

# A NOTE ON CUBE-FREE PROBLEMS

YUCHEN MENG

ABSTRACT. Eberhard and Pohoata conjectured that every 3-cube-free subset of  $[N]$  has size less than  $2N/3 + o(N)$ . In this paper we show that if we replace  $[N]$  with  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  the upper bound of  $2N/3$  holds, and the bound is tight when  $N$  is divisible by 3 since we have  $A = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}_N : a \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{3}\}$ . Inspired by this observation we conjecture that every  $d$ -cube-free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  has size less than  $(d-1)N/d$  where  $N$  is divisible by  $d$ , and we show the tightness of this bound by providing an example  $B = \{b \in \mathbb{Z}_N : b \equiv 1, 2, \dots, d-1 \pmod{d}\}$ . We prove the conjecture for several interesting cases, including when  $d$  is the smallest prime factor of  $N$ , or when  $N$  is a prime power.

We also discuss some related issues regarding  $\{x, dx\}$ -free sets and  $\{x, 2x, \dots, dx\}$ -free sets. A main ingredient we apply is to arrange all the integers into some square matrix, with  $m = d^s \times l$  having the coordinate  $(s+1, l - \lfloor l/d \rfloor)$ . Here  $d$  is a given integer and  $l$  is not divisible by  $d$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A set is called sum-free if there are no solutions to the equation  $x + y = z$ . For example, any subset of integers consisting of odd numbers is sum-free, as the sum of any two odd numbers results in an even number. The study on sum-free set traces its roots back to the early 20th century when Schur [9] used a combinatorial argument to show that Fermat's Last Theorem does not hold in the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .

In addition to exploring the sum-free problem, the research community has shown considerable interest in generalizations. For instance, one of them is to study the so-called  $(k, l)$ -sum-free sets, which is a set with no solutions to  $x_1 + \dots + x_k = y_1 + \dots + y_l$ . In particular, the avoidance density for such sets was recently determined by by Jing and Wu [6, 7], generalizing the line of research for sum-free sets by Bourgain [1], by Eberhard, Green, and Manners [5], and by Eberhard [4].

In this note our primary focus lies in yet another branch of generalization for sum-free problems — the study of cube-free subsets within the cyclic group  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ . To establish the foundation for our exploration, we present the definition of cubes, or more precisely, projective cubes:

**Definition 1.1.** Given a multiset  $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_d\}$  of size  $d$ , we define the projective  $d$ -cube generated by  $S$  as

$$\Sigma^* S = \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} a_i : \emptyset \neq I \subset [d] \right\}.$$

**Definition 1.2.** We say  $A$  is  $d$ -cube-free if there does not exist a multiset  $S$  of size  $d$  with  $(\Sigma^* S) \subset A$ .

For example, a set is 3-cube-free if it contains no  $\{x, y, z, x+y, y+z, x+z, x+y+z\}$  as a subset.

The motivation behind this research is derived from a similar problem concerning cube-free subsets of the set  $[N]$ , which was conjectured by Eberhard and Pohoata:

**Conjecture 1** (Eberhard–Pohoata). *Suppose  $A \subset [N]$  is 3-cube-free, then*

$$|A| \leq (2/3 + o(1))N.$$

*The equality holds when  $A = \{x \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{3}\}$  or  $A = (N/3, N]$ .*

It is easy to verify that the two examples are 3-cube-free. However, it is important to note that when discussing the problem within cyclic groups whose order is divisible by 3, the latter condition is no longer 3-cube-free, while the former still holds. This observation suggests the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 2.** *Let  $A$  be a  $d$ -cube-free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  where  $d \mid N$ , then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{d-1}{d}N.$$

The main result of this note verifies Conjecture 2 for many interesting cases:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $A$  be a  $d$ -cube-free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  where  $d \mid N$ . We have*

$$|A| \leq \frac{d-1}{d}N$$

*when one of following is true:*

- (i)  $d = 3$ .
- (ii)  $d$  is the smallest prime factor of  $N$ .
- (iii)  $N$  is the power of some prime  $p$ .

