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Abstract: We show that, for any subsets $S$ and $T$ of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$, there are subsets $S' \subset S$ and $T' \subset T$ such that $|S'| + |T'| < c_q^n$ for some $c_q < q$, and $(S' + T) \cup (S + T') = S + T$.

The novel approach to additive combinatorics in abelian groups introduced by Croot, Lev, and Pach in [4] has led to rapid progress in a range of problems in extremal combinatorics: for instance, a new upper bound for the cap set problem [5], bounds for complexity of matrix-multiplication methods based on elementary abelian groups [2], bounds for the Erdős-Szemerédi sunflower conjecture [9], and polynomial bounds for the arithmetic triangle removal lemma [6]. In many of the applications, the original bound on cap sets in [5] does not suffice for applications: for instance, in [2] and [6] one needs to bound the size of a multi-colored sum-free set, a somewhat more general object.

In the present note, we use the Croot-Lev-Pach lemma, combined with an older result of Meshulam on linear spaces of low-rank matrices, to prove a still more general lemma on sumsets which implies many of the combinatorial bounds used in applications so far. Loosely speaking, we show that the sumset $S + T$ of two large subsets $S$ and $T$ of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ can be expressed “more efficiently” as a union of sumsets of smaller subsets.

We first introduce some notation. Write $m_d$ for the number of monomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ with degree at most $(q - 1)$ in each variable and total degree at most $(q - 1)n/3$, and write $M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ for the upper bound proved in [5] for the size of a subset of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ with no three-term arithmetic progressions; to be precise, we have

$$M(\mathbb{F}_q^n) = 3m_{(q-1)n/3}$$

and $M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ is bounded above by $c^n$ for some $c < q$. (We note that for the sake of the present argument there is no need to consider prime powers $q$ other than primes.)

Theorem 1. Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field and let $S, T$ be subsets of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$. Then there is a subset $S'$ of $S$ and a subset $T'$ of $T$ such that...
• \(|S'| + |T'| \leq M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\);
• \((S' + T) \cup (S + T') = S + T\).

Applying Theorem 1 to the symmetric case \(S = T\), we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.** Let \(S\) be a subset of \(\mathbb{F}^n_q\). Then \(S\) has a subset \(S'\) of size at most \(M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\) such that \(S' + S = S + S\).

**Proof.** By Theorem 1 there are subsets \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) of \(S\) such that \(S + S = (S_1 + S) \cup (S + S_2)\) and \(|S_1| + |S_2| \leq M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\). Taking \(S'\) to be \(S_1 \cup S_2\) we are done.

This immediately implies the bound proved in [5] on subsets of \(\mathbb{F}^n_q\) with no three terms in arithmetic progression:

**Corollary 3 ([5]).** A subset \(S\) of \(\mathbb{F}^n_q\) containing no three-term arithmetic progression has size at most \(M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\).

**Proof.** If \(S\) has no 3-term arithmetic progression, then \(S' + S\) is strictly smaller than \(S + S\) for every proper subset \(S' \subset S\) (because \(S' + S\) fails to contain \(2x\) if \(x\) lies in the complement of \(S'\)). Thus, the subset \(S'\) guaranteed by Corollary 2 must be equal to \(S\), whence \(|S| = |S'| \leq M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\).

Theorem 1 also implies the bounds on multi-colored sum-free sets proved in [7] and [2]. (We note that [2] proves a substantially more general result which applies, for example, to arbitrary abelian groups of bounded exponent.)

**Corollary 4 (Th 1, [7]).** Let \(S, T\) be subsets of \(\mathbb{F}^n_q\) of the same cardinality \(N\), assigned an ordering \(s_1, \ldots, s_N\) and \(t_1, \ldots, t_N\) such that the equation \(s_i + t_i = s_j + t_k\) holds only when \((j, k) = (i, i)\). Then \(N \leq M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\).

**Proof.** Let \(S', T'\) be chosen as in Theorem 1. Each sum \(s_i + t_i\) therefore lies in either \(S + T'\) or \(S' + T\). But since \(s_i + t_i\) cannot be expressed as \(s_j + t_k\) for any other \(j, k\), this implies that either \(s_i \in S'\) or \(t_i \in T'\). It follows that \(N \leq |S'| + |T'| \leq M(\mathbb{F}_q^n)\).

We now prove Theorem 1. The proof is along the same lines as the arguments in the papers cited, but there is one new ingredient: a result of Meshulam [8] on linear spaces of matrices of low rank.

**Proof.** Let \(V\) be the space of polynomials in \(\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_n]\) with degree at most \(q - 1\) in each variable and total degree at most \(d\), that vanish on the complement of \(S + T\). Then \(\dim V\) is at least \(m_d - q^n + |S + T|\). Write \(M\) for the space of of \(|S| \times |T|\) matrices, where the rows are understood to be indexed by \(S\) and the columns by \(T\).

For each \(P \in V\) we may consider the matrix \(M(P) \in M\) whose entries are \(P(s + t)\) when \((s, t) \in S \times T\). By the argument of the Croot-Lev-Pach lemma [4], this matrix has rank at most \(2m_d/2\).

Note that \(M\) is a homomorphism from \(V\) to \(M\), which is injective: if \(P\) lies in the kernel, it vanishes at \(S + T\), but \(P\) vanishes on the complement of \(S + T\), so \(P\) vanishes on every point of \(\mathbb{F}^n_q\) and is 0.

