HIGHER-ORDER GENERALIZATIONS OF STABILITY AND ARITHMETIC REGULARITY

C. TERRY AND J. WOLF

Abstract. We define a natural notion of higher-order stability and show that subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ that are tame in this sense can be approximately described by a union of low-complexity quadratic subvarieties up to linear error. This generalizes the arithmetic regularity lemma for stable subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ proved by the authors in [73], and subsequent refinements and generalizations [19, 74], to the realm of higher-order Fourier analysis.
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1. Introduction

A major theme in arithmetic combinatorics is the decomposition of a mathematical object (say a graph, set, or function) into a structured and a random-looking (or pseudorandom) part. Discarding the pseudorandom contributions and explicitly computing the contributions from the structured part, it is often possible to obtain a count of certain substructures inside the object in question. This philosophy has its roots in techniques in classical analytic number theory, and came to the fore in graph theory with Szemerédi’s regularity lemma \cite{66} in the 1970s. The key is to define a suitable notion of pseudorandomness for the problem at hand, and then to obtain a structural counterpart. While the latter is usually regarded as the deep and difficult part of the problem, the former is evidently crucial to the success of any decomposition endeavour.

In many famous instances, such as Roth’s theorem on 3-term arithmetic progressions, the $\ell^\infty$ norm of the Fourier transform provides a suitable measure of pseudorandomness. Indeed, any bounded function on $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ can be decomposed into a part that is pseudorandom in this sense, plus a structured part, which is determined by a small number of linear phases (associated with the large Fourier coefficients of the function).

However, it was (re)discovered by Gowers in his groundbreaking work on Szemerédi’s theorem \cite{27,28} that the Fourier transform is not sufficiently sensitive for controlling, for example, arithmetic progressions of length 4. He introduced a new measure of pseudorandomness, the so-called $U^3$ norm, which turns out to be more suitable for this purpose. He also proved a structure result for functions with large $U^3$ norm, namely that they correlate with suitably defined quadratic phases, and thereby opened the door to so-called quadratic decomposition theorems, which break down a function into a quadratically pseudorandom part (as measured by the $U^3$ norm) and a part determined by a small number of quadratic phases.
Indeed, this higher-order Fourier analysis has developed into an exceedingly active area of research over the past two decades, leading to a number of high-profile applications such as the Green-Tao theorem on long arithmetic progressions in the primes [38]. It has also engendered numerous fruitful connections to other sub-disciplines, including ergodic theory and theoretical computer science.

In applications, the quantitative aspects of such decompositions are often extremely important, and it is natural to ask whether there are circumstances where particularly efficient decompositions can be guaranteed. In the case of linear decompositions of bounded functions on $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ the authors showed in [73] that the model-theoretic notion of stability provides such a sufficient condition. This work was motivated by results of Malliaris and Shelah [53] in the context of graph regularity, and generalized in [3, 19, 22, 65, 74].

In the present paper we study corresponding questions for higher-order (specifically, quadratic) decompositions. This time, it turns out that model-theoretic stability is not sufficiently sensitive to capture the circumstances under which efficient quadratic decompositions can be obtained. We therefore introduce a new model-theoretic notion of tameness which generalizes model-theoretic stability. The main result of the paper is, roughly speaking, that in the presence of such tameness, one can always obtain a very efficient quadratic decomposition, with the approximation error displaying strong linear structure.

There is a loose correspondence between arithmetic regularity in the setting of groups as discussed above, and hypergraph regularity. We examine the analogous questions in the setting of hypergraphs in our companion paper [76], and refer the interested reader to the introduction of that paper for a statement of results obtained in that setting.

The work carried out in the remaining pages further strengthens the connections between stable group theory and arithmetic combinatorics. Beginning with the Baldwin-Saxl theorem [5] in the 1980s, stable group theory has been highly influential in the development of modern model theory. It has guided several important research programs, for example, the long-running program to classify finite simple groups of finite Morley rank [12], groundbreaking work on stability of the free group [63], beautiful results about groups definable in o-minimal expansions of the real field [57], and connections to topological dynamics found in NIP groups [58].

It was Hrushovski [49] who first realized the potential connections with arithmetic combinatorics, using tools from stable group theory to prove a non-abelian analogue of Freiman’s theorem. More recently, Conant, Pillay, and Terry [21, 22], exhibited interesting correspondences between domination-type statements from stable and NIP group theory, and efficient linear decomposition theorems.

The approach in this paper is combinatorial and finitary in nature, but we expect there is a rich model-theoretic framework to be developed over the coming years which corresponds to the notions discussed here. As was the case for the aforementioned work on linear decompositions, we expect the model-theoretic tools, once developed, to be vastly more general than those available to arithmetic combinatorialists at this stage. Since the paper is already somewhat lengthy, we barely touch on these further directions.
1.1. Group properties. We begin by introducing a framework which allows us to formalize questions about efficient decompositions, or low-complexity descriptions, of subsets of finite groups. Recall that a graph property is a class of finite graphs closed under isomorphism. A graph property is hereditary if it is also closed under induced subgraphs. Graph properties have proved to be an important concept for studying various notions of combinatorial and algorithmic complexity in graphs and hypergraphs, see e.g. [4, 6, 25]. It turns out that the language of hereditary properties allows for especially clear statements about correspondences between combinatorial notions from model theory and strong regularity lemmas, see [76].

In this paper, our goal is to study strong arithmetic regularity lemmas in the setting of groups. Our objects of interest are pairs \((G, A)\) where \(G\) is a finite group and \(A\) is a distinguished subset of \(G\). We will work with analogues of graph properties tailored to this setting.

Suppose \(G\) and \(H\) are groups. An affine embedding from \(H\) into \(G\) is an injective map \(f : H \to G\) such that for all \(x, y \in H\), \(f(x \cdot y) = f(x) \cdot f(1_H) - 1 \cdot f(y)\). We will largely focus on the context of elementary \(p\)-groups, where an affine embedding from \(\mathbb{F}_p^m\) into \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) is an injection \(f : \mathbb{F}_p^m \to \mathbb{F}_p^n\) such that \(\text{Im}(f) = H + g\) for some \(g \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\) and \(H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n\), and where for all \(x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p^m\), if \(f(x) = a + g\) and \(f(y) = b + g\), then \(f(x + y) = a + b + g\).

Given distinguished subsets \(A \subseteq G\) and \(A' \subseteq H\), an affine embedding from \((H, A')\) to \((G, A)\) is an an affine embedding \(f : H \to G\) such that \(x \in A'\) if and only if \(f(x) \in A\). When such an \(f\) is a bijection, we say it is an isomorphism from \((G, A)\) to \((H, A')\). If there exists an affine embedding/isomorphism from \((H, A')\) into \((G, A)\), then we say \((H, A')\) is an affine substructure of/isomorphic to \((G, A)\).

**Definition 1.1 (Group properties).** A group property (GP) is a class \(\mathcal{P}\) of pairs of the form \((G, A)\), where \(G\) is a finite group and \(A \subseteq G\), so that \(\mathcal{P}\) is closed under isomorphism. A group property consisting entirely of elementary \(p\)-groups is called an elementary \(p\)-group property (epGP).

A hereditary group property (HGP) is a group property closed under affine substructures. When an HGP consists entirely of elementary \(p\)-groups, it is called a hereditary elementary \(p\)-group property (HepGP).

This definition is closely related to the notion of an affine-invariant property, see e.g. [8,9]. Unlike these papers, we will not consider the case of characteristic \(p = 2\) here. Much like hereditary graph properties, the definition of a hereditary group property has equivalent formulations in terms of forbidden substructures and universal axioms. These equivalences are given in Appendix A.1.

1.2. Linear atomicity, stability and NIP. Our focus in this paper is on approximating subsets of groups by algebraically defined partitions, which motivates the following definitions.

---

1Extra care must be taken when carrying out higher-order Fourier analysis in low characteristic, and we leave this to future work.
Definition 1.2 (Atomicity). Suppose $G$ is a group, $A \subseteq G$, and $\mathcal{X}$ is a partition of $G$.

(i) Given $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we say $X$ is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$ if $|A \cap X|/|X| \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1-\epsilon, 1]$.

(ii) We say $\mathcal{X}$ is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$ if every $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

(iii) We say $\mathcal{X}$ is $\delta$-almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$ if there is a set $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that

(a) every $X \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \Sigma$ is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$; and

(b) $|\{x \in G : \text{ there is } X \in \Sigma \text{ with } x \in X\}| \leq \delta|G|$.

When $\epsilon = \delta$, we simply say $\mathcal{X}$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

The next definition will allow us to quantify the extent to which a group property has an efficient linear decomposition.

Definition 1.3 ((Almost) linear atomicity ((A)LA)). Suppose $P$ is a group property.

(i) We say $P$ is (strongly) linearly atomic ((S)LA) if for all $\epsilon > 0$ (respectively, and all functions $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$), there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $(G, A) \in P$ with $G$ sufficiently large, there is $H \leq G$ of index $k \leq K$ such that the partition of $G$ into cosets of $H$ is $\epsilon$-atomic ($\epsilon p^{-g(k)}$-atomic) with respect to $A$.

(ii) We say $P$ is almost (strongly) linearly atomic (A(S)LA) if for all $\epsilon > 0$ (respectively, and all functions $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$), there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $(G, A) \in P$ with $G$ sufficiently large, there is $H \leq G$ of index $k \leq K$, such that the partition of $G$ into cosets of $H$ is $\epsilon$-almost $\epsilon$-atomic ($\epsilon$-almost $\epsilon p^{-g(k)}$-atomic) with respect to $A$.

Before being able to state what is known about conditions under which exceptionally efficient linear decompositions can be obtained, we need to adapt the definition of model-theoretic stability to the setting of hereditary group properties.

Definition 1.4 (Stable HGP). Given a group $G$ and a subset $A$, we say that the pair $(G, A)$ has the $k$-order property in $G$ (or has $k$-OP) if there exist $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k \in G$ such that $a_i \cdot b_j \in A$ if and only if $i \leq j$. If $(G, A)$ does not have the $k$-order property in $G$, then we say $A$ is $k$-stable (or $k$-NOP) in $G$.

We say that a group property $P$ is stable (or NOP) if there is $k \geq 1$ such that every pair $(G, A) \in P$ is $k$-stable. Otherwise, we say that $P$ is unstable (or has OP).

The terminology NOP and OP are somewhat non-standard within model theory, where the terms stable and unstable are preferred. They will, however, be helpful in the context of the present paper as they highlight the manner in which our later definitions generalize existing model-theoretic notions.

Linear atomicity has been shown to be intimately related to stability. In particular, the authors first showed in [73] that stability implies linear atomicity in elementary $p$-groups. That result was strengthened to strong linear atomicity (without explicit bounds) for general groups in [21], and finally, a quantitative, strong version was shown for general groups by Conant in [19].

Theorem 1.5. If $P$ is a stable group property, then it is strongly linearly atomic.
These results can be seen as algebraic analogues of graph regularity lemmas under the assumption of stability, in particular [53]. Prior to [53], efficient graph regularity lemmas had already been obtained under the assumption bounded VC-dimension (see e.g. [2]), which we now define for the group-theoretic context.

**Definition 1.6** (VC-dimension of an HGP). Given a finite group \( G \) and \( A \subseteq G \), we say \((G, A)\) has **VC-dimension at least** \( k \) if and only if there exist group elements \( \{a_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\} \subseteq G \) such that \( a_i \cdot b_S \in A \) if and only if \( i \in S \). We then define the **VC-dimension of** \((G, A)\), denoted \( \text{VC}(G, A) \), to be the largest \( k \) such that \((G, A)\) has VC-dimension at least \( k \).

A group property \( \mathcal{P} \) is **NIP** if there is \( k \geq 1 \) such that for all \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P}\), \( \text{VC}(G, A) \leq k \). In this case we let \( \text{VC}(\mathcal{P}) = \max\{\text{VC}(G, A) : (G, A) \in \mathcal{P}\} \). Otherwise, we say \( \mathcal{P} \) has **IP**.

When the group \( G \) is obvious, we may omit it and simply write \( \text{VC}(A) \) for the VC-dimension of \( A \subseteq G \). It is easy to see that \( \text{IP} \Rightarrow \text{OP} \).

Almost linear atomicity turns out to be related to VC-dimension. It was implicit in earlier work of the authors [73] that a HepGP with bounded VC-dimension is almost linearly atomic. This result was generalized, with strong explicit bounds, to abelian groups of bounded exponent in [3], and to abelian groups in [65]. It was shown in [22], qualitatively, that these results can be strengthened to almost strong linear atomicity for general groups of bounded exponent.

**Theorem 1.7.** Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is an GP of bounded exponent and bounded VC-dimension. Then \( \mathcal{P} \) is almost strongly linearly atomic.

Finally, Conant [18] gave a quantitative proof of almost atomicity in general groups of bounded exponent. As far as the authors are aware, there is at present no quantitative proof of almost strong atomicity in general groups.

It is natural to ask whether or not a group property has an efficient linear decomposition of a given type depends only on its equivalence class with respect to a certain notion of closeness. Given a finite group \( G \), and two subsets \( A, A' \subseteq G \), we say \((G, A)\) and \((G, A')\) are \( \delta \)-close if \(|A \Delta A'| \leq \delta|G|\).

**Definition 1.9** (Closeness of GPs). We say a group property \( \mathcal{P} \) is **close to** \( \mathcal{P}' \) if for all \( \delta > 0 \), there is \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) such that if \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P}\) with \(|G| \geq N\), then there is \((G, A') \in \mathcal{P}'\) such that \((G, A)\) and \((G, A')\) are \( \delta \)-close.

When \( \mathcal{P} \) is close to \( \mathcal{P}' \), and \( \mathcal{P}' \) is close to \( \mathcal{P} \), then we say \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{P}' \) are **close**, and denote this by \( \mathcal{P} \sim \mathcal{P}' \).

\(^2\text{IP stands for “independence property” and NIP for “not the independence property”. These are model theoretic terms for unbounded and bounded VC-dimension, respectively.}\)
Clearly $\sim$ forms an equivalence relation on GPs. It is not difficult to show that whether or not a group property satisfies any part of Definition 1.3 depends only on its $\sim$-class, see Appendix A.2.

**Proposition 1.10.** If $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ are close then $\mathcal{P}$ is

(strongly) linearly atomic/almost (strongly) linearly atomic

if and only if $\mathcal{P}'$ is.

In the setting of graphs, a hereditary graph property is stable if and only if it has regular decompositions with no irregular pairs, see for example [76, Theorem 1.4] for a precise statement. Although it is known that in the setting of hypergraphs, stability implies an analogous result (see [114]), we show in [76] that it does not characterize when certain regular decomposition with no irregular triples exist. In particular, we present hereditary properties of 3-uniform hypergraphs which are unstable but still close to stable, and thus admit “stable-like” regular decompositions (see [76]).

Hereditary group properties turn out to behave more like hypergraphs than graphs in this regard. In particular, while Theorem 1.5 shows that if $\mathcal{P}$ is stable, then it is strongly linearly atomic, the converse to Theorem 1.5 is false. This is because there exist HepGPs which are unstable, but close to stable in the sense of Definition 1.9.

**Proposition 1.11** (Strongly linearly atomic does not imply stable). There exists a hereditary group property $\mathcal{H}$ which is close to a stable group property, but which is unstable. In particular, $\mathcal{H}$ is strongly linearly atomic and unstable.

The proof of Proposition 1.11 is given in Appendix A.3. Note that Proposition 1.11 is not too surprising in light of the fact that every HepGP is associated to sum graphs of arbitrary finite arity. Therefore, the problems we consider in this paper do not sit in strict analogy to problems about hereditary properties of graphs, or indeed hereditary properties of $k$-uniform hypergraphs for any fixed $k$. We nonetheless conjecture that a HepGP $\mathcal{H}$ is linearly atomic if and only if it is close to stable. We also conjecture that a HepGP is linearly atomic if and only if it is strongly linearly atomic.

In light of Proposition 1.11 to understand linear atomicity one must look for minimal structures of the form $(G, A)$ which prevent a property from being linearly atomic. We give an abstract definition of such a collection in Definition 1.12 below. The following notation will be useful. If $\mathcal{P}$ is an epGP, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{P}_n$ denote the set of pairs $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ where $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Observe that $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{P}_n$ contains a representative of every isomorphism type in $\mathcal{P}$.

**Definition 1.12** (Obstruction to linear atomicity). Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is an epGP. We say $\mathcal{P}$ is an obstruction to linear atomicity if $\mathcal{P}_n \neq \emptyset$ for arbitrarily large $n$ and the following holds. For every linearly atomic epGP $\mathcal{H}$, there is some $N$ so that for all $n \geq N$, $\mathcal{P}_n \cap \mathcal{H}_n = \emptyset$.

A clear candidate for such a class was given by Green and Sanders in [37]. Given $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $H_i := \{ \bar{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x_1 = \ldots = x_i = 0 \}$ and let $e_i$ denote the $i$th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. 

Definition 1.13 (Green-Sanders example (GS)). Suppose \( n \geq 1 \). Let GS\((n, p)\) be the pair \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A_{\text{GS}}(n, p))\), where 
\[
A_{\text{GS}}(n, p) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(H_i + e_i).
\]

Green and Sanders showed that in \( \mathbb{F}_3^n \), the zero coset of any subspace always has a non-trivial large Fourier coefficient with respect to \( A_{\text{GS}}(n, 3) \). It is therefore unsurprising that these examples prevent an GP from being linearly atomic. Specifically, we prove in Section 2.3 that the following is true, where \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)} \) denotes the closure of \( \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \text{GS}(n, p) \) under isomorphism.

Proposition 1.14 (GS obstructs linear atomicity). \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)} \) is an obstruction to linear atomicity.

On the other hand, we will show in Section 2.3 that \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)} \) is NIP, and consequently, by Theorem 1.7, almost strongly linearly atomic. While these results address some aspects of Problem 1.8, the main focus of this paper is on “higher order” versions of these questions, which we discuss in the next sections.