Notably, the method we employed in proving Theorem 1.3 (i) holds considerable promise for addressing similar problems. To establish this theorem, we concentrate on subsets that are free of the diagonal solutions, namely  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (d-1)x\}$ -free, and the proofs for Theorem 1.3 (ii) and Theorem 1.3 (iii) are subsequently derived from this fundamental idea.

2. THE TIGHTNESS OF THE UPPER BOUND

**Theorem 2.1.** *The bound in conjecture 2 is tight, since we have*

$$A = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}_N : a \equiv 1, 2, \dots, d-1 \pmod{d}\}$$

*which is  $d$ -cube-free.*

We are going to prove a lemma to show the correctness of the example, which is based on the Cauchy–Davenport Theorem [2, 3]. Throughout this section we use standard definitions and notations in Additive Combinatorics as given in [10]. Given  $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}$ , we write

$$A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}, \quad \text{and} \quad AB := \{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}.$$

When  $A = \{x\}$ , we simply write  $x + B := \{x\} + B$  and  $x \cdot B := \{x\}B$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Cauchy–Davenport). *Let  $A, B \subset \mathbb{F}_p$ , then*

$$|A + B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 1, p\}.$$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_d \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . We define*

$$S_t := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i a_i : (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_t) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0) \right\}$$

*where  $t \leq d$ . If  $0 \notin S_t$ , then  $|S_t| \geq t$ .*

*Proof.* When  $d = p$  is a prime, the lemma is indicated by the Cauchy–Davenport Theorem. Indeed, note that

$$S_t \supseteq \{a_1\} + \sum_{i=2}^t \{0, a_i\}.$$

The right hand side is the sum of  $k$  sets. We only need to consider the case that  $|\{a_1\} + \sum_{i=2}^k \{0, a_i\}|$  is strictly less than  $d$  for all  $k \leq t$ , or else  $|S_t| = d$  so that  $0 \in S_t$ . By using the Cauchy–Davenport Theorem for  $(t-1)$  times, we have

$$|\{a_1\} + \sum_{i=2}^t \{0, a_i\}| \geq |\{a_1\}| + \sum_{i=2}^t |\{0, a_i\}| - (t-1).$$

Thus  $|S_t| \geq t$ .

When  $d$  is not a prime, the proof goes by induction on  $d$  and then induction on  $t$ . According to the discussion above, we have already proved the lemma for prime factors, as a foundation of the induction on  $d$ . Now we suppose that the lemma holds in  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  with  $k$  being all the factors of  $d$  and start our induction on  $t$ . To begin with,  $|S_t| \geq t$  for  $t = 1, 2$ . Indeed, when  $t = 2$ ,  $S_t = \{a_1, a_2, a_1 + a_2\}$ . It is impossible to

have  $a_1 = a_2 = a_1 + a_2$ , which implies that  $a_1 = a_2 = 0$ . Now we assume  $|S_k| \geq k$  for all integers  $k \leq t$ . Note that

$$S_{t+1} \supseteq S_t + \{0, a_{t+1}\} \supseteq S_t + a_{t+1} \supseteq S_t.$$

The induction hypothesis gives  $|S_{t+1}| \geq |S_t| \geq t$ . Suppose  $|S_{t+1}| = t < t + 1$ , then

$$S_{t+1} = S_t = S_t + a_{t+1}.$$

Adding up all the elements in three sets respectively, we have

$$\sum_{x \in S_{t+1}} x = \sum_{x \in S_t} x = \sum_{x \in S_t} (x + a_{t+1}).$$

