

# The structure of critical sets for $\mathbb{F}_p$ arithmetic progressions

Ernie Croot

August 31, 2021

## 1 Introduction

Given a function  $h : \mathbb{F}_p \times \mathbb{F}_p \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , we define the usual expectation operator

$$\mathbb{E}_{n_1, \dots, n_k}(h) := p^{-k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{F}_p} h(n_1, \dots, n_k).$$

We also define, for  $f : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , the operator

$$\Lambda(f) := \mathbb{E}_{n,d}(f(n)f(n+d)f(n+2d)).$$

If  $f$  were an indicator function for some set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ , this would give a normalized count of the number of three-term progressions in  $S$ .

In the present paper we establish a new structure theorem for functions  $f : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that minimize the number of three-term progressions, subject to a density constraint; and, as a consequence of this result, we prove a further structural result, which can also be deduced from the work of Green [3], though only for high densities (Green's result only works for densities exceeding  $1/\log_*(p)$ , though perhaps his method can be generalized for this particular problem to handle lower densities).

Before stating the theorem, it is worth mentioning that Green and Sisask [5] have shown that sets of high density (density close to 1) that minimize the number of three-term arithmetic progressions, are the complement of the union of two long arithmetic progressions (actually, their result is stated in terms of sets that maximize the number of three-term progressions, but there is a standard trick to relate this to the minimizing sets).

Our main theorem is now given as follows:

**Theorem 1** *Suppose that*

$$f : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

minimizes  $\Lambda(f)$ , subject to the constraint that

$$\Lambda(f) \geq \theta \in (0, 1].$$

Then,

- Let  $C(n)$  equal  $f(n)$  rounded to the nearest integer, which is therefore 0 or 1. Then,

$$\sum_n |f(n) - C(n)| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3}.$$

So,  $f$  must be approximately an indicator function. Furthermore, we get the same conclusion if  $f$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}(f) \geq \theta$ , and  $\Lambda(f)$  comes within  $O(1/p)$  of the minimal value for this density constraint.

- There exists a function  $r : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(r) = \mathbb{E}(f)$ , where  $\Lambda(r)$  is very close to the minimal  $\Lambda(f)$ , specifically

$$\Lambda(r) = \Lambda(f) + O(p^{-1}),$$

such that if we let, for some  $L$ ,

$$S := \{n \in \mathbb{F}_p : (r * r)(2n) + 2(r * g)(-n) \leq L\}, \text{ where } g(n) := r(-n/2),$$

then

$$\sum_n |r(n) - S(n)| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3}. \quad (1)$$

(Please see subsection 1.1 for an explanation of this part of the theorem.)

- We have that there exist sets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , with  $|A| > p^{1-o(1)}$  and  $|B| > p^{1/2}$ , such that the set for which  $f$  is approximately an indicator function, is roughly the sumset  $A + B$ . More precisely: If we let  $C(n)$  denote  $f$  rounded to the nearest integer, as in the first bullet above, then

$$\sum_n |(A * B)(n) - |B|C(n)| \ll p|B|(\log \log p)^{-2/3}.$$

Furthermore, we may take  $A = C$  and take  $B$  to be a certain ‘‘Bohr neighborhood’’  $\mathcal{B}$ , which is described in the proof of the theorem.

## 1.1 A remark on the second part of the theorem

By (1) we see that  $r$  is nearly an indicator function for the set  $S$ . Let us suppose, for the purposes of discussion, that it is exactly an indicator function for some set, and let  $R$  be this set. Note that  $R$  and  $S$  must have small symmetric difference.

When does an  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$  belong to the set  $S$ ? To decide this, given  $n$ , we let  $N_1$  be the number of pairs  $(x, y) \in R \times R$  such that  $n, x, y$  forms an arithmetic progression; we let  $N_2$  be the number of pairs  $(x, y) \in R \times R$  such that  $x, n, y$

is an arithmetic progression; and, we let  $N_3$  be the number of such ordered pairs where  $x, y, n$  is an arithmetic progression. For  $n$  to belong to  $S$ , we must have that

$$N_1 + N_2 + N_3 \leq L.$$

Since  $S$  and  $R$  have small symmetric difference, we see that our  $r$  can be thought of as enjoying a “local minimal” property: Not only does  $r$  minimize  $\Lambda(r)$  up to an error  $O(1/p)$ , subject to  $\mathbb{E}(r) \geq \theta$ , but we can easily decide whether  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$  belongs to  $R$  or not, simply by checking to see how many progressions pass through the point  $n$ , with the other two end-points in  $R$ . If this count is small enough, then  $n$  likely belongs to  $R$  (though it certainly belongs to  $S$ ); but, if the count is large,  $n$  likely does not belong to  $R$ .

The most difficult part of this proof that  $R$  and  $S$  are nearly the same, is handling those  $n$  where  $N_1 + N_2 + N_3$  exactly equals  $L$ .

## 1.2 Remarks on the third part of the theorem

One reason to believe the third bullet above is that from the second bullet we expect that  $f$  is an indicator function for a level set of a “smooth function”  $(r * r)(2n) + 2(r * g)(-n)$ ; and, as is well known, such level sets must be approximately the union of a bunch of translates of a Bohr neighborhood of the function, at least when their density is large enough.

It should be remarked that sumsets are quite special structures, as are smooth functions of the type  $(r * r)(2n) + 2(r * g)(-n)$ , and only a vanishingly small proportion of the subsets of  $\mathbb{F}_p$  are sumsets or form the support of a smooth function; so, the third bullet is saying something fairly non-trivial about our minimal  $f$ .

