

On the image of convolutions along an arithmetic progression

Ernie Croot and Chi-Nuo Lee

November 6, 2023

Abstract

We consider the question of determining the structure of the set of all d -dimensional vectors of the form $N^{-1}(1_A * 1_{-A}(x_1), \dots, 1_A * 1_{-A}(x_d))$ for $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$, and also the set of all $(2N + 1)^{-1}(1_B * 1_B(x_1), \dots, 1_B * 1_B(x_d))$, for $B \subseteq \{-N, -N + 1, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, N\}$, where x_1, \dots, x_d are fixed positive integers (we let $N \rightarrow \infty$). Using an elementary method related to the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem on decompositions of doubly-stochastic matrices we show that both the above two sets of vectors roughly form polytopes; and of particular interest is the question of bounding the number of corner vertices, as well as understand their structure.

1 Introduction

Fix an additive group \mathbb{G} , and suppose A, B are finite subsets of \mathbb{G} . Understanding the structure of sumsets $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$ is an important theme in additive combinatorics and additive number theory. And one way this is often done is through studying convolutions

$$1_A * 1_B(x) = \sum_{\substack{u+v=x \\ u, v \in \mathbb{G}}} 1_A(u)1_B(v) = \#\{a \in A, b \in B : a + b = x\}.$$

(Although there may be infinitely many u, v in the case where \mathbb{G} is infinite, all but a finite number of the terms will be 0.)

A basic question one could ask about the distribution of these convolutions is the following. Suppose we take $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}$, and suppose we fix some

distinct points $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{Z}$. What can one say about the image of the mapping?

$$f : A \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \longrightarrow (1_A * 1_A(x_1), 1_A * 1_A(x_2), \dots, 1_A * 1_A(x_d)).$$

Why might we care about this problem, besides the fact that it's a very natural one to pose? To answer this, suppose we knew the values of $1_A * 1_A(x)$ for all x in a subset of the $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$. Could we maybe then conclude something about the convolution at the remaining x_i 's? One could imagine a strong enough solution to this kind of problem could have some applications in solving other additive problems. For example, suppose we knew that A was not too small, say $A \subseteq [-N, N]$, $|A| > Nd^{-\varepsilon}$. For which x_1, \dots, x_d would knowing that $1_A * 1_A(x_1), \dots, 1_A * 1_A(x_{d-1})$ are all near 0 imply that $1_A * 1_A(x_d)$ is near 0? A good enough answer to this might help better understand when $A + A$ contains long arithmetic progressions, a well-studied problem [2, 3, 4, 5].

To address the original question of understanding the image of f , we define the sets of normalized convolutions given integers $N \geq 1$ as follows.

$$S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \{N^{-1}(1_A * 1_{-A}(x_1), \dots, 1_A * 1_{-A}(x_d)) : A \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}\}$$

and

$$T_N(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \{(2N + 1)^{-1}(1_A * 1_A(x_1), \dots, 1_A * 1_A(x_d)) : A \subseteq \{-N, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, N\}\}.$$

Note that

$$S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d), T_N(x_1, \dots, x_d) \subseteq [0, 1]^d.$$

We will first be working with the case $x_i = i$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, which motivates why we chose to define $T_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ in terms of subsets $A \subset [-N, N]$ instead of $[1, N]$. If A consisted of positive integers then the convolutions $1_A * 1_A(i)$ would be very small, making the problem less interesting.

The main focus of this work is to show that S and T are approximately polytopes, and to develop descriptions of the corner vertices in this polytope, as well as bounds on their number. To accomplish this we use a variant of the Birkhoff-von-Neumann Theorem [1], as discussed in section 2.2.

We will also be working with unnormalized ℓ^∞ norms of vectors, which we define as

$$\|(u_1, \dots, u_d)\|_\infty = \max_{i=1, \dots, d} |u_i|.$$

We will use the slightly non-standard notation

$$\mathbb{Z}_M = \text{the cyclic group of order } M \text{ under addition.}$$

And for a set of vectors $\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_d$ in a real vector space we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{convex-hull}(\{v_1, \dots, v_d\}) = \\ \{\lambda_1 \vec{v}_1 + \dots + \lambda_d \vec{v}_d : \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \geq 0, \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_d = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Our main theorem is as follows.

Theorem 1 *Let $S = S_N(1, 2, 3, \dots, d)$ and $T = T_N(1, 2, 3, \dots, d)$; that is, we are working with the case where $x_i = i$, $i = 1, \dots, d$.*

- **Shape of S and T :** *There exist sequences of points*

$$\vec{y}_1, \dots, \vec{y}_m, \vec{z}_1, \dots, \vec{z}_{m'} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

such that if

$$H := \text{convex-hull}(\{\vec{y}_1, \dots, \vec{y}_m\}), \quad H' := \text{convex-hull}(\{\vec{z}_1, \dots, \vec{z}_{m'}\}),$$

then for any $\vec{s} \in S$ and $\vec{t} \in T$ there exist $\vec{h} \in H$ and $\vec{h}' \in H'$ such that

$$\|\vec{s} - \vec{h}\|_\infty = O(2^d m/N), \quad \|\vec{t} - \vec{h}'\|_\infty = O(2^d m'/N). \quad (1)$$

And, conversely, for any $\vec{h} \in H$ and $\vec{h}' \in H'$ there exist $\vec{s} \in S$ and $\vec{t} \in T$ so that (1) holds.

