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Abstract
Let \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) be randomly chosen subsets of the first \( n \) integers of cardinalities \( s_2 \geq s_1 = \Omega(s_2) \), such that their sumset \( A_1 + A_2 \) has size \( m \). We show that asymptotically almost surely \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are almost fully contained in arithmetic progressions \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) with the same common difference and cardinalities approximately \( s_1 m / (s_1 + s_2) \). We also prove a counting theorem for such pairs of sets in arbitrary abelian groups. The results hold for \( s_i = \omega(\log^3 n) \) and \( s_1 + s_2 \leq m = o(s_2 / \log^3 n) \). Our main tool is an asymmetric version of the method of hypergraph containers which was recently used by Campos to prove similar results in the special case \( A = B \).

1 Introduction and Main Results
The general framework of problems in additive combinatorics is to ask for the structure of a set \( A \) subject to some additive constraint in an additive group. The celebrated theorem of Freiman [8] provides such a structural result in terms of arithmetic progressions when the sumset \( A + A \) is small. Classical results like the Kneser theorem in abelian groups or the Brunn–Minkowski inequality in Euclidian spaces naturally address a similar problem for the addition of distinct sets \( A \) and \( B \). The proof by Ruzsa of the theorem of Freiman does provide the same structural result for distinct sets \( A, B \) with the same cardinality when their sumset is small. When the sumset \( A + A \) is very small, then another theorem of Freiman shows that the set is dense in one arithmetic progression, and this result has been also extended to distinct sets \( A \) and \( B \) by Lev and Smeliansky [15] showing that both sets are dense in arithmetic progressions with the same common difference. Discrete versions of the Brunn–Minkowski inequality have also been addressed for distinct sets by Ruzsa [18] and Gardner and Gronchi [9].

Motivated by the Cameron-Erdős conjecture on the number of sum-free sets in the first \( N \) integers, there has been a quest to analyze the typical structure of sets satisfying some additive constraint. One of the most efficient techniques to address this problem is the method of hypergraph containers first introduced by Balogh, Morris and Samotij [2] and independently by Saxton and Thomason [19], which has been successfully applied to a number of problems of this flavour.

A conjecture by Alon, Balogh, Morris and Samotij [1] on the number of sets \( A \) of size \( s \geq C \log n \) contained in the first \( n \) positive integers which have sumset \( |A + A| \leq K|A| \), \( K \leq s/C \) was proved by Green and Morris [10] for \( K \) constant and recently extended by Campos [4] to \( K = o(s/(\log n)^3) \). These counting results are naturally connected to the typical structure of these sets, showing that they are almost contained in an arithmetic progression of length \((1 + o(1))Ks/2 \). We build on the later work by Campos to adapt the result to distinct sets. Our main result is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( n \geq s_2 \geq s_1 = \Omega(s_2) \) be integers and \( m \) an integer satisfying
\[
s_1 + s_2 \leq m = o(s_2^2/(\log n)^3).
\]
Then for almost all sets $X_1, X_2 \subset Z$ such that $|X_1| = s_1$ and $|X_1 + X_2| \leq m$, there exist arithmetic progressions $P_1$ and $P_2$ with the same common difference of size $|P_i| = (1 + o(1))s_in/(s_1 + s_2)$ and $|X_1 \setminus P_i| = o(s_i)$.

Theorem 1.1 extends the result by Campos which corresponds to the symmetric case $X_1 = X_2$. It is derived from Theorem 4.1 in Section 4 which gives more detailed quantitative estimations of the asymptotics involved in the above statement.

The strength of the statement can be illustrated by considering the case where $s_2 = n^\alpha$ for some $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$. Then $m = n^{\alpha(2-\epsilon)} = s_2^{2-\epsilon}$ is a valid choice for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, and hence Theorem 1.1 states that for almost every pair of sets $A, B$ of size $\Theta(n^\alpha)$ such that $|A + B| \leq s_2^{2-\epsilon}$, both $A$ and $B$ are (up to scaling and translating) almost contained in an interval of size $O(n^{\alpha(2-\epsilon)}) = o(n)$. Our proof requires that the cardinalities of the two sets $X_1, X_2$ are not arbitrarily far apart, with specifics being discussed in Section 6. But this seems natural: Even if the condition $s_1 = \Omega(s_2)$ can be weakened, it is not clear to us that a nontrivial structural result should hold when $s_1$ is much smaller than $s_2$.

We can also prove the following counting analogue to Theorem 1.1 for an arbitrary abelian group, which can be compared to Theorem 1.4 in [4]. We need the following definition. For an abelian group $G$ and any positive real number $t$ define $\beta(t) = \max\{|H| : H \leq G, |H| \leq t\}$.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $G$ be an abelian group. Let $n \geq s_2 \geq s_1 = \Omega(s_2)$ be integers and $m$ an integer satisfying $s_1 + s_2 \leq m = o(s_2^2(\log s_2)^{-4}(\log n)^{-3})$. Then for any $F_1, F_2 \subset G$ with $|F_i| = n$, the number of pairs of sets $(X_1, X_2) \in 2^{F_1} \times 2^{F_2}$ such that $|X_i| = s_i$ and $|X_1 + X_2| \leq m$ is at most

$$2^{o(s_2)} \left(\frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2}(m + \beta)\right) \left(\frac{s_2}{s_1 + s_2}(m + \beta)\right),$$

where $\beta = \beta((1 + o(1))m)$.

In groups that allow a result similar to Freiman’s $3k - 4$ theorem one can get rid of the $\log s_2$ term in the upper bound of $m$ in Theorem 1.2. Specific examples would be the integers $G = Z$ or the integers modulo some prime $p$, that is, $G = Z/pZ$. An example discussed in [4] that can easily be adapted to the asymmetric case shows that the range of $m$ for which Theorem 1.2 holds cannot be improved to $m = \Omega(s_2^2/\log n)$. It is not clear whether the same holds true for Theorem 1.1, and an interesting question would be to investigate whether it might be true for any $m = o(s_2^2)$.

The proofs of both Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 will make use of the method of hypergraph containers. The usual structure of this method is to essentially have two separate ingredients, the first being a result about independent sets in hypergraphs following certain degree conditions, and the second being supersaturation and stability results. Our proof will also follow along these lines.

To that end, in Section 2 we will present with Theorem 2.1 a new variant of the asymmetric container lemma introduced by Morris, Samotij and Saxton [16], which is extended to a multipartite version. This extension does not require new ideas but the verification of the statement involves some technical issues so that for completeness we include a full proof in Section 5. The main focus of Section 2 will instead be the application of this multipartite version of the container lemma to prove Theorem 2.2, a statement which provides a relatively small family of sets which essentially contain sets whose product has bounded cardinality in a group. We chose to state Theorem 2.2 in more generality than is required for our results as it follows in a natural way from the container lemma and can be used in further applications. In Section 3 we will then develop the required supersaturation and stability results. Unlike previous works on these problems, which use variants of a theorem by Pollard [17] on averages of the representation...
function, for the stability results we use a robust version of Freiman’s $3k - 4$–theorem by Shao and Xu [21], which itself built on earlier work by Lev [14]. The $3k - 4$–theorem of Freiman, or rather its asymmetric version by Lev and Smeliansky [15], states that if the sumset of two sets is sufficiently small, then the sets themselves are dense in arithmetic progressions. Shao and Xu extended the result to the sum of two sets along the edges of a sufficiently dense graph, its robust version. The statement of Shao and Xu applies to two sets with the same cardinality, and both its statement and proof actually rely on this condition, a circumstance which prevents it from being used in our context directly. We give a similar robust version, Theorem 3.3, that can be seen as a truly asymmetric robust version of the Lev–Smeliansky theorem and may be of independent interest. It requires a different proof than the one given in [21], although a key result in both proofs is an appropriate robust version of Kneser’s addition theorem, Theorem 3.6 in the current work. To our knowledge this is the first statement of this kind which is applicable to pairs of sets of completely unrelated cardinalities, and thus represents progress on a conjecture of Lev [13]. In Section 4 we combine the two ingredients to prove Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, which are more technical versions of our main theorems. The paper concludes with some final remarks in Section 6, both regarding specific aspects of the current results as well as discussions on some open problems.

2 The Method of Hypergraph Containers

One of the key techniques used in [4] is based on an asymmetric version of the container lemma introduced by Morris, Samotij and Saxton [16] which allows for applications to forbidden structures with some sort of asymmetry. This asymmetry can be interpreted as considering bipartite hypergraphs. The first key component to proving Theorem 1.2 is to further extend this bipartite version to a multipartite one as follows.

Let $r$ be a positive integer. For an $r$-vector $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ we call an $r$-partite hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ with vertex set $V(\mathcal{H}) = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_r$ $x$-bounded if $|E \cap V_i| \leq x_i$ for every hyperedge $E \in E(\mathcal{H})$ and every $1 \leq i \leq r$. Denote by $\mathcal{I}$ the family of independent sets of $\mathcal{H}$, and for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) := \{I : I \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } |I \cap V_r| \geq |V_r| - m\}.$$ 

For a subset of vertices $L \subset V(\mathcal{H})$, the codegree is defined as $d_{\mathcal{H}}(L) = |\{E \in E(\mathcal{H}) : L \subset E\}|$. Also, given a vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, denote

$$\Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) := \max\{d(L) : L \subset V(\mathcal{H}), |L \cap V_i| = v_i, \ 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$ 

Finally, for any vector $y$, $|y|$ will denote its 1-norm $\sum |y_i|$.

**Theorem 2.1.** For all non-negative integers $r, r_0$ and each $R > 0$ the following holds. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ is a non-empty $r$-partite $(1, \ldots, 1, r_0)$-bounded hypergraph with $V(\mathcal{H}) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \ldots \cup V_r$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $w = (|V_1|, |V_2|, \ldots, |V_{r-1}|, m)$ and $b, q$ are integers with $b \leq \min_i w_i$ and $q \leq m$, satisfying

$$\Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) \leq R \left( \prod_{i=1}^r w_i^{w_i} \right)^{-1} b^{|v|-1} e(\mathcal{H}) \left( \frac{m}{q} \right)^1 \mathbb{1}_{[v_r, >0]}$$

for every vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r) \in \left( \prod_{i=1}^r (0, 1) \right) \times \{0, 1, \ldots, r_0\}$. Then there exists a family $\mathcal{S} \subset \prod_{i=1}^r (V_i)_{<v_i}$ and functions $f : \mathcal{S} \to \prod_{i=1}^r \mathbb{Z}^{V_i}$ and $g : \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{S}$, such that, letting $\delta = 2^{-(r_0+r-1)(2r_0+r)} R^{-1}$, the following three things are true.

(i) If $f(g(I)) = (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r)$ with $A_i \subset V_i$, then $I \cap V_i \subset A_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$.  

(ii) For every \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r) \in f(S)\), either \(|A_i| \leq (1 - \delta)|V_i|\) for some \(1 \leq i \leq r - 1\), or \(|A_i| \leq |V_i| - \delta q\).

(iii) If \(g(I) = (S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r)\) and \(f(g(I)) = (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r)\), then \(S_i \subset I \cap V_i\) for all \(1 \leq i \leq r\). Furthermore, \(|S_i| > 0\) only if \(|A_j| \leq |V_j| - \delta w_j\) for some \(j \geq i\).

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is lengthy and very similar to the original asymmetric lemma of Morris, Samotij, and Saxton [16], but for the sake of completeness we present it in full in Section 5. For now, let us see how to successively apply it to construct the container family we want to work with. We will be making use of the following hypergraph construction. For a group \(G\) and finite subsets \(F_1, \ldots, F_r \subset G\), define the \(r\)-partite and \((1, \ldots, 1)\)-bounded hypergraph \(\mathcal{H}(F_1, \ldots, F_r)\) in the following way. The vertex set is \(\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{F}} F_i\) and \(\{f_1, \ldots, f_r\}\) is a hyperedge if \(f_i \in F_i\) for all \(i \in [r]\) and \(f_r = f_1 \cdots f_{r-1}\). Note that the sets \(F_i\) need not actually be disjoint.

