

# Matrix Formulation of Moreira Theorem

Sayan Goswami \*

## Abstract

In a celebrated article, Moreira proved for every finite coloring of the set of naturals, there exists a monochromatic copy of the form  $\{x, x + y, xy\}$ , which gives a partial answer to one of the central open problems of Ramsey theory asking whether  $\{x, y, x + y, xy\}$  is partition regular. In this article, we prove the matrix version of the Moreira theorem. We prove that if  $A$  and  $B$  are two finite image partition regular matrices of the same order, then for every finite coloring of the set of naturals, there exist two vectors  $\vec{X}, \vec{Y}$  such that  $\{A\vec{X}, A\vec{X} + B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\}$  is monochromatic, where addition and multiplication are defined coordinate-wise.

## 1 Introduction

Arithmetic Ramsey theory deals with the monochromatic patterns found in any given finite coloring of the integers or of the natural numbers  $\mathbb{N}$ . Here “coloring” means disjoint partition and a set is called “monochromatic” if it is included in one piece of the partition. A collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  is called partition regular if, for every finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists a monochromatic element  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . Similarly an equation  $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$  over  $\mathbb{N}$  is called partition regular if, for every finite partition of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists a monochromatic solution of the equation  $F$ . One of the longstanding open problems in Ramsey theory that appeared in literature is the following.

**Question 1.1.** ([3, Question 3], [5, Page 58], [8, Question 11]) *Is the pattern  $\{x, y, x + y, xy\}$  partition regular?*

This question was studied at least as early as 1979 by Hindman [7] and Graham [6] by brute force computation, where they found affirmative answers for 2-coloring. Recently in [4] Bowen found a combinatorial proof of this result. However, for any finite coloring, the question is still open. In [10], Moreira proved for any finite coloring of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{x, x + y, x \cdot y\}$  is monochromatic. Later Alweiss found a short proof in [2]. Recently in [1], we proved a set-theoretic version of Moreira’s theorem.

For any nonempty set  $X$ , denote by  $\mathcal{P}_f(X)$ , the set of all nonempty finite subsets of  $X$ , and by  $\mathbb{P}$  we denote the set of all polynomials with no constant term. The following result follows from the [10, Proof of Theorem 1.4].

**Theorem 1.2.** *For any  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $F \in \mathcal{P}_f(\mathbb{P})$  and for any  $r$ -coloring  $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r C_i$  there exists  $i \in [1, r]$  and  $y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\{x : \{x, xy, x + f(y) : f \in F\} \subset C_i\}$$

*is infinite.*

*In particular  $\{x, xy, x + y\}$  is partition regular.*

A matrix  $A$  is said to be an image partition regular matrix if, for any finite colorings of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\vec{X}$  such that the entries of  $A\vec{X}$  are monochromatic. Many Ramsey theoretic results can be formulated in terms of images of matrices. For example, van der Waerden’s theorem [11] which guarantees the existence

---

\*Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal-711202, India, sayan92m@gmail.com.

of monochromatic arithmetic progressions can be formulated as the images of the matrix  $A_l = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & l \end{pmatrix}$ ,

where  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Similarly Hindman's Finite Sum Theorem can be formulated as the image of the infinite matrix each of whose rows consists of all zeros but finitely many 1. In this article, we prove the following theorem. Before that note addition and multiplication are defined coordinate-wise.

**Theorem 1.3.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are two finite image partition regular matrices of same order, then for every finite coloring of the set of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\vec{X}, \vec{Y}$  such that  $\{A\vec{X}, A\vec{X} + B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\}$  is monochromatic.*

Although our original result is little stronger. Our proof confirms that the set  $\{a, a + b, ab : a \in A\vec{X}, b \in B\vec{Y}\}$  is monochromatic.

Letting  $A = B = (1)$ , from Theorem 1.3 we have  $\{x, x + y, xy\}$  is monochromatic.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We will use the following lemma to prove Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are two finite image partition regular matrices then for every finite coloring of the set of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\vec{X}, \vec{Y}$  such that  $\{A\vec{X}, B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\}$  is monochromatic.*

Let us first prove Theorem 1.3 assuming the above lemma.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3 assuming Lemma 2.1.* By a compactness argument, let  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that for any  $r$ -coloring of  $[1, R]$ , there exists a monochromatic copy of the form  $\{A\vec{X}, B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\}$ . Define the  $r^R$  coloring  $\omega'$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  by choosing

$$\omega'(\alpha) = \omega'(\beta) \text{ if and only if } \omega(i\alpha) = \omega(i\beta) \text{ for all } i \in [1, R].$$

For every  $P \in \mathbb{P}$ , and  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ , define a new polynomial  $P_r \in \mathbb{P}$  by  $P_r(x) = P(rx)$ . Define

$$F_1 = \left\{ \frac{1}{y} P_{\frac{z}{y}} : P \in F, \text{ and } y, z \in [1, R] \right\} \in \mathcal{P}_f(\mathbb{P}).$$

Now from Theorem 1.2, there exists  $y \in \mathbb{N}$  and infinitely many  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{x, x \cdot y, x + P(y) : P \in F\}$  is monochromatic under the coloring  $\omega'$ . We say  $C$  to be this collection of such  $x$ 's. Define

$$\mathcal{P} = \{x, x \cdot y, x + P(y) : P \in F, x \in C\}.$$

Now  $\omega'(x) = \omega'(x \cdot y) = \omega'\{x + P(y) : P \in F\}$  induces a  $r$ -coloring  $\chi$  over  $[1, R]$  as

$$\chi(m) = \omega(m \cdot \mathcal{P}).$$

Now from the choice of  $R$  there exists  $a, d \in [1, R]$  such that

$$\omega\left(\{A\vec{X}, B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\} \cdot \mathcal{P}\right) = \text{constant}.$$

