

ON THE INDEPENDENCE NUMBER OF SPARSER RANDOM CAYLEY GRAPHS

MARCELO CAMPOS, GABRIEL DAHIA, AND JOÃO PEDRO MARCIANO

ABSTRACT. The Cayley sum graph Γ_A of a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ is defined to have vertex set \mathbb{Z}_n and an edge between two distinct vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ if $x + y \in A$. Green and Morris proved that if the set A is a p -random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n with $p = 1/2$, then the independence number of Γ_A is asymptotically equal to $\alpha(G(n, 1/2))$ with high probability. Our main theorem is the first extension of their result to $p = o(1)$: we show that, with high probability,

$$\alpha(\Gamma_A) = (1 + o(1))\alpha(G(n, p))$$

as long as $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$.

One of the tools in our proof is a geometric-flavoured theorem that generalizes Freiman’s lemma, the classical lower bound on the size of high dimensional sumsets. We also give a short proof of this result up to a constant factor; this version yields a much simpler proof of our main theorem at the expense of a worse constant.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a large prime. The Cayley sum graph Γ_A of a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ is defined to have \mathbb{Z}_n as its vertices and an edge between two distinct $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ if $x + y \in A$. Alon [1, Conjecture 4.4] conjectured that for each $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $|A| = t$ and Γ_A has independence number at most $\frac{n}{t}(\log n)^{O(1)}$, and moreover remarked that “the conjecture may well hold for a random choice of A .”

Green more generally asked (see [17, Question 2]) which parameters of Γ_A match those of the random graph $G(n, p)$ when A is a random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n . In that same work, he showed that if A is chosen uniformly at random over all subsets of \mathbb{Z}_n , then with high probability the size of the largest independent set¹ of Γ_A is at most $\alpha(G(n, 1/2))$, up to a constant factor.

This result is in fact a consequence of a theorem in additive combinatorics. Recall that the sumset $X + Y$ and the restricted sumset $X \hat{+} X$ are defined as

$$X + Y = \{x + y : x \in X, y \in Y\}, \quad X \hat{+} X = \{x_1 + x_2 : x_1, x_2 \in X, x_1 \neq x_2\},$$

and observe that $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ is independent in Γ_A exactly when $X \hat{+} X \subseteq A^c$. Green deduced his bound on the typical size of $\alpha(\Gamma_A)$ from estimates on the number of sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $|X| = k$ and $|X + X| \leq \sigma k$, where σ is some upper bound on the doubling of X . When referring to the doubling of the set itself, we will use $\sigma[X]$, i.e. $\sigma[X] = |X + X|/|X|$.

¹Green actually states this for the clique number, but this is equivalent to what we state since a 1/2-random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n has the same distribution of its complement.

Later, Green and Morris [18] showed that better estimates on the number of such sets are possible if one handles ranges of $\sigma[X]$ differently. When $\sigma[X]$ is constant, they used an arithmetic regularity lemma to obtain a tighter bound. When the doubling is close to its maximum, they refined Green’s estimate by leveraging the isoperimetric inequality on \mathbb{Z}^d to bound the number of “quasi-random” elements in those sets. As a consequence, they determined the correct constant for the independence number of Γ_A when $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ is uniform random, showing that it asymptotically matches $\alpha(G(n, 1/2))$ with high probability [18].

Our main theorem extends the above result of Green and Morris to the more challenging setting when A is a sparse random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n , and can be seen as progress towards Alon’s aforementioned conjecture. To state it, it is useful to denote by Γ_p the (random) Cayley sum graph Γ_A when A is a p -random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n for $p = p(n)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let n be a prime number and let $p = p(n)$ satisfy $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$. The random Cayley sum graph Γ_p of \mathbb{Z}_n satisfies*

$$\alpha(\Gamma_p) = (2 + o(1)) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n \tag{1}$$

with high probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

When $p = o(1)$, this bound is asymptotically equal to $(2 + o(1))(\log n)/p$; it also matches $\alpha(G(n, p))$ in the corresponding range of p [4, 21]. We remark that we do not believe the lower bound on p in Theorem 1.1 to be close to optimal, so we do not optimize the constant in the exponent of the log. Nonetheless, there is a natural barrier for our methods when proving upper bounds at around $p \approx (\log n)^{-1}$ (see Section 10).

The lower bound in (1) follows from a second moment computation together with a simple combinatorial argument (see Section 9). The proof of the upper bound, on the other hand, is much more challenging, even though it has the same broad outline pioneered by Green [17]. In fact, we use his bounds on the number of sets with given doubling for the “middle” range $k^\beta < \sigma[X] = o(k)$, and a minor extension (that follows from the same proof) of the theorem of Green and Morris [18] for the “upper” range $\sigma[X] = \Theta(k)$. Our contribution is therefore in the “lower” doubling range, $\sigma[X] \leq k^\beta$ for a small constant $\beta > 0$, where even the correct count of such sets would not be enough to prove our main theorem.

To overcome this obstacle, we show that each of those sets contains a much smaller subset F – we call it a “fingerprint” of X – so that, after determining that F possesses some special properties, it suffices to count the fingerprints to deduce Theorem 1.1. This idea is inspired by the application of the asymmetric container method of Morris, Samotij, and Saxton [23] to the problem of counting sets with small sumset by the first author [9]. In fact, we could also use asymmetric containers as a tool to prove our main theorem, but we prefer this simpler approach as it results in better bounds and a more self-contained proof.

Specifically, the special property we require of each fingerprint $F \subseteq X$ is having a sufficiently large sumset. Ideally, we would like $F + F$ to be as large as $X + X$; this obviously imposes a lower bound of $|F| \geq |X + X|^{1/2}$. Bollobás, Leader, and Tiba recently studied the question of finding such $F \subseteq X$ and showed how to obtain one satisfying $|F + F| \approx |X + X|$

for general Abelian groups when X has bounded doubling [7, Theorem 2]. However, their result does not serve our needs because it does not handle the case of $\sigma[X]$ being k^β for fixed, small $\beta > 0$.

We pursue a different approach to obtain our collection of fingerprints, one that is able to handle sets with doubling that is polynomial in their size. This approach yields fingerprints such that $|F| \approx |X + X|^{1/2} \log |X|$, which is only a logarithmic factor away from the ideal bound, but $|F + F|$ is in general far from $|X + X|$. What we can show is that the size of the sumset is as large as in Freïman's lemma, which is just enough for our application.

It is therefore useful to recall Freïman's lemma, and to do so we need a definition. We will write $\text{rank}(X)$ for the minimum dimension of a hyperplane that contains a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$; if $\text{rank}(X) = d$, then we say X has full rank. The statement of the lemma is then:

Lemma 1.2 (Freïman [15]). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set of full rank. Then,*

$$|X + X| \geq (d + 1)|X| - \binom{d + 1}{2}.$$

Observe that Lemma 1.2 is a statement about subsets of \mathbb{R}^d rather than \mathbb{Z}_n . To amend this, we can use the (by now) standard machinery of Freïman isomorphisms (see, for example, [27, Chapter 5.3]) to reach similar conclusions for subsets of the integers modulo n , changing rank for Freïman dimension when appropriate. We therefore change the setting to \mathbb{R}^d for the rest of this informal discussion.

Like applications of the hypergraph container method, the way to show that $F + F$ is almost as large as $(d + 1)|X|$ is by proving a suitable supersaturation result (see Theorem 2.2, below). In fact, from this result we will be able to show that picking a fingerprint randomly inside X works. Theorem 2.2 informally says the following: if a set Y approximates $X + X$ in terms of its popular sums, then it is (almost) as large as the bound in Freïman's lemma.

This key step in the proof of Theorem 2.2 is a result stating that we can find some small $T \subseteq X$ such that $X + T$ almost attains the bound in Freïman's lemma. Proving this theorem is the most difficult part of our proof, and we consider it to be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma > r^{-1/3}$ and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. There exists $T \subseteq X$ such that $|T| \leq 4(r + 1)/\gamma$ and*

$$|X + T| \geq (1 - 5\gamma) \frac{(r + 1)|X|}{2}.$$

The proof of this theorem is technical; however, we will also show that if we were satisfied with $1/6$ being the leading constant instead of $(1 - 5\gamma)/2$, then a much simpler approach would suffice. This weaker version would also be enough to prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 with 6 being the leading constant instead of 2.

Recently, Jing and Mudgal [22] proved the following theorem that is closely related to Theorem 1.3. It obtains the correct leading constant, i.e. without the $(1 - 5\gamma)/2$ or $1/6$ loss in our bound, at the expense of a worse relationship between the number of translates and the dimension of the set:

Theorem 1.4 ([22, Theorem 1.2]). *Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant $C = C(d) > 0$ such that, for every finite set of full rank $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist $x_1, \dots, x_C \in X$ satisfying*

$$|X + \{x_1, \dots, x_C\}| \geq (d + 1)|X| - 5(d + 1)^3.$$

Theorem 1.4 is part of a recent line of work [6, 13] that relies on a beautiful theorem of Bollobás, Leader, and Tiba [6, Theorem 8] to obtain sumset lower bounds via few-translates. Unfortunately, the proof of this theorem uses Shao’s [26] almost-all Balog–Szemerédi–Gowers theorem, and, as a consequence, the dependency of the number of translates C on the dimension d is of tower-type [6, 26].

A related result, which avoids super-polynomial dependencies between its parameters, is the following elegant theorem proved by Fox, Luo, Pham, and Zhou [13]. Its proof relies on a clever path counting argument akin to Gowers’ proof of the Balog–Szemerédi theorem. Note that we state a specialized version of their much more general result.

Theorem 1.5 ([13, Theorem 1.1]). *There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|X| = k$. For every $s \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there exists $T \subseteq X$ such that $|T| \leq s$ and*

$$|X + T| \geq c \min \{ \sigma[X]^{1/3}, s \} |X|. \tag{2}$$

This result would work for our needs if we could ensure $\sigma[X] > c^{-1}d^3$, but we cannot. Alas, Fox, Luo, Pham, and Zhou also exhibit a construction [13, Proposition 2.4] which shows that we cannot even replace $\sigma[X]^{1/3}$ in (2) by $\sigma[X]^{1/1.29}$; this means that our requirement for the rank of the set in Theorem 1.3 is essential.

In the next section, we give a detailed sketch of our proof strategy, and a proof of our fingerprint theorem. Then, in Section 3, we give a simple proof of a weaker version of our “Freĭman’s lemma via few translates” theorem that nevertheless contains some of the main ideas required for the full proof of Theorem 1.3. Section 4 is dedicated to improving the constant to $(1 - 5\gamma)/2$, assuming two additional technical lemmas, which we prove in Sections 5 and 6. In Section 7, we derive our supersaturation result from Theorem 1.3, and in Sections 8 and 9 we complete the proof of our main theorem. Finally, in Section 10, we discuss future work and open problems.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE PROOF

Throughout, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ will always be a sufficiently large prime number; we will also adopt the standard convention of omitting floors and ceilings whenever they are not essential. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the bound that we want to show for the independence number and let A_p be a p -random subset of \mathbb{Z}_n . Denoting $\mathcal{X} := \binom{\mathbb{Z}_n}{k}$, we will show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X} : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is equivalent to proving that $\alpha(\Gamma_p) < k$ *w.h.p.*

We will follow Green's general approach of partitioning $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2 \cup \mathcal{X}_3$ where each sub-collection is defined based on the doubling $\sigma[X]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}_1 &= \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \sigma[X] \leq k^\beta\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_2 &= \{X \in \mathcal{X} : k^\beta < \sigma[X] \leq \delta k/10\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{X}_3 &= \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \delta k/10 < \sigma[X]\},\end{aligned}$$

for $\beta = 1/40$ and some $\delta = o(1)$, and handle each one differently. Explicitly, we use the union bound to deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X} : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A^c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_i : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A^c).$$

It turns out that we can bound the terms related to \mathcal{X}_2 and \mathcal{X}_3 using the same techniques of Green [17] and Green and Morris [18]; we therefore defer working out the details regarding these terms to Section 8. For the remaining term, we could try to follow the methods in [18] and take a union bound over the sets in \mathcal{X}_1 :

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_1 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{P}(X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c). \quad (3)$$

Observe that, for each $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$, the probability in the summand is

$$\mathbb{P}(X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) = (1 - p)^{|X \hat{+} X|}.$$

Since there are more than $\binom{m/2}{k}$ sets X such that $|X \hat{+} X| = m$, the right-hand side of (3) is at least

$$\sum_{m=2k-1}^{k^{1+\beta}} \binom{m/2}{k} (1 - p)^m \geq \binom{2k}{k} \exp(-5kp) \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, whenever $p = o(1)$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$. The conclusion is that any approach that uses the union bound over all sets with small doubling cannot give the optimal upper bound on the independence number for p smaller than some explicit constant, like $1/5$.

As we mentioned in the introduction, one of the key new ideas in this paper is to show that there exists a family \mathcal{F} of fingerprints such that it suffices to consider only the events $\{F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c\}_{F \in \mathcal{F}}$ instead of the collection $\{X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c\}_{X \in \mathcal{X}_1}$. Trivially, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{X}_1$ is such a family, so, to make this strategy work and improve upon taking the union bound over all X , we must choose \mathcal{F} in a more clever way.

The first property of these fingerprints that we require is that $|\mathcal{F}|$ is sufficiently small, where small vaguely means that a union bound over all $F \in \mathcal{F}$ works. One direct way to achieve that is picking each fingerprint F to be small, but there is a subtle trade-off between the size of F and the upper bound on the probability term $(1 - p)^{|F \hat{+} F|}$. To circumvent this issue, we can use the fact that we have a bound (even if a polynomially large one) on the doubling of each $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$. In this setting, Freiman's theorem [14] says that X is contained in

a generalised arithmetic progression P such that both the size s and dimension d of P are small. Recall that a d -dimensional generalised arithmetic progression is a set of the form

$$\left\{ a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d w_i a_i : w_i \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq w_i < \ell_i \right\}$$

for some differences $a_0, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ and side-lengths $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in \mathbb{N}$, and P is proper when every possible choice of $\{w_1, \dots, w_d\}$ corresponds to a distinct element of P . Therefore, instead of choosing F directly from \mathbb{Z}_n , we first choose P and then select F inside P .

Now we can state the first requirement for $F \in \mathcal{F}$ in more detail. Let P be the generalised arithmetic progression given by Freĭman's theorem for X . Then, F should be small enough compared to $|F \hat{+} F|$ for a union bound over choices of $F \subseteq P$ to work:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists F \subseteq P : F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \binom{s}{|F|} (1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \rightarrow 0 \quad (5)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To get to this point, however, we must also choose this generalised arithmetic progression in a previous union bound. Hence, our second requirement for each F is that $F \hat{+} F$ is sufficiently large to pay for the number of choices for the generalised arithmetic progression P .

As we can count generalised arithmetic progressions with dimension d and size s by choosing the a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d and ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_d , there are at most $(ns)^{d+1}$ of them. Temporarily ignoring the number of choices for the fingerprint inside the progression (which we already dealt with in (5)), this amounts to requiring that F satisfies

$$(ns)^{d+1} (1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. While these conditions may seem too strict – small F with large $F \hat{+} F$ for every X – this is exactly what we are able to do.

To state the actual theorem, we need to relate the dimension of the progression to some notion of dimension for X . The notion that we use is the Freĭman dimension of X , but to state its definition, we must first define what are Freĭman homomorphisms and Freĭman isomorphisms. A Freĭman homomorphism is a function $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ such that for every $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in X$,

$$a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2 \quad \text{implies} \quad \phi(a_1) + \phi(b_1) = \phi(a_2) + \phi(b_2).$$

A Freĭman isomorphism is a bijection ϕ such that both ϕ and its inverse ϕ^{-1} are Freĭman homomorphisms. The Freĭman dimension of X , $\dim_{\text{F}}(X)$, is then defined to be the largest $d \in \mathbb{N}$ for which there is a full rank subset of \mathbb{Z}^d that is Freĭman isomorphic to X .

It is furthermore useful to define the robustness of the Freĭman dimension of X : we say that X has ε -robust Freĭman dimension d if $\dim_{\text{F}}(X) \geq d$ and there is no $X' \subseteq X$ such that $|X'| \geq (1-\varepsilon)|X|$ and $\dim_{\text{F}}(X') < d$. In words, this means that the Freĭman dimension of X is at least d even if we remove an ε proportion of its elements.

With these definitions, we can state our fingerprint theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *Let n be a large enough prime and let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $0 < \gamma < 1/2$, there exists $C = C(\gamma) > 0$ such that the following holds for all $m \geq (d+1)k/2$ and $C/k < \varepsilon < \gamma$. For each d -dimensional generalised arithmetic progression $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$, there exists a collection $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{k,m,\varepsilon}(P)$ of subsets of P satisfying:*

(a) *For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we have*

$$|F| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{m \log m} \quad \text{and} \quad |F \hat{+} F| \geq \frac{(1-\gamma)(d+1)k}{2}. \quad (6)$$

(b) *For all $X \in \binom{P}{k}$ with $|X \hat{+} X| \leq m$ and ε -robust Freïman dimension d , there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \subseteq X$.*

We will deduce this theorem from the following supersaturation result.