1.3. Almost quadratic atomicity and NIP\(_2\). In order to formulate our next results, we will need the notion of a quadratic factor, first introduced by Green and Tao [36] in analogy with related concepts in ergodic theory (see e.g. [51]). Quadratic (and analogously defined higher-order) factors serve as descriptions of the structured part of higher-order arithmetic regularity lemmas. For the purpose of this introduction, it suffices to think of a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) as a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) into the joint level sets of a given collection of quadratic and linear maps. We refer to each of these level sets as an atom, and denote the collection of all atoms associated with the quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) by \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \). A typical atom is of the form 
\[
\{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M_1 x = a_1, x^T M_2 x = a_2, \ldots, x^T M_q x = a_q, x^T r_1 = b_1, x^T r_2 = b_2, \ldots, x^T r_\ell = b_\ell \},
\]
for some symmetric \( n \times n \) matrices \( M_1, \ldots, M_q \) with entries in \( \mathbb{F}_p \), and some (usually linearly independent) vectors \( r_1, \ldots, r_\ell \). The atom is said to be labeled by \( a_1, \ldots, a_q, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p \). The complexity of the partition \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) associated with a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) is given by the number of linear and quadratic maps that define it, in this case \((\ell, q)\), and its rank is the minimum rank of any non-trivial linear combination of the matrices \( M_1, \ldots, M_q \). In applications, we require the rank of the factor to be sufficiently high to ensure that the factor has various helpful properties (for example, that its atoms are of roughly equal size).

A partition into cosets of a given subgroup can be viewed as a degenerate case of a quadratic factor, which is given by linear maps only. We will therefore henceforth refer to such a partition as a linear factor. For a more detailed exposition, see Section 3.3.

We say that a factor \( \mathcal{B} \) is \( \epsilon \)-atomic/\( \epsilon \)-almost \( \delta \)-almost \( \epsilon \)-atomic if the associated partition \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) is. Definition 1.15 below is therefore analogous to Definition 1.3.

Definition 1.15 ((Almost) quadratic atomicity ((A)QA)). Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is an epGP.

(i) We say \( \mathcal{P} \) is \textit{quadratically atomic} (QA) if for all \( \epsilon > 0 \), and all rank functions \( \rho : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \), there are integers \( D, N \) such that for all \( n \geq N \), and all \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P}\)
with $|G| \geq p^n$, the following holds. There exists $(\ell, q)$ satisfying $\ell + q \leq D$, and a quadratic factor $\mathcal{B}$ in $G$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ which is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

(ii) We say $\mathcal{P}$ is almost quadratically atomic (AQA) if for all $\epsilon > 0$, and all rank functions $\rho : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, there are integers $D, N$ such that for all $n \geq N$, and all $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|G| \geq p^n$, the following holds. There exists $(\ell, q)$ satisfying $\ell + q \leq D$, and a quadratic factor $\mathcal{B}$ in $G$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$, which is $\epsilon$-almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

Note that (ii) implies (i). The results in this paper address the following problem.

**Problem 1.16.** Characterize when a HepGP is (strongly) quadratically atomic/almost (strongly) quadratically atomic.

While one might expect this problem to be somewhat independent from Problem 1.16, we will show that the two are in fact closely related.

In general, there is a loose analogy between graphs and 3-uniform hypergraphs on the one hand, and linear and quadratic structure on the other (see, for example, [29]). This idea is borne out in our first result, which shows that a sufficient condition for a set to be almost quadratically atomic is for it to have bounded VC$_2$-dimension. The latter is a higher-dimensional analogue of VC-dimension, which has already been shown to be related to hypergraph regularity and other combinatorial problems in [15, 72], as well as bilinear forms over vector spaces [46]. We now define it in the context of hereditary group properties.

**Definition 1.17** (VC$_2$-dimension of an HGP). Given $k \geq 1$, a finite group $G$ and $A \subseteq G$, we say that $A$ has VC$_2$-dimension at least $k$ if and only if there exist

$$\{a_S : S \subseteq [k] \times [k]\} \cup \{b_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{c_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq G$$

such that $b_i \cdot c_j \cdot a_S \in A$ if and only if $(i, j) \in S$.

The VC$_2$-dimension of $(G, A)$, denoted VC$_2(G, A)$, is defined to be the largest $k$ such that $(G, A)$ has VC$_2$-dimension at least $k$.

We say a group property $\mathcal{P}$ is NIP$_2$ if there is $k \geq 1$ such that for all $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$, VC$_2(G, A) \leq k$. In this case we let $VC_2(\mathcal{P}) = \max\{VC_2(G, A) : (G, A) \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Otherwise, we say $\mathcal{P}$ has IP$_2$.

We will show in Section 2 that a union of finitely many atoms of a quadratic factor has bounded VC$_2$-dimension. Our first main result shows an approximate converse, namely that in fact, any set of bounded VC$_2$-dimension is well approximated by atoms of a quadratic factor of high rank and bounded complexity.

**Theorem 1.18** (Sets of bounded VC$_2$-dimension are almost quadratically atomic). For all $k \geq 1$, $\mu > 0$ and there is $\omega_1 : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, such that for all $\omega \geq \omega_1$ (pointwise) there is $n_0 = n_0(k, \mu, \omega)$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq n_0$, and $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ satisfies VC$_2(A) < k$. Then there are $\ell, q \leq C(\mu, k, \omega)$, a quadratic factor $\mathcal{B}$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$, and a set $\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{B})$ satisfying $|\Sigma| \leq \epsilon p^{\ell+q}$, such that for all $B \in \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \setminus \Sigma$, $|A \cap B|/|B| \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1]$. 


This theorem is analogous to the structural results for sets of bounded VC-dimension found in [3, 22, 65, 73]. As an immediate corollary, we have the following.

**Corollary 1.19** (NIP₂ implies AQA). Let \( p \geq 3 \) be a prime and let \( \mathcal{P} \) be an elementary \( p \)-group property which is NIP₂. Then \( \mathcal{P} \) is almost quadratically atomic.

We prove an analogous result in the hypergraph setting in [76] (see also [15]). We also obtain the following structural result for sets of bounded VC₂-dimension.

**Corollary 1.20** (Structure of sets with bounded VC₂-dimension). For all \( \epsilon > 0 \), \( k \geq 1 \), and rank functions \( \rho : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \), there are integers \( D, N \) such that the following holds. For all \( n \geq N \) and \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) with \( \text{VC}_2(A) < k \), there is a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \rho(\ell + q) \), and a set \( I \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) such that \( \ell, q \leq D \), and \( |\mathbb{A} \Delta (\bigcup_{B \in I} B)| \leq \epsilon p^n \).

Corollary 1.20 is a higher-order analogue of earlier results [3, 22, 65, 73] that state that a set of bounded VC-dimension is approximately a union of cosets of a subgroup of bounded index (in other words, a union of atoms from a purely linear factor).

In fact, we believe that something stronger is true. In analogy with Definition 1.3, we say that \( \mathcal{P} \) is almost strongly quadratically atomic if for all \( \epsilon > 0 \), all functions \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \), and all rank functions \( \rho : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \), there are integers \( D, N \) such that for all \( n \geq N \), and all \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( |G| \geq p^n \), the following holds. There exists \((\ell, q)\) satisfying \( \ell + q \leq D \), and a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) in \( G \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \rho(\ell + q) \), which is \( \epsilon \)-almost \( \epsilon p^{-g(\ell + q)} \)-atomic with respect to \( A \).

**Conjecture 1.21.** If an epGP is NIP₂, then it is almost strongly quadratically atomic.

As was the case for linear decompositions (see Proposition 1.10), it is not difficult to show that whether or not a group property satisfies any part of Definition 1.15 depends only on its \( \sim \)-class, see Appendix A.2.

**Proposition 1.22.** If \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{P}' \) are close then \( \mathcal{P} \) is (strongly) quadratically atomic/almost (strongly) quadratically atomic if and only if \( \mathcal{P}' \) is.

In light of this, the above conclusions also hold when \( \mathcal{P} \) is close to a group property with bounded VC₂-dimension.

1.4. **Quadratic atomicity and the hyperplane order property.** While the fact that the Green-Sanders example obstructs linear atomicity (Proposition 1.14) is not unexpected in the context of [37], it is somewhat more surprising that the same example forms an obstruction to quadratic atomicity, which we now define.

**Definition 1.23** (Obstruction to quadratic atomicity). We say an elementary \( p \)-group property \( \mathcal{P} \) is an obstruction to quadratic atomicity if \( \mathcal{P}_n \neq \emptyset \) for arbitrarily large \( n \), and for every quadratically atomic epGP \( \mathcal{H} \), there is some \( N \) so that if \( n \geq N \), then \( \mathcal{P}_n \cap \mathcal{H}_n = \emptyset \).

**Proposition 1.24** (Green-Sanders obstructs quadratic atomicity). \( \mathcal{P}_{GS(p)} \) is an obstruction to quadratic atomicity.
Thus, even though the $P_{GS(p)}$ is “essentially linear”, in the sense that it is almost linearly atomic, it is nevertheless an obstruction to quadratic atomicity. The same is true for several natural generalizations of $P_{GS(p)}$, see the forthcoming note [??].

This raises the question of whether all obstructions to quadratic atomicity are essentially linear in nature. It turns out that the answer to this question is negative, as the following example shows.

**Definition 1.25** (Quadratic Green-Sanders example (QGS)). Given $n \geq 1$, the quadratic Green-Sanders $p$-example of dimension $n$, denoted $QGS(n, p)$, is the pair $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, where $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is defined as follows.

Let $(M_i)_{i=1}^n$ be a basis for a vector space of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices of rank $n$ with entries in $\mathbb{F}_p$. For odd $n$, the existence of such a space follow from [24, Lemma 3], for example. For every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let

$$Q_i(e_i) := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M_1 x = x^T M_2 x = \cdots = x^T M_{i-1} x = 0, x^T M_i x = 1\},$$

and let $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n Q_i(e_i)$.

We now define $P_{QGS(p)}$ to be the closure of $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} QGS(n, p)$ under isomorphism. There are many ways in which $P_{QGS(p)}$ behaves as a quadratic analogue of $P_{GS(p)}$. We will show that $P_{QGS(p)}$ is almost quadratically atomic but not quadratically atomic, just like $P_{GS(p)}$ is almost linearly atomic but not linearly atomic. We further conjecture in Section 3.4 that $P_{QGS(p)}$ is NIP, in analogy to the fact that $P_{GS(p)}$ is NIP. We are particularly interested in $P_{QGS(p)}$ as it is an obstruction to quadratic atomicity which is “essentially quadratic” in the following sense.

**Proposition 1.26** (QGS obstructs quadratic atomicity in an essentially quadratic way). $P_{QGS(p)}$ is an obstruction to quadratic atomicity which is almost quadratically atomic but not almost linearly atomic.

In order to make progress on the question of what characterizes quadratic atomicity, we first consider the question of what combinatorial property (if any) characterizes quadratic atoms. Given a set $A \subseteq G$, we say that $A$ has the cube auto-completion property (CAP$_2$) if for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \in G$ satisfying $x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in Q$ for each $(i, j, k) \in [2]^3 \setminus \{(2, 2, 2)\}$, one also has $x_2 \cdot y_2 \cdot z_2 \in Q$.

If $Q \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ is an atom of a quadratic factor, then it has CAP$_2$ (see Section 2). This makes atoms of quadratic factors analogous to cosets of subgroups in the following sense. Given a group $G$, if $C \subseteq G$ is a coset of a subgroup, then it has square auto-completion (CAP$_1$): for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in G$, if $x_i \cdot y_j \in C$ for all $(i, j) \in [2]^2 \setminus \{(2, 2)\}$, then $x_2 \cdot y_2 \in C$. Indeed, the square auto-completion property gives a necessary and sufficient condition for when a subset of $G$ is a coset of a subgroup. It is easy to see, after some reindexing, that having square auto-completion is equivalent to having no 2-OP. The cube and square auto-completion properties, respectively, also imply that quadratic atoms have VC$_2$-dimension at most 1 and cosets of subgroups have VC-dimension at most 1.

Based on the above discussion, one might reasonably expect analogues of Theorems 1.7 and 1.5 to hold in which subgroups are replaced by quadratic atoms, VC-dimension is
replaced by VC$_2$-dimension, and stability is replaced by a natural property extending the definition of cube auto-completion. As the preceding section showed, the results around VC$_2$-dimension play out in the expected way. However, the results around generalizations of stability came with surprises, which we now explain.

To obtain a combinatorial property that extends the definition of cube auto-completion, we first observe that a set $A$ has cube auto-completion if and only if for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \in G$, it is not true that $x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A$ if and only if $i < j + k$. Based on this observation we make the following definition.

**Definition 1.27** (Hyperplane order property (HOP$_2$)). We say $(G, A)$ has $k$-HOP$_2$ if there are $\{a_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{b_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{c_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq G$ such that $a_u \cdot b_v \cdot c_w \in A$ if and only if $u < v + w$.

We say a GP $\mathcal{P}$ has HOP$_2$ if it has $k$-HOP$_2$ for arbitrarily large $k$. Otherwise, we say $\mathcal{P}$ is NHOP$_2$.

Here, the letter “H” in HOP$_2$ can also interpreted to stand for “higher” order property. With regard to the choice of subscript, the difficulty of distinguishing between the degree of the factor and the dimension of the associated cube auto-completion property is well known in arithmetic combinatorics: as we discuss in Section 4, the $U^3$ norm is associated with quadratic behaviour, so it would have been natural to write HOP$_3$ instead of HOP$_2$. However, since the notation IP$_2$ is established in model theory, it seemed preferable to adopt the convention above.

Geometrically, Definition 1.27 is a natural guess when attempting to extend the definition of cube auto-completion to an analogue of the order property. Indeed, the order property can be viewed as a 2-dimensional structure representing a square that is cut out below a (diagonal) line, while HOP$_2$ can be viewed as a 3-dimensional structure representing a cube that is cut below a certain hyperplane. An easy exercise in re-indexing HOP$_2$ and OP makes this analogy clear. Indeed, it is straightforward to see (see Appendix B.2) that $A$ has $\ell$-HOP$_2$ if and only if there are $a_1, \ldots, a_{\ell}, b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell}, c_1, \ldots, c_{\ell} \in G$ such that $a_i \cdot b_j \cdot c_k \in A$ if and only if $i + j + k \geq \ell + 2$, while $A$ has $\ell - \text{OP}$ if and only if there are $a_1, \ldots, a_{\ell}, b_1, \ldots, b_{\ell} \in G$ such that $a_i \cdot b_j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq \ell$. We could thus regard OP as HOP$_1$ (but see also the discussion at the end of this introduction).

Generalizing the fact that a single atom is NHOP$_2$ by definition, we shall show in Section 2.2 that a union of $k$ quadratic atoms (possibly even from different factors) has no $k'$-HOP$_2$, for some $k'$ depending only on $k$. Thus, just as unions of subgroups are NOP, unions of quadratic atoms are NHOP$_2$. A reasonable conjecture based on this information would be that NHOP$_2$ properties are quadratically atomic. However, this turns out to be false, as we shall see in Section 2.3. In particular, we prove the following.

**Proposition 1.28** (NHOP$_2$ does not imply QA). $\mathcal{P}_{GS(3)}$ has no 4-HOP$_2$ and is not quadratically atomic.

So while HOP$_2$ may have looked like a promising candidate for a higher-order generalization of the order property, we have to go back to the drawing board.
1.5. The functional order property. Our goal in this section is to isolate a combinatorial property exhibited by $P_{QGS(p)}$ which is tied to its essentially quadratic behaviour. It will be instructive to contrast $P_{QGS(p)}$ with the following quadratic example. For each $n \geq 1$, set $Q_n = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T x = 0\}$, and define $Q$ to be the closure of $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{F}_p^n, Q_n)$ under isomorphism. It is straightforward to see that $Q$ is quadratically atomic. In looking to explain the sense in which $P_{QGS(p)}$ is an essentially quadratic obstruction to quadratic atomicity, we are looking for a definition which distinguishes $P_{QGS(p)}$ from both $Q$ and $P_{GS(p)}$. This is because, on the one hand, $Q$ is not an obstruction to quadratic atomicity, while on the other hand, $P_{GS(p)}$ is essentially linear rather than essentially quadratic in nature.

One temptation could be to look towards HOP$_2$. Indeed, we will show in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 that $Q$ and $P_{GS(p)}$ are both NHOP$_2$, while it will follow from our results in Section 5.1 that $P_{QGS(p)}$ is HOP$_2$. However, it turns out that there is additional complexity in $P_{QGS(p)}$ which is more fully captured by the following notion.

**Definition 1.29** (Functional order property (FOP$_2$)). Given a group $G$ and a subset $A$, we say that $(G, A)$ has $\ell$-FOP$_2$ if there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell, z_1, \ldots, z_\ell \in G$, and for any function $f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell]$, there are $y_1^f, \ldots, y_\ell^f \in G$ such that $x_i \cdot y_j^f \cdot z_k \in A$ holds if and only if $k \leq f(i, j)$.

We say that a GP $\mathcal{P}$ has FOP$_2$ if for all $\ell \geq 1$, there is $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\ell$-FOP$_2$. If $\mathcal{P}$ does not have FOP$_2$, we say it is NFOP$_2$.

It is immediate from the definition that $\ell$-FOP$_2 \Rightarrow \ell - \text{HOP}_2$, and we will see in Section 2.2 that, at least in general, the implication is strict. We will also show in Section 5.1 that $P_{QGS(p)}$ has FOP$_2$, and therefore HOP$_2$ as claimed above.

Like HOP$_2$, we may view FOP$_2$ as a ternary version of the order property. Indeed, it is easy to check that a subset $A \subseteq G$ has the $k$-order property if and only if there exist $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in G$, and for each $f : [k] \to [k]$, $b_1^f, \ldots, b_n^f \in G$ such that $a_i \cdot b_j^f \in A$ if and only if $j \leq f(i)$. Indeed, suppose there are $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in G$ and for all $f : [k] \to [k]$, $b_1^f, \ldots, b_n^f$ such that $a_i \cdot b_j^f \in A$ if and only if $j \leq f(i)$. Let $f_1(x) = x$. Then $a_i \cdot b_j^{f_1} \in A$ if and only if $j \leq i$, so $A$ has the $k$-order property. Conversely, suppose $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k \in G$ are such that $a_i \cdot b_j \in A$ if and only if $i \leq j$. For each $f : [k] \to [k]$, and $i \in [k]$, set $b_j^f = b_{f(j)}$. Then given $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, we have that $a_i \cdot b_j^f \in A$ holds if and only if $i \leq f(j)$.