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \(G\) be a group, \(h \geq 2\) an integer and \(\epsilon > 0\). Suppose \(n, m, s_1, \ldots, s_h\) are integers such that \(\log n \leq \max s_i \leq m \leq \log n (\min s_i)^h\), and let \(F_1, \ldots, F_h\) be subsets of \(G\) of cardinality \(|F_i| = n\) with product set \(F = F_1 F_2 \cdots F_h\). Then there exists a family \(\mathcal{A} \subset \prod_{i \in [h]} 2^{F_i} \times 2^{F}\) of \((h+1)\)-tuples \((A_1, \ldots, A_h, B)\) of size

\[
|\mathcal{A}| \leq \exp \left(2^{(h+1)(h+5)} \epsilon^{-h} m^{1/h} (\log n)^{(2h-1)/h}\right)
\]

such that the following two things are true:

(a) For all \(X_i \subset F_i\), \(Y \subset F\) with \(|X_i| = s_i\), \(X_1 X_2 \cdots X_h \subset Y \) and \(|Y| \leq m\), there exists a tuple \((A_1, \ldots, A_h, B) \in \mathcal{A}\) such that \(B \subset Y\) and \(X_i \subset A_i\) for all \(i \in [h]\).

(b) For every \((A_1, \ldots, A_h, B) \in \mathcal{A}\) it holds that \(|B| \leq m\) and either \(\max_i |A_i| < m/\log n\) or there are at most \(e^h \prod_i |A_i|\) tuples \((a_1, \ldots, a_h) \in \prod_i A_i\) such that \(a_1 a_2 \cdots a_h \notin B\).

**Proof.** We will construct a rooted tree \(T\) with root \(\mathcal{H}(F_1, \ldots, F_h, F)\) and leaves \(\mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1})\) such that one of the following properties holds:

(i) \(|A_i| < s_i\) for some \(i \leq h\),

(ii) \(\max\{ |A_1|, \ldots, |A_h|\} < m/\log n\),

(iii) \(|A_{h+1}| < |F| - m\), or

(iv) \(\mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1})\) has less than \(e^h \prod_{i \in [h]} |A_i|\) hyperedges.

The end-goal is to essentially have \(\mathcal{A}\) be the subset of the leaves of \(T\) that correspond to properties (ii) and (iv).

We construct \(T\) in the following way. Given a vertex \(\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(V_1, \ldots, V_{h+1})\) of \(T\) with \(\max_{i \in [h]} |V_i| \geq m/\log n\), \(|V_i| \geq s_i\) for all \(i \in [h]\), \(|V_{h+1}| \geq |F| - m\) and \(e(\mathcal{H}) \geq e^h \prod_{i \in [h]} |A_i|\), we apply Theorem 2.1 with parameters \(R = e^{-h}, q = m/\log n \) and \(b = q^{1/h}\). Note that \(b \leq \min s_i\) because of our upper bound on \(m\). Let us show that these choices indeed satisfy the codegree conditions of the container lemma. Let \(v = (v_1, \ldots, v_{h+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^{h+1}\). The edges of the hypergraph are defined by a linear relation, hence if we fix \(|v|\) entries of an edge according to the vector \(v\), at most \(h - |v|\) of the \(h + 1 - |v|\) remaining components can be chosen freely, and hence the maximum \(v\)-degree of \(\mathcal{H}\) can be upper bounded by the product of cardinalities of the \(h - |v|\) smallest open sets. Expressing this as formula, we see

\[
\Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) \leq \min_{w=\{w_1, \ldots, w_{h+1}\}} \prod_{i=1}^{h} \frac{|V_i|^{w_i}(V_1 V_2 \cdots V_h) \cap V_{h+1}|^{w_{h+1}}}{|w|=h-|v|}.
\]
Because of our lower bound on \( e(\mathcal{H}) \), in order to prove that (1) holds, it suffices that the parameters are chosen such that the right-hand side of (3) can be upper bounded by

\[
e^h R q^{-v_{h+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{h} |V_i|^{1-v_i} b^{v_i-1}.
\]

We begin by looking at a special case, \( v = (1, \ldots, 1) \). It is easy to see that the codegree \( \Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) \) is 1, and hence we get the condition

\[
e^h R q^{-1} b^h \geq \Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) = 1.
\]

We now consider \( v \) such that \( v_{h+1} = 1 \) and \( |v| \leq h \). Let \( j \in [h] \) be the index that corresponds to the largest \( V_i \). Since there clearly is a \( v \) such that \( v_j = 0 \), equation (3) implies that we need

\[
e^h R q^{v_j} \max_{i \in [h]} |V_i| \geq q,
\]

so in particular if \( v = (0, \ldots, 0, 1) \) we get the most restrictive one (any sensible \( b \) will be positive), namely

\[
e^h R \max_{i \in [h]} |V_i| \geq q.
\]

Finally we consider \( v \) such that \( v_{h+1} = 0 \) and note \( |v| \leq h \). It suffices to be larger than any one of the expressions on the right-hand side of equation (3), so we can ignore the product set expression and have \( w_i = 1 \) for the \( h - v \) smallest available \( V_i \) with \( i \in [h] \), and hence

\[
\Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{h} |V_i|^{1-v_i}.
\]

We can ignore the case \( |v| = h \), since this will lead to a weaker restriction than (4). For \( v \) with \( |v| < h \), the above implies \( e^h R q^{v_j} \max_{i \in [h]} |V_i| \geq q \), which in its most restrictive form with \( |v| = 1 \) means

\[
e^h \geq R.
\]

So we see that \( R = e^{-h} \), \( q = m/\log n \) and \( b = q^{1/h} \) are indeed valid choices. Hence, by Theorem 2.1, there exists a family \( C \subset \prod 2^{V_i} \) of size at most

\[
|C| \leq \prod_{i=1}^{h+1} \left( \frac{|V_i|}{b} \right) \leq b^{h+1} \left( \frac{n^{h}}{b} \right)^h \leq n^{2hb} = \exp \left( 2hm^{1/h}(\log n)^{(h-1)/h} \right),
\]

such that for each \( I \in \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \) there exist \((A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1}) \in C \) with \( I \cap V_i \subset A_i \) for all \( i \in [h+1] \), and either \( |A_i| \leq (1-\delta)|V_i| \) for some \( i \in [h] \), or \( |A_{h+1}| \leq |V_{h+1}| - \delta q \), with \( \delta = b^{2-(h+1)(h+3)} \).

For each \((A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1}) \in C \), add \( \mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1}) \) as a child of \( \mathcal{H} \) in \( \mathcal{T} \). In order to bound the number of leaves of \( \mathcal{T} \), we will first bound its height.

**Claim.** The tree \( \mathcal{T} \) has height at most \( d = 2^{(h+1)(h+4)} e^{-h} \log n \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( \mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_{h+1}) \) is a vertex of \( \mathcal{T} \) of depth \( d \). Recall that after each application of Theorem 2.1, one component shrunk, hence after \( d \) applications one of them shrunk at least \( d/(h+1) \) times. Since we started at \( \mathcal{H}(F_1, \ldots, F_h, F) \) and \( \delta = 2^{-(h+1)(h+3)} e^{-h} \), either

\[
|A_{h+1}| \leq |F| - \frac{d\delta q}{h+1} = |F| - \frac{d\ delta m}{(h+1)2^{(h+1)(h+3)} \log n} < |F| - m,
\]

or for one \( i \in [h] \),

\[
|A_i| \leq (1-\delta)^{d/(h+1)} n \leq \exp(-\delta d/(h+1)) n \leq 1,
\]

and so this vertex has no children.
We will now define the family \( \mathcal{A} \) formally. If \( \mathcal{L} \) is the set of leaves of \( \mathcal{T} \), let

\[
\mathcal{A} = \left\{ (A_1, \ldots, A_h, B) : \mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_h, F \setminus B) \in \mathcal{L}, |B| \leq m \text{ and } |A_i| \geq s_i \text{ for all } i \in [h] \right\}.
\]

Since every tuple \((A_1, \ldots, A_h, B)\) in this family corresponds to a leaf with \( |A_i| \geq s_i \) for every \( i \in [h] \) and \( |F \setminus B| \geq |F| - m \), we must have either \( \max_{i \in [h]} |A_i| < m/\log n \) or the corresponding hypergraph must have less than \( e^h \prod_{i \in [h]} |A_i| \) edges, that is, there are less than \( e^h \prod_{i \in [h]} |A_i| \) \( h \)-tuples \((a_1, \ldots, a_h)\) \( \in \prod_{i \in [h]} A_i \) such that \( a_1 a_2 \cdots a_h \notin B \). In any case, (b) holds. The size of \( \mathcal{A} \) is at most the \( d \)-th power of the maximal number of children of a vertex in \( \mathcal{T} \), and so by (7) we see that

\[
|\mathcal{A}| \leq \exp \left( d 2hm^{1/h} (\log n)^{(h-1)/h} \right) \leq \exp \left( 2^{(h+1)(h+5)} \varepsilon^{-h} m^{1/h} (\log n)^{(2h-1)/h} \right),
\]

and so (2) holds. Finally, property (a) holds since for all \( X_1, \ldots, X_h \) with \( X_i \subset F_1, Y \subset F \) satisfying \( |X_i| = s_i \) for \( i \in [h] \), \( |Y| \leq m \) and \( X_1X_2 \cdots X_h \subset Y \), we see that \( \bigcup_{i \in [h]} X_i \cup (F \setminus Y) \) is contained in \( \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}(F_1, \ldots, F_h, F)) \), and so by the properties of the containers there is a path in \( \mathcal{T} \) from the root to a leaf \( \mathcal{H}(A_1, \ldots, A_h, F \setminus B) \) such that \( X_i \subset A_i \) and \( B \subset Y \). By the size bounds for \( X_i \) and \( Y \) it is clear that this leaf must correspond to an \((h + 1)\)-tuple in \( \mathcal{A} \).

\section{Supersaturation and Stability Statements}

For any abelian group \( G \) and finite subsets \( U, V \subset G \), define

\[
\alpha(U, V) = \max \{ |V'| : V' \subset G, |V'| \leq |V|, |\langle V' \rangle| \leq |U| + |V| - |V'| \}.
\]

The following theorem is a variant, due to Campos, of a generalization of Pollard’s theorem proved by Hamidoune and Serra.

\begin{proposition}[Theorem 3.2 in \cite{4}] Let \( G \) be an abelian group, \( t \) be a positive integer and \( U, V \subset G \) satisfying \( t \leq |V| \leq |U| < \infty \). Then

\[
\sum_{x \in U+V} \min(r_{U,V}(x), t) \geq t(|U| + |V| - t - \alpha),
\]

where \( \alpha = \alpha(U, V) \).
\end{proposition}

This can be used to get the following supersaturation result for sets of distinct sizes.

\begin{corollary}
Let \( G \) be an abelian group, \( A_1, A_2, B \subset G \) be finite and non-empty subsets of \( G \) and \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1/2 \), and denote \( \beta = \beta((1 + 4\varepsilon)|B|) \). If

\[
|A_1| + |A_2| \geq (1 + 2\varepsilon)(|B| + \beta),
\]

then there are at least \( \varepsilon^2 |A_1||A_2| \) pairs \((a_1, a_2) \in A_1 \times A_2 \) such that \( a_1 + a_2 \notin B \).
\end{corollary}

\textbf{Proof.} Without loss of generality we can assume \( |A_2| \geq |A_1| \). If \( |B| \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2)|A_2| \), then since \( r_{A_1,A_2}(b) \leq |A_1| \) for every fixed \( b \in B \), we have at least

\[
|A_1||A_2| - |B||A_1| \geq \varepsilon^2 |A_1||A_2|
\]

pairs \((a_1, a_2) \in A_1 \times A_2 \) such that \( a_1 + a_2 \notin B \). So we can assume \( |B| > (1 - \varepsilon^2)|A_2| \), which also implies \( |A_1| \geq \varepsilon|A_2| \). Now applying Proposition 3.1 with \( t = \varepsilon|A_2| \), \( U = A_2 \) and \( V = A_1 \) gives us

\[
\sum_{x \in A_1 + A_2} \min(r_{A_1,A_2}(x), \varepsilon|A_2|) \geq \varepsilon|A_2|(|A_1| + (1 - \varepsilon)|A_2| - \alpha)
\]
and hence

\[ \sum_{x \in (A_1 + A_2) \setminus B} \min(r_{A_1, A_2}(x), \epsilon |A_2|) \geq \epsilon |A_2|(|A_1| + (1 - \epsilon)|A_2| - |B| - \alpha). \tag{9} \]

We will show that

\[ \alpha \leq \max(\beta, |A_1| + |A_2| - (1 + 4\epsilon)|B|). \]

Indeed, suppose \( A' \subset G \) satisfies \( |A'| \leq |A_1| \) and \(|(A')| \leq |A_1| + |A_2| - |A'|. \) If \(|A'| \leq \beta \) we are done, so suppose \(|A'| > \beta, \) and hence \(|(A')| \geq (1 + 4\epsilon)|B| \) by definition of \( \beta. \) So \( A' \) satisfies

\[ |A'| \leq |A_1| + |A_2| - |(A')| \leq |A_1| + |A_2| - (1 + 4\epsilon)|B|, \]

which is what we wanted to show. Now note that since \( \epsilon < 1/2 \) and \(|B| \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)|A_2| \) we have \(|B| \geq 2|A_2| \) and hence

\[ |A_1| + (1 - \epsilon)|A_2| - |B| - (|A_1| + |A_2| - (1 - 4\epsilon)|B|) = 4\epsilon|B| - \epsilon|A_2| \geq \epsilon|A_2| \geq \epsilon|A_1|. \]

Similarly, since \(|A_1| + |A_2| \geq (1 + 2\epsilon)(|B| + \beta) \) and \( \epsilon < 1/2 \) we have

\[ |A_1| + (1 - \epsilon)|A_2| - |B| - \beta \geq |A_1| + (1 - \epsilon)|A_2| - \frac{|A_1| + |A_2|}{1 + 2\epsilon}, \]

\[ > |A_1| + (1 - \epsilon)|A_2| - (1 - \epsilon)(|A_1| + |A_2|) \]

\[ = \epsilon|A_1|. \]

Hence (9) implies

\[ \sum_{x \in (A_1 + A_2) \setminus B} r_{A_1, A_2}(x) \geq \epsilon^2|A_1||A_2|. \]

\[ \blacksquare \]

For the stability statement, results in the literature were mainly concerned with handling the case of sets having the same cardinality. Note that this would even be an issue if we stipulated that \( s_1 = s_2 \) in Theorem 1.2. The problem here is that while the pairs of sets that are counted may have the same size, the containers obtained via Theorem 2.2 might differ slightly. We modify the recently obtained robust version of Freiman’s \( 3k - 4 \) theorem by Shao and Xu [21], which itself built on earlier work by Lev [14] to handle this, and obtain the following stability result.