Theorem 2.2. *For every $0 < \gamma < 1$, there exists a constant $c = c(\gamma) > 0$ such that, for every sufficiently large set $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$, every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma$, the following holds. If X has ε -robust Freïman dimension d and $Y \subseteq X + X$ satisfies*

$$|\{(x_1, x_2) \in X^2 : x_1 + x_2 \notin Y\}| \leq c\varepsilon|X|^2, \quad (7)$$

then $|Y| \geq (1-\gamma)(d+1)|X|/2$.

In words, whenever $Y \approx X + X$ in the sense of (7), then it also (almost) satisfies the lower bound given by Freïman's lemma (Lemma 1.2), up to a factor of $1/2$. Once we have this theorem, the proof of Theorem 2.1 is substantially simpler than usual for a similarly strong container theorem. In fact, it is also the only part of the proof that we could omit by using the container theorem for sumsets [9, Theorem 4.2]. The self-contained proof is so simple that we include it here in the overview to motivate the usefulness of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 assuming Theorem 2.2. Our aim is to show that, for every $X \in \binom{P}{k}$ with $|X \hat{+} X| \leq m$ and ε -robust Freïman dimension d , there exists a subset $F \subseteq X$ such that (6) holds. We will show that a q -random subset F of X satisfies the first inequality by a suitable choice of q , and the second one via an application of Theorem 2.2 with $Y = F \hat{+} F$.

In order to apply Theorem 2.2 to $Y = F \hat{+} F$, we need to show that Y satisfies (7). To this end, we will first prove that a random choice of F makes it unlikely for $F \hat{+} F$ to miss any y such that

$$\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) \geq \frac{2\varepsilon k^2}{Cm}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) = |\{(x_1, x_2) \in X^2 : x_1 \neq x_2, x_1 + x_2 = y\}|$$

is the number of pairs of distinct elements of X that sum to a given $y \in X \hat{+} X$. Hereon, we will refer to the y satisfying (8) as the popular elements of $X \hat{+} X$. We will take a q -random subset where either

$$q = \frac{C\sqrt{m \log m}}{2\varepsilon k} \quad (9)$$

if the right-hand side is at most 1, and $q = 1$ otherwise (a trivial case which we will ignore).

Notice that we can upper bound the number of missing pairs by:

$$|\{(x_1, x_2) \in X^2 : x_1 + x_2 \notin F \hat{+} F\}| \leq |X| + \sum_{y \in (X \hat{+} X) \setminus (F \hat{+} F)} \rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) \quad (10)$$

where the term $|X|$ comes from the pairs (x, x) for $x \in X$. Once we have proved that $F \hat{+} F$ contains all popular $y \in X \hat{+} X$, we will have an upper bound on $\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y)$ for every $y \in (X \hat{+} X) \setminus (F \hat{+} F)$. Inserting this into (10), we deduce that the number of missing pairs is at most

$$|X| + \sum_{y \in (X \hat{+} X) \setminus (F \hat{+} F)} \rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) < |X| + \frac{2\varepsilon k^2}{Cm} |X \hat{+} X| \leq c\varepsilon |X|^2, \quad (11)$$

if we take $C \geq 3/c$, where $c = c(\gamma)$ is the constant in Theorem 2.2, since $|X| = k$, $|X \hat{+} X| \leq m$ and $\varepsilon k > C$. The upper bound in (11) is what we need to apply Theorem 2.2; doing so gives

$$|F \hat{+} F| \geq \frac{(1 - \gamma)(\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X) + 1)k}{2},$$

from which we can use our assumption that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X) \geq d$ to complete the proof.

It therefore only remains to prove our claim that with positive probability F contains all popular elements of $X \hat{+} X$ while also being sufficiently small. Notice that our choice of F as a q -random subset of X implies, for each $y \in X \hat{+} X$, that

$$\mathbb{P}(y \notin F \hat{+} F) = (1 - q^2)^{\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y)/2} \quad (12)$$

because (i) each pair $(x_1, x_2) \in X^2$ that satisfies $x_1 + x_2 = y$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ is counted twice in $\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y)$ and (ii) the probability that such a pair is chosen in F is q^2 .

Take B_F to be the random variable counting the number of $y \in X \hat{+} X$ such that

$$\rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) \geq \frac{2\varepsilon k^2}{Cm} \quad \text{and} \quad y \notin F \hat{+} F.$$

By linearity of expectation and (12), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[B_F] = \sum_{\substack{y \in X \hat{+} X \\ \rho_{X \hat{+} X}(y) \geq 2\varepsilon k^2 / Cm}} \mathbb{P}(y \notin F \hat{+} F) \leq m(1 - q^2)^{\varepsilon k^2 / Cm} \leq m \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon q^2 k^2}{Cm}\right),$$

where we used $|X \hat{+} X| \leq m$ to bound the number of terms in the sum.

Since $\varepsilon q^2 k^2 / (Cm) = (C/4\varepsilon) \log m$ by our choice (9) of q , it follows by Markov's inequality that

$$\mathbb{P}(B_F > 0) \leq m^{-1},$$

where we also used that $\varepsilon < 1$ and $C \geq 8$. Using Chernoff's inequality to bound the probability that $|F| > 2qk$, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}(|F| > 2qk) + \mathbb{P}(B_F > 0) < 1,$$

which proves that there exists a fingerprint $F \subseteq X$ satisfying (6), as required. \square

Before moving on with the overview, let us briefly discuss the robustness property in Theorem 2.2. This condition may at first seem unnatural, but the following simple construction shows that some form of robustness is necessary: take X to be the union of $d-1$ random points with a progression P , and define $Y = P + P$. We have simultaneously *w.h.p.* that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X) = d$, $|Y| \approx 2|X|$ and the sum of almost all pairs of elements of X are in Y .

With Theorem 2.1 in hand, we can now check that for the family \mathcal{F} of all sets satisfying (6), our requirements for the fingerprints F are satisfied. Recall that what we need from the size of the sumset is

$$(ns)^{d+1}(1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $s = |P|$ and $d = \dim(P)$. Modern formulations of Freïman's theorem tells us that we can take $s \leq \exp(\sigma^{1+o(1)})k$, which in our range of σ and k corresponds to $n^{o(1)}$. However, we can only apply Theorem 2.1 to sets $X \subseteq P$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X) \geq \dim(P)$ (ignoring the robustness for the moment). Standard formulations of Freïman's theorem only guarantee that $\dim(P)$ is at most $\sigma[X]$, which would not be good enough for us.

Fortunately, Chang [10] proved a version of Freïman's theorem that guarantees that $\dim(P)$ is at most $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$, at the cost of a weaker bound on the size of P as compared to the more recent results of Schoen [25] and Sanders [24]. The impact of the suboptimal size of the progression is a slight reduction in the range of p for which our proof works.

Theorem 2.3 (Chang [10], see [19, Proposition 1.3]). *There exists $C' > 0$ such that for all finite subsets $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ with $|X| \geq 2$ and $\sigma[X] \leq \sigma$, there is a d -dimensional generalised arithmetic progression P such that $X \subseteq P$,*

$$|P| \leq \exp(C'\sigma^2(\log \sigma)^3)|X|$$

and $d \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$.

Now, we can use the lower bound on $|F \hat{+} F|$ given by Theorem 2.1 to obtain

$$(1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \leq \exp(-(1-\gamma)(d+1)kp/2),$$

which, choosing $k = (2 + o(1)) \log_{1/(1-p)} n$ (a little larger than $(2 \log n)/p$), is at most

$$\exp(-(1+\gamma)(d+1) \log n). \tag{13}$$

Replacing this back in the previous equation, and recalling that $s = n^{o(1)}$, thus yields

$$(ns)^{d+1}(1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \leq n^{-\gamma} \rightarrow 0.$$

The attentive reader may have noticed that Chang's theorem is stated for subsets of \mathbb{Z} instead of \mathbb{Z}_n . To use it for subsets of \mathbb{Z}_n , we will use instead a version of the Green–Ruzsa theorem (Freïman's theorem for general Abelian groups) due to Cwalina and Schoen [12]; even though it does not bound $\dim(P) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ directly, it yields a proper generalised arithmetic progression, which is enough by using a simple argument (see Corollary 8.5).

Moreover, it is not true that every X has ε -robust Freïman dimension equal to $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$. This is not a problem, however, since it is straightforward to prove (see Proposition 8.3) that every set X has a large enough subset X' with ε -robust Freïman dimension $d' \in \mathbb{N}$.

Finally, let us check that the size of F given to us by Theorem 2.1 is compatible with the range of p in Theorem 1.1. To do so, we need to show that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\binom{s}{|F|} (1-p)^{|F \hat{+} F|} \rightarrow 0.$$

As we already know from (13) that the second term is at most n^{-d} , we need

$$\binom{s}{|F|} \leq s^{|F|} \leq \exp(C\varepsilon^{-1}(m \log m)^{1/2} \log s) = n^{o(1)}. \quad (14)$$

The second inequality in (14) follows from (6) in Theorem 2.1, while the third is a consequence of our choice of k and the bound on s given by Theorem 2.3. Indeed, we have

$$C\varepsilon^{-1}(m \log m)^{1/2} \log s \ll k^{3/4} = o(\log n), \quad (15)$$

because $m \leq k^{1+\beta}$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$, which implies that $\log s \leq k^{3\beta}$, and we can take $\varepsilon = k^{-2\beta}$ and C to be a constant. Our choice of $\beta = 1/40$ is therefore more than sufficient to prove (15).

At this point, one might ask why we decided to keep track of the constant C up to the final computation. Note that it is crucial that the value of C does not increase too quickly with d growing, since otherwise (15) would not hold for large d . Recall that in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we took $C \approx c^{-1}$. The constant c is essentially given to us by our supersaturation result and its value is tied to how many translates we need in our approximate bound for Freĭman's lemma (Theorem 1.3).

To see where the dependency of c on the number of translates comes from, consider the contrapositive of Theorem 2.2: if the set Y is small, then it misses many pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in X^2$. By Theorem 1.3, we can find a small $T \subseteq X$ such that

$$|X + T| - |Y| \geq \gamma(d+1)|X|.$$

The pigeonhole principle then ensures us that there is some $x \in T$ satisfying

$$|(X+x) \setminus Y| \geq \frac{\gamma(d+1)|X|}{|T|} = c|X|$$

for $c = \gamma(d+1)/|T|$. Now, if we add the $c|X|$ pairs determined by $(X+x) \setminus Y$ to our collection of missing pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in X^2$ such that $x_1 + x_2 \notin Y$, remove x from X and repeat this procedure t times, we would have at least $c|X|t$ missing pairs in total. Recalling that X has ε -robust Freĭman dimension d , we can take $t = \varepsilon|X|$ while maintaining $\dim_{\text{F}}(X) \geq d$, and hence obtain $c\varepsilon|X|^2$ missing pairs, as required.

The above sketch proof of Theorem 2.2 shows that to prove our supersaturation result with c being an absolute constant, we really need the size of T to be a linear function of d , as in Theorem 1.3. In fact, for (15), a bound of the form $d^{O(1)}$ would suffice. Unfortunately, the theorem of Jing and Mudgal (Theorem 1.4) gives a super-polynomial dependency on d . Nevertheless, we use their result to prove Theorem 2.2 in the range $d = O(1)$.

The only missing part in this overview is a proof of Theorem 1.3 itself. Instead of sketching it, we complete the picture with the (short) proof of its weaker version in the next section.

3. A SIMPLE PROOF OF A WEAKER FREĪMAN'S LEMMA VIA FEW TRANSLATES

This section is dedicated to proving a weaker form of Theorem 1.3. Although it is not strong enough to prove the upper bound in our main theorem, it does imply a weaker version where the constant 2 in (1) is replaced by a 6. The deduction of this weaker result is the same as that of Theorem 1.1 (see Sections 7 and 8) simply replacing Theorem 1.3 by Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. There exists a set $T \subseteq X$ such that $|T| \leq r/2 + 1$ and*

$$|X + T| \geq \frac{r|X|}{6}.$$

The idea of the proof is to add elements of X to T one by one, picking in each step a new translate that adds a substantial number of new elements to the sumset. This suggests a greedy argument, picking $x \in X \setminus T$ that increases the size of the sumset the most. However, it is not clear how to show that we can make substantial progress for a sufficient number of steps. Previous arguments, such as the one by Fox, Luo, Pham, and Zhou [13, Theorem 1.1], show that if progress stops, then X must have small doubling; as we must handle polynomially large $\sigma[X]$, such strategies do not work in our case. Instead, we adopt a variation of this idea that incorporates the geometry of the set, allowing us to reach conclusions that do not rely on the doubling of the set and depend only on its rank.

Roughly speaking, in the proof of Proposition 3.2 below, we will show that we can add a new element to T so that it increases the size of $X + T$ by a factor proportional to $|X \setminus \text{span}(T)|$. Notice that, as long as $|T| < \text{rank}(X)$, we can take a non-trivial step.

Now, if we have enough steps that add $|X|/3$ elements to the sumset, then after $r/2$ steps we will have both the bound for the sumset and for $|T|$ in Theorem 3.1. Otherwise, as we will show that every step makes at least $|X \setminus \text{span}(T)|/2$ “progress”, it follows that, after the last “good” step, we must have $|X \cap \text{span}(T)| \geq |X|/3$. In this scenario, we define

$$X^* = X \cap \text{span}(T) \quad \text{and} \quad X' = X \setminus \text{span}(T),$$

and observe that

$$\text{rank}(X') \geq \text{rank}(X) - \text{rank}(T) \geq r - r/2 = r/2, \tag{16}$$

since $|T| \leq r/2$. At this point, we now discard our old T and greedily choose elements of a new set of translates $Z \subseteq X'$ each increasing the rank of $X^* \cup Z$ by one. Each new element that we add yields a disjoint, translated copy of X^* in the sumset. We then obtain

$$|X + Z| \geq |X^* + Z| = \frac{r|X^*|}{2} \geq \frac{r|X|}{6},$$

because, by (16), we can greedily add $r/2$ elements to Z , and $|X^*| \geq |X|/3$.

We proceed by formalizing the notion that either the greedy argument suffices, or a significant part of X lies in the span of the elements already in T . The version we state below is more general than we need to prove Theorem 3.1 because we will reuse it when proving Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma > 0$ and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. If $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $0 \in T$, $\text{rank}(T) < r$ and $|X \cap \text{span}(T)| \leq \gamma|X|$, then there exists an element $x_* \in X$ such that*

$$|X + (T \cup \{x_*\})| \geq |X + T| + \frac{(1 - \gamma)|X|}{2}. \quad (17)$$

The key idea here is to find a co-dimension 1 hyperplane \mathcal{H} which intersects X exactly in $X \cap \text{span}(T)$. We can find such a hyperplane because X is finite and $\text{rank}(T) < \text{rank}(X)$. Note that the two open half-spaces defined by \mathcal{H} induce a partition $X' = X_+ \cup X_-$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $|X_+| \geq |X_-|$, and our goal is now to add, for each point in X_+ , a new element to the sumset. To achieve this, we let u be a normal vector of \mathcal{H} , choose $y_+ \in X_+$ to maximise $\langle y_+, u \rangle$, and observe that $y_+ + X_+$ is disjoint from $X + T$.

Proof. First, choose a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the normal of the hyperplane \mathcal{H} discussed above. It should satisfy the following properties

- (1) $u \neq 0$,
- (2) $\langle z, u \rangle = 0$, for all $z \in \text{span}(T)$, and
- (3) $\langle z, u \rangle \neq 0$, for all $z \in X \setminus \text{span}(T)$.

There is a u satisfying items 1 and 2 since $0 \in T$ and $\text{rank}(T) < r$. We can furthermore find a u for which item 3 also holds because there are only finitely many elements in $X \setminus \text{span}(T)$, as X itself is finite.

We partition $X = X_+ \cup X_* \cup X_-$ according to the position of its elements relative to the hyperplane defined by $\langle x, u \rangle = 0$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} X_+ &= \{x \in X : \langle x, u \rangle > 0\}, \\ X_* &= \{x \in X : \langle x, u \rangle = 0\}, \\ X_- &= \{x \in X : \langle x, u \rangle < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume without loss of generality that $|X_+| \geq |X_-|$ by swapping the sign of u if necessary, and take $y_+ \in X_+$ to be a maximiser of $f(y) = \langle y, u \rangle$.

We claim that $X_+ + y_+$ is disjoint from $X + T$. In fact, if we let $a \in X_+$, $b \in X$ and $c \in T$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a + y_+, u \rangle &> \langle y_+, u \rangle, && \text{as } a \in X_+, \\ &\geq \langle b, u \rangle, && \text{by the maximality of } y_+, \\ &= \langle b + c, u \rangle, && \text{as we chose } u \text{ with } c \perp u. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $|X_+| \geq (1 - \gamma)|X|/2$, we can pick $x_* = y_+$ and prove the proposition:

$$\begin{aligned} |X + (T \cup \{x_*\})| &\geq |X + T| + |X_+ + x_*| \\ &\geq |X + T| + \frac{(1 - \gamma)|X|}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, since we took $|X_+| \geq |X_-|$ and $X_+ \cup X_* \cup X_-$ partition X , we have

$$|X_*| = |X| - |X_-| - |X_+| > \gamma|X|. \quad (18)$$

By our choice of u and the definition of X_* , we have $X_* = X \cap \text{span}(T)$, which, by (18), contradicts our assumption that $|X \cap \text{span}(T)| \leq \gamma|X|$. \square

The 1-dimensional perspective we took in this proof suggests that instead of adding a single maximiser y_+ to T at each step, we should pick both the maximiser y_+ and the minimiser y_- . Unfortunately, if we add $\{y_+, y_-\}$ to T , then we could increase $\text{rank}(T)$ by two instead of one, causing the greedy argument to run for only half as many steps.

