

On common energies and sumsets II

Shkredov I.D.

Annotation.

We continue to study the relationship between the size of the sum of a set and the common energy of its subsets. We find a rather sharp subexponential dependence between the doubling constant of a set A and the minimal common energy taken over all partitions of A into two disjoint subsets. As an application, we give a proof of the well-known arithmetic regularity lemma with better dependence on parameters.

1 Introduction

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

$$A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}. \quad (1)$$

The study of the structure of sumsets is a fundamental problem in classical additive combinatorics see, e.g., [5], [13], [6] and other papers. Another important combinatorial concept closely related to the sumset $A + A$ is the *additive energy* $E(A, A)$ or, more generally, the *common additive energy* $E(A, B)$ of A and B , which is defined as

$$E(A, B) = |\{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in A \times A \times B \times B : a_1 - b_1 = a_2 - b_2\}|. \quad (2)$$

The additive energy and the size of the sumset are trivially related via the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, namely,

$$E(A, B)|A \pm B| \geq |A|^2|B|^2, \quad (3)$$

but a much deeper connection is given to us by the famous Balog–Szemerédi–Gowers theorem (see [2] and [7]).

Theorem 1 *Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set and $K \geq 1$ be a real number. Then*

$$E(A, A) \gg \frac{|A|^3}{K^{C_1}} \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists A' \subseteq A : |A' + A'| \ll K^{C_2}|A| \quad \text{and} \quad |A'| \gg \frac{|A|}{K^{C_2}}. \quad (4)$$

Here $C_1 = O(C_2)$ and $C_2 = O(C_1)$.

In recent paper [12] the author obtained another polynomial relation between the additive energy and $|A + A|$.

Theorem 2 *Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set and $K \geq 1$ be a real number. Then*

$$|A + A| \ll K^{C_1} |A| \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall X, Y \subseteq A, |X| \geq |A|/2 : \mathbf{E}(X, Y) \geq \frac{|X||Y|^2}{K^{C_2}}. \quad (5)$$

Here, as above, $C_1 = O(C_2)$ and $C_2 = O(C_1)$.

Therefore it is possible to express the doubling constant of A in terms of the common additive energy of subsets of A .

In this paper we consider a weaker condition than (5), namely, instead of taking all pairs $X, Y \subseteq A$, $|X| \geq |A|/2$ we have deal with $X, Y \subseteq A$ such that $X \cup Y = A$ and the union is disjoint (then, trivially, either $|X|$ or $|Y|$ is at least $|A|/2$). These kinds of restrictions were considered in excellent paper [4] (at the graph level), although the common energy $\mathbf{E}(X, Y)$ is a nonlinear and more subtle quantity than the usual graph density. It turns out that in the case of disjoint unions we do *not* have polynomial dependence between this new quantity (the rigorous definition can be found in Section 2) and the *doubling constant* $\mathcal{D}[A] := |A + A|/|A|$ of A . More precisely (see Theorems 6, 7 below), we obtain

Theorem 3 *Let \mathbf{G} be an abelian group, $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set. Suppose that for any $X, Y \subseteq A$ such that $X \cup Y = A$ and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ one has*

$$\mathbf{E}(X, Y) \geq \frac{|X|^2|Y|^2}{K|A|}. \quad (6)$$

Then

$$\frac{|A + A|}{|A|} \leq \exp(O(K^{1/3} \log^2 K)). \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, there is an abelian group \mathbf{G} and a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ such that (6) takes place for all $X, Y \subseteq A$ such that $X \cup Y = A$ and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ but

$$\frac{|A + A|}{|A|} \geq \exp(\Omega(K^{1/4} \log K)). \quad (8)$$

If $|A + A| = \mathcal{D}[A] \cdot |A|$, then the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality (3) gives us $\mathbf{E}(X, Y) \geq \frac{|X|^2|Y|^2}{\mathcal{D}[A]|A|}$ for any $X, Y \subseteq A$ and hence estimates (7), (8) tell us that the dependence between the quantity $\mathcal{D}[A]$ and K in (6) is subexponential.