For subsets \( U, V \) of some abelian group \( G \) and \( \Gamma \subset U \times V, \) denote by

\[ U + V = \{u + v : (u, v) \in \Gamma \} \]

the restricted subset of \( U \) and \( V. \)

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \( 0 < \epsilon < 1/2 \) and let \( U, V \) be finite subsets of \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( N = \min\{|U|, |V|\} \geq 3 \)
and \( M = \max\{|U|, |V|\} \geq 2/\sqrt{7}. \) Let \( \Gamma \subset U \times V \) with \(|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|U||V| \) and

\[ |U + V| = |U| + |V| + r. \]

If

\[ r < \frac{N}{2} - 13\sqrt{7}M, \]

then there are arithmetic progressions \( P \) and \( Q \) with the same common difference and lengths \(|P| \leq |U| + r + 5\sqrt{7}M, |Q| \leq |V| + r + 5\sqrt{7}M \) such that \(|P \cap U| \geq (1 - \sqrt{7})|U| \) and \(|Q \cap V| \geq (1 - \sqrt{7})|V| \).
Corollary 3.4. Let \( s_1 \leq s_2 \) be positive integers, and \( 0 < \epsilon \leq 2^{-8} \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} \right)^2 \). If \( A_1, A_2, B \subset \mathbb{Z} \), such that \((1 - \epsilon)|B| \leq |A_1| + |A_2| \) and \( |A_i| \leq \left( \frac{s_i}{s_1 + s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B| \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), then one of the following holds:

(a) There are at least \( \epsilon^2|A_1||A_2| \) pairs \( (a_1, a_2) \in A_1 \times A_2 \) such that \( a_1 + a_2 \notin B \).

(b) There are arithmetic progressions \( P_1, P_2 \) of length \( |P_i| \leq \left( \frac{s_i}{s_1 + s_2} \right)|B| + 4\sqrt{\epsilon}|B| \) with the same common difference such that \( P_i \) contains all but at most \( \epsilon|A_i| \) points of \( A_i \).

Proof. Let \( \Gamma = \{(a_1, a_2) \in A_1 \times A_2 : a_1 + a_2 \in B\} \). If \( |\Gamma| < (1 - \epsilon^2)|A_1||A_2| \) case (a) holds, so assume the converse. It is a straightforward computation that for \( \epsilon \leq 2^{-8} \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} \right)^2 \),

\[
\frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon \right) + (1 - 13\epsilon) \left( 1 - \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon \right) > 1,
\]

and so since

\[
|A_i| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|B| - \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B| = \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - \epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B|,
\]

it holds that

\[
|A_1 \cap A_2| \leq |B| \\
\leq \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon \right)|B| + (1 - 13\epsilon) \left( 1 - \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon \right)|B| \\
\leq \frac{3}{2} |A_i| + (1 - 13\epsilon)|A_{3-i}|.
\]

We can thus apply Theorem 3.3 with \( \epsilon^2 \) in place of \( \epsilon \). Note that since \( s_2 \geq s_1 \), both \( |A_1| \) and \( |A_2| \) are upper bounded by \( \left( \frac{s_2}{s_1 + s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon}|B| \right) \), and so the theorem implies that there exist arithmetic progressions \( P_1, P_2 \) with the same common difference of length

\[
|P_1| \leq |A_1 + A_2| - |A_{3-i}| + 5\epsilon \left( \frac{s_2}{s_1 + s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B| \\
\leq |B| - \left( \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2} - \epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B| + 5\epsilon \left( \frac{s_2}{s_1 + s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \right)|B| \\
\leq \frac{s_1}{s_1 + s_2}|B| + 4\sqrt{\epsilon}|B|
\]

such that

\[
|A_i \setminus P_i| = |A_i| - |A_i \cap P_i| \leq \epsilon|A_i|,
\]

so case (b) holds. \( \blacksquare \)

**Proof of Theorem 3.3**

We may think of \( \Gamma \subset U \times V \) as a subgraph of the complete bipartite graph \( K_{|U|,|V|} \) where the edges \((u, v)\) are colored by the element \( c = u + v \in G \). The language of graphs will be handy, and in this way \( d_{\Gamma}(x) \) and \( N_{\Gamma}(x) \) will denote the degree (resp. neighborhood) of some vertex \( x \). Following Lev [14], we introduce the following definition.
**Definition 3.5.** Let $U, V$ be two finite sets in an additive group and $K, s$ non-negative integers. A subset $\Gamma \subset U \times V$ is $(K, s)$-regular if the following two things are true:

(i) $d_\Gamma(u) \geq |V| - s$ for each $u \in U$ and $d_\Gamma(v) \geq |U| - s$ for each $v \in V$.

(ii) For any $c \in U + V$ with $r_{U,V}(c) \geq K$, it holds that $c \in U_\Gamma + V$.

Our first step will be to prove a robust version of Kneser’s theorem which is effective even for sets of very different sizes. This can be compared to Proposition 3.1 in [21] as well as Theorem 2 in [14] in the abelian case, which have slightly better constants when the sets are close in size.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let $U, V$ be finite sets in an abelian group $G$ with $|U| \leq |V|$ and let $K, s$ be non-negative integers. If $\Gamma \subset U \times V$ is $(K, s)$-regular and $U_\Gamma + V \neq U + V$, then

$$|U + V| \geq |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - K - 2s.$$ 

**Proof.** Suppose the statement is false and take a counterexample that minimizes $|U|$, the cardinality of the smaller set. Note that we can assume that the graph $\Gamma$ is saturated, meaning that if some color $\sigma \in U + V$ is contained in $U_\Gamma + V$, then in fact all edges $(u, v) \in U \times V$ with $u + v = \sigma$ are contained in $\Gamma$. We start by showing that for any $u, u' \in U$, the distance $u - u'$ has many representations in $V - V$. To do this, note that since $\Gamma$ is $(K, s)$-regular, we have $|(u + V) \setminus (U_\Gamma + V)| \leq s$, and similarly if we replace $u$ by $u'$. So

$$|u + V \cup u' + V| \leq |U + V| + 2s < |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - K,$$

which implies

$$r_{V, -V}(u - u') = |u + V \cap u' + V| = 2|V| - |u + V \cup u' + V| > |V| - \frac{|U|}{2} + K. \quad (10)$$

Next, we will show that there are many popular colors in $\Gamma$. For this, define the set $P$ by

$$P = \left\{ \sigma \in U_\Gamma + V : r_{U,V}(\sigma) \geq \frac{|U|}{2} \right\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma$ is saturated, so the number of representations in $U_\Gamma + V$ and $U + V$ is identical for every color that actually appears. By $(K, s)$-regularity and the assumed upper bound on $|U + V|$, we have

$$|U|(|V| - s) \leq |\Gamma| = \sum_{\sigma \in P} r_{U,V}(\sigma) + \sum_{\sigma \notin P} r_{U,V}(\sigma) < |P||U| + \left( |U + V| - |P| \right) \frac{|U|}{2}$$

$$< |P| \frac{|U|}{2} + \left( |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - K - 2s \right) \frac{|U|}{2},$$

which can be rearranged to get

$$|P| > |V| - \frac{|U|}{2} + K. \quad (11)$$
Next, we will show that for every \( v \in V \) with \( U + v \cap P \neq \emptyset \), we in fact have

\[
U + v \subset U + V.
\]

To see this, suppose \( u_0 + v \in P \). By the definition of \( P \), there is a set \( P_0 \in U \times V \) with \(|P_0| \geq |U|/2\) such that \( u' + v' = u_0 + v \) for each \( (u', v') \in P_0 \). Note that since \( u_0 + v \) was fixed, the second components of these tuples are all pairwise distinct. Let \( u \in U \) be chosen arbitrarily. It follows from (10) that there is a set \( P_1 \in V \times V \) with \(|P_1| \geq |V| - |U|/2 + K\) such that \( v'' - v' = u - u_0 \) for each \( (v', v'') \in P_1 \). Again, \( u \) and \( u_0 \) are fixed, and hence the first components of these tuples are pairwise distinct as well. Hence by pigeonhole, there are at least \( K \) pairs in \( P_0 \) whose second coordinate coincides with the first coordinate of some pair in \( P_1 \). Each two such pairs \( ((u', v'), (v', v'')) \in P_0 \times P_1 \) define the relation \((u' + v') + (v'' - v') = (u_0 + v) + (u - u_0) = v + u\), implying that

\[
r_{U \times V}(u + v) \geq K,
\]

and so \( u + v \in U + V \) by \((K, s)\)-regularity. Since the choice of \( u \) is arbitrary, this proves (12).

Let \( V' \subset V \) be the set of elements \( v \) such that \( U + v \cap P = \emptyset \). Then

\[
\Gamma \cap (U \times (V \setminus V')) = U \times (V \setminus V'),
\]

so since \( U + V \neq U + V' \), we must have \( U + V' \neq U + V' \), where \( \Gamma' = \Gamma \cap (U \times V') \) is the induced subgraph of \( \Gamma \) on \( U \times V' \). Furthermore, \( \Gamma' \) is \((K, s)\)-regular: Firstly, it is clear that at most \( s \) edges are missing in the neighborhood of every vertex, since this was the case for \( \Gamma \). Secondly, suppose \( x \in U + V' \) is an element such that \( r_{U \times V'}(x) \geq K \). Then since \( V' \subset V \), \( r_{U \times V}(x) \geq K \), and so \( x \in U + V \). Since \( \Gamma \) was saturated, every edge that represented \( x \) was included, and hence \( x \in U + V' \).

Next we will show that \(|U| > |V'|\). To see this, first note that we have the trivial lower bound

\[
|U + V'| \geq |V'| - s,
\]

by using \((K, s)\)-regularity and looking at the neighborhood of a single vertex of \( U \) in \( \Gamma' \). On the other hand, every color in \( U + V' \) is contained in \( U + V \setminus P \), and by (11) we thus have

\[
|U + V'| \leq |U + V| - |P| < |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - 2s - K - \left( |V| - \frac{|U|}{2} + K \right) = |U| - 2s - 2K.
\]

Combining these inequalities implies

\[
|U| > |V'| + s + 2K,
\]

so in particular \(|U| > |V'|\). Since \( U \) and \( V \) represented a counterexample that minimized the cardinality of the smaller set, we must have

\[
|U + V'| \geq |U| + \frac{|V'|}{2} - 2s - K.
\]

But then by combining (11) and (13),

\[
|U + V| \geq |P| + |U + V'| > |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - 2s + \frac{|V'|}{2} > |V| + \frac{|U|}{2} - 2s - K,
\]

a contradiction. ■
We next prove an intermediate result. For a finite set of integers $U$ we denote its convex hull by $[U] = [\min(U), \max(U)]$.

**Proposition 3.7.** Let $U, V$ be two finite sets of integers. Assume that $\gcd(U \cup V) = 1$ and that $|U| = [0, \ell], |V| = [0, \ell']$, where $\ell' \leq \ell$. Let $n = \min\{|U|, |V|\}$.