We need the following simple lemma to handle the case when $|X \cap \text{span}(T)|$ is large.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $d, r, s \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma > 0$ and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. If $X_* \subseteq X$ with $\text{rank}(X_*) < s$, then there exists a set $Z \subseteq X \setminus X_*$ such that*

$$|X_* + Z| \geq (r - s)|X_*|$$

and $|Z| \leq r - s$.

Proof. First, note that for any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{rank}(S) < s$, we have $\text{rank}(\text{span}(S)) \leq s$. That is, taking the span of a set that does not contain 0 may increase its rank by 1.

We will construct $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{r-s}\} \subseteq X \setminus X_*$ one element at a time, also defining

$$Z_i = \{z_1, \dots, z_i\} \quad \text{and} \quad W_i = \text{span}(X_* \cup Z_i)$$

for $i \in \{0, \dots, r-s\}$. Notice that if $i < r-s$, then $\text{rank}(W_i) \leq s+i < r$, by our assumption on X^* and the definition of W_i . Therefore, there exists $z_{i+1} \in X \setminus W_i$, as $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. Since $X^* \subseteq W_i$, this implies that $X^* + z_{i+1}$ and W_i are disjoint, and hence that $X^* + z_{i+1}$ is disjoint from $X^* + Z_i$. This readily implies the lemma because

$$|X_* + Z| = \sum_{i=1}^{r-s} |X_* + z_i| = (r-s)|X_*|,$$

where in the first equality we repeatedly used that $X_* + z_{i+1}$ and $X_* + Z_i$ are disjoint. \square

The proof of Theorem 3.1 now follows easily from Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.3:

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume that $0 \in X$; notice that this translation does not change $\text{rank}(X)$. First, we construct sets $T_i = \{x_0, \dots, x_i\} \subseteq X$ by choosing $x_0 = 0$ and x_{i+1} as given by Proposition 3.2. In details, let t be the first index for which

$$|X \cap \text{span}(T_t)| > \frac{|X|}{3}. \quad (19)$$

Note that while (19) does not hold, we have $\text{rank}(T_i) < \text{rank}(X)$ since $T_i \subseteq X$. We may therefore apply Proposition 3.2 to T_i with $\gamma = 1/3$ to define x_i , which then implies that

$$|X + T_i| \geq \frac{|T_i||X|}{3} = \frac{(i+1)|X|}{3} \quad (20)$$

for all $i \leq t$. Hence, if $t \geq r/2$, then, by (20), we have

$$|X + T_t| \geq \frac{(t+1)|X|}{3} \geq \frac{r|X|}{6},$$

and taking $T = T_t$ concludes the proof. We may therefore assume that $t < r/2$.

In this case, we want to apply Lemma 3.3 with $X_* = X \cap \text{span}(T_t)$ and $s = r/2$. Note that, as $\text{rank}(T_t) \leq t$ and $0 \in T_t$, we have

$$\text{rank}(X_*) \leq \text{rank}(\text{span}(T_t)) \leq t < r/2,$$

where in the last inequality we used our assumption that $t < r/2$. This application yields a set $Z \subseteq X \setminus X_*$ such that $|Z| \leq r - s = r/2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |X + Z| &\geq |X_* + Z| && \text{because } X_* \subseteq X, \\ &\geq \frac{r|X_*|}{2} && \text{by Lemma 3.3,} \\ &\geq \frac{r|X|}{6} && \text{since } |X_*| \geq |X|/3 \text{ by (19).} \end{aligned}$$

Taking $T = Z$ concludes the proof. \square

4. IMPROVING THE BOUND FOR FREĬMAN'S LEMMA VIA FEW-TRANSLATES

To obtain the sharp upper bound for $\alpha(\Gamma_p)$, the bound $|X + T| \geq r|X|/6$ is not enough; we need at least $|X + T| \geq (1 - 5\gamma)(r + 1)|X|/2$ for small $\gamma > 0$. In this section, we describe the overall approach and state the intermediate results we require to improve the bound. Once we have stated these results, we will show that assuming them is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.3 – this will motivate their statements, since neither they nor their proofs are straightforward. We will prove that these results hold in subsequent sections.

To discuss the methods that we will use to improve the bound, it will be convenient to first make some definitions.

Definition 4.1. *For finite sets $X, W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define*

$$Z(X, W) = \Pi_{W^\perp}(X),$$

where $\Pi_U(V)$ denotes the orthogonal projection of V onto U . We also partition \mathbb{R}^d into equivalence classes in that projection, denoting these² by

$$[z]_W = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \Pi_{W^\perp}(x) = z\},$$

and partition X into equivalence classes in the same way:

$$[[z]]_{W,X} = [z]_W \cap X.$$

²To avoid confusion between the equivalence class $[z]$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we avoid using the latter notation.

It will be convenient to omit the dependency of those definitions on X and W whenever these sets are clear from context, leaving us with the notation $Z, [z], \llbracket z \rrbracket$. We also refer to $[z]$ as a “fibre”, and say that a fibre $[z]$ is “empty” if $z \notin Z$.

The start of the proof follows the same idea as in Section 3: to obtain T_{i+1} from T_i , at each step we add the element provided by Proposition 3.2. We do this for t steps, where t is the first index for which $|X \cap \text{span}(T_t)| > \gamma|X|$. If $t \geq r$, then, by Proposition 3.2, we have $|X + T_t| \geq (1 - \gamma)(t + 1)|X|/2$, and we are done. Otherwise, we define

$$T^* = T_{t-1} \quad \text{and} \quad W = \text{span}(T_t), \quad (21)$$

and we look into the set of non-empty fibres $Z = Z(X, W)$. Notice that W is neither \mathbb{R}^d nor $\{0\}$ since $0 < t < r$. The rest of the argument is divided into two different cases.

If there are many distinct non-empty fibres in $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$, then we use the following generalization of Lemma 3.3. Whereas for that previous result we needed one point per dimension, in Proposition 4.2 we take one point $y_i \in \llbracket z_i \rrbracket$ per non-empty fibre to be our set T , and show that such a choice yields disjoint translates $y_i + X_*$ for $X_* = X \cap W$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\gamma > 0$, and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. If $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is such that $|X \cap W| \geq \gamma|X|$ and $|Z| \geq (r + 1)/\gamma$, where $Z = Z(X, W)$, then there exists $T \subseteq X$ such that*

$$|X + T| \geq (r + 1)|X|$$

and $|T| = (r + 1)/\gamma$.

Proof. Define $m = (r + 1)/\gamma$. Take $\{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \subseteq Z$ and, for each z_i , pick some arbitrary $y_i \in \llbracket z_i \rrbracket$. Note that $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket = X \cap W$. As we have chosen $y_i \in \llbracket z_i \rrbracket$, we have $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + y_i \subseteq [z_i]$. Doing the same with $i \neq j$ shows that

$$(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + y_i) \cap (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + y_j) \subseteq [z_i] \cap [z_j] = \emptyset. \quad (22)$$

We can therefore conclude that taking $T = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \subseteq X$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |X + T| &\geq |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T| && \text{as } \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \subseteq X \text{ by definition,} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + y_i| && \text{by (22),} \\ &\geq m\gamma|X| && \text{as } |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| \geq \gamma|X|, \text{ by assumption,} \\ &= (r + 1)|X|, \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

The case when there are few non-empty fibres, i.e. $Z = Z(X, W)$ is small, is more complex. Letting $r_W = \text{rank}(W)$ and recalling (21), we have

$$|X + T^*| \geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(r_W + 1)|X|}{2}.$$

Therefore, to obtain a final set of translates T such that $|X + T| \geq (1 - 5\gamma)(r + 1)|X|/2$, we need to find a set T' that roughly satisfies

$$|X + T'| \geq \frac{(r - r_W)|X|}{2}. \quad (23)$$

To combine T^* and T' , though, we must take care not to count overlaps between the sumsets $X + T'$ and $X + T^*$ more than once.

The content of the next proposition shows that choosing T' as discussed above is possible. It says that we can choose a T' which almost attains (23) while avoiding not only $X + T^*$, but the whole of $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ – recall that $T^* \subseteq W \cap X = \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $d, r, r_W \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta > 0$, and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set with $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$. Let also $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a subspace with dimension r_W , and $Z = Z(X, W)$. If $|\llbracket z \rrbracket| \leq \eta|X|$ for every $z \in Z \setminus \{0\}$, then there exists $T' \subseteq X$ such that*

$$\left| (X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| \geq \frac{r - r_W}{2} \left(|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| \right) - \eta|Z||X| \quad (24)$$

and $|T'| \leq |Z|$.

To gain some intuition for why Proposition 4.3 is true, consider the following. Applying Freĭman’s lemma in the projected world W^\perp , if we could obtain a lower bound depending on $|X|$, instead of $|Z|$ – which is what we actually get – then we would be done. Notice, however, that this naive application considers every non-empty fibre $\llbracket z \rrbracket$ as a single element to avoid repeated counts. That is, for each $z_1 + z_2 \in Z + Z$, this approach counts only $x + y$ for a single choice of $x \in \llbracket z_1 \rrbracket$ and $y \in T' \cap \llbracket z_2 \rrbracket$.

In the proof of Proposition 4.3, we will show that we can instead consider $\llbracket z_1 \rrbracket + y$ and not overcount. To achieve that, we assign to each $z \in Z$ a weight that encodes the size of the corresponding fibre $\llbracket z \rrbracket$, and incorporate this weight into the proof of Freĭman’s lemma in the projected world. Although considering $\llbracket z_1 \rrbracket + y$ is still not enough to replace $|Z|$ with $|X|$ in the bound, we can crucially choose $z_1, z_2 \in Z$ whichever way we want, as long as $y \in \llbracket z_2 \rrbracket$. We therefore choose the representation that maximises $|\llbracket z_1 \rrbracket|$ and show that this modification is enough to obtain the bound in Proposition 4.3.

The above discussion overlooks the removal of the zero fibre from the sumset, i.e. it gives a lower bound for $|X + T'|$ instead of one for $|(X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket)|$. To incorporate it, we must take into account our choice maximizing $|\llbracket z_1 \rrbracket|$, which imposes the (technical) requirement that every non-zero fibre has size at most $\eta|X|$. As this is not always the case, in order to apply Proposition 4.3, we will change W slightly to make it so: we will “add” to W the large non-zero fibres until we have $|\llbracket z \rrbracket| \leq \eta|X|$ for all remaining $z \in Z$. As we will do this economically, using this new W will not hurt our bound too much.

Nevertheless, combining T' and T^* had another unanticipated cost: it incurred a negative $(r - r_W)|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|/2$ term in the bound of Proposition 4.3. The following proposition shows that a simple change suffices to offset this loss: we add two extra points from each non-empty fibre to our final T .

Proposition 4.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set. For every $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there is $T'' \subseteq X$ satisfying $|T''| \leq 2|Z|$ and*

$$\left| (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| \geq |Z| \left(|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*| \right),$$

where $Z = Z(X, W)$ and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* = \{x \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket : \langle x, u^* \rangle = 0\}$.

It is not immediate that Proposition 4.4 is really enough to make up for what we lost in Proposition 4.3, as we are removing $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ instead of $X + T^*$, and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ is determined by W and u^* . What we need is that, for our choice of u^* , both $|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*| \leq \gamma|X|$ and $T_{t-1} = T^* \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$. This condition, combined with the following observation, is enough to prove Theorem 1.3. The proof of the observation is a simple (but slightly tedious) manipulation of set relations.

Observation 4.5. *For every $T', T'' \subseteq X$, we have*

$$\left| (X + \hat{T}) \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| \geq \left| (X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| + \left| (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{T} = T' \cup T''$.

Proof. Note first that $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T''$ is a subset of $X + \hat{T}$: this follows easily from

$$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket \subseteq X \quad \text{and} \quad T'' \subseteq \hat{T}.$$

We therefore have

$$|X + \hat{T}| \geq |S| + |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T''| \quad (26)$$

where $S = (X + T') \setminus (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'')$, and moreover,

$$\left| (X + \hat{T}) \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| \geq \left| S \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| + \left| (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right|. \quad (27)$$

As the last term in (27) already matches what appears in (25), the proof is reduced to showing that

$$\left| S \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \right| \geq \left| (X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right|, \quad (28)$$

where, recall,

$$S \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) = (X + T') \setminus ((\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \cup (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*)).$$

It is enough, therefore, to prove that

$$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'' \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket + X \quad \text{and} \quad X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* \subseteq X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket.$$

Both inclusions are trivial, as $T'' \subseteq X$ by assumption, and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ by definition. \square

We are now ready to put the pieces together and prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 assuming Propositions 4.3 and 4.4. By translating if necessary, we may assume that $0 \in X$; note that this does not change $\text{rank}(X)$. As in the proof of the weaker version, Theorem 3.1, we start by defining $T_0 = \{0\}$: observe that $\text{rank}(T_0) = 0$ and

$$|X + 0| = |X|. \quad (29)$$

The next steps consist of taking $T_{i+1} = T_i \cup \{x_{i+1}\}$, where $x_{i+1} \in X$ is defined to be the x^* given by Proposition 3.2 applied to T_i . We can do so as long as $|X \cap \text{span}(T_i)| < \gamma|X|$

and $i < r$, because $|T_i| = i + 1$ implies that $\text{rank}(T_i) \leq i$. We also stop this process for the first t such that

$$|X \cap \text{span}(T_t)| \geq \gamma|X|. \quad (30)$$

By (29) and our choice of x_{i+1} via Proposition 3.2, we have, for all $i \leq t$,

$$|X + T_i| \geq |X| + (1 - \gamma)\frac{i|X|}{2} \geq (1 - \gamma)\frac{(i + 2)|X|}{2}, \quad (31)$$

and $|T_i| \leq i + 1$.

Now, if $t \geq r$, then we can take $T = T_t$, and we have completed the proof by (31). Otherwise, we may assume that $t < r$ and define $W_1 = \text{span}(T_t)$. We would like to use W_1 for the rest of the proof, but Proposition 4.3 requires that all non-zero fibres have size at most $\eta|X|$. To continue, then, we need to define a subspace W such that for every $z \in Z(W, X) \setminus \{0\}$ and given $\eta > 0$,

$$|\llbracket z \rrbracket_{W, X}| \leq \eta|X|.$$

We will do so by iteratively projecting these large fibres onto the 0 fibre until none remain. With foresight, we set $\eta = \gamma^2$. Formally, our process is:

- (1) Start with $\ell = 1$ and $W_1 = \text{span}(T_t)$.
- (2) If there exists $z_\ell \in Z(W_\ell, X) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\llbracket z_\ell \rrbracket| \geq \eta|X|$, then we let

$$W_{\ell+1} = \text{span}(W_\ell \cup \{z_\ell\}).$$

- (3) If there is no such z_ℓ , we stop with output W_ℓ .

A simple and important observation is that $\ell \leq 1/\eta$, since $\eta < \gamma$ and

$$|X| \geq |W_\ell \cap X| \geq \ell\eta|X|.$$

Noting that $\dim(W_1) \leq t$, since $|T_t| \leq t + 1$ and $0 \in T_t$, it follows that

$$r_W := \dim(W_\ell) \leq \dim(W_1) + 1/\eta \leq t + 1/\eta. \quad (32)$$

Take W to be the output of the above process. Moreover, let $Z = Z(W, X)$ and divide the rest of the proof into two cases depending on $|Z|$. The first case is if $|Z| \geq (r + 1)/\gamma$. Here, we claim that applying Proposition 4.2 completes the proof. The set $T \subseteq X$ provided by this application satisfies

$$|X + T| \geq (r + 1)|X| \geq (1 - 5\gamma)\frac{(r + 1)|X|}{2},$$

and

$$|T| = \frac{r + 1}{\gamma} \leq \frac{4(r + 1)}{\gamma},$$

as required.

It remains to deal with the other case, and we may thus assume that $|Z| < (r + 1)/\gamma$. In this scenario, our set T will be the union of three sets: the second to last set T_{t-1} , the set

T' given by Proposition 4.3, and T'' , the output of Proposition 4.4 for a suitable choice of $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that it consists of few translates:

$$|T| \leq |T_{t-1}| + |T'| + |T''| \leq t + |Z| + 2|Z| \leq \frac{4(r+1)}{\gamma},$$

where the last inequality follows from our assumptions that $t < r$ and $|Z| < (r+1)/\gamma$. It remains to show that $X + T$ has the appropriate size.