As an application of Theorem 3 we obtain a direct proof of the well-known arithmetic regularity lemma of Green and Sisask [8, Proposition 3.2] with better dependence on parameters, see Section 5. Nowadays, the arithmetic regularity lemma is a rather popular tool in additive combinatorics, some of its applications can be found in papers [1], [3], [8] and [11].

We hope that the tools developed in this paper will add flexibility to working with the doubling constants.

2 Definitions

Below \mathbf{G} denotes an abelian group with the group operation $+$. The sumset of two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ was defined in formula (1) of the introduction. In a similar way one can define the *difference sets* and the *higher sumsets*, e.g., $2A - A$ is $A + A - A$. Recall that the doubling constant of a finite set A is given by the formula

$$\mathcal{D}[A] := \frac{|A + A|}{|A|}. \quad (9)$$

We say that the sum of A and B is direct if $|A + B| = |A||B|$. In this case we sometimes write $A \dot{+} B$. The important Plünnecke–Ruzsa inequality (see, e.g., [9] or [13]) says that for any positive integers n and m the following holds

$$|nA - mA| \leq \left(\frac{|A + A|}{|A|} \right)^{n+m} \cdot |A|. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, bound (10) connects the cardinality of the original set A and its higher sumsets $nA - mA$. The common additive energy of two sets was defined in (2) and the generalization of the common additive energy for four sets $A, B, C, D \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ is given by the formula

$$\mathbf{E}(A, B, C, D) = |\{(a, b, c, d) \in A \times B \times C \times D : a + b = c + d\}|.$$

The disjoint union of two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ is denoted as $A \sqcup B$.

Given finite sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ and a real number $T \geq 1$ we defined the quantity $\mathcal{E}_T[A]$ in paper [12] as

$$\mathcal{E}_T[A] = \max_{X \subseteq A, |X| \geq |A|/T, Y \subseteq A} \frac{|X|^2 |Y|^2}{|A| \mathbf{E}(X, Y)}.$$

Thus Theorem 2 from the introduction says that the quantities $\mathcal{D}[A]$ and $\mathcal{E}_2[A]$ are polynomially equivalent. In this paper we consider the new quantity

$$\mathcal{E}_*[A] = \max_{X \sqcup Y = A} \frac{|X|^2 |Y|^2}{|A| \mathbf{E}(X, Y)}.$$

In view of inequality (3) and the discussion after Theorem 2 one has for any $T \geq 2$ that

$$\mathcal{E}_*[A] \leq \mathcal{E}_2[A] \leq \mathcal{E}_T[A] \leq \mathcal{D}[A].$$

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

3 The proof of the main result

In this section we obtain the first part of Theorem 3 from the introduction. We start with a simple lemma.

Lemma 4 *Let $A, B \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, $|A| \geq |B|$ and $\mathbf{E}(A, B) = |A||B|^2/K$. Then there is $X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ such that*

$$\frac{|A|}{4K|B|} \leq |X| \leq \frac{2K|A|}{|B|}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$|A \cap (B + X)| \geq \frac{|A|}{4K}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. We have $\mathbf{E}(A, B) = \sum_x |A \cap (B + x)|^2$ and hence there is $x \in \mathbf{G}$ such that

$$|A \cap (B + x)| \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}(A, B)}{|A||B|} \geq \frac{|B|}{K}.$$

Also, for $A' = A \setminus (B + x)$ one has

$$\mathbf{E}(A', B) \geq \mathbf{E}(A, B) - 2|A \cap (B + x)||B|^2.$$

Thus, iterating this procedure we obtain a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ such that $|X||B|/2K \leq |A|$ and

$$2|A \cap (B + X)||B|^2 \geq 2^{-1}\mathbf{E}(A, B) = |A||B|^2/(2K).$$

It follows that $|A \cap (B + X)| \geq |A|/(4K)$ and the last inequality implies $|X| \geq |A|/(4K|B|)$. This completes the proof. \square

Now we show that sets $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ with small quantity $\mathcal{E}_*[A]$ have some rather specific properties. Namely, Proposition 5 below shows that if such A contains a large subset with small doubling constant, then A also has small doubling constant. Of course, this result does not hold for an arbitrary set.