- **Number of Corners:** *We will show that the polytopes H and H' have at most*

$$m \leq 2^{d(d+1)}, \quad m' \leq 4^{d(d+1)}$$

corners, respectively.

- **Rational coordinates and subsets of cyclic groups:** Furthermore, we will show that the \vec{y}_i s and z_j s have the following property: for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, m'$, there exist positive integers $M = M(i) \leq 2^d$, $M' = M'(j) \leq 4^d$, and subsets $B_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_M$ and $B'_j \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{M'}$, such that

$$\vec{y}_i = (a_{i,1}/M, \dots, a_{i,d}/M), \quad \vec{z}_j = (b_{j,1}/M', \dots, b_{j,d}/M') \in [0, 1]^d,$$

where for $i, j, h = 1, \dots, d$,

$$a_{i,h} = 1_{B_i} * 1_{-B_i}(h), \quad b_{j,h} = 1_{B'_j} * 1_{B'_j}(h).$$

We have the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 1 For arbitrary positive integers $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_d$ we have that $S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ and $T_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ are approximately polytopes as in Theorem 1; however, the number of corners k and k' in this case will be bounded as follows:

$$k \leq 2^{x_d(x_d+1)}, \quad k' \leq 4^{x_d(x_d+1)}.$$

Now we discuss how to prove the corollary. We first consider the case $S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ and bounds on k . To prove the corollary in this case, first let $\vec{v} \in S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$. Note that this \vec{v} has an associated subset $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ so that the i th coordinate of \vec{v} equals $N^{-1}1_A * 1_{-A}(x_i)$. This i th coordinate is, in turn, the x_i th coordinate of some vector $\vec{w} \in S_N(1, 2, \dots, x_d)$ of dimension x_d . This motivates defining the projection operator

$$\rho : \mathbb{R}^{x_d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where

$$\rho((z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{x_d})) = (z_{x_1}, z_{x_2}, \dots, z_{x_d}).$$

We note that $\rho(S_N(1, 2, \dots, x_d)) = S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$, and if $\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_m$ are corners whose convex hull contains all of $S_N(1, 2, \dots, x_d)$, then the convex hull of $\rho(\vec{c}_1), \dots, \rho(\vec{c}_m)$ will contain all of $S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$. Among $\rho(\vec{c}_1), \dots, \rho(\vec{c}_m)$ will be a minimal set of k vectors whose convex hull contains $S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$. So we have

$$k \leq m \leq 2^{x_d(x_d+1)}.$$

by Theorem 1. The proof for the bounds on k' are similar, giving

$$k' \leq m' \leq 4^{x_d(x_d+1)}.$$

1.1 Discussion and the special case $d = 2$

To get a feel for what this theorem is saying, we consider the case $d = 2$ and only the convolutions $1_A * 1_{-A}$. In this case, it turns out that the set H that encloses S is the convex hull of the following points in \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$(0, 0), (1, 1), (1/4, 0), (0, 1/2). \quad (2)$$

Now we will see why this is the case: the theorem claims that the corners are determined by sets $B_i \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, M_i - 1\}$, for some integer $M_i \geq 1$. Based on the proof, it will turn out that the possible M_i here are the cycle lengths in a de Bruijn graph for binary strings of length $d = 2$; and each corner (and set B_i) will correspond to one of these cycles. This graph has 4 vertices, 8 edges, and 6 cycles. The possible cycle lengths for this de Bruijn graph are 1, 2, 3, and 4, and nothing else (the cycle of length 1 is via the loops from the vertex for the strings 00 and 11 to themselves.) The 6 possible cycles (including loops), along with the associated M , sets B_i , and $M^{-1}(1_{B_i} * 1_{-B_i}(1), 1_{B_i} * 1_{-B_i}(2))$ they correspond to, respectively, are:

$$\begin{aligned} 00 &\rightarrow 00, M = 1, B = \emptyset, (0, 0) \\ 11 &\rightarrow 11, M = 1, B = \{0\}, (1, 1) \\ 01 &\rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 01, M = 2, B = \{0\}, (0, 1/2) \\ 00 &\rightarrow 01 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 00, M = 3, B = \{0\}, (0, 0) \\ 11 &\rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 01 \rightarrow 11, M = 3, B = \{0, 1\}, (1/3, 1/3) \\ 00 &\rightarrow 01 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 00, M = 4, B = \{0, 1\}, (1/4, 0). \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that the point $(1/3, 1/3)$ is contained within the convex hull of the points (2); and this is minimal, as we cannot make the list any smaller (each of the 4 remaining points cannot be enclosed in the convex hull of the remaining 3). Thus, (2) are exactly the corners of H .