We shall show in Section 2 that

$$\text{IP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{FOP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{IP},$$

and that all the implications are strict.\footnote{To be precise, we show in \cite{70} that $\text{IP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{FOP}_2$ is strict in general, and Conjecture 3.18 together with Corollary 6.12 would imply that the implication is also strict for group properties.}

The fact that $P_{GS(p)}$ is NFOP$_2$ therefore follows from the fact that it is NIP, which is shown in Section 2.3. We will also show in Section 2.2 that for all $n \geq 1$, $Q_n = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T x = 0\}$ has no 2-FOP$_2$, which implies that $Q$ is NFOP$_2$. 
It turns out that FOP$_2$ is related to a rather well-structured decomposition which is intermediate in strength between a quadratically atomic and and an almost quadratically one. In particular, these decompositions will allow for the existence of error atoms but will insist that they are all contained in a small number of purely linear atoms.

**Definition 1.30** (Almost quadratic atomicity with linear error (AQALE)). Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$. We say $B$ is $\delta$-almost $\epsilon$-atomic with linear error with respect to $A$ if there exists a set $\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ such that

(i) $|\Sigma| \leq \delta p^\ell$; and

(ii) for all $L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \Sigma$ and all $Q \in \text{At}(\mathcal{Q})$, $L \cap Q$ is $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

When $\epsilon = \delta$, we simply say $B$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with linear error with respect to $A$.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{P}$ is an epGP. We say $\mathcal{P}$ is almost quadratically atomic with linear error (AQALE) if for all $\epsilon > 0$ and rank functions $\rho : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, there are integers $D, N$ such that for all $n \geq N$, and all $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|G| \geq p^n$, the following holds. There is an $(\ell, q)$ satisfying $\ell + q \leq D$, and a quadratic factor $B$ in $G$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with linear error with respect to $A$.

It is trivial to see that $\mathcal{Q}$ is almost quadratically atomic with linear error, since it is quadratically atomic. On the other hand, the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)}$ is almost quadratically atomic with linear error, since it is almost linearly atomic. In contrast, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{QGS}(p)}$ has no such decomposition. We prove the following result in Section 3.4.

**Proposition 1.31.** $\mathcal{P}_{\text{QGS}(p)}$ is not almost quadratically atomic with linear error.

The proof of the above in fact implies our earlier Proposition 1.26.

The second main result of this paper shows that all NFOP$_2$ properties are almost quadratically atomic with linear error.

**Theorem 1.32** (NFOP$_2$ implies AQALE). Let $p \geq 3$ be prime and let $\mathcal{P}$ be an epGP with NFOP$_2$. Then $\mathcal{P}$ is almost quadratically atomic with linear error.

Theorem 1.32 follows from a finitary structure theorem for sets with no $k$-FOP$_2$.

**Theorem 1.33** (Sets with no FOP$_2$ are almost quadratically atomic with linear error). For all $k \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and increasing functions $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there exists $D_1$ such that for every rank function $\omega : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{F}_p^n$, there exists $D_2$ and $N$ so that for all $n \geq N$ and $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, if $A$ does not have $k$-FOP$_2$, then there exists a quadratic factor $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and a set $\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ such that

(i) $\ell \leq D_2$, $q \leq D_1$, and $B$ has rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$;

(ii) $|\Sigma| \leq \epsilon p^\ell$;

(iii) for all $L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \Sigma$ and all $Q \in \text{At}(\mathcal{Q})$, $L \cap Q$ is $p^{-\psi(\phi)}$-atomic with respect to $A$.

Note that Theorem 1.33 in fact states something a priori stronger about NFOP$_2$ than Theorem 1.32 suggests. Indeed, the error on atoms outside of $\Sigma$ can be made arbitrarily small compared with the complexity of the quadratic part of the factor. We do not know at present whether it is possible to obtain an error of the form $p^{-\psi(\ell + q)}$. 
One might be tempted to conjecture that NFOP$_2$ characterizes quadratic atomicity. However, as we have already seen, the Green-Sanders example is NFOP$_2$ and not quadratically atomic. We therefore conjecture the following.

**Conjecture 1.34.** If an epGP $\mathcal{P}$ is NFOP$_2$, then it is either quadratically atomic or contains a generalized Green-Sanders example.

In the forthcoming note [75] we define a candidate for this class of generalized Green-Sanders examples. We also show that if $\mathcal{P}$ has no 2-FOP$_2$, then either it is quadratically atomic, or it contains an “essentially linear obstruction” (meaning an almost linearly atomic obstruction to quadratic atomicity).

1.6. Discussion. It is clear from the preceding two sections that neither HOP$_2$ nor FOP$_2$ are able to characterize quadratic atomicity. Our work [76] in the hypergraph setting helps contextualize these facts. To explain our results in [76] we must first give an informal explanation of hypergraph regularity.

Recall that a 3-uniform hypergraph is a pair $H = (V, E)$, where $V$ is a vertex set and $E \subseteq \binom{V}{3}$. In this setting, regular decompositions consist of a partition of the vertex set $V$, as well as a partition of the set of pairs of vertices $\binom{V}{2}$. A decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ of $V$ consists of an equipartition of the vertex set $V = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_t$, along with a partition of each Cartesian product $V_i \times V_j = \bigcup_{\alpha \leq \ell} P_{ij}^\alpha$. Such a decomposition yields a partition of $\binom{V}{3}$ into triads, where a triad from $\mathcal{P}$ is a 3-partite graph of the form $G_{ijk}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} := (V_i \cup V_j \cup V_k, P_{ij}^\alpha \cup P_{jk}^\beta \cup P_{ik}^\gamma)$.

A triad $G_{ijk}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is then said to be regular with respect to $H$ if the bipartite graphs $P_{ij}^\alpha$, $P_{jk}^\beta$, and $P_{ik}^\gamma$ are each sufficiently quasirandom with approximately equal densities, and the edges of $H$ are “uniformly distributed” across the set of triples $xyz$ forming a triangle in $G_{ijk}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ (see Definition 4.5). The decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ is then considered a regular decomposition of $H$ if almost all triples $xyz$ belong to a triad which is regular with respect to $H$ (see Definition 1.25). The main problem motivating [76] is to characterize when hereditary properties of 3-uniform hypergraphs admit regular decompositions with certain special properties regarding the distribution its irregular triads.

Two of these special properties are relevant to the results of this paper (we use the same terminology as in [76] for ease of cross-referencing). A hereditary 3-graph property is said to admit linear disc$_{2,3}$-error [76, Definition 1.21(3)] if every sufficiently large element of $\mathcal{H}$ has a regular decomposition $\mathcal{P}$, where moreover, there is a set $\Omega \subseteq \binom{V}{3}$ so that $|\Omega| \leq \varepsilon t^3$, and so that every irregular triad of $\mathcal{P}$ is contained in $V_iV_jV_k$ for some $ijk \in \Omega$. The name linear error was chosen due to an explicit connection to Definition 1.30 (see Section 4.5).

The second special property requires the irregular triads to be controlled using purely binary structure. A hereditary 3-graph property is said to admit binary disc$_{2,3}$-error [76, Definition 1.21(2)] if every sufficiently large element of $\mathcal{H}$ has a regular decomposition $\mathcal{P}$, where moreover, there is a set $\Gamma \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, so that $|\Gamma| \leq \varepsilon t^2$, and so that every irregular triad involves a pair $V_iV_j$ from $\Gamma$.

Thus, when a hereditary property $\mathcal{H}$ of 3-uniform hypergraphs has binary or linear disc$_{2,3}$-error, the elements in $\mathcal{H}$ admit regular decompositions where the irregular triads...
are constrained in a certain well-defined sense (by $\Omega$ in the case of linear error, and by $\Gamma$ in the case of binary error). A central question explored at length in [76] is the following: which hereditary properties of 3-uniform hypergraphs admit binary/linear $\text{disc}_{2,3}$-error?

To this end, we show in [76] that a hereditary property of 3-uniform hypergraphs admits linear error if and only if it is $\text{NFOP}_2$. We will show in Section 4.5 that our results about $\text{NFOP}_2$ sets in elementary $p$-groups match up in a precise way with this hypergraph theorem. In [76], we also give two examples of hereditary properties of 3-uniform hypergraphs which do not admit binary error but do admit linear error. One of these, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{GS}(p)}$, is defined from the ternary sum graphs of elements of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)}$. The other, $\mathcal{G}_{\text{HOP}_2}$, is defined from instances of $\ell$-$\text{HOP}_2$ for every $\ell$.

These results suggest that there is another generalization of the order property, distinct from $\text{FOP}_2$, which is present in both $\mathcal{G}_{\text{GS}(p)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{HOP}_2}$, and which is responsible for preventing a hereditary property of 3-uniform from admitting binary error, and a hereditary group property from being quadratically atomic.

For the purpose of this discussion, let us refer to an (as of yet unknown) property that fulfills this requirement as $\text{XOP}_2$ (for Unknown Order Property). Since the Green-Sanders example is NIP but not quadratically atomic (and therefore witnesses $\text{XOP}_2$), it has to be the case that $\text{XOP}_2$ does not imply IP, in contrast to $\text{FOP}_2$.

**Conjecture 1.35.** There exists a definition of $\text{XOP}_2$ such that the following hold.

(i) If an epGP $\mathcal{P}$ is NXOP$_2$, then $\mathcal{P}$ is quadratically atomic.

(ii) If a hereditary property $\mathcal{H}$ of 3-uniform hypergraphs is NXOP$_2$, then $\mathcal{H}$ admits binary $\text{disc}_{2,3}$-error.

These important open questions notwithstanding, it is natural to imagine higher-order generalizations of the work presented in this paper. Indeed, it is straightforward to write down a definition of a higher-order analogue of the functional order property, denoted by $\text{FOP}_k$, where $k \geq 3$. We conjecture that subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ which are $\text{NFOP}_k$ are essentially unions of atoms of a bounded complexity factor of degree $k$, up to an error that is contained in a small number of atoms of degree $k - 1$.

In a similar vein, it is natural to attempt to generalize the results in this paper beyond elementary $p$-groups. From the point of view of arithmetic combinatorics, an obvious candidate are the prime cyclic groups, where much of the higher-order Fourier analysis required in this paper is already well developed. Having said this, the technical effort required for a quantitative generalization to this class of groups is likely to be substantial, and the difficulties of moving beyond the case of prime cyclic groups at present insurmountable.

It is here that model theory is likely to make a major contribution. In previous work on the linear case, in particular [21], it was established that strong linear structure is intimately related to the so-called connected component (in the model-theoretic sense) of the group. We expect an analogous model-theoretic object to lie at the heart of strong quadratic decomposition theorems, which will almost certainly be related to so-called “nilstructures” as laid out, for example, in [11,43].
1.7. Structure of the paper. In Section 2, we begin by giving several important examples, as well as proving various implications amongst the notions defined in the introduction. In Section 3, we provide a brief review of linear and quadratic Fourier analysis, with the model-theoretic reader in mind. It is in this section that we formally define quadratic factors and state the quadratic regularity lemma. In Section 4 we prove our main results concerning sets of bounded VC₂-dimension and NIP₂-properties. In the process, we also lay out important connections between arithmetic and hypergraph regularity. In Section 5, we prove our main results about sets with no k-FOP₂ and about NFOP₂ group properties. These proofs rely on a generalization of the stable regularity lemma proved by the authors in [72], the proof of which is the topic of Section 5.4.
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2. Basic properties and examples

The goal of this section is two-fold. Firstly, we establish relationships between FOP₂, HOP₂, IP₂, IP, and OP, in the setting of group properties. Specifically we will show that for a hereditary group property

\[ \text{IP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{FOP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{HOP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{IP} \Rightarrow \text{OP}, \]

and furthermore, that all the implications are strict.

Our second main goal is to introduce several important examples and to show that the notions of FOP₂ and HOP₂ arise naturally from studying atoms of high-rank quadratic factors. For instance, a single atom in any quadratic factor has no 2-HOP₂ (see Example 2.9). Further, we will show that for all k, there is a k′ such that a union of k quadratic atoms (even from different factors) has no k′-HOP₂, no k′-FOP₂, and has VC₂-dimension at most k′. This is important for us heuristically as the main question motivating this paper is whether a converse holds: if a set has no k-HOP₂/k-FOP₂/VC₂-dimension at most k, must it look like a union of atoms? Both of our main results, Theorems 1.18 and 1.32, address this question.

Our aim is to provide a self-contained treatment accessible to readers in and outside of model theory. For this reason, we work in the context outlined in the introduction, i.e. pairs \((G, A)\) where \(G\) is a finite group and \(A \subseteq G\). For all the general implications presented, the proofs can be carried out with minor changes in the setting of formulas in first order structures, as we believe will be clear to the model theorist reading this section. Some results will be straightforward to a model theorist (e.g. Lemmas 2.4 2.7),
while others will not (e.g. Example 2.9, Theorems 2.16 and 2.13). Conversely, some of the results and examples just mentioned will not come as a surprise to anyone versed in the arithmetic combinatorics literature.

2.1. VC\(_2\)-dimension. We begin by asking the reader to recall Definition 1.17. It is well known (see, for example, [13]) that in any first order structure the set of formulas of bounded VC\(_2\)-dimension is closed under finite boolean combinations. A consequence of this is that for all \(k\) and \(\ell\), there is \(m\) such that for any group \(G\) and subsets \(A_1, \ldots, A_k \subseteq G\), each of VC\(_2\)-dimension at most \(\ell\), any boolean combination of the sets \(A_1, \ldots, A_k\) has VC\(_2\)-dimension at most \(m\). Another well-known fact about VC\(_2\)-dimension is the so-called “universality” property. In the setting of 3-uniform hypergraphs (where a model-theoretic reader might recognise it most readily), it says that if a 3-uniform hypergraph has sufficiently large VC\(_2\)-dimension, then it embeds all 3-partite 3-uniform hypergraphs up to a certain size. Specifically, for all \(k\), there is \(\ell\) such that if \(G = (V, E)\) is a 3-uniform hypergraph with VC\(_2\)-dimension at least \(\ell\), then for every 3-partite 3-uniform hypergraph \((X \cup Y \cup Z, R)\) with \(|X| = |Y| = |Z| = k\), there is an injection \(f : X \cup Y \cup Z \to V\) such that \(xyz \in R\) if and only if \(f(x)f(y)f(z) \in E\) (see, for example, [13]). The universality property and the boolean combinations property imply several of the results proved in this section, but for the sake of concreteness we give self-contained proofs where possible.

It is easy to see that unbounded VC\(_2\)-dimension implies unbounded VC-dimension. In the setting of group properties \((G, A)\), this manifests itself as follows.

**Lemma 2.1.** If \(A \subseteq G\) has VC\(_2\)(\(A\)) = \(\ell\) for some \(\ell\), then VC\(_2\)(\(A\)) \(\geq \ell\).

We leave the proof as an exercise to the reader. A subgroup of an elementary \(p\)-group, for example, has bounded VC-dimension, and therefore bounded VC\(_2\)-dimension (see e.g. [73]).

However, sets with bounded VC\(_2\)-dimension can take on more interesting shapes, for example, quadratic subvarieties as in Example 2.2 below. We first prove that these have unbounded VC\(_2\)-dimension.

**Example 2.2.** For all \(n\), if \(Q = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T x = 0\}\), then \(Q\) has VC\(_2\)-dimension at least \(n - 2p - 1\).

**Proof.** Given \(m < k\), write \([m, k] := \{m, m + 1, \ldots, k\}\). Given \(I \subseteq [2p + 2, n]\), set \(y_I = \sum_{i \in I} e_i\) and let \(\ell_I = y_I \cdot y_I\). If \(\ell_I = 0\), set \(z_I = y_I\). Otherwise, let \(t_I = p - \ell_I\) and set \(z_I = e_1 + \ldots + e_{t_I} + y_I\). Note that in either case we have \(z_I^T z_I = 0\).

Given \(i \in [2p+2, n]\), set \(x_i = e_p + \ldots + e_{2p-2} + e_i\). Note \(x_i^T x_i = 0\) and for any \(I \subseteq [2p+2, n]\),

\[
x_i^T z_I = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } i \notin I \\
1 & \text{if } i \in I.
\end{cases}
\]

Now observe that

\[
(x_i + z_I)^T (x_i + z_I) = x_i^T x_i + 2x_i^T z_I + z_I^T z_I = 2x_i^T z_I = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } i \notin I \\
2 & \text{if } i \in I.
\end{cases}
\]
Thus $x_i + z_i \in Q$ if and only if $i \in I$, and thus the VC-dimension of $Q$ is at least $|2p + 2, n| = n - 2p - 1$. □

This can be generalized as follows.

**Example 2.3** (Quadratic atoms of high-rank factors have large VC-dimension). For all $\ell$, there are $\rho$ and $N$ so that if $n \geq N$, and $M$ is a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix of rank at least $\rho$, then the set $Q := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M x = 0 \} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has VC-dimension at least $\ell$.

The proof of Example 2.3 requires a small amount of machinery, and is therefore postponed until Section 4.2.

In contrast, it will follow from the implication $\text{IP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{FOP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{HOP}_2$, proved in the next subsection, together with the remark following Example 2.3, that the set $Q$ in Example 2.3 has bounded VC$_2$-dimension.

### 2.2. The hyperplane and functional order properties

In this subsection we prove several facts about $\text{FOP}_2$ for subsets of elementary $p$-groups, with a focus on quadratic atoms. For several reasons, it is useful to consider $\text{HOP}_2$ in tandem.

It is immediate from Definitions [1.27 and 1.29 in the introduction that $\text{NHOP}_2$ implies $\text{NFOP}_2$. More specifically, if $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has $\ell\text{-FOP}_2$ for some $\ell$, then it will have $\ell\text{-HOP}_2$. We also observe that $\text{NHOP}_2$ generalizes the notion of stability (NOP), in the sense that any NOP property is NHOP$_2$. This follows from the following simple lemma.

**Lemma 2.4** (NOP implies NHOP$_2$). If $A \subseteq G$ does not have $\ell\text{-OP}$ for some $\ell$, then it does not have $\ell\text{-HOP}_2$.

*Proof.* Suppose that $A$ has $\ell\text{-HOP}_2$. We show it has $\ell\text{-OP}$. By assumption, there exist $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_\ell, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_\ell$ in $G$ with the property that $x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A$ if and only if $i < j + k$. For each $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$, let $a_i := x_i \cdot y_i$ and let $b_j := z_{\ell - j + 1}$. Then $a_i \cdot b_j = x_i \cdot y_i \cdot z_{\ell - j + 1}$ is in $A$ if and only if $\ell < i + \ell - j + 1$, i.e. if and only if $j < i + 1$, i.e. if and only if $j < i$. Hence $A$ has $\ell\text{-OP}$. □

We next show that both $\text{NFOP}_2$ and $\text{NHOP}_2$ are closed under taking complements.