Also, there are loads of other consequences that one can deduce from the third bullet. One of these is that, upon decomposing the Bohr neighborhood  $\mathcal{B}$  into a union of arithmetic progressions, one can deduce that  $C$  is essentially the union of a “small number” of somewhat “long” arithmetic progressions (“small number” can mean a power of  $p$ , say  $p^c$ , where  $c < 1$ ), all having the same common difference.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of this structure theorem depends on a certain function  $r_3$ , which we presently define.

**Definition.** Given a subset  $S$  of a group  $G$ , we let  $r_3(S)$  denote the size of the largest subset of  $S$  free of solutions to  $x + y = 2z$ ,  $x \neq y$ . In all the uses

of  $r_3$  in the present paper,  $G = \mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = [N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , for various different values of  $N$ .

Bourgain [2] has recently shown that

$$r_3([N]) \ll N(\log N)^{-2/3}, \quad (2)$$

and from a result of Behrend [1], we know that for  $N$  sufficiently large,

$$r_3([N]) > N \exp(-c\sqrt{\log N}),$$

for a certain constant  $c > 0$ .

## 2.1 Proof of the first part of Theorem 1

For this part we will begin by assuming that  $\mathbb{E}(f) > \kappa p(\log p)^{-2/3}$ , for as large a  $\kappa > 0$  as we might happen to need, since this part of the theorem is trivially true otherwise.

Here we will first show that the minimal  $f$  is well-approximated by an indicator function; actually, we will prove even more – we will show that if  $\Lambda(f)$  comes within  $O(p^{-1})$  of this smallest value, subject to the density constraint  $\mathbb{E}(f) > \theta$ , then  $f$  must be approximately an indicator function. To do this, we will require the following proposition, proved in subsection 2.4.

**Proposition 1** *Suppose that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint subsets of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , such that  $f : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  has the property*

$$\text{for } n \in A, f(n) \leq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < 1/3,$$

*and suppose that*

$$\text{support}(f) = A \cup B.$$

*Then, for  $\beta > 0$  satisfying*

$$\varepsilon\beta \geq p^{-1/2} \log p,$$

*there exists a function  $g : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(g) \geq \mathbb{E}(f),$$

*and yet*

$$\Lambda(g) < \Lambda(f) + 2\beta - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0 / 4 + O(p^{-1}),$$

*where*

$$W_0 := \sum_{a, a+d, a+2d \in A} f(a)f(a+d)f(a+2d).$$

We also will require the following quantitative version of Varnavides's theorem [7].

**Lemma 1** *If  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$  satisfies  $|S| \geq 2(r_3(N)/N)p$ , we will have for any  $2 \leq N \leq p$  that*

$$\Lambda(S) \geq \frac{2r_3([N])}{N^3 + O(N^2)}.$$

**Proof of the Lemma.** The proof of this lemma is via some easy averaging: We let  $\mathcal{A}_N$  denote the set of all arithmetic progressions  $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$  having length  $N$ . These arithmetic progressions are to be identified by ordered pairs  $(a, d)$ ,  $d \neq 0$ , where  $a$  is the first term in the progression, and where  $d$  is the common difference. Note that this means we “double count” arithmetic progressions in that the progression  $a, a + d, a + 2d, \dots, a + kd$  is distinct from  $a + kd, a + (k - 1)d, \dots, a$ .

It is easy to check that each sequence  $a, a + d, a + 2d$ ,  $d \neq 0$  is contained in exactly  $N^2/2 + O(N)$  of these  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$ : We have that each three-term progression is contained in the same number of  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$ , and each  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  contains  $N^2/2 + O(N)$  three-term progressions; hence, if  $P$  denotes the number of  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  containing a particular sequence  $a, a + d, a + 2d$ , we have since there are  $p(p - 1)$  non-trivial progressions in  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , that

$$p(p - 1)P = |\mathcal{A}_N|(N^2/2 + O(N)),$$

whence  $P = N^2/2 + O(N)$ .

So, if we let  $T_3(X)$  denote the number of sequences  $a, a + d, a + 2d \in X$ ,  $d \neq 0$ , we have that

$$T_3(S) = (N^2/2 + O(N))^{-1} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_N} T_3(A \cap S). \quad (3)$$

Next, we need a lower bound on how many  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  satisfy  $|A \cap S| \geq r_3(N)$ : First, note that for each  $d \in \mathbb{F}_p$ ,  $d \neq 0$ , there are exactly  $N$  arithmetic progressions  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  having common difference  $d$  that contain a particular point  $a \in \mathbb{F}_p$ . So,

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_N} |A \cap S| = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathbb{F}_p \\ d \neq 0}} N = (p - 1)N|S|.$$

Let  $Y$  be the number of  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  for which  $|A \cap S| > r_3(N)$ . Then, we have

$$(|\mathcal{A}_N| - Y)r_3(N) + YN \geq (p - 1)N|S|,$$

which implies

$$Y \geq \frac{(p - 1)N|S| - |\mathcal{A}_N|r_3(N)}{N - r_3(N)} \geq (p - 1)|S| - |\mathcal{A}_N|(r_3(N)/N).$$

