta \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \min \left\{ \frac{\eta^2}{4\sigma(A') \max(A')}, \frac{\eta}{2 \max(A')} \right\} \right)$$

Since all integers in A' are 0 except for those in A^* , the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B' \cap A^*) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A^*) \right| > \eta \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \min \left\{ \frac{\eta^2}{4\sigma(A^*) \max(A^*)}, \frac{\eta}{2 \max(A^*)} \right\} \right).$$

Let $\eta = 4c \sqrt{|A^*|} \max(A^*)$. One can verify that this probability is bounded by $\exp(-c)$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let A be a multi-set of k non-negative integers. Let A_1, \dots, A_ℓ be a partition of A . Let B be a multi-set of s integers randomly sampled from A without replacement. For any $c \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A) \right| > 4c \cdot \log \ell \cdot \sum_i \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \leq \exp(-c).$$

Proof. By Lemma C.2, we have that, for each A_i ,

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B \cap A_i) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A_i) \right| > 4c \cdot \log \ell \cdot \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \leq \exp(-c)/\ell.$$

Note that $\sigma(B) = \sum_i \sigma(B \cap A_i)$ and that $\sigma(A) = \sum_i \sigma(A_i)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A) \right| > 4c \cdot \log \ell \cdot \sum_i \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \\ & \leq \sum_i \Pr \left(\left| \sigma(B \cap A_i) - \frac{s}{k} \sigma(A_i) \right| > 4c \cdot \log \ell \cdot \sqrt{|A_i|} \max(A_i) \right) \\ & \leq \exp(-c). \end{aligned}$$

\square

References

- [ABHS22] Amir Abboud, Karl Bringmann, Danny Hermelin, and Dvir Shabtay. SETH-based Lower Bounds for Subset Sum and Bicriteria Path. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 18(1):1–22, January 2022. doi:10.1145/3450524. 1
- [ABJ⁺19] Kyriakos Axiotis, Arturs Backurs, Ce Jin, Christos Tzamos, and Hongxun Wu. Fast modular subset sum using linear sketching. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 58–69. SIAM, 2019. 1
- [Alo87] N. Alon. Subset sums. *Journal of Number Theory*, 27(2):196–205, October 1987. doi:10.1016/0022-314X(87)90061-8. 4
- [AR15] Andrew Arnold and Daniel S. Roche. Output-Sensitive Algorithms for Sumset and Sparse Polynomial Multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC 2015)*, pages 29–36, New York, USA, June 2015. doi:10.1145/2755996.2756653. 4
- [AT19] Kyriakos Axiotis and Christos Tzamos. Capacitated Dynamic Programming: Faster Knapsack and Graph Algorithms. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132, pages 19:1–19:13, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2019.19. 4
- [BC22] Karl Bringmann and Alejandro Cassis. Faster Knapsack Algorithms via Bounded Monotone Min-Plus-Convolution. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2022)*, volume 229, pages 31:1–31:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2022.31. 1, 4
- [BC23] Karl Bringmann and Alejandro Cassis. Faster 0-1-Knapsack via Near-Convex Min-Plus-Convolution. In *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2023)*, volume 274, pages 24:1–24:16, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2023.24. 3, 4, 14
- [Bel57] Richard Bellman. *Dynamic Programming*, volume 33. Princeton University Press, 1957. arXiv:j.ctv1nxcw0f, doi:10.2307/j.ctv1nxcw0f. 1, 4
- [BFN21] Karl Bringmann, Nick Fischer, and Vasileios Nakos. Sparse nonnegative convolution is equivalent to dense nonnegative convolution. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2021)*, pages 1711–1724, Virtual Italy, June 2021. doi:10.1145/3406325.3451090. 4
- [BFN22] Karl Bringmann, Nick Fischer, and Vasileios Nakos. Deterministic and Las Vegas Algorithms for Sparse Nonnegative Convolution. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2022)*, Proceedings, pages 3069–3090, January 2022. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977073.119. 4, 5
- [BHSS18] MohammadHossein Bateni, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Saeed Seddighin, and Cliff Stein. Fast algorithms for knapsack via convolution and prediction. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2018)*, pages 1269–1282, New York, NY, USA, June 2018. doi:10.1145/3188745.3188876. 4