**Lemma 2.5** (NHOP$_2$ and NFOP$_2$ are closed under complements). If $A \subseteq G$ has $\ell\text{-HOP}_2$ for some $\ell$, then $\neg A$ has $\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor\text{-HOP}_2$. If $A \subseteq G$ has $\ell\text{-FOP}_2$ for some $\ell$, then $\neg A$ has $(\ell - 1)\text{-FOP}_2$.

*Proof.* Suppose $A$ has $\ell\text{-HOP}_2$. Then there exist $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_\ell, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_\ell \in G$ such that $x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A$ holds if and only if $i < j + k$. For each $i, j, k \in [1, \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor]$, let $a_i = x_{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor + i}, b_j = y_{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - j + 1}$, and $c_k = z_k$. Then $a_i \cdot b_j \cdot c_k \in \neg A$ holds if and only if $\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor + i \geq \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - j + 1 + k \iff i + j \geq k + 1 \Rightarrow i + j > k$.

This shows $\neg A$ has $\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor\text{-HOP}_2$.

Suppose now $A$ has $\ell\text{-FOP}_2$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell, z_1, \ldots, z_\ell$ and $\{y_i^f : i \in [\ell], f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell]\}$ witness this. For each $f : [\ell - 1]^2 \to [\ell - 1]$, let $g_f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell]$ be the function defined by

---

4In keeping with model theoretic custom, for a set $A \subseteq G$ we denote by $\neg A$ the complement of $A$. 

For every \( i \in [\ell - 1] \), let \( u_i = z_{\ell - i + 1} \), \( v_i = x_i \), and for each \( f : [\ell - 1]^2 \to [\ell - 1] \), let \( w_i^f = y_i^{gf} \). Then for each \( i,j,k \in [\ell] \), \( v_i \cdot w_j^f \cdot u_k = x_i \cdot y_j^{gf} \cdot z_{\ell - k + 2} \in A \) if and only if \( \ell - k + 2 < gf(i,j) \), if and only if \( \ell - k + 1 < \ell - f(i,j) + 1 \), and if and only if \( f(i,j) < k \). Thus \( x_i \cdot w_j^f \cdot u_k \in \neg A \) if and only if \( k \leq f(i,j) \). This shows \( \neg A \) has \((\ell - 1)\-FOP_2\). \( \square \)

We next show that if a set \( A \) has bounded VC-dimension, then there is a bound on the length of any functional order property in \( A \).

**Lemma 2.6** (FOP_2 implies IP). Suppose \( A \subseteq G \) has \( \ell \)-FOP_2 for some \( \ell \). Then \( A \) has VC-dimension at least \( \ell \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( A \subseteq G \) has \( \ell \)-FOP_2. Let \( I = \{ f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell] \} \) and \( \{ b_i^f, a_i, c_i : i \in [\ell], f \in I \} \subseteq G \) witness this. Let \( X = \{ a_i, c_2 : i \in [\ell] \} \), and for each \( Y \subseteq [\ell] \), let \( x_Y = b^X_Y \) where \( f^X_Y : [\ell] \to [\ell] \) is defined by \( f^X_Y(u,v) = 2 \) if \( v = 2 \) and \( a_u, c_2 \in Y \) and \( f^X_Y(u,v) = 1 \) otherwise. Then \( x_Y \cdot a_i \cdot c_2 \in A \) if and only if \( 2 \leq f^X_Y(i,2) \) if and only if \( a_i \cdot c_2 \in Y \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.7** (IP_2 implies FOP_2). Suppose \( A \subseteq G \) has \( \text{VC}_2(A) \geq \ell \) for some \( \ell \). Then \( A \) has \( \ell \)-FOP_2.

**Proof.** Suppose \( G \) is a group and \( A \subseteq G \). If \( \text{VC}_2(A) \geq \ell \), then there are subsets \( Y = \{ y_1, \ldots, y_\ell \} \) and \( Z = \{ z_1, \ldots, z_\ell \} \) of \( G \) with \( |Y| = |Z| = \ell \), such that for all \( U \subseteq Y \times Z \), there is \( x_U \in G \) such that for all \( (y,z) \in Y \times Z \), \( x_U \cdot y \cdot z \in A \) if and only if \( (y,z) \in U \).

For each \( f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell] \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell \), let \( U^f_i = \{(u,z) : u \leq f(i,v)\} \), and set \( a_i^f = x_{U^f_i} \). Then for all \( 1 \leq i, j, k \leq \ell \), \( a_i^f \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A \) if and only if \( j \leq f(i,k) \). This shows \( A \) has \( \ell \)-FOP_2. \( \square \)

We further show in Example D.7 of [76] that the implication IP_2 \( \Rightarrow \) FOP_2 is strict, by exhibiting a 3-uniform hypergraph which has \( \ell \)-FOP_2 for arbitrary \( \ell \) but \( \text{VC}_2 \)-dimension 1. If Conjecture 3.18 is true, then the quadratic Green-Sanders example (Definition 1.25) provides another example in the setting of group properties.

**Lemma 2.7** implies that if \( A \subseteq G \) has no \( \ell \)-HOP_2, then it has \( \text{VC}_2(A) < \ell \). On the other hand, there are no general implications between HOP_2 and VC-dimension. For example, it is straightforward to show that a coset of a subspace \( H \leq \mathbb{F}^n_p \) has no 2-OP, and thus no 2-HOP_2, as well as VC-dimension at most 2. On the other hand, as the following example shows, subsets of groups can have very small VC-dimension while having \( k \)-HOP_2 for arbitrarily large \( k \).

**Example 2.8.** For every \( \ell \geq 1 \), there is an abelian group \( G \) and a subset \( A \subseteq G \) such that \( \text{VC}(A) \leq 4 \) and such that \( A \) has \( \ell \)-HOP_2.
Proof. Fix $\ell \geq 1$. Choose a prime $p > \ell^4$, and consider $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $A = \{(p - 1)/2, \ldots, p\}$. It is shown in [3], for example, that this set has VC-dimension at most 4. To see that $A$ has $\ell$-HOP$_2$, let $x_i = y_i = i$ and $z_i = (p - 1)/2 - i - 1$ for each $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Then $x_i + y_j + z_k \in A$ if and only if $(p - 1)/2 - k - 1 + j + k \in \{(p - 1)/2, \ldots, p\}$. Since $p > \ell^4$, this holds if and only if $(p - 1)/2 - k - 1 + j + k \geq (p - 1)/2$, i.e. if and only if $j + k > i$. \hfill $\Box$

Conversely, there are sets which have no 2-HOP$_2$ but have very large VC-dimension.

**Example 2.9.** The set $Q := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T x = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has VC-dimension at least $n - 2p - 1$ but does not have 2-HOP$_2$.

**Proof.** We have already shown in Example 2.2 that $Q$ has VC-dimension at least $n - 2p - 1$. We must show that $Q$ does not have 2-HOP$_2$. Suppose that we have $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2$ and $z_1, z_2$ such that $x_1 + y_j + z_i \in Q$ if $i < j + k$, that is, $x_1 + y_1 + z_2 \in Q$, and so are $x_2 + y_1 + z_2$, $x_1 + y_2 + z_1$, $x_2 + y_2 + z_1$, $x_1 + y_2 + z_2$, $x_2 + y_2 + z_2$ and $x_1 + y_1 + z_1$. Since

$$(x_2 + y_1 + z_1)^2 - (x_1 + y_1 + z_2)^2 - (x_1 + y_2 + z_1)^2 = (x_2 + y_2 + z_1)^2 + (x_1 + y_2 + z_2)^2 - (x_2 + y_2 + z_2)^2,$$

we have that $(x_2 + y_1 + z_1)^T (x_2 + y_1 + z_1) = 0$, and therefore $x_2 + y_1 + z_1 \in Q$. \hfill $\Box$

**Remark 2.10.** In fact, by the exact same proof, any set of the form $Q' := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M x = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, where $M$ is any symmetric $n \times n$ matrix with entries in $\mathbb{F}_p$, has no 2-HOP$_2$. This is simply a consequence of the cube auto-completion property defined in [1,4] which is reflected in the quadratic identity used in Example 2.9 above.

In the notation of Remark 2.10, if the matrix $M$ is of rank tending to infinity with $n$, then the set $Q'$ will have density $p^{-1} + o(1)$ (see Lemma 3.13). We also saw in Example 2.3 that if $M$ has high rank, then $Q'$ has large VC-dimension. Therefore, high-rank atoms of the form $Q'$ form a class of non-trivial examples that have no 2-FOP but large VC-dimension. Indeed, they can be used to build group properties which have no 2-FOP$_2$ and unbounded VC-dimension, for example the property $Q$ from Section 1.5.

If, on the other hand, the matrix $M$ has low (constant) rank $r$, then $Q'$ will have strong linear structure. Indeed, the value of $x^T M x$ is determined by the coset of $\ker(M)^\perp$ in which $x$ lies, and consequently $Q' := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M x = 0\}$ is a union of at most $p^r$ cosets of $\ker(M)^\perp$. It follows from [62] Lemma 1.5] that in this case $Q'$ is $(p^r + 1)$-stable. At the same time, it follows from Warning’s Second Theorem (see, for example, [45]) that if $Q'$ is non-empty, then it has density at least $p^{-2}$. In other words, there are dense subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ that are NHOP$_2$ but are not atoms of a high-rank quadratic factor.

Very concretely, the following is easy to verify.

---

5Here, for $u \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $u^2$ should be interpreted as $u^T u$.

6Note that the proof of Example 2.3 in Section 1.2 breaks down when the rank of $M$ is low.
Example 2.11. Suppose $H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$. If $p > 2$, then any union of two distinct cosets of $H$ is 2-NHOP$_2$. For $p > 3$, any union of three cosets of $H$ that do not lie in arithmetic progression is 2-NHOP$_2$.

Proof. Given any subgroup $H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ with $p > 2$, consider without loss of generality the set $A = H \cup (y + H)$ for some $y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \setminus H$. Suppose we have $x, x + a, x + b, x + c, x + a + b, x + a + c, x + b + c$ all in $A$. Then either $x \in H$ or $x \in y + H$. Suppose in the first instance that $x \in H$. Since $x + a \in H \cup (y + H)$, we must have either $a \in H$ or $a \in y + H$. Similarly for $b$ and $c$. If any two of $a, b$ and $c$ lie in $y + H$, say $a$ and $b$, then $x + a + b \in 2y + H$, which means (if $p > 2$) that $x + a + b \notin A$. It follows that at most one of $a, b, c$ may lie in $y + H$. But if one of $a, b, c$ does indeed lie in $y + H$, then $x + a + b + c$ is also in $y + H \subset A$. On the other hand, if all of $a, b, c$ lie in $H$, then $x + a + b + c$ is also in $H \subset A$. It is therefore impossible for $A$ to have a 2-HOP$_2$ with $x \in H$. The argument for the case $x \in y + H$ is identical.

Suppose now that $p > 3$ and that $A = H \cup (y + H) \cup (z + H)$, where $H$, $y + H$ and $z + H$ do not lie in arithmetic progression. As before, suppose we have that $x, x + a, x + b, x + c, x + a + b, x + a + c, x + b + c$ are all in $A$, and consider first the case $x \in H$. Then since $x + a$ lies in $A$, we have that $a$ lies in either $H$, $y + H$ or $z + H$. The same is true of $b$ and $c$. In a slight generalization to before, if two of $a, b$ and $c$ lie in the same non-trivial coset of $H$, say $a$ and $b$ lie in $y + H$, then $x + a + b \in 2y + H$. But we have assumed that $2y \neq z \neq 0$, so $x + a + b \notin A$, a contradiction. If two of $a, b$ and $c$ lie in distinct non-trivial cosets of $H$, say $a \in y + H$ and $b \in z + H$, then $x + a + b \in y + z + H$. But since the three cosets do not lie in arithmetic progression, $y + z + H \cap A = \emptyset$, another contradiction.

It follows that at most one of $a, b, c$ may lie in a non-trivial coset, and the argument concludes as before. 

We can construct more sophisticated examples of NHOP$_2$ sets by taking unions of quadratic atoms. We first show that such unions may contain small instances of HOP$_2$.

Example 2.12. For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, p - 1$, let $Q(i) := \{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T x = i \} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Then for any $p \geq 5$, the set $A = Q(0) \cup Q(1)$ has 3-HOP$_2$.

Proof. Since the configuration $x_i + y_j + z_k$ for $(i, j, k) \in \{ 1, 2 \}^3 \setminus \{ (1, 1, 2), (2, 1, 1) \}$ is of (Cauchy-Schwarz) complexity 1, and since the quadratic atoms involved are Fourier-uniform sets, it is straightforward to find $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $x_i + y_j + z_k \in Q(0)$ for $(i, j, k) \in \{ 1, 2 \}^3 \setminus \{ (1, 1, 2), (2, 1, 1) \}$ and $x_1 + y_1 + z_2 \in Q(1)$. But the 8th point in the cube depends quadratically on the other seven, that is, $(x_2 + y_1 + z_1)^2$ is equal to

\[(x_1 + y_1 + z_1)^2 + (x_2 + y_1 + z_2)^2 + (x_2 + y_2 + z_1)^2 - (x_1 + y_1 + z_2)^2 - (x_1 + y_2 + z_1)^2 - (x_2 + y_2 + z_2)^2 = -1.
\]

These terms are briefly touched upon in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 and not central to this paper.
It follows that \(x_2 + y_1 + z_1 \notin A\), so that \(x_i + y_j + z_k \in A\) if and only if \(i < j + k\). This shows that \(A\) has 2-HOP\(_2\).

To see that \(A\) also has 3-HOP\(_2\), we observe that the system of linear forms
\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 + y_1 + z_1 & \quad x_2 + y_2 + z_1 & \quad x_3 + y_2 + z_1 & \quad x_2 + y_1 + z_3 & \quad x_1 + y_3 + z_2 \\
x_1 + y_2 + z_1 & \quad x_2 + y_3 + z_1 & \quad x_3 + y_2 + z_2 & \quad x_2 + y_2 + z_3 & \quad x_1 + y_2 + z_3 \\
x_1 + y_1 + z_2 & \quad x_2 + y_2 + z_2 & \quad x_2 + y_1 + z_2 & \quad x_3 + y_1 + z_3 & \quad x_2 + y_3 + z_3 \\
x_1 + y_2 + z_2 & \quad x_2 + y_3 + z_2 & \quad x_3 + y_2 + z_2 & \quad x_3 + y_2 + z_3 & \quad x_1 + y_2 + z_3
\end{align*}
\]
has complexity 1. We can therefore guarantee the existence of such a configuration with \(x_2 + y_2 + z_2 \in Q(1)\), and all the other points in \(Q(0)\). By quadratic dependence, this implies that
\[
x_1 + y_1 + z_3 \quad x_1 + y_3 + z_3 \quad x_3 + y_3 + z_3 \quad x_1 + y_3 + z_1
\]
are also in \(Q(1)\), which in turn implies that
\[
x_2 + y_1 + z_1 \quad x_3 + y_2 + z_1 \quad x_3 + y_1 + z_2
\]
are in \(Q(-1)\). Finally, we find that \(x_3 + y_1 + z_1 \in Q(-2)\), and hence not in \(A\) whenever \(p > 3\). We have thus constructed an instance of 3-HOP\(_2\) in \(A\).

On the other hand, Lemma 2.16 below, which states that unions of sets with no 2-HOP\(_2\) do not have \(\ell\)-HOP\(_2\) for some \(\ell\), will tell us that Example 2.12 is indeed NHOP\(_2\).

We therefore turn to the natural question of whether NFOP\(_2\) and NHOP\(_2\) are closed under finite boolean combinations. In [76, Corollary D.5 and Proposition D.6], we prove that certain conjunctions of NFOP\(_2\) formulas are NFOP\(_2\). Adapted to the setting of group properties, this reads as follows.

**Theorem 2.13.** For all \(k \geq 1\) there exists \(\ell \geq 2\) such that whenever \(A, B \subseteq G\) each have no \(k\)-FOP\(_2\), then \(A \cap B\) has no \(\ell\)-FOP\(_2\).

We may deduce that finite boolean combinations of NFOP\(_2\) sets are still NFOP\(_2\), using Lemma 2.15. On the other hand, it remains an open question whether the intersection of two NHOP\(_2\) sets is NHOP\(_2\).

**Question 2.14.** Does there exist a function \(f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\) such that whenever \(A, B \subseteq G\) have no \(k\)-HOP\(_2\), then \(A \cap B\) has no \(f(k)\)-HOP\(_2\)?

There is, however, one special case in which we can answer Question 2.14. The next lemma can be seen as a quadratic analogue of the fact that the intersection of a \(k\)-stable set with a 2-stable set remains \(k\)-stable [73, Lemma 3].

**Lemma 2.15.** Let \(\ell \geq 2\) be an integer. Suppose \(A, B \subseteq G\), \(A\) has no \(\ell\)-HOP\(_2\) and \(B\) has no 2-HOP\(_2\). Then \(A \cap B\) has no \(\ell\)-HOP\(_2\).

**Proof.** Suppose to the contrary that there are \(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell, y_1, \ldots, y_\ell, z_1, \ldots, z_\ell\) such that \(x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A \cap B\) if and only if \(i < j + k\). Clearly this implies that \(x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in A\) whenever \(i < j + k\).
Suppose now that \( i, j, k \in [\ell] \) are such that \( i \geq j + k \) and \( x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \notin B \). Note that \( i \geq j + k \) implies that \( i > j \) (as \( k \in [\ell] = \{1, \ldots, \ell\} \)). Thus we have \( x_j \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in B, x_j \cdot y_i \cdot z_i \in B, x_i \cdot y_i \cdot z_i \in B, x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_i \in B, \) but \( x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \notin B \). This contradicts the assumption that \( B \) has no 2-HOP\(_2\).

By the above, for all \( i \geq j + k, x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \in B, \) and by assumption, \( x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \notin A \cap B, \) it follows that \( x_i \cdot y_j \cdot z_k \notin A \). But this contradicts the assumption that \( A \) has no \( \ell\)-HOP\(_2\).