First, we separate the contributions of T_{t-1} and $\hat{T} = T' \cup T''$ to the sumset

$$|X + T| \geq |X + T_{t-1}| + |(X + \hat{T}) \setminus (X + T_{t-1})|, \quad (33)$$

and we would like to apply Observation 4.5 to bound the second term in the right-hand side. To do this, we need to show that $T_{t-1} \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ for some $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as that would imply

$$(X + \hat{T}) \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \subseteq (X + \hat{T}) \setminus (X + T_{t-1}). \quad (34)$$

Besides $T_{t-1} \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$, our choice of u^* will also need to satisfy

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*| < \gamma|X|. \quad (35)$$

To achieve that, we define the subspace $W_0 = \text{span}(T_{t-1})$ and claim that we can pick $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* = \{x \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket : \langle x, u^* \rangle = 0\} = X \cap W_0. \quad (36)$$

As we have stopped the greedy process at t , we must have $|X \cap W_0| < \gamma|X|$, so this choice also satisfies (35). We can choose $u^* \in W_0^\perp$ satisfying (36) because X is finite and

$$\dim(W_0) \leq t < r \leq d,$$

since $|T_{t-1}| \leq t$ and $0 \in T_{t-1}$. Notice that this choice of u^* mimics that of u in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

With this choice of u^* , we have $T_{t-1} \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$, as required, and so combining (34) with Observation 4.5 yields, in (33),

$$|X + T| \geq |X + T_{t-1}| + |(X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket)| + |(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*)| \quad (37)$$

for $T = T_{t-1} \cup T' \cup T''$, and T' and T'' as given by Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4, respectively. As T' originates from Proposition 4.3, we have

$$|(X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket)| \geq \frac{(r - r_W)}{2}(|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|) - \eta|Z||X|, \quad (38)$$

where, recall, $r_W \leq t + 1/\eta$, by (32). Moreover, by Proposition 4.4, we have

$$|(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*)| \geq |Z|(|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*|), \quad (39)$$

which, by (35), implies that

$$|(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T'') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*)| \geq |Z|(|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - \gamma|X|). \quad (40)$$

Recall that, by (31), we have

$$|X + T_{t-1}| \geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(t+1)|X|}{2},$$

which, replaced alongside (38) and (40) in (37), yields

$$\begin{aligned} |X + T| &\geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(t+1)}{2} |X| \\ &\quad + \frac{(r - r_W)}{2} (|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\quad - \eta |Z| |X| \\ &\quad + |Z| (|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - \gamma |X|). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The rest of the proof is dedicated to showing that this expression is at least the bound we need.

To this end, observe that

$$|Z| \geq \text{rank}(Z) \geq \text{rank}(X) - \text{rank}(W) \geq r - r_W. \quad (43)$$

Another important observation is that

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| \geq |X \cap W_1| \geq \gamma |X|, \quad (44)$$

since $X \cap W_1 \subseteq \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$.

It follows from (43) and (44) that the sum of (41) and (42) is at least

$$\frac{r - r_W}{2} (|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|) + |Z| (|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - \gamma |X|) \geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(r - r_W)}{2} |X|. \quad (45)$$

Replacing (45) in our lower bound for the size of $X + T$, we obtain

$$|X + T| \geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(t+1)}{2} |X| + (1 - \gamma) \frac{(r - r_W)}{2} |X| - \eta |Z| |X|$$

and using that $r_W \leq t + 1/\eta$ by (32), yields

$$|X + T| \geq (1 - \gamma) \frac{(r+1)}{2} |X| - \frac{(1 - \gamma)}{2\eta} |X| - \eta |Z| |X|. \quad (46)$$

It is now enough to determine that

$$(1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{2\eta} + \eta |Z| \leq 2\gamma(r + 1) \quad (47)$$

as replacing it in (46) gives the desired bound:

$$|X + T| \geq (1 - 5\gamma) \frac{r+1}{2} |X|.$$

To obtain (47), observe that

$$\eta |Z| \leq \gamma(r + 1) \quad (48)$$

follows from our choice of $\eta = \gamma^2$ and our assumption that, in the current case, $|Z| \leq (r + 1)/\gamma$.

Moreover, the following holds

$$\frac{1}{2\eta} < \gamma(r + 1) \quad (49)$$

since $\gamma^3 r \geq 1$ by assumption. The proof is complete by substituting (48) and (49) in (47). \square

5. OFFSETTING THE LOSS OF THE ZERO FIBRE: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.4

As we remarked in the previous section, we offset the loss of the zero fibre by adding two carefully selected points from each non-empty fibre to the final set of translates. These points are the maximiser and minimiser of the linear function $x \mapsto \langle x, u^* \rangle$ in each fibre. Let $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$. For each $z_i \in Z$, we choose $y_i^+, y_i^- \in \llbracket z_i \rrbracket$ to be, respectively, a maximiser and a minimiser of $y \mapsto \langle y, u^* \rangle$ in $\llbracket z_i \rrbracket$, and set $Y_i := \{y_i^+, y_i^-\}$.

Recall that $Z = Z(X, W)$ is now defined as the projection of X onto W^\perp , where X and W come from the statement of the proposition. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 3.2, we will define “positive” and “negative” parts of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ as

$$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ = \{x \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket : \langle x, u^* \rangle > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- = \{x \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket : \langle x, u^* \rangle < 0\},$$

which complement the “null part” $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* = \{x \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket : \langle x, u^* \rangle = 0\}$ defined in the statement and complete a partition of the zero fibre.

Each pair of minimiser and maximiser we put in the set of translates will add to the sumset a translated copy of the sets $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$ and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-$. As they form a partition of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket \setminus \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$, this will correspond to adding $|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*|$ elements to the sumset for each of the $m = |Z|$ non-empty fibres. Showing this only requires the following simple geometric observations. The first says that the translates $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i$ and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_j$ are disjoint if Y_i and Y_j lie in distinct fibres.

Observation 5.1. *For all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, if $i \neq j$, then*

$$(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i) \cap (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_j) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Note that $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i \subseteq [z_i]$, and recall from (22) that $[z_i] \cap [z_j] = \emptyset$. □

The second observation says that the positive part of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ translated by the fibre maximiser y_i^+ is disjoint from its negative part translated by the corresponding fibre minimiser. Its proof is essentially contained in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Observation 5.2. *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have*

$$(y_i^+ + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+) \cap (y_i^- + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-) = \emptyset. \tag{50}$$

Proof. Note that for any $a \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+, b \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-$, we have

$$\langle y_i^+ + a, u^* \rangle > \langle y_i^+, u^* \rangle \geq \langle y_i^-, u^* \rangle > \langle y_i^- + b, u^* \rangle.$$

Hence, $y_i^+ + a \neq y_i^- + b$ for every $a \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$ and $b \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-$, which implies (50). □

The final observation says that the original set translated by the “null part” of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ does not intersect the positive part of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ translated by the fibre maximiser y_i^+ , and that the analogous statement holds for the negative part and the fibre minimiser y_i^- .

Observation 5.3. *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have*

$$(X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \cap (y_i^+ + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+) = (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*) \cap (y_i^- + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Recall that $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \llbracket z_j \rrbracket$ is a partition. Whenever $\llbracket z_j \rrbracket$ and y_i^+ are in distinct fibres, we have that $\llbracket z_j \rrbracket + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ and $y_i^+ + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$ are disjoint by (22),

$$\llbracket z_j \rrbracket + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* \subseteq [z_j] \quad \text{and} \quad y_i^+ + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ \subseteq [z_i].$$

We now consider the case when they are in the same fibre. Take $a \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$, $c \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ and $y \in \llbracket z_i \rrbracket$. Note that $\langle a, u^* \rangle > 0$ since $a \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$, and $\langle c, u^* \rangle = 0$ as $c \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$. Then $c + y \neq a + y_i^+$, because

$$\langle a + y_i^+, u^* \rangle > \langle c + y_i^+, u^* \rangle \geq \langle c + y, u^* \rangle,$$

and this completes the proof in the y_i^+ case. The proof in the y_i^- case is analogous. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Recall that $m = |Z|$, where $Z = Z(X, W)$, and $Y_i = \{y_i^+, y_i^-\}$ consists of a maximiser and minimiser of $y \mapsto \langle y, u^* \rangle$ in $\llbracket z_i \rrbracket$ for each $z_i \in Z$. Y_i is well defined because Z is the set of non-empty fibres, although it may be a singleton for example if $|\llbracket z_i \rrbracket| = 1$. We define T'' to be the following set with (trivially) at most $2m$ elements

$$T'' = \bigcup_{i=1}^m Y_i.$$

To avoid cumbersome notation, we will first prove the weaker inequality

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T''| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |y_i^+ + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+| + |y_i^- + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-|, \quad (51)$$

and then show that the same steps can be applied removing the set $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ in the left-hand side to obtain the desired bound.

As T'' is the union of the Y_i , we use Observation 5.1 to obtain

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + T''| = \sum_{i=1}^m |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i|. \quad (52)$$

Now, because $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+$, $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_-$ partition $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$, we may decompose, for each Y_i , the term in (52) as

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i| = |(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ + Y_i) \cup (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_* + Y_i) \cup (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- + Y_i)|, \quad (53)$$

which, ignoring the term corresponding to $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ and the ‘‘mixed-sign’’ terms, $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- + y_+$ and $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ + y_-$, yields

$$|\llbracket 0 \rrbracket + Y_i| \geq |(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ + y_i^+) \cup (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- + y_i^-)|. \quad (54)$$

We can now apply Observation 5.2, which implies that the right-hand side of (54) is at least

$$|(\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ + y_i^+) \cup (\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- + y_i^-)| = |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_+ + y_i^+| + |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_- + y_i^-|, \quad (55)$$

hence establishing (51) via (52).

To obtain the desired bound, we now show that the same steps can be applied removing the set $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ in the left-hand side of (51). First, (52) holds if we remove $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket_*$ from the set in the left-hand side and those in the sum in the right-hand side because removing a

set cannot create intersections in disjoint sets. We then repeat the steps in (53) and (54) – they are also possible regardless of the set removal – and, upon reaching (55), we again use that disjointness is preserved under set removal. This gives us

$$\left| ([0] + T'') \setminus (X + [0]_*) \right| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \left| (y_i^+ + [0]_+) \setminus (X + [0]_*) \right| + \left| (y_i^- + [0]_-) \setminus (X + [0]_*) \right|.$$

We are now in a position to use Observation 5.3 to deduce that the set we removed is disjoint from the ones in the right-hand side above, and recover the lower bound prior to the removal

$$\begin{aligned} \left| ([0] + T'') \setminus (X + [0]_*) \right| &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m |y_i^+ + [0]_+| + |y_i^- + [0]_-| \\ &= m \left(|[0]_+| + |[0]_-| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again using that $[0]_- \cup [0]_* \cup [0]_+$ is a partition of $[0]$, we get

$$m \left(|[0]_+| + |[0]_-| \right) = m \left(|[0]| - |[0]_*| \right),$$

as required to complete the proof. \square

6. WEIGHTED FREĬMAN'S LEMMA: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.3

The final piece we need to prove Theorem 1.3 is detailing how to choose $T' \subseteq X$ such that $|T'| \leq |Z|$ and (24) holds, and how to prove a variant of Freĭman's lemma where the size of the original, unprojected set X appears in the lower bound, instead of simply $|Z|$.

We will first prove a weaker, insufficient statement to make the reader comfortable with the notation and ideas in the proof of Proposition 4.3. Our goal here is to show that we can choose $T' \subseteq X$ such that $|T'| \leq |Z|$ and³

$$|X + T'| \geq \sum_{w \in Z+Z} \max_{z \in (w-Z) \cap Z} |[z]|. \quad (56)$$

Before proceeding, it will be useful to let $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$. Here (and in the proof itself), we will take

$$T' = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\},$$

where, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $y_i \in [z_i]$ is arbitrary. It is immediate that the size of T' is appropriate, that is,

$$|T'| \leq |Z|,$$

so we must show that it also satisfies (24).

Having defined T' , we start this warm-up by partitioning $X + T'$ into fibres of $Z + Z$:

$$X + T' = \bigcup_{w \in Z+Z} [w] \cap (X + T'). \quad (57)$$

³Notice that $(w - Z) \cap Z = \{z \in Z : \exists z' \in Z \text{ such that } z + z' = w\}$.

As (57) defines a partition, we also have

$$\left| \bigcup_{w \in Z+Z} ([w] \cap (X + T')) \right| = \sum_{w \in Z+Z} \left| ([w] \cap (X + T')) \right|.$$

Note also that if $w = z_i + z_j \in Z + Z$, then

$$\llbracket z_i \rrbracket + y_j \subseteq ([w] \cap (X + T')) \quad (58)$$

since $\llbracket z_i \rrbracket \subseteq X$ and $y_j \in \llbracket z_j \rrbracket \cap T'$.

Our approach will be to count only the elements in a single (translated) fibre $\llbracket z_i \rrbracket + y_j$ and ignore the rest of $[z_i + z_j] \cap (X + T')$ – by (57) and (58), this is a valid lower bound for $|X + T'|$. As the union in (57) ranges over all $w \in Z + Z$, we can pick any possible representation $z_i + z_j$ for w . Our choice will be the one for which $|\llbracket z_i \rrbracket|$ is as large as possible, resulting in

$$\sum_{w \in Z+Z} \left| ([w] \cap (X + T')) \right| \geq \sum_{w \in Z+Z} \max_{z \in (w-Z) \cap Z} |\llbracket z \rrbracket|,$$

since $|\llbracket z \rrbracket + y| = |\llbracket z \rrbracket|$. This completes the proof of (56).

In the proof of Proposition 4.3, the statement that is analogous to (56) is

$$\left| (X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| \geq \sum_{w \in (Z^* + Z^*) \setminus Z} \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket|, \quad (59)$$

where $Z^* = Z \setminus \{0\}$ – in words, we “remove the 0 from Z ” before doing the sumset. The proof of (59) is essentially the same as the warm-up above, but that is still not enough. We must have a good lower bound for its right-hand side in order to complete a proof of Proposition 4.3.

To prove a lower bound for (59), we will use the following classical result of Balinski [3]. For a convex polytope K , its skeleton graph $\mathcal{S}(K)$ has vertex set corresponding to the vertices of K , and its edges are pairs of vertices that lie in a one-dimensional face of K .

Theorem 6.1 (Balinski [3]). *If $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a d -dimensional convex polytope, then $\mathcal{S}(K)$ is d -vertex connected. That is, one must remove at least d vertices to disconnect $\mathcal{S}(K)$.*

Lemma 6.2, below, is the lower bound we need for the right-hand side of (59): when applying it to prove Proposition 4.3, we will set $U = Z^*$ and $f(z) = |\llbracket z \rrbracket|$. The proof of the lemma is similar to traditional proofs of Freĭman’s lemma, but we must take into account the weight $f(u)$ of each $u \in U$ when selecting vertices of $\text{conv}(U)$, the convex hull of U , instead of choosing an arbitrary vertex⁴.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. For every finite $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, we have*

$$\sum_{w \in U+U} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \frac{\text{rank}(U) + 1}{2} \sum_{u \in U} f(u). \quad (60)$$

⁴Hence the name “weighted Freĭman’s lemma”.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $|U|$. In the base case, we have an empty set, so the left-hand side of (60) is equal to 0, as is the right-hand side. We can therefore assume that for every $U' \subsetneq U$, we have (60).

For the induction step, we proceed similarly to the standard proof of Freiman's lemma. The main difference is that instead of choosing an arbitrary element from V , the vertices of $\text{conv}(U)$, we must choose a vertex considering the weight function f . To be precise, we choose a vertex $v \in V$ such that

$$f(v) \leq \frac{1}{s+1} \sum_{u \in U} f(u), \quad (61)$$

where $s = \text{rank}(U)$, noting that such a choice exists by the pigeonhole principle,

$$(s+1) \min_{v \in V} f(v) \leq |V| \min_{v \in V} f(v) \leq \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \leq \sum_{u \in U} f(u).$$

We fix one such $v \in V$, define $U' = U \setminus \{v\}$ and divide the remainder of the proof based on whether or not $\text{rank}(U') = s$.

Consider first the case $\text{rank}(U') = s$. The induction hypothesis implies that

$$\sum_{w \in U'+U'} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \sum_{w \in U'+U'} \max_{u \in (w-U') \cap U'} f(u) \geq \frac{s+1}{2} \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \quad (62)$$

since $U' \subseteq U$. Therefore, by (62), we can accomplish our goal by finding a set $S \subseteq (U+U) \setminus (U'+U')$ such that

$$\sum_{w \in S} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \frac{s+1}{2} f(v). \quad (63)$$

In order to define our candidate set for S , let $H = \mathcal{S}(\text{conv}(U))$ and let $N_H(v)$ be the neighbourhood of v in the graph H . We claim that $\overline{N_H(v)} + v$, where $\overline{N_H(v)} = N_H(v) \cup \{v\}$, is disjoint from $U'+U'$ and satisfies (63), and is therefore a suitable choice for S .

To see that $\overline{N_H(v)} + v$ and $U'+U'$ are disjoint, first notice that $2v \notin U'+U'$ follows from v being a vertex of $\text{conv}(U)$. For the remaining elements of $\overline{N_H(v)}$, i.e. $v' \in N_H(v)$, $v'+v$ is not in $U'+U'$ because $(v+v')/2$ is a midpoint of the segment connecting v and v' , and this midpoint clearly lies outside $\text{conv}(U')$.

It remains to show that (63) holds with $S = \overline{N_H(v)} + v$. Observe that if $w = v' + v$ for some $v' \in \overline{N_H(v)}$, then $v \in (w-U) \cap U$. Hence,

$$\sum_{w \in \overline{N_H(v)} + v} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \sum_{w \in \overline{N_H(v)} + v} f(v) = |\overline{N_H(v)}| f(v) \geq (s+1) f(v), \quad (64)$$

where in the last inequality we used that H has minimum degree at least s , by Theorem 6.1. Combining (62) and (64), this completes the induction step in the case $\text{rank}(U') = s$.