Proposition 5 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $M := \mathcal{E}_*[A]$ and there is a subset $A' \subseteq A$ such that*

$$|A' + A'| \leq K|A'| \quad \text{and} \quad |A'| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|A|, \quad (13)$$

where $\varepsilon = (2^6 M)^{-1}$. Then $|A + A| \ll K^4 M^2 |A|$.

Proof. We can assume that $|A|$ is sufficiently large; otherwise, there is nothing to prove. By the covering lemma (see, e.g., [13, Section 2.4]) we find $Z \subseteq A$ such that $|A' + Z| = |A'||Z|$ and $A \subseteq A' - A' + Z$. Let us remark that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)|A||Z| \leq |A'||Z| = |A' + Z| \leq |A + A| \leq 2^{-1}(|A|^2 + |A|)$$

and therefore

$$|Z| \leq \frac{|A| + 1}{2(1 - \varepsilon)} \leq \frac{3|A|}{4}.$$

In particular, we have $|Z^c| \geq |A|/4$, where $Z^c = A \setminus Z$. Put $A'_Z = A' \cap Z^c$ and $\Omega = Z^c \setminus A'_Z$. Clearly, $|\Omega| \leq \varepsilon|A|$. By the definition of the quantity $\mathcal{E}_*[A]$ and the fact that the sum $A' + Z$ is direct, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|Z|^2|Z^c|^2}{M|A|} &\leq \mathbf{E}(Z, Z^c) \leq \mathbf{E}(Z, A'_Z) + \mathbf{E}(Z, Z, Z^c, \Omega) + \mathbf{E}(Z, Z, A'_Z, \Omega) \leq \mathbf{E}(Z, A') + 2|\Omega||Z|^2 \\ &\leq |Z||A| + 2\varepsilon|A||Z|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the inequality $|Z^c| \geq |A|/4$ and our choice of ε one has

$$|Z| \leq \frac{2M|A|^2}{|Z^c|^2} \leq 2^5 M.$$

Using the last bound, the covering lemma and the Plünnecke inequality (10), we derive

$$|A + A| \leq |2A' - 2A'| |Z + Z| \ll K^4 M^2 |A|.$$

This completes the proof. \square

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

Theorem 6 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}[A] \leq \exp(O(\mathcal{E}_*^{1/3}[A] \cdot \log^2 \mathcal{E}_*[A])). \quad (14)$$

Proof. Let $M = \mathcal{E}_*[A]$. Split the set A into two sets $|A_1| \sim |A_2| \sim |A|/2$ in an arbitrary way. Then one has $\mathbf{E}(A) \gg |A|^3/M$. Applying a version of the Balog–Szemerédi–Gowers Theorem (see, e.g., [10]), we find $A' \subseteq A$, $|A'| \gg |A|/M$ such that $|A' - A'| \ll M^4|A'|$. Let T be a parameter, $T = CM^2$, where $C > 1$ is a sufficiently large absolute constant. Using some kind of greedy algorithm, we construct a set $Z \subseteq A$, $Z \cap A' = \emptyset$ such that for any $x \in \mathbf{G}$ one has

$$|Z \cap (A' + x)| \leq \frac{|A'|}{T}. \quad (15)$$

Indeed, at the first step of our algorithm put $Z_0 = A \setminus A' := (A')^c$ and if (15) takes place for $Z = Z_0$, then we are done. Otherwise, there is $x_1 \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $|(A')^c \cap (A' + x_1)| \geq |A'|/T$. Put $Y_1 := A' \sqcup ((A')^c \cap (A' + x_1))$ and $Z_1 = Y_1^c$. If (15) holds for $Z = Z_1$, then we are done. If not, then there is $x_2 \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $|Z_1 \cap (A' + x_2)| \geq |A'|/T$ and we put $Y_2 = Y_1 \sqcup (Z_1 \cap (A' + x_2))$ and $Z_2 = Y_2^c$. And so on. Clearly, the algorithm must stop after at most $s_1 := \lceil T|A|/|A'| \rceil = O(M^3)$ number of steps.