We also show in Appendix \([3] \) that the union of finitely many sets that have no 2-HOP\(_2\) has no \( k\)-HOP\(_2\) for some \( k \).

**Lemma 2.16.** For all \( k \geq 1 \) there exists \( \ell \geq 2 \) such that whenever \( A_1, \ldots, A_k \) do not have 2-HOP\(_2\), then \( A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_k \) does not have \( \ell\)-HOP\(_2\).

Combined with Remark \([2.10] \) Lemma \(2.16\) implies that a union of a bounded number of quadratic factors is NHOP\(_2\) (and thus NFOP\(_2\)), even if the atoms come from different quadratic factors.

We end this section by presenting an equivalent formulation of \( k\)-FOP\(_2\) for group properties.

**Proposition 2.17.** Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is a group property. Then the following are equivalent.

(i) \( \mathcal{P} \) has FOP\(_2\).

(ii) For any \( m \geq 1 \) there is \( (G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \), \( b_1, \ldots, b_m, c_1, \ldots, c_m \in A \) and for every \( f : [m] \to [m] \), there is \( a_f \in G \) such that \( a_f \cdot b_i \cdot c_j \in A \) if and only if \( j \leq f(i) \).

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): Assume \( \mathcal{P} \) has FOP\(_2\). Fix \( m \geq 1 \), and let \( s = m^m \). By assumption, there is \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( s\)-FOP\(_2\). Enumerate \([m]^m = \{f_1, \ldots, f_s\} \). Define \( f : [m]^2 \to [m] \) such that \( f(i, j) = f_i(j) \) if \( j \leq m \) and \( f(i, j) = m \) if \( j > m \). By assumption, there are \( b_1, \ldots, b_m, c_1, \ldots, c_m \in G \) and for each \( f : [m]^2 \to [m], a_1^f, \ldots, a_m^f \in G \) so that \( a_1^f \cdot b_1 \cdot c_1 \in A \) if and only if \( k \leq f(i, j) \). Then for all \( j \leq \ell, \) we have \( a_1^f \cdot b_j \cdot c_k \in A \) holds if and only if \( k \leq f_i(j) \).

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i): Fix \( \ell \geq 1 \). Suppose \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \), and \( b_1, \ldots, b_\ell, c_1, \ldots, c_\ell \in G, \) and for each \( f : [\ell] \to [\ell] \) and \( a_f \in G \) are such that \( a_f \cdot b_j \cdot c_k \in A \) if and only if \( k \leq f(j) \). Fix \( f : [\ell]^2 \to [\ell], \) and for \( i \leq \ell, \) define \( f_i : [\ell] \to [\ell] \) so that \( f_i(j) = f(i, j) \). Set \( a_i^f = a_{f_i} \). Then \( a_i^f \cdot b_j \cdot c_k \) holds if and only if \( k \leq f_i(j) \), if and only if \( k \leq f(i, j) \). This shows \( \mathcal{P} \) has \( \ell\)-FOP\(_2\).

This reformulation makes clear that FOP\(_2\) is related to a notion called OP\(_2\) defined by Takeuchi in \([67] \). In particular, Takeuchi’s definition corresponds to a modified condition (ii) above, where one only insists on the existence of \( a_f \) for increasing functions \( f : [n] \to [n] \). This means that we have the implications

\[ \text{FOP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{OP}_2 \Rightarrow \text{HOP}_2. \]

It is unclear to the authors at the time of writing whether the first implication is strict.

**Question 2.18.** Is the implication FOP\(_2\) \( \Rightarrow \) OP\(_2\) strict?
An example demonstrating that the second implication is strict is the closure of $\bigcup_{N \geq 1}(\mathbb{Z}_N, [0, N/4])$ under isomorphism. It is not hard to show that this group property has HOP and bounded VC-dimension (see [76], Section 6). On the other hand, it was shown by Takeuchi that OP implies IP, so this property has HOP but not OP.

We note, however, that OP also fails to characterize quadratic atomicity since like FOP, it implies IP (see the discussion in Section 1.6). Example 7.22 in [76] further shows that the implication IP 2 ⇒ FOP 2 is strict, answering a question about the relationship between IP 2 and OP 2 asked in [67].

2.3. The Green-Sanders example. In this subsection we show that for all $p \geq 3$ and $n \geq 1$, GS($n, p$) has the $n - 1$ order property, and VC-dimension at most 4. Consequently $\mathcal{P}_{\text{GS}(p)}$ is unstable and NIP. We prove the quadratic decomposition properties of the linear Green-Sanders example in Section 3.4 and also study its quadratic counterpart there.

It is easy to see that GS($n, p$) has an order property of length $n - 1$ (see also [73], Example 4). For instance, for each $i \in [n]$, let $a_i = e_i$ and $b_i = 2e_i$. Then $a_i + b_j = e_i + 2e_j \in A$ if and only if $i < j$. After reindexing, one can arrive at an order property of length $n - 1$.

On the other hand, showing that GS($n, p$) has VC-dimension at most 3 requires a bit more work. We will give short proof for the case $p = 3$, and refer the reader to Appendix C for the longer proof that appears to be necessary for general $p$.

Throughout this discussion, we will use the following notation. Given $x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, define $f(x) := \max \left( \{1\} \cup \{2 \leq j \leq n : \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < j, x_i = 0\} \right)$ to be the first non-zero coordinate of $x$.

**Proposition 2.19** (Green-Sanders examples have bounded VC-dimension). For all $n \geq 1$, GS($n, 3$) = $(\mathbb{F}_3^n, A_{\text{GS}}(n, 3))$ has VC-dimension 3.

**Proof.** We write $A = A_{\text{GS}}(n, 3)$. We begin by showing its VC-dimension is less than 4. Suppose towards a contradiction that there exists a set $X = \{a^1, a^2, a^3, a^4\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_3^n$ of size 4 which is shattered by $A$. So for all $Y \subseteq X$, there is some $e_Y \in \mathbb{F}_3^n$ so that $(A - e_Y) \cap X = Y$. Let $m = \max \left( \{0\} \cup \{i \in [n] : \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq i, a^j_1 = a^j_2 = a^j_3 = a^j_4\} \right)$

For each $i \in [4]$, set $b^i = a^i - a^1$. Then $X' = \{b^1, b^2, b^3, b^4\}$ is still shattered by $A$, and $m + 1 = \min \{f(b^1), f(b^2), f(b^3), f(b^4)\} < \max \{f(b^1), f(b^2), f(b^3), f(b^4)\} = f(b^1) = n$.

Since the $b^i$ are pairwise distinct, we have $f(b^2), f(b^3), f(b^4) < f(b^1)$.

Suppose first that $f(b^2) < f(b^3) < f(b^4)$. Let $u \in \{1, 2\}$ be such that

$$b^2 = u e_{f(b^2)} + \sum_{i = f(b^2) + 1}^n b^2_i e_i.$$ 

Suppose first $u = 1$. By assumption, there exists some $y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $(A - y) \cap X' = \{b^1\}$. Since $b^1 = 0, y + b^1 \in A$ implies $y$ has the form $e_{f(y)} + \sum_{i = f(y) + 1}^n y_i e_i$. Then since $y + b^2 \in \neg A$, we must have that $f(y) = f(b^2) < f(b^3)$. But this forces $y + b^3 \in A$, a contradiction.
Suppose now \( u = 2 \). By assumption, there exists some \( y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \) such that \((A - y) \cap X' = \{b^2, b^3\}\). Since \( b^1 = 0 \), \( y + b^1 \notin A \) implies \( y \) has the form \( 2e_{f(y)} + \sum_{i=f(y)+1}^{n} y_ie_i \). Then since \( y + b^2 \in A \), we must have that \( f(y) = f(b^2) < f(b^3) \). But this forces it to hold that \( y + b^3 \notin A \), a contradiction.

A symmetric argument arrives at a contradiction if \( f(b^3) < f(b^2) < f(b^1) \). We must therefore have that \( f(b^2) = f(b^3) < f(b^1) \). Repeating the same argument with \( b^3, b^1, b^1 \) yields that \( f(b^3) = f(b^1) < f(b^1) \). So we have that for \( r = f(b^2) = f(b^3) = f(b^4) < n \), there are \( x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \{2, 3\} \), such that

\[
 b^2 = x_2e_r + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} b^2_i, \quad b^3 = x_3e_r + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} b^3_i, \quad \text{and} \quad b^4 = x_4e_r + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} b^4_i.
\]

By the pigeonhole principle, two of \( \{x_2, x_3, x_4\} \) are equal.

Assume first that \( x_2 = x_3 = 1 \). Let \( y \) be such that \((A - y) \cap X' = \{b^2, b^1\}\). Clearly we must have that \( f(y) = r \) and \( y_r = 2 \). But then \( y + b^1 \notin A \), a contradiction. Assume instead that \( x_2 = x_3 = 2 \). Let \( y \) be such that \((A - y) \cap X' = \{b^2, b^1\}\). Clearly we must have that \( f(y) = r \) and \( y_r = 1 \). But then \( y + b^1 \notin A \), a contradiction. This shows we cannot have \( x_2 = x_3 \). A similar argument shows that we cannot have \( x_1 = x_2 \) or \( x_1 = x_3 \), so we have arrived at a contradiction, and thus, we must have that \( \text{VC}(A) < 4 \).

We end the proof with a quick example of a set of size 3 which is shattered in \( \text{GS}(3, 3) \), from which it follows that all \( \text{GS}(n, 3) \) contain shattered sets of size 3. Indeed, let \( Z = \{(000), (012), (021)\} \). It is straightforward to check that \( Z \) is shattered by \( A \), using its translates by the elements \((011), (020), (000), (010), (001), (022), (100), (200) \).

Proposition 2.19 implies, via Lemma 2.6, that \( \text{GS}(n, p) \) has no 4-FOP$_2$. In fact, we shall also show the following.

**Proposition 2.20.** \( \text{GS}(n, 3) \) has 3-HOP$_2$ but no 4-HOP$_2$.

The proof of this proposition proceeds by a rather tedious case analysis, and has therefore been relegated to Appendix C. We further conjecture that the following generalization of Proposition 2.20 holds.

**Conjecture 2.21.** For every prime \( p \), there is \( m \geq 1 \) so that \( \text{GS}(n, p) \) has no \( m \)-HOP$_2$.

Finally, we provide evidence for the claim that the GS \( p \)-example is not linearly atomic. Indeed, the following proposition follows straight from [37], and implies Proposition 1.14. In fact, we give a simpler proof of a stronger statement.

**Proposition 2.22.** There is \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that for all \( D \) and \( N \), there is some \( n \geq N \) such that there is no \( \epsilon \)-atomic linear factor of complexity \( D \) with respect to \( \text{GS}(n, p) \). In fact, for any linear factor \( L \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \( \ell \leq D \), the density of \( \text{AGS}(n, p) \) in \( L(0) \) is always in \([1/p, 1 - 1/p]\).

**Proof.** Suppose \( L = \{r_1, \ldots, r_\ell\} \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \( \ell \leq D \). Let \( i_0 = \max \left( \{0\} \cup \{j \in [n] : e_j \text{ is contained in the span of } L \} \right) \).
Then
\[ |A_{GS}(n,p) \cap L(0)| \geq |L(0) \cap (H_{i_0+1} + e_{i_0+1})| \geq p^{-1}|L(0)|, \]
while
\[ |\neg A_{GS}(n,p) \cap L(0)| \geq |L(0) \cap (H_{i_0+1} + 2e_{i_0+1})| \geq p^{-1}|L(0)|. \]
This shows that the density of \( A_{GS}(n,p) \) in \( L(0) \) is always in \([1/p, 1-1/p]\). \( \square \)

3. A brief review of quadratic Fourier analysis

Higher-order Fourier analysis has its roots in Gowers’s work on Szemerédi’s theorem [27, 28], and has since been developed in multiple important directions and into adjacent fields. For the purpose of this brief overview, we shall only mention the groundbreaking work of Host and Kra in ergodic theory [48] and efforts of Szegedy and co-authors (culminating in [11], see also references therein) to generalize the framework beyond a small class of finite abelian groups.

The recent survey [31] by Gowers gives an excellent overview of these various developments, with a strong focus on motivating problems in arithmetic combinatorics and number theory. A more technical but nevertheless outstanding introduction to the setting of vector spaces over a small finite field in particular is given by Green [36]. For a more infinitary viewpoint, we recommend the book by Tao [68].

We return to the underlying theme set out in the introduction, namely our goal to decompose a set or a function into a structured and a pseudorandom part. For certain applications, such as counting 3-term arithmetic progressions (3-APs), measuring pseudorandomness by the maximum size of the Fourier coefficients of the function is perfectly adequate, and the associated structured part will be pleasantly linear in nature (in a sense to be made precise momentarily). For other applications, such as counting 4-term and longer progressions, a more sophisticated measure of pseudorandomness is required, and the object of primary interest in this paper is the resulting higher-order polynomial (specifically, quadratic) structure that forms its counterpart.

In the moderately more detailed discussion that follows, we shall restrict our attention to the setting of bounded functions defined on \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) with \( p \geq 2 \). Almost all of the concepts introduced can be generalized to other abelian groups, but often only with significant effort. The reader familiar with the literature may skip Sections 3.1-3.3 but should be aware that we will be using some results in the form in which they are stated in these sections (which may not always be standard).

3.1. An arithmetic regularity lemma for the \( U^2 \) norm. As far back as the 1950s, Roth [59] observed that the \( \ell^\infty \) norm of the Fourier transform of the characteristic function of a set can be used to control the count of 3-APs contained in the set. In today’s language, and adapted to our setting, his observation can be stated as follows.

**Fact 3.1** (Fourier transform controls 3-APs). Let \( f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{C} \). Then
\[ |\mathbb{E}_x,d f(x)f(x+d)f(x+2d)| \leq \|\hat{f}\|_\infty. \]
We shall make no explicit use of the Fourier transform $\hat{f}$ in this paper, so we refer the interested reader to [3] for a definition. Indeed, it turns out to be more useful for the study of general linear patterns to replace the $\ell^\infty$ norm of the Fourier transform by a more combinatorial measure of uniformity.

**Definition 3.2** ($U^2$ norm). For $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{C}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{U^2}^4 = \mathbb{E}_{x,a,b} f(x)f(x+a)f(x+b)f(x+a+b) = \mathbb{E}_x |\mathbb{E}_a f(x)f(x+a)|^2 = \mathbb{E}_x |\mathbb{E}_a \Delta_a f(x)|^2,$$

where we have defined $\Delta_a f(x) = f(x)f(x+a)$.

**Fact 3.3.** For $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{C}$, we have $\|f\|_{U^2}^4 = \|\hat{f}\|_4^4$. Furthermore, if $\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, we have $\|\hat{f}\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{f}\|_4 \leq \|f\|_{U^2}^4 \leq \|\hat{f}\|_\infty^2$.

This means that, at least loosely, a function $f$ is Fourier-uniform (meaning that the $\ell^\infty$ norm of its Fourier transform is small) if and only if $f$ has small $U^2$ norm. As a corollary of Facts 3.1 and 3.3, we see that the 3-AP count weighted by a function $f$ is controlled by its $U^2$ norm. In particular, writing $1_A$ for the characteristic function of a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ of density $\alpha$ and substituting $f_A = 1_A - \alpha$ (the so-called balanced function of $A$), we see that if $\|f_A\|_{U^2}$ is small, then $A$ contains roughly the number of 3-APs expected in a random subset of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of the same density.

It therefore remains to draw a useful conclusion from the opposite assumption, namely that $\|f\|_{U^2}$ is non-negligible. This follows straight from 3.3 and the definition of the Fourier transform: if $\|f\|_{U^2} \geq \eta > 0$, then there exists a character $\gamma \neq 0$ on $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $|\langle 1_A, \gamma \rangle| \geq \eta^2$.

The aforementioned conclusions are the two sides of the structure-randomness coin: either the set $A$ in question is uniform (in the sense that its balanced function has small $U^2$ norm), or we can identify some structure (in the form of a non-negligible correlation with a linear character). These two statements can be refined and combined, in more or less sophisticated ways, to give a proof of Roth’s theorem in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ (see [77] and references therein, for example).

A particularly poignant way of formulating this dichotomy, reminiscent of Szemerédi’s regularity lemma [66] in graph theory, is given by Theorem 3.5 below. We will use the following notion of a linear factor in the statement of Theorem 3.5 as well as throughout the paper.

**Definition 3.4** (Linear factor). A linear factor $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ is a set of finitely many vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. The atoms of $\mathcal{L}$ are the sets of the form

$$\{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T v_1 = r_1, \ldots, x^T v_\ell = r_\ell \},$$

for $r_1, \ldots, r_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_p$. We let $\text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ denote the set of atoms of $\mathcal{L}$. The complexity of $\mathcal{L}$ is the dimension of the linear span of $v_1, \ldots, v_\ell$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$.

---

8 The definition of the $U^2$ norm is in close correspondence with a well-known measure of quasirandomness in graphs, namely the count of 4-cycles.

9 For model theorists, by a random set of the same density we mean a subset $A$ of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that each element of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ has been chosen to lie in $A$ independently with probability $\alpha$. 
We define the complexity of \( \mathcal{L} \) to be the dimension of the linear span of \( v_1, \ldots, v_\ell \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Note that given a linear factor \( \mathcal{L} \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \( \ell \), \( \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \) is a partition\(^{10} \) of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) with \( p^\ell \) parts, each of which has size \( p^{n-\ell} \). It is easy to see that \( \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \) is in fact the set of cosets of a codimension-\( \ell \) subgroup.

We write \( \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{L}) \) for the projection onto \( \mathcal{L} \), that is the function whose value at \( x \) is the average of \( f \) over the atom in \( \mathcal{L} \) that contains \( x \). More specifically, given \( x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), \( \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{L})(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{L}} f(y) \), where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the element from \( \mathcal{L} \) containing \( x \).

**Theorem 3.5** (\( U^2 \) arithmetic regularity). For every \( \epsilon > 0 \) and for any growth function \( \omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) (which may depend on \( \epsilon \)), there exists \( n_0 = n_0(\epsilon, \omega) \) such that the following holds. Let \( n > n_0 \) and let \( f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to [-1,1] \) be a function. Then there is a linear factor \( \mathcal{L} \) of complexity \( \ell \) with the following properties:

(i) the complexity of \( \mathcal{L} \) satisfies \( \ell \leq C(\epsilon, \omega) \) for some fixed function \( C \);

(ii) we can write

\[
  f = f_1 + f_2 + f_3,
\]

with \( f_1 = \mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{L}) \), \( \|f_2\|_{U^2} \leq 1/\omega(\ell) \), and \( \|f_3\|_2 \leq \epsilon \).

