

On universal sets and sumsets

I.D. Shkredov

Annotation.

We study the concept of universal sets from the additive–combinatorial point of view. Among other results we obtain some applications of this type of uniformity to sets avoiding solutions to linear equations, and get an optimal upper bound for the covering number of general sumsets.

1 Introduction

Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group. Given two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, define the *sumset* of A and B as

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

In a similar way we define the *difference sets* and the *higher sumsets*, e.g., $2A - A$ is $A + A - A$. The study of the structure of sumsets is a fundamental problem in classical additive combinatorics [28], and this relatively new branch of mathematics provides us with a number of excellent results on this object. For example, the Plünnecke–Ruzsa inequality (see, e.g., [19] or [28]) says that for any positive integers n and m the following holds

$$|nA - mA| \leq \left(\frac{|A + A|}{|A|} \right)^{n+m} \cdot |A|. \quad (1)$$

Thus, bound (1) connects the cardinality of the original set A and its higher sumsets $nA - mA$. In this paper we do not consider cardinalities of sumsets, but rather deal with a new characteristic of a numerical set, namely universality and study how this characteristic changes from addition. Namely, a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ is called the *k -universal set* if for any $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbf{G}$ there exists $s \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $x_1 + s, \dots, x_k + s \in A$. The term “universal set” was coined in [2] and some applications to the Kakeya problem can be found in [12]. If we denote the maximal k with the above property by $\text{un}(A)$, then our first result says that

$$\text{un}(A + B) \geq \text{un}(A)\text{un}(B). \quad (2)$$

The estimate (2) is optimal and it shows, in particular, that the characteristic $\text{un}(\cdot)$ grows rapidly upon addition. A “statistical” or “quantitative” version of inequality (2) can be found in Section 3 and can be considered as a generalization of the Ruzsa triangle inequality [28]. The author hopes that such characteristics are interesting in its own right and can find application in further additive–combinatorial problems. In the proofs we make extensive use of the concept of higher

sumsets/higher energies, see [22] and therefore the main idea of obtaining inequalities as (2) is to move into higher dimensions.

Any k -universal set has some random properties; universality can be thought of as a combinatorial version of ordinary uniform sets (see, e.g., [28]). For example, we show in Section 5 that any k -universal subset U of a finite group \mathbf{G} intersects an arbitrary sumset $A + B$, where $|A| = \alpha|\mathbf{G}|$, $|B| = \beta|\mathbf{G}|$ and $\alpha \gg \frac{\log(1/\beta)}{k}$, say. In particular, U intersects any sufficiently long arithmetic progression or Bohr set. Even stronger properties of universal sets can be found in Sections 4, 5 and 7. On the other hand, universality is much weaker property than classical uniformity (for example, *any* set $U \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ of size $|U| > (1 - 1/k)|\mathbf{G}|$ is k -universal) and this gives the concept considerable flexibility. Using this flexibility, we obtain several applications.

In our first application we study sets $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, $|\mathbf{G}| < \infty$, $|A| = \delta|\mathbf{G}|$ avoiding solutions to general linear equations

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = \beta, \quad (3)$$

where $n \geq 3$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are coprime to $|\mathbf{G}|$. Denote by $f_A(x)$ the balanced function of the set A (all required definitions can be found in Section 2). In the case of $n = 3$, in the first part of the Kelly–Meka proof [10] it was shown that the so-called \mathbf{E}_k -norm f_A , $k = O(\log(2/\delta))$ controls the number of solutions to the equation (3) in the sense that if $\|f_A\|_{\mathbf{E}_k}$ is small, then (3) has $\Omega(\delta^3 |\mathbf{G}|^2)$ solutions. For larger n equation (3) was studied in [8], [13], [21] and in other papers. Using the universality one can, in particular, easily show that for large n one needs \mathbf{E}_{k_*} -norm of f_A with much smaller $k_* = k_*(n)$ to control the number of the solutions to the equation (3).

Theorem 1 *Let \mathbf{G} be a finite abelian group, $n \geq 4$ be an integer, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $|A| = \delta|\mathbf{G}|$ and A has no solutions to the equation*

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = \beta, \quad x_j \in A, j \in [n], \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are coprime to $|\mathbf{G}|$. Also, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8]$ be any number. Then there is $l \leq (3 \log(1/\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}} + 1$ such that

$$\|f_A\|_{\mathbf{E}_l}^{2l} \geq \varepsilon^{2l} \delta^{2l} |\mathbf{G}|^{l+1}. \quad (5)$$

The second area of our applications concerns the so-called covering numbers. Let \mathbf{G} be a finite abelian group and $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set. The *covering number* of A is defined as

$$\text{cov}(A) = \min_{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}} \{|X| : A + X = \mathbf{G}\}. \quad (6)$$

In other words, the covering number of A is the minimum number of translates A required to cover the group. In such a generalized form this concept can be found in [4] (see also previous papers [15], [20]), which contains many references to this issue. The case of an infinite group \mathbf{G} (e.g. \mathbb{Z}^d or \mathbb{R}^d) is different, and the interested reader may refer to, for example, the classic book [17].

In this generality, the covering number $\text{cov}(A)$ can be considered as a characteristic of the randomness of A . Indeed, for any set A one has $\text{cov}(A) \geq |\mathbf{G}|/|A|$ and the last bound is attained

if, say, $\mathbf{G} = \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$, $|A|$ divides N and A is an arithmetic progression $\{1, \dots, |A|\}$. On the other hand, using the simplest greedy algorithm, one can show (see, e.g., [4, Corollary 3.2]) that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{G}|}{|A|} \leq \text{cov}(A) \leq \frac{|\mathbf{G}|}{|A|} (\log |A| + 1) < \frac{|\mathbf{G}|}{|A|} \log |\mathbf{G}|. \quad (7)$$

The upper bound in (7) is tight and attained at a random set A . Thus one would expect that $\text{cov}(A)$ should be close to the lower bound in (7) for structured sets as arithmetic progressions and should be close to the upper bound if A has some random properties.

A classic result of additive combinatorics, namely the Ruzsa covering lemma (see [18] and [28, Lemma 2.14]), confirms this heuristic and gives us a good upper bound for the covering number of difference sets considered in additive theory as a typical example of structural sets.

Theorem 2 *Let \mathbf{G} be a finite abelian group, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $|A| = \alpha|\mathbf{G}|$. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A - A) \leq \alpha^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

We obtain a generalization of Theorem 2, namely, we show that a similar result takes place for an arbitrary sumset $A + B$. The method of the proof differs from [18].

Theorem 3 *Let \mathbf{G} be a finite abelian group, $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, $|A| = \alpha|\mathbf{G}|$, and $|B| = \beta|\mathbf{G}|$. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A + B) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{1}{\beta} + 1. \quad (9)$$

Bound (9) in Theorem 3 is absolutely tight, see Section 5. It is also interesting to note that while an infinite analogue of Theorem 2 takes place, see [7], [27] but the correspondent infinite version of Theorem 3 for infinite sets fails (see, e.g., [27]).

Our main new observation is the following: the *complement* A^c of any set A with large $\text{cov}(A)$ is a universal set, namely, we have the basic formula

$$\text{cov}(A) = \text{un}(A^c) + 1, \quad (10)$$

and therefore A^c must have some random/repulsive properties. On the other hand, the complements to sumsets of dense sets are known to be additively rich sets (see, e.g., [5], [24], [25]) and this contradiction gives us that the required upper bound for the covering number of any sumset.

In our last result, the group \mathbf{G} coincides with the prime field \mathbb{F}_p , and we study two covering numbers $\text{cov}^+/\text{cov}^\times$ with respect to addition/multiplication in \mathbb{F}_p . As the reader can see we are able to calculate the covering numbers for the sumsets/product sets of almost all possible types in \mathbb{F}_p . Given sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we write $A +_\varepsilon B$ for the set of $x \in \mathbf{G}$, having at least $\varepsilon|\mathbf{G}|$ representations as sum of $a + b$, $a \in A$, $b \in B$.

Theorem 4 *Let p be a prime number, and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be sets. Suppose that A, B and all sets below have positive density. Write L for $\log p$. Then*

	$A - A$	$(A - A)^c$	$A + B$	$(A + B)^c$	AB	$(AB)^c$	$(A + B)^{-1}$	$((A + B)^{-1})^c$
cov^+	$O(1)$	$\forall_{O(1)}$	$O(1)$	$\forall_{O(1)}$	$?_{\Omega(L)}$	$\Omega(L)$	$?_{\Omega(L)}$	$\Omega(L)$
cov^\times	$O(1)$	$\Omega(L)$	\forall	\forall	$O(1)$	$\forall_{O(1)}$	\forall	\forall

Here the symbol \forall means that the correspondent covering number can be $O(1)$ or $\Omega(L)$.

The symbol $\forall_{O(1)}$ means that the covering number of $(A + B)^c$, say, can be arbitrary but the covering number of $(A +_{\Omega(1)} B)^c$ is $O(1)$.

Similarly, the question mark $?_{\Omega(L)}$ means that the covering number of AB , say, is unknown but the covering number of $A \cdot_{\Omega(1)} B$ is $\Omega(L)$.

It follows from Theorem 4 that there are sets S , $|S| = o(p)$ such that

$$\max\{\text{cov}^+(S), \text{cov}^\times(S)\} = O(1).$$

Indeed, take $S = A - A$, $|S| = o(p)$, where $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ is a set of large density. Thus, an analogue of the sum-product phenomenon (see, e.g., [28]) *has no place* for the covering numbers.