Now let $Y := Y_{s_1}$, $Z = Z_{s_1}$ and $Y_* = Y \setminus A'$. Below we assume that $|Z| \geq |A|/2$. Since $Y \sqcup Z = A$, then thanks to our choice of parameter T (here it is sufficient to have $T = \Omega(M)$) we derive that

$$\frac{|A'| |Y| |Z|^2}{M|A|} \leq \frac{|Y|^2 |Z|^2}{M|A|} \leq \mathbf{E}(Y_* \sqcup A', Z) \leq \mathbf{E}(Y_*, Z) + 2\mathbf{E}(Y, A', Z, Z) \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}(Y_*, Z) + \frac{2|A'||Y||Z|}{T} \leq \mathbb{E}(Y_*, Z) + \frac{|Y|^2|Z|^2}{2M|A|}. \quad (17)$$

Thus writing $\mathbb{E}(Y_*, Z) = |Y_*|^2|Z|/T_*$ for some $T_* \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{|Y|^2|Z|^2}{2M|A|} \leq \mathbb{E}(Y_*, Z) = \frac{|Y_*|^2|Z|}{T_*}, \quad (18)$$

and hence

$$|Y_*| \geq \sqrt{\frac{T_*}{M}} \cdot \frac{|Y|}{2} \geq \frac{|A'|}{2\sqrt{M}} \gg \frac{|A|}{M^{3/2}}. \quad (19)$$

Also, notice that estimate (18) implies the following rough bound on T_*

$$T_* \leq \frac{2M|A|}{|Z|} \leq 4M. \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, by the definition of the quantity T_* one has $\mathbb{E}(Y_*, Z) = \frac{|Y_*|^2|Z|}{T_*}$ and hence applying Lemma 4, bound (19), combining with estimate (20), we find $X \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ with

$$|X| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{4M|A|}{|Y_*|}, \frac{2T_*|Z|}{|Y_*|} \right\} \leq \frac{4\sqrt{MT_*}|Z|}{|Y|} \leq \frac{4\sqrt{MT_*}|A|}{|A'|} \ll M^2 \quad (21)$$

and such that

$$|Z \cap (Y_* + X)| \geq \frac{|Z|}{4T_*}. \quad (22)$$

Now we apply the same algorithm starting with the set $Y(1) := Y$. And so on. Thus we construct an increasing sequence of sets $A' \subseteq Y(1) \subseteq Y(2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq Y(t') \subseteq A$ and let us put $Z(j) = Y^c(j)$. Inequality (19), combined with the estimate $|A'| \gg |A|/M$ show that we obtain $|Z(t')| < |A|/2$ after at most $t' = O(M^{1/2} \log M)$ number of steps. Let us improve the last bound and check that in view of inequality (22) the real number of steps t' is $O(M^{1/3} \log M)$. Indeed put $R = \lceil M^{1/3} \rceil$ and consider the first R sets $Y(j)$, $j \in [R]$. Besides sets $Y(j)$ for any $j \in [R]$ we have sets $Z(j)$, where $Y(j) \sqcup Z(j) = A$ and the parameter $T_*(j)$. Then we have two cases: either there are at least $R/2$ numbers $j \in [R]$ such that $T_*(j) \geq R$ or there exist at least $R/2$ numbers $j \in [R]$ such that $T_*(j) < R$. In the first case we use inequality (19) and see that

$$|Y(R)| \geq |A'| \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2\sqrt{M}} \right)^{R/2} \geq |A'|(1+c), \quad (23)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. In the second case one can apply estimate (22) and obtain

$$|Z(R)| \leq |Z| \left(1 - \frac{1}{4R} \right)^{R/2} \leq (1-\tilde{c})|Z|, \quad (24)$$

where $\tilde{c} > 0$ is another absolute constant and hence, say,

$$|Y(2R)| \geq (1+2^{-1}\tilde{c})|Y| \geq (1+2^{-1}\tilde{c})|A'|.$$

Formulae (23), (24) show that in any case we cannot have more than $t' = O(R \log M) = O(M^{1/3} \log M)$ steps.

