

Sets with more differences than sums

Jan-Christoph Schlage-Puchta

Abstract. We show that a random set of integers with density 0 has almost always more differences than sums.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000). Primary 11P70; Secondary 11B75.

Keywords. sum set, difference set, random set.

For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ set $A+A = \{a_1+a_2 : A_i \in A\}$, and $A-A = \{a_1-a_2 : a_i \in A\}$. A finite set A is called difference dominant, if $|A-A| > |A+A|$, and sum dominant, if $|A-A| < |A+A|$. Nathanson[2] constructed infinite sequences of sum dominant sets, and stated the opinion that the majority of all subsets of $[1, n]$ is difference dominant. However, Martin and O'Bryant[1] showed that the proportion of sum dominant sets is at least $2 \cdot 10^{-7}$. They conjectured that sets of density 0 are almost always difference dominant. In this note we prove this conjecture. More precisely, we have the following.

Theorem 0.1. *Let p_n be a sequence of real numbers with $p_n \in [0, 1]$, $p_n \rightarrow 0$ and $np_n \rightarrow \infty$. Let ξ_{in} , $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ be independent random variables satisfying $P(\xi_{in} = 1) = p_n$, and set $A_n = \{i : \xi_{in} = 1\}$. Then the probability that A_n is difference dominant tends to 1.*

Martin and O'Bryant noted that for $p_n = o(n^{-3/4})$, this theorem follows from the fact that in this case almost every set is a Sidon set and has therefore almost twice as many differences as sums.

Proof. We shall suppress the subscript n throughout our argument.

To simplify the computations we first deal with the case $p = o(n^{-1/2})$. The number of elements of A is asymptotically normal distributed with mean and variance np , while the expected number of solutions of the equation $x + y = u + v$ with $x, y, u, v \in A$ is $\mathcal{O}(n^3 p^4)$. Hence, with probability tending to 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A-A| &\geq |A|(|A|-1) - |\{(x, y, u, v \in A^4 : x-y = u-v)\}| \\ &> (1-\epsilon)(np)^2 - \epsilon^{-1}n^3 p^4 > (1-2\epsilon)(np)^2 \geq \frac{(|A|+1)|A|}{2} \geq |A+A|, \end{aligned}$$

and our claim follows. Hence, from now on we shall assume that $p > cn^{-1/2}$. Define random variables ζ_{1i}, ζ_{2i} as

$$\zeta_{1i} = \begin{cases} 1, & \exists a, b : a + b = i, \xi_a = \xi_b = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \zeta_{2i} = \begin{cases} 1, & \exists a, b : a - b = i, \xi_a = \xi_b = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

and set $S_j = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \zeta_{ji}$. Then the probability of A to be difference dominant equals the probability of the event $S_2 > S_1$. We first compute the expectation of S_j . Noting that an even integer can be represented as the sum of two different integers or as the double of an integer, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} S_1 &= \sum_{k=0}^{2n-2} \zeta_{1k} \\ &= (1 - (1 - p^2)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}) + 2 \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n-2 \\ 2 \nmid i}} (1 - (1 - p^2)^{(i-1)/2}) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n-2 \\ 2 \mid i}} (1 - (1 - p)(1 - p^2)^{i/2-1}) \\ &= 2 \int_0^n 1 - (1 - p^2)^{t/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)} dt + \mathcal{O}(1) \\ &= 2n - \frac{1 - (1 - p^2)^{n/2}}{-\log(1 - p^2)^{1/2}} + \mathcal{O}(1) \\ &= 2n - \frac{2 - 2(1 - p^2)^{n/2}}{p^2} + \mathcal{O}(1), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} S_2 &= \sum_{i=-n+1}^{n-1} \zeta_{2i} \\ &= 1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - (1 - p^2)^{n-i}) + \mathcal{O}(1) \\ &= 2 \int_0^n 1 - (1 - p^2)^t dt + \mathcal{O}(1) \\ &= 2n - \frac{1 - (1 - p^2)^n}{p^2} + \mathcal{O}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $p \gg n^{-1/2}$, we obtain $\mathbf{E} S_2 - \mathbf{E} S_1 \gg p^{-2}$.