2 Definitions and notation

Let \mathbf{G} be a finite abelian group and we denote the cardinality of \mathbf{G} by N . Given two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, define the *sumset* of A and B as

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

Similarly, if $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ we can define the *product set* and the *ratio set*

$$AB := \{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}, \quad A/B := \{a/b : a \in A, b \in B \setminus \{0\}\},$$

Given sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we write $A +_\varepsilon B$ for the set of $x \in \mathbf{G}$, having at least $\varepsilon|B|$ representations as sum of $a + b$, $a \in A$, $b \in B$. Sometimes such subsets of $A + B$ are called *popular* sumsets. Also, denote by A^c the complement of $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, that is $A^c = \mathbf{G} \setminus A$. If $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $\lambda \neq 0$, then we write $\lambda \cdot A := \{\lambda a : a \in A\}$. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and a positive integer k , we put

$$\Delta_k(A) := \{(a, a, \dots, a) : a \in A\} \subseteq \mathbf{G}^k.$$

Also, let $\Delta_k(x) := \Delta_k(\{x\})$, $x \in \mathbf{G}$. Now we have

$$A - A := \{a - b : a, b \in A\} = \{s \in \mathbf{G} : A \cap (A + s) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (11)$$

A natural generalization of the last formula in (11) is the set

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbf{G}^k : A \cap (A + x_1) \cap \dots \cap (A + x_k) \neq \emptyset\} = A^k - \Delta_k(A), \quad (12)$$

which is called the *higher difference set* (see [22]). A simple characterization of the higher difference sets is given in [23, Proposition 10].

Lemma 5 *Let $k \geq 2$, $m \in [k]$ be positive integers, and let $A_1, \dots, A_k, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be finite subsets of an abelian group \mathbf{G} . Then*

$$A_1 \times \dots \times A_k - \Delta_k(B) = \bigsqcup_{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in A_1 \times \dots \times A_m - \Delta_m(B)} \{(x_1, \dots, x_m)\} \times (A_{m+1} \times \dots \times A_k - \Delta_{k-m}(B \cap (A_1 - x_1) \cap \dots \cap (A_m - x_m))). \quad (13)$$

In particular, having a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and another set $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and writing

$$A_X = (A + x_1) \cap \dots \cap (A + x_k),$$

we see that

$$A^k - \Delta_k(A) = \{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}^k : A \cap A_X \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Observe the basic inclusion

$$A_X - X \subseteq A. \quad (14)$$

We need the generalized triangle inequality [22, Theorem 7].

Lemma 6 *Let k_1, k_2 be positive integers, $W \subseteq \mathbf{G}^{k_1}$, $Y \subseteq \mathbf{G}^{k_2}$ and $X, Z \subseteq \mathbf{G}$. Then*

$$|W \times X| |Y - \Delta_{k_2}(Z)| \leq |W \times Y \times Z - \Delta_{k_1+k_2+1}(X)|, \quad (15)$$

and

$$|W \times Z - \Delta_{k_1+1}(X)| = |W \times X - \Delta_{k_1+1}(Z)|. \quad (16)$$

In particular, for any $k \geq 2$ and sets $A_1, \dots, A_k \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ one has

$$|A_1 \times \dots \times A_k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G})| = |\mathbf{G}| |A_1 \times \dots \times A_{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(A_k)|. \quad (17)$$

Let $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}$ be its dual group in representation theory. For any function $f : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\rho \in \widehat{\mathbf{G}}$ define the Fourier transform of f at ρ by the formula

$$\widehat{f}(\rho) = \sum_{g \in \mathbb{F}_p} f(g) \overline{\rho(g)}. \quad (18)$$

The Parseval identity is

$$N \sum_{g \in \mathbf{G}} |f(g)|^2 = \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{\mathbf{G}}} |\widehat{f}(\rho)|^2. \quad (19)$$

The Wiener norm of a function $f : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is

$$\|f\|_W := N^{-1} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{\mathbf{G}}} |\widehat{f}(\rho)|. \quad (20)$$

We use the same capital letter to denote a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and its characteristic function $A : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ define the *spectrum* of A as

$$\text{Spec}_\varepsilon(A) = \{\chi \in \mathbf{G} : |\widehat{A}(\chi)| \geq \varepsilon|A|\}. \quad (21)$$

We write $\text{Spec}'_\varepsilon(A)$ for $\text{Spec}_\varepsilon(A) \setminus \{1\}$. If $f, g : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are some functions, then

$$(f * g)(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathbf{G}} f(y)g(x - y) \quad \text{and} \quad (f \circ g)(x) := \sum_{y \in \mathbf{G}} f(y)g(y + x).$$

For a real function f put

$$\|f\|_{\mathbb{E}_k}^{2k} = \sum_x (f \circ f)^k(x) \geq 0.$$

In particular, we obtain the *higher energy* (see [22])

$$\mathbb{E}_k(A) = \sum_x (A \circ A)^k(x).$$

Consider a refinement of definition (6) which allows to say something about the set of shifts X . Namely, let $f : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ be a parameter. Define

$$\text{cov}_{f,\varepsilon}(A) = \min_{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}} \{|X| : A + X = \mathbf{G}, |\widehat{X * f}(\chi)| \leq \varepsilon|X|\|f\|_1, \forall \chi \neq 1\}. \quad (22)$$

Clearly, $\text{cov}(A) \leq \text{cov}_{f,\varepsilon}(A)$. Further, assuming that $\varepsilon \geq N^{-1/3} \log N$ and taking a random set X , $|X| \gg \varepsilon^{-2} \log^2 N$ one can show that

$$\text{cov}_{f,\varepsilon}(A) \ll \max \left\{ \frac{N}{|A|} \cdot \log N, \varepsilon^{-2} \log^2 N \right\}, \quad (23)$$

see details in the proof of Theorem 22 below.

We need a special case of [25, Proposition 15] (the best results are contained in [24], and the first result of this type was obtained in [5]), see also [25, Section 6] for general \mathbf{G} . Recall that for a given subset $\Gamma \subseteq \widehat{\mathbf{G}}$ and a number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ the set $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma, \varepsilon)$ is called *Bohr set* (see, e.g., [28, Section 4.4]), if

$$\mathcal{B}(\Gamma, \varepsilon) = \{x \in \mathbf{G} : |\chi(x) - 1| \leq \varepsilon, \forall \chi \in \Gamma\}.$$

The size of Γ is called the *dimension* of $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma, \varepsilon)$, ε is the *radius* of $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma, \varepsilon)$. The connection between the size of the Bohr set, its dimension and radius is well-known, see, for example, [28, Lemma 4.20]

$$|\mathcal{B}(\Gamma, \varepsilon)| \geq (\varepsilon/2\pi)^{|\Gamma|} |\mathbf{G}|. \quad (24)$$

Theorem 7 *Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a parameter, $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, $|A|, |B| \gg |\mathbf{G}|$ and $|(A + B)^c| \gg |\mathbf{G}|$. Then the complement to $A +_\delta B$ contains a shift of a Bohr set \mathcal{B} of dimension $O_\delta(1)$ and the radius $\Omega_\delta(1)$.*

Finally, we need [26, Theorem 5.4] to fill in some gaps in the proof of Theorem 4.

Lemma 8 *Let q be a positive integer, $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ be a set, $|A| = \alpha q$. Suppose that the least prime factor of q greater than $2\alpha^{-1} + 3$. Then $\text{cov}^\times(A - A) \leq \alpha^{-1} + 1$.*

The signs \ll and \gg are the usual Vinogradov symbols. When the constants in the signs depend on a parameter M , we write \ll_M and \gg_M . Let us denote by $[n]$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. All logarithms are to base e . For a prime number p we write $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{F}_p^* = \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$.

3 On universal sets

In this section we discuss properties of universal sets and obtain a generalization of Ruzsa's triangle inequality. Having a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ we put

$$\text{un}(A) = \text{un}(A, \mathbf{G}) = \max\{k \geq 1 : A^k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}^k\}. \quad (25)$$

Alternatively, since $A - \Delta_1(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{G}$, we have in view of formula (17) of Lemma 6 that

$$\text{un}(A) = \max\{1, \max\{k \geq 2 : A^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(A) = \mathbf{G}^{k-1}\}\}. \quad (26)$$

For example, $\text{un}(A) = 2$ iff $A - A = \mathbf{G}$. If there is no such k , then we define $\text{un}(A) = 1$ appealing to the first definition (25). The statement $A^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(A) = \mathbf{G}^{k-1}$ is equivalent to say that A is a k -universal set, that is for any $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbf{G}$ there is $w \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $z_1 + w, \dots, z_k + w \in A$. In particular, any set is 1-universal and that is why we always have $\text{un}(A) \geq 1$. It is easy to see, that for any $A \neq \mathbf{G}$ one has $\text{un}(A) < \infty$ and, by convention, we put $\text{un}(\mathbf{G}) = \infty$. Also, if $B \subseteq A$, then $\text{un}(B) \leq \text{un}(A)$. Finally, we have

$$\text{un}(A) = \text{un}(A + x) = \text{un}(\lambda \cdot A)$$

for any $x \in \mathbf{G}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(\lambda, |\mathbf{G}|) = 1$. It is easy to observe (take a random intersection A_X) that a trivial upper bound for $\text{un}(A)$, where $|A| = \delta N$ is

$$\text{un}(A) \leq \frac{\log N}{\log(1/\delta)} \quad (27)$$

and this bound is tight in general, see Section 5.