We may therefore assume that $\text{rank}(U') = s-1$; that is, the removal of the vertex v decreases the rank of U . It will be useful for this case to recall (61), our criterion for the

choice of v , in the following (trivially) equivalent form:

$$\sum_{u \in U} f(u) \geq (s+1)f(v). \quad (65)$$

Applying our induction hypothesis to U' yields

$$\sum_{w \in U'+U'} \max_{u \in (w-U') \cap U'} f(u) \geq \frac{s}{2} \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u'), \quad (66)$$

so, to deduce the bound (60), it is enough to add to (66) the term

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \right) + \frac{s+1}{2} f(v) \quad (67)$$

using elements of $(U+U) \setminus (U'+U')$.

In order to add (67) to (66), we argue that $U'+U'$, $\{2v\}$ and $U'+v$ are disjoint. This follows from our assumption that $\text{rank}(U') < \text{rank}(U)$, which implies that $v \notin \mathcal{U}$, where \mathcal{U} is an affine subspace with dimension $\text{rank}(U')$ containing U' . We can therefore conclude that

$$\sum_{w \in U+U} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \frac{s}{2} \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') + f(v) + \sum_{w \in U'+v} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u). \quad (68)$$

Our first observation towards bounding the right-hand side of (68) is that

$$\sum_{w \in U'+v} \max_{u \in (w-U) \cap U} f(u) \geq \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \quad (69)$$

because if $w = u' + v$ for some $u' \in U'$, then $u' \in (w-U) \cap U$. It will therefore suffice to show that

$$f(v) + \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \right) + \frac{s+1}{2} f(v),$$

or, equivalently,

$$2f(v) + \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \geq (s+1)f(v).$$

We now use that our choice of v satisfies (65), which implies that

$$2f(v) + \sum_{u' \in U'} f(u') \geq \sum_{u \in U} f(u) \geq (s+1)f(v), \quad (70)$$

and hence completes the proof of the induction step. \square

With Lemma 6.2, we are now ready to prove Proposition 4.3.

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Our first claim is that finding a $T' \subseteq X$ such that $|T'| \leq |Z|$ and

$$\left| (X+T') \setminus (X+\llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| \geq \sum_{w \in (Z^*+Z^*) \setminus Z} \max_{z \in (w-Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket|, \quad (71)$$

where $Z^* = Z \setminus \{0\}$, is enough to complete the proof. To see that, apply Lemma 6.2 with $U = Z^*$ and $f(z) = |\llbracket z \rrbracket|$ to get the lower bound

$$\sum_{w \in Z^* + Z^*} \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket| \geq \frac{\text{rank}(Z^*) + 1}{2} \sum_{z \in Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket| \geq \frac{r - r_W}{2} (|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|), \quad (72)$$

where in the last equality we have used that

$$Z^* = Z \setminus \{0\}, \quad X = \bigcup_{z \in Z} \llbracket z \rrbracket \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rank}(Z^*) \geq r - r_W - 1,$$

by our assumptions that $Z = \Pi_{W^\perp}(X)$, $\text{rank}(X) \geq r$ and $r_W = \text{rank}(W)$.

However, the left-hand side of (72) is considering elements $w \in Z$ that are not in the sum in (71). This is not an issue because

$$\sum_{w \in Z} \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket| \leq \eta |Z| |X| \quad (73)$$

follows from our assumption that $|\llbracket z \rrbracket| \leq \eta |X|$ for all $z \in Z^*$. We obtain the claim that T' as specified finishes the proof by substituting (73) and (72) into (71):

$$\sum_{w \in (Z+Z) \setminus Z} \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket| \geq \frac{r - r_W}{2} (|X| - |\llbracket 0 \rrbracket|) - \eta |Z| |X|.$$

As it now suffices to find $T' \subseteq X$ such that $|T'| \leq |Z|$ and (71) holds, we simply need to repeat the proof of (56) given in the warm-up, but with the set $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ removed. That is, let $Z^* = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$, and define

$$T' = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \quad (74)$$

where each y_i is an arbitrary element of $\llbracket z_i \rrbracket$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. The first step to show that T' satisfies (71) is partitioning $X + T'$ into fibres of $Z + Z$ to obtain

$$\left| (X + T') \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| = \sum_{w \in Z+Z} \left| ([w] \cap (X + T')) \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right|. \quad (75)$$

In order to handle the set removal, we claim that if $w \notin Z$, then the sets $[w]$ and $X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ are disjoint, and therefore

$$\sum_{w \in Z+Z} \left| ([w] \cap (X + T')) \setminus (X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \right| \geq \sum_{w \in (Z+Z) \setminus Z} |[w] \cap (X + T')|. \quad (76)$$

To see this, simply note that if $x \in X$ and $x' \in \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$, then

$$\Pi_{W^\perp}(x + x') = \Pi_{W^\perp}(x) + \Pi_{W^\perp}(x') \in Z + 0 = Z$$

by the definitions of $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket$ and Z , and therefore $\Pi_{W^\perp}(X + \llbracket 0 \rrbracket) \subseteq Z$.

Having established (76), we can proceed (almost) like in the warm-up. Restricting our attention to $Z^* + Z^* \subseteq Z + Z$, observe that every $w \in Z^* + Z^*$ can be written as

$$w = z + z' \quad \text{where} \quad z, z' \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*. \quad (77)$$

For each $w \in Z^* + Z^*$, then, we pick the pair $(z, z') \in (Z^*)^2$ satisfying (77) that maximises $|\llbracket z \rrbracket|$. Let y be the (unique) element of $T' \cap [z']$, and note that, as $\llbracket z \rrbracket + y \subseteq [w] \cap (X + T')$, we can conclude that

$$|[w] \cap (X + T')| \geq \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket|. \quad (78)$$

Replacing (78) into (76) yields that (71) holds for T'

$$\sum_{w \in (Z + Z) \setminus Z} |[w] \cap (X + T')| \geq \sum_{w \in (Z^* + Z^*) \setminus Z} \max_{z \in (w - Z^*) \cap Z^*} |\llbracket z \rrbracket|,$$

and the proof therefore follows from our first claim. \square

7. THE SUPERSATURATION RESULT

This section is dedicated to the proof of the following theorem, restated for convenience:

Theorem 2.2. *For every $0 < \gamma < 1$, there exists a constant $c = c(\gamma) > 0$ such that, for every sufficiently large set $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$, every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma$, the following holds. If X has ε -robust Freïman dimension d and $Y \subseteq X + X$ satisfies*

$$|\{(x_1, x_2) \in X^2 : x_1 + x_2 \notin Y\}| \leq c\varepsilon|X|^2, \quad (7)$$

then $|Y| \geq (1 - \gamma)(d + 1)|X|/2$.

Now that we have Theorem 1.3, proving Theorem 2.2 is simple. Assume that Y is small, that is, $|Y| \leq (1 - \gamma)(d + 1)|X|/2$; our goal is to show that it misses many pairs of X^2 . If we can find $\varepsilon|X|$ elements $x^{(i)} \in X$ such that Y contains at most a $1 - c$ proportion of $X + x^{(i)}$, we are done. To do that, we will use Theorem 1.3 to find a small set $T \subseteq X$ such that $|X + T| - |Y| \gtrsim \gamma(d + 1)|X|$. By the pigeonhole principle, it follows that there exists an $x^{(i)} \in T$ such that Y misses many elements of $X + x^{(i)}$. We can then remove $x^{(i)}$ from X and repeat the process until the dimension of X drops below its original value (removing the $x^{(i)}$ is a simple way to avoid using the same element twice while keeping our working set large). As we assumed that X has ε -robust Freïman dimension d , this can only happen after we have removed $\varepsilon|X|$ translates.

This is essentially the proof except for the fact that Theorem 1.3 requires $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and the set in Theorem 2.2 is a subset of \mathbb{Z}_n . To handle this, we use Freïman isomorphisms, relying on the fact that if ϕ is a Freïman isomorphism, then $|X_1 + X_2| = |\phi(X_1) + \phi(X_2)|$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Assume that⁵ $|Y| \leq (1 - \gamma')(d + 1)|X|/2$. We claim that there exists a sequence of distinct elements $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(t)} \in X$, where $t = \varepsilon|X|/4$, such that the sets $X_i = X \setminus \{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(i)}\}$ have the following two properties

$$d_i = \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i) \geq d \quad \text{and} \quad |(X_i + x^{(i+1)}) \setminus Y| \geq 4c|X|. \quad (79)$$

The first property holds because, for all $i \leq t$,

$$|X_i| \geq |X| - i \geq |X| - t = \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)|X|, \quad (80)$$

⁵We use γ' instead of γ because its value is (slightly) less than the γ in the application of Theorem 1.3.

so we still have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i) \geq d$, since X has ε -robust Freĭman dimension d .

To prove that X_i satisfies the second property in (79), we will show how to select each $x^{(i+1)}$. That is, assume that we have distinct translates $\{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(i)}\}$ such that the set X_i satisfies (79). Since $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i) = d_i \geq d$, there exists a Freĭman isomorphism $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow X'_i$ such that $X'_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ has full rank. If $\gamma' > 2^6 d^{-1/3}$, then we can apply Theorem 1.3 to the set X'_i with $r = d$ and $\gamma = 2^{-6}\gamma'$, to obtain a set $T'_i \subseteq X'_i$ such that

$$|T'_i| \leq \frac{2^6(d+1)}{\gamma'} \quad \text{and} \quad |X'_i + T'_i| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma'}{4}\right) \frac{(d+1)|X'_i|}{2}.$$

Otherwise, we have $\gamma' \leq 2^6 d^{-1/3}$, i.e. $d \leq 2^{18}\gamma'^{-3}$. In this case, we can⁶ apply Theorem 1.4 and obtain $T'_i = \{x_1, \dots, x_C\} \subseteq X'_i$ such that

$$|X'_i + T'_i| \geq (d+1)|X'_i| - 5(d+1)^3 \geq \frac{(d+1)|X'_i|}{2},$$

for some constant $C = C(\gamma')$, since X_i satisfies (80), X is sufficiently large and $d \leq 2^{18}\gamma'^{-3}$. Therefore, it follows that we have a set of translates T'_i of size at most $2^{-6}\gamma'(d+1)/c$ for some constant $c = c(\gamma') > 0$, in either case.

As ϕ_i is a Freĭman isomorphism, we know that the preimage $T_i = \phi_i^{-1}(T'_i)$ satisfies

$$|X_i + T_i| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma'}{4}\right) \frac{(d+1)|X_i|}{2} = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma'}{4}\right) \frac{(d+1)(|X| - i)}{2}$$

and $|T_i| \leq 2^{-6}\gamma'(d+1)/c$. Since $i \leq t = \varepsilon|X|/4 < \gamma'|X|/4$, this is at least

$$|X_i + T_i| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma'}{4}\right)^2 \frac{(d+1)|X|}{2} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma'}{2}\right) \frac{(d+1)|X|}{2}.$$

Recalling our assumption $|Y| \leq (1 - \gamma')(d+1)|X|/2$, it follows that

$$|(X_i + T_i) \setminus Y| \geq |X_i + T_i| - |Y| \geq \frac{\gamma'(d+1)|X|}{4}.$$

Thus, by the pigeonhole principle, there exists $x^{(i+1)} \in T_i$ such that

$$|(X_i + x^{(i+1)}) \setminus Y| \geq \frac{\gamma'(d+1)|X|}{4} \left(\frac{\gamma'(d+1)}{2^6 c}\right)^{-1} > 4c|X|,$$

since $|T_i| \leq 2^{-6}\gamma'(d+1)/c$ and $T_i \subseteq X_i$. Repeating this for each i from 1 to t thus yields the sets X_i and $\{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(t)}\}$ satisfying (79).

Now that we have the sets X_i , note that each $X + x^{(i)}$ contributes $4c|X|$ ordered pairs whose sum are not in Y . This gives us a total of

$$4c|X|t \geq c\varepsilon|X|^2$$

such pairs, because $t = \varepsilon|X|/4$. □

⁶As it is stated, Theorem 1.4 can only be used for $d = d_i$, but that could result in too many translates. To circumvent this issue, we can randomly project the set to \mathbb{R}^d , and apply Theorem 1.4 to the projected set instead, using the randomness to avoid collisions.

8. AN UPPER BOUND FOR THE INDEPENDENCE NUMBER

In this section, we prove the upper bound part of our main result, Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 8.1. *Let n be a prime number and let $p = p(n)$ satisfy $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$. The random Cayley sum graph Γ_p of \mathbb{Z}_n satisfies*

$$\alpha(\Gamma_p) \leq (2 + o(1)) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$$

with high probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Throughout, we fix a small enough $\delta > 0$ and $k = (2 + 4\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$. We will also follow the outline presented in Section 2 and use the notation defined there. Each sub-collection \mathcal{X}_i requires different techniques to bound the probability that $\alpha(\Gamma_p) > k$, so we handle each separately and show all three go to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

8.1. Bounding the probability over choices in \mathcal{X}_1 . A brief recap: in this doubling range, there are far too many choices for $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ for a union bound to work. The key observation is that we do not need to count every such X : if somehow going to a smaller subset $\Lambda \subseteq X$ reduces our choices considerably, this would also be enough, since the event $\{\Lambda \hat{+} \Lambda \subseteq A_p^c\}$ contains $\{X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c\}$. As a matter of fact, we will use this idea twice.

The first time we use this idea is in order to replace each set $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ by a large subset $X' \subseteq X$ whose Freiman dimension is robust in the sense required by Theorem 2.2, our supersaturation result. We build the set X' from X by greedily removing small, “bad” subsets $B \subseteq X$ such that removing them from X reduces its Freiman dimension. Each such removal reduces $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ by at least one, so we finish in at most $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ steps. A step reduces the size of the working set by at most $\varepsilon|X|$, which would already give $|X'| \geq (1 - \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)\varepsilon)|X|$. To get a bound that depends on σ instead of on $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$, we use the following trivial consequence of Freiman’s lemma, Lemma 1.2, which we record for ease of reference later.

Observation 8.2. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $\sigma[X] \leq \sigma$. Then, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X) + 1 \leq 2\sigma$.*

Proof. Let $d = \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$, and take $X' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ of full rank to be the image of X under a Freiman isomorphism ϕ . Applying Freiman’s lemma to X' yields

$$|X' + X'| \geq (d + 1)|X'| - \binom{d + 1}{2}$$

but $|X' + X'| \leq \sigma|X'|$ and $|X'| = |X|$ by our choice of ϕ . Dividing both sides by $|X|$ yields

$$\sigma \geq d + 1 - \frac{d + 1}{2}$$

where we used $|X| \geq d$ to simplify the right-hand side. The proof follows by rearranging. \square

The proof of the following proposition is just formalizing the sketch using Observation 8.2.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $\sigma[X] \leq \sigma$ and let $\varepsilon < 1/2\sigma$. There exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X' \subseteq X$ such that $|X'| > (1 - 2\varepsilon\sigma)|X|$ and X' has ε -robust Freiman dimension d .*

Proof. We start an iterative process with $X_0 = X$ and $i = 0$. While there exists $B \subseteq X_i$ such that

$$|B| \leq \varepsilon|X| \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i \setminus B) < \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i),$$

we define $X_{i+1} = X_i \setminus B$. Let t be the number of steps in this process, and let $X' = X_t$.

First, notice that $t \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ since each step reduces $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_i)$ by at least one. We argue that X' has ε -robust Freiman dimension by considering two cases. If $t < \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$, then X_t has ε -robust Freiman dimension $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X_t)$. Otherwise, we have stopped when $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X') = 1$, and such sets trivially have ε -robust dimension 1.

Since $|X_i| \geq |X| - i\varepsilon|X|$, it follows that

$$|X'| \geq (1 - \varepsilon t)|X| \geq (1 - \varepsilon \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X))|X| > (1 - 2\varepsilon\sigma)|X|,$$

where in the last inequality we used Observation 8.2. □

The second time we employ the idea of going to smaller subsets is when we use the fingerprints given by Theorem 2.1, whose statement we repeat here for convenience.

Theorem 2.1. *Let n be a large enough prime and let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $0 < \gamma < 1/2$, there exists $C = C(\gamma) > 0$ such that the following holds for all $m \geq (d+1)k/2$ and $C/k < \varepsilon < \gamma$. For each d -dimensional generalised arithmetic progression $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$, there exists a collection $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{k,m,\varepsilon}(P)$ of subsets of P satisfying:*

(a) *For every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we have*

$$|F| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{m \log m} \quad \text{and} \quad |F \hat{+} F| \geq \frac{(1-\gamma)(d+1)k}{2}. \quad (6)$$

(b) *For all $X \in \binom{P}{k}$ with $|X \hat{+} X| \leq m$ and ε -robust Freiman dimension d , there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $F \subseteq X$.*

As we remarked in the overview, applying the previous theorem to the (trivial) generalised arithmetic progression \mathbb{Z}_n would result in too many fingerprints. To overcome this, we will use Corollary 8.5 below, which is a simple consequence of the following strengthening of the Green–Ruzsa theorem due to Cwalia and Schoen [12].

Theorem 8.4 (Cwalia and Schoen [12, Theorem 4]). *There exists $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Let G be an Abelian group, and let $X \subseteq G$ be a finite set with $\sigma[X] \leq \kappa$. Either there exists a proper coset progression $P + H$ such that*

$$X \subseteq P + H, \quad \dim(P + H) \leq 2\kappa, \quad \text{and} \quad |P + H| \leq \exp(C\kappa^4(\log(\kappa + 2))^2)|X|$$

or X is fully contained in at most $C\kappa^3(\log \kappa)^2$ cosets, whose total cardinality is bounded by $\exp(C\kappa^4(\log(\kappa + 2))^2)|X|$, of some subgroup of G .