For each of these  $Y$  progressions  $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$  we will have that  $T_3(A \cap S) \geq 1$ ; and so, we deduce from (3) that

$$T_3(S) \geq \frac{(p-1)|S| - |\mathcal{A}_N|(r_3(N)/N)}{N^2/2 + O(N)}.$$

Using the easy to see fact that  $|\mathcal{A}_N| = p(p-1)$ , we deduce that if

$$|S| > 2(r_3(N)/N)p,$$

then

$$T_3(S) \geq \frac{2p^2(r_3(N)/N)}{N^2 + O(N)}.$$

The lemma easily follows on rephrasing this in terms of  $\Lambda(S)$ . ■

Now we let

$$A := \{n \in \mathbb{F}_p : f(n) \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]\},$$

where  $\varepsilon > 0$  will be determined later. In order for  $f$  to be minimal, from Proposition 1 we deduce that we must have that if  $\varepsilon\beta = p^{-1/2} \log p$ , then

$$\beta \geq \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0 / 8 + O(1/p).$$

So, since we trivially have that

$$W_0 \geq \varepsilon^3 p^2 \Lambda(A),$$

it follows that

$$\Lambda(A) \leq 8\varepsilon^{-6} p^{-1/2} \log p. \tag{4}$$

We would like to now apply Lemma 1 to this, but in order to do so, we must solve for  $N$  such that

$$|A| > 2r_3(N)p/N.$$

To this end, we require the bound (2) of Bourgain, which implies that if we let

$$N = \exp(c(p/|A|)^{3/2}) < p, \text{ since } |A| > \kappa p (\log p)^{-2/3},$$

then we will have that

$$|A| > p(\log N)^{-2/3} > 2r_3(N)p/N,$$

as we require.

From this it follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\Lambda(A) > r_3(N)/N^3 > 1/N^3 > \exp(-3c(p/|A|)^{3/2}).$$

It follows now from (4) that

$$|A| \ll p \log^{-2/3}(\varepsilon^{12}p), \text{ for } \varepsilon > p^{-1/12} \log p.$$

So, if we let  $C$  be the function  $f$  rounded to the nearest integer (which will be either 0 or 1), then for  $n \in A$  we will have  $|f(n) - C(n)| \leq 1$ , while for all other  $n$  we will have  $|f(n) - C(n)| \leq \varepsilon$ . It follows that

$$\sum_n |f(n) - C(n)| \ll (\varepsilon + (\log \varepsilon^{12}p)^{-2/3})p, \text{ for } \varepsilon > p^{-1/12} \log p.$$

Choosing  $\varepsilon = (\log p)^{-2/3}$ , we deduce that this sum is  $O(p(\log p)^{-2/3})$ , just as in Bourgain's theorem (2). This completes the proof of the first part of our theorem.

## 2.2 Proof of the second part of Theorem 1

Given a function  $h : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , we let

$$h_2(n) := h(-n/2),$$

and then we define

$$F_h(n) := (h * h)(2n) + (h * h_2)(-n).$$

In order to proceed further, we will require the following proposition.

**Proposition 2** *Fix  $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ , and associate to each  $a \in A$  a real number  $w_a \in [0, 1]$ . Among all functions  $h : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}(h) = \gamma > \sum_{a \in A} w_a,$$

*those which minimize  $\Lambda(h)$  have the property that there exists  $L > 0$  such that*

$$\text{for } n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A, \quad h(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } F_h(n) < L; \\ 0, & \text{if } F_h(n) > L. \end{cases}$$

The proof of this proposition can be found in subsection 2.5.

We will use this proposition to construct a sequence of sets

$$A_1, A_2, \dots \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p,$$

and a sequence of functions

$$r_1, r_2, \dots : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1], \text{ and all } \mathbb{E}(r_i) = \mathbb{E}(f).$$

such that the following all hold.

- First,  $|A_1| = 2$  and  $A_{i+1} = A_i \cup \{x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\}$ ;
- second,  $\Lambda(r_i) \leq \Lambda(f) + 5p^{-2}|A_i|$ ;
- third, given particular fixed values for  $r_i(n)$  on  $A_i$ , we have that  $r_i$  minimizes  $\Lambda(r_i)$ , subject to the density constraint  $\mathbb{E}(r_i) = \mathbb{E}(f)$ ;
- and finally, for each  $n \in A_i$ ,  $r_i(n) \in [1/4, 3/4]$ .

Clearly, this process cannot continue past the  $\lfloor p/2 \rfloor$ th iteration, as the sets  $A_i$  grow by two elements after each iteration. Furthermore, we will show that whenever the process *does* terminate (which it will in either case 1 or case 2 below), we will be left with a function  $r : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying the conclusion in the second bullet of Theorem 1.

For the time being, let us suppose that these sequences can be constructed as claimed: Suppose we have constructed  $A_i$ ; we will now show how to construct  $A_{i+1}$ . To this end, we apply Proposition 2 with  $A = A_i$  (in the case  $i = 0$  we let  $A$  be the empty set), and then we deduce that for some  $L > 0$ ,  $r_i(n) = 1$  (we use  $r_0(n) := f(n)$ ) for  $F_{r_i}(n) < L$  and  $r_i(n) = 0$  for  $F_{r_i}(n) > L$ . We furthermore apply the already-proved first part of Theorem 1 from subsection 2.1, and deduce that since  $\Lambda(r_i) \leq \Lambda(f) + 10ip^{-2}$ ,

$$\sum_n |r_i(n) - C(n)| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3},$$

where  $C(n)$  is  $r_i(n)$  rounded to the nearest integer.

Now, if there are two distinct places  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  for which

$$r_i(x), r_i(y) \in [1/4, 3/4],$$

then we just let

$$A_{i+1} := \{x, y\}, \text{ and } r_{i+1} := r_i.$$

So suppose that there are no such  $x$  and  $y$ ; there are three possibilities to consider.