In paper [22, inequality (29)] it was proved, in particular, that for any k -universal set U and an arbitrary set S one has

$$|U + S| \geq N \cdot \left(\frac{|S|}{N}\right)^{1/k}. \quad (28)$$

The last bound is a consequence of the formula $U^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(U) = \mathbf{G}^{k-1}$ and inequality (15) of Lemma 6, namely,

$$|S|N^{k-1} = |S||U^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(U)| \leq |U^k - \Delta_k(S)| \leq |U - S|^k. \quad (29)$$

In particular, taking any S with $|S| = 1$, we obtain

$$|U| \geq N^{1-1/k}. \quad (30)$$

We want to study the connection between sumsets and universal sets. Probably, the first result in this direction was obtained by N.G. Moshchevitin (see paper [22, Proposition 15], where the reader can find some additional results on this topic).

Lemma 9 *Let k_1, k_2 be positive integers, and $X_1, \dots, X_{k_1}, Y, Z_1, \dots, Z_{k_2}, W$ be finite subsets of an abelian group. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & |X_1 \times \dots \times X_{k_1} - \Delta_{k_1}(Y)| |Z_1 \times \dots \times Z_{k_2} - \Delta_{k_2}(W)| \leq \\ & \leq |(X_1 - W) \times \dots \times (X_{k_1} - W) \times (Y - Z_1) \times \dots \times (Y - Z_{k_2}) - \Delta_{k_1+k_2}(Y - W)|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any non-empty sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ one has

$$\text{un}(A + B) \geq \text{un}(A) + \text{un}(B) - 1. \quad (31)$$

We improve estimate (31) significantly, see Corollary 11 below. First of all, let us obtain a simple lemma.

Lemma 10 *Let $A, B, X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, and $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$. Put $D = A - B$ and suppose that B_i are subsets of B , $i \in [t]$. Then*

$$A_X \subseteq D \bigcup_{i=1}^t (B_i + x_i). \quad (32)$$

In particular,

$$A_X \subseteq D_{B+X}. \quad (33)$$

Proof. Let $z \in A_X \neq \emptyset$. By definition $z - x_i \in A$ for all $i \in [t]$. Also, let $b_i \in B_i$. Then $z \in D + b_i + x_i$ iff $z - x_i - b_i \in A - b_i \subseteq D$, $i \in [t]$. Thus, we have obtained (32) and putting $B_i = B$, we get (33). Another way to prove (33) is to use a particular case of the main inclusion (14), namely, $A \subseteq D_B$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 11 *Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$. Then*

$$\text{un}(A + B) \geq \text{un}(A)\text{un}(B). \quad (34)$$

Proof. Let $D = A - B$, $m = \text{un}(A)$, $n = \text{un}(B)$. Take any $s_1, \dots, s_m \in \mathbf{G}^n$. By assumption the set B is n -universal set and hence any vector $s_i \in \mathbf{G}^n$, $i \in [m]$ can be written as $s_i = b_i + \Delta_n(x_i)$, where $x_i \in \mathbf{G}$ and $b_i = (b_i^{(1)}, \dots, b_i^{(n)})$. Let $B_i = \{b_i^{(1)}, \dots, b_i^{(n)}\}$, $i \in [m]$ and $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$. Using inclusion (32) of Lemma 10, we obtain

$$A_X \subseteq D_{\bigcup_{i=1}^m (B_i + x_i)} = D_{s_1, \dots, s_m}. \quad (35)$$

Notice that the vector (s_1, \dots, s_m) belongs to \mathbf{G}^{mn} . By assumption A is m -universal set and hence $A_X \neq \emptyset$. It means that D is mn -universal set. This completes the proof. \square

Let us show that bound (34) is tight.

Example 12 Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^k S_i = [n]$, $|S_i| \sim n/k$ and let

$$H_i = H_i(S_i) = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbf{G} : x_j = 0, \forall j \in S_i\}.$$

Then each H_i is a subspace of \mathbf{G} , $|H_i| \sim N^{1-1/k}$ and it is easy to check (or see [2, Theorem 2.1]) that $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^k H_i$ is k -universal set, $|U| \sim kN^{1-1/k}$. Let $U' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k'} H'_i$, where subspaces $H'_i = H_i(S'_i)$ and the sets S'_i , $|S'_i| \sim n/k'$ form a random splitting of $[n]$. Then it is easy to check that the sumset $U + U' = \bigcup_{i=1, j=1}^{k, k'} (H_i + H'_j)$ has size $O(kk'N^{1-1/kk'})$ and hence in view of (30) one has $\text{un}(U + U') \leq \text{un}(U)\text{un}(U') = kk'$ for $(kk')^2 \log(kk') \ll \log N$, say. A similar construction can be found in [12].

Now we want to obtain a quantitative (or in other words, statistical) version of universality, which allows us to generalize Corollary 11. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and a positive integer n define

$$\mathcal{U}_n(A) = \mathcal{U}_n(A, \mathbf{G}) := \frac{|A^n - \Delta_n(\mathbf{G})|}{N^n} \leq 1.$$

In other words, $\mathcal{U}_n(A)$ is the proportion of n -tuples from \mathbf{G} whose shifts belong to A . In particular, $\mathcal{U}_n(A) = 1$ iff A is n -universal. Sometimes we write $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_n(A) = \mathcal{U}_n^{1/n}(A)$. In this terms, the inequality (29) above can be rewritten as

$$|A + S| \geq \left(\frac{|S|}{N} \cdot \mathcal{U}_n(A) \right)^{1/n} N = \left(\frac{|S|}{N} \right)^{1/n} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_n(A) N, \quad (36)$$

where n be a positive integer and A is an arbitrary set. Further we know that (see [22])

$$|A^{nm} - \Delta_{nm}(A)| \leq |A^n - \Delta_n(A)|^m. \quad (37)$$

In terms of the quantity \mathcal{U}_n the last estimate can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{U}_{nm+1}(A) \leq \mathcal{U}_{n+1}^m(A), \quad (38)$$

and therefore $\{\overline{\mathcal{U}}_n(A)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is decreasing by a subsequence. In this paper we are interested in lower bounds for the quantity \mathcal{U}_n . To generalize Corollary 11 we need several new concepts. Given a vector $\vec{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_l)$, we write $|\vec{v}| = l$ for the number of components of \vec{v} .

Definition 13 Let m, n be positive integers, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m$, $B \subseteq \mathbf{G}^n$, and $m_1 + \cdots + m_n = m$, where $0 < m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in [n]$. Define the following subset of \mathbf{G}^{m+n}

$$A \times_{m_1, \dots, m_n} B = \{(a_1, b_1, \dots, a_n, b_n) : (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A, (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B, |a_i| = m_i, \forall i \in [n]\}.$$

Also, put

$$\Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B) = \{(\Delta_{m_1}(b_1), \dots, \Delta_{m_n}(b_n)) : (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B\} \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m.$$

Let us make some useful remarks. First of all, we have $|\Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)| = |B|$ and for any $x \in \mathbf{G}^n$ one has

$$\Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B + x) = \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B) + \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(x). \quad (39)$$

Also, notice that formula (17) gives us for any $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$

$$|A^m - \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(\mathbf{G}^n)| = N^n \prod_{i=1}^n |A^{m_i-1} - \Delta_{m_i-1}(A)|. \quad (40)$$

Finally, the corresponding Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that connects our new difference set and a kind of energy is the following

$$\begin{aligned} & |Q|^{2m} |B|^2 \leq |Q^m - \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)| \\ & \times \sum_{b=(b_1, \dots, b_n), b'=(b'_1, \dots, b'_n) \in B} (Q \circ Q)^{m_1}(b_1 - b'_1) \dots (Q \circ Q)^{m_n}(b_n - b'_n), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $Q \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, $B \subseteq \mathbf{G}^n$ are arbitrary sets.

Now we are ready to obtain the general triangle inequality which contains Lemma 6 for $n = 1$.

Lemma 14 Let m, n be positive integers, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m$, $B, C \subseteq \mathbf{G}^n$, and $m_1 + \cdots + m_n = m$, where $0 < m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in [n]$. Then

$$|C| |A - \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)| \leq |A \times_{m_1, \dots, m_n} B - \Delta_{m_1+1, \dots, m_n+1; n}(C)|, \quad (42)$$

and

$$|A \times_{m_1, \dots, m_n} B - \Delta_{m_1+1, \dots, m_n+1; n}(C)| = |A \times_{m_1, \dots, m_n} C - \Delta_{m_1+1, \dots, m_n+1; n}(B)|. \quad (43)$$

Besides

$$|C| |A \pm \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)| \leq |A \pm \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(C)| |B \pm C|. \quad (44)$$

Proof. Let us take any element $x := (a_1 - \Delta_{m_1}(b_1), \dots, a_n - \Delta_{m_n}(b_n)) \in A - \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)$, where $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A$, $|a_i| = m_i$, $i \in [n]$, and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B$. As always we assume that there is a unique pair (a, b) representing a fixed element x of $A - \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)$. Now consider the map

$$(x, c) \rightarrow (a_1, b_1, \dots, a_n, b_n) - (\Delta_{m_1+1}(c_1), \dots, \Delta_{m_n+1}(c_n)) \in A \times_{m_1, \dots, m_n} B - \Delta_{m_1+1, \dots, m_n+1; n}(C),$$

where $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C$. Subtracting $a_i - \Delta_{m_i}(c_i)$ and $b_i - c_i$ for any $i \in [n]$, we see that the defined map is an injection. In gives us (42) and bound (44) with minuses follows from the obtained estimate (42). To get (44) with pluses consider the magnification ratio

$$R_A[B] = R_A[B](m_1, \dots, m_n) := \min_{\emptyset \neq X \subseteq B} \frac{|A + \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(X)|}{|X|}.$$

Repeating the Petridis argument [16] (combining with formula (39), also see [22, Section 8]), we obtain for any $C \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m$ that

$$|A + \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(C + X)| \leq R_A[B] \cdot |C + X|.$$

Combining the last formula with standard arguments (see, e.g., [22, Corollary 37]), one obtains

$$|C| |A + \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(B)| \leq |A + \Delta_{m_1, \dots, m_n; n}(C)| |B + C|$$

as required. Finally, the map

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1, b_1, \dots, a_n, b_n) - (\Delta_{m_1+1}(c_1), \dots, \Delta_{m_n+1}(c_n)) \\ & \rightarrow (a_1, c_1, \dots, a_n, c_n) - (\Delta_{m_1+1}(b_1), \dots, \Delta_{m_n+1}(b_n)) \end{aligned}$$

is injection and hence (43) follows. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 14 implies the following quantitative version of Corollary 11.