Let $K \geq 2, s \geq 0$ and let $\Gamma \subset U \times V$ be $(K, s)$-regular. Then,

$$|U^\Gamma + V| \geq \begin{cases} \ell + |V| - 2s, & \ell \leq |U| + |V| - 2K - 2 \\ |U| + |V| + \frac{n}{2} - 4s - 2K - 2, & \ell > |U| + |V| - 2K - 2. \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$ be the canonical projection. We write $f(x) = \bar{x}$ and a similar notation for images of sets. From $U, V, \Gamma$ we build the modular version $\hat{U}, \hat{V}, \hat{\Gamma}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$. We have $|\hat{U}| \geq |U| - 1$ and $|\hat{V}| \geq |V| - 1$.

**Claim.** $\hat{\Gamma}$ is $(2K, s)$-regular.

**Proof.** The $s$ missing edges incident to each vertex in $\Gamma$ produce at most $s$ missing edges incident to $\bar{x}$ in $\hat{\Gamma}$. On the other hand, since $\ell = \max(U) \geq \max(V)$, the preimage of each color different from zero in $\hat{U} \times \hat{V}$ produces at most two colors in $U \times V$. Hence, every nonzero color appearing at least $2K$ times in $\hat{U} \times \hat{V}$ must be present in $\Gamma$ and therefore it must also be present in $\hat{\Gamma}$. If $0$ appears more than $2K$ times in $\hat{U} \times \hat{V}$, since $0$ and $2\ell$ appear at most one time in $U \times V$ and $K \geq 2$, then $\ell$ must appear at least $K$ times and the color is in $\Gamma$ (and hence in $\hat{\Gamma}$). Thus $\hat{\Gamma}$ is $(2K, s)$-regular. 

Now note that for every element $c \in N_T(0) \cap N_T(\ell) \subset V$, $c$ and $c + \ell$ are distinct elements in $U + V$, but are mapped to the same element in $\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$. Since $|N_T(u)| \geq |V| - s$ for any $u \in U$ by $(K, s)$-regularity, using inclusion exclusion we see that

$$|U^\Gamma + V| \geq |\hat{U}^\Gamma + \hat{V}| + |N_T(0) \cap N_T(\ell)| \geq |\hat{U}^\Gamma + \hat{V}| + |V| - 2s.$$ (14)

Suppose first that $\ell \leq |U| + |V| - 2K - 2$. Then every $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$ appears in $\hat{U} \times \hat{V}$ at least

$$|\hat{U} \cap (\bar{x} - \hat{V})| = |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - |\hat{U} \cup (\bar{x} - \hat{V})| \geq |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - \ell \geq |U| + |V| - 2 - \ell \geq 2K,$$

times, and hence it appears in $\hat{\Gamma}$ by $(2K, s)$-regularity. Therefore, $\hat{U}^\Gamma + \hat{V} = \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$ and (14) gives

$$|U^\Gamma + V| \geq \ell + |V| - 2s,$$

as claimed.

Suppose now that $\ell > |U| + |V| - 2K - 2$. If $\hat{U}^\Gamma + \hat{V} \neq \hat{U} + \hat{V}$ then applying Theorem 3.6 gives

$$|\hat{U}^\Gamma + \hat{V}| \geq \max\{|\hat{U}|, |\hat{V}|\} + \frac{n - 1}{2} - 2K - 2s \geq |U| + \frac{n}{2} - 2K - 2s - \frac{3}{2},$$

and (14) yields

$$|U^\Gamma + V| \geq |U| + |V| + \frac{n}{2} - 2K - 4s - \frac{3}{2}.$$
as claimed.

Now suppose \( \hat{U} + \hat{V} = \hat{U} + \hat{V} \). If \(|\hat{U} + \hat{V}| \geq |\hat{U}| + (n-1)/2\), then again (14) yields

\[
|U + V| \geq |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| + |V| - 2s \geq |U| + |V| + \frac{n}{2} - 2s - \frac{3}{2}
\]

Suppose that \(|\hat{U} + \hat{V}| < |\hat{U}| + (n-1)/2\). Then Kneser’s theorem implies that there is a nonzero subgroup \( H \leq G \) such that

\[
|\hat{U} + \hat{V}| = |\hat{U} + \hat{V} + H| = |\hat{U} + H| + |\hat{V} + H| - |H|.
\]

If \( H = \mathbb{Z}/\ell \mathbb{Z} \), then (14) with our current hypothesis \( \ell \geq |U| + |V| - 2K - 2 \) gives the conclusion with room to spare. Suppose that \( H \) is a proper subgroup. We now repeat the adaptation by Shao and Xu of Lev’s argument. Let

\[
C_1 = \{ c \in U + V : \hat{c} \in \hat{V} \},
\]

\[
C_2 = \{ c \in U + V : \hat{c} \in (\hat{V} + H) \setminus \hat{V} \}, \text{ and}
\]

\[
C_3 = \{ c \in U + V : \hat{c} \in (\hat{U} + \hat{V}) \setminus (\hat{V} + H) \},
\]

which are pairwise disjoint by definition.

Using the same argument that was used to justify (14), we have

\[
|C_1| \geq |\hat{V}| + |V| - 2s.
\]

For \( C_2 \), note that since \( \hat{U} + \hat{V} = \hat{U} + \hat{V} \), every element in \((\hat{V} + H) \setminus \hat{V} \subset \hat{U} + \hat{V} \) has a preimage in \( U + V \), so that

\[
|C_2| \geq |\hat{V} + H| - |\hat{V}|.
\]

Since \( \gcd(U \cup V) = 1 \) and \( 0 \in U \cap V \), it cannot happen that both \( \hat{U} \) and \( \hat{V} \) are contained in a single coset of \( H \). If \( \hat{U} + H = H \), then \(|\hat{V} + H| \geq 2|H| \geq |U| + n - 1 \), so that

\[
|U + V| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| \geq |\hat{V} + H| + |V| - 2s \geq |U| + |V| + n - 2s - 2
\]

and we are done. Assume \( \hat{U} + H \neq H \), and let \( N = (|\hat{U} + \hat{V}) \setminus (\hat{V} + H|)/|H| \) be the number of cosets of \( H \) outside \( \hat{V} + H \). By Kneser’s theorem there is at least one such coset, say \( \hat{u} + \hat{v} + H \) with \( \hat{u} \notin H \). Let \( U' = f^{-1}(\hat{u} + H) \cap U \) and \( V' = f^{-1}(\hat{v} + H) \cap V \). Then

\[
|f^{-1}(\hat{u} + \hat{v} + H) \cap (U + V)| \geq |U'| + |V'| - 2s - 1,
\]

(15)

where the last inequality comes from considering the \(|U'| + |V'| - 1\) different sums \((\min(U') + V') \cup (U' + \max(V'))\) from which at most 2s are missing. By inserting in (15) the estimates

\[
|H| - |U'| \leq |(\hat{U} + H) \setminus \hat{U}|, \quad |H| - |V'| \leq |(\hat{V} + H) \setminus \hat{V}|,
\]

we obtain

\[
|C_3| \geq N(|U'| + |V'| - 2s - 1)
\]

\[
\geq N(2|H| - |(\hat{U} + H) \setminus \hat{U}| - (\hat{V} + H) \setminus \hat{V}| - 2s - 1)
\]

\[
\geq N(|H| + |\hat{U}| + |\hat{V}| - |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - 2s - 1)
\]

\[
\geq N(|H| + (|\hat{U}| + |\hat{V}| - |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - 2s - 1)
\]

\[
= |(\hat{U} + \hat{V}) \setminus (\hat{V} + H)| + (|\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - |\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - 2s - 1)
\]

\[
|\hat{U} + \hat{V}| - |\hat{V} + H| - 2s - 1,
\]
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where in the third inequality we applied Kneser’s theorem. Finally,

$$|U + V| \geq |C_1| + |C_2| + |C_3| \geq |\bar{U}| + |\bar{V}| + |V| - 4s - 1 \geq |U| + |V| + n - 4s - 3.$$  

This completes the proof.

Now we can proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.3.

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** Let

$$U' = \{ u \in U : d_{\Gamma}(u) \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|V| \},$$

and observe that since $(1 - \epsilon)|U||V| \leq |\Gamma| \leq |U'||V| + (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})(|U| - |U'|)|V|$, it holds that $|U'| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|U|$. Similarly, if $V'$ is the set of $v \in V$ with $d_{\Gamma'}(v) \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|U|$, we have $|V'| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|V|$. If $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \cap (U' \times V')$ is the restriction of $\Gamma$, then for every $u \in U'$ we see that

$$d_{\Gamma_1}(u) = |N_{\Gamma}(u) \cap V'| \geq d_{\Gamma}(u) + |V' - |V'|| \geq |V'| - \sqrt{\epsilon}|V|.$$  

Similarly, $d_{\Gamma_1}(v) \geq |U'| - \sqrt{\epsilon}|U|$ for every $v \in V'$. We may assume that $|U'| = [0, \ell(U')]$, $|V'| = [0, \ell(V')]$ and gcd$(U' \cup V') = 1$. Furthermore, without loss of generality assume that

$$\ell(U') \geq \ell(V').$$

For a set $X$ with $|X| = [0, \ell(X)]$, denote by $h(X) = \ell(X) - |X| + 1$ the number of holes of $X$. We consider two cases.

**Case 1.** $h(U') > h(V')$. Set $K = s = \sqrt{\epsilon}M$, and define

$$\Gamma' = \Gamma_1 \cup \{ (u, v) \in U' \times V' : r_{U';V'}(u + v) \geq K \}.$$

Note that by doing this we have added at most

$$\frac{(U' \times V') \setminus \Gamma_1}{K} \leq \frac{(U \times V) \setminus \Gamma}{K} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}N$$

elements $x \in (U' + V') \setminus (U' + V')$, and hence

$$|U + V| \geq |U' + V'| - \sqrt{\epsilon}N. \quad (16)$$

Since $\Gamma'$ is $(K, s)$-regular by construction, we can apply Proposition 3.7 to get

$$|U' + V'| \geq \begin{cases} \ell(U') + |V'| - 2s, \quad \ell(U') \leq |U'| + |V'| - 2K - 2 \\ |U'| + |V'| + \frac{\min(|U'|, |V'|)}{2} - 4s - 2K - 2, \quad \ell(U') > |U'| + |V'| - 2K - 2. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Note that by our lower bounds on $|U'|, |V'|$ and (16), the second line of (17) would imply

$$|U + V| \geq |U' + V'| - \sqrt{\epsilon}N \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})(|U| + |V| + N/2) - 6\sqrt{\epsilon}M - 2 - \sqrt{\epsilon}N \geq |U| + |V| + \frac{N}{2} - 11\sqrt{\epsilon}M,$$ 
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which violates our initial assumption on $|U + V|$, so the first case must hold. In particular,

$$\ell(U') \leq |U' + V'| - |V'| + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}M$$

$$\leq |U + V| - (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})|V| + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}M + \sqrt{\varepsilon}N$$

$$< |U| + r + 4\sqrt{\varepsilon}M,$$

and similarly using $h(U') > h(V')$,

$$\ell(V') < \ell(U') + |V'| - |U'| < |V| + r + 4\sqrt{\varepsilon}M.$$  

**Case 2.** $h(U') \leq h(V')$. Define $U'_1 = U' \cap [0, \ell(V')], U'_2 = U' \setminus U'_1$ and $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma \cap (U'_1 \times V')$. We see that

$$|U + V| \geq |U_1 + V'| \geq |U'_1 + V'| + |U_2' - \sqrt{\varepsilon}|U|.$$  

(18)

Since $h(U'_1) \leq h(U') \leq h(V')$ and $\ell(U'_1) = \ell(V')$ by construction, we have $|U'_1| \geq |V'|$. Furthermore, by definition of $U'$, for every $u \in U'_1$ it holds that $d_{\Gamma'_1}(u) \geq |V'| - \sqrt{\varepsilon}|V|$, and similarly, $d_{\Gamma'_1}(v) \geq |U'_1| - \sqrt{\varepsilon}|U|$ for every $v \in V'$. Setting $K = s = \sqrt{\varepsilon}M$ and defining

$$\Gamma'' = \Gamma'_1 \cup \{(u, v) \in U'_1 \times V': r_{U'_1, V'}(u + v) \geq K\},$$

we again see that

$$|U'_1 + V'| \geq |U'_1 + V'| - \sqrt{\varepsilon}N.$$  

(19)

Again, $\Gamma''$ is $(K, s)$-regular by construction, and so applying Proposition 3.7 we get

$$|U_1 + V' + V'| \geq \begin{cases} \ell(V') + |U'_1| - 2s, & \ell(V') \leq |U'| + |V'| - 2K - 2 \\ 2|V'| + |U'_1| - 4s - 2K - 2, & \ell(V') > |U'| + |V'| - 2K - 2. \end{cases}$$  

(20)

Putting together (19) and (18), the second line of this would imply

$$|U + V| \geq |U'_1 + V'| + |U'_2| - \sqrt{\varepsilon}|U| - \sqrt{\varepsilon}N$$

$$\geq \frac{3}{2}|V'| + |U'_1| - 10\sqrt{\varepsilon}M$$

$$\geq |U| + |V| + \frac{N}{2} - 13\sqrt{\varepsilon}M,$$

a contradiction to our initial assumption. Hence the first case of (20) must hold, which implies

$$\ell(V') \leq |U'_1 + V'| - |U'_1| + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}M$$

$$\leq |U + V| - |U'| + 4\sqrt{\varepsilon}M$$

$$\leq |V| + r + 5\sqrt{\varepsilon}M.$$  

Since $h(U') \leq h(V')$, we also have

$$\ell(U') \leq \ell(V') - |V'| + |U'| \leq |U| + r + 5\sqrt{\varepsilon}M.$$  

This completes the proof.  