### 2.2.1 Case 1: $r_i(n) \geq 1/2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$ where $F_{r_i}(n) = L$ .

Note that we include in this case the possibility that there are no  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  such that  $F_{r_i}(n) = L$ .

If we are in this case, then it means that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i : F_{r_i}(n) = L} |r_i(n) - 1| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3};$$

and so,  $r_i(n)$  is very close to 1 at most places  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  where  $F_{r_i}(n) = L$ . It follows that if we were to let  $S$  be the set of all  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  with  $F_{r_i}(n) \leq L$ , then

$$\sum_{n \in S} |r_i(n) - 1| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3}.$$



In order to extend this sum to all  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$ , we will need to show that  $|A_i|$  cannot be too big. Basically, we will show that if it is, then  $\Lambda(f)$  could not be minimal.

To see this last point, we apply Proposition 1, using  $A := A_i$ ,  $h := r_i$ ,  $\varepsilon = 1/4$ , and  $\varepsilon\beta = p^{-1/2} \log p$ , and we deduce that there exists

$$g : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1], \mathbb{E}(g) \geq \mathbb{E}(r_i),$$

and yet

$$\Lambda(g) \leq \Lambda(f) + 8p^{-1/2} \log p - p^{-2}W_0/64 + O(p^{-1}),$$

where

$$W_0 := \sum_{a, a+d, a+2d \in A} r_i(a)r_i(a+d)r_i(a+2d) \geq 4^{-3}p^2\Lambda(A).$$

We wish to apply Lemma 1: First, let

$$N = \exp(c(p/|A_i|)^{3/2}) < p,$$

such that from (2) we deduce that

$$|A_i| > 2p(\log N)^{-2/3} > 2r_3([N])p/N,$$

as we require.

From this it follows now from Lemma 1 that

$$\Lambda(A_i) \geq \frac{2r_3(N)}{N^3 + O(N^2)} > 1/N^3 \gg \exp(-3c(p/|A_i|)^{3/2}), \quad (5)$$

for  $N$  sufficiently large.

In order for  $f$  to minimize  $\Lambda(f)$ , we must have that

$$8p^{-1/2} \log p = 2\beta \geq p^{-2}W_0/64 + O(1/p);$$

so, ignoring the  $O(1/p)$ , we see that

$$\Lambda(A_i) \leq 4^3p^{-2}W_0 \leq 4^8p^{-1/2} \log p.$$

It follows from this and (5) that

$$|A_i| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3},$$

as claimed. It follows that if we extend  $S$  to be the set of all  $n$  where  $F_{r_i}(n) \leq L$ , then

$$\sum_n |r_i(n) - S(n)| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3},$$

and the second bullet of Theorem 1 is proved upon setting  $r = r_i$ .

**2.2.2 Case 2:**  $r_i(n) < 1/2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  where  $F_{r_i}(n) = L$ .

If we are in this case, then it means that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i : F_{r_i}(n) = L} r_i(n) \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3};$$

and so, if we let  $L' = L - \delta$ , for small enough  $\delta > 0$ , then we will have that for  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$ ,  $r_i(n) = 1$  for  $F_{r_i}(n) \leq L'$ , while  $r_i(n)$  is usually near 0 when  $F_{r_i}(n) > L'$ . It follows then that if we let  $S$  be the set of  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  where  $F_{r_i}(n) \leq L'$ , then

$$\sum_{n \in S} |r_i(n) - 1| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3},$$

We wish to extend this to where  $S$  is the set of all  $n$  satisfying  $F_{r_i}(n) \leq L'$ , by showing that  $|A_i|$  cannot be too big, and we proceed exactly the same way as in Case 1 above. We then deduce that, upon redefining  $S$  in this way, that

$$\sum_n |r_i(n) - S(n)| \ll p(\log p)^{-2/3},$$

and again this proves the second bullet of Theorem 1 upon setting  $r = r_i$ .

**2.2.3 Case 3:** There exists  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A_i$  where  $F_{r_i}(x) = F_{r_i}(y) = L$ , and  $r_i(x) < 1/2 < r_i(y)$ .

In order to decide what to do in this case, we will require the following basic fact, which is an immediate consequence of the formula for  $\Lambda(h_3)$  in the proof of Proposition 2 in section 2.5 in equation (10): We have that if we let

$$r_{i+1}(n) := \begin{cases} r_i(n), & \text{if } n \neq x, y; \\ (r_i(x) + r_i(y))/2, & \text{if } n = x \text{ or } y, \end{cases}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(r_{i+1}) &\leq \Lambda(r_i) + p^{-2}(r_{i+1}(x) - r_i(x))F_{r_i}(x) + p^{-2}(r_{i+1}(y) - r_i(y))F_{r_i}(y) + 10p^{-2} \\ &\leq \Lambda(r_i) + 10p^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

So, when we are in this case, we just let

$$A_{i+1} := \{x, y\},$$

and so the properties of  $A_{i+1}, r_{i+1}$  that we require all hold.

## 2.3 Proof of the third part of Theorem 1

We assume for this part of the proof of our theorem that  $\theta > (\log \log p)^{-2/3}$ , since our problem is trivial otherwise.

We now prove the third bullet of Theorem 1. To this end, we let

$$f_3(n) := (f * \mu)(n),$$

where  $\mu$  is defined as follows: First, we locate the places  $b_1, \dots, b_t$  where the Fourier transform

$$|\hat{f}(b_i)| > \varepsilon_0 p,$$

where  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  will be decided later, and then we define the Bohr neighborhood  $\mathcal{B}$  to be all those  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$  where

$$\|b_i n/p\| < \varepsilon_0, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, t.$$

Finally, we just let  $\mu(n) = 1/|\mathcal{B}|$  if  $n \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $\mu(n) = 0$  otherwise.