Next, we give an upper bound for the variance of S_j . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} S_j^2 &= (\mathbf{E} S_j)^2 + 2 \sum_{i < k} \left(P(\zeta_{ji} \zeta_{jk} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)P(\zeta_{jk} = 1) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_i P(\zeta_{ji} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)^2 \\ &= (\mathbf{E} S_j)^2 + \sum_i \mathbf{Var} \zeta_i + 2 \sum_{i < k} \left(P(\zeta_{ji} \zeta_{jk} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)P(\zeta_{jk} = 1) \right) \\ \mathbf{Var} S_j &= \sum_i \mathbf{Var} \zeta_i + 2 \sum_{i < k} \left(P(\zeta_{ji} \zeta_{jk} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)P(\zeta_{jk} = 1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Our aim is to show that $\mathbf{Var} S_j = o(p^{-4})$ for $j = 1, 2$, our claim then follows from Chebyshev's inequality together with our estimate for $\mathbf{E} S_2 - \mathbf{E} S_1$.

Obviously, the first term on the right-hand side is already of the right magnitude, that is, it remains to bound the correlation of ζ_{jk} and ζ_{ji} for $i < k$.

Clearly, the correlation of ζ_{ji} and ζ_{jk} is non-negative, that is, it suffices to bound every summand from above. We use two different estimates for $P(\zeta_{ji} \zeta_{jk} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)P(\zeta_{jk} = 1)$ depending on whether $P(\zeta_{jk} = 1)$ is close to 1 or not. First, we have

$$P(\zeta_{ji} \zeta_{jk} = 1) - P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)P(\zeta_{jk} = 1) \leq P(\zeta_{ji} = 1)(1 - P(\zeta_{jk} = 1)).$$

On the other hand, if $j = 1$ and $i < k \leq n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P(\zeta_{1i} \zeta_{1k} = 1) - P(\zeta_{1i} = 1)P(\zeta_{1k} = 1) &\leq \\ P(\exists \mu, \nu, \kappa : \xi_{1\mu} = \xi_{1\nu} = \xi_{1\kappa} = 1, \mu + \nu = i, \mu + \kappa = k) &\leq ip^3. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $i \leq n < k$, then

$$P(\zeta_{1i} \zeta_{1k} = 1) - P(\zeta_{1i} = 1)P(\zeta_{1k} = 1) \leq \max(0, i + n - k)p^3.$$

Hence, we have to show that the sum

$$\sum_{i < k \leq n} \min(ip^3, \frac{(1-p^2)^k}{p^2})$$

is of order $o(p^{-4})$. For each k we either use the first or the second estimate for all i , and obtain

$$\sum_{k \leq n} \min \left(k^2 p^3, \frac{k(1-p^2)^k}{p^2} \right) \ll \min_{k_0} \left(k_0^3 p^3 + \frac{k_0(1-p^2)^{k_0}}{p^4} \right).$$

Putting $k_0 = 7p^{-2} \log p^{-1}$, the second term becomes $o(1)$, while the first one is $\mathcal{O}(p^{-3} \log^4 p^{-1}) = o(p^{-4})$, since $p \rightarrow 0$, which is of the desired size. A similar computation shows that S_2 has variance $o(p^{-4})$, and we conclude that the random variable $S_2 - S_1$ has mean p^{-2} and variance $o(p^{-4})$, together with $p \rightarrow 0$ our claim follows. \square

References

- [1] G. Martin, K. O'Bryant, *Many sets have more sums than differences*, Additive combinatorics, 287–305, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 43, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [2] M. B. Nathanson, *Sets with more sums than differences*, Integers **7** (2007), A5.

Jan-Christoph Schlage-Puchta
Building S22
Krijgslaan 281
9000 Gent
Belgium
e-mail: `jensp@cage.ugent.be`