Corollary 15 *Let m, n be positive integers, and $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{nm}(A + B) \geq \mathcal{U}_m(A) \mathcal{U}_n^m(B). \quad (45)$$

In particular, for any set $S \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ one has

$$|A + B + S| \geq \left(\frac{|S|}{N} \right)^{1/mn} \bar{\mathcal{U}}_m^{1/n}(A) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_n(B) N, \quad (46)$$

and for any positive integer l the following holds

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{m^l}(lA) \geq (\bar{\mathcal{U}}_m(A))^{\frac{m^l-1}{m^l-m^{l-1}}}. \quad (47)$$

Proof. Let $D = A - B$, $\mathcal{A} = A^m - \Delta_m(\mathbf{G})$, and $\mathcal{B} = B^{nm}$. From the proof of Corollary 11 (see formula (35)) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |D^{nm} - \Delta_{nm}(\mathbf{G})| &\geq \left| \bigcup_{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in A^m - \Delta_m(\mathbf{G})} ((B^n - \Delta_n(x_1)) \times \dots \times (B^n - \Delta_n(x_m))) \right| \\ &= |\mathcal{B} - \Delta_{n, \dots, n; m}(\mathcal{A})|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 14, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}| |B^n - \Delta_n(\mathbf{G})|^m &= |\mathcal{A}| |\mathcal{B} - \Delta_{n, \dots, n; m}(\mathbf{G}^m)| \leq |\mathcal{B} \times_{n, \dots, n} \mathbf{G}^m - \Delta_{n+1, \dots, n+1; m}(\mathcal{A})| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{B} - \Delta_{n, \dots, n; m}(\mathcal{A})| N^m. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two bounds, we derive

$$|(A - B)^{nm} - \Delta_{nm}(\mathbf{G})| \geq N^{-m} |A^m - \Delta_m(\mathbf{G})| |B^n - \Delta_n(\mathbf{G})|^m,$$

and (45) follows.

To get (46) we use the obtained bound and repeat the calculations from (29). It gives us

$$N|A - B + S|^{nm} \geq |S| |D^{nm} - \Delta_{nm}(\mathbf{G})| \geq N^{-m} |S| |\mathcal{A}| |B^n - \Delta_n(\mathbf{G})|^m$$

Finally, estimate (47) follows from (45) by induction. This completes the proof. \square

Considering the simplest case $m = n = 2$ of (46), we derive

$$|A + B + S|^4 \geq |S| |A - A| |B - B|^2.$$

Of course, the real power of (45), (46) comes when the parameters m and n are large.

The same argument gives us a new expanding property of universal sets.

Corollary 16 *Let n, k be positive integers, $U \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a k -universal set, and $S \subseteq \mathbf{G}^n$ be an arbitrary set, $|S| = \sigma N^n$. Then*

$$|U^{nk} - \Delta_{k, \dots, k; n}(S)| \geq \sigma N^{nk}. \quad (48)$$

In particular, for any sets $A, S \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and an arbitrary $m \geq 1$ the following holds

$$|U + A + S| \geq N \left(\frac{|S|}{N} \right)^{1/km} \bar{U}_m^{1/k}(A). \quad (49)$$

Proof. Let $m = nk$. Applying estimate (42) of Lemma 14, we get

$$|S| N^m = |S| |U^m - \Delta_{k, \dots, k; n}(\mathbf{G}^n)| \leq |U^m \times_{k, \dots, k} \mathbf{G}^n - \Delta_{k+1, \dots, k+1; n}(S)| \leq N^n |U^m - \Delta_{k, \dots, k; n}(S)|$$

as required. Bound (49) follows from (46). This completes the proof. \square

4 Universality and sets avoiding solutions to linear equations

The first result of this section shows that universal sets (or, more generally, sets with large \mathcal{U}_n) always contain solutions of all linear equations. It can be considered as a combinatorial reformulation of the first part of Kelley–Meka proof [10].

Proposition 17 *Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $|A| = \delta N$ and A has no solutions to the equation*

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = \beta, \quad x_j \in A, j \in [n], \quad (50)$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are coprime to $|\mathbf{G}|$. Then for $n = 3$ one has

$$\text{un}(A) \leq \delta^{-1} \log(1/\delta), \quad (51)$$

and for $n > 3$, we obtain

$$\text{un}(A) \leq (2 \log(1/\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}}. \quad (52)$$

Finally, one has $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_m(A) < 7/8$ for all m greater than

$$(3 \log(1/\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}}. \quad (53)$$

Proof. By Corollary (11) we know that for $U = \alpha_1 \cdot A + \cdots + \alpha_{n-2} \cdot A$ one has $\text{un}(U) \geq \text{un}^{n-2}(A)$. Since the set A has no solutions to (50), it follows that

$$N - |A| \geq |U + \alpha_{n-1} \cdot A| > N(1 - \text{un}^{-1}(U) \log(1/\delta))$$

and in the case $n = 3$ the result follows. For $n > 3$ let us write $n = l + l' + 2$, where $l' \geq l = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1$ and define $U_1 = \alpha_1 \cdot A + \cdots + \alpha_l \cdot A$, $U_2 = \alpha_{l+3} \cdot A + \cdots + \alpha_n \cdot A$. Now observe that the sets $\alpha_{l+1} \cdot A + U_1$, $-(\alpha_{l+2} \cdot A + U_2)$ both have sizes greater than $N/2$ and thus they intersect. Thus (52) follows.

Finally, assume that $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_m(A) \geq 7/8$, where m is given by (53). Using inequality (47), combining with (36), we obtain

$$|\alpha_{l+1} \cdot A + U_1| \geq \delta^{1/m^l} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{m^l}(U_1) N \geq \delta^{1/m^l} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_m(A)^{\frac{m^l-1}{m^l-m^{l-1}}} N \geq \delta^{1/m^l} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_m(A)^{\frac{m}{m-1}} N.$$

and similar for $|\alpha_{l+2} \cdot A + U_2|$. Therefore by our choice of m , we get

$$|\alpha_{l+1} \cdot A + U_1| > 3N/4 \cdot (1 - m^{-l} \log(1/\delta)) \geq N/2.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In the next lemma we show that the uniformity in the Kelly–Meka sense implies universality. Of course, one can relax condition (54) using the Hölder inequality but we do not need this step.

Lemma 18 *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a real number, k be a positive integer, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $|A| = \delta N$ and*

$$\|f_A\|_{\mathbb{E}_l}^{2l} = \sum_x (f_A \circ f_A)^l(x) \leq \varepsilon^{2l} \delta^{2l} N^{l+1}, \quad \forall l \in [k]. \quad (54)$$

Then

$$\overline{U}_k(A) > \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2}. \quad (55)$$

Proof. We have $(A \circ A)(x) = \delta^2 N + (f_A \circ f_A)(x)$ and hence

$$\mathbf{E}_k(A) = \sum_x (A \circ A)^k(x) = \delta^{2k} N^{k+1} + \sum_{l=2}^k \binom{k}{l} (\delta^2 N)^{k-l} \sum_x (f_A \circ f_A)^l(x) = \delta^{2k} N^{k+1} + \mathcal{E}.$$

Using our assumption (54), one obtains

$$\mathcal{E} \leq \delta^{2k} N^{k+1} \sum_{l=2}^k \binom{k}{l} \varepsilon^{2l} < \delta^{2k} N^{k+1} ((1 + \varepsilon^2)^k - 1).$$

Combining the last two bounds with the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (see, e.g., (41)), we get

$$|A|^{2k} \leq \mathbf{E}_k(A) |A^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(A)| < \delta^{2k} N^k (1 + \varepsilon^2)^k |A^k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G})|.$$

It follows that $\overline{U}_k(A) > (1 + \varepsilon^2)^{-1}$. This completes the proof. \square

Now let us obtain the main result of this section that shows how to use universality to control the number of the solutions to any linear equation (56).

Theorem 19 *Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $|A| = \delta N$ and A has no solutions to the equation*

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = \beta, \quad x_j \in A, j \in [n], \quad (56)$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are coprime to $|\mathbf{G}|$. Also, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8]$ be any number. Then there is $l \leq (3 \log(1/\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}} + 1$ such that

$$\|f_A\|_{\mathbb{E}_l}^{2l} \geq \varepsilon^{2l} \delta^{2l} N^{l+1}. \quad (57)$$

Proof. Assume that (57) does not hold, otherwise there is nothing to prove. By assumption $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8]$ and hence using Lemma 18, we see that, in particular, $\overline{U}_k(A) > \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon^2} > 7/8$, where $k = (3 \log(1/\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}} + 1$. This contradicts bound (53) of Proposition 17. \square

Theorem 19 allows us to say something about sets in \mathbb{F}_p^s , avoiding solutions to affine equations.