The first such regularity lemma was due to Green \[35\], and provided the starting point for the investigations in our first joint paper \[73\]. There \[73, Definition 4\] we worked with the following notion of *local* uniformity. Given \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) and \( H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), a coset \( g+H \) was said to be \( \epsilon \)-uniform with respect to \( A \) if \( \sup_{t \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} |\hat{f}_A^g(t)| \leq \epsilon \), where \( \hat{f}_A^g(x) = (1_{(A-g) \cap H}(x) - \alpha_{g+H})\mu_H(x) \) is the balanced function of \( A \) localised to \( g-H \), \( \alpha_{g+H} := |(g+H) \cap A|/|H| \) is the density of \( A \) on \( g+H \), and \( \mu_H(x) = (|\mathbb{F}_p^n|/|H|)1_H(x) \) is the characteristic measure of \( H \).

In this terminology, the arithmetic regularity lemma of Green \[35\] states that given \( \epsilon > 0 \), whenever \( n \) is sufficiently large, there is a subspace \( H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of codimension bounded only in terms of \( \epsilon \), such that all but an \( \epsilon \)-proportion of the cosets of \( H \) are \( \epsilon \)-uniform with respect to \( A \). This result can indeed be deduced from Theorem 3.5 above.

As a side note, and because we shall need it later, a more elementary manifestation of the structure-randomness dichotomy appears in \[73, Lemma 7\].

**Fact 3.6.** For all \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is \( N = N(\epsilon) \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( A \subseteq G \) and \( H \leq G \) is a subspace of size at least \( N \). Then there are \( H' \leq H \) and \( y \in H \) such that \( H' \) has codimension at most \( \lceil 2/\epsilon \rceil \) in \( H' \), \( \frac{|A \cap H'|}{|H'|} \geq \frac{|A \cap H|}{|H|} \), and \( H' + y \) is \( \epsilon \)-uniform with respect to \( A \).

### 3.2. The role of the Gowers \( U^3 \) norm.

It is a well known fact that the Fourier transform (and similarly, the \( U^2 \) norm) is not sensitive enough to control longer arithmetic progressions or other configurations of similar complexity; see for example, the introduction to \[33\]. There, the authors showed that the Fourier transform does not control patterns for which the squares of the linear forms defining the pattern are linearly dependent\(^{11} \), and went on

\(^{10}\) The term “factor” usually refers to the partition generated by the atoms of \( \mathcal{L} \) (see e.g. \[36\]). For convenience, we identify the factor with its set of constraints.

\(^{11}\) Such patterns are said to be of complexity 2.
to show that linear independence of the squares is not only a necessary but a sufficient condition for a linear pattern to be controlled by the Fourier transform (or, equivalently, the $U^2$ norm). This deep phenomenon also lies (indirectly) at the heart of the present paper, in particular the definition of HOP$_2$.

However, it is possible to generalize the $U^2$ norm in such a way that its generalization does control 4-APs and patterns of higher complexity. For this it is helpful to view the $U^2$ norm from a more combinatorial perspective, as the count over additive quadruples $x, x + a, x + b, x + a + b$, weighted by the function $f$ (see Definition 3.2). We now define the $U^3$ norm as the average over products over the eight vertices of the 3-dimensional cube given by $x, x + a, x + b, x + c, x + a + b, x + a + c, x + b + c, x + a + b + c$.

**Definition 3.7** ($U^3$ norm). For $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we define
\[
\|f\|_{U^3}^6 = \mathbb{E}_c \|\Delta_c f\|_{U^2}^6 = \mathbb{E}_{x,a,b,c} f(x) f(x + a) f(x + b) f(x + c) f(x + a + b) f(x + a + c) f(x + b + c) f(x + a + b + c).
\]

More generally, we may define the $U^d$ norm for $d > 2$ inductively by $\|f\|_{U^d}^{2d} = \mathbb{E}_h \|\Delta_h f\|_{U^{d-1}}^{2^{d-1}}$.\footnote{If we define the semi-norm $\|f\|_{U^1} = |\mathbb{E}_x f(x)|$, we see that Definition 3.2 is consistent with this inductive definition.}

With this inductive definition, it is not difficult to see that the norms are nested, in the sense that for every $d$, $\|f\|_{U^d} \leq \|f\|_{U^{d+1}}$. Of course, it is not obvious that the formulas in Definitions 3.2 and 3.7 do define a norm, but equipped with the Gowers-Cauchy-Schwarz inequality below, this is not too hard to prove. We state the latter here for $d = 3$ only, which is the case we shall be using in Section 4 (see, for example, [69, Section 11]).

**Lemma 3.8** (Gowers-Cauchy-Schwarz inequality). For each $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}^3$, let $f_\epsilon : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function. Then
\[
\langle f_{000}, f_{100}, \ldots, f_{011}, f_{111} \rangle_{U^3} \leq \prod_{\epsilon \in \{0,1\}^3} \|f_\epsilon\|_{U^3},
\]
where the Gowers inner product $\langle f_{000}, f_{001}, \ldots, f_{011}, f_{111} \rangle_{U^3}$ is defined as
\[
\mathbb{E}_{x,a,b,c} f_{000}(x) f_{100}(x + a) f_{010}(x + b) f_{001}(x + c) f_{110}(x + a + b) f_{101}(x + a + c) f_{011}(x + b + c) f_{111}(x + a + b + c).
\]

There is now a statement that is analogous to Fact 3.1, which, alongside the definition of the $U^3$ norm and the Gowers-Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, first appeared in [27].

**Proposition 3.9** ($U^3$ controls 4-APs). For $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\|f\|_2 \leq 1$, we have
\[
|\mathbb{E}_{x,d} f(x) f(x + d) f(x + 2d) f(x + 3d)| \leq \|f\|_{U^3}.
\]

We say that a set is **quadratically uniform** if its balanced function has small $U^3$ norm. It is not difficult to see (but not at all obvious either) that sets whose balanced functions are
quadratically uniform contain roughly the number of 4-APs expected in a random subset of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of the same density.

In order to be able to deal with non-quadratically uniform sets, we need to understand the structure of functions whose \( U^3 \) norm is bounded away from zero. The attentive reader might observe that a class of functions for which this holds is that of quadratic phase functions, that is, functions of the form \( \omega^q(x) \) for some quadratic form \( q \), whose \( U^3 \) norm always equals 1. It would not be unreasonable to conjecture that functions with large \( U^3 \) norm must always correlate with such “quadratic characters” (in the same way that, as we saw earlier, functions with large \( U^2 \) norm correlate with linear characters).

Based heavily on prior results of Gowers, such an inverse theorem for the \( U^3 \) norm in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) was first proved by Green and Tao [39] for characteristic \( p \geq 3 \), and in characteristic 2 by Samorodnitsky [60].

**Theorem 3.10** (Inverse theorem for \( U^3 \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \)). Let \( f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{C} \) be a function satisfying \( \|f\|_\infty \leq 1 \). Then for all \( \eta > 0 \), there is a constant \( c(\eta) \) (tending to zero as \( \eta \) tends to zero) such that the following holds. If \( \|f\|_{U^3} \geq \eta \), then there exists a quadratic form \( q \) on \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) such that \( |\langle f, \omega^q \rangle| \geq c(\eta) \).

In arithmetic combinatorics and theoretical computer science, the quantitative form of the dependence of \( c(\eta) \) on \( \eta \) is an important open question. Indeed, whether or not it is polynomial has been shown to be equivalent to the *Polynomial Freiman-Ruzsa Conjecture* [41]. The best bounds, which are quasipolynomial in nature, are due to Sanders [61]. Until recent work of Gowers and Miličević [32], a corresponding result for the \( U^4 \) norm on \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) was only known in a qualitative fashion [7, 70]. Special considerations apply in small characteristic [52, 71].

For completeness, we mention that corresponding inverse results are also known in other abelian groups, in particular the cyclic groups [39, 42–44] but also in locally compact abelian groups [11]. The first quantitative bounds in the higher-order cyclic case were only recently obtained by Manners [54] (see also [10]).

### 3.3. A quadratic arithmetic regularity lemma

The quadratic structure-randomness dichotomy laid out above gives rise to a “quadratic” regularity lemma. In order to state this formally, we shall need to formally define quadratic factors and quadratic atoms.

**Definition 3.11** (Quadratic factor). A quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) is a pair \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) where \( \mathcal{L} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\} \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( \mathcal{Q} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\} \) is a set of finitely many symmetric \( n \times n \) matrices over \( \mathbb{F}_p \). The atoms of \( \mathcal{B} \) are the sets of the form

\[
\{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T v_1 = r_1, \ldots, x^T v_\ell = r_\ell, x^T M_1 x = s_1, \ldots, x^T M_q x = s_q \},
\]

for some \( r_1, \ldots, r_\ell, s_1, \ldots, s_q \in \mathbb{F}_p \).

We let \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) denote the set of atoms of \( \mathcal{B} \), and say \( \mathcal{B} \) has complexity \((\ell', q)\), where \( \ell' \) is the complexity of the linear factor \( \mathcal{L} \).

When \( \mathcal{B} \) is a quadratic factor of complexity \((\ell, q)\), \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) forms a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) with at most \( p^{\ell+q} \) parts. Computing the size of an atom in a quadratic factor is more subtle than in the purely linear case. We will need to consider the following notion.
Definition 3.12 (Rank of a factor). Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, where $\mathcal{Q} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{r_1, \ldots, r_\ell\}$. The rank of $B$ is

$$\max\{\text{rk}(\lambda_1 M_1 + \ldots + \lambda_q M_q) : \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q \in \mathbb{F}_p \text{ are not all 0}\}.$$ 

When a factor has high rank, then all its atoms have roughly the same size, see [36, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 3.13 (Size of an atom). Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank $r$. Then for any $B \in \text{At}(\mathcal{B})$,

$$|B| = (1 + O(p^{\ell+q-r/2}))p^{n-\ell-q}.$$ 

We define a rank function to be any strictly increasing function $\omega : \{1, 2, \ldots\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Given two rank functions, $\omega, \omega'$, we write $\omega \geq \omega'$ to denote that $\omega(x) \geq \omega'(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$. The following immediate corollary of Lemma 3.13 will be used throughout the paper. Note that given $a, b, \epsilon > 0$, we write $a = b \pm \epsilon$ to denote that $a \in (b - \epsilon, b + \epsilon)$.

Corollary 3.14. For any function $\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there is a rank function $\rho = \rho(\tau)$ such that if $B$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$, then for any $B \in \text{At}(\mathcal{B})$, $|B| = (1 \pm p^{-\tau(\ell+q)})p^{n-\ell-q}$. 

When $\tau$ is the constant function $\tau(x) = \log_p(e^{-1})$, we will write $\rho(\epsilon)$ instead of $\rho(\tau)$.

It turns out that any factor can be made to have high rank by changing a bounded number of its constraints, as Lemma 3.15 below shows.

Given two quadratic factors $B$ and $B'$, we say that $B'$ refines $B$, denoted $B' \preceq B$, if the partition $\text{At}(B')$ of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ refines the partition $\text{At}(B)$ of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. We now state Lemma 3.15, which is essentially [36, Lemma 3.11], with some care taken to keep track of a few technicalities.

Lemma 3.15. Suppose $r$ is a rank function and $C > 0$. Let $\tau_r : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the function $\tau_r(x) = x + r(x)x$. Assume $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor with complexity $(\ell, q)$ for some $\ell + q \leq C$, and $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_q\}$ is a fixed enumeration. Then there exist a constant $C' \leq \tau_r(C)$ and a quadratic factor $(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}') \preceq (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ of complexity $(\ell', q')$, where $\ell' + q' \leq C'$, such that $\mathcal{L}' \supseteq \mathcal{L}$, and so that the following hold.

(i) The rank of $(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}')$ is at least $r(C')$,

(ii) If $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ has rank less than $r(C')$, then $|\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{Q}'| < |\mathcal{Q}|$.

(iii) For each $1 \leq i \leq q$, if $(\mathcal{L}, Q_i)$ has rank at least $r(C')$, then $Q_i \subseteq \mathcal{Q}'$, where for each $1 \leq i \leq q$, $Q_i = \{M_1, \ldots, M_i\}$.

Proof. To prove this, one proceeds exactly as in the proof of [36, Lemma 3.11] with the added caveat that whenever one encounters a linear combination of matrices of low rank, one deletes the matrix with the largest index in the fixed enumeration.

We will mainly use only conclusion (i) of Lemma 3.15 with the exception of Proposition 3.19.

We now state the arithmetic regularity lemma for the $U^3$ norm, which is due to Green and Tao [36, Proposition 3.9] and follows from an iterated application of Theorem 3.10 and Lemma 3.15. As with a linear factor, given a quadratic factor $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$, we write
\( \mathbb{E}(f|B) \) for the projection onto \( B \). In other words, \( \mathbb{E}(f|B) \) is the function whose value at \( x \) is the average of \( f \) over the atom in \( B \) that contains \( x \). More specifically, given \( x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), 
\[
\mathbb{E}(f|\mathcal{L})(x) = \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{y \in B} f(y),
\]
where \( B \) is the element for \( B \) containing \( x \).

**Theorem 3.16** (U³ arithmetic regularity lemma). For every \( \epsilon > 0 \) and for all growth functions \( \omega_1, \omega_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) (which may depend on \( \epsilon \)), there exists \( n_0 = n_0(\epsilon, \omega_1, \omega_2) \) such that the following holds. Let \( n > n_0 \) and let \( f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to [-1, 1] \) be a function. Let \( (\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}') \) be a quadratic factor of complexity \( (\ell', q') \). Then there is a quadratic factor \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) of complexity \( (\ell, q) \) with the following properties.

1. \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) refines \( (\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}') \);
2. the complexity of \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) satisfies 
   \[
   \ell, q \leq C(\epsilon, \omega_1, \omega_2, \ell', q')
   \]
   for some fixed function \( C \);
3. the rank of \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is at least \( \omega_1(\ell + q) \);
4. we can write 
   \[
   f = f_1 + f_2 + f_3,
   \]
   with \( f_1 = \mathbb{E}(f|B) \), \( \|f_2\|_{U^3} \leq 1/\omega_2(\ell + q) \), and \( \|f_3\|_2 \leq \epsilon \).

This can be done whilst ensuring that \( f_2 \) and \( f_3 \) remain bounded in absolute value by the constant 2 (see for example, [9, Theorem 4.9], or [34, Theorem 4.1]). Applied to the balanced function of a set \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), this implies that the set is locally (on almost all atoms) well distributed in the sense of \( U^3 \) (see also Section 4).

Finally, we set up some more notation to help us talk about specific atoms more easily. Suppose \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a quadratic factor, where \( \mathcal{Q} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\} \) and \( \mathcal{L} = \{r_1, \ldots, r_\ell\} \). Given \( \bar{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_\ell) \), \( \bar{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_q) \in \mathbb{F}_p^q \), and \( \bar{d} = \bar{a} \bar{b} \), we write

\[
L(\bar{a}) = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T r_i = a_i \text{ for each } i \in [\ell]\},
\]
\[
Q(\bar{b}) = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M_j x = b_j \text{ for each } j \in [q]\},
\]
\[
B(\bar{d}) = L(\bar{a}) \cap Q(\bar{b}).
\]

We will also sometimes write \( B(\bar{a}; \bar{b}) \) for the atom \( B(\bar{d}) = L(\bar{a}) \cap Q(\bar{b}) \). If \( \mathcal{L} = \emptyset \), we will call \( B \) purely quadratic, and refer to it simply as \( Q \). By convention, if \( \mathcal{Q} \) is the trivial factor, that is, the one with no constraints, then it has infinite rank, complexity \((0, 0)\), and a single non-trivial atom, \( G \).

To conclude this brief overview of higher-order Fourier analysis, some further remarks are in order. First, there are numerous generalizations of the above regularity lemma, both to higher-order uniformity norms, for instance [9][34], as well as other groups, e.g. [11][40]. All these results are obtained iteratively from an inverse theorem (such as Theorem 3.10), and therefore the bounds in the arithmetic regularity lemma necessarily depend on those in the inverse theorem as discussed at the end of Section 3.1. Having said this, regardless of the particular shape of the bound in Theorem 3.10 the known bounds in Theorem 3.16 are
of wowzer type. That bounds of this form are necessary in general is suggested\textsuperscript{13} by work of Moskiovitz and Shapira \textsuperscript{[55]} on the corresponding hypergraph problem. Indeed, the above quadratic decomposition theorem is closely related, at least in spirit, to decompositions of 3-uniform hypergraphs as given by a regularity lemma in that setting. For further details, see Section 4.1 and \textsuperscript{[76]}.

### 3.4. Quadratic decomposition properties of the Green-Sanders examples

In this subsection we prove Proposition 1.24 which tells us that if an epGP contains GS\((n, p)\) for arbitrarily large \(n\), then it cannot be quadratically atomic. In particular, Proposition 1.24 is an immediate corollary of the following.

**Proposition 3.17.** There is an \(\epsilon > 0\) and a rank function \(\omega\) such that for all \(\ell, q \geq 0\), there is \(N \geq 1\) such that the following holds. For all \(n \geq N\), and quadratic factors \(B\) in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(\ell, q)\), there is an atom \(B\) of \(B\) such that \(|B \cap A_{GS}(n, p)|/|B| \in (1 - \epsilon/p^{-1}, 1 - (1 - \epsilon/p^{-1})\).

Interestingly, this boils down to the GS-example’s failure to be linearly atomic.

**Proof.** Given \(\epsilon > 0\), let \(\omega_1 = \omega_1(\epsilon/p)\) be the rank function coming from Corollary 3.14. Then define the rank function \(\omega\) by setting \(\omega(x) = \omega_1(x + 1)\) for all \(x\). Suppose \(\ell, q \geq 0\).