Our goal now will be to show that

$$\sum_n |f_3(n) - f(n)| \ll p(\log \log p)^{-2/3}, \quad (6)$$

for this will imply the third bullet of Theorem 1 holds: To see this, note that from the already-proved first bullet, we know that if we let  $C(n)$  be  $f(n)$  rounded to the nearest integer, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n \|\mathcal{B}\|^{-1} (C * \mathcal{B})(n) - C(n) &= \sum_n \|\mathcal{B}\|^{-1} (f * \mathcal{B})(n) - f(n) + O(p(\log p)^{-2/3}) \\ &= \sum_n |f_3(n) - f(n)| + O(p(\log p)^{-2/3}) \\ &\ll p(\log \log p)^{-2/3}, \end{aligned}$$

which is just what the third bullet claims.

Now we show that (6) holds: First note that Parseval gives

$$t \leq \theta \varepsilon_0^{-2};$$

and the following standard lemma tells us that our Bohr neighborhood is “large”.

**Lemma 2** *We have that*

$$|\mathcal{B}| \geq (\varepsilon_0 + O(1/p))^t p.$$

**Proof of the lemma.** For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , we let

$$\alpha_i(x) := (\varepsilon_0 p + 1)^{-1} \left( \sum_{\|b_i n/p\| < \varepsilon_0/2} e^{2\pi i n x/p} \right)^2$$

We note that  $\alpha_i(x)$  is always a non-negative real for all real numbers  $x$ , and  $\alpha_i$  is the Fourier transform of a function  $\beta_i : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Furthermore,

$$|\alpha_i(0)| = \varepsilon_0 p + O(1).$$

Now letting

$$\beta(n) := (\beta_1 \cdots \beta_t)(n),$$

we find that  $\beta : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , and has support contained within  $\mathcal{B}$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}| \geq \hat{\beta}(0) &= p^{-t+1}(\hat{\beta}_1 * \hat{\beta}_2 * \cdots * \hat{\beta}_t)(0) \\ &= p^{-t+1}(\alpha_1 * \alpha_2 * \cdots * \alpha_t)(0) \\ &\geq p^{-t+1}\alpha_1(0) \cdots \alpha_t(0) \\ &\geq (\varepsilon_0 + O(1/p))^t p. \end{aligned}$$

■

Now, from the easy-to-check fact that

$$\|\hat{f}_3(a) - \hat{f}(a)\|_\infty = \|\hat{f}(a)(1 - \hat{\mu}(a))\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_0 p,$$

we easily deduce, via standard arguments (Parseval and Cauchy-Schwarz) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(f_3) &= p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{f}_3(a)^2 \hat{f}_3(-2a) = p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{f}(a)^2 \hat{f}(-2a) + E \\ &= \Lambda(f) + E, \end{aligned}$$

where the “error”  $E$  satisfies

$$|E| \leq 10\varepsilon_0.$$

Now let  $A$  be all those  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$  for which

$$f_3(n) \in [\varepsilon_1, 1 - \varepsilon_1].$$

Then, we have that

$$W_0 := \sum_{a, a+d, a+2d \in A} f_3(a) f_3(a+d) f_3(a+2d) \geq \varepsilon_1^3 p^2 \Lambda(A).$$

In order to apply Lemma 1 to this, we let

$$N = \exp(c(p/|A|)^{3/2}) < p,$$

so that from (2) we deduce that

$$|A| > p(\log N)^{-2/3} > 2r_3(N)p/N,$$

as we require.

From this it follows now from Lemma 1 that

$$\Lambda(A) \geq \frac{2r_3(N)}{N^3 + O(N^2)} > 1/N^3 \gg \exp(-3(2p/|A|)^{3/2}),$$

for  $N$  sufficiently large.

In order for  $\Lambda(f)$  to be minimal, we must have that

$$\Lambda(f) \leq \Lambda(f_3) \leq \Lambda(f) + 2\beta + 10\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1^2 p^{-2} W_0 / 4 + O(1/p).$$

Setting  $\beta = 5\varepsilon_0$  we must have

$$20\varepsilon_0 \geq \varepsilon_1^2 p^{-2} W_0 / 2 + O(1/p) \geq \varepsilon_1^5 \Lambda(A) / 2 + O(1/p);$$

and so,

$$\Lambda(A) \leq 80\varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_1^{-5} + O(1/p).$$

Combining this with our lower bound for  $\Lambda(A)$  above, we deduce that

$$|A| \ll p(\log \varepsilon_1^5 \varepsilon_0^{-1})^{-2/3}.$$

It now follows that if  $C(n)$  is  $f_3(n)$  rounded to the nearest integer, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n |f_3(n) - C(n)| &\leq \sum_{n \in A} 1/2 + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus A} \varepsilon_1 \\ &\ll p(\log \varepsilon_1^5 \varepsilon_0^{-1})^{-2/3} + \varepsilon_1 p. \end{aligned}$$

Now we will set

$$\varepsilon_0 := \sqrt{\theta \log \log p / \log p}, \text{ and } \varepsilon_1 := (\log \log p)^{-2/3},$$

which will give

$$|\mathcal{B}| > p^{1/2},$$

and then our sum on  $|f_3(n) - C(n)|$  will be at most

$$\sum_n |f_3(n) - C(n)| \ll p(\log \log p)^{-2/3},$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

## 2.4 Proof of Proposition 1

### 2.4.1 Technical lemmas needed for the proof of the Proposition

We will need to assemble some lemmas to prove this proposition. We begin with the following standard fact:

**Lemma 3** *Suppose that  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$  satisfies  $|S| = \alpha p$ . Let  $T$  denote the complement of  $S$ . Then, we have that*

$$\Lambda(S) + \Lambda(T) = 1 - 3\alpha + 3\alpha^2.$$

**Proof of the lemma.** One way to prove this is via Fourier analysis: We have that

$$\Lambda(S) + \Lambda(T) = p^{-3} \sum_a (\hat{S}(a)^2 \hat{S}(-2a) + \hat{T}(a)^2 \hat{T}(-2a)).$$

Since  $\hat{S}(a) = -\hat{T}(a)$  for  $a \neq 0$ , we have that all the terms except for  $a = 0$  vanish. So,

$$\Lambda(S) + \Lambda(T) = p^{-3} (\hat{S}(0)^3 + \hat{T}(0)^3) = \alpha^3 + (1 - \alpha^3) = 1 - 3\alpha + 3\alpha^2. \quad \blacksquare$$

From this lemma, one can deduce the following corollary, which we state as another lemma:

**Lemma 4** *For  $\alpha > 2/3$  we have that there exists a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$  satisfying  $|S| = \lfloor \alpha p \rfloor$ , and*

$$\Lambda(S) \leq \alpha^3(1 - (1 - \alpha)^2/2) + O(1/p).$$

**Proof of the Lemma.** Let  $\beta = 1 - \alpha < 1/3$ , and then let  $S$  just be the arithmetic progression  $\{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \alpha p \rfloor - 1\}$ , and then let  $T$  be the complement of  $S$ , which is also just an arithmetic progression. It is easy to check that

$$\Lambda(T) = |T|^2/2p^2 + O(|T|/p^2) = \beta^2/2 + O(1/p),$$

as the solutions to  $x + y = 2z$ ,  $x, y, z \in T$  are exactly those ordered pairs  $(x, z) \in T \times T$  of the same parity.

Applying Lemma 3 to this set  $T$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(S) &= (1 - 3\beta + 3\beta^2) - \beta^2/2 + O(1/p) \\ &= 1 - 3\beta + 5\beta^2/2 + O(1/p) \\ &< (1 - \beta)^3(1 - \beta^2/2) + O(1/p), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \blacksquare

### 2.4.2 Body of the proof of Proposition 1

We will define the function  $g : \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$\text{support}(g) \subseteq A \cup B,$$

where

$$\text{for } n \in B, g(n) = f(n),$$

but on the set  $A$ , the function  $g$  will be different from  $f$ : Basically, we let  $S$  be the set produced by Lemma 4 with  $\alpha = 1 - \varepsilon$ , then take  $T$  to be a random translate and dilate of  $S$ , say

$$T := m.S + t = \{ms + t : s \in S\}.$$

Then, we let

$$\text{for } n \in A, g(n) = (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1}f(n)T(n).$$

Note that this is  $\leq 1$ , because we know  $f(n) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$  on  $A$ .

We will show that, so long as there are “enough” three-term progressions lying in  $A$ , this new function  $g$  will have the property that  $\Lambda(g)$  is much smaller than  $\Lambda(f)$ . To this end, we consider three types of arithmetic progressions that give rise to the counts  $\Lambda(f)$  and  $\Lambda(g)$ : Those progressions that pass through both  $A$  and  $B$  (say one point in  $A$  and two in  $B$ ; or two in  $A$  and one in  $B$ ); those that lie entirely within  $A$ ; and those that lie entirely within  $B$ .

The contribution to  $\Lambda(g)$  of those arithmetic progressions lying entirely within  $B$  is the same as the contribution to  $\Lambda(f)$ . So, we don’t need to account for these when trying to prove our upper bound on  $\Lambda(g)$ ; and therefore there are only two non-trivial cases that we need to work out:

**Case 1 (all three points in  $A$ ).**

Define the random variable

$$Z_0 := \sum_{a, a+d, a+2d \in A} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d),$$

and let  $W_0$  be the analogous sum but with  $g$  replaced by  $f$ . We note that if we only consider those terms with  $d \neq 0$ , we lose at most  $O(p)$  in estimating  $Z_0$ .

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_0) &= \sum_{\substack{a, a+d, a+2d \in A \\ d \neq 0}} \mathbb{E}(g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d)) + O(p) \\ &= p^{-2}(1 - \varepsilon)^{-3} \sum_{\substack{a, a+d, a+2d \in A \\ d \neq 0}} f(a)f(a+d)f(a+2d) \sum_{\substack{m, t \in \mathbb{F}_p \\ a, a+d, a+2d \in m.S+t}} 1 + O(p) \\ &= p^{-2}(1 - \varepsilon)^{-3} \sum_{\substack{a, a+d, a+2d \in A \\ d \neq 0}} \sum_{b, b+d', b+2d' \in S} \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{m, t \in \mathbb{F}_p \\ mb+t=a, m(b+d')+t=a+d}} f(a)f(a+d)f(a+2d) + O(p). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate this inner sum, we note that the contribution of those terms with  $d' = 0$  is 0; and, when  $d' \neq 0$ , we get a contribution of  $f(a)f(a+d)f(a+2d)$  to just the inner sum, because there is only one pair  $m, t$  which works. Thus, we deduce from this and Lemma 4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_0) &= p^{-2}(1 - \varepsilon)^{-3} \sum_{\substack{b, b+d', b+2d' \in S \\ a, a+d, a+2d \in A}} f(a)f(a+d)f(a+2d) + O(p) \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon)^{-3} \Lambda(S)W_0 + O(p) \\ &< (1 - \varepsilon^2/2)W_0 + O(p). \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2 (at least one point in  $A$ , and at least one in  $B$ ).**