Corollary 20 *Let $p > 2$ be a prime number, $n \geq 4$ be an integer, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^s$ be a set, $|A| = \delta N$ and A has no solutions to the equation*

$$\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = 0, \quad x_j \in A, j \in [n], \quad (58)$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ and $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n = 0$. Then

$$|A| \ll q^{s-s\frac{1}{5}-\frac{2}{25\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 15}}. \quad (59)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}(\delta) = \log(2/\delta)$, and $p_* = (3\mathcal{L}(\delta))^{\frac{1}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1}} + 1$. Applying Theorem 19 with $\varepsilon := 1/8$, we see that (57) takes place. Now it remains to use the arguments of [3]. Namely, applying [3, Lemma 6] with $\alpha = \delta$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \delta^{p_*}$, we find a subspace $V \leq \mathbb{F}_p^s$ and $x \in \mathbb{F}_p^s$ such that $|A \cap (V + x)| \geq \delta(1 + \varepsilon/2)$ and

$$\text{codim}(V) \ll_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}^2(\delta) \mathcal{L}^2(\delta^{p_*}) \ll p_*^2 \mathcal{L}^4(\delta).$$

Applying the usual density increment argument, one obtains a contradiction after at most $\mathcal{L}(\delta)$ steps and after some calculations we arrive at (59). This completes the proof. \square

The same method works for general abelian groups. Indeed, using Lemma 8 from [3] instead of [3, Lemma 6] and repeating the argument will reduce roughly two logarithms from the main result of [3] in the case of large $n > 3$. Nevertheless, we do not include the final bound due to the fact that the better estimate is contained in [21] (also, see previous paper [13]).

5 On covering numbers

Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group and $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set. Further put $\Omega = \Omega(A) = A^c$. We have

$$\text{cov}(A) = \text{cov}^+(A) = \min_{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}} \{|X| : A + X = \mathbf{G}\} = \min_{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}} \{|X| : \Omega_X = \emptyset\}. \quad (60)$$

In other words, for any Y , $|Y| \leq \text{cov}(A) - 1 := k$ one has $\Omega_Y \neq \emptyset$. The last statement is equivalent to $\Omega^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(\Omega) = \mathbf{G}^{k-1}$ and thus Ω is a k -universal set. In particular, we have our basic formula (10) and using (27) as well as (10), we obtain the second upper bound of (7). Also, formulae (10), (31) give us

$$(\text{cov}(\Omega(A)) - 1)^n + 1 \leq \text{cov}(\Omega(nA)). \quad (61)$$

More generally, for any set $E \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ we put

$$\text{cov}(A; E) = \min_{X \subseteq \mathbf{G}} \{|X| : E \subseteq A + X\}. \quad (62)$$

In particular, $\text{cov}(A; \mathbf{G}) = \text{cov}(A)$. Also, if $A' \subseteq A$ and $E' \subseteq E$, then $\text{cov}(A; E) \leq \text{cov}(A'; E)$ and $\text{cov}(A; E') \leq \text{cov}(A; E)$. Notice that

$$\text{cov}(A) = \text{cov}(A; \mathbf{G}) \leq \text{cov}(A; E) \cdot \text{cov}(E; \mathbf{G}). \quad (63)$$

Since

$$\Omega(A + X) = \Omega(A)_X \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega(A_X) = \Omega(A) + X, \quad (64)$$

it follows that $E \subseteq A + X$ is equivalent to $\Omega(A)_X \subseteq \Omega(E)$. In other words, putting $k = \text{cov}(A; E) - 1$ we see that for any $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbf{G}$ there is $w \in E$ such that $z_1 + w, \dots, z_k + w \in \Omega(A)$. Another consequence of (64) that follows from (10) is

$$\text{un}(A + X) = \text{cov}(\Omega(A)_X) - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{un}(A_X) = \text{cov}(\Omega(A) + X) - 1. \quad (65)$$

In a similar way, using the second formula of (64), the basic identity (10), and Corollary 11, we obtain for any $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ that

$$\text{cov}(A_X) \geq (\text{cov}(A) - 1)(\text{cov}(X^c) - 1) + 1. \quad (66)$$

The last formula gives us an interesting connection between $\text{cov}(A)$ and $\text{cov}(A^c)$.

Lemma 21 *Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be any sets. Then*

$$|B| \text{cov}(A + B) \geq \text{cov}(A) \geq (\text{cov}(A + B) - 1)(\text{cov}(B^c) - 1) + 1. \quad (67)$$

In particular,

$$\text{cov}(A) \geq (\text{cov}(A - A) - 1)(\text{cov}(A^c) - 1) + 1. \quad (68)$$

Proof. Let $A + B + Z = \mathbf{G}$, where $|Z| = \text{cov}(A + B)$. Using formulae (64), one obtains $\Omega(A + B + Z) = \Omega(A)_{B+Z} = \emptyset$ and hence $\text{cov}(A) \leq \text{cov}(A + B)|B|$. Now apply (66) with $A = A + B$ and $X = (-B)$. It remains to notice that $A \subseteq (A + B)_{-B}$ and hence $\text{cov}((A + B)_{-B}) \leq \text{cov}(A)$. This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 22 *Let $A, B, C, E \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, $|A| = \alpha N$, $|B| = \beta N$, and $|C| = \gamma N$. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A + B; E) \leq \alpha^{-1} \log \frac{|B - E|}{|B|} + 1, \quad (69)$$

In particular,

$$\text{cov}(A + B) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{1}{\beta} + 1. \quad (70)$$

Now if $\alpha \geq N^{-2/3} \log^2 N$, then

$$\text{cov}_{C, \sqrt{\alpha/8}}(A + B + C) \ll \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \log^2 \frac{2}{\alpha\gamma} \cdot \left(\log \frac{2}{\beta} + \log^2 \frac{2}{\alpha\gamma} \right). \quad (71)$$

Proof. Let us start with (71) since to it is harder to prove and instead of $\text{cov}_{C, \sqrt{\alpha/8}}(A+B+C)$ we consider the simpler quantity $\text{cov}(A+B+C)$. Put $\Omega = (A+B+C)^c$. Further, let $k = \text{cov}(A+B+C) - 1$ and let $X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set of size $ck/\log(1/\beta)$ which we will define later. Here $c > 0$ is an absolute small constant. Thanks to (14), we have

$$(A+C) \cap (\Omega_X - B - X) = \emptyset. \quad (72)$$

We know that Ω is a k -universal set. Then it is easy to see that the set Ω_X is $k_* := [k/|X|]$ -universal set. Using (72) and taking the absolute constant c to be sufficiently small, we get

$$|\Omega_X - B| \geq N\beta^{1/k_*} \geq N/2. \quad (73)$$

Let $T = \Omega_X - B$. Applying the Fourier transform, we rewrite property (72) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A||C||T||X|}{N} &\leq N^{-1} \sum_{\chi \neq 1} |\hat{A}(\chi)| |\hat{C}(\chi)| |\hat{T}(\chi)| |\hat{X}(\chi)| \\ &\leq N^{-1} \sum_{\chi \notin \text{Spec}_\varepsilon(C)} |\hat{A}(\chi)| |\hat{C}(\chi)| |\hat{T}(\chi)| |\hat{X}(\chi)| + N^{-1} \sum_{\chi \in \text{Spec}'_\varepsilon(C)} |\hat{A}(\chi)| |\hat{C}(\chi)| |\hat{T}(\chi)| |\hat{X}(\chi)| \\ &= \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ is a certain parameter. Using the Parseval identity (19) and estimate (73), we get

$$\sigma_1 < \varepsilon |C||X| \sqrt{|A||T|} \leq \frac{|A||C||T||X|}{2N},$$

where we have taken $\varepsilon = \sqrt{\alpha/8}$ to satisfy the last inequality. In a similar way, applying the Parseval identity again, one has $t := |\text{Spec}_\varepsilon(C)| \ll (\alpha\gamma)^{-1}$. To estimate σ_2 we choose our set X randomly. By the standard Chernoff-type inequality see, e.g., [1, Lemma 3.2], one has for any $|X| \leq N^{2/3}$ that

$$|\hat{X}(\chi)| \ll \sqrt{|X|} \log t,$$

where χ runs over the set $\text{Spec}'_\varepsilon(C)$. We have the condition $|X| \leq N^{2/3}$, since otherwise our estimate (71) immediately follows from the simple bound (23) (which is a direct consequence of [1, Lemma 3.2]) and our assumption $\alpha \geq N^{-2/3} \log^2 N$. Thus, as above

$$\sigma_2 \ll \sqrt{|X|} \log t \cdot |C| \sqrt{|A||T|} \leq \frac{|A||C||T||X|}{2N},$$

provided $|X| \gg \alpha^{-1} \log^2 t$. Returning (74), we obtain a contradiction and it means that

$$\frac{\text{cov}(A+B+C)}{\log(1/\beta)} \ll \frac{k}{\log(1/\beta)} \ll |X| \ll \alpha^{-1} \log^2 t \ll \alpha^{-1} \log^2(1/\alpha\gamma).$$

Thus, we have obtained an upper bound for $\text{cov}(A+B+C)$ which is even better than (71). But it is easy to check that our construction gives a similar estimate for $\text{cov}_{C, \sqrt{\alpha/8}}(A+B+C)$. Indeed, put $k = \text{cov}_{C, \sqrt{\alpha/8}}(A+B+C) - 1$ as above and let us obtain a good upper bound for k .