Having reached the inequality $|Z(t')| < |A|/2$, we apply the same algorithm to the set $Y(t')$ to obtain another increasing sequence of sets $Y(t') \subseteq Y(t'+1) \subseteq \dots \subseteq Y(t'+t'')$ and so on, but this time suppose that for all $j \geq t'$ one $|Z(j)| \geq \varepsilon|A|$ holds, where $\varepsilon := (2^6 M)^{-1}$. Now we have $|Y(j)| \geq |A|/2$, $j \geq t'$, $T = CM^2$ and repeating the computations in (16)–(18), we see that

$$\frac{|Z(j)|^2|A|}{8M} \leq \frac{|Y(j)|^2|Z(j)|^2}{2M|A|} \leq \mathbb{E}(Y_*(j), Z(j)) = \frac{|Y_*(j)|^2|Z(j)|}{T_*(j)},$$

and hence

$$|Y_*(j)| \geq |Z(j)| \cdot \left(\frac{T_*(j)|A|}{8M|Z(j)|} \right)^{1/2} \geq |Z(j)| \cdot \left(\frac{T_*(j)}{4M} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (25)$$

As above we consider two cases: either there are at least $R/2$ numbers $j \in [R]$ such that $T_*(j) \geq R$ or there exist at least $R/2$ numbers $j \in [R]$ such that $T_*(j) < R$. Thus bounds (24), (25) show that $t'' = O(R \log M) = O(M^{1/3} \log M)$ and therefore the set $\mathcal{A} := Y(t)$ has size at least $(1 - \varepsilon)|A|$, where $t := t' + t'' \ll M^{1/3} \log M$. Let us show that \mathcal{A} has small doubling and then apply Proposition 5 to obtain that our initial set A has small doubling. We have $\mathcal{A} \subseteq A' + X_1 + \dots + X_t$, where one has $|X_j| \ll M^3$ thanks to our choice of the parameter T , bounds (20), (21), (25) and the estimate $|A'| \gg |A|/M$. It follows that

$$|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}| \leq (|X_1| \dots |X_t|)^2 |A' + A'| \ll \exp(O(t \log M)) |A'| \ll \exp(O(M^{1/3} \log^2 M)) \cdot |A|.$$

Using Proposition 5, we complete the proof. \square

4 A counterexample

In this section we obtain the second part of Theorem 3. Our construction follows naturally from the proof of Theorem 6 of the previous section (in the notation of the latter theorem we basically construct the sets $Y(j)$ in the example below) and resembles a “bridge graph” see, e.g., [13, Section 6.5] and especially [4] (note also that in [4, Remark 4.3] the connectedness α is of order $1/k^2$, not $1/k$ as claimed).

Theorem 7 *Let $p > 2$ be a prime number. Then there exists a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}[A] = \min \left\{ \Omega_p \left(\frac{|A| \log^2 \log |A|}{\log^2 |A|} \right), \exp(\Omega_p(\mathcal{E}_*^{1/4}[A] \cdot \log \mathcal{E}_*[A])) \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Proof. Let $a, M > p$ and $k, M \ll k \leq M/2, kM^{k-1} \ll a$ be some integer parameters which we will choose later and we suppose that a/k and $M+1$ are some powers of p . We take $L_k < L_{k-1} < \dots < L_1 < \mathbb{F}_p^n$ be some subspaces, $\frac{a}{kM^{j-1}} \leq |L_j| \leq \frac{ap}{kM^{j-1}}$, $j \in [k]$, and $H_2, \dots, H_k < \mathbb{F}_p^n$ be another collection of subspaces, where $|H_j| = M+1$, $j = 2, \dots, k$. Put $H_j^* = H_j \setminus \{0\}$. We assume that H_2^*, \dots, H_k^* and L_1 are mutually independent in the sense that

the sumset $H_2^* + \dots + H_k^* + L_1$ is direct (for example, L_1 occupies the first m_1 coordinates in the standard basis and each H_2^*, \dots, H_k^* occupies some other coordinates in \mathbb{F}_p^n). Put $A_1 = L_1$ and $A_j = L_j \dot{+} (H_2^* \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} H_j^*)$, $j = 2, \dots, k$ and let $A = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^k A_j$. Then $a \leq |A| \leq pa$ and

$$|A + A| \geq |A_1 + A_k| = |L_1| |H_2^* + \dots + H_k^*| \geq \frac{M^{k-1}a}{k} \gg_p |A| \cdot \exp(\Omega(M \log M)), \quad (27)$$

and thus $\mathcal{D}[A] = \exp(\Omega_p(M \log M))$.