Set \(N = 2(\ell + q) + 1\). Now suppose \(n \geq N\), and \(B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) is a quadratic factor in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(\ell, q)\). Let

\[
i_0 = \max \left(\{0\} \cup \{j \in [n] : e_j \text{ is contained in the span of } \mathcal{L}\}\right).
\]

Then by definition of \(A\), Lemma 3.13 and since \(B\) has rank at least \(\omega_1(\ell + q + 1)\), we have that

\[
|A \cap B(0)| \geq |A \cap B(0) \cap (H_{i_0 + 1}(0) + e_{i_0 + 1})| \geq (1 - \epsilon/p) |B(0)| \text{ and}
\]

\[
|\neg A \cap B(0)| \geq |A \cap B(0) \cap (H_{i_0 + 1}(0) + 2e_{i_0 + 1})| \geq (1 - \epsilon/p) |B(0)|.
\]

This shows that the relative density of \(A\) on \(B(0)\) lies in the desired interval. \(\Box\)

We now turn to the quadratic version of the Green-Sanders example. Recall from the introduction that given \(n \geq 1\), a quadratic Green-Sanders example of dimension \(n\) is a pair \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) for which there exists a purely quadratic factor \(Q = \{M_i : i \in [n]\}\) of complexity \(n\) and rank \(n\) such that \(A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n Q_i(e_i)\), where

\[
Q_i(e_i) = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M_1 x = x^T M_2 x = \ldots = x^T M_{i-1} x = 0, x^T M_i x = 1\}.
\]

Note that, since for every \(i\), the quadratic factor generated by \(M_1, \ldots, M_i\) has rank \(n\), we have that each \(Q_i(e_i)\) has density \(p^{-i} + O(p^{-n/2})\) in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) (see Lemma 3.13). Since these atoms are all disjoint, the density of \(A\) in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) is

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \left(p^{-i} + O(p^{-n/2})\right) + O(n/2 \cdot p^{-n/2}) = \frac{p^{-1} - p^{-(n/2+1)}}{1 - p^{-1}} + O(n/2 \cdot p^{-n/2}) = \frac{1}{p - 1} + O(p^{-n/3}).
\]

\textsuperscript{13}To the best of our knowledge, there is no explicit lower-bound construction for the \(U^3\) arithmetic regularity lemma.
As a by-product of our proof of Theorem 3.32, we shall prove that for any \( \ell \), a sufficiently large quadratic Green-Sanders example has \( \ell \)-FOP\(_2\) (see Corollary 5.12). Therefore, any large quadratic Green-Sanders example has unbounded VC-dimension. However, we conjecture that the quadratic Green-Sanders examples have bounded VC-dimension.

**Conjecture 3.18.** There is \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) so that for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and primes \( p \), QGS\((n,p)\) has VC\(_2\)-dimension at most \( m \).

This would be analogous to Corollary C.4 which states that the linear Green-Sanders examples have VC-dimension at most 4.

Our next proposition, Proposition 3.19 will be used to prove Proposition 1.26, which says an epGP \( \mathcal{P} \) containing quadratic Green-Sanders examples of arbitrarily large dimension is not quadratically atomic. We will also deduce from Proposition 3.19 that \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{QGS}(p)} \) is not almost quadratically atomic with linear error.

**Proposition 3.19.** There is a rank function \( \omega \) so that for all \( \ell, q \geq 0 \), there is \( N \geq 1 \) so that for all \( n \geq N \), if \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) is a quadratic Green-Sanders example of dimension \( n \), and \((\mathcal{L}, Q)\) is a quadratic factor of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), then for every \( L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \), there is some \( Q \in \text{At}(Q) \) such that \( |A \cap Q \cap L|/|Q \cap L| \in (\frac{1}{2p}, 1 - \frac{1}{2p}) \).

**Proof.** Choose \( \mu > 0 \) sufficiently small compared to \( p^{-1} \), and let \( \omega = \omega(\mu) \) be from Corollary 3.14. Fix \( \ell, r \geq 0 \) and choose \( N \) sufficiently large compared to \( \ell, r, \) and \( \mu^{-1} \).

Suppose \( n \geq N \) and \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) is a quadratic Green-Sanders example of dimension \( n \), and \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}) \) is a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \((\ell, r)\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + r) \).

Enumerate \( \mathcal{R} \) as \( \{R_1, \ldots, R_r\} \). Recall \( A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n Q_i(\bar{e}_i) \), where for each \( i \), \( \bar{e}_i \) is the \( i \)-th standard basis vector in \( \mathbb{F}_p^\ell \) and \( Q_i = \{M_1, \ldots, M_i\} \), where \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\} \) is a set of matrices with rank \( n \). We begin with the following claim.

**Claim 3.20.** There is some \( q', r' \leq r \) and a quadratic factor \((\mathcal{L}', Q')\) of complexity \((\ell', r')\) such that the following hold.

(i) \( \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}' \), and \((\mathcal{L}', Q') \preceq (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}) \),

(ii) Both \((\mathcal{L}', Q')\) and \((\mathcal{L}', Q' \cup \{M_{q'+1}\})\) have rank at least \( \omega(\ell + r + 1) \),

(iii) After possibly reindexing \( Q' = \{M_1, \ldots, M_{q'}\} \cup \mathcal{R}' \) where \( \mathcal{R}' \subseteq \{R_{q'+1}, \ldots, R_r\} \).

**Proof.** We proceed inductively.

Step 1: If \( \mathcal{R} \cup \{M_1\} \) has rank at least \( \omega(r + 1) \), let \( q' = 0 \), \( \ell' = \ell \), \( \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} \), and \( Q' = Q \). Otherwise, apply Lemma 3.15 to \((\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{M_1\})\) using an enumeration listing \( M_1 \) first, to obtain \((\mathcal{L}_1, S_1) \preceq (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \cup \{M_1\})\) so that \( \mathcal{L}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{L} \), \( |L_1| := \ell_1 \leq C(\ell, \omega, r + 1) \), \( S_1 \supseteq \mathcal{R} \cup \{M_1\} \), and so that \((\mathcal{L}_1, S_1)\) has rank at least \( \omega(r + 1) \). Since \( M_1 \) has rank \( n \), our application of Lemma 3.15 ensures \( M_1 \in S_1 \). Possibly after reindexing, we may assume \( S_1 = \{M_1\} \cup \mathcal{R}_1 \), where \( \mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \{R_2, \ldots, R_r\} \).

Step \( i + 1 \): Suppose \( i \geq 1 \), \( \mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \{R_{i+1}, \ldots, R_r\} \), \( \mathcal{L}_i \supseteq \mathcal{L} \), and \( S_i = \{M_1, \ldots, M_i\} \cup \mathcal{R}_i \) are such that \( |L_i| = \ell_i \leq C(\ell_{i-1}, \omega, r + 1) \) and \((\mathcal{L}_i, S_i) \preceq (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}) \). If \( S_i \cup \{M_{i+1}\} \) has rank at least \( \omega(\ell_i + r + 1) \), let \( q' = i \), \( \ell' = \ell_i \), \( Q' = S_i \), and \( \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}_i \), and end the construction.

Otherwise, apply Lemma 3.15 to \((\mathcal{L}_i, S_i \cup \{M_{i+1}\})\), using an enumeration listing \( M_1, \ldots, M_{i+1} \) first. From this we obtain \( \mathcal{L}_{i+1} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_i \) and \( S_{i+1} \subseteq S_i \cup \{M_{i+1}\} \) so that \( |L_{i+1}| := \ell_{i+1} \leq \omega(\ell_i + r + 1) \).
\( C(\ell, r, \omega) \), and \( (\mathcal{L}_{i+1}, \mathcal{S}_{i+1}) \) has rank at least \( \omega(\ell_i + r + 1) \). Since \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_{i+1}\} \) has rank \( n \), our application of Lemma \ref{lem:rank} ensures that \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_{i+1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{i+1} \). After possibly reindexing, we may assume \( \mathcal{S}_{i+1} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_{i+1}\} \cup \mathcal{R}_{i+1} \), where \( \mathcal{R}_{i+1} \subseteq \{R_{i+2}, \ldots, R_r\} \).

This process will either halt some \( q' < r \) many steps, or after \( q' = r \) many steps, it will delete all the elements of \( \mathcal{R} \), at which point it will halt because \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_r, M_{r+1}\} \) has rank \( n \). \hfill \( \Box \)

Let \( q', \mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{R}' \) be as in the conclusion of Claim \ref{claim:qprime}. Given \( L(\bar{d}) \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \), define

\[
J_{d} = \{ \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^r : L(\bar{d}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R(\bar{a}) \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Then for each \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \), define \( J_{a,d} = \{ \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r-\ell} : L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R(\bar{a}) \neq \emptyset \} \). Observe that for any \( \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \) and \( \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r-\ell} \), if \( L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R(\bar{a}) \neq \emptyset \) then

\[
L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R(\bar{a}) = L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}'),
\]

where \( \bar{a}|\mathcal{R}' = (a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{R}'} \). Thus, for all \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \),

\[
J_{a,d} = \{ \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r-\ell} : L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}') \neq \emptyset \}.
\]

Since \( \mathcal{Q}' = Q_{q'} \cup \mathcal{R}' \) has rank at least \( \omega(\ell' + r + 1) \), Corollary \ref{cor:rank} implies that for all \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \),

\[
|J_{a,d}| = |\{ \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r-\ell} : L'(\bar{d}\bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}') \neq \emptyset \}| = p^{\ell' - \ell}.
\]

Because \( (\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q'} \cup \{M_{q+1}\}) \) has rank at least \( \omega(\ell' + r + 1) \), Corollary \ref{cor:rank} implies that for all \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \), \( \bar{b} \in J_{a,d} \), and \( u \in \mathbb{F}_p \),

\[
(1 + \mu)p^{n-\ell'-r'-1} = |L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}') \cap \{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^TM_{q+1}x = u \}|
\]

\[
= \frac{1 + \mu}{p}|L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}')|.
\]

Consequently, by definition of \( \mathcal{A} \), the following holds, for any \( \bar{b} \in J_{a,d} \) (to see this, take the above with \( u = 1 \) and \( u = 2 \)).

\[
\min \left\{ \frac{|A \cap L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}')|}{|L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}')|}, \frac{|A \cap L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}')|}{|L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}')|} \right\} \geq \frac{(1 - \mu)^2}{p}.
\]

Note that for all \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \), \( L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) = \bigcup_{\bar{b} \in J_{a,d}} L'(\bar{d}, \bar{b}) \cap Q_{q'}(0) \cap R'(\bar{a}|\mathcal{R}') \). Consequently, if \( \bar{a} \in J_{d} \), then

\[
\min \left\{ \frac{|A \cap L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a})|}{|L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a})|}, \frac{|A \cap L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a})|}{|L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a})|} \right\} \geq \frac{(1 - \mu)^2 |J_{a,d}| p^{n-\ell'-r'}}{p|L(\bar{d}) \cap R(\bar{a})|} \geq (1 - \mu)^3 |J_{a,d}| p^{\ell'-\ell+r'-1},
\]

where both inequalities use Corollary \ref{cor:rank}. By \ref{cor:rank}, our choice of \( \mu \ll 1/p \), and the fact that \( r' \leq r \), the final expression is bounded below by \( 1/2p \).
Therefore, we have only left to show that $J_{\bar{d}} \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, observe that $|L(\bar{d}) \cap Q'_{q'}(0)| = (1 \pm \mu)p^{n-\ell-q'}$, and

$$L(\bar{d}) \cap Q'_{q'}(0) = \bigcup_{\bar{a} \in J_{\bar{d}}} L(\bar{d}) \cap Q'_{q'}(0) \cap R(\bar{a}).$$

Thus $L(\bar{d}) \cap Q'_{q'}(0) \neq \emptyset$ implies $J_{\bar{d}} \neq \emptyset$. □

Proof of Proposition 1.31. Suppose $\mathcal{P}'$ is an epGP containing $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$, Let $\omega$ be as in Proposition 3.19. Fix any $D, N \geq 1$. By assumption $\mathcal{P}'$ contains a QGS-example, $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, of dimension $n \geq N$. By Proposition 3.19 for every quadratic factor $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ with $\ell + q \leq D$ and with rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$, we have that for every $L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ there is $Q \in Q$ so that $L \cap Q$ is not $1/p$-atomic with respect to $A$. This shows $\mathcal{P}'$ is not almost quadratically atomic with linear error. Consequently, $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$ is not almost quadratically atomic with linear error. □

Proof of Proposition 1.26. It is straightforward to see from the definitions, that if $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$ were almost linearly atomic, then it would be almost quadratically atomic with linear error. Thus by Proposition 1.31, $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$ is not almost linearly atomic.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$ is almost quadratically atomic. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and a rank function $\omega$. Choose $D$ sufficiently large so that $|p^{-D}| < \epsilon$. Suppose $n \geq 2D$ and $A = A_{\text{QGS}}(p,n) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Then $Q_D = \{M_1, \ldots, M_D\}$ has complexity $D$ and rank $n$, and for all $B \in \text{At}(Q_D) \setminus \{Q_D(0)\}$, the density of $A$ is either 0 or 1. By assumption on $D$, $1 \leq \epsilon p^n$, so $Q_D$ is $\epsilon$-almost 0-atomic with respect to $A$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}_\text{QGS}(p)$ is almost quadratically atomic. □

4. NIP$_2$-Properties are Almost Quadratically Atomic

In this section we prove our results about sets of bounded VC$_2$-dimension and NIP$_2$ elementary $p$-group properties. The main result is Theorem 1.18, which says that sets of bounded VC$_2$-dimension in elementary $p$-groups can be approximated by unions of quadratic atoms.

The first ingredient will be Proposition 4.10, which says that a quasirandom triple in a 3-uniform hypergraph with bounded VC$_2$-dimension must have density near 0 or near 1. This is a straightforward application of the counting lemma for 3-uniform hypergraphs, and is an analogue of Proposition 1 in [73]. This will appear in Section 4.1, which also contains preliminaries about quasirandom graphs.

Section 4.2 establishes basic facts about binary and ternary sum graphs defined on pairs and triples of quadratic atoms. We will then show in Section 4.3 how to translate the quadratic regularity lemma into a hypergraph regularity lemma for ternary sum graphs, where the partitions are defined by quadratic atoms and bilinear forms. This is analogous to a result from [35] which shows that in elementary $p$-groups, one can translate the linear regularity lemma into a regular partition of the binary sum graph, where the parts are all cosets of a single subgroup. We will also prove results in Section 4.3 which connect the
results here with our work in the hypergraph setting \cite{76}. In Section \ref{4.4} we will prove our main results about NIP\textsubscript{2} properties.

4.1. Notions of quasirandomness for graphs and hypergraphs. This subsection contains preliminaries about notions of quasirandomness in graphs and hypergraphs along with the statement of Proposition \ref{4.10}. Throughout we will say that an \(r\)-uniform hypergraphs \(G = (V, E)\) is \(k\)-partite if there is a partition \(V = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_k\) such that for all \(e \in E\), and \(i \in [k]\), \(|e \cap V_i| \leq 1\). When \(k = 2\), we say \(G\) is bipartite, and we will write \(G = (V_1 \cup V_2, E)\) to denote that \(V_1, V_2\) are the parts of \(G\). Similarly, when \(k = 3\), we say \(G\) is tripartite, and write \(G = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3, E)\) to denote that \(V_1, V_2, V_3\) are the parts of \(G\). Given a graph or hypergraph \(G\), we let \(E(G)\) denotes the edge set of \(G\), and \(V(G)\) denote its vertex set. When \(G = (U \cup W, E)\) is a bipartite graph, the density of \(G\) is \(|E(G)|/|U||W|\).

Definition 4.1 (\(\gamma\)-quasirandom functions and graphs). A function \(f : X \times Y \to [-1, 1]\) is said to be \(\gamma\)-quasirandom if

\[
\sum_{x,x' \in X} \sum_{y,y' \in Y} f(x, y)f(x, y')f(x', y)f(x', y') \leq \gamma |X|^2|Y|^2.
\]

Suppose \(G\) is a bipartite graph on \(X \cup Y\), with density \(\delta\). Then \(G\) is said to be \(\gamma\)-quasirandom if the function \(f : X \times Y \to [-1, 1]\) defined by \(f(x, y) = 1_{G}(x, y) - \delta\) is \(\gamma\)-quasirandom.

We next define quasirandomness of a ternary hypergraph, relative to an underlying graph. We will use the following notation. Given a sets \(V_1, V_2 \subseteq V\), \(K_2[V_1, V_2] = \{xy : x \in V_1, y \in V_2\}\). If \(G = (V, E)\) is a graph, we define

\[E[V_1, V_2] = E \cap K_2[V_1, V_2]\]

and \(G[V_1, V_2] := (V_1 \cup V_2, E[V_1, V_2])\).

We will also use the following notation for 3-uniform hypergraphs whose edges sit atop triangles from an underlying graph.

Definition 4.2. Let \(G = (V, E)\) be a graph. Define

\[K_3^{(2)}(G) = \left\{xyz \in \binom{V}{3} : xy, yz, xz \in E\right\}.
\]

Let \(H = (V, E')\) be a 3-uniform hypergraph on the same vertex set as \(G\). We say \(G\) underlies \(H\) if \(E' \subseteq K_3^{(2)}(G)\).

In other words, \(K_3^{(2)}(G)\) is the set of triples from \(V(G)\) which form a triangle in \(G\), and \(G\) underlies \(H\) if every edge in \(H\) sits atop a triangle from \(G\).

Definition 4.3 (\(\eta\)-quasirandom hypergraph relative to a graph). Let \(G\) be a tripartite graph on \(X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3\), with \(G[X_1, X_2]\), \(G[X_2, X_3]\), \(G[X_1, X_3]\) of densities \(\delta_{12}, \delta_{23}, \delta_{13}\), respectively. Let \(f : X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 \to [-1, 1]\) be a function supported on \(K_3^{(2)}(G)\). Then \(f\)
is said to be $\eta$-quasirandom relative to $G$ if
\[
\text{oct}(f) := \sum_{x,x' \in X} \sum_{y,y' \in Y} \sum_{z,z' \in Z} \left( f(x, y, z) f(x, y', z) f(x', y, z) f(x', y', z') \cdot f(x, y, z) f(x, y', z') f(x', y, z') f(x', y', z') \right)
\]
\[
\leq \eta \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \delta_{ij}^4 \prod_{i=1}^3 |X_i|^2.
\]
Let $H$ be a tripartite 3-uniform hypergraph on $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$, and suppose that $E(H) \subseteq K_3^{(2)}(G)$ with $|E(H)| = \gamma |K_3^{(2)}(G)|$. Then $H$ is said to be $\eta$-quasirandom relative to $G$ if the function $f : X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3 \to [-1, 1]$ is $\eta$-quasirandom, where $f(x, y, z) = 1_H(x, y, z) - \gamma$ for $(x, y, z) \in K_3^{(2)}(G)$, and $f(x, y, z) = 0$ if $(x, y, z) \notin K_3^{(2)}(G)$.