First of all, we know that for $|X| \gg \alpha^{-1} \log^2 t$ one has $|\widehat{X * C}(\chi)| \leq \varepsilon |X| |C|$, $\forall \chi \neq 1$ thanks to our construction. Secondly, our set X is a random one, thus it is taken with probability close to one, and hence $|\Omega^{k-1} - \Delta_{k-1}(\Omega)| \geq 2^{-1} N^{k-1}$, say. Here $\Omega = (A + B + C)^c$ as above. Applying (29), we get

$$|\Omega - B| \gg N \beta^{1/k_*} \gg N \quad (75)$$

for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$. Unfortunately, to get an analogue of (73) we need to replace the set Ω with the set Ω_X in (75), and the later is not k_* -universal set in general (due to the fact that the set of shifts X is rather specific). Nevertheless, take another random set X' , $|X'| = k_*$, $k_* |X| \leq k$ and then in view of

$$|\widehat{X + X'}(\chi)| = |\widehat{X * X'}(\chi)| \ll \sqrt{|X| |X'|} \log^2 t \leq \varepsilon |X| |X'|, \quad \forall \chi \in \text{Spec}'_\varepsilon(C), \quad (76)$$

we derive that with high probability $\Omega_{X+X'} \neq \emptyset$ thanks to the definition of the set Ω and the quantity $\text{cov}_{C, \sqrt{\alpha/8}}(A + B + C)$. Here we have used the fact that $|X| |X'| \gg k$ and if the second inequality in (76) does not hold, then we obtain (71) immediately. In particular, for any random set $X' = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_{k_*}\}$ there is $z \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $z + x'_1, \dots, z + x'_{k_*} \in \Omega_X$ and thus $|\Omega_X^{k_*-1} - \Delta_{k_*-1}(\Omega_X)| \gg N^{k_*-1}$. It follows that $|\Omega_X - B| \gg N$ and we can repeat the argument above.

Now to obtain (70) we use the previous argument with $X = C = \{0\}$. In particular, $\Omega = (A + B)^c$. Then by estimate (73) with $k_* = k := \text{cov}(A + B) - 1$ one has

$$|\Omega - B| \geq N \beta^{1/k} > N(1 - k^{-1} \log(1/\beta)), \quad (77)$$

and the last quantity is greater than $|N| - |A|$, provided

$$\text{cov}(A + B) = k + 1 > \alpha^{-1} \log(1/\beta) + 1.$$

Finally, to get (69) we use an analogue of inequality (77) as well as estimates (28), (29). Namely, for $k := \text{cov}(A + B; E) - 1$, taking into account estimate (15), as well as the argument after (64), we have the following

$$|B| N^k = |B| |\Omega^k - \Delta_{k-1}(E)| \leq |\Omega^k \times E - \Delta_k(B)| \leq |\Omega - B|^k |E - B|,$$

and thus

$$|\Omega - B| \geq N (|B|/|B - E|)^{1/k}.$$

It follows that

$$\text{cov}(A + B; E) = k + 1 \leq \alpha^{-1} \log(|B - E|/|B|) + 1.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Clearly, estimate (70) is tight up to some constants. Indeed, let $A = B$ be an arithmetic progression, $|A| = \alpha N$, then $\text{cov}(A) \geq (2\alpha)^{-1}$ and, consequently, the dependence on α is correct. On the other hand, if B is any set such that $|B| = 1$ and A is a random set, then in view of (7) (also, consult Example 28) we see that (70) is optimal. A similar construction works for estimate

(71). Also, notice that the proof of inequalities (69), (70) says that, actually, $A + B + X = \mathbf{G}$ for all typical X , $|X| \gg \alpha^{-1} \log(1/\beta)$.

The argument above gives us an upper bound for the covering numbers of A in terms of A_B . Notice that the condition $A_B \neq \emptyset$ in (78) means that B belongs to $A^{|B|} - \Delta_{|B|}(\mathbf{G})$ and the assumption $A + B \neq \mathbf{G}$ in (79) is equivalent to say that B is contained in $\mathbf{G} \setminus (x - A)$ for some $x \in \mathbf{G}$.

Corollary 23 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A) \leq \min_{B \subseteq \mathbf{G} : A_B \neq \emptyset} \frac{N}{|A_B|} \log \frac{N}{|B|} + 1, \quad (78)$$

and

$$\text{cov}(\Omega(A)) \leq \min_{B \subseteq \mathbf{G} : A+B \neq \mathbf{G}} \frac{N}{N - |A + B|} \log \frac{N}{|B|} + 1. \quad (79)$$

In particular, if for a certain $B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, $|B| = \beta N$ one has $|A + B| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)N$, then

$$\text{cov}(\Omega(A)) \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \log(1/\beta) + 1. \quad (80)$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from (70) and the inclusion (14). The second bound is a consequence of the first one, it remains to notice that $|\Omega(A)_B| = |\Omega(A + B)| = N - |A + B|$ thanks to (64). Formula (80) follows from (79). This completes the proof. \square

From the estimate (80) it follows, in particular, that for $|A| \gg N$ from the condition $\text{cov}(\Omega(A))$ tends to infinity, we have $|A - A|, |A + A| = (1 - o(1))N$.

In the next corollary we show that inequality (8) of Theorem 2 can be generalized for some subsets of $A - A$.

Corollary 24 *Let k be a positive integer, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, and $|A| = \alpha N$. Put $D = A - A$. Then for any $X \in A^k - \Delta_k(A)$ one has*

$$\text{cov}(D_X) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{N}{|A_X|} + 1. \quad (81)$$

Proof. It is well-known [9] and easy to see that $A_X - A \subseteq D_X$. After that apply estimate (70) of Theorem 22. \square

Using the same method, something can be said concerning higher sumsets (also, see Section 7).

Corollary 25 *Let $A, B, C, D \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, $|A| = \alpha N$, $|B| = \beta N$, $C = \gamma N$, and $|D| = \delta N$. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A \times B + \Delta_2(C + D)) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\beta\delta} + 1. \quad (82)$$

Proof. We have

$$A \times B + \Delta_2(C + D) = \{(a + c, c) : a \in A, c \in C\} + \{(d, b + d) : b \in B, d \in D\} = \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{Y}.$$

Also, $|\mathcal{X}| = |A||C|$ and $|\mathcal{Y}| = |B||D|$. Using Theorem 22 with the sets \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} and the group \mathbf{G}^2 , we obtain the result. \square

Question 26 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, $|A| \gg N$ and $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Is it true that $\text{cov}(A^k - \Delta_k(A)) \ll 1$?*

Finally, we show that it is always possible to decrease the covering number of a set by adding an arithmetic progression.

Lemma 27 *Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be sets, $|B| = \beta N$ and $|B + B| \leq K|B|$. Then*

$$\text{cov}(A \cup B) \geq 2^{-1} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta K^3}, \max \left\{ \frac{\beta \text{cov}(A)}{\log(2K^4)}, \frac{\text{cov}(A)}{2K^4 \log(1/\beta)} \right\} \right\}. \quad (83)$$

In particular, for any A and an arbitrary $k_ \in [1, \text{cov}(A)/\log \text{cov}(A)]$ there is B such that*

$$ck_* \leq \text{cov}(A \cup B) \leq Ck_*, \quad (84)$$

where $c, C >$ are some absolute constants.

Proof. Let $k = \text{cov}(A)$, $\Omega = A^c$ and $\Omega' = (A \cup B)^c \subseteq \Omega$. Also, let $l = \text{cov}(A \cup B)$. We have for a certain X , $|X| = l$ that $\Omega'_X = \emptyset$. It is easy to see that the last formula implies that $\Omega_X \subseteq B + X$. We can assume that $l \leq (2\beta)^{-1}$, since otherwise there is nothing to prove. Putting $D = (B + X)^c$, we see that $|D| \geq N/2$. Consider a maximal disjoint family of sets $2B + z$, $z \in Z$, belonging to the set D . By maximality, we have $D \subseteq (2B - 2B) + Z$ and hence

$$|Z| \geq \frac{|D|}{|2B - 2B|} \geq \frac{N}{2K^4|B|} \quad (85)$$

thanks to inequality (1). It remains to check that $Z \neq \emptyset$. But if $Z = \emptyset$, then for any $z \in \mathbf{G}$ one has $(2B + z) \cap (B + X) \neq \emptyset$ and therefore $|X| \geq \beta^{-1}K^{-3}$ by the Plünnecke inequality. Thus, we can assume that (85) takes place and denoting $Y = Z + B$, $|Y| = |Z||B| \geq N/(2K^4)$, we see that $(Y + B) \cap \Omega_X = \emptyset$. But Ω_X is $[(k-1)/(l-1)]$ -universal set and the argument of the proof of Theorem 22 gives us

$$\frac{k}{2l} \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{l-1} \right\rceil \leq \max\{\beta^{-1} \log(2K^4), 2K^4 \log(1/\beta)\}$$

as required.

It remains to get (84). Take B to be any difference set with $|B + B| \ll |B|$ and $|B| \sim N/k_*$. Then $\text{cov}(A \cup B) \leq \text{cov}(B) \ll k_*$ by Theorem 2, say. Using our assumption we see that $k_* \log k_* \ll k$ and hence by (83) we obtain $\text{cov}(A \cup B) \gg \beta^{-1} \gg k_*$. This completes the proof. \square

6 Some examples and the sum–product phenomenon

Now we give several examples of sets from \mathbb{F}_p (and general abelian groups) having large covering numbers $\text{cov}^+, \text{cov}^\times$. We study these quantities simultaneously, thus some statements in this section can be considered as part of the sum–product phenomenon. The first results in this direction were obtained in [26], where we derived (see [26, Proposition 5.2]) the following simple sum–product–type result

$$\text{cov}^\times(A - A) \leq \text{cov}^+(A).$$

Our first example is well–known and uses the random construction.