- [BN20] Karl Bringmann and Vasileios Nakos. Top-k-convolution and the quest for near-linear output-sensitive subset sum. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2020)*, pages 982–995, 2020. doi:10.1145/3357713.3384308. 4
- [BN21a] Karl Bringmann and Vasileios Nakos. Fast n-Fold Boolean Convolution via Additive Combinatorics. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.41. 4
- [BN21b] Karl Bringmann and Vasileios Nakos. A Fine-Grained Perspective on Approximating Subset Sum and Partition. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2021)*, Proceedings, pages 1797–1815, January 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.108. 4
- [Bri17] Karl Bringmann. A Near-Linear Pseudopolynomial Time Algorithm for Subset Sum. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2017)*, pages 1073–1084, January 2017. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974782.69. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 18
- [Bri23] Karl Bringmann. Knapsack with Small Items in Near-Quadratic Time, September 2023. arXiv:2308.03075. 4
- [BW21] Karl Bringmann and Philip Wellnitz. On Near-Linear-Time Algorithms for Dense Subset Sum. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2021)*, pages 1777–1796, January 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.107. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 19, 20
- [CFG89a] Mark Chaimovich, Gregory Freiman, and Zvi Galil. Solving dense subset-sum problems by using analytical number theory. *Journal of Complexity*, 5(3):271–282, 1989. 1
- [CFG89b] Mark Chaimovich, Gregory Freiman, and Zvi Galil. Solving dense subset-sum problems by using analytical number theory. *Journal of Complexity*, 5(3):271–282, September 1989. doi:10.1016/0885-064X(89)90025-3. 4
- [CH02] Richard Cole and Ramesh Hariharan. Verifying candidate matches in sparse and wildcard matching. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2002)*, pages 592–601, New York, NY, USA, May 2002. doi:10.1145/509907.509992. 4
- [Cha99] Mark Chaimovich. New algorithm for dense subset-sum problem. *Astérisque*, 258:363–373, 1999. 1, 4
- [CL15] Timothy M. Chan and Moshe Lewenstein. Clustered Integer 3SUM via Additive Combinatorics. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2015)*, pages 31–40, New York, NY, USA, June 2015. doi:10.1145/2746539.2746568. 4
- [CLMZ24a] Lin Chen, Jiayi Lian, Yuchen Mao, and Guochuan Zhang. Approximating partition in near-linear time, 2024. arXiv:2402.11426. 2, 4, 7, 21

- [CLMZ24b] Lin Chen, Jiayi Lian, Yuchen Mao, and Guochuan Zhang. Faster algorithms for bounded knapsack and bounded subset sum via fine-grained proximity results. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4828–4848. SIAM, 2024. [1](#), [4](#), [18](#)
- [DJM23] Mingyang Deng, Ce Jin, and Xiao Mao. Approximating Knapsack and Partition via Dense Subset Sums. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2023)*, Proceedings, pages 2961–2979, January 2023. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch113](#). [4](#)
- [GM91] Zvi Galil and Oded Margalit. An Almost Linear-Time Algorithm for the Dense Subset-Sum Problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 20(6):1157–1189, December 1991. [doi:10.1137/0220072](#). [1](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [Hoe63] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963. [14](#), [22](#)
- [HX24] Qizheng He and Zhean Xu. Simple and faster algorithms for knapsack. In *2024 Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 56–62. SIAM, 2024. [3](#), [14](#)
- [IK75] Oscar H. Ibarra and Chul E. Kim. Fast Approximation Algorithms for the Knapsack and Sum of Subset Problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 22(4):463–468, 1975. [doi:10.1145/321906.321909](#). [4](#)
- [Jin23] Ce Jin. 0-1 Knapsack in Nearly Quadratic Time, August 2023. [arXiv:2308.04093](#). [1](#), [4](#)
- [JR23] Klaus Jansen and Lars Rohwedder. On integer programming, discrepancy, and convolution. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(3):1481–1495, 2023. [4](#)
- [JW19] Ce Jin and Hongxun Wu. A simple near-linear pseudopolynomial time randomized algorithm for subset sum. In *Proceedings of 2nd Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA 2019)*, volume 69, pages 17:1–17:6, 2019. [doi:10.4230/OASICS.SOSA.2019.17.1](#)
- [Kar72] Richard M. Karp. *Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems*, pages 85–103. Springer US, Boston, MA, 1972. [doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9](#). [1](#)
- [Kar75] Richard M Karp. The fast approximate solution of hard combinatorial problems. In *Proc. 6th South-Eastern Conf. Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Florida Atlantic U. 1975)*, pages 15–31, 1975. [4](#)
- [Kle22] Kim-Manuel Klein. On the fine-grained complexity of the unbounded subsetsum and the frobenius problem. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3567–3582. SIAM, 2022. [4](#)
- [KPS97] Hans Kellerer, Ulrich Pferschy, and Maria Grazia Speranza. An efficient approximation scheme for the subset-sum problem. In Hon Wai Leong, Hiroshi Imai, and Sanjay Jain, editors, *Algorithms and Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 394–403, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997. [doi:10.1007/3-540-63890-3_42](#). [4](#)