We note that $2^{d(d+1)} = 64$ is much larger than 4, the number of corners we use. Thus, already with $d = 2$ we see that this bound is far from being tight.

1.2 Some unsolved problems and discussion

We finish the introduction by introducing some problems that we were not able to solve.

1. A theorem similar to Theorem 1 might be provable using the circle method. One could imagine perhaps the “corners” of the polytope might fall out of some “major arc” calculations. It might be worth exploring whether the *reverse* is true, however: are there any interesting problems traditionally solved using the circle method that can be (possibly more naturally) solved using cycles in graphs along with Birkhoff-von Neumann decompositions as we do here?
2. Determine the best possible bounds for m and m' , the number of corners needed for the polytopes in the above theorem. Perhaps the true upper bound is something like $m, m' \leq c \cdot 2^d$.
3. What is the best upper bound on k and k' in Corollary 1 one can prove? Can one prove k, k' are bounded from above by a function of d , perhaps $k, k' \leq c2^d$ (for some $c > 0$)? One case where it might be true is when $x_i = iM$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. For example, if $N > M$ is a prime number then we will have that for any set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_N$ (switching temporarily to when the ambient group is \mathbb{Z}_N) and $B \equiv t \cdot A \pmod{N}$ with $t \equiv M^{-1} \pmod{N}$ (B is the set of dilates of A by the multiplicative inverse of M), then

$$1_A * 1_{-A}(x_i) = 1_{tA} * 1_{-tA}(tx_i) = 1_B * 1_{-B}(i).$$

And for M much smaller than N something similar will hold (up to a small error when you transfer the problem from \mathbb{Z}_N to \mathbb{Z}) so that $S_N(1, 2, \dots, d)$ is approximately the same as $S_N(M, 2M, \dots, dM)$.

4. If it's *not* possible to bound m in terms of d as asked by the previous problems, give a good construction of a set of places x_1, \dots, x_d such that the number of corners of $S_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ and $T_N(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ are rather large.
5. Once the polytope associated with some sequence x_1, \dots, x_d is pinned down we can ask about the *distribution* of the number of sets A such that $N^{-1}(1_A * 1_A(x_1), \dots, 1_A * 1_A(x_d)) = (t_1, \dots, t_d)$ for some targets t_1, \dots, t_d . Perhaps it is roughly some kind of multi-dimensional normal distribution, not just near the mean value but even near the boundary of the region.

2 Proof

2.1 Initial setup, defining the weighted graph G_A

We begin by letting $G = (V, E)$ denote the directed de Bruijn graph (with loops) on 2^d vertices V labeled by all the binary strings on d symbols, where there is an edge from $v \rightarrow w$ if one can produce the string w by removing the left-most symbol from v and then concatenating an additional symbol to right of the string. For example, there is a connection from $10110 \rightarrow 01101$, since upon removing that 1 on the left of 10110 we get the string 0110 ; and then adding a 1 to the right, we get 01101 .

Note that the vertices labeled $000\dots 0$ and $111\dots 1$ both have loops, and are in fact the only vertices with loops.

As is well-known, every vertex v except for $000\dots 0$ and $111\dots 1$ have exactly two edges that point from v to some other vertex; and then there are two edges pointing *into* v from some other vertex. The vertices $000\dots 0$ and $111\dots 1$ have only one edge pointing out to some other vertex and one edge pointing in.

The graph G will be useful for understanding $S_N(1, 2, \dots, d)$. To understand $T_N(1, 2, \dots, d)$ we will need to define the following related graph: we let $G' = (V', E')$ denote the directed graph with vertex labels given by all ordered pairs of binary strings of length d (or alternatively binary strings of length $2d$) where a vertex with label (s, t) (s and t are binary strings of length d) has an edge pointing to (s', t') if there are edges $s' \rightarrow s$ and $t \rightarrow t'$ in the de Bruijn graph G . In other words, one can produce s' by appending a 0 or 1 to the beginning (left end) of s while also deleting the right-most character from s ; and one can produce t' by appending a 0 or 1 to the right end of t while also deleting the left-most character from t .

Now we suppose $A \subseteq [N]$ and $A' \subseteq [-N, N] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Note that these gives rise to a vector $\vec{h} \in H$ via

$$\vec{h} = N^{-1}(1_A * 1_{-A}(1), \dots, 1_A * 1_{-A}(d)). \quad (3)$$

and a vector

$$\vec{h}' = (2N + 1)^{-1}(1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(1), \dots, 1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(d)). \quad (4)$$

We can represent A as a binary string s_A of length N , where there is a 1 in the i th position if $i \in A$ and a 0 in the i th position if $i \notin A$. And we

likewise can represent A' by a binary string $s'_{A'}$ of length $2N + 1$, indexed by the integers $i \in [-N, N]$, where there is a 1 in position i if the element $i \in A'$ and there is a 0 in position i otherwise.