Now let us estimate $\mathcal{E}_*[A]$. Take any sets S, T such that $A = S \sqcup T$. We have either

$$|S \cap A_1| \geq \frac{|A_1|}{2} = \frac{a}{2k} \quad (28)$$

or $|T \cap A_1| \geq |A_1|/2$ (or both). Without loosing of the generality assume that inequality (28) takes place. Choose the maximal j such that $|S \cap A_i| \geq |A_i|/2$ for all $i \in [j]$. Therefore we see that if $j < k$, then $|T \cap A_{j+1}| \geq |A_{j+1}|/2$. Put $S' = S'_j := S \cap A_j$ and $T' = T'_j := T \cap A_{j+1}$. By the construction one has

$$|S'| \geq \frac{a}{2k} \geq \frac{|S|}{2kp}, \quad \text{and} \quad |T'| \geq \frac{a}{2k} \geq \frac{|T|}{2kp}, \quad (29)$$

provided $j < k$. Put $\Lambda_S = H_2^* \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} H_j^*$, $\Lambda_T = H_2^* \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} H_{j+1}^*$ and then by the mutual independence, we have

$$S' = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_S} \{s' \in S' : s' = \lambda + l, l \in L_j\} = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_S} S'_\lambda,$$

and similarly for T' . Let $\tilde{\Lambda}_S$ be the collection of $\lambda \in \Lambda_S$ such that $|S'_\lambda| \geq |S'|/(2|\Lambda_S|)$. Then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_S} |S'_\lambda| \geq \frac{|S'|}{2} \geq \frac{|L_j| M^{j-1}}{4}$$

and hence $|\tilde{\Lambda}_S| \geq |\Lambda_S|/4$. In a similar way, one can define $\tilde{\Lambda}_T$ and then $|\tilde{\Lambda}_T| \geq |\Lambda_T|/4$. Finally, put $S'' = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_S} S'_\lambda$ and $T'' = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_T} T'_\lambda$. Let us estimate $\mathbf{E}(S'', T'')$ from below, this will give us a lower bound for $\mathbf{E}(S, T)$. Applying the mutual independence, the estimate $j \leq k \leq M/2$ and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(S'', A_j, T'', A_{j+1}) &\geq \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_S, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_T : \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \mu_1 + \mu_2} \mathbf{E}(S'_{\lambda_1}, L_j, T'_{\mu_1}, L_{j+1}) \quad (30) \\ &\geq \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_S, \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \tilde{\Lambda}_T : \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \mu_1 + \mu_2} \frac{|S'_{\lambda_1}| |T'_{\mu_1}| |L_j| |L_{j+1}|}{|L_j|} \gg \frac{|L_{j+1}| |A_j| |A_{j+1}|}{|\Lambda_S| |\Lambda_T|} \cdot \mathbf{E}(\tilde{\Lambda}_S, \tilde{\Lambda}_T) \\ &\gg \frac{|L_{j+1}| |A_j| |A_{j+1}| |\Lambda_S| |\Lambda_T|}{|\Lambda_S + \Lambda_T|} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{M+1}\right)^j \cdot |L_{j+1}| |A_j| |A_{j+1}| |\Lambda_S| \\ &\gg \frac{|L_{j+1}| |S'|^2 |T'|}{|L_j|} \gg_p \frac{|S'|^2 |T'|}{M}. \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

Now using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one more time, we get

$$\mathbb{E}(S, T)\mathbb{E}(A_j, A_{j+1}) \geq \mathbb{E}(S'', T'')\mathbb{E}(A_j, A_{j+1}) \gg_p \frac{|S'|^4 |T'|^2}{M^2}. \quad (32)$$

From the mutual independence it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}(A_j, A_{j+1}) \ll_p \left(\frac{a}{k}\right)^3 M^{-(j-1)} M^{-2j} (M^{j-1})^3 M \ll \frac{a^3}{Mk^3}, \quad (33)$$

similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}(A_j) \ll_p \left(\frac{a}{k}\right)^3 M^{-3(j-1)} (M^{j-1})^3 \ll \frac{a^3}{k^3}, \quad (34)$$

and hence in view of (29) and our choice of the parameter k one derive from (32)

$$\mathbb{E}(S, T) \gg_p \frac{k^3 |S'|^4 |T'|^2}{Ma^3} \gg \frac{k |S'|^2 |T'|^2}{Ma} \gg \frac{|S|^2 |T|^2}{Mk^3 a} \gg \frac{|S|^2 |T|^2}{M^4 |A|}. \quad (35)$$