- [KX17] Konstantinos Koiliaris and Chao Xu. A faster pseudopolynomial time algorithm for subset sum. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1062–1072, 2017. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611974782.68](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974782.68). 1
- [KX18] Konstantinos Koiliaris and Chao Xu. Subset Sum Made Simple, July 2018. [arXiv:1807.08248](https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.08248). 1
- [MWW19] Marcin Mucha, Karol Węgrzycki, and Michał Włodarczyk. A Subquadratic Approximation Scheme for Partition. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2019)*, Proceedings, pages 70–88, January 2019. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.5](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975482.5). 4
- [Nak20] Vasileios Nakos. Nearly Optimal Sparse Polynomial Multiplication. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(11):7231–7236, November 2020. [doi:10.1109/TIT.2020.2989385](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2020.2989385). 4
- [Pis99] David Pisinger. Linear Time Algorithms for Knapsack Problems with Bounded Weights. *Journal of Algorithms*, 33(1):1–14, October 1999. [doi:10.1006/jagm.1999.1034](https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.1999.1034). 1, 4
- [Pis03] Pisinger. Dynamic programming on the word ram. *Algorithmica*, 35:128–145, 2003. 1
- [PRW21] Adam Polak, Lars Rohwedder, and Karol Węgrzycki. Knapsack and Subset Sum with Small Items. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, volume 198, pages 106:1–106:19, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021. [doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.106](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.106). 1, 4
- [Sár89] A. Sárközy. Finite addition theorems, I. *Journal of Number Theory*, 32(1):114–130, May 1989. [doi:10.1016/0022-314X\(89\)90102-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-314X(89)90102-9). 4
- [Sár94] A. Sárközy. Fine Addition Theorems, II. *Journal of Number Theory*, 48(2):197–218, August 1994. [doi:10.1006/jnth.1994.1062](https://doi.org/10.1006/jnth.1994.1062). 4
- [SV05] E. Szemerédi and V. Vu. Long arithmetic progressions in sumsets: Thresholds and bounds. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 19(1):119–169, September 2005. [doi:10.1090/S0894-0347-05-00502-3](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-05-00502-3). 2, 3, 4, 21
- [SV06] E. Szemerédi and V. H. Vu. Finite and Infinite Arithmetic Progressions in Sumsets. *Annals of Mathematics*, 163(1):1–35, 2006. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20159950>. 4
- [Tam09] Arie Tamir. New pseudopolynomial complexity bounds for the bounded and other integer Knapsack related problems. *Operations Research Letters*, 37(5):303–306, 2009. [doi:10.1016/j.orl.2009.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2009.05.003). 4
- [WC22] Xiaoyu Wu and Lin Chen. Improved Approximation Schemes for (Un-)Bounded Subset-Sum and Partition, December 2022. [arXiv:2212.02883](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.02883). 4