As our group of interest is \mathbb{Z}_n , a proper coset progression $P + H$ is either all of \mathbb{Z}_n , or simply a proper generalised arithmetic progression $P + a = P'$. We can therefore deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 8.5. *There exists $C > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a prime, and let $\kappa \geq 2$. If $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ satisfies*

$$\sigma[X] \leq \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad C\kappa^3(\log \kappa)^2 < |X| < \exp(-C\kappa^4(\log \kappa)^2)n, \quad (81)$$

then there is a proper generalised arithmetic progression $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that

$$X \subseteq P, \quad |P| \leq \exp(C\kappa^4(\log \kappa)^2)|X| \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(P) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X). \quad (82)$$

Proof. As \mathbb{Z}_n contains no non-trivial subgroups when n is a prime, we claim that we cannot obtain the second case when applying Theorem 8.4 to X . None of the cosets obtained in the second outcome can be \mathbb{Z}_n itself, since, by (81), its cardinality alone would exceed $\exp(C\kappa^4(\log(\kappa+2))^2)|X|$. The claim follows by noting that the cosets cannot also all be of the form $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, since their total number is bounded by $C\kappa^3(\log \kappa)^2$, and, by (81), this is insufficient to cover X .

We have shown that we always get the first outcome of Theorem 8.4 under our assumptions, so applying it to X yields a proper coset progression $P' + H \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that

$$X \subseteq P' + H \quad \text{and} \quad |P' + H| \leq \exp(C\kappa^4(\log \kappa)^2)|X|, \quad (83)$$

where we used that $\kappa \geq 2$ to turn $\log(\kappa+2)$ into $\log \kappa$ for a slightly larger value of C . Moreover, $P'' = P' + H$ is actually a proper generalised arithmetic progression, because

$$\exp(C\kappa^4(\log \kappa)^2)|X| < n = |P' + \mathbb{Z}_n|$$

follows from (81), hence H must be a singleton.

Now, let P be the proper generalised arithmetic progression obtained as follows: keep only the differences a_j'' in P'' that have a corresponding $x \in X \cap P''$ such that

$$x = a_0'' + \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(P'')} w_i a_i'' \quad \text{with} \quad w_j'' \neq 0.$$

Observe that P trivially satisfies (83). We furthermore claim that $d = \dim(P) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$. To see this, let

$$P = \left\{ a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d w_i a_i : w_i \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq w_i < \ell_i \right\}$$

and let $\phi : P \rightarrow \phi(P) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ be the function defined by

$$\phi(y) = (w_1^{(y)}, \dots, w_d^{(y)}) \quad \text{where} \quad y = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d w_i^{(y)} a_i.$$

Since P is proper, we know that ϕ is a Freiman isomorphism; this and $X \subseteq P$ imply that so is $\phi|_X : X \rightarrow \phi(X)$. By the definition of P , we have that $\phi(X) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ has full rank, and the bound $d \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(X)$ follows from the definition of Freiman dimension. \square

We are now ready to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_1 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (84)$$

Proof of (84). Recall that $k = (2 + 4\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$, and that for all $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$, we know that $|X| = k$ and $\sigma[X] \leq k^{1/40}$. Fixing $\varepsilon = k^{-1/20}$, we can apply Proposition 8.3 to X with ε and $\sigma = k^{1/40}$ to conclude that every such set contains a X' of size at least

$$|X'| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon\sigma)k \geq (1 - 2k^{-1/40})k \quad (85)$$

with ε -robust Freiman dimension d_X , for some $d_X \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that (85) implies that the doubling of X' is at most 2σ :

$$\sigma[X'] = \frac{|X' + X'|}{|X'|} \leq \frac{|X + X|}{|X'|} \leq 2\sigma, \quad (86)$$

for all sufficiently large k . We fix⁷ one X' for each $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$, and denote by \mathcal{X}'_1 the collection of all such X' .

As we remarked before, $X' \hat{+} X' \subseteq A_p^c$ is implied by $X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c$ for each $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$. Therefore, we have the bound

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_1 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists X' \in \mathcal{X}'_1 : X' \hat{+} X' \subseteq A_p^c).$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{Y}(P)$ be the collection of subsets $Y \subseteq P$ with

$$(1 - 2k^{-1/40})k \leq |Y| \leq k \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma[Y] \leq 2\sigma \quad (87)$$

such that Y has ε -robust Freiman dimension d_Y for some $d_Y \geq \dim(P)$. We claim that we can take another union bound:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X' \in \mathcal{X}'_1 : X' \hat{+} X' \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)} \mathbb{P}(\exists Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P) : Y \hat{+} Y \subseteq A_p^c) \quad (88)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is the collection of generalised arithmetic progressions $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that

$$|P| \leq \exp(k^{1/5}). \quad (89)$$

In order to prove (88), it is enough to show that, for every $X' \in \mathcal{X}'_1$, there exists a generalised arithmetic progression $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ such that $X' \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$; we will do so by applying Corollary 8.5 with $\kappa = 2\sigma$. From this application, we will obtain a generalised arithmetic progression $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ such that

$$\dim(P) \leq \dim_F(X') = d_X \quad \text{and} \quad X' \subseteq P. \quad (90)$$

The property $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ follows from (82), as

$$|P| \leq \exp(C'\sigma^4(\log \sigma)^2)k \leq \exp(C'k^{1/10}(\log k)^2)k \leq \exp(k^{1/5}), \quad (91)$$

where we used that $\sigma = k^{1/40}$ in the second inequality, and in the last one we used that k is sufficiently large. We now confirm that we can apply Corollary 8.5 as we want, by verifying that every $X' \in \mathcal{X}'_1$ satisfies (81). The lower bound holds because

$$|X'| \geq (1 - 2k^{-1/40})k \geq k^{1/10} \geq C'\sigma^3(\log \sigma)^2,$$

⁷Abusing notation to denote such a mapping via the $'$ symbol.

by (85) and using that k is sufficiently large, whereas the upper bound in (81) follows from

$$\exp(C'\sigma^4(\log \sigma)^2)|X'| \leq \exp(k^{1/5}) \leq \exp((\log n)^{2/5}) < n,$$

where we used (91), and that $k \leq (\log n)^2$ and n is sufficiently large.

We now claim that $X' \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$, where $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is the generalised arithmetic progression given by applying Corollary 8.5 to $X' \in \mathcal{X}'_1$. To see this, simply note that the conditions in (87) follow from (85) and (86), and the ε -robust Freiman dimension bound $d_X \geq \dim(P)$ follows from (90) and Proposition 8.3, so this completes the proof of (88).

In order to bound the term in the right-hand side of (88), we analyse the contribution of each fixed $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Notice that if $\mathcal{Y}(P)$ is empty, then the probability term is equal to 0, so we may assume that $\mathcal{Y}(P)$ is non-empty. Rather than directly taking a union bound over choices of $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$, our final union bound is over a collection of fingerprints $\mathcal{F}(P)$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P) : Y \hat{+} Y \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists F \in \mathcal{F}(P) : F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c) \quad (92)$$

$$\leq |\mathcal{F}(P)| \max_{F \in \mathcal{F}(P)} \mathbb{P}(F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c). \quad (93)$$

That is true as long as, for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}(P)$ such that $F \subseteq Y$; again we are using that $F \hat{+} F \subseteq Y \hat{+} Y$. We claim that applying Theorem 2.1 to P with $\gamma = \gamma(\delta)$ (to be determined later) and $m = 2\sigma k$ yields such a collection of fingerprints $\mathcal{F}(P)$.

First, we define a candidate for $\mathcal{F}(P)$ which proves our claim, and later we show that we can construct this candidate. Our candidate for $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(P) = \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)} \mathcal{F}_{|Y|, m, \varepsilon}(P) \quad (94)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{|Y|, m, \varepsilon}(P)$ is the collection of fingerprints given by Theorem 2.1. For $\mathcal{F}(P)$ to prove our claim, we must thus show that, for each $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$, there is a $F \in \mathcal{F}_{|Y|, m, \varepsilon}(P)$ such that $F \subseteq Y$. By property (b) of Theorem 2.1, it suffices for each Y to have ε -robust Freiman dimension $d_Y \geq \dim(P)$ and $|Y + Y| \leq m = 2\sigma k$. These, however, hold for Y by (87), and so we have that $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is a valid candidate of fingerprints for P .

To confirm that we can apply Theorem 2.1 to P as in (94), we need to check that

$$m \geq \frac{|Y|(\dim(P) + 1)}{2} \quad (95)$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$. (95) follows from

$$\frac{|Y|(\dim(P) + 1)}{2} \leq \frac{|Y|(\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(Y) + 1)}{2} \leq |Y + Y| \leq 2\sigma k = m$$

where the first inequality uses that $\dim(P) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(Y)$ by definition of $\mathcal{Y}(P)$, the second inequality relies on Observation 8.2 and the third one on (87). Therefore, (94) is a valid definition for $\mathcal{F}(P)$.

We proceed to give an upper bound to the right-hand side of (93). With the goal of first bounding the size of $\mathcal{F}(P)$, define $\Phi(P) = \max\{|F| : F \in \mathcal{F}(P)\}$ and note that, trivially,

$$|\mathcal{F}(P)| \leq \sum_{q=0}^{\Phi(P)} \binom{|P|}{q} \leq (|P| + 1)^{\Phi(P)}.$$

Since, by (6) in Theorem 2.1, $|F| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{m \log m}$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(P)$, we can use that $m = 2\sigma k$, $\varepsilon = k^{-1/20}$ and $\sigma = k^{1/40}$ to obtain

$$|\mathcal{F}(P)| \leq \exp(2Ck^{3/5} \log |P|) \leq \exp(k^{4/5}) \quad (96)$$

where in the first inequality we used that k is sufficiently large, and in the last we used (91).

To obtain an upper bound on $\mathbb{P}(F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(P)$, we use (6), the lower bound on $|F \hat{+} F|$ given by Theorem 2.1:

$$|F \hat{+} F| \geq \frac{(1 - \gamma)(\dim(P) + 1)}{2} \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)} |Y|.$$

Since $\gamma = \gamma(\delta)$ is a constant and $|Y| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon\sigma)k$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P)$ by (87), we obtain

$$\max_{F \in \mathcal{F}(P)} \mathbb{P}(F \hat{+} F \subseteq A_p^c) \leq (1 - p)^{(1-2\gamma)(\dim(P)+1)k/2}, \quad (97)$$

as k is sufficiently large. Replacing (96) and (97) back into (93) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists Y \in \mathcal{Y}(P) : Y \hat{+} Y \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \exp(k^{4/5})(1 - p)^{(1-2\gamma)(\dim(P)+1)k/2}. \quad (98)$$

This will be our bound for each term in the right-hand side of (88).

Observe that (98) does not depend on the specific choice of P , only on its size and dimension. Recalling that $|P| \leq \exp(k^{1/5}) =: s$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ by (91), we can group terms in the right-hand side of (88) based on $d = \dim(P)$ to deduce that, by (98), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_1 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} s(ns)^{d+1} \exp(k^{4/5})(1 - p)^{(1-2\gamma)(d+1)k/2}, \quad (99)$$

where we have bounded the number of d -dimensional generalised arithmetic progressions in \mathbb{Z}_n with size at most s by $s(ns)^{d+1}$.

It is therefore enough to prove that the right-hand side of (99) goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that, as $k = (2 + 4\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$, we have

$$(1 - p)^{k/2} = n^{-(1+2\delta)},$$

which combined with a suitably small choice of $\gamma = \gamma(\delta)$, implies that

$$n^{d+1}(1 - p)^{(1-2\gamma)(d+1)k/2} = n^{d+1-(1-2\gamma)(1+2\delta)(d+1)} \leq n^{-\delta(d+1)}. \quad (100)$$

The final observation is that it follows from $s = \exp(k^{1/5})$ that there is $1 > \nu > 0$ such that

$$s^{d+2} \exp(k^{4/5}) \leq \exp((d+1)(\log n)^{1-\nu}) \quad (101)$$

since $k \leq 3(\log n)/p$ for $\delta < 1/4$. The value of ν depends on the specific exponent of the $\log n$ term in our choice of p . For instance, $\nu = 0.18$ works for $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$.

Combining (100) with (101), we obtain, for sufficiently large n , the following bound for (99):

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} s(ns)^{d+1} \exp(k^{4/5})(1-p)^{(1-2\gamma)(d+1)k/2} \leq \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} n^{-\delta d/2}$$

which goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as we wanted to show. \square

8.2. Bounding the probability over choices in \mathcal{X}_2 . Our goal is to show that the term corresponding to choices in \mathcal{X}_2 tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We emphasize that, in this section, no new ideas, or even modification of previous, existing results, are needed. We just need to use the following result of Green [17].

Proposition 8.6 ([17], see [18, Proposition 6.1]). *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq 2k - 1$, there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with*

$$r \leq \min\{4m/k, k\} \quad \text{and} \quad r \leq \frac{2m}{k} + \frac{1}{k} \binom{r}{2}, \quad (102)$$

such that

$$|\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)}| \leq n^r k^{4k}, \quad (103)$$

where $\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)} = \{X \in \mathcal{X}_2 : |X \hat{+} X| = m\}$.

With Proposition 8.6, we can take a union bound over each $X \in \mathcal{X}_2$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_2 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \sum_{m=k^{1+1/40}}^{\delta k^2/10} |\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)}| (1-p)^m \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (104)$$

and we prove the last step below.

Proof of (104). First, we bound the r in Proposition 8.6 using (102):

$$r \leq \frac{2m}{k} + \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{4m}{k} \right)^2 \leq \frac{m}{k} (2 + 2\delta)$$

since sets $X \in \mathcal{X}_2^{(m)} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_2$ satisfy $m/k = \sigma[X] \leq \delta k/10$. Now, applying Proposition 8.6 to each $\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)}$, we obtain that

$$|\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)}| \leq n^r k^{4k} \leq n^{(2+2\delta)m/k + (\log n)^{1/50} \log \log n} \quad (105)$$

and the last inequality follows from $k \leq (\log n)^{51/50}$, which is implied by $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$.

Notice that it follows from $k = (2 + 4\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$ that

$$(1-p)^m = n^{-(2+4\delta)m/k}. \quad (106)$$

Together with (105) and the fact that $m/k = \sigma[X] \geq k^{1/40} \geq (\log n)^{1/40}$, (106) yields

$$|\mathcal{X}_2^{(m)}| (1-p)^m \leq n^{-\delta m/k}$$

from which the result follows by summing over all $k^{1+1/40} \leq m \leq \delta k^2/10$. \square

8.3. **Bounding the probability over choices in \mathcal{X}_3 .** Similarly to the previous case, we start with a union bound

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists X \in \mathcal{X}_3 : X \hat{+} X \subseteq A_p^c) \leq \sum_{m=\delta k^2/10}^{k^2} |\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| (1-p)^m, \quad (107)$$

letting $\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}$ be the sub-collection of \mathcal{X}_3 consisting of subsets $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $|X \hat{+} X| = m$. We will need the following slight strengthening of Proposition 5.1 of [18], here stated in a way that matches our notation:

Proposition 8.7. *Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small and let $\eta > 0$. If $k \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta}$ and $m \geq \delta k^2/10$, then*

$$|\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| \leq n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k},$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)} = \{X \in \mathcal{X}_3 : |X \hat{+} X| = m\}$.

The proof of Proposition 8.7 is the same as the one given in [18]; we only optimize constants and exponents. Therefore, we defer its presentation to Appendix A.

Proof that (107) $\rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that

$$k \leq \frac{3 \log n}{p} \leq (\log n)^{41/40} \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta},$$

by our choice of $p \geq (\log n)^{-1/80}$. Hence, we can apply Proposition 8.7 to bound, for every $m \geq \delta k^2/10$, the size of $\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}$ by

$$|\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| \leq n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k} \leq n^{(2+2\delta)m/k}$$

where the last inequality holds for large k . We can bound each term of (107) by:

$$|\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| (1-p)^m \leq n^{(2+2\delta)m/k} n^{-(2-4\delta)m/k} \leq n^{-\delta m/k}.$$

Summing over $m \geq \delta k^2/10$ yields the desired result. \square

9. THE LOWER BOUND

In this section, we prove the lower bound in Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 9.1. *Let n be a prime number and let $p = p(n)$ satisfy $1/2 \geq p \geq n^{-o(1)}$. The random Cayley sum graph Γ_p of \mathbb{Z}_n satisfies*

$$\alpha(\Gamma_p) \geq (2 + o(1)) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$$

with high probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of this result is significantly easier than the upper bound. In fact, using only the pseudorandom properties of Γ_p is enough to obtain $\alpha(\Gamma_p) \geq (1/2 + o(1))(\log n)/p$ (see [1] and [2, Corollary 2.2]). To improve the leading constant to 2, we use both the randomness (as opposed to only the pseudorandomness) and the fact that we can restrict our attention to any sub-collection of potential independent sets in Γ_p .