We now map A and A' to weighted directed graphs G_A and $G'_{A'}$, respectively, as follows. The vertices and edges of G_A are the same as for G ; and the vertices and edges of $G'_{A'}$ are the same as for G' . It remains to say what the edge weights are: we will first produce from A a walk $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{N-d+1}$. We begin by letting v_1 be the vertex whose label is given by the first d symbols in the string s_A . v_2 is then the vertex whose label is given by the symbols in positions 2 through $d + 1$ in s_A ; and so on, where v_{N-d+1} is the vertex corresponding to the symbols in the $N - d + 1$ through N position.

We similarly produce from A' a walk v'_1, \dots, v'_{N-d+1} through G' . Recall that the vertices of G' have labels of the form (s, t) , where s and t are binary strings of length d . In our case we will let v'_1 be the vertex where the corresponding string s is the symbols of $s'_{A'}$ in the positions $i = -d + 1, \dots, -2, -1, 0$ and the string t is the symbols of $s'_{A'}$ in the positions $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Then, we let v'_2 correspond to having s be the symbols in positions $i = -d, \dots, -1$ in $s'_{A'}$, and t be the symbols in positions $i = 2, \dots, d + 1$. We continue in this vein, producing $v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_{N-d+1}$. The string s corresponding to v'_{N-d+1} will be in positions $i = -N + 1, \dots, -N + d$ and the t will correspond to positions $i = N - d + 1, \dots, N$. It would seem that we are missing the contribution of $i = -N$, however the value of $1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(1), \dots, 1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(d)$ is not affected at all by adding or removing $-N$ from the set A' , because in order to add to $1, 2, \dots, d$ there A' would also have to contain elements in the interval $[N + 1, \dots, N + d]$, which is outside its range.

Note that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - d$ there is an edge $v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}$ in G and likewise an edge from $v'_i \rightarrow v'_{i+1}$ in G' . However, the walks do not necessarily return at the end to v_1 or v'_1 ; that is, it isn't necessarily the case that $v_{N-d+1} = v_1$ or $v'_{N-d+1} = v'_1$. Nonetheless, by extending the walks to at most d additional vertices $v_{N-d+2}, v_{N-d+3}, \dots$ and $v'_{N-d+2}, v'_{N-d+3}, \dots$ we can produce walk v_1, v_2, \dots, v_M and $v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_{M'}$, $N - d + 1 \leq M, M' \leq N + 1$ where $v_M = v_1$ and $v'_{M'} = v'_1$.

We now count up the number of times during the walk v_1, \dots, v_M that we cross any particular edge $e \in E$, say this count is w_e . Likewise, for any edge $e' \in E'$ we let $w'_{e'}$ denote the number of times during the walk $v'_1, \dots, v'_{M'}$ we cross the edge e' . Then we simply let w_e be the weight for the edge e and let $w'_{e'}$ be the weight for the edge e' .

Now, for each vertex $v \in V$ the sum of the weights of the edges leading

into v from another vertex equals the sum of the weights of edges exiting v to another vertex (note that this excludes the contribution of loops). This is an immediate consequence of the fact that the walk is a closed loop ($v_M = v_1$), which guarantees that we can pair up each time we enter a vertex v along an edge with a time when we leave it, including for start vertex v_1 .

Likewise, the sum of the weights of the edges entering any $v' \in V'$ equals the sum of the weights of the edges leaving that vertex.

2.2 Construction of weighted graphs G_0, G_1, \dots

We claim that we can decompose G_A into a sum of cycles in the following sense: let $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ denote the set of cycles (including the two loops) in the de Bruijn graph G . For each $c_i \in C$, we write or identify c_i with a formal sum of its directed edges $c_i = e_{i,1} + e_{i,2} + \dots + e_{i,\ell_i}$, where ℓ_i is the length of c_i and where $e_{i,j}$ denotes the j th edge of c_i . Likewise, through an abuse of notation we can identify G_A with a weighted formal sum of its edges

$$G_A = \sum_{e \in E} w_e e.$$

We claim that we can write this as

$$G_A = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i c_i = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i (e_{i,1} + \dots + e_{i,\ell_i}) = \sum_{e \in E} e \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ e \text{ an edge of } c_i}} n_i, \quad (5)$$

where the integers $n_i \geq 0$ satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^m n_i \ell_i = M - 1, \quad (6)$$

which is the number of edges in the walk v_1, \dots, v_M .

Likewise, we claim that we can decompose $G'_{A'}$ into a similar formal sum:

$$G'_{A'} = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} n'_i c'_i, \quad (7)$$

where $C' = \{c'_1, \dots, c'_{m'}\}$ is the set of cycles in the graph G' , where we can write the cycle $c'_i = e'_{i,1} + \dots + e'_{i,\ell'_i}$, a formal sum of its edges. Letting ℓ'_i

denote the length of the cycle c'_i , we also have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m'} n'_i \ell'_i = M' - 1. \quad (8)$$

These results (really just a lemma) on decomposing G_A and $G'_{A'}$ into cycles can be related to the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem [1], which says the following.