The second equality implies

$$ta_{t+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{d}.$$

Similarly by symmetry we have

$$ta_j \equiv 0 \pmod{d}$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, t + 1$ . Let  $(t, d) = s, t = st_1, d = sd_1$ , then  $(t_1, d_1) = 1$  and  $d_1 \mid a_j$ . We must have  $s > 1$ , or else  $d \mid a_j$ , i.e.  $a_j = 0$ . Now we have

$$a'_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{s},$$

$$S'_{t+1} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \lambda_i a'_i : (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_t) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0) \right\}.$$

where  $s = d/d_1 < d, a'_i = a_i/d_i$ . Clearly  $|S'_{t+1}| = |S_{t+1}| = t$ , so by induction hypothesis there exist  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{t+1}$  not all zero such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \lambda_i a'_i \equiv 0 \pmod{s}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \lambda_i a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{d}.$$

Now we finish the proof by showing that  $0 \in S_{t+1}$  if  $|S_{t+1}| \leq t$ . □

## 3. RELATED PROBLEMS

To start further discussion, we prove the case  $d = 3$  in advance. Recall Theorem 1.3 (i).

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $A$  be a 3-cube-free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  where  $3 \mid N$ , then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{2}{3}N.$$

*Proof.* The proof consists of two parts discussing whether  $A$  contains  $\{x, 2x\}$  as a subset for some  $x$ , namely  $\{x, 2x\}$ -free or not. When  $A$  is  $\{x, 2x\}$ -free, it is equivalent to

$$A \cap 2 \cdot A = \emptyset.$$

Here  $2 \cdot A$  is defined by  $2 \cdot A := \{2a : a \in A\}$ , as mentioned in Section 2. Note that for all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ , there is at most one pair  $(b, c)$  with  $b \neq c$  such that  $2b = 2c = a$ , which implies

$$|2 \cdot A| \geq \frac{1}{2}|A|.$$

Thus

$$N \geq |A| + |2 \cdot A| \geq \frac{3}{2}|A|,$$

and then  $|A| \leq 2N/3$ .

Now let  $A$  be not  $\{x, 2x\}$ -free, then there exists  $x$  such that  $x, 2x \in A$ . Consider the cube generated by  $\{x, x, y\}$  where  $y$  is selected among all the elements in  $A$ , we have

$$A \cap (A - x) \cap (A - 2x) = \emptyset.$$

By taking the complementary set

$$A^c \cup (A - x)^c \cup (A - 2x)^c = \mathbb{Z}_N.$$

Note that both  $(A - x)$  and  $(A - 2x)$  are copies of  $A$ , thus

$$3|A^c| \geq N,$$

and then  $|A| \leq 2N/3$ . □

Actually the proof above can be generalized to all cyclic group, not necessarily  $3 \mid N$ . It gives a quite trivial upper bound of  $2N/3$ , but in some cases there might exist a better one, for instance  $(5/8 + o(1))N$  conjectured by Long and Wagner [8] where  $N = 2^k$ .

Inspired by the proof on 3-cube discussing whether  $\{x, 2x\}$  is forbidden, one can naturally expect to generalize the proof to larger cubes, which leads to the conjecture as follows.

**Conjecture 3.** *Let  $A$  be a  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (d-1)x\}$ -free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  where  $d \mid N$ , then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{d-1}{d}N.$$

*Proof of Conj 2 assuming Conj 3.* It suffices to prove it when  $A$  is not  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (d-1)x\}$ -free. Now there must be an  $x$  such that  $x, 2x, \dots, (d-1)x \in A$ . Consider the  $d$ -cube generated by  $\{x, x, \dots, x, y\}$  where  $y$  is selected among all the elements in  $A$ , we have

$$A \cap (A-x) \cap (A-2x) \cap \dots \cap (A-(d-1)x) = \emptyset.$$

This implies

$$|A| \leq \frac{d-1}{d}N.$$

□

It must be pointed out that we have a similar bound for  $\{x, dx\}$ -free subsets as follows.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $A$  be a  $\{x, dx\}$ -free subset of  $[N]$ , then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{d}{d+1}N + O(\log N).$$

*Proof.* Given  $d$ , note that every positive integer  $m$  can be uniquely written as  $m = d^s \times l$  with  $s$  being a non-negative integer and  $l$  being a positive integer not divisible by  $d$ . Thus we can divide all the integers into different chains starting with integers not divisible by  $d$ :  $l, dl, d^2l, \dots$ . We denote the chain started with  $l$  by  $C_l$ .