More precisely, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define Z_k to be the random variable counting all independent k -sets in Γ_p with maximal doubling, that is

$$Z_k = |\{X \in \mathcal{Z}_k : X \hat{+} X \subset A_p^c\}| \quad (108)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Z}_k = \left\{ X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n : |X| = k, |X \hat{+} X| = \binom{k}{2} \right\}. \quad (109)$$

If $Z_k > 0$, then $\alpha(\Gamma_p) \geq k$ regardless of the potential independent k -sets that Z_k overlooks.

In order to prove the lower bound, it is enough to show that $\text{Var}(Z_k) = o(\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2)$ since

$$\mathbb{P}(\alpha(\Gamma_p) \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z_k > 0) \geq 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(Z_k)}{\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2},$$

by Chebyshev's inequality. The first step is to estimate $\mathbb{E}[Z_k]$, which we do by showing that \mathcal{Z}_k is large and using linearity of expectation.

Lemma 9.2. *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k = o(n^{1/4})$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{Z}_k| = (1 - o(1)) \binom{n}{k}.$$

Proof. We will (equivalently) show that almost all $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $|X| = k$ satisfy $|X \hat{+} X| = \binom{k}{2}$. Observe that if $|X \hat{+} X| < \binom{k}{2}$, then there are distinct $x_1, x_2, x'_1, x'_2 \in X$ such that

$$x_1 + x_2 = x'_1 + x'_2.$$

Motivated by that observation, define

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{ \{x_1, x_2, x'_1, x'_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n : x_1 + x_2 = x'_1 + x'_2, \text{ and } x_1, x_2, x'_1, x'_2 \text{ are distinct} \},$$

and let Y be a uniformly random k -set in \mathbb{Z}_n . Taking a union bound over \mathcal{Q} yields

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \notin \mathcal{Z}_k) \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{P}(Q \subseteq Y) \leq n^3 \left(\frac{k}{n} \right)^4 = \frac{k^4}{n},$$

where the second inequality is due to the choices of x_1, x_2 and x'_1 determining $x'_2 = x_1 + x_2 - x'_1$ for $\{x_1, x_2, x'_1, x'_2\} \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since $k = o(n^{1/4})$, the lemma follows. \square

The second lemma that we need to prove Theorem 9.1 gives a bound on $\text{Var}(Z_k)$.

Lemma 9.3. *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p = p(n) \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\text{Var}(Z_k) \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_k] + \binom{n}{k} \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2}-ks/2}.$$

The main step in the proof of Lemma 9.3 is to show, for every $X \in \mathcal{Z}_k$, that

$$\sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k \\ Y \sim X}} (1-p)^{|(X \hat{+} X) \cup (Y \hat{+} Y)|} \leq \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2}-ks/2} \quad (110)$$

where $Y \sim X$ if

$$Y \neq X \quad \text{and} \quad (X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y) \neq \emptyset. \quad (111)$$

In order to do that, define

$$\mathcal{I}(X, Y) = \{Y' \subseteq Y : (X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y' \hat{+} Y') = \emptyset\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}^*(X, Y) = \{Y' \in \mathcal{I}(X, Y) : (y + Y') \cap (X \hat{+} X) \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } y \in Y \setminus Y'\}. \quad (112)$$

The definition of $\mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$ is motivated by the following lemma, which gives an upper bound on $|(X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y)|$:

Lemma 9.4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X, Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k$. If $Y \sim X$, then*

$$|(X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y)| \leq \frac{k(k-t)}{2}, \quad (113)$$

where $t = \min \{|Y'| : Y' \in \mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)\}$.

To prove Lemma 9.4, we will need the following simple observation about graphs.

Observation 9.5. *Let G be a graph with k vertices. If all maximal independent sets of G have at least t vertices, then G has at most $k(k-t)/2$ edges.*

Proof. Take $v \in V(G)$ to be a vertex of maximum degree, and $I_v \subseteq V(G)$ to be a maximal independent set containing v . Then,

$$t \leq |I_v| \leq k - d(v) = k - \Delta(G).$$

Thus, $\Delta(G) \leq k - t$, and the claimed bound follows. \square

To deduce Lemma 9.4, we will apply Observation 9.5 to $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$, the Cayley sum graph over $X \hat{+} X$ restricted to the vertex set Y .

Proof of Lemma 9.4. We claim that

$$|(X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y)| = e(\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]), \quad (114)$$

which not only implies that the collection $\mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$ is exactly the collection of maximal independent sets in $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$, but also reduces the proof to applying Observation 9.5 with t to $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$. Therefore, we first establish (114), and then the characterization of $\mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$.

To show (114), recall that, by the definition of the Cayley sum graph, $y_1 y_2 \in \binom{Y}{2}$ is an edge of $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$ if and only if $y_1 + y_2 \in X \hat{+} X$. We obtain equality by observing that each sum in $Y \hat{+} Y$ corresponds to exactly one pair $y_1 y_2 \in \binom{Y}{2}$, since $|Y \hat{+} Y| = \binom{k}{2}$ by $Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k$.

It follows from (114) that $\mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ corresponds to independent sets in $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$. Moreover, for every $Y^* \in \mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$, we know that there are no $Y' \in \mathcal{I}(X, Y)$ such that $Y^* \subsetneq Y'$ by the condition in (112). Our definition of t then corresponds to all maximal independent sets in $\Gamma_{X \hat{+} X}[Y]$ having at least t vertices, so we can apply Observation 9.5 as desired. \square

With Lemma 9.4 in hand, the proof of (110) now relies on an efficient count of $Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ with $Y \sim X$, for each fixed $X \in \mathcal{Z}_k$. Notice that $\mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$ is not empty, as every graph has at least one maximal independent set, so we can fix a set $Y^* \in \mathcal{I}^*(X, Y)$ of minimum size. Our counting strategy is to consider the choices for elements in Y^* and then the choices for $Y \setminus Y^*$; in fact, a trivial count of all sets $Y^* \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ suffices, so we only need to count the possible elements in $Y \setminus Y^*$ efficiently.

In order to bound the choices for $Y \setminus Y^*$, notice that for every $y \in Y \setminus Y^*$, we have $(y + Y^*) \cap (X \hat{+} X) \neq \emptyset$ by (112). It follows that there are $y^* \in Y^*$ and distinct $x_1, x_2 \in X$ such that $y + y^* = x_1 + x_2$, or, equivalently,

$$Y \setminus Y^* \subseteq X \hat{+} X - Y^*.$$

We can therefore choose the elements of $Y \setminus Y^*$ from a set of size at most

$$|X \hat{+} X - Y^*| \leq |X|^2 |Y^*| \leq k^3,$$

so there are at most k^{3s} choices for $Y \setminus Y^*$ if $s = |Y \setminus Y^*|$. Bounding the number of choices for Y^* by $\binom{n}{k-s}$ yields the bound in (110), except for the $(1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2}-ks/2}$ term, which we obtain by using Lemma 9.4.

We now have all the ingredients to prove Lemma 9.3.

Proof of Lemma 9.3. Observe that, via standard calculations, we have that

$$\text{Var}(Z_k) \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_k] + \sum_{X \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k \\ Y \sim X}} (1-p)^{|(X \hat{+} X) \cup (Y \hat{+} Y)|}, \quad (115)$$

where, recall, $Y \sim X$ was defined in (111). We therefore need to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k \\ Y \sim X}} (1-p)^{|(X \hat{+} X) \cup (Y \hat{+} Y)|} \leq \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2}-ks/2} \quad (116)$$

for each $X \in \mathcal{Z}_k$.

To prove (116), fix $X \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ and, for each $Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ with $Y \sim X$, choose a set $Y^* = Y^*(X, Y)$ of minimum size. If we group the sets Y by the size of their corresponding Y^* , we can count them by first enumerating the choices for Y^* and then the choices for $Y \setminus Y^*$. For fixed $s = |Y \setminus Y^*| = k - |Y^*|$, there are at most $\binom{n}{k-s}$ choices for Y^* , and there are at most k^{3s} choices for $Y \setminus Y^*$ since $Y \setminus Y^* \subseteq X \hat{+} X - Y^*$.

We then bound the size of the union in (116) by applying Lemma 9.4 to the pair (X, Y)

$$|(X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y)| \leq \frac{ks}{2}$$

which means that we can ignore the case $s = 0$ because it would contradict $Y \sim X$. A trivial inclusion-exclusion now yields the bound we need for the size of the union:

$$|(X \hat{+} X) \cup (Y \hat{+} Y)| = 2\binom{k}{2} - |(X \hat{+} X) \cap (Y \hat{+} Y)| \geq 2\binom{k}{2} - \frac{ks}{2}. \quad (117)$$

Replacing (117) and the above count of Y for fixed s into the left-hand side of (116) gives

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{Z}_k \\ Y \sim X}} (1-p)^{|(X \dot{\cup} X) \cup (Y \dot{\cup} Y)|} \leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2} - ks/2}.$$

Trivially bounding the number of choices for $X \in \mathcal{Z}_k$ by $\binom{n}{k}$ and plugging the result into (115) completes the proof. \square

With Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3, the proof of Theorem 9.1 is just checking that the bounds match those of the statement.

Proof of Theorem 9.1. Fix $p = p(n)$ satisfying $1/2 \geq p \geq n^{-\delta/8}$ for some $\delta > 0$, and let $k = (2 - 2\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$. It suffices to show that

$$\frac{\text{Var}(Z_k)}{\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (118)$$

First, we compute the expected value of Z_k using Lemma 9.2 and linearity of expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_k] = (1 - o(1)) \binom{n}{k} (1-p)^{\binom{k}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{k} n^{-(1-\delta)\binom{k-1}{2}} \rightarrow \infty \quad (119)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by our choice of k . Now, if we assume that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_k] \geq \binom{n}{k} \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2} - ks/2}, \quad (120)$$

then, by Lemma 9.3, we have $\text{Var}(Z_k) \leq 2\mathbb{E}[Z_k]$ and

$$\frac{\text{Var}(Z_k)}{\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2} \leq \frac{2}{\mathbb{E}[Z_k]} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

by (119). We therefore assume that the converse of (120) holds.

Before we proceed, observe that applying the standard binomial inequality

$$\binom{n}{k-s} \leq \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^s \binom{n}{k}$$

to the right-hand side of (120) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \binom{n}{k-s} (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2} - ks/2} &\leq \binom{n}{k}^2 (1-p)^{2\binom{k}{2}} \sum_{s=1}^k k^{3s} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^s (1-p)^{-ks/2} \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2 \sum_{s=1}^k \left(\frac{k^4}{n^\delta}\right)^s, \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

where in the last inequality we used (119) with n sufficiently large and also

$$(1-p)^{-ks/2} = n^{(1-\delta)s}$$

because $k = (2 - 2\delta) \log_{\frac{1}{1-p}} n$.

By Lemma 9.3, our assumption that the converse of (120) holds, and (121), we have

$$\text{Var}(Z_k) \leq 8\mathbb{E}[Z_k]^2 \sum_{s=1}^k \left(\frac{k^4}{n^\delta}\right)^s. \quad (122)$$

Replacing (122) into (118), we conclude that the proof is complete if we show that

$$\sum_{s=1}^k \left(\frac{k^4}{n^\delta}\right)^s \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This is easily seen to be true when $k = o(n^{\delta/4})$, which holds for our choice of $p \geq n^{-\delta/8}$. \square

10. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The most important open question left by our work is extending the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 to p as small as possible. However, already when $p \leq (\log n)^{-1}$, there is an obstacle that prevents any approach similar to ours from working. To understand the barrier, consider the following approximate summary of our strategy. We find a family $\mathcal{S} = \{F(X) + F(X) : X \in \binom{\mathbb{Z}_n}{k}\}$ of subsets of \mathbb{Z}_n of size s (for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$) with the following two properties:

- (1) For each set $X \in \binom{\mathbb{Z}_n}{k}$, there exists $S \in \mathcal{S}$ with $S \subseteq X + X$.
- (2) The family is small, that is, $|\mathcal{S}| \leq (1-p)^{-s}$.

Observe that each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is of the form $F(X) + F(X)$ and has size s , so we must trivially have $|F(X)| \geq \sqrt{s}$ for all $X \in \binom{\mathbb{Z}_n}{k}$. Naively counting every set $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $|F| = \sqrt{s}$ when bounding the size of \mathcal{S} , we obtain

$$|\mathcal{S}| \geq \binom{n}{\sqrt{s}} \approx \exp(\sqrt{s} \log n). \quad (123)$$

In our proof, we show that we can choose F inside a small generalised arithmetic progression P , thus replacing the $\log n$ term in (123) with $\log |P|$. However, even if we could find such a set P with $|P| = O(\sqrt{s})$, we could not improve the bound in (123) beyond $\exp(\sqrt{s})$.

Combining this lower bound on the size of \mathcal{S} with the upper bound that we require in property (2) gives

$$\exp(\sqrt{s}) \leq |\mathcal{S}| \leq (1-p)^{-s},$$

which implies that $s \geq p^{-2}$. Now, consider any $X \in \binom{\mathbb{Z}_n}{k}$ with $\sigma[X] = O(1)$: the corresponding set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies $S \subseteq X + X$ and therefore

$$p^{-2} \leq s = |S| \leq |X + X| \leq O(k).$$

As k is the upper bound we are trying to prove for $\alpha(\Gamma_p)$, it follows that the best we can hope for this approach is, for some constant $C > 2$,

$$\alpha(\Gamma_p) \leq C \max\{p^{-2}, p^{-1} \log n\}, \quad (124)$$

where the second term in the maximum is the lower bound that we proved in Section 9.

While (124) would still be far from what we believe is true for p much smaller than $(\log n)^{-1}$, proving it would still be very interesting; even if we optimized our approach, we could not get close to proving (124) for all $p \geq (\log n)^{-1}$.

Improving the upper bound is related to the following problem due to Shachar Lovett: is there a list of $2^{n^{o(1)}}$ subsets of \mathbb{F}_2^n with density at least $1/100$ such that, whenever $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ has density at least $1/3$, $X + X$ contains one of these sets? This question is relevant because we can embed sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $\sigma[X] = O(1)$ as dense subsets of an Abelian group using Ruzsa’s model lemma. Now, if the positive answer to this problem does not rely too much on the details of the setting (the structure of \mathbb{F}_2^n and the particular densities of the subsets) and a similar list exists for any Abelian group, then we could take a union bound over its elements and hope to circumvent (124) in the bounded doubling setting.

We would also like to highlight that for very small p , close to $n^{-1} \log n$, upper and lower bounds for $\alpha(\Gamma_p)$ follow from a theorem of Bourgain [8]; this is the only other result that we are aware of in the regime $p = o(1)$. Another way to obtain an upper bound in this range is as follows: observe that the first eigenvalue of Γ_p is highly concentrated around np , and that we can use elementary Fourier analysis to show that its second eigenvalue is, with high probability, at most $O(\sqrt{np \log n})$ (see, for example, [1, Sections 3.1 and 3.2]). Using Hoffman’s ratio bound, we then obtain

$$\alpha(\Gamma_p) \leq \left(\frac{Cn \log n}{p} \right)^{1/2},$$

which matches $\alpha(G(n, p))$ up to a logarithmic factor if $p \approx n^{-1} \log n$.

Another interesting open question is to improve the bounds on Freĭman’s lemma via few translates. One possibility is to attempt to reduce the d^3 error term obtained by Jing and Mudgal [22] in Theorem 1.4, which is the best known result if we require the error term to depend only on the dimension of the set.

A different avenue which we believe is worth pursuing is to determine the minimum number of translates necessary to obtain the correct leading constant of $d + 1$. This is closely related to the question asked (and partially settled) by Bollobás, Leader, and Tiba [6] on whether three translates suffice to obtain the Cauchy–Davenport lower bound for two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$. Even though their question was recently resolved by Fox, Luo, Pham, and Zhou [13] in the affirmative, it is not clear what is the truth in higher dimensions, even in the simpler case of $A = B$. We conjecture the following:

Conjecture 10.1. *There exists $C > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and all finite sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of full rank, X contains a subset T such that $|T| \leq Cd$ and*

$$|X + T| \geq (d + 1)|X| - d^C. \tag{125}$$

The best negative result we have for this problem is given by the following simple construction. Let $d \geq 3$, and let $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Consider

$$X = P + \{0, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}\} \quad \text{where} \quad P = \{0, e_d, 2e_d, \dots, ke_d\}$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It is not hard to show that the following holds for this example: for every $\gamma > 0$, there is $c = c(\gamma) > 0$ such that if $T \subseteq X$ with $|T| < (2 - \gamma)d$, then

$$|X + T| \leq (1 - c)(d + 1)|X|.$$

Theorem 1.3 is actually not the best result that we know towards Conjecture 10.1. While we were finishing the writing of this paper, Gowers, Green, Manners, and Tao [16] made a breakthrough and proved Marton’s conjecture, also known as the Polynomial Freïman–Ruzsa conjecture for finite fields. In a previous work, Green, Manners, and Tao [20, Corollary 1.12] proved that a positive answer to Marton’s conjecture would imply what is known as the “weak” Polynomial Freïman–Ruzsa conjecture for \mathbb{Z}^d : for every $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\sigma[X] \leq \sigma$, there exists $X' \subseteq X$ such that

$$\text{rank}(X') \leq C \log \sigma \quad \text{and} \quad |X'| \geq \sigma^{-C}|X|$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

Combining this weak version of PFR in \mathbb{Z}^d with a variation of the argument we developed in Section 6, we can prove a version of Theorem 1.3 that attains a bound of the form $|X + T| \geq (d + 1 - O(\log d))|X|$ at the cost of d^C translates, for $C > 0$ an absolute constant. We develop these ideas in a separate work, dedicated to answering a question of Green and Morris [18] about the number of subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with prescribed doubling, where we require that both the number of translates is a polynomial in d , and the leading constant is at least $1 - o(1)$. Nonetheless, we think that Conjecture 10.1 should not depend on results as deep as variants of PFR.