We thus can, and shall, think of \(V\) as a vector subspace of \(M\) of dimension at least \(m_d - q^n + |S + T|\), each of whose members has rank at most \(2m_d/2\).
The arguments of [5],[7],[2] proceed by showing that, if $S,T$ satisfy the conditions Corollary 4, then $V$ contains a diagonal matrix with at least $m_d - q^n + |S|$ nonzero entries, which implies

$$m_d - q^n + |S| \leq 2m_d/2,$$

an upper bound on $|S|$. The mild novelty of the present paper is to exploit the Croot-Lev-Pach rank bound for the whole space $V$, not just for its subspace of diagonal matrices. The earlier papers use the easy fact that a vector space of diagonal matrices of dimension at least $r$ contains a matrix of rank at least $r$. For spaces of general matrices, the problem of controlling the maximal rank attained in a linear space of matrices is much richer. We will use a theorem of Meshulam [8, Theorem 1] in this area, which (rather surprisingly to us) turns out to be perfectly adapted to the combinatorial application. (Indeed, we did not set out to prove Theorem 1; rather, we encountered Meshulam’s theorem and simply worked out what it had to say about sumsets when combined with the argument of [5].)

In the interest of self-containedness, we state Meshulam’s theorem below.

**Theorem 5 (Meshulam).** Let $k$ be a field and $W$ a vector subspace of $M_d(k)$. For each $w \in W$ let $p(w) \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \times \{1,\ldots,n\}$ be the lexicographically first $(i,j)$ such that the entry $w_{ij}$ is nonzero, and let $\Sigma$ be the set of all $p(w)$ as $w$ ranges over $W$. Suppose every matrix in $W$ has rank at most $r$. Then there exists a set of $m$ rows and $m'$ columns such that every element of $\Sigma$ is contained in one of the rows or one of the columns, and $m + m' \leq r$.

We now return to the proof of Theorem 1. Choose an ordering on $S$ and an ordering on $T$. These choices endow the entries of a matrix in $W$ with a lexicographic order. As above, for each matrix $A \in W$, we denote by $p(A) \in S \times T$ the location of the lexicographically first nonzero entry of $A$.

We note that $p(M(P))$ cannot be an arbitrary element of $S \times T$, since $M(P)$ has equal entries at $(s,t)$ and $(s',t')$ whenever $s + t = s' + t'$. In particular, this means that $(s,t)$ and $(s',t')$ cannot both be $p(M(P))$ for polynomials $P \in V$; only the lexicographically prior of these two pairs can appear.

By Gaussian elimination, there is a basis $A_1,\ldots,A_{\dim V}$ for $V$ such that $p(A_1),\ldots,p(A_{\dim V})$ are distinct. Now apply Theorem 5, which shows that there is a set of $2m_d/2$ lines (a line being a row or a column) whose union contains $p(A_i)$ for all $i$.

This set of lines consists of a subset of $S$, which we call $S_0$, and a subset of $T$, which we call $T_0$, satisfying $|S_0| + |T_0| = 2m_d/2$.

We now have, for $i = 1,\ldots,\dim V$,

$$p(A_i) = (s_i,t_i)$$

with either $s_i \in S_0$ or $t_i \in T_0$. What’s more, $s_i + t_i$ and $s_j + t_j$ are distinct whenever $i$ and $j$ are. So the union of $S_0 + T$ with $S + T_0$ contains at least $\dim V$ elements of $S + T$.

Since $\dim V \geq m_d - q_n + |S + T|$, the set $W$ of elements of $S + T$ not contained in $(S_0 + T) \cup (S + T_0)$ has cardinality at most $q_n - m_d$. Let $S_1$ be a subset of $S$ of size $q_n - m_d$ such that each $w \in W$ is represented as $s + t$ for some $s \in S_1$. Then taking $S' = S_0 \cup S_1$ and $T' = T_0$, we have that $S' + T \cup S + T'$ contains all of $S + T$; moreover,

$$|S'| + |T'| \leq 2m_d/2 + q_n - m_d$$

and minimizing over $d$ we get the desired result. \qed
Remark 6. We note that the algebraic approach to bounding sumsets is much older than [4] and [5]; one ancestor, for instance, is Alon’s short proof of the Erdős-Heilbronn conjecture via combinatorial Nullstellensatz [1, Prop 4.2], which also proceeds by considering algebraic properties of a polynomial vanishing on the set of distinct sums in an abelian group (in that case a cyclic group.)

Question 7. Corollary 4, the bound on multi-colored sum-free sets, can be expressed in a more symmetric, and thus more appealing, form: Suppose $S, T, U$ are subsets of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ such that the set
\[
\{(s, t, u) \in S \times T \times U : s + t + u = 0\}
\]
forms a perfect matching between the three sets. Then $|S| = |T| = |U|$ is at most $M(\mathbb{F}_q^3)$. The proof, too, has a symmetric formulation; Tao introduced the notion of slice rank for tensors in $\mathbb{F}_q^n \otimes \mathbb{F}_q^n \otimes \mathbb{F}_q^n$ which was quickly generalized in many directions and applied to a range of further combinatorial problems (see e.g. [10].)

Symmetric methods of this type seem to be the most elegant way to approach these problems. Is there a way to state Theorem 1, and prove it, as a statement about solutions to $s + t + u = 0$ which places the three summands on an equal footing?

Question 8. One naturally wonders whether Theorem 1 has an analogue for cyclic groups. That is: let $g(N)$ be the smallest integer such that, for any subsets $S$ and $T$ of $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$, there are always $S' \subset S$ and $T' \subset T$ with $(S + T') \cup (S' + T) = S + T$ and $|S'| + |T'| \leq g(N)$. What can we say about the growth of $g(N)$? Behrend’s example [3] of a large subset of $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ with no three-term arithmetic progressions shows that $g(N)$ would have to be at least $N^{1-\epsilon}$. Jacob Fox and Will Sawin explained to me that $g(N) = o(N)$ follows from known bounds for arithmetic triangle removal.
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