It is clear that  $A$  is  $\{x, dx\}$ -free if and only if there are no two elements of  $A$  adjacent in one chain. To acquire the upper bound, we just need to consider the extreme cases on different chains independently. Given  $l$  and  $C_l$ , since only one of  $\{d^k l, d^{k+1} l\}$  can be contained in  $A$  for all  $k \geq 0$  such that  $d^{k+1} l \leq N$ , the extreme case appears when the elements are selected alternately. More precisely, when  $|[N] \cap C_l|$  is odd, the elements of  $A \cap C_l$  take up all the odd positions in  $C_l$ ; when  $|[N] \cap C_l|$  is even, the elements of  $A \cap C_l$  take up either all the odd positions or all the even positions in  $C_l$ .

Since different chains have different lengths, it is difficult to count  $|A \cap C_l|$  respectively and then add them together. Instead, we count them by layers which are defined by

$$L_i := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : d^{i-1} \mid x, d^i \nmid x\}.$$

It is clear that all the integers can be divided into different layers, i.e.

$$\mathbb{Z}_+ = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} L_i.$$

For convenience, we may assume the elements of  $A$  take up all the odd positions in  $C_l$  no matter whether  $|[N] \cap C_l|$  is even or odd, as it does not change the size. Based on this assumption, the maximal  $A$  can be write as

$$A = \left( \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} L_{2i+1} \right) \cap [N].$$

Also all the layers are pairwise disjoint, thus

$$|A| = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |L_{2i+1} \cap [N]|.$$

Suppose  $d^s \leq N < d^{s+1}$ . When  $s$  is odd, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= \sum_{i=0}^{(s-1)/2} |L_{2i+1} \cap [N]| \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{(s-1)/2} \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{d^{2i+1}} N + \frac{d-1}{d} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{(s-1)/2} \left( \frac{d-1}{d^{2i+1}} N + \frac{d-1}{d} \right) + O(s) \\ &= \frac{d}{d+1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{d^{s+1}} \right) N + \frac{(s+1)(d-1)}{2d} + O(s) \\ &= \frac{d}{d+1} N + O(s) = \frac{d}{d+1} N + O(\log N). \end{aligned}$$

And when  $s$  is even, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= \sum_{i=0}^{s/2} |L_{2i+1} \cap [N]| \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{s/2} \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{d^{2i+1}} N + \frac{d-1}{d} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{s/2} \left( \frac{d-1}{d^{2i+1}} N + \frac{d-1}{d} \right) + O(s) \\ &= \frac{d}{d+1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{d^{s+2}} \right) N + \frac{(s+2)(d-1)}{2d} + O(s) \\ &= \frac{d}{d+1} N + O(s) = \frac{d}{d+1} N + O(\log N). \end{aligned}$$

□

This bound may be helpful when we consider cube-free subsets of  $[N]$ . As for cyclic group case, we can get rid of the remainder term.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $A$  be a  $\{x, dx\}$ -free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $k = (d, N)$ , then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{k}{k+1}N.$$

*Proof.* We are going to count the number of solutions to the equation  $x_0 = da$  where  $x_0$  is fixed. Suppose  $da \equiv db \pmod{N}$ , then

$$a \equiv b \pmod{N/k}.$$

This implies there will be at most  $k$  solutions to the equation. Thus

$$|d \cdot A| \geq \frac{1}{k}|A|.$$

Since  $A \cap d \cdot A = \emptyset$ , we have

$$|A| \leq \frac{k}{k+1}N.$$

□

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $A$  be a  $\{x, (d-1)x\}$ -free subset of  $[N]$  where  $d \mid N$ , then  $k = (d-1, N) \leq d-1$  and*

$$|A| \leq \frac{k}{k+1}N \leq \frac{d-1}{d}N.$$

Since  $\{x, (d-1)x\}$  is a subset of  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (d-1)x\}$ , a larger density is implied when the latter is forbidden. But comparing Conjecture 3 with Corollary 3.4, we find that these two sets give rise to a same density when forbidden (or at least we expect them to).