Now assume that $j = k$. In this case we have $|S \cap A_i| \geq |A_i|/2$ for all $i \in [k]$ and in particular $|S| \geq a/2$. Let $J \subseteq [k]$ be the collection of indexes such that $|T \cap A_j| \geq |T|/(2k)$. For $j \in J$ put $T_j^* := T \cap A_j$. Applying the previous argument for all $j \in J$ and repeating the computations in (30)–(31), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(S_j'', A_j, T_j^*, A_j) \gg |L_j| |A_j| |T_j^*| |\Lambda_S| \gg |S_j'|^2 |T_j^*|.$$

Thus summing over $j \in J$ and using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we obtain as above

$$\sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{E}^{1/2}(S_j'', T_j^*) \mathbb{E}^{1/2}(A_j) \gg \sum_{j \in J} |S_j'|^2 |T_j^*| \gg \frac{|S|^2 |T|}{k^2}.$$

It remains to apply the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one more time, as well as bound (34) to derive

$$\frac{a^3}{k^3} \mathbb{E}(S, T) k \gg_p \frac{|S|^4 |T|^2}{k^4} \gg \frac{|S|^2 |T|^2 a^2}{k^4}.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E}(S, T) \gg_p \frac{|S|^2 |T|^2}{k^2 a} \gg \frac{|S|^2 |T|^2}{M^2 |A|}. \quad (36)$$

Combining bounds (35) and (36), we see that $\mathcal{E}_*[A] \ll_p M^4$. Substituting this bound into (27), we obtain the result. It remains to check the condition $kM^{k-1} \ll M^M \ll a$ but if not, then choose $k \sim M$ such that $M^M \sim |A|$ and then bound (27) gives us $\mathcal{D}[A] \gg \Omega_p \left(\frac{|A| \log^2 \log |A|}{\log^2 |A|} \right)$. This completes the proof. \square

5 An application

Now we obtain an application to the arithmetic regularity lemma, see [8]. We formulate our result in the following form.

Theorem 8 *Let $A \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a set, $\mathbf{E}(A) = |A|^3/K$ and let $\varepsilon, \omega \in (0, 1/4]$ be parameters. Then there is a decomposition of A as a disjoint union $A = \left(\bigsqcup_{j=1}^k A_j\right) \bigsqcup \Omega$ such that*

- (i) *(Components are large).* $|A_j| \geq \sqrt{\omega/2K} \cdot |A|$, $j \in [k]$.
- (ii) *(Components are structured).* $\mathcal{E}_*[A_j] \leq 4K(\omega\varepsilon)^{-2}$, $j \in [k]$. In particular, for any $j \in [k]$ one has $\mathcal{D}[A_j] \ll \exp(O(K^{1/3}(\omega\varepsilon)^{-2/3} \cdot \log^2(K\omega^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1})))$.
- (iii) *(Different components do not communicate).* $\mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j) \leq \varepsilon \frac{|A_i|^2|A_j|^2}{|A|}$, $i, j \in [k]$, $i \neq j$.
- (iv) *(Noise term).* $\mathbf{E}(\Omega, A) \leq \omega\mathbf{E}(A)$, $j \in [k]$.

Proof. In the proof we follow the argument from [4]. Put $\varepsilon_1 = \omega\varepsilon/2$. For $B \subseteq A$ write $\mu(B) = |B|/|A|$. Consider all partitions of A into disjoint sets A_1, \dots, A_l , $l \geq 1$ and choose one such that the sum