$\blacksquare$  
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4 Proofs of the Main Results

In this section we will prove more technical versions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We start with the structural result.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( s_1, s_2, n \) be integers and \( \alpha > 0 \) a fixed real number satisfying
\[
s_2 \geq s_1 \geq 2^{10} \alpha^{-1} (s_1 + s_2)^{11/12} (\log n)^{1/4},
\]
and let \( m \) be an integer such that
\[
(1 + \alpha)(s_1 + s_2) \leq m < 2^{-108} \alpha^{12} s_1^{12} s_2^{12} (s_1 + s_2)^{-10} (\log n)^{-3}.
\]
Suppose \( X_1, X_2 \subset [n] \) are two uniformly chosen random sets with \( |X_1| = s_1, |X_2| = s_2 \) and \( |X_1 + X_2| \leq m \). With probability at least \( 1 - \exp(-2^5 m^{1/6} (s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n}) \) the following holds: there are sets \( T_1 \subset X_1 \) of size \( |T_1| \leq 2^{11} \alpha^{-1} m^{1/6} (s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n} \), such that \( X_i \setminus T_i \) is contained in an arithmetic progression \( P_i \) of size
\[
\frac{s_i m}{s_1 + s_2} + 2^6 m^{13/12} (s_1 + s_2)^{-1/6} (\log n)^{1/4},
\]
where \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) have the same common difference.

Let us first see that this indeed implies Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** If \( m = (1 + o(1))(s_1 + s_2) = s_1 + s_2 + o(s_1) \), we can apply Freiman’s 3k − 4 theorem directly and see that any sets \( X_1, X_2 \) satisfying the theorem hypotheses are contained in arithmetic progressions \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) with the same common difference of size
\[
|P_i| = (1 + o(1))s_i = (1 + o(1))s_i m / (s_1 + s_2).
\]
If on the other hand there exists some absolute constant \( \alpha > 0 \) such that \( m \geq (1 + \alpha)(s_1 + s_2) \), we can apply Theorem 4.1 instead. \( \square \)

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we need the following technical bound on the product of two specific binomial coefficients. The proof is straightforward but rather lengthy and might distract somewhat from the main thrust of the paper, so we include it in Appendix A.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( m, s \) and \( t \) be positive integers and let \( 1 \geq \alpha > 0 \) such that \( m \geq (1 + \alpha)(s + t) \) and \( s + t \geq 2^5 \alpha^{-1} \). If \( \epsilon > 0 \) satisfies
\[
\frac{2^{10} \min(s^2, t^2)}{(s + t)^2 m^2} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{\alpha^2 \min(s^2, t^2)}{2^{10} (s + t)^2 m^2},
\]
then
\[
\left( \frac{\frac{1}{s+t} - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} + 2\epsilon}{t} \right) m \left( \frac{\frac{s}{s+t} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon}}{s} \right) m \leq e^{-\epsilon (s+t)} \left( \frac{s m}{s+t} \right) \left( \frac{t m}{s+t} \right).
\]

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** The upper bound on \( m \) in particular implies \( m \leq s_1^2 \log n \), so let \( A \) be the family obtained from Theorem 2.2 applied with \( G = Z, \ h = 2, \ F_1 = F_2 = |n| \) and \( 2^{-10} \alpha^2 s_1^2 / (s_1 + s_2)^2 > \epsilon > 2^{10} s_1^2 (s_1 + s_2)^{-2} m^{-2} \) to be specified later. We claim that one of the following holds for every triple \((A_1, A_2, B) \in A:\)
\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \ |A_1| + |A_2| &\leq (1 - \epsilon)m, \\
(b) \ |A_1| + |A_2| &\leq (1 - \epsilon)m,
\end{align*}
\]

(b) \(|A_i| > \frac{s_im}{s_1+s_2} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon}m\) for some \(i \in \{1, 2\}\), or

(c) There are arithmetic progressions \(P_1, P_2\) with the same common difference and sets \(T_1, T_2\) such that \(|P_i| \leq \frac{s_im}{s_1+s_2} + 4\sqrt{\epsilon}m\), \(|T_i| \leq \epsilon|A_i|\) and \(A_i \setminus T_i \subseteq P_i\) for \(i = 1, 2\).

Note first that we always have \(|A_1| + |A_2| \leq (1 + 2\epsilon)m\) since by Theorem 2.2(b) applied with \(G = \mathbb{Z}\), either there are at most \(\epsilon^2|A_1||A_2|\) pairs \((a_1, a_2) \in A_1 \times A_2\) with \(a_1 + a_2 \notin B\), and hence Corollary 3.2 together with \(|B| \leq m\) gives the required upper bound on \(|A_1| + |A_2|\), or max\(|\{A_1, |A_2|\} < m/\log n\). Suppose neither (a) nor (b) hold, then by Proposition 3.4(b) we see that (c) holds.

We will now count the number of pairs of sets \(X_1, X_2\) of size \(s_1\) and \(s_2\) respectively, satisfying \(|X_1 + X_2| \leq m\) that do not have large intersections with arithmetic progressions in the sense of the theorem. To do this, recall that by Theorem 2.2(a), for any such pair, there exists a container triple \((A_1, A_2, B) \in \mathcal{A}\) such that \(X_i \subset A_i\). We begin by giving an upper bound on the number of \(X_1, X_2\) with containers satisfying property (a), that is, \(|A_1| + |A_2| \leq (1 - \epsilon)m\). Clearly there are at most \(\sum (|A_1|, |A_2|)\) of these. By comparing \((\alpha - \beta, \beta)\) and \((\alpha - \beta - 1, \beta + 1)\) it is easy to check that an expression of this form has its maximum at \((\frac{\alpha n}{c + d})\). So choosing \(\epsilon = 2^8m^{1/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log n} < 2^{-10} \alpha^2 s_1(s_1 + s_2)^{-2}\) and using (2), we see that

\[
\sum_{\mathcal{A}} \binom{|A_1|}{s_1} \binom{|A_2|}{s_2} \leq |\mathcal{A}| \left(1 - \frac{m^{1/6}}{s_1+s_2}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{m^{1/6}}{s_1+s_2}\right) \\
\leq \exp(2^{21} \sqrt{m} e^{-2}(s_1 + s_2)^{3/2}) \left(1 - \frac{m^{1/6}}{s_1+s_2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{m^{1/6}}{s_1+s_2}\right) \left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2}\right) \left(\frac{s_2^{2m}}{s_1+s_2}\right) .
\]

We will now count pairs coming from containers of type (b). We will not make use of the fact that \(s_2 \geq s_1\) so suppose without loss of generality that (b) holds for \(i = 2\). Similar to the previous case, it suffices to give an upper bound for

\[
\sum_{\mathcal{A}} \binom{|A_1|}{s_1} \binom{|A_2|}{s_2} \leq \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} \left(2\epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\right) m\right) \left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} \left(2\epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\right) m\right) .
\]

Noting that \(\epsilon = 2^8 m^{1/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log n} > 2^{10} s_1(s_1 + s_2)^{-2} m^{-2}\) we can apply Lemma 4.2 and see that

\[
\left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} + 2\epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\right) m \left(\frac{s_2^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} + 2\epsilon - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\right) m \leq e^{-\epsilon(s_1 + s_2)} \left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left(\frac{s_2^{2m}}{s_1+s_2}\right) ,
\]

and hence

\[
\sum_{\mathcal{A}} \binom{|A_1|}{s_1} \binom{|A_2|}{s_2} \leq \exp(-2^7 m^{1/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n}) \left(\frac{s_1^{2m}}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left(\frac{s_2^{2m}}{s_1+s_2}\right) .
\]

Finally, it remains to count the relevant \(X_1, X_2\) with containers satisfying property (c). Observe that there are at most

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{s_i = 8\alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)}^{s_i} \binom{|A_i|}{s_i} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_{3-i}}
\]

(24)
pairs of sets $X_i \subset A_i$ with $|X_i| = s_i$ that violate the theorem statement, since for at least one $\delta \in \{1, 2\}$ there must be at least $s_i' \geq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)$. Indeed, otherwise $X_i \setminus T_i \subset P_i$ with $|P_i| \leq \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} + 4 \sqrt{e} m$ and $|X_i \cap T_i| \leq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)$ for both $i$. For any $d \leq c \leq a/4$, it holds that

$$
\binom{a}{c} \binom{b}{d} \leq \binom{a}{c} \left( \frac{4bc}{ad} \right)^{d},
$$

so applying this to each innermost summand of (24) gives

$$
\binom{|A_i|}{s_i - s_i'} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'} \leq \binom{|A_i|}{s_i} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'} \leq \left( \frac{4\epsilon s_i}{s_i'} \right)^{s_i'} \binom{|A_i|}{s_i} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'} \leq \left( \frac{4\epsilon s_i}{s_i'} \right)^{s_i'} \binom{|A_i|}{s_i} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'} \leq \left( \frac{4\epsilon s_i}{s_i'} \right)^{s_i'} \binom{|A_i|}{s_i} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'}
$$

for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $s_i \geq s_i' \geq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)$. Here, for the last inequality we used the bound $\binom{c}{d} \leq \frac{a-c}{b-c} \binom{b}{d}$ valid for any $a \geq b \geq c \geq 0$, as well as the upper bound $a \leq 1$. Note that, by our choice of $\epsilon$, we have $\max(|A|, s_1 + s_2) \leq \exp(\epsilon(s_1 + s_2))$, hence summing (24) over all triples $(A_1, A_2, B) \in A$ we obtain

$$
\sum_{A} \sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{s_i} \sum_{s_i' \geq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)} \binom{|A_i|}{s_i - s_i'} \binom{|A_{3-i}|}{s_3'} \leq |A|(1 + 4 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon)^{s_1 + s_2} \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{s_i} \max_{s_i' \geq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)} \left( \frac{4\epsilon s_i}{s_i'} \right)^{s_i'} 
$$

$$
\leq \exp(6 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)) 2^{-16 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)} \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{s_i} \max_{s_i' \geq 8 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)} \left( \frac{4\epsilon s_i}{s_i'} \right)^{s_i'} 
$$

$$
\leq \exp(-4 \alpha^{-1} \epsilon(s_1 + s_2)) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) 
$$

$$
= \exp(-2^{10} m^{1/6} (s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n}) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2} \right). 
$$

To conclude, note that bounds (22), (23) and (25) imply the probability we claimed in the statement since we can fix a single pair of disjoint arithmetic progressions of length $\frac{s_i'm}{s_1 + s_2}$ respectively with the same common difference and see that any of the $\prod (s_i'm/(s_1 + s_2))$ pairs of $s_i$-subsets will have a sumset of size at most $m$. 

We now turn to the technical version of Theorem 1.2.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $G$ be an abelian group. Let $s_1, s_2, n$ be integers satisfying

$$
s_2 \geq s_1 \geq \max \left( \sqrt{(s_1 + s_2) \log n}, 2^{18}(\log n)^3 - s_2 \right),
$$

and let $m$ be an integer such that

$$
s_1 + s_2 \leq m \leq \min \left( \frac{s_1^2}{\log n} - s_2^2 \right).$$
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Then for any \( F_1, F_2 \subset G \) with \(|F_1| = n\), it holds that the number of pairs of sets \((X_1, X_2) \in 2^{F_1} \times 2^{F_2}\) with \(|X_1| = s_1\) and \(|X_1 + X_2| \leq m\) is at most
\[
\exp \left( 2^{10} m^{1/6} (s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \lambda^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n} \right) \left( \frac{s_1(m + \beta)/(s_1 + s_2)}{s_1} \right) \left( \frac{s_2(m + \beta)/(s_1 + s_2)}{s_2} \right),
\]
where \( \lambda = \min \left( \frac{m}{m-s_1-s_2}, \log(s_1 + s_2) \right) \) and \( \beta = \beta(m + 2^8 m^{7/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{-1/3} \lambda^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log n}) \).