Define the random variables

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1 &:= \sum_{\substack{a, a+d \in A \\ a+2d \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d) \\
Z_2 &:= \sum_{\substack{a, a+2d \in A \\ a+d \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d) \\
Z_3 &:= \sum_{\substack{a+d, a+2d \in A \\ a \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d) \\
Z_4 &:= \sum_{\substack{a \in A \\ a+d, a+2d \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d) \\
Z_5 &:= \sum_{\substack{a+d \in A \\ a, a+2d \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d) \\
Z_6 &:= \sum_{\substack{a+2d \in A \\ a, a+d \in B}} g(a)g(a+d)g(a+2d).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, let  $W_1, \dots, W_6$  be the analogous constants with  $g$  replaced by  $f$  (note that these are not random variables).

We will now compute the expectations of these random variables; though, we will not do all of these here, and instead will just work it out for  $Z_1$ , as showing it for all the others can be done in exactly the same way, and leads to the same bounds.

We have that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_1) = \sum_{a+2d \in B} f(a+2d) \sum_{a, a+d \in A} \mathbb{E}(g(a)g(a+d)).$$

To evaluate this last expectation, let us suppose that  $a+2d \in B$  and  $a, a+d \in A$ , where  $d \neq 0$  (if  $d = 0$  then we would have that  $a$  lies both in  $A$  and  $B$ , which is impossible). Then, given any pair of distinct elements  $x, y \in S$ , there exists a unique pair  $(m, t) \in \mathbb{F}_p \times \mathbb{F}_p$  such that

$$mx + t = a \text{ and } my + t = b.$$

So, the probability that

$$g(a)g(a+d) = (1 - \varepsilon)^{-2} f(a)f(a+d),$$

given  $a+2d \in B$ ,  $a, a+d \in A$ , is  $1/p^2$  times the number of ordered pairs  $(x, y)$  of distinct elements of  $S$ , which is  $|S|(|S| - 1)$ . Note that if  $g(a)g(a+d)$  is not equal to this, then it must take the value 0. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_1) = p^{-2}|S|(|S| - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)^{-2}W_1 = W_1 + O(p). \quad (7)$$

Likewise for the other  $Z_i$ , we will have that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_i) = W_i + O(p).$$



**Collecting the two cases together.**

Let  $Z_7$  denote the contribution of arithmetic progressions lying entirely in  $B$ ; that is,

$$Z_7 = \sum_{b,b+d,b+2d \in B} f(b)f(b+d)f(b+2d) = \sum_{b,b+d,b+2d \in B} g(b)g(b+d)g(b+2d).$$

Note that in this case  $W_7 = Z_7$ .

Putting together our above estimates, and using the fact that

$$\Lambda(g) = p^{-2}(Z_0 + \cdots + Z_7),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Lambda(g)) &= p^{-2}(W_0 + \cdots + W_7 - \varepsilon^2 W_0/2 + O(p)) \\ &= \Lambda(f) - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0/2 + O(1/p). \end{aligned}$$

Using Markov's inequality we have

$$\text{Prob}(\Lambda(g) < \Lambda(f) - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0/4) \geq 1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Lambda(g))}{\Lambda(f) - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0/4} > \varepsilon^2/8,$$

since  $\Lambda(f) \geq p^{-2} W_0$ .

**$\mathbb{E}(g)$  is close to  $\mathbb{E}(f)$  with high probability.**

Before we “derandomize” and pass to an instantiation of  $g$ , we will need to also show that  $\mathbb{E}(g)$  is close to  $\mathbb{E}(f)$  with high probability. This can be accomplished in several different ways, though here we will just use the second moment method: First, let

$$F := \sum_{a \in A} f(a), \text{ and } G := \sum_{a \in A} g(a).$$

Now, as is easy to show,  $F + O(1/p) = \mathbb{E}(G)$ ; and so, since  $\varepsilon\beta > p^{-1/2} \log p$ , we have that

$$\text{Prob}(|F - G| \geq 2\beta p) \leq \text{Prob}(|G - \mathbb{E}(G)| \geq \beta p). \quad (8)$$

It follows from Chebychev's inequality that this last probability is at most

$$\frac{\text{Var}(G)}{\beta^2 p^2} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(G^2) - \mathbb{E}(G)^2}{\beta^2 p^2}.$$

To bound this from above we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}(G^2) = \sum_{a,b \in A} \mathbb{E}(g(a)g(b)).$$

Now, as a consequence of what we worked out just before (7), we have that  $g(a)$  and  $g(b)$  are independent whenever  $a \neq b$ . So,

$$\mathbb{E}(G^2) = \mathbb{E}(G^2) + O(p),$$

and it follows that the probability of the right-most event in (8) is at most  $O(\beta^{-2}/p)$ . It is easy to see that with probability  $1 - O(\beta^{-2}/p)$  we will have

$$\mathbb{E}(g) \geq \mathbb{E}(f) - 2\beta. \tag{9}$$

### Conclusion of the proof.

It follows that with probability at least

$$(1 - O(\beta^{-2}/p)) + \varepsilon^2/8 - 1$$

we will have that

$$\mathbb{E}(g) \geq \mathbb{E}(f) - 2\beta \text{ and } \Lambda(g) \leq \Lambda(f) - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0/4 + O(1/p).$$

Using our assumption that

$$\varepsilon\beta > p^{-1/2} \log p,$$

we have that this probability is positive. So, there exists an instantiation of  $g$  such that both hold; henceforth,  $g$  will no longer be random, but will instead be one of these instantiations.