Example 28 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ or $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be a random set, each element of A is taken independently at random with a certain probability δ . Then [4, Theorem 4.1] the following holds $\text{cov}^+(A) \sim \delta^{-1} \log N$ and $\text{cov}^\times(A) \sim \delta^{-1} \log p$. Generally, one can take a random subset of an interval I in \mathbf{G} and obtain a similar bound. Thus, sets with small sumset can have very large covering number. Finally, using the first inequality from (67) one can see that $\text{cov}^+(A + X), \text{cov}^\times(AX) \geq (\delta|X|)^{-1} \log p$ for any set $X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$.*

Unlike the previous example, the following set is deterministic and has large covering number.

Example 29 *Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbb{F}_p$, where p be a prime number and \mathcal{R} be the set of quadratic residue in \mathbb{F}_p . Then $\text{cov}^+(\mathcal{R})$ is at least $(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log_2 p$ see, e.g., [22, Proposition 14]. The same method gives $\text{cov}^\times(\mathcal{R} + s) \geq (\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log_2 p$ for any non–zero $s \in \mathbb{F}_p$. In a similar way, it is easy to check that $\bar{U}_k(\mathcal{R}) = 1 - o(1)$ for $k = (1 - o(1)) \log_2 p$ and in view of (27) this estimate is optimal.*

Let us generalize the previous example.

Proposition 30 *Let p be a prime number, $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be sets, $|A| = \alpha p$, $|B| = \beta p$ such that $A/B \neq \mathbb{F}_p$ and $s \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$. Then both $\text{cov}^+(\mathbb{F}_p \setminus (A/B))$ and $\text{cov}^\times(\mathbb{F}_p \setminus (A/B) + s)$ are at least $\frac{\log p}{\log(1/\alpha\beta)}(1 - o(1))$. Similarly, if $A + B \neq \mathbb{F}_p$, then $\text{cov}^+(\mathbb{F}_p \setminus (A + B)^{-1})$ and $\text{cov}^\times(\mathbb{F}_p \setminus ((A + B)^{-1} + s))$ are both at least $\frac{\log p}{\log(1/\alpha\beta)}(1 - o(1))$.*

Proof. We start with the first part and let us prove $k := \text{cov}^+(\Omega(A/B)) \geq \frac{\log p}{\log(1/\alpha\beta)}(1 - o(1))$, the second inequality follows similarly. Let $f(x)$ counts the number of solutions to $x = a/b$, where $a \in A, b \in B$. Using the multiplicative Fourier transform, the Parseval identity and Weil’s bound for the sums over multiplicative characters, we get for different $x_j, j \in [k]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_z f(z + x_1) \dots f(z + x_k) &= \frac{1}{(p-1)^k} \sum_{\chi_1, \dots, \chi_k} \hat{f}(\chi_1) \dots \hat{f}(\chi_k) \sum_z \chi_1(z + x_1) \dots \chi_k(z + x_k) \\ &> \frac{(|A||B|)^k}{(p-1)^{k-1}} - (k+1)\sqrt{p}(|A||B|)^{k/2} > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

provided $k = \frac{\log p}{\log(1/\alpha\beta)}(1 - o(1))$. Inequality (86) implies that $(A/B)_{x_1, \dots, x_k} \neq \emptyset$.

Now let us obtain the second part of our result and again it suffices to estimate the quantity $k := \text{cov}^+(\Omega(A+B)^{-1})$, since the second bound follows in a similar way. Putting $f = A * B$ and applying the additive Fourier transform, we obtain

$$\sum_z f((z+x_1)^{-1}) \dots f((z+x_k)^{-1}) = \frac{1}{p^k} \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_k} \widehat{f}(r_1) \dots \widehat{f}(r_k) \sum_z e(r_1(z+x_1)^{-1} + \dots + r_k(z+x_k)^{-1}).$$

One can check (calculating the Wronskian, for example) that the functions $(z+x_1)^{-1}, \dots, (z+x_k)^{-1}$ are linearly independent. After that we use the Weil bound again as well as the previous argument. In the case of $\text{cov}^\times(\mathbb{F}_p \setminus ((A+B)^{-1} + s))$ our functions are $f((x_j z - s)^{-1})$ and, thus we can actually repeat our approach. This completes the proof. \square

Question 31 Let $\Gamma \leq \mathbb{F}_p^*$ be a multiplicative subgroup, $|\Gamma| < p^{1-\varepsilon}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is any constant. Is it true that $\text{cov}^+(\Gamma) \gg_\varepsilon \frac{p \log |\Gamma|}{|\Gamma|}$?

Now let us consider the complements to the sets from Proposition 30.

Question 32 Let p be a prime number and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be sets such that $|A|, |B| \gg p$ and $|(A/B)^c| \gg p$, $|(A-B)^c| \gg p$. Is it true that $\text{cov}^+(A/B)$ and $\text{cov}^+((A-B)^{-1})$ are both $\Omega(\log p)$? For $A = B$?

We give a partial answer to the question above.

Proposition 33 Let p be a prime number and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be sets such that $|A|, |B| \gg p$ and $|(AB)^c| \gg p$, $|(A+B)^c| \gg p$. Then $\text{cov}^+(A \cdot_{\Omega(1)} B)$ and $\text{cov}^+((A +_{\Omega(1)} B)^{-1})$ are both $\Omega(\log p)$.

Proof. Consider the case of $\text{cov}^+((A +_{\Omega(1)} B)^{-1})$, say, another bound follows similarly. By assumption $|A|, |B| \gg p$ and $|(A+B)^c| \gg p$. Hence Theorem 7 implies that the complement to $A +_{\Omega(1)} B$ contains a translation $\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon) + s$ of a Bohr set $\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon)$, where $d = O(1)$ and $\varepsilon \gg 1$. In view of estimate (24), we see that $|\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon)| \gg p$. Clearly, $\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon) + s$ contains $(\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon/2) + s) + \mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon/2)$. Using Proposition 30, we get

$$\text{cov}^+((A +_{\Omega(1)} B)^{-1}) \geq \text{cov}^+(((\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon/2) + s) + \mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon/2))^{-1})^c \gg \log p \quad (87)$$

as required. \square

A natural approach to Question 32 is to try to choose a random subset S of $A+B$ (we consider the question about $\text{cov}^+((A+B)^{-1})$, say) with small Wiener norm (20) and repeat the proof of Proposition 30. However, generally speaking, this is impossible, since the Wiener norm of an arbitrary set tends to infinity [11], [14]. Anyway, the proof of Proposition 30 gives us the following connection between the Wiener norm of a set and its covering number.

Corollary 34 Let p be a prime number, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be a set such that $|A| = \alpha p$, $\|A\|_W = K$ and $s \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be an arbitrary non-zero number. Then $\text{cov}^+(\Omega(A^{-1}))$ and $\text{cov}^\times(\Omega(A^{-1} + s))$ are both at least $\frac{\log p}{2 \log(K/\alpha)}(1 - o(1))$.

The next example is of a different type and provides a wide family of sets with large cov^\times .

Example 35 Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbb{F}_p$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$, $|A| = \alpha p$ be an arbitrary set such that $A - A \neq \mathbb{F}_p$ and consider $(A - A)^c$. We know that $A - A$ contains a multiplicative shift of any collection of points $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$, where $k \leq \frac{\log(p-1)}{\log(1/\alpha)}$ see, e.g., [22, Corollary 6]. Thus $\text{cov}^\times((A - A)^c) \geq \frac{\log(p-1)}{\log(1/\alpha)}$ (for sets A with small sumsets consult [6]). For example, $\text{cov}^\times([p/3, 2p/3]) \gg \log p$ and the last fact was known before see, e.g., [26, Section 5]. In view of Lemma 8 one can see that in general $\text{cov}^\times((A + B)^c)$ can be small.

The later example allows us to say something about the covering numbers of sets avoiding solutions to some linear equations.

Corollary 36 Let $c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be a nonzero number, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$, $|A| = \alpha p$ be a set having no solutions to the equation $x - y = cz$, where $x, y, z \in A$. Then $\text{cov}^\times(A) = \Omega(\log p / \log(1/\alpha))$.

Finally, let us show that there are universal sets of special type. We will need this example in the proof of Theorem 4 from the introduction.

Example 37 Given $1 \leq k \ll \log N$ let us construct a k -universal set $U \subset \mathbf{G} := \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$U = A + B, \quad |U^c| \gg N \quad \text{and} \quad |A|, |B| \gg N.$$

Let $d_0 = \lceil \sqrt{N} \rceil$ and let d be a prime $d_0 \leq d \leq 2d_0$, d does not divide N . It is easy to see that such d exists. Now choose a set S_0 , $|S_0| = cd$, where $c > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant such that S_0 is an arbitrary $k' = \Omega(k)$ -universal subset of $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$. Such sets exist thanks to Example 28 or see paper [2]. Put $S = S_0 \cup (S_0 + d)$. Further, any $x \in \{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}$ can be written as $x = y + dz$, where $y, z \in \{0, 1, \dots, d - 1\}$. Given any $x_1, \dots, x_{k'} \in \mathbf{G}$ consider them as elements of $\{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}$ and therefore we can write $x_j = y_j + dz_j$, where $y_j, z_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d - 1\}$, $j \in [k']$. Since S_0 is k' -universal set of $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$, it follows that there are $w_1, w_2 \in \{0, 1, \dots, p - 1\}$ such that $y_j + w_1 \in S$ and $z_j + w_2 \in S$ for all $j \in [k']$. Put $w = w_1 + dw_2$. Thus $x_j + w \in S + d \cdot S$, $j \in [k']$ and hence $S + d \cdot S$ is k' -universal set in \mathbf{G} . Now let $P = [c_* N]$, where $c_* > 0$ is another sufficiently small constant and choose $s \in \mathbf{G}$ in a random way. Then with high probability the set $Q = d^{-1}(P + s) \cap P$ has size $\Omega(|P|^2/N) = \Omega(N)$. Put $A = S \cup d \cdot Q$, $B = d \cdot S \cup Q$. Then $|A|, |B| \gg N$. Finally, the set $U := A + B$ is $\Omega(k)$ -uniform and

$$|U| \leq |S + d \cdot S| + 2|S + P| + |P + P + s| \leq |S|^2 + 4|P| + 2d < 3N/4 \quad (88)$$

as required. Here we have chosen our constants c, c_* to be sufficiently small.