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} (\mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j, A, A) - \varepsilon_1 \mu(A_i) \mu(A_j) \mathbf{E}(A))$$

is minimal. If the minimal value is attained at several partitions, take any of them. Clearly, for an arbitrary $i \in [l]$ and any S, T such that $S \bigsqcup T = A_i$ one has $\mathbf{E}(S, T, A, A) \geq \varepsilon_1 \mu(S) \mu(T) \mathbf{E}(A)$ (otherwise we have a contradiction with the minimality). Thus by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality the following holds

$$\mathbf{E}(S, T) \geq \varepsilon_1^2 \frac{|S|^2|T|^2 \mathbf{E}(A)}{|A|^4} = \varepsilon_1^2 \frac{|S|^2|T|^2}{K|A|}$$

and therefore $\mathcal{E}_*[A_i] \leq 4K(\omega\varepsilon)^{-2}$ for all $i \in [l]$. Then Theorem 6 gives us the required upper bound for $\mathcal{D}[A_i]$. Using the minimality again, we see that for all $i, j \in [l]$, $i \neq j$ the following holds

$$\mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j, A, A) \leq \varepsilon_1 \mu(A_i) \mu(A_j) \mathbf{E}(A). \quad (37)$$

Putting $I := \{i : |A_i| \leq \sqrt{\omega/2K} \cdot |A|\}$ and $\Omega = \bigsqcup_{i \in I} A_i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(A, \Omega) &= \sum_{i, j \in [l]} \mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j, \Omega, \Omega) \leq \sum_{m \in [l]} \mathbf{E}(A_m, \Omega) + \varepsilon_1 \mathbf{E}(A) \sum_{i, j \in [l]} \mu(A_i) \mu(A_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in [l]} \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}(A_m, A_m, A_i, A) + \varepsilon_1 \mathbf{E}(A) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}(A_i) + 3\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{E}(A) \\ &\leq 2^{-1} \omega |A|^3 / K + 3\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{E}(A) \leq \omega \mathbf{E}(A) \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have obtained (iv). Finally, in view of (37) for any $i, j \notin I$, $i \neq j$ one has

$$\mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j) \leq \mathbf{E}(A_i, A_j, A, A) \leq \varepsilon_1 \mu(A_i) \mu(A_j) \mathbf{E}(A) \leq \varepsilon \frac{|A_i|^2 |A_j|^2}{|A|}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Our dependence on the parameters is better than in [8, Proposition 3.2] and in [4, Theorems 4.1, 4.4, 4.6]. Although the proof of Theorem 8 follows the method from [4] the advantage is that we use the more subtle quantity $\mathcal{E}_*[A]$ in our application of Theorem 6. Finally, we note that sometimes in the formulation of Theorem 8 there is an additional parameter L , but this twist is completely unimportant and is a consequence of the result given above (for more details see [8]).

References

- [1] J. Aaronson. Maximising the number of solutions to a linear equation in a set of integers. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 51(4):577–594, 2019.
- [2] A. Balog and E. Szemerédi. A statistical theorem of set addition. *Combinatorica*, 14(3):263–268, 1994.
- [3] B. B. Bhattacharya, S. Ganguly, X. Shao, and Y. Zhao. Upper tail large deviations for arithmetic progressions in a random set. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2020(1):167–213, 2020.
- [4] G. Elekes and I. Z. Ruzsa. The structure of sets with few sums along a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 113(7):1476–1500, 2006.
- [5] G. A. Freiman. Foundations of a structural theory of set addition. *Translation of Math. Monographs*, 37, 1973.
- [6] W. Gowers, B. Green, F. Manners, and T. Tao. Marton’s Conjecture in abelian groups with bounded torsion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02244*, 2024.
- [7] W. T. Gowers. A new proof of Szemerédi’s theorem for arithmetic progressions of length four. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(3):529–551, 1998.
- [8] B. Green and O. Sisask. On the maximal number of 3-term arithmetic progressions in subsets of $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 40(6):945–955, 2008.
- [9] I. Z. Ruzsa. An application of graph theory to additive number theory. *Scientia, Ser. A*, 3(97-109):9, 1989.
- [10] T. Schoen. New bounds in Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers theorem. *Combinatorica*, 35(6):695–701, 2015.
- [11] X. Shao. Large values of the additive energy in \mathbf{R}^d and \mathbf{Z}^d . In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 156, pages 327–341. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [12] I. D. Shkredov. On common energies and sumsets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08113*, 2024.
- [13] T. Tao and V. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.