By reassigning at most  $2\beta p$  places  $a \in A$  where  $g(a) = 0$  to the value 1, we can guarantee that  $\mathbb{E}(g) \geq \mathbb{E}(f)$ , and one easily sees that

$$\Lambda(g) < \Lambda(f) + 2\beta - \varepsilon^2 p^{-2} W_0/4 + O(1/p).$$

This completes the proof of our proposition. ■

## 2.5 Proof of Proposition 2

We have that if we define the new function  $h_3(n) = h(n)$  at all  $n \in \mathbb{F}_p$ , except for  $n = x$  and  $n = y$ , then

$$\Lambda(h_3) = \Lambda(h) + E_1 + \cdots + E_{13},$$

where if we let  $\omega = e^{2\pi i/p}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a)^2 (h_3(y) - f(y)) \omega^{-2ay} = p^{-2} (h * h)(2y) (h_3(y) - h(y)) \\
E_2 &= p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a)^2 (h_3(x) - h(x)) \omega^{-2ax} = p^{-2} (h * h)(2x) (h_3(x) - h(x)) \\
E_3 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) \hat{h}(-2a) (h_3(y) - h(y)) \omega^{ay} \\
&= 2p^{-2} (h * h_2)(-y) (h_3(y) - h(y)) \\
E_4 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) \hat{h}(-2a) (h_3(x) - h(x)) \omega^{ax} \\
&= 2p^{-2} (h * h_2)(-x) (h_3(x) - h(x)) \\
E_5 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) (h_3(y) - h(y))^2 \omega^{-ay} = 2p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y))^2 h(y) \\
E_6 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) (h_3(y) - h(y)) (h_3(x) - h(x)) \omega^{a(y-2x)} \\
&= 2p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y)) (h_3(x) - h(x)) h(2x - y) \\
E_7 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) (h_3(y) - h(y)) (h_3(x) - f(x)) \omega^{a(x-2y)} \\
&= 2p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y)) (h_3(x) - f(x)) h(2y - x) \\
E_8 &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(a) (h_3(x) - h(x))^2 \omega^{-ax} = 2p^{-2} (h_3(x) - h(x))^2 h(x) \\
E_9 &= p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(-2a) (h_3(y) - h(y))^2 \omega^{2ay} = p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y))^2 h(y) \\
E_{10} &= p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(-2a) (h_3(x) - h(x))^2 \omega^{2ax} = p^{-2} (h_3(x) - h(x))^2 h(x) \\
E_{11} &= 2p^{-3} \sum_a \hat{h}(-2a) (h_3(x) - h(x)) (h_3(y) - h(y)) \omega^{a(x+y)} \\
&= 2p^{-2} (h_3(x) - h(x)) (h_3(y) - h(y)) h((x+y)/2) \\
E_{12} &= p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y))^3 \\
E_{13} &= p^{-2} (h_3(x) - h(x))^3.
\end{aligned}$$

There are actually 6 more terms that make up the above ‘‘error’’; however, all of these give a contribution of 0, which is why they were not listed.

So, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(h_3) &= \Lambda(h) + p^{-2} (h_3(x) - h(x)) F_h(x) + p^{-2} (h_3(y) - h(y)) F_h(y) \\
&\quad + E_5 + \cdots + E_{13}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

To prove our proposition, all we need to show is that if there is a pair  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ ,  $x, y \notin A$ , with

$$F_h(x) < F_h(y), \text{ and } h(y) > 0,$$

then in fact

$$h(x) = 1.$$

Suppose there were such a pair  $x, y$  for which  $h(x) < 1$ . Then, we will show that  $h$  fails to minimize  $\Lambda(h)$  subject to the various constraints: Basically, we let

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min(1 - h(x), h(y))$$

(its exact value will be decided later) and then we consider the function  $h_3$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } n \in \mathbb{F}_p, n \neq x, y, \text{ we set } h_3(n) &= h(n); \text{ and,} \\ h_3(x) &= h(x) + \varepsilon, h_3(y) = h(y) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

From our formula (10), we easily deduce that

$$\Lambda(h_3) \leq \Lambda(h) + \varepsilon p^{-2}(F_h(x) - F_h(y)) - O(\varepsilon^2 p^{-2}).$$

Clearly, if we take  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, we will get

$$\Lambda(h_3) < \Lambda(h),$$

which contradicts the minimality of  $h$ . We conclude, therefore, that  $h(x) = 1$ , as claimed. ■

## References

- [1] F. A. Behrend, *On the Sets of Integers Which Contain No Three in Arithmetic Progression*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **23** (331-332), 1946.
- [2] J. Bourgain, *Roth's Theorem on Progressions Revisited*, preprint.
- [3] B. Green, *A Szemerédi-Type Regularity Lemma in Abelian Groups*, Geom. and Funct. Anal. **15** (2005), 340-376.
- [4] ———, *Roth's Theorem in the Primes*, Annals of Math. **161** (2005), 1609-1636.
- [5] B. Green and O. Sisask, *On the Maximal Number of Three-Term Arithmetic Progressions in Subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$* , preprint on the ARXIVES.
- [6] B. Green and I. Ruzsa, *Counting Sumsets and Sumfree Sets Modulo a Prime*. Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **41** (2004), 285-293.
- [7] P. Varnavides, *On Certain Sets of Positive Density*, J. London Math. Soc. **34** (1959), 358-360.