Notice that it is possible to take $B = A$ or $B = -A$. Indeed, in the first case just choose $A = B = A_0(S) := S \cup d \cdot Q_* \cup d \cdot S \cup Q_*$, where $Q_* = P \cap d^{-1}(P + s) \cap d(P + t)$ and the shifts s, t are taken in a random way. It gives us $|Q_*| \gg N$ and an analogue of (88) holds. In the second case let $A = A_0(S')$, $B = -A_0(S')$, where $S' = \pm S_0 \cup \pm(S_0 + d)$, $S' = -S'$.

Now we are ready to proof Theorem 4.

Proof. We need to say something about any element of our table, which corresponds to the matrix 2×8 . Denote this matrix by M . Theorem 22 allows us to fill cells M_{11}, M_{13}, M_{52} by

$O(1)$. Further, M_{21} follows from Lemma 8, M_{16} , M_{18} , and M_{15} , M_{17} follow from Propositions 30, 33. Example 35 corresponds to cells M_{22} and M_{24} . Similarly, one can have everything (i.e. $O(1)$ or $\Omega(L)$) in M_{23} and M_{27} thanks to Example 35 due to $[p/3, 2p/3]$ is a sunset. Finally, the remaining cells M_{12}, M_{14}, M_{26} are all $\forall_{O(1)}$. Indeed, by Theorem 7 the popular sums of these sets contain a shift of a Bohr set $\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon)$, $|\mathcal{B}(d, \varepsilon)| \gg p$ (additive or multiplicative). Thus, using Theorem 22 and calculation in (87), we obtain that the corresponding covering numbers are $O(1)$. On the other hand, the usual sumsets in M_{12}, M_{14}, M_{26} and in M_{28} can have $O(1)$ or $\Omega(L)$ as the covering numbers. Indeed, consider, for example, M_{12} . Then $\text{cov}^+((A - A)^c)$ is, basically, $\text{un}^+(A - A)$ and in the light of Example 37 it can be $\Omega(L)$ and if A is a sufficiently small arithmetic progression, then $\text{cov}^+((A - A)^c) \ll 1$. The same is true for M_{14}, M_{26} . As for M_{28} one has

$$\text{cov}^\times(((A + B)^{-1})^c) = \text{un}^\times((A + B)^{-1}) + 1 = \text{un}^\times(A + B) + 1$$

and thus we arrive at the cell M_{24} . This completes the proof of Theorem 4. \square

7 Concluding remarks

Universal sets also have other very strong properties. For example, let $U \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a (one-dimensional) k -universal set. Then by estimate (28) we know that U has the repulsion property, namely, for an arbitrary set S one has

$$|U + S| \geq N \cdot \left(\frac{|S|}{N}\right)^{1/k}. \quad (89)$$

Now let m be a positive integer, U_1, \dots, U_m be k -universal sets and let us consider the following multi-dimensional set $\mathcal{U} := U_1 \times \dots \times U_m \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m$. One can check that

$$\mathcal{U}^k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G}^m) = (U_1^k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G})) \times \dots \times (U_m^k - \Delta_k(\mathbf{G})) = \mathbf{G}^{mk}$$

and thus \mathcal{U} is a k -universal set as well. One can rewrite the last formula as

$$\text{un}(U_1 \times \dots \times U_m, \mathbf{G}^m) = \min_{j \in [m]} \text{un}(U_j, \mathbf{G}). \quad (90)$$

In particular, we have an analogue of inequality (89) for the set \mathcal{U} . It is easy to see that bound (89) can be generalized and refined for the sets of the form $\Delta_m(S)$. Indeed, let $k - m < k_* \leq k$ be the maximal number not exceeding k such that m divides k_* . Write $d = k_*/m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then as in (29), we get

$$|S|N^{k_*-1} = |S||U^{k_*-1} - \Delta_{k_*-1}(U)| \leq |U^{k_*} - \Delta_{k_*}(S)| \leq |U^m - \Delta_m(S)|^d.$$

Thus if $|S| = \sigma N$, then

$$|U^m - \Delta_m(S)| \geq N^m \sigma^{1/d} > N^m (1 - d^{-1} \log(1/\sigma)).$$

This argument gives us the following result about universal sets and hence about the complements of sets with the large covering number, see examples of Section 6. In particular, it is possible to obtain an analogue of Corollary 23 for higher sumsets.

Corollary 38 *Let $U \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a k -universal set, and $S \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be an arbitrary set, $|S| = \sigma N$. Then*

$$|U^m - \Delta_m(S)| > N^m \left(1 - \frac{m}{k-m+1} \log(1/\sigma) \right). \quad (91)$$

In particular, for any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{G}^m$, $|\mathcal{A}| = \alpha N^m$ one has

$$(\mathcal{A} + \Delta_m(S)) \cap U^m \neq \emptyset,$$

provided $\alpha \geq \frac{m}{k-m+1} \log(1/\sigma)$.

Thanks to formulae (13) of Lemma 5 we have, in particular, that

$$\sum_{x \in U-S} |U - (S \cap (U - x))| = |U^2 - \Delta_2(S)| > N^2 \left(1 - \frac{2 \log(1/\sigma)}{k-1} \right),$$

and

$$\sum_{x \in U-S} |U - (S \cap (U - x))|^2 \geq \sum_{x \in U-S} |U^2 - \Delta_2(S \cap (U - x))| = |U^3 - \Delta_3(S)| > N^3 \left(1 - \frac{3 \log(1/\sigma)}{k-2} \right).$$

Thus, for any sufficiently dense set $S \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ there are many shifts of the universal set U such that $U - (S \cap (U - x))$ is close to the entire group \mathbf{G} .

It would be interesting to find further properties of universal sets.

References

- [1] N. Alon. Large sets in finite fields are sumsets. *Journal of Number Theory*, 126(1):110–118, 2007.
- [2] N. Alon, B. Bukh, and B. Sudakov. Discrete Kakeya-type problems and small bases. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 174(1):285–301, 2009.
- [3] T. F. Bloom and O. Sisask. An improvement to the Kelley-Meka bounds on three-term arithmetic progressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02353*, 2023.
- [4] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. On covering by translates of a set. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 38(1-2):33–67, 2011.
- [5] E. Croot. Some properties of lower level-sets of convolutions. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 21(4):515–530, 2012.
- [6] E. Croot, I. Ruzsa, and T. Schoen. Arithmetic progressions in sparse sumsets. *Combinatorial Number Theory (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2007)*, pages 157–164, 2007.
- [7] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 31(1):204–256, 1977.

- [8] D. Gijswijt. Excluding affine configurations over a finite field. *Discrete Analysis*, 2023.
- [9] N. H. Katz and P. Koester. On additive doubling and energy. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 24(4):1684–1693, 2010.
- [10] Z. Kelley and R. Meka. Strong bounds for 3-progressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05537*, 2023.
- [11] S. V. Konyagin. On the Littlewood problem. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 45(2):243–265, 1981.
- [12] S. Kopparty, V. F. Lev, S. Saraf, and M. Sudan. Kakeya-type sets in finite vector spaces. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 34:337–355, 2011.
- [13] T. Kosciuszko. Counting solutions to invariant equations in dense sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08567*, 2023.
- [14] O. C. McGehee, L. Pigno, and B. Smith. Hardy’s inequality and the L1 norm of exponential sums. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 613–618, 1981.
- [15] D. J. Newman. Complements of finite sets of integers. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 14(4):481–486, 1967.
- [16] G. Petridis. New proofs of Plünnecke-type estimates for product sets in groups. *Combinatorica*, 32(6):721–733, 2012.
- [17] C. A. Rogers. *Packing and covering*, volume 54. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1964.
- [18] I. Ruzsa. An analog of Freiman’s theorem in groups. *Astérisque*, 258(199):323–326, 1999.
- [19] I. Z. Ruzsa. An application of graph theory to additive number theory. *Scientia, Ser. A*, 3(97-109):9, 1989.
- [20] W. M. Schmidt. Complementary sets of finite sets. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 138(1):61–71, 2003.
- [21] T. Schoen. On convex equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09584*, 2023.
- [22] T. Schoen and I. D. Shkredov. Higher moments of convolutions. *J. Number Theory*, 133(5):1693–1737, 2013.
- [23] T. Schoen and I. D. Shkredov. Additive dimension and a theorem of Sanders. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 100(1):124–144, 2016.
- [24] A. Semchankau. A new bound for $A(A+A)$ for large sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.11468*, 2020.
- [25] A. Semchankau, D. Shabanov, and I. Shkredov. Number of $A+B \neq C$ solutions in abelian groups and application to counting independent sets in hypergraphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 100:103453, 2022.

- [26] I. D. Shkredov. On some multiplicative properties of large difference sets. *arXiv:2301.09206v1*, 2023.
- [27] C. L. Stewart and R. Tijdeman. On infinite-difference sets. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 31(5):897–910, 1979.
- [28] T. Tao and V. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.