#### 4. SPECIFIC CASES

In this section we are going to prove Theorem 1.3 (ii) and Theorem 1.3 (iii) by showing Conjecture 3 holds respectively. It must be pointed out that the idea of counting the family of sets partly comes from Long and Wagner [8].

**4.1. When  $d$  is the smallest prime factor.** We define the set  $\mathcal{F}$  as

$$\mathcal{F} := \{\{x, 2x, 3x, \dots, (d-1)x\} : x \in \mathbb{Z}_N \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Note that every element  $B$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  has size exactly  $d-1$ . Otherwise, there exist  $i_1, i_2 \in [d-1]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$N \mid (i_1 - i_2)x.$$

Since  $|i_1 - i_2| \leq d - 2$  and  $N$  has no prime factors smaller than  $d$ , we have

$$(i_1 - i_2, N) = 1$$

and then  $N \mid x$  which is contradictory.

Moreover, observe that every element in  $\mathbb{Z}_N \setminus \{0\}$  appears precisely  $d - 1$  times among all different  $B$ . Indeed, for all  $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_N \setminus \{0\}$  and  $t \in [d - 1]$ , the congruence equation with respect to  $x$

$$x_0 \equiv tx \pmod{N}$$

has one and only solution. This is because  $(t, N) = 1$  and thus  $0, t, 2t, \dots, (N - 1)t$  form a complete system of residues modulo  $N$ .

Now we are able to figure out the size of  $\mathcal{F}$  by double counting all the elements covered.

$$(d - 1)|\mathcal{F}| = (d - 1)(N - 1).$$

Let  $A$  be a  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (d - 1)x\}$ -free subset, it is clear that for every  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  there exist at least one element  $a_B \in A^c$ , and  $a_B$  appears repeatedly at most  $d - 1$  times, which indicates

$$|A^c| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{d - 1} = \frac{N - 1}{d - 1} \geq \frac{N}{d}.$$

Then

$$|A| \leq N - \frac{N}{d} = \frac{d - 1}{d}N.$$

**4.2. When  $N = p^l$ .** We are to prove a better result for an  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (p^d - 1)x\}$ -free subset  $A$ :

$$|A| \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d - 1}\right)N.$$

First we define the layers in  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^l}$  by

$$L_i := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^l} : x \equiv p^{i-1} \pmod{p^i}\}.$$

For convenience we write

$$L_{[a,b]} := L_a \cup L_{a+1} \cup \dots \cup L_{b-1} \cup L_b.$$

The proof goes by dividing  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^l}$  into  $\lceil (l + 1)/d \rceil$  blocks, each block consisting of several continuous layers. Indeed, with  $q$  being the largest integer such that  $qd \leq l + 1$ , the division is

$$\mathbb{Z}_{p^l} = L_{[1,d]} \cup L_{[d+1,2d]} \cup \dots \cup L_{[(q-1)d+1,qd]} \cup L_{[qd+1,l+1]}.$$

For an integer  $a \leq l - d + 1$ , we define the set  $\mathcal{F}_a$  as

$$\mathcal{F}_a := \{\{x, 2x, 3x, \dots, (p^d - 1)x\} : x \in L_a\}.$$

Note that for any  $B \in \mathcal{F}_a$ ,  $B$  has size exactly  $p^d - 1$ . Otherwise there exists  $i_1, i_2 \in [p^d - 1]$  and  $x \in L_a$  such that

$$p^l \mid (i_1 - i_2)x.$$

Since  $|i_1 - i_2| \leq p^d - 2$ ,  $(i_1 - i_2)$  is not divisible by  $p^d$ . Recall that  $x \in L_a$  with  $a \leq l - d + 1$ , thus we can find a contradiction.