Theorem 2 (Birkhoff-von Neumann) *Suppose that Q is an $n \times n$ doubly-stochastic matrix, which means that the entries are all in $[0, 1]$ and the sum across every row and down any column is always 1. Then, Q is a convex combination of $n \times n$ permutation matrices. That is, there exist permutation matrices P_1, \dots, P_k so that*

$$Q = \lambda_1 P_1 + \dots + \lambda_k P_k,$$

where all $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = 1$.

The connection between this theorem and the decompositions (5) and (7) is as follows. First, we suppose the vertices of G_A are ordered so that we can talk about the “ i th vertex” of the graph. We then form the weighted adjacency matrix for G_A , where the i, j entry is the weight of the edge connecting the i th vertex of G_A to the j th vertex of G_A . If ij is not an edge in the graph, the i, j entry of the matrix is 0. Now, the fact that G_A has the property that the sum of the weights along edges entering any vertex $v \in V$ is the same as the sum of the weights of edges exiting v implies that the sum of the entries in the i th row of the adjacency matrix equals the sum of the entries in the i th column of the matrix. This is not a doubly stochastic matrix, nor can we easily transform it into one (simply rescaling rows and then rescaling columns does not work as one might think). If it *were* possible to renormalize in this way to apply the theorem, writing this matrix as the linear combination of permutation matrices would be the kind of conclusion we are after. Each such permutation matrix would correspond to a disjoint union of cycles (no vertex appearing in more than one cycle) in the graph.

Instead of applying this theorem, and especially because the renormalization idea doesn’t work in general, we will just directly prove what we need

(the proof is very simple). To show that it is possible to write G_A and $G'_{A'}$ this way, we construct sequences

$$G_0 := G_A, G_1, G_2, \dots \text{ and } G'_0 := G'_{A'}, G'_1, G'_2, \dots$$

of weighted graphs by successively removing cycles where all the edges in the cycle are assigned weight 1. In other words, $G_{i+1} = G_i - c$ for some cycle c of G_i , and $G'_{i+1} = G'_i - c'$ for some cycle c' of G'_i . The fact that such cycles c and c' even exist is due to the fact that at each step starting at G_0 and G'_0 we have that the sum of the weights of edges leading into each vertex of those graphs equals the sum of the weights leaving. So at each step G_i is either a collection of isolated points (no edges) or else contains a cycle, which we could then subtract away to get the next graph in the sequence; and the same for G'_i . Eventually, though, we end up with a graph of isolated points, no edges. Now for each cycle c_i in G if we let n_i denote the number of times we subtracted the cycle c_i until we reach some G_i to have no edges, then we clearly get (5).

Likewise the same argument gives us that (7) holds for the graph $G'_{A'}$.

2.3 Building a set from a sum of weighted cycles

We will now see how to associate to $\sum_i n_i c_i$ a special walk that may be different from v_1, \dots, v_M we had before, and we will do the analogous thing for $\sum_i n'_i c'_i$ and $v'_1, \dots, v'_{M'}$: we will think of the term $n_1 c_1 = n_1(e_{1,1} + \dots + e_{1,\ell_1})$ as corresponding to a walk where we start at any vertex of c_1 and then traverse through the cycle n_1 times in total. Thus, so far we have a walk of length $n_1 \ell_1$. Next, we enlarge the walk by at most d additional steps until we reach any vertex of c_2 . The initial walk on at most $n_1 \ell_1 + d$ edges leading up to a vertex of c_2 we will call W_1 . Next, we traverse the cycle c_2 a total of n_2 times, and then walk to at most d more vertices to reach a vertex of c_3 . This second walk of length at most $n_2 \ell_2 + d$ we will call W_2 . At this point we have a walk W_1, W_2 of total length at most $n_1 \ell_1 + n_2 \ell_2 + 2d$. We continue this process, creating walks W_3, W_4, \dots, W_{m-1} . When we get to W_m we do not need to add d additional edges to the end, so it has length $n_m \ell_m$. When the process finishes we get a walk W produced by connecting the smaller walks W_1, W_2, \dots, W_m end-to-end. This walk W will have total length at most

$$n_1 \ell_1 + \dots + n_m \ell_m + (m-1)d. \tag{9}$$

And the length of W is *at least* $n_1\ell_1 + \cdots + n_m\ell_m$, which is the total sum of all the weights of G_A , which has size $M - 1$, where $N - d + 1 \leq M \leq N + 1$. Note that this implies the upper bound in (9) satisfies

$$n_1\ell_1 + \cdots + n_m\ell_m + (m - 1)d = M - 1 + (m - 1)d.$$

We get the same story for $v'_1, \dots, v'_{M'}$: we can create a sequence of walks $W'_1, W'_2, \dots, W'_{m'}$, and then link them together to get one giant walk W' of total length at most

$$n'_1\ell'_1 + \cdots + n'_{m'}\ell'_{m'} + (m - 1)d. \tag{10}$$

Associated to the walk W , we get a corresponding binary string of length at most $M - 1 + md$, which then corresponds to a set $B \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, \dots, M - 1 + md\}$. Now, if we let E denote the edges of the de Bruijn graph, and let $w(e)$ denote the weight of the edge in W and $w_0(e)$ denote the weight of the edge in G_A , then we will have for every $e \in E$,

$$w_0(e) \leq w(e).$$

Likewise, associated to W' we get a string $B' \subseteq [-(M - 1) - md, (M - 1) + md]$, where the association works in the same way as when we related a subset $A' \subseteq [-N + d - 1, N - d + 1]$ to the walk $v'_1, \dots, v'_{N - d + 1}$.