It will be convenient to have some compact notation for these quasirandomness notions, which is the motivation for Definitions 4.4 and 4.5 below. This particular notation comes from [56], but has older roots (see e.g. [17]).

**Definition 4.4** (dev$_2$). Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $G = (U \cup V, E)$ be a bipartite graph. Then $G$ has dev$_2(\epsilon)$ if the following holds for $d_2 = |E|/|U||V|$.
\[
\sum_{u_0, u_1 \in U} \sum_{v_0, v_1 \in V} \prod_{i \in \{0, 1\}} \prod_{j \in \{0, 1\}} g(u_i, v_j) \leq \epsilon |U|^2 |V|^2,
\]
where $g(u, v) = 1 - d_2$ if $uv \in E$ and $g(u, v) = -d_2$ if $uv \notin E$.

We say $G$ has dev$_2(\epsilon, d)$ if it has dev$_2(\epsilon)$ and $|E|/|U||V| \in (d - \epsilon, d + \epsilon)$.

Note that by definition, a graph $G = (X \cup Y, E)$ is $\gamma$-quasirandom if and only if it has dev$_2(\gamma)$. We now define the ternary version of the dev notation, which is useful for dealing with quasirandom 3-uniform hypergraphs, relative to an underlying graph.

**Definition 4.5** (dev$_2(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$). Let $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$, and let $H = (V, R)$ be a 3-uniform hypergraph. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a 3-partite graph underlying $H$ with vertex partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$. Let $d_3$ be such that $|R| = d_3 |K_3^{(2)}(G)|$. We say that $(H, G)$ has dev$_2(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ if there is $d_2 \in (0, 1]$ such that for each $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, the graph $G[V_i, V_j]$ has dev$_2(\epsilon_2, d_2)$, and
\[
\sum_{u_0, u_1 \in V_1} \sum_{v_0, v_1 \in V_2} \sum_{w_0, w_1 \in V_3} \prod_{i,j,k \in \{0, 1\}} h_{H,G}(u_i, v_j, w_k) \leq \epsilon_1 d_2^2 |V_1|^2 |V_2|^2 |V_3|^2,
\]
where
\[
h_{H,G}(u, v, w) = \begin{cases} 1 - d_3 & \text{if } uvw \in R \\ -d_3 & \text{if } uvw \in K_3^{(2)}(G) \setminus R \\ 0 & \text{if } uvw \notin K_3^{(2)}(G). \end{cases}
\]

The dev notation is a convenient way to talk about quasirandomness of a hypergraph and an underlying graph at the same time. In particular, suppose that $G = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3, E)$
is a 3-partite graph and \( H = (V_1 ∪ V_2 ∪ V_3, R) \) is a 3-partite 3-uniform hypergraph underlied by \( G \). Then it is straightforward to check that if \((H, G)\) has dev\(_{3,3}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)\), then \( G \) is \( \epsilon_2 \)-quasirandom and \( H \) is \( \epsilon_1(1 + \epsilon_2)^{12} \)-quasirandom relative to \( G \). On the other hand, if \( H \) is \( \epsilon_1 \)-quasirandom relative to \( G \), and there is some \( d_2 > 0 \) such that for each \( ij \in \binom{[3]}{2} \), \( G[V_i, V_j] \) is \( \epsilon_2 \)-quasirandom with density in \((d_2 - \epsilon_2, d_2 + \epsilon_2)\), then \((H, G)\) has dev\(_3(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)\).

We now state two counting lemmas, one for graphs and one for 3-graphs.

**Lemma 4.6** (Graph counting lemma). For all \( t \geq 1 \) and \( \epsilon, \gamma > 0 \), there is \( \mu = \mu(k, \epsilon, r) > 0 \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( G = (U, E) \) is a graph, \( U = \bigcup_{i=1}^t U_i \) is a partition, and for each \( 1 \leq i < j \leq t \), \( G[U_i, U_j] \) has dev\(_2(\mu, r)\). Then the number of \((u_i)_{i \in [t]} \in \prod_{i \in [t]} U_i\) such that \( u_i u_j \in E \) for each \( ij \in \binom{[t]}{2} \) is \((1 + \epsilon)r^{(t)} \prod_{i \in [t]} |U_i|\).

Lemma 4.6 follows from Theorem 3.5 in [29] (for a proof, see Corollary 2.6 and Proposition 2.3 in [76]). We now state a version of the counting lemma for 3-graphs, first proved by Gowers (see Corollary 5.3 in [30] for the original, and Theorem 1.1 in [50] for the exact statement).

To ease notation, if \( G = (V, E) \) is a graph and \( V_1, V_2, V_3 \subseteq V \), we let \( G[V_1, V_2, V_3] = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3, E \cap (K_2[V_1, V_2] \cup K_2[V_1, V_3] \cup K_2[V_2, V_3])) \).

**Theorem 4.7** (Counting lemma for 3-graphs). For all \( t \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \xi, d_3 > 0 \), there exists \( \delta_3 > 0 \) such that for every \( d_2 > 0 \), there exists \( \delta_2 > 0 \) and \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that the following holds.

Let \( G = (V, E) \) be a \( t \)-partite graph, with vertex partition \( V = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_t \), so that for each \( 1 \leq i \leq t \), \( |V_i| = n \), and so that for each \( ij \in \binom{[t]}{2} \), \( G[V_i, V_j] \) has dev\(_2(\delta_2; d_2)\). Let \( H = (V, R) \) be a 3-uniform hypergraph underlied by \( G \), and for each \( ijk \in \binom{[t]}{3} \), set \( G^{ijk} = G[V_i, V_j, V_k] \), \( H^{ijk} = (V_i \cup V_j \cup V_k; K_3^{(2)}(G^{ijk}) \cap R) \), let \( d_{ijk} \) be such that \( |E(H^{ijk})| = d_{ijk}|K_3^{(2)}(G^{ijk})| \).

Suppose that for each \( ijk \in \binom{[t]}{3} \), \( d_{ijk} \geq d_3 \), and \((H^{ijk}, G^{ijk})\) satisfies dev\(_3(\delta_3, \delta_2)\). Then the number of \((v_i)_{i \in [t]} \in \prod_{i \in [t]} V_i\) with \( v_i v_j v_k \in E(H^{ijk}) \) for each \( ijk \in \binom{[t]}{3} \), is \((1 + \xi)d_2^{(t)} \) \( d^{nt} \), where \( d = \prod_{ijk \in \binom{[t]}{3}} d_{ijk} \).

For the application of this theorem in Section 5, we will be mainly interested in certain 3-partite 3-uniform hypergraphs, specifically the ones used to define \( k \)-IP\(_2\) and \( k \)-FOP\(_2\). For those results, it will be convenient to have an induced version of Theorem 4.7 tailored to certain 3-partite configurations.

**Lemma 4.8** (3-partite 3-graph induced counting lemma). For all \( \xi, d_3 > 0 \) and \( t \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists \( \delta_3 = \delta_3(\xi, d_3, t) > 0 \) such that for every \( d_2 > 0 \), there exists \( \delta_2 > 0 \) and \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that the following holds.

Let \( F = (U \cup W \cup Z, R_F) \) be a 3-partite 3-graph with \( U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{t_1}\} \), \( W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{t_2}\} \), and \( Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{t_3}\} \) for some \( t_1 + t_2 + t_3 = t \). Suppose \( H = (A \cup B \cup C, R) \) is a 3-partite 3-graph, and assume \( G = (V, E) \) is a \( t \)-partite graph on \( n \) vertices, with vertex partition \( V = A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_{t_1} \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{t_2} \cup C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_{t_3} \), where each \( A_i \subseteq A \), each \( B_j \subseteq B \), each \( C_k \subseteq C \), where each part has size \( \frac{n}{3t}(1 + \delta_2) \). For each \((i, j, s) \in [t_1] \times [t_2] \times [t_3] \), set \( G^{ijs} = G[A_i, B_j, C_s] \), \( H^{ijs} = (A_i \cup B_j \cup C_s; K_3^{(2)}(G^{ijs}) \cap R) \),
and let $d_{ijs}$ be such that $|E(H^{ijs})| = d_{ijs}|K_3^{(ijs)}(G^{ijs})|$. Assume that for each $(i,j,s) \in [t_1] \times [t_2] \times [t_3]$, each of $G[A_i, B_j], G[A_i, C_s]$, and $G[B_j, C_s]$ have $\text{dev}_2(\delta_2; d_2)$, $(H^{ijs}, G^{ijs})$ satisfies $\text{dev}_{2,3}(\delta_3, \delta_2)$, and

$$
\begin{cases}
    d_{ijs} \geq d_i & \text{if } u_i v_j z_s \in R_F, \\
    d_{ijs} \leq (1 - d_3) & \text{if } u_i v_j z_s \notin R_F.
\end{cases}
$$

Then the number of tuples $\tilde{abc} \in \prod_{i=1}^{t_1} A_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{t_2} B_j \times \prod_{s=1}^{t_3} C_i$ such that $a_i b_j c_s \in E(H)$ if and only if $u_i w_j z_s \in R_F$ is

$$d(1 + \xi) \prod_{i=1}^{t_1} |A_i| \prod_{j=1}^{t_2} |B_j| \prod_{s=1}^{t_3} |C_i|,
$$

where $d = (\prod_{u_i v_j w_s \in R_F} d_{ijs})(\prod_{u_i v_j w_s \in R_F} (1 - d_{ijs}))$.

Lemma 4.8 follows easily from Theorem 4.7. For a proof, see Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 2.11 in [76]. The main corollary of Theorem 4.7 that we need for this section is Proposition 4.10 below, which tells us that quasirandom hypergraphs of uniformly bounded VC2-dimension have density close to 0 or 1. We recall the definition of the VC2-dimension of a 3-graph.

**Definition 4.9.** Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-graph. We say that the VC2-dimension of $H$ is at least $k$ if there exist $\{a_i, b_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq V$ and $\{c_s : S \subseteq [k]^2\} \subseteq V$ so that $a_i b_j c_s \in E$ if and only if $(i, j) \in S$.

The VC2-dimension of $H$ is $\text{VC}_2(H) := \max\{k : H \text{ has VC2-dimension at least } k\}$.

**Proposition 4.10.** (Regular triples in a hypergraph of bounded VC2-dimension have trivial density) For all $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists a $\delta_3 > 0$ such that for every $d_2 > 0$, there is $\delta_2 > 0$ and $m_0 \geq 1$ such that the following holds. Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a 3-partite graph with vertex partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$, and $H = (V, R)$ is a 3-uniform hypergraph with $\text{VC}_2(H) < k$. Assume $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ is a partition with $\min\{|V_1|, |V_2|, |V_3|\} \geq m_0$, and $|V_i - |V_j|| \leq \delta_3 |V_i|$ for each $ij \in \binom{[3]}{2}$, and assume that for each $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, $G[V_i, V_j]$ has $\text{dev}_2(\delta_2; d_2)$. Let $H' = (V, R \cap K_3^{(2)}(G))$ and suppose $(H', G)$ has $\text{dev}_{2,3}(\delta_2, \delta_3)$. Then

$$\frac{|R \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|}{|K_3^{(2)}(G)|} \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1].$$

For a proof of Proposition 4.10, we refer the reader to Propositions 3.2 and 2.11 in [76].

### 4.2. Quasirandomness for pairs and triads of atoms

This subsection lays out some notation and results about graphs and hypergraphs arising from pairs and triples of quadratic atoms. We begin by recalling a few crucial facts from the linear setting. Lemma 4.11 below says that given $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and a subspace $H \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, the density of the binary sum graph $E_A^{(2)}$ on a pair of cosets $(H + g_1, H + g_2)$ is equal to density of $A$ on the sum of the two cosets, $H + g_1 + g_2$. Further, if the coset $H + g_1 + g_2$ is uniform with respect to $A$, then
$E^{(2)}_A$ behaves like a quasirandom graph on the pair $(H+g_1, H+g_2)$. We will use these facts directly in Section 5.4, and also prove quadratic analogues later on in this subsection.

**Definition 4.12.** Suppose $Q = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. Given $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^q$, let

$$\beta_Q(\bar{b}) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n}: \text{for each } i \in [q], x^T M_i x = b_i\}.$$ 

**Lemma 4.13.** For any $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to [0, 1]$, there is a rank function $\rho$ such that the following holds. Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$. Suppose $B_1, B_2 \in \text{At}(B)$ and $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_q^q$. Then $(B_1 \cup B_2, \beta_Q(\bar{a}) \cap K_2[B_1, B_2])$ has $\text{dev}_2(\epsilon_2(p^{\ell+q}), p^{-q})$.

The proof of Lemma 4.13 appears in Appendix D. As an application, we can now give a proof of Example 2.3 which says that the zero-atom of a quadratic factor defined by a single high rank matrix has large VC-dimension.

**Proof of Example 2.3.** Fix $\ell \geq 1$ and let $N_1$, and $\mu$ be as in Lemma 4.11 for $\epsilon = 1/2$, $t = \ell + 2^\ell$, and $r = p^{-1}$. Let $\rho_1 = \rho_1(1/p)$ as in Corollary 3.11, and let $\rho_2 = \rho_2(\mu/2)$ be as in Lemma 4.13. Then define $\rho := \max\{\rho_2(1), \rho_1(1)\}$. Choose $N_2$ sufficiently large so that $(2p)^{-\ell/2} N_2 > 0$, and let $N = \max\{2pN_1, 2pN_2\}$.

Suppose $n \geq N$, and $M$ is a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of rank at least $\rho$, and $A := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M x = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$.

Given $u \in \mathbb{F}_p$, set $M(u) = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M x = u\}$ and $\beta_u = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2n} : x^T M y = u\}$. Observe that for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$, if $xy \in K_2[M(a), M(b)] \cap \beta_c$, then $x + y \in M(a + 2c + b)$. Indeed, for any such $xy$,

$$(x + y)^T M (x + y) = x^T M x + 2x^T M y + y^T M y = a + 2c + b.$$

This implies that $K_2[M(0), M(0)] \cap \beta_0 \subseteq E^{(2)}_A$ and $K_2[M(0), M(0)] \cap \beta_1 \cap E^{(2)}_A = \emptyset.$
We define a bipartite graph $G$ as follows. For each $i \in [\ell]$ and $S \subseteq [\ell]$, set $W_i = U_S = M(0)$. Then set $U = \bigcup_{S \subseteq [\ell]} U_S$, $W = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} W_i$. For each $S \subseteq [\ell]$ and $i \in [\ell]$, let

$$F_{S,i} = \begin{cases} \beta_0 \cap K_2[U_S, W_i] & \text{if } i \in S \text{ and} \\ \beta_1 \cap K_2[U_S, W_i] & \text{if } i \notin S. \end{cases}$$

For each $S \neq S' \subseteq [\ell]$, and $i \neq i' \in [\ell]$, set $F_{S,S',i} = \beta_0 \cap K_2[U_S, U_{S'}]$ and $F_{i,i'} = \beta_0 \cap K_2[W_i, W_i']$. Define $G$ to be the graph with vertex set $V = U \cup W$ and edge set

$$F = \bigcup_{i \in [\ell], S \subseteq [\ell]} F_{i,i} \cup \bigcup_{S \neq S' \subseteq [\ell]} F_{S,S',i} \cup \bigcup_{i \neq i' \in [\ell]} F_{i,i'}.$$

Note that for all $i, i' \in [\ell]$ and $S, S' \subseteq [\ell]$, Lemma 4.13 implies $G[U_S, W_i], G[U_S, U_{S'}]$, and $G[W_i, W_i']$ have $\text{dev}_2(\mu/2, p^{-1})$.

By Lemma 4.6 and because $N$ is large, there exists a tuple $(u_S)_{S \subseteq [\ell]}(w_i)_{i \in [\ell]} \in \prod_{S \subseteq [\ell]} U_S \times \prod_{i \in [\ell]} W_i$, such that $v_S w_i \in F$ for all $S \subseteq [\ell]$ and $i \in [\ell]$. By definition, if $i \in S$, then $G[U_S, W_i] \subseteq E_A^{(2)}$ and if $i \notin S$, then $G[U_S, W_i] \cap E_A^{(2)} = \emptyset$. Consequently, we have that $u_S + w_i \in A$ if and only if $i \in S$. Thus the VC-dimension of $A$ is at least $\ell$. $\square$

We will also work with tripartite graphs similar to the bipartite graph appearing in Lemma 4.13. In particular, given a quadratic factor $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, these tripartite graphs will have the form

$$G = (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3, (\beta_Q(\bar{a}_{12}) \cap K_2[B_1, B_2]) \cup (\beta_Q(\bar{a}_{13}) \cap K_2[B_1, B_2]) \cup (\beta_Q(\bar{a}_{23}) \cap K_2[B_2, B_3]),$$

for some $B_1, B_2, B_3 \in \text{At}(B)$ and some $\bar{a}_{12}, \bar{a}_{13}, \bar{a}_{23} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, the behavior of $E_A^{(3)}$ relative to $G$ will be related to the behavior of $A$ on the $B$-atom containing the sums of all triples from $K_2^{(3)}(G)$. Clearly we will need some more compact notation for these tripartite graphs, as well as a way of tracking which atom contains all the corresponding sums. This is the purpose of the next definition.

**Definition 4.14.** Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$.

(i) Given $\bar{e} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{b}_2, \bar{a}_{12}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2\ell+3q}$, set

$$\Sigma_Q(\bar{e}) = \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2 + \bar{a}_{12}, \quad \Sigma_\mathcal{L}(\bar{e}) = \bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\bar{e}) = \Sigma_\mathcal{L}(\bar{e})\Sigma_Q(\bar{e}).$$

The bipartite graph corresponding to $\bar{e}$ is

$$\Delta^{(2)}(\bar{e}) := (B(\bar{a}_1; \bar{b}_1) \cup B(\bar{a}_2; \bar{b}_2), \beta)$$

where $\beta = \beta_Q(\bar{a}_{12}) \cap K_2[B(\bar{a}_1; \bar{b}_1), B(\bar{a}_2; \bar{b}_2)]$. Note that if $(x, y) \in \Delta^{(2)