The final future research direction we would like to highlight is the extension of our result to other groups. During the preparation of this paper, it came to our knowledge that Conlon, Fox, Pham, and Yepremyan [11] proved an upper bound of $O(\log N \log \log N)$ for the clique/independence number in the uniform random Cayley graph of any group G , where N is the order of G . As there are some groups, like \mathbb{F}_2^n , where this is tight up to the constant factor, their result can be seen as a generalization of Green’s theorem [17] about $\alpha(\Gamma_{1/2})$.

Moreover, over certain groups, like \mathbb{F}_3^n , they can show that there exist Cayley graphs which have both clique and independence number $(2 + o(1)) \log N$, even though a uniform random Cayley graph has clique number $O(\log N \log \log N)$. It would be interesting if our methods, combined with their techniques, can extend these results to sparser graphs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to greatly thank Rob Morris for carefully reading the paper, detecting mistakes and suggesting improvements and corrections. Without his support, this work would not have its current form. We would also like to thank Lucas Aragão for helpful discussions, and David Conlon, Huy Tuan Pham and Shachar Lovett for comments on the manuscript.

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, Brasil (CAPES).

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon. Large sets in finite fields are sumsets. *J. Number Theory*, 126(1):110–118, 2007.
- [2] N. Alon, M. Krivelevich, and B. Sudakov. List coloring of random and pseudo-random graphs. *Combinatorica*, 19(4):453–472, 1999.
- [3] M. L. Balinski. On the graph structure of convex polyhedra in n -space. *Pacific J. Math.*, 11:431–434, 1961.
- [4] B. Bollobás. *Random graphs*. Academic Press, Inc., London, 1985.
- [5] B. Bollobás and I. Leader. Compressions and isoperimetric inequalities. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 56(1):47–62, 1991.
- [6] B. Bollobás, I. Leader, and M. Tiba. Large sumsets from small subsets, 2022. arXiv:2204.07559.
- [7] B. Bollobás, I. Leader, and M. Tiba. Large sumsets from medium-sized subsets, 2022. arXiv:2206.09366.
- [8] J. Bourgain. Ruzsa’s problem on sets of recurrence. *Israel J. Math.*, 59(2):150–166, 1987.
- [9] M. Campos. On the number of sets with a given doubling constant. *Israel J. Math.*, 236(2):711–726, 2020.
- [10] M. Chang. A polynomial bound in Freiman’s theorem. *Duke Math. J.*, 113(3):399–419, 2002.
- [11] D. Conlon, J. Fox, H. T. Pham, and L. Yepremyan. On the clique number of random Cayley graphs and related topics. Manuscript.
- [12] K. Cwalina and T. Schoen. A linear bound on the dimension in Green–Ruzsa’s theorem. *J. Number Theory*, 133:1262–1269, 2013.
- [13] J. Fox, S. Luo, H. T. Pham, and Y. Zhou. Small subsets with large sumset: Beyond the Cauchy–Davenport bound. *Comb. Probab. Comput.*, pages 1–21, 2024.
- [14] G. A. Freĭman. The addition of finite sets. I. *Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika*, (6):202–213, 1959.
- [15] G. A. Freĭman. Structure theory of set addition. *Astérisque*, (258):xi, 1–33, 1999.
- [16] W. T. Gowers, B. Green, F. Manners, and T. Tao. On a conjecture of Marton, 2023. arXiv:2311.05762.
- [17] B. Green. Counting sets with small sumset, and the clique number of random Cayley graphs. *Combinatorica*, 25(3):307–326, 2005.
- [18] B. Green and R. Morris. Counting sets with small sumset and applications. *Combinatorica*, 36(2):129–159, 2016.
- [19] B. Green and T. Tao. Compressions, convex geometry and the Freiman-Bilu theorem. *Q. J. Math.*, 57(4):495–504, 2006.
- [20] B. Green, F. Manners, and T. Tao. Sumsets and entropy revisited, 2023. arXiv:2306.13403.
- [21] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random graphs*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000.
- [22] Y. Jing and A. Mudgal. Kemperman’s inequality and Freiman’s lemma via few translates, 2023. arXiv:2307.03066.
- [23] R. Morris, W. Samotij, and D. Saxton. An asymmetric container lemma and the structure of graphs with no induced 4-cycle. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 26(5):1655–1711, 2024.
- [24] T. Sanders. The structure theory of set addition revisited. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, 50(1):93–127, 2013.
- [25] T. Schoen. Near optimal bounds in Freiman’s theorem. *Duke Math. J.*, 158(1):1–12, 2011.
- [26] X. Shao. On an almost all version of the Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers theorem. *Discrete Anal.*, 2019. Paper No. 12, 18.
- [27] T. Tao and V. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [28] D. L. Wang and P. Wang. Discrete isoperimetric problems. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 32(4):860–870, 1977.

APPENDIX A. COUNTING SETS WITH LARGE DOUBLING

Recall that n is a large prime and that we are dealing with sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ of size k . We restate the result which we aim to prove for the reader's convenience:

Proposition 8.7. *Let $\delta > 0$ be sufficiently small and let $\eta > 0$. If $k \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta}$ and $m \geq \delta k^2/10$, then*

$$|\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| \leq n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k},$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)} = \{X \in \mathcal{X}_3 : |X \hat{+} X| = m\}$.

The proof of Proposition 8.7 is essentially identical to that of [18, Proposition 5.1], and to obtain the statement above we only need to optimize the dependencies between the parameters. Before proceeding, we recall a key definition from [18]:

Definition A.1. *A set $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ is M -dissociated if $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i x_i \neq 0$ for every $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i| \leq M$.*

It is useful to understand this notion as an analogue of linear independence for elements of \mathbb{Z}_n taking coefficients in \mathbb{Z} , with a restriction on the sum of their magnitudes. The first result that we need to optimize is Lemma A.2, a slight strengthening of [18, Lemma 5.3].

Lemma A.2. *For every sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, the following holds. Fix a large prime n and $M = (\log n)/(\log \log n)^4$. If $k \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta}$ and $m \geq \delta k^2/10$, then any M -dissociated subset of $X \in \mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}$ has size at most $(2 + \delta + o(1))m/k$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

We will begin by giving an overview of the proof from [18], alongside some useful definitions of our own. Whenever there is $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i x_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i| \leq M$, we will say that x is in the M -span of $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$. In that same situation, we will say that x can be written as an M -bounded combination of $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$.

The proof starts by fixing the value of $M = (\log n)/(\log \log n)^4$ and any M -dissociated set $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\} \subseteq X$. We define G' to be the graph with vertex set \mathbb{Z}_n and edges between a pair of vertices if their difference can be written as $\pm x_i \pm x_j$ for some $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. The graph G' is useful because of the following observation:

Observation A.3. *For each $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, let $V_a \subseteq V(G')$ denote its connected component in G' . Every element $b \in V_a$ can be expressed as $b = a + \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j x_j$ with $\sum_{j=1}^d |\lambda_j| \leq 2 \text{diam}(V_a)$.*

Proof. Take $b \in V_a$, and consider any shortest path P connecting a to b in G' . Observe that

$$b - a = \sum_{j=1}^d (\lambda_j^+ - \lambda_j^-) x_j$$

where λ_j^+, λ_j^- count respectively the number of times $x_j, -x_j$ appear as terms in P . Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^d (|\lambda_j^+| + |\lambda_j^-|) \leq 2|P| \leq 2 \text{diam}(V_a)$$

where the last step follows from P being a shortest path in V_a . □

Having thus related the span of D with the diameter of connected components in G' , we will decompose $G = G'[X]$ using the following lemma, also from [18], with $\Delta = k^{1/2} \log k$:

Lemma A.4 ([18, Lemma 5.4]). *Let G be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and let $\Delta > 1$. There exists a partition $V(G) = X_* \cup X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_t$ such that*

- (1) $|X_*| \leq 32(v(G)/\Delta)^2$.
- (2) $e(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for every $i \neq j$.
- (3) The diameter of $G[X_i]$ is at most Δ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$.

Applying Lemma A.4 to G yields a partition $X = X_* \cup X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_t$ such that

- (i) if $X_i \neq X_j$, then $X_i + D$ and $X_j + D$ are disjoint, and
- (ii) every X_i has a $y_i \in X_i$ such that $X_i - y_i$ is contained in the 2Δ -span of D .

To see that property (i) holds, notice that if $X_i + D$ and $X_j + D$ intersect, then there is an edge of G connecting X_i and X_j , contradicting item (2) of Lemma A.4. Property (ii), on the other hand, follows directly from an application of Observation A.3 to X_i , the diameter of which is bounded by item (3) in Lemma A.4.

To combine these two properties into a proof of Lemma A.2, notice that the disjointness given by property (i) yields a lower bound for $X + X$ in terms of each X_i :

$$|X + X| \geq \sum_i |X_i + D|.$$

We now want a lower bound for each $|X_i + D|$ in terms of d . Towards that goal, we will define, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, a Freĭman isomorphism $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow X'_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$. Each will map (a translate of) D to a structured set, where structured only means that we have a lower bound for its sumset with any sufficiently small set. These isomorphisms are naturally defined by the 2Δ -bounded decomposition of $X_i - y_i$ given by property (ii).

Observation A.5. *The function $\phi_i : X_i \rightarrow X'_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ defined by $\phi_i(x) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, where $x - y_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j x_j$ is a 2Δ -bounded decomposition of $x - y_i$, is a Freĭman isomorphism.*

Proof. The fact that $\phi^{-1} : X'_i \rightarrow X_i$ is a Freĭman homomorphism follows from its linearity, so we focus on the other direction of the implication. Take $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in X_i$ such that

$$a_1 + a_2 = a_3 + a_4, \tag{126}$$

and we want to show that $\phi_i(a_1) + \phi_i(a_2) = \phi_i(a_3) + \phi_i(a_4)$. For $\ell \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, write

$$a_\ell - y_i = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lambda_i^{(\ell)}, \tag{127}$$

a 2Δ -bounded combination of D . We now replace (127) in (126) and rearrange to obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^d x_j (\lambda_j^{(1)} + \lambda_j^{(2)} - \lambda_j^{(3)} - \lambda_j^{(4)}) = 0.$$

Using the fact that each (127) is 2Δ -bounded yields, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^4 \sum_{j=1}^d |\lambda_j^{(\ell)}| \leq 4(2\Delta) \leq 8k^{1/2} \log k \leq (\log n)^{1-\eta/3} \leq M,$$

where the inequalities follow by the definitions/assumptions which we now recall

$$\Delta = k^{1/2} \log k, \quad k \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad M = (\log n)/(\log \log n)^4.$$

However, D is M -dissociated, so we conclude that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$(\lambda_j^{(1)} + \lambda_j^{(2)}) - (\lambda_j^{(3)} + \lambda_j^{(4)}) = 0,$$

which, by the definition of ϕ_i , is just another way to write $\phi_i(a_1) + \phi_i(a_2) = \phi_i(a_3) + \phi_i(a_4)$. \square

Observe that $\phi_i(D + y_i) = \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$, where $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ is the canonical basis of \mathbb{Z}^d . Hence, to obtain a lower bound for the size of $X_i + D$ in terms of d and complete the proof of Lemma A.2, we will bound $|\phi_i(X_i) + \phi_i(D + y_i)|$ using the isoperimetric inequality of Wang and Wang [28], as stated in [18] (see also [5]).

Proposition A.6 ([28], see [18, “The Isoperimetric Inequality”]). *For every $\gamma > 0$ and $C > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\gamma, C)$ such that the following holds for every $d \geq d_0$. If $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a set of size at most Cd , then*

$$|S + \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \gamma\right) d|S|.$$

Proof of Lemma A.2. Fix $X \in \mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}$ and let $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ be any M -dissociated subset of X . Towards our aim of showing that $|D| = d \leq (2 + \delta + o(1))m/k$, recall the definition of the graph G' : its vertices are \mathbb{Z}_n and there are edges between vertices $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ only when some of $\pm(a - b)$ can be written as either $x_i - x_j$ or $x_i + x_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

We apply Lemma A.4 to $G = G'[X]$ with $\Delta = k^{1/2} \log k$ and obtain $X_* \cup X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_t$, a partition of X such that $e(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$,

$$\text{diam}(G[X_i]) \leq k^{1/2} \log k \tag{128}$$

and

$$|X_*| \leq 32 \left(\frac{k}{k^{1/2} \log k}\right)^2 = o(k). \tag{129}$$

In order to obtain a lower bound for $X + X$, we use property (i) of G to show that

$$|X + X| \geq \sum_{i=1}^t |X_i + D|. \tag{130}$$

Now, we define, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, the function ϕ_i ; by property (ii) and Observation A.5, we have that ϕ_i is a Freïman isomorphism from X_i to $X'_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$. By the definition of Freïman isomorphisms, we obtain

$$|X_i + D| = |X_i + (D + y_i)| = |X'_i + \phi_i(D + y_i)|. \tag{131}$$

Recall that the definition of ϕ_i implies that $\phi_i(D + y_i) = \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$. Hence, to apply Proposition A.6 to the right-hand side of (131), we need to bound $|X'_i|$ in terms of d and show that d is sufficiently large. We will show both of these by observing that if $k > 10d/\delta$, then we are already done, since

$$d \leq \frac{\delta k}{10} \leq \frac{m}{k} \leq (2 + \delta + o(1)) \frac{m}{k},$$

which is what we wanted to show. We can therefore assume that $d \geq \delta k/10$, which simultaneously implies that d is large when $k \rightarrow \infty$, and that $|X'_i| \leq k \leq 10d/\delta$. Applying Proposition A.6 to X'_i with $\gamma = \delta^2$ and $C = 10/\delta$, we obtain

$$|X'_i + \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta^2\right) d |X'_i| \quad (132)$$

for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$.

Replacing (132) in (130), and using (131), we conclude that

$$|X + X| \geq d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta^2\right) \sum_{i=1}^t |X'_i|.$$

Thus, using the fact that $|X'_i| = |X_i|$, which follows from each ϕ_i being a Freiman isomorphism, and that $X = X_* \cup X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_t$ is a partition, we have

$$d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta^2\right) \sum_{i=1}^t |X'_i| = d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta^2\right) (|X| - |X_*|) = d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \delta^2\right) (1 - o(1))k$$

where we used (129) to bound $|X_*|$. Finally, it follows from $|X + X| \leq m$ and δ being sufficiently small that $d \leq (2 + \delta + o(1))m/k$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

With Lemma A.2, we need only one more piece, the following lemma. It is a simple count of the number of choices for coefficients in a dissociated set, and we will use it to repeat the proof of Proposition 5.1 in Green and Morris [18] and obtain Proposition 8.7.

Lemma A.7 ([18, Lemma 5.5]). *For every $M, d \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of choices for $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i| \leq M$ is at most $(4d)^M$.*

Proof of Proposition 8.7. Fix $M = (\log n)/(\log \log n)^4$ and take $X \in \mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}$. We will count the choices for X by first choosing a maximal M -dissociated subset $D = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\} \subseteq X$ and then choosing the remaining elements of $X \setminus D$ using the properties of D .

First, we count the choices for D naively, and rely on Lemma A.2 to bound its size. That is, we apply Lemma A.2 to D , obtain $|D| \leq d \leq (2 + \delta + o(1))m/k$, and thus deduce that the number of choices for D is at most:

$$\sum_{t=1}^d \binom{n}{t} \leq (n+1)^d \leq n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k}. \quad (133)$$

The second step is counting the choices for $X \setminus D$, and we do so by counting the possible ways to write each of its elements as an M -bounded combination of D . Fix $x' \in X \setminus D$, and note that the maximality of D implies that there is $\Lambda = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\lambda_0 x' + \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j x_j = 0$$

and the elements of Λ satisfy

$$\sum_{j=0}^d |\lambda_j| \leq M, \quad \lambda_0 \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i \neq 0 \text{ for some } i > 0.$$

We can therefore use Lemma A.7 to count the number of choices for Λ and observe that

$$(4d + 4)^M \leq \exp(3M \log k) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\log n}{(\log \log n)^2}\right) = n^{1/\log k}$$

where the first inequality follows from the (trivial) observation that $d \leq k$, and the rest is a consequence of our choice of $M = (\log n)/(\log \log n)^4$ and our assumption that $k \leq (\log n)^{2-\eta}$.

We can now choose each of the $k - d$ elements of $X \setminus D$ by the above procedure, and obtain that there are at most

$$n^{(k-d)/(\log k)} = n^{o(k)} \tag{134}$$

such elements. Combining (133) and (134) with $m \geq \delta k^2/10$ thus yields

$$|\mathcal{X}_3^{(m)}| \leq n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k+o(k)} = n^{(2+\delta+o(1))m/k},$$

as required. □

IMPA, ESTRADA DONA CASTORINA 110, JARDIM BOTÂNICO, RIO DE JANEIRO, 22460-320, BRASIL
Email address: {gabriel.dahia, joao.marciano}@impa.br

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0WA, UK
Email address: mc2482@cam.ac.uk