**Proof.** We can apply Theorem 2.2 with \( s_1, s_2, m, n \) and \(1/4 > \epsilon > 0\) to be specified later, let \( \mathcal{A} \) be the family obtained this way. So for every pair of sets \((X_1, X_2) \in F_1 \times F_2\) there exists a container triple \((A_1, A_2, B) \in \mathcal{A}\) such that \(X_i \subset A_1\) and \(B \subset X_1 + X_2\). Note that if we define \( \beta = \beta(m + 4m)\), it holds true that \(|A_1| + |A_2| \leq (1 + 2\epsilon)(m + \beta)\) for any pair \((A_1, A_2)\) appearing in a container triple in \( \mathcal{A} \). Indeed, by Theorem 2.2(b), we either have
\[
|A_1| + |A_2| \leq 2 \max |A_i| < 2m/\log n \leq (1 + 2\epsilon)(m + \beta),
\]
or there are at most \( \epsilon^2|A_1||A_2| \) pairs \((a_1, a_2)\) such that \(a_1 + a_2 \notin B\), and hence Corollary 3.2 gives the required bound. Hence the number of pairs \((X_1, X_2)\) satisfying the theorem hypotheses is at most
\[
|\mathcal{A}| \max_{(A_1, A_2, B) \in \mathcal{A}} \left( \frac{|A_1|}{s_1} \right) \left( \frac{|A_2|}{s_2} \right) \leq \exp \left( 2^{21} \sqrt{m(\log n)^3} \right) \left( \frac{s_1(1+2\epsilon)(m+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_2(1+2\epsilon)(m+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right). \tag{26}
\]

If \( m/(m - s_1 - s_2) \leq \log(s_1 + s_2) \) we can again apply the bound \((\frac{m}{t+c})^{\frac{b}{c}} \leq \left( \frac{a-b}{t+c} \right)^{\frac{b}{c}}\) valid for any \( a \geq b \geq c \geq 0 \) to both binomials in (26) separately and see that it is at most
\[
\exp \left( 2^{21} \epsilon^{-2} \sqrt{m(n)^{3/2}} + 2\epsilon \lambda(s_1 + s_2) \right) \left( \frac{s_1(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_2(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right).
\]

Suppose now that \( m/(m - s_1 - s_2) \geq \log(s_1 + s_2) \), and note that this implies in particular \( m = s_1 + s_2 + o(1) \). We compute
\[
\log \left( \frac{(1+\delta)a}{b} \right) \left( \frac{a}{b} \right)^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{b-1} \log \left( 1 + \frac{\delta a}{a-i} \right) \leq \delta a \int_0^b (a-x)^{-1} dx \leq \delta a \log a.
\]
Applying this with \( \delta = 2\epsilon \), \( a = s_i(1+\beta)/(s_1+s_2) \) and \( b = s_i \) and noting that \( \beta \leq 2m \), we can upper bound (26) by
\[
\exp \left( 2^{21} \epsilon^{-2} \sqrt{m(n)^{3/2}} + 2\epsilon \lambda(s_1 + s_2) \right) \left( \frac{s_1(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_2(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right).
\]
Hence setting \( \epsilon = 2^6 m^{1/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{-1/3} \lambda^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log n} < 1/4 \) implies
\[
\beta(m + 4m) = \beta(m + 2^8 m^{7/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{-1/3} \lambda^{-1/3} \sqrt{\log n})
\]
and the number of pairs \((X_1, X_2)\) satisfying the theorem hypotheses is at most
\[
\exp \left( 2^{10} m^{1/6}(s_1 + s_2)^{2/3} \lambda^{2/3} \sqrt{\log n} \right) \left( \frac{s_1(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right) \left( \frac{s_2(1+\beta)}{s_1+s_2} \right).
\]
\(\blacksquare\)
5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

5.1 Setup

Let \( r, r_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) and let \( R \) be a positive real. Let \( b \) be positive integer and suppose that \( \mathcal{H} \) is a \((1, \ldots, 1, r_0)\)-bounded \( r \)-partite hypergraph* with vertex set \( V = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_r \) satisfying (1) for each vector \( v \in \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \{0, 1\} \right) \times \{0, 1, \ldots, r_0\} \), \( b \leq \min_i |V_i| \) and \( b \leq m \) as in the statement of Theorem 2.1, and let \( w = (|V_1|, |V_2|, \ldots, |V_{r-1}|, m) \). We claim that, without loss of generality we may assume that \( m \leq |V_r| \). Indeed, if \( m > |V_r| \), then we may replace \( m \) with \( |V_r| \) as \( \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{m'}(\mathcal{H}) \) for any \( m' \geq m \), and the right-hand side of (1) is a non-increasing function in \( m \). We shall be working only with hypergraphs with edge cardinalities coming from the set

\[
\mathcal{U} := \left\{ x \in \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \{0, 1\} \right) \times \{1, 2, \ldots, r_0\} : x_i \leq x_{i+1} \text{ and } r_0 x_{r-1} \leq x_r \text{ for } 1 \leq i < r \right\}.
\]

The maximum codegrees we must check for each edge size \( x \in \mathcal{U} \) will come from the set

\[
\mathcal{V}(x) := \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r} \{0, \ldots, x_i\} \right) \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}.
\]

We now define a collection of numbers that will be upper bounds on the maximum codegrees of the hypergraphs constructed by our algorithm. To be more precise, for each \( x \in \mathcal{U} \) and all \( v \in \mathcal{V}(x) \), we shall force the maximum \( v \)-codegree of the \( x \)-bounded hypergraph not to exceed the quantity \( \Delta_v^x \), defined as follows.

**Definition 5.1.** For every \( x \in \mathcal{U} \) and every \( v \in \mathcal{V}(x) \), we define the number \( \Delta_v^x \) using the following recursion:

1. If \( x = (1, \ldots, 1, r_0) \), set \( \Delta_v^x := \Delta_v(\mathcal{H}) \) for all \( v \in \mathcal{V}(x) \).

2. Given \( x \in \mathcal{U} \), let \( i^* = \min\{i : x_i > 0\} \) and \( x-e_{i^*} = x' \in \mathcal{U} \) where \( e_1, \ldots, e_r \) are the standard basis vectors of \( \mathbb{R}^r \). If \( v \in \mathcal{V}(x) \) satisfies \( v_{i^*} > 0 \), denote similarly \( v-e_{i^*} : = v' \in \mathcal{V}(x') \).

Then define

\[
\Delta_v^{x'} := \max \left\{ 2 \Delta_v^x, \frac{b}{w_{i^*}} \Delta_v^{x'} \right\}.
\]

The above recursive definition will be convenient in some parts of the analysis. In other parts, we shall require the following explicit formula for \( \Delta_v^x \), which one easily derives from Definition 5.1 using a straightforward induction on \( r_0 + r - 1 - |x| \).

**Observation 5.2.** For all \( x \) and \( v \) as in Definition 5.1,

\[
\Delta_v^x = \max \left\{ 2|z| \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \left( \frac{b}{|V_i|} \right)^{1-v_{i}-z_i} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{r_0-v_{r-1}-z_r} \Delta_v(z \mathcal{H}) : z \in \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \{0, 1-x_i\} \right) \times \{0, r_0 - x_r\} \right\}.
\]

For future reference, we note the following two simple corollaries of Observation 5.2 and our assumptions on the maximum degrees of \( \mathcal{H} \), see (1). Suppose that \( x \in \mathcal{U} \) such that \( i \in [r] \) is the

---

*We remark that from now on all hypergraphs are allowed to have multi-edges, and the edges are counted with multiplicity.

†In this case \( i' \) depends on \( x \), so \( v' \) also depends on \( x \) not only on \( v \), but we omit it from the notation to avoid clutter.
least index with $e_i \in \mathcal{V}(x)$. If $i < r$, then by definition of $\mathcal{U}$ it holds that $x_j = 0$ for all $1 \leq j < i$, $x_j = 1$ for all $i \leq j < r$ and $x_r = r_0$, so

$$\Delta^x_{e_i} \leq 2^i R \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \frac{b}{|V_j|} \right)^{e(\mathcal{H})/|V_i|}. \quad (27)$$

If $i = r$, then $x_j = 0$ for all $1 \leq j < r$ and

$$\Delta^x_{e_i} \leq 2^{r+r_0} R \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} \left( \frac{b}{|V_j|} \right)^{e(\mathcal{H})/q}. \quad (28)$$

We will build a sequence of hypergraphs with decreasing maximum edge size, starting with $\mathcal{H}$, and making sure that for each hypergraph $\mathcal{G}$ in the sequence we have an appropriate bound on its maximum codegrees. To this end we define the following set of pairs with large codegree.

**Definition 5.3.** Given $x \in \mathcal{U}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}(x)$, and an $x$-bounded hypergraph $\mathcal{G}$, we define

$$M^x_v(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ L \in \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left( \frac{V_i}{V_i} \right) : \text{d}_\mathcal{G}(L) \geq \Delta^x_v / 2 \right\}. \quad (29)$$

**5.2 The algorithm**

We shall now define precisely a single round of the algorithm we use to prove the container lemma. To this end, fix some $x \in \mathcal{U}$, set $i' := \min\{i : x_i > 0\}$ and

$$x' = x - e_{i'}. \quad (29)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is an $x$-bounded hypergraph with $V(\mathcal{G}) = V(\mathcal{H})$. A single round of the algorithm takes as input an arbitrary $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})$ and outputs an $x'$-bounded hypergraph $\mathcal{G}_s$ satisfying $V(\mathcal{G}_s) = V(\mathcal{G})$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}_s)$ as well as a set $S \subseteq I \cap V_{i'}$ such that $|S| \leq b$. Crucially, the number of possible outputs of the algorithm (over all possible inputs $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})$) is at most $\binom{|V_{i'}|}{\leq b}$.

Assume that there is an implicit linear order $\preceq$ on $V(\mathcal{G})$. The $i'$-maximum vertex of a hypergraph $\mathcal{A}$ with $V(\mathcal{A}) = V(\mathcal{G})$ is the $\preceq$-smallest vertex among all $v \in V_{i'}$ of maximal degree.

**The algorithm.** Set $\mathcal{A}^{(0)} = \mathcal{G}$, $S = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}_s = (V(\mathcal{G}), \emptyset)$. Do the following for each integer $j \geq 0$ in turn:

- **(S1)** If $|S| = b$ or $\mathcal{A}^{(j)}$ is empty, then set $L = j$ and STOP.
- **(S2)** Let $u_j \in V_{i'}$ be the $i'$-maximum vertex of $\mathcal{A}^{(j)}$.
- **(S3)** If $u_j \in I$, then add $j$ to the set $S$ and let

  $$\mathcal{G}^{(j+1)}_s := \mathcal{G}^{(j)}_s \cup \left\{ E \setminus \{u_j\} : E \in \mathcal{A}^{(j)} \text{ and } u_j \in E \right\}. \quad (30)$$

- **(S4)** Let $\mathcal{A}^{(j+1)}$ be the hypergraph obtained from $\mathcal{A}^{(j)}$ by removing from it all edges $E$ such that either of the following hold:

  a) $u_j \in E$,

  b) there exists a non-empty $T \subseteq E$, such that $T \in M^{x'}_v(\mathcal{G}^{(j+1)}_s)$

  for some $v \in \mathcal{V}(x')$.  
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Finally, set $\mathcal{A} := A^{(L)}$ and $G_s := G_s^{(L)}$. Moreover, set

$$W := \{0, \ldots, L-1\} \setminus S = \{j \in \{0, \ldots, L-1\} : u_j \not\in I\}.$$  

Observe that the algorithm always stops after at most $|V(G)|$ iterations of the main loop. Indeed, since all hyperedges $E$ with $u_j \in E$ are removed from $A^{(j+1)}$ in part (a) of step (S4), the vertex $u_j$ cannot be the $i$-maximum vertex of any $A^{(j')}$ with $j' > j$ and hence the map $\{0, \ldots, L-1\} \ni j \mapsto u_j \in V(G)$ is injective.