Moreover, observe that for every  $B \in \mathcal{F}_a$ ,  $B \subset L_{[a, a+d-1]}$  and every element of  $L_{[a, a+d-1]}$  appears in precisely  $(p - 1)p^{d-1}$  (that is, the size of  $[p^d - 1] \cap L_1$ ) different sets in  $\mathcal{F}_a$ .

Now we are able to figure out the size of  $\mathcal{F}_a$  by double counting all the elements covered.

$$(p^d - 1)|\mathcal{F}_a| = (p - 1)p^{d-1}|L_{[a, a+d-1]}|.$$

Let  $A$  be an  $\{x, 2x, \dots, (p^d - 1)x\}$ -free subset. It is clear that for every set  $B \in \mathcal{F}_a$  there exists an element  $x_B \in B$  with  $x_B \notin A$ , and every  $x_B$  recurs at most  $(p - 1)p^{d-1}$  times, therefore

$$|A^c \cap L_{[a, a+d-1]}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{F}_a|}{(p - 1)p^{d-1}} = \frac{1}{p^d - 1}|L_{[a, a+d-1]}|.$$

$$\frac{|A \cap L_{[a, a+d-1]}|}{|L_{[a, a+d-1]}|} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p^d - 1}.$$

Especially, we set  $a = 1 + td, t = 0, 1, \dots, q - 1$  to obtain

$$(1) \quad \frac{|A \cap L_{[1+td, (t+1)d]}|}{|L_{[1+td, (t+1)d]}|} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p^d - 1}.$$

Since  $0 = p^l \notin A$  and  $qd + 1 \geq l - d + 2$  we have

$$(2) \quad \frac{|A \cap L_{[qd+1, l+1]}|}{|L_{[qd+1, l+1]}|} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{|L_{[qd+1, l+1]}|} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p^{d-1}} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p^d - 1}.$$

Finally we combine (1) and (2) to draw the conclusion that in each block  $A$  has a density less than  $1 - 1/(p^d - 1)$ , therefore  $|A| \leq (1 - 1/(p^d - 1))N$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Yifan Jing and Jiaao Li for discussion and guidance.

#### REFERENCES

1. Jean Bourgain, *Estimates related to sumfree subsets of sets of integers*, Israel J. Math. **97** (1997), 71–92. MR 1441239
2. Augustin Louis Baron Cauchy, *Recherches sur les nombres*, J. École Polytech **9** (1813), 99–116.
3. Harold Davenport, *On the addition of residue classes*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **10** (1935), 30–32.

4. Sean Eberhard, *Følner sequences and sum-free sets*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **47** (2015), no. 1, 21–28. MR 3312960
5. Sean Eberhard, Ben Green, and Freddie Manners, *Sets of integers with no large sum-free subset*, Ann. of Math. (2) **180** (2014), no. 2, 621–652. MR 3224720
6. Yifan Jing and Shukun Wu, *The largest  $(k, l)$ -sum-free subsets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **374** (2021), no. 7, 5163–5189.
7. ———, *A note on the largest sum-free sets of integers*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2023), 1–19.
8. Jason Long and Adam Zsolt Wagner, *The largest projective cube-free subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_{2^n}$* , Eur. J. Combin. **81** (2019), 156–171.
9. Issai Schur, *Über die Kongruenz  $x^m + y^m \equiv z^m \pmod{p}$* , Jber. Deutseh. Math. Verein. **25** (1916), 114–117.
10. Terence Tao and Van H Vu, *Additive combinatorics*, vol. 105, Cambridge University Press, 2006.