Let $w'(e')$ denote the weight of e' when traversing W' , and let $w'_0(e)$ denote the weight associated to $G'(A')$. We will then also have for all such e' ,

$$w'_0(e') \leq w'(e').$$

Now, each time we move to a new vertex in the walk W , we either get a contribution of 0 or 1 to $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$; and then adding up all the contributions of all the edges, as well as the contribution to the convolution coming from the initial choice of vertex, gives us the value of that convolution. We get the analogous thing for $1_A * 1_{-A}(j)$ traversing the walk used to build G_A .

More precisely, we get a contribution of 1 to $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$ when we walk from a vertex v to a vertex v' in W if and only if both the following hold: (1) that edge $e = vv'$ in the de Bruijn graph corresponds to adding 1 to the right-hand end of a string; and, (2) the label (binary string of length d)

corresponding to v has a 1 in the $d - j + 1$ position. And the analogous thing holds for $1_A * 1_{-A}(j)$ and the walk used to produce G_A .

But this doesn't account for all the possible contributions to the convolutions $1_B * 1_{-B}$ and $1_A * 1_{-A}$. The remaining possible contribution comes from the label of the initial vertex in the walk. It is equal to the number of pairs of 1's that are j apart in the label of the initial vertex. Thus, this "remaining possible contribution" would have size at most $O(d)$.

In the end, $1_A * 1_{-A}(j)$ and $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$ are completely determined by the choice of starting vertex in the corresponding walks, as well as how often we visit various edges in the de Bruijn graph.

We have therefore that for all $j = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1_A * 1_{-A}(j) &\leq 1_B * 1_{-B}(j) + O(d) \\ &\leq 1_A * 1_{-A}(j) + \sum_{e \in E} (w(e) - w_0(e)) + O(d) \\ &\leq 1_A * 1_{-A}(j) + (m - 1)d + O(d). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The first inequality follows from the fact that $1_A * 1_{-A}(j)$ and $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$ are completely determined by the starting vertex v_1 in the walks associated to A and B , as well as the number of times each of the edges are visited, where each edge is visited at least as many times in the walk W as in the walk v_1, \dots, v_{N-d+1} . And the second inequality is due to the fact that for each edge e , the difference in $w(e) - w_0(e) \geq 0$ is an upper bound for the additional contribution of the edge e to $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$ versus $1_A * 1_{-A}(j)$.

We get a similar story when considering $1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j)$: to find this convolution we merely need to add up the contributions from the starting vertex and then each edge we traverse in the double de Bruijn graph in completing the walk W' . The contribution of an edge $(s, t) \rightarrow (s', t')$ to the convolution will be either 0, 1, or 2. Note that the transition $s \rightarrow s'$ corresponds to adding or not (depending on whether the corresponding edge in the de Bruijn graph has label 0 or 1) some number $1 \leq k \leq M - 1 + md$, and the transition $t \rightarrow t'$ corresponds to adding or not adding $-k + 1$.

We would get a contribution of 2 to $1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j)$ for the edge $(s, t) \rightarrow (s', t')$ if we include k in B' and $-k + j$ was already in B' , and whether $-k + j$ was included can be read off from the vertex t , because its label keeps a record of the previous (in the range $-k + 1$ to $-k + d + 1$) several negative elements added to B' .

And traversing $(s, t) \rightarrow (s', t')$ gives a contribution of 0 to $1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j)$ if

k is not added to B' . The contribution of 1 is a special case and corresponds to sums $2b = b + b = j$ for $b \in B'$, so happens only for $1 \leq b \leq j/2$; and so it contributes at most $O(d)$ to the overall value of $1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j)$.

In the end we get for $j = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(j) &\leq 1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j) + O(d) \\ &\leq 1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(j) + 2 \sum_{e \in E} (w'(e) - w'_0(e)) + O(d) \\ &\leq 1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(j) + 2(m-1)d + O(d). \end{aligned}$$

2.4 Relating B to a polytope, proof of (1)

Like how we related the walk W_1, \dots, W_m to the set B , we can individually relate W_i to a set $B_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n_i \ell_i + d\}$, so that for $j = 1, \dots, d$,

$$1_B * 1_{-B}(j) = \sum_{i=1}^m 1_{B_i} * 1_{-B_i}(j) + O(dm). \quad (12)$$

Since W_i is a walk around a cycle c_i again and again, except at the end (where we add vertices to the walk to hop to a vertex of c_{i+1}) we will have that for $1 \leq b \leq (n_i - 1)\ell_i$ that $b \in B_i$ if and only if $b + \ell_i \in B_i$; that is, B_i has a kind of periodicity property.