Denote

$$D = \{A\vec{X}, B\vec{Y}, A\vec{X} \cdot B\vec{Y}\} \cdot \mathcal{P}.$$

Fix  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{x, xy, x + P(y) : P \in F\} \subset \mathcal{P}$ . Now for each  $a \in A\vec{X}$  and  $b \in B\vec{Y}$ , we have

$$a \cdot \left(x + \frac{b}{a}y\right) = ax + by$$

is a member of  $A\overline{x\overline{X}} + B\overline{y\overline{Y}}$ . Hence  $A\overline{x\overline{X}} + B\overline{y\overline{Y}} \subseteq D$ . Again for  $a \in A\overline{X}$  and  $b \in B\overline{Y}$ , we have

$$(ab) \cdot (xy) = (ax) \cdot (by)$$

is a member of  $A\overline{x\overline{X}} \cdot B\overline{y\overline{Y}}$ . And also  $A\overline{x\overline{X}} \subseteq D$ . But the set  $D$  is monochromatic. So after we redefine  $\overline{x\overline{X}}$  by  $\overline{X}$  and  $\overline{y\overline{Y}}$  by  $\overline{Y}$ , we have  $\{A\overline{X}, A\overline{X} + B\overline{Y}, A\overline{X} \cdot B\overline{Y}\}$  is monochromatic. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we prove Lemma 2.1. We need some technical facts about ultrafilters to prove Lemma 2.1. Let  $\beta\mathbb{N}$  be the collection of ultrafilters and for any two  $p, q \in \beta\mathbb{N}$  let  $A \in p \cdot q \iff \{x : x^{-1}A \in q\} \in p$ , where  $x^{-1}A = \{y : xy \in A\}$ . Then  $(\beta\mathbb{N}, \cdot)$  forms a compact right topological semigroup with the right action is continuous. Let  $K(\beta\mathbb{N}, \cdot)$  be the minimal two-sided ideal. Each member of the idempotents of  $K(\beta\mathbb{N}, \cdot)$  is a minimal idempotent ultrafilter and its members are called Central sets. From [9, Exercise 15.6.2], it follows that if  $A$  is a finite image partition regular matrix and  $p \in K(\beta\mathbb{N}, \cdot)$ , then for every  $C \in p$ , there exists  $\overline{X}$  such that  $A\overline{X} \subseteq C$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* Let  $p$  be a minimal idempotent ultrafilter and  $C \in p$ . Then the set  $C^* = \{n \in C : n^{-1}C \in p\} \in p$ , and so from the [9, Lemma 4.14], we have for each  $m \in C^*$ ,  $m^{-1}C^* \in p$ . As  $p$  is minimal, from [9, Exercise 15.6.2] we have  $\overline{X}$  such that each element of  $A\overline{X}$  lies in  $C^*$ . Hence

$$D = C^* \cap \bigcap_{m \in A\overline{X}} m^{-1}C^* \in p.$$

Now from [9, Exercise 15.6.2] there exists  $\overline{Y}$  such that  $\{n : n \in B\overline{Y}\} \subseteq D$ . Hence all elements of  $A\overline{X}, B\overline{Y}, A\overline{X} \cdot B\overline{Y}$  are members of  $C$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

However, we don't know if Theorem 1.3 is true for infinite image partition regular matrices  $A$  and  $B$ .

## Acknowledgement

The author of this paper is supported by NBHM postdoctoral fellowship with reference no: 0204/27/(27)/2023/R & D-II/11927.

## References

- [1] S. D. Adhikari, and S. Goswami: Homogeneous patterns in Ramsey theory, ArXiv: submit/6159148.
- [2] R. Alweiss: Monochromatic sums and products of polynomials, Discrete Anal. 2024:5, 7 pp. 2.
- [3] V. Bergelson: Ergodic Ramsey theory—an update, in Ergodic Theory of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  Actions (Warwick, 1993–1994), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 228, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 1–61.
- [4] M. Bowen: Monochromatic products and sums in 2-colorings of  $\mathbb{N}$ , Adv. Math. 462 (2025), 110095.
- [5] P. Erdős: Problems and results on combinatorial number theory. III, Number theory day (Proc. Conf., Rockefeller Univ., New York, 1976), Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 626, Springer, Berlin, 1977, pp. 43–72.
- [6] R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, and J. H. Spencer: Ramsey Theory, second ed., Wiley-Intersci. Ser. Discrete Math. Optim., John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
- [7] N. Hindman: Partitions and sums and products of integers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 247 (1979), 227–245.

- [8] N. Hindman, I. Leader, and D. Strauss: Open problems in partition regularity, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 12 (2003), 571–583.
- [9] N. Hindman, and D. Strauss: *Algebra in the Stone-Čech Compactifications: theory and applications*, second edition, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
- [10] J. Moreira: Monochromatic sums and products in  $\mathbb{N}$ , *Annals of Mathematics (2)* 185 (2017), no. 3, 1069–1090.
- [11] B.L. van der Waerden: Beweis einer baudetschen vermutung. *Nieuw. Arch. Wisk.*, 15(1927), 212 – 216.