5.3 The analysis

We shall now establish some basic properties of the algorithm described in the previous subsection. To this end, let us fix some $x \in \mathcal{U}$, $x'$ and $i'$ as defined in (29). Moreover, suppose that $G'$ is an $x$-bounded hypergraph and that we have run the algorithm with input $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ and obtained the $x'$-bounded hypergraph $G_s$, the integer $L$, the injective map $\{0, \ldots, L-1\} \ni j \mapsto u_j \in V(G)$, and the partition of $\{0, \ldots, L-1\}$ into $S$ and $W$ such that $u_j \in I$ if and only if $j \in S$. We first state two straightforward, but fundamental, properties of the algorithm.

**Observation 5.4.** If $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$, then $I' \in \mathcal{I}(G_s)$.

**Proof.** Observe that $G_s$ contains only edges of the form $E \setminus \{v\}$ where $v \in E \cap I$ and $E \in G$, see (S3). Hence, if $I$ contained the edge $E \setminus \{v\}$ it would also contain the edge $E$. \hfill \blacksquare

The next observation says that if the algorithm applied to two sets $I$ and $I'$ outputs the same set $\{u_j : j \in S\}$, then the rest of the output is also the same.

**Observation 5.5.** Fix the hypergraph $G$ we input in the algorithm, suppose that the algorithm applied to $I' \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ outputs a hypergraph $G_s'$, an integer $L'$, a map $j \mapsto u_j'$, and a partition of $\{0, \ldots, L'-1\}$ into $S'$ and $W'$. If $\{u_j : j \in S\} = \{u_j' : j \in S'\}$, then $G_s = G_s'$, $L = L'$, $u_j = u_j'$ for all $j$, and $W = W'$.

**Proof.** The only step of the algorithm that depends on the input pair $I$ is (S3). There, an index $j$ is added to the set $S$ if and only if $u_j \in I$. Therefore, the execution of the algorithm depends only on the set $\{u_j : j \in S\}$ and the hypergraph $G$. \hfill \blacksquare

The next two lemmas will allow us to maintain suitable upper and lower bounds on the degrees and densities of the hypergraphs obtained by applying the algorithm iteratively. The first lemma, which is the easier of the two, states that if all the maximum degrees of $G$ are appropriately bounded, then all the maximum degrees of $G_s$ are also appropriately bounded.

**Lemma 5.6.** Given $v \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ with $v_{v'} > 0$, let $v' = v - e_{v'}$. If $\Delta_v(G) \leq \Delta_v^{x'}$, then $\Delta_{v'}(G_s) \leq \Delta_{v'}^{x'}$.

**Proof.** Suppose (for a contradiction) that there exists a set $T$, with $|T \cap V_i| = v_i'$ for all $i$, such that $\deg_{G_s}(T) > \Delta_{v'}^{x'}$. Let $j$ be the smallest integer satisfying

$$\deg_{G_s^{(j+1)}}(T) > \Delta_{v'}^{x'}/2$$

and note that $j \geq 0$, since $G_s^{(0)}$ is empty. We claim first that

$$\deg_{G_s}(T) = \deg_{G_s^{(j+1)}}(T).$$

Indeed, observe that $T \in M_{v'}(G_s^{(j+1)})$, and therefore the algorithm removes from $A^{(j)}$ (when forming $A^{(j+1)}$ in step (S4)) all edges $E$ such that $T \subset E$. As a consequence, no further edges $E$ with $T \subset E$ are added to $G_s$ in step (S3).
We next claim that
\[ \deg_{G^{(j+1)}}(T) - \deg_{G^{(j)}}(T) \leq \Delta_v^x. \] (31)
To see this, recall that when we extend \( G^{(j)} \) to \( G^{(j+1)} \) in step (S3), we only add edges \( E \setminus \{u_j\} \) such that \( E \in A^{(j)} \subseteq G \) and \( u_j \in E \). Therefore, setting \( T^* = T \cup \{u_j\} \), we have
\[
\deg_{G^{(j+1)}}(T) - \deg_{G^{(j)}}(T) \leq \deg_G(T^*) \leq \Delta_v(G) \leq \Delta_v^x,
\]
where the last inequality is by our assumption, as claimed.
Combining (30) and (31), it follows immediately that
\[
\deg_{G_*}(T) \leq \Delta_v^x/2 + \Delta_v^x \leq \Delta_v^x,
\]
where the final inequality holds by Definition 5.1. This contradicts our choice of \( T \) and therefore the lemma follows. ■

We are now ready for the final lemma, which is really the heart of the matter. We will show that if \( G \) has sufficiently many edges and all of the maximum degrees of \( G \) are appropriately bounded, then either the output hypergraph \( G_* \) has sufficiently many edges, or the output set \( W \) must be big. We remark that here we shall use the assumption that \( |I \cap V_r| \geq |V_r| - m \).

**Lemma 5.7.** Suppose that \( |I \cap V_r| \geq |V_r| - m \) and let \( \alpha > 0 \). If

(A1) \( e(G) \geq \alpha \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \left( \frac{n_i}{|V_i|} \right)^{1-x_i} \left( \frac{b}{m} \right)^{r_0-x_r} e(H) \) and

(A2) \( \Delta_v(G) \leq \Delta_v^x \) for every \( v \in V(x) \),

then at least one of the following statements is true:

(P1) \( e(G_*) \geq 2^{-|x|-x_r-1} \alpha \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \left( \frac{n_i}{|V_i|} \right)^{1-x_i} \left( \frac{b}{m} \right)^{r_0-x'_r} e(H) \).

(P2) \( i' < r \) and \( |W| \geq 2^{-i'-1} R^{-1} \alpha |V_r| \).

(P3) \( i' = r \) and \( |W| \geq 2^{-r-r_0-1} R^{-1} \alpha q \).

Proof. Observe that
\[
e(G_*) = \sum_{j \in S} \left( e(G_*^{(j+1)}) - e(G_*^{(j)}) \right) = \sum_{j \in S} \Delta_v(A^{(j)}),
\]
then (32)
since \( e(G_*^{(j+1)}) - e(G_*^{(j)}) = d_{A^{(j)}}(\{u_j\}) \) and \( u_j \) is the \( i' \)-maximum vertex of \( A^{(j)} \) for each \( j \in S \), and \( G_*^{(j+1)} = G_*^{(j)} \) for each \( j \not\in S \). To bound the right-hand side of (32), we count the edges removed from \( A^{(j)} \) in (a) and (b) of step (S4), which gives
\[
e(A^{(j)}) - e(A^{(j+1)}) \leq \Delta_v(A^{(j)}) + \sum_v |M_v(r^{(j+1)}_v)\setminus M_v(r^{(j)}_v)| \cdot \Delta_v(G).
\]
Summing over \( j \in \{0, \ldots, L - 1\} \) it follows (using (32)) that
\[
e(G) - e(A) \leq e(G_*) + |W| \cdot \Delta_v(G_*) + \sum_v |M_v(r^{(j)}_v)| \cdot \Delta_v^x,
\]

\footnote{Recall that \( G_* \) (and \( G_*^{(j)} \) etc.) are multi-hypergraphs and that edges are counted with multiplicity.}
since \( A = A^{(k)} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A^{(0)} = G \) and \( \Delta_v(G) \leq \Delta^x_v \) by (A2). Furthermore, 
\[
\Delta_{e_{v'}}(A) \leq \Delta_{e_{v'}}(A^{(j)}) \leq \Delta_{e_{v'}}(G) \leq \Delta^x_{e_{v'}},
\]
(33) 
since \( A \subseteq A^{(j)} \subseteq G \) and \( G \) satisfies (A2), which implies 
\[
e(G) - e(A) \leq e(G_s) + |W|\Delta^x_{e_{v'}} + \sum_v |M^x_v(G_s)|\Delta^x_v.
\]
(34) 
Combining (32) and (33), we get 
\[
e(G_s) = \sum_{j \in S} \Delta_{e_{v'}}(A^{(j)}) \geq |S|\Delta_{e_{v'}}(A) = b\Delta_{e_{v'}}(A),
\]
(35) 
where the equality is due to the fact that \( |S| \neq b \) only when \( A \) is empty, see step (S1).

Next, to bound the sum in (34), observe that, by Definition 5.3, we have 
\[
|M^x_v(G_s)|\Delta^x_v/2 \leq \sum_{T: |T \cap V_i| = v_i} \deg_{G_s}(T) \leq \left(\frac{x_r}{v_r}\right) e(G_s) \leq 2^{x_r} e(G_s)
\]
for each \( v \in V(x') \) and therefore 
\[
\sum_{v \in V(x')} |M^x_v(G_s)|\Delta^x_v \leq 2^{x_r+1} \sum_v e(G_s) \left(\frac{\Delta^x_v}{\Delta^x_v'}\right)
\]
\[
\leq 2^{x_r+1} (2|x'| - 1) e(G_s) \max_v \left\{ \Delta^x_v/\Delta^x_v' \right\}
\]
\[
\leq 2^{x_r+1} (2|x'| - 1) e(G_s) w_{e_{v'}}/b,
\]
(36) 
where the last inequality follows from Definition 5.1.

Suppose first that \( i' < r \) and observe that substituting (36) into (34) yields 
\[
e(G) - e(A) \leq e(G_s) + |W|\Delta^x_{e_{v'}} + 2^{x_r+1} (2|x'| - 1) e(G_s) |V_{i'}/b.
\]
(37) 
Moreover, by (35) we have 
\[
\frac{e(G_s)}{b} \geq \Delta_{e_{v'}}(A) \geq \frac{e(A)}{|V_{i'}/b|}
\]
(38) 
since the maximum degree of a hypergraph is at least as large as its average degree. Combining (37) and (38), we obtain 
\[
e(G) \leq e(G_s)|V_{i'}/b\left(\frac{b}{|V_{i'|}} + 1 + 2^{x_r+|i'|+1} - 2\right) + |W|\Delta^x_{e_{v'}}
\]
\[
\leq e(G_s)|V_{i'}/b2^{x_r+|i'|} + |W|\Delta^x_{e_{v'}}
\]
(39) 
since \( b \leq |V_{i'}/b| \). Now, if the first summand on the right-hand side of (39) exceeds \( e(G)/2 \), then (A1) implies (P1). Otherwise, the second summand is at least \( e(G)/2 \) and by (A1) and (27), 
\[
|W| \geq \frac{e(G)}{2\Delta^x_{e_{v'}}} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{x+1}R}|V_{i'}/b|
\]
which is (P2).

Finally, suppose \( i' = r \). Substituting (36) into (34) yields, using the bound \( \Delta^x_v/\Delta^x_v' \leq m/b \), 
\[
e(G) - e(A) \leq e(G_s) + |W|\Delta^x_{e_{v'}} + (2^{x_r+|i'|} - 2^{x_r+1})e(G_s)m/2b.
\]
(40)
We claim that
\[ \frac{e(G_s)}{b} \geq \Delta_{e_r}(A) \geq \frac{e(A)}{m}. \tag{41} \]
The first inequality follows from (35), so we only need to prove the second inequality. To do so, since \( I \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \) is an independent set in \( \mathcal{A} \) (and all edges of \( \mathcal{A} \) are contained in \( \mathcal{V}_r \)) then every edge in \( \mathcal{A} \) must be incident to \( \mathcal{V}_r \setminus I \), which has size at most \( m \) by assumption. This shows that
\[ \Delta_{e_r}(A) \geq \frac{e(A)}{|\mathcal{V}_r \setminus I|} \geq \frac{e(A)}{m}. \]
Combining (40) and (41), we obtain
\[ e(G) \leq e(G_s) \frac{m}{b} \left( \frac{b}{m} + 1 + 2^{x_r + |x|} - 2^{x_r + 1} \right) + |W| \Delta_{e_r}^x, \tag{42} \]
\[ \leq e(G_s) \frac{m}{b} 2^{x_r + |x|} + |W| \Delta_{e_r}^x, \]
since \( b \leq m \). Now, if the first summand on the right-hand side of (39) exceeds \( e(G)/2 \), then (A1) implies (P1). Otherwise, the second summand is at least \( e(G)/2 \) and by (A1) and (28),
\[ |W| \geq \frac{e(G)}{2 \Delta_{e_r}^x} \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{r_0 + r + 1} R q}, \]
which is (P3). \[ \blacksquare \]

### 5.4 Construction of the container

In this section, we present the construction of containers for pairs in \( \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \) and analyse their properties, thus proving Theorem 2.1. For each \( s \in \{0, \ldots, r_0 + r - 1\} \), define
\[ \alpha_s = 2^{-s(2r_0 + r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_s = \alpha_s \prod_{j=1}^{\min\{r-1,s\}} \left( \frac{b}{|V_j|} \right) \left( \frac{b}{m} \right)^{\max\{0,s-r+1\}}. \]
Given an \( I \in \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \), we construct the container \((A_1, \ldots, A_r)\) for \( I \) using the following procedure.