We now let, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $C_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\ell_i}$ be $B_i \cap [1, \ell_i]$, interpreted as a subset mod ℓ_i .

From the periodicity property of the set B_i we have for $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$ that

$$1_{B_i} * 1_{-B_i}(j) = n_i 1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(j) + O(d).$$

Let

$$\vec{y}_i = \ell_i^{-1} (1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(1), \dots, 1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(d)) \in [0, 1]^d. \quad (13)$$

For $j = 1, \dots, d$ let

$$\lambda_j := \frac{n_j \ell_j}{M-1}.$$

Then from (6) we have $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1$, and we have from (12) and (11) that for any $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$, the k th coordinate of $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \vec{y}_i$ equals

$$1_A * 1_{-A}(k) = 1_B * 1_{-B}(k) + O(d) = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i 1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(k) + O(dm).$$

Since $M = N + O(d)$ from (3) we then deduce that

$$\vec{h} = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \vec{y}_i + O(dm/N).$$

Thus, we see that the first part of (1) holds, and note that the vectors \vec{y}_i have rational coordinates as required by the theorem.

As for the analogous result for W'_i , we associate to it a *pair* of sets

$$B'_i \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'_i \ell'_i + d\}, \quad B''_i \subseteq \{-n'_i \ell'_i - d + 1, \dots, 0\}$$

so that

$$1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m'} 1_{B'_i} * 1_{B''_i}(j) + O(m'd).$$

We could combine these two sets B'_i and B''_i together into a single set $D_i := B'_i \cup B''_i$ and then write

$$1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(j) = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} 1_{D_i} * 1_{D_i}(j) + O(m'd),$$

however in order to relate these convolutions $1_{D_i} * 1_{D_i}$ to some convolution in a finite group $\mathbb{Z}_{\ell'_i}$ we need to *not* try to combine B'_i and B''_i into a single set D_i .

Now, as with the set B_i , the sets B'_i and B''_i have an approximate periodicity property. Specifically, for every $1 \leq b \leq (n'_i - 1)\ell'_i$ we have that $b \in B'_i$ if and only if $b + \ell'_i \in B'_i$; and for $-(n'_i - 1)\ell'_i \leq b \leq 0$ we have $b \in B''_i$ if and only if $b - \ell'_i \in B''_i$.

So, as with how we created the sets C_i , we let

$$C'_i := B'_i \cap \{1, 2, \dots, \ell'_i\}, \quad C''_i := B''_i \cap \{-\ell'_i + 1, -\ell'_i + 2, \dots, 0\},$$

where we are to think of both of these sets as subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_{\ell'_i}$ (instead of just \mathbb{Z}). Then we observe that

$$1_{B'_i} * 1_{B'_i}(j) = 2n'_i 1_{C'_i} * 1_{C''_i}(j) + O(d).$$

Let

$$\vec{z}_i := (\ell'_i)^{-1} (1_{C'_i} * 1_{C''_i}(1), \dots, 1_{C'_i} * 1_{C''_i}(d)) \in [0, 1]^d.$$

For $k = 1, \dots, d$ we note that

$$1_{A'} * 1_{A'}(k) = 1_{B'} * 1_{B'}(k) + O(dm') = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m'} n'_i 1_{C'_i} * 1_{C''_i}(k) + O(dm').$$

So, since $M' = N + O(d)$, from (4) we deduce that if we let for $i = 1, \dots, m'$,

$$\lambda'_i = \frac{n'_i \ell'_i}{M' - 1},$$

then $\lambda'_1 + \dots + \lambda'_{m'} = 1$ and

$$\vec{h}' = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} \lambda'_i \vec{z}_i + O(dm'/N),$$

which establishes the second part of (1).

2.4.1 The “conversely” part of (1)

Now suppose $\vec{h} \in H$ and $\vec{h}' \in H'$. Thus, there exist $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \geq 0$ and $\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_{m'} \geq 0$ such that

$$\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1 = \lambda'_1 + \dots + \lambda'_{m'}$$

and such that

$$\lambda_1 \vec{y}_1 \cdots + \lambda_m \vec{y}_m = \vec{h}, \text{ and } \lambda'_1 \vec{z}_1 + \dots + \lambda'_{m'} \vec{z}_{m'} = \vec{h}'.$$

Next, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, m'$ let

$$n_i := [N \ell_i^{-1} \lambda_i], \text{ and } n'_j := [N \ell'_j^{-1} \lambda'_j].$$

And then we consider the weighted de Bruijn graph G_w and the weighted double de Bruijn graph $G'_{w'}$ which we define through linear combinations of cycles like in section 2.2 as follows:

$$G_w := \sum_{i=1}^m n_i c_i, \quad G'_{w'} := \sum_{i=1}^{m'} n'_i c'_i,$$

where c_1, \dots, c_m are the cycles of the de Bruijn graph G and $c'_1, \dots, c'_{m'}$ are the cycles of the double de Bruijn graph G' .

Next, we basically repeat the construction of the sequence of walks W_1, W_2, \dots, W_m associated to G_w from the section 2.3, and then to a subset $B \subseteq \{1, \dots, M - 1 + (m - 1)d\}$, where

$$M - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i \ell_i = N \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i + E = N + E,$$

where

$$|E| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i \leq 2^d m.$$

Thus, by trimming at most $O(2^d m)$ elements from B , we can ensure that $B \subseteq [1, N]$, and the convolutions $1_B * 1_{-B}(j)$ will only change by at most $O(2^d m)$.

Then, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$, as in section 2.4,

$$1_B * 1_{-B}(k) = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i 1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(k) + O(dm).$$

By (13), within an error of $O(dm)$ this is the k th coordinate of $\sum_{i=1}^m \ell_i n_i \vec{y}_i$, which is, within an error $O(m(d + 2^d))$, the k th coordinate of $N \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \vec{y}_i$. From this the first part of (1) follows.

Analogously, to prove the second part of (1) we pass from G'_w to walks $W'_1, \dots, W'_{m'}$ as discussed in section 2.3; and then from these walks we pass to a set $B' \subseteq [-N, N]$. And then all the steps above that worked for B will also work for B' , except that in place of $1_{C_i} * 1_{-C_i}(k)$ we have $2 \cdot 1_{C'_i} * 1_{C''_i}(k)$. In the end, though, the second part of (1) will follow.

2.5 Upper bounds on m and m'

One way to bound m and m' would be to bound the number of cycles in a certain de Bruijn graph and a related graph for m' . However, this will give bounds that are much too large.

An alternative approach would be to attempt to find some minimal decomposition of G_A (and $G'_{A'}$) as an positive integer linear combination of cycles, where the number of cycles is minimal. Such decompositions might involve significantly fewer cycles than exist in the de Bruijn graph. Indeed, it is known [6, 7] that an $n \times n$ doubly-stochastic matrix can be written as a

sum of *at most* $n^2 - 2n + 2$ permutation matrices. However, this bound would apply only for a single matrix, not the set of *all* doubly-stochastic matrices at the same time using the same set of $n^2 - 2n + 2$ matrices.

Yet another alternative, which is the one we will actually use, relies on the fact that we don't really need to do something like (related to) bound the number of vertices in the polytope of doubly stochastic matrices. All we care about is convolutions, and so we can simply use the fact that the \vec{y}_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$ and \vec{z}_j , $j = 1, \dots, m'$, have rational coordinates with denominators of size ℓ_i and ℓ'_j , respectively, where the numerators are integers in $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell_i - 1\}$ and $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell'_j - 1\}$, respectively. So, an upper bound for the number of vectors $\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_m$ is

$$\sum_{\ell_i} \ell_i^d,$$

where the sum is over all the ℓ_i that are possible cycle lengths in a de Bruijn graph.

As is well known, de Bruijn graphs contain Hamilton cycles, so we do not get any better bound than $\ell_i \leq 2^d$ on the possibilities for the length ℓ_i . Thus, we get the upper bound

$$m \leq \sum_{j=1}^{2^d} j^d \leq 2^{d(d+1)}.$$

We can actually improve this by a factor of d or so, but there is no reason to bother since the bound is probably nowhere near the true upper bound.

Using an analogous argument and the fact that the double de Bruijn graph has 4^d vertices we get that

$$m' \leq \sum_{j=1}^{4^d} j^d \leq 4^{d(d+1)}.$$

References

- [1] G. Birkhoff, Tres observaciones sobre el algebra lineal, Univ. Nac. Tucumán, Rev. Ser. A, no. 5 (1946), 147–151.
- [2] J. Bourgain, *On arithmetic progressions in sums of sets of integers*, A tribute to Paul Erdős, 105–109 (CUP, 1990)

- [3] E. Croot, I. Ruzsa, and T. Schoen, Arithmetic progressions in sparse sumsets, *Combinatorial Number Theory*, 157-164 (de Gruyter, Berlin, 2007).
- [4] E. Croot and O. Sisask, *A probabilistic technique for finding almost-periods of convolutions*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **20** (2010), no. 6, 1367-1396.
- [5] B. Green, *Arithmetic progressions in sumsets*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 12 (2002), no. 3, 584–597.
- [6] J. Kulkarni, E. Lee, and M. Singh, Minimum Birkhoff-von Neumann Decomposition, In: Eisenbrand, F., Koenemann, J. (eds) *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization. IPCO 2017. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 10328.
- [7] M. Marcus, R. Ree, *Diagonals of doubly stochastic matrices*, *Q. J. Math.* **10** (1959), 296–302.