**Construction of the container.** Initialize \( s = 0 \), \( x = (1, \ldots, 1, r_0) \), \( \mathcal{H}^x = \mathcal{H} \) and \( S_i = \emptyset \) for all \( i \in [r] \).

(C1) Let \( i' \) and \( x' \) be defined from \( x \) as before.

(C2) Run the algorithm with \( \mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{H}^x \) to obtain the \( x' \)-bounded hypergraph \( G_s \), the sequence \( u_0, \ldots, u_{L-1} \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{H}) \), and the partition \( \{0, 1, \ldots, L - 1\} = S \cup W \).

(C3) Let \( S_{i'} \leftarrow S_{i'} \cup \{u_j : j \in S\} \).

(C4) If \( e(G_s) < \beta_s e(\mathcal{H}) \), then define \((A_1, \ldots, A_r)\), the container for \( I \), by
\[ A_{i'} = V_{i'} \setminus \{u_j : j \in W\} \]
and \( A_j = V_j \) for \( j \neq i' \) and STOP.

(C5) Otherwise, let \( \mathcal{H}^x \leftarrow G_s \), \( x \leftarrow x' \) and \( s \leftarrow s + 1 \) and CONTINUE.

We will show that the above procedure indeed constructs containers for \( \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H}) \) that have the desired properties. To this end, we first claim that for each \( x \in \mathcal{U} \cup \{0\} \), the hypergraph \( \mathcal{H}^x \), if it was defined, satisfies:
\[(i) \ I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H}^x) \text{ and} \]
\[(ii) \ \Delta_v(\mathcal{H}^x) \leq \Delta_v^x \text{ for every } v \in \mathcal{V}(x). \]

Indeed, one may easily prove \((i)\) and \((ii)\) by induction on \(|x| - |v|\). The base case is true by Definition 5.1, and the inductive step follows immediately from Observation 5.4 and Lemma 5.6.

Secondly, we claim that for each input \(I \in \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H})\), step \((C4)\) is called for some \(s\) and hence the container \((A_1, \ldots, A_r)\) is defined. If this were not true, the condition in step \((C5)\) would be met \(r + r_0 - 1\) times and, consequently, we would finish with a non-empty \((0, \ldots, 0)\)-bounded hypergraph \(\mathcal{H}^0\), i.e., we would have \(\emptyset \in E(\mathcal{H}^0)\). But this contradicts \((i)\), since \(\emptyset \subset I\), so it would not be independent.

Suppose, therefore, that step \((C4)\) is executed when \(G = \mathcal{H}^x\) for some \(x \in \mathcal{U}\). We claim that \(e(\mathcal{H}^x) \geq \beta_s e(\mathcal{H})\). This is trivial if \(s = 0\) since here \(\mathcal{H}^x = \mathcal{H}\), and for \(s > 0\) it holds since otherwise step \((C4)\) would have been executed in the previous iteration. We therefore have

\[
e(\mathcal{G}) = e(\mathcal{H}^x) \geq \beta_s e(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{and} \quad e(\mathcal{G}_s) < \beta_{s+1} e(\mathcal{H}),
\]

which, by Lemma 5.7 and \((ii)\), implies that either \((P2)\) or \((P3)\) of Lemma 5.7 holds. Define \(\delta = 2^{-(r_0+r-1)(2r_0+r)} R^{-1}\) and note that \(\delta \leq \alpha_s R^{-1}\) for all \(s \in [0, r_0 + r - 1]\). If \(i' < r\), we see that \((P2)\) implies

\[
|W| \geq 2^{r-1} R^{-1} \alpha_s |V_{i'}| \geq \alpha_r R^{-1} |V_{i'}| \geq \delta |V_{i'}|,
\]

Similarly, if \(i' = r\), then by \((P3)\),

\[
|W| \geq 2^{-r_0-r-1} R^{-1} \alpha_s q \geq \alpha_{r_0+r-1} R^{-1} q = \delta q.
\]

This verifies that \((A_1, \ldots, A_r)\) satisfies property \((ii)\) from the statement of Theorem 2.1.

Let \(S\) denote the set of all tuples \((S_1, \ldots, S_r)\) that were defined in \((C3)\) when running the procedure for all \(I \in \mathcal{I}_m(\mathcal{H})\). We define \(g(I) = (S_1, \ldots, S_r)\) and \(f(g(I)) = (A_1, \ldots, A_r)\), where \((A_1, \ldots, A_r)\) is the container tuple that was defined in \((C4)\). Note that \(f\) is well-defined by Observation 5.5. This follows directly when \(i' < r\), since here the set \(S_{i'}\) is equivalent to the set \(S\) obtained in \((C2)\). But then, in particular, everything will be the same the first time that \(i' = r\), and hence \(r\)-maximum vertices will be considered at the same time.

Finally, we see that clearly the inclusion statements of properties \((i)\) and \((iii)\) hold by construction, and the second one in \((iii)\) is true since every \(S_i\) starts empty and we stop as soon as \((C4)\) is true for the first time.

\section{Concluding Remarks}

In this paper we have focussed on the asymmetric version of the typical structure of a pair of sets subject to a constraint on the size of their sunset. As explained in the introduction, this formulation of the result is very natural with respect to the perspective of classical results on sumsets like the Brunn–Minkowski inequality or Kneser’s theorem. As illustrated by this paper, obtaining such asymmetric versions of results in additive combinatorics, which is most often concerned with studying a single set possessing some additive structure, can be a nontrivial task. It is worth noting that our result as is does not supersede but rather complements the one by Campos [4] for the case \(A = B\): The latter cannot be directly derived from ours, as here the estimations leading to an almost surely result are based on the random choice of two independent sets rather than only one. Still, the quantitative bounds of our result are comparable when considering sets of the same size.

Even if a simpler version of the container result, Theorem 2.1, would have been sufficient for the proof of our main result, we have chosen to state it in more generality, at no cost, as in
this wider generality the result may be suitable to address a number of additional applications, which nevertheless require developments which do not fit the length of a single paper.

A natural step further is to handle multiple set addition: if $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ is a family of independently chosen random sets of integers with cardinality $s$ among those satisfying a constraint on their sumset, say $|A_1 + \cdots + A_l| \leq Ks$, then with high probability each of the sets is almost contained in an arithmetic progression of size $Ks/l$ having the same common difference. The quantitative aspects of the statement depend on the strength of supersaturation and stability results analogous to Corollaries 3.2 and 3.4, which are only partially existing in the literature. Tight bounds on the cardinality of multiple set addition can be found for example in Lev [12], but to our knowledge no inverse results deriving the structure of sets in this multiple addition setting are available. A result of this kind, both for the analogue of the $3k - 4$ theorem and its robust version might be attained along the lines of known results for the addition of two distinct sets by the use of the multiple set addition version of Kneser’s theorem given by DeVos, Goddyn, and Mohar [7]. This opens a path to be yet explored.

A second natural direction is to translate the structural result into the more general setting of arbitrary abelian groups. The parameter $\beta(t)$ measuring the size of the largest subgroup with cardinality up to $t$ is a useful one when we consider the counting version of our main result. We have included its asymmetric version in this paper, Theorem 1.2. The structural description given by Green and Ruzsa [11] in their extension of Freiman’s theorem to general abelian groups provides a guideline for the structure of typical sets with bounded sumset in general abelian groups. As explored in this paper as well as in [4] and [5], the typical structure of sets with bounded sumset in the integers, in this case plain arithmetic progressions, is a lot simpler than the general one given by Freiman’s theorem, so one would expect the same to be the case in more general groups. The recently obtained robust version of the Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers theorem by Shao [20], combined with an appropriate Freiman $3k - 4$ type theorem seems to be the correct set of tools to achieve this objective. An important natural case to explore is that of groups of prime order, $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, where sufficiently strong analogues of the Freiman $3k - 4$ Freiman theorem are already available and an equivalent statement of our main result might require less work to prove.

An even less explored direction is to also translate the structural result to general groups, not necessarily abelian. Perhaps the more appropriate quest in this setting is to ask for the typical structure of approximate groups in the light of its structural characterization by Breuillard, Green and Tao [3].

Coming back to more classical problems in additive combinatorics, let us conclude by mentioning a natural example which can illustrate the use of the techniques used in this paper, the case of $A+B$ when $B = \lambda A$, the dilation of $A$ by some factor $\lambda$. It is known that $A + \lambda A$ has size at least $(\lambda + 1)|A|$ and, for $\lambda$ prime, the structure of extremal sets is known [6]. Can one prove an approximate structure result similar in scope to Theorem 1.1 for this specific problem?
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A Proof of Lemma 4.2

Dividing by the binomial coefficients on the right hand side of (21) and taking the logarithm, we need to prove

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \log \left( 1 - \frac{(2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 2\epsilon)m}{s+t} - i \right) + \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2\sqrt{\epsilon}m}{s+t} - j \right) \leq -\epsilon(s+t). \tag{43}
\]

By using the bound \( \log(1 + x) \leq x - x^2 + \frac{x^3}{3} \) valid on the interval \((-1, \infty)\), it suffices to prove the upper bound in (43) for the expression

\[
-2(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon) \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left( \frac{t}{s+t} - \frac{i}{m} \right)^{-1} - \frac{(2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 2\epsilon)^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{t}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-2} \\
+ 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-1} - 2\epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-2} + 4\epsilon^{3/2} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-3}. \tag{44}
\]

Next, we are going to approximate the sums in (44) by integrals, using the bounds

\[
\int_a^b f(x) - \frac{2(b-a)}{n} \|f\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n}^{nb} f \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) \leq \int_a^b f(x)
\]
which hold for any continuous, non-decreasing function \( f \) on the interval \([a, b]\). We start with the linear terms. Defining \( K > (1 + \alpha) \) by \( m = K(s + t) \), we get

\[
-2(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon) \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \frac{1}{s+t} \leq -2(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon) \left( m \int_0^{t/m} \frac{1}{s+t-x} dx - 2 \frac{t}{m} \left( \frac{t}{s+t} - \frac{t}{m} \right)^{-1} \right) \\
= -2(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon) \left( -m \log \left( 1 - \frac{s+t}{m} \right) - \frac{2}{K-1} \right) \\
\leq -2m(\sqrt{\epsilon} - \epsilon) \log \left( \frac{K}{K-1} \right) + \frac{4\sqrt{\epsilon}}{K-1},
\]

and similarly

\[
2\sqrt{\epsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-1} \leq 2m\sqrt{\epsilon} \log \left( \frac{K}{K-1} \right).
\]

For the quadratic terms, we see that

\[
\frac{(2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 2\epsilon)^2}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left( \frac{t}{s+t} - \frac{i}{m} \right)^{-2} \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 2\epsilon)^2}{2} \left( \frac{K(s+t)^2}{t(K-1)} - \frac{2K(s+t)}{t(K-1)^2} \right) \\
\leq -2\epsilon K(s+t)^2 \frac{4\epsilon^3/2K(s+t)^2}{t(K-1)} + 8\epsilon K(s+t) \frac{8\epsilon K(s+t)}{t(K-1)^2},
\]

and similarly for the one involving \( s \),

\[
-2\epsilon \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-2} \leq -2\epsilon K(s+t)^2 \frac{4\epsilon K(s+t)}{s(K-1)} + 4\epsilon K(s+t) \frac{8\epsilon K(s+t)}{s(K-1)^2}.
\]

Finally, for the cubic term we see that

\[
4\epsilon^{3/2} \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{s}{s+t} - \frac{j}{m} \right)^{-3} \leq \frac{2\epsilon^{3/2}K(2K-1)(s+t)^3}{s^2(K-1)^2}.
\]

Note that the \( 2m\sqrt{\epsilon} \) parts of the linear terms cancel out, while

\[
2\epsilon K(s+t) \log \left( \frac{K}{K-1} \right) \leq \frac{2\epsilon K(s+t)^2}{\max(s,t)(K-1)},
\]

which follows from the fact that \( x \log(1+x^{-1}) \leq 1 \) for all \( x > 0 \). On the other hand, because of \( (s + t) \geq 2^\alpha - 1 \geq 2^5(K - 1)^{-1} \) and the bounds on \( \epsilon \), the sum of all remaining positive term in Equations (45)–(49) can be upper bounded by \( \frac{e^{K(s+t)^2}}{\min(s,t)(K-1)} \), and hence we see that

\[
(44) \leq -\frac{\epsilon K(s+t)^2}{\min(s,t)(K-1)} \leq -\epsilon(s + t),
\]

which implies (43) and hence proves the statement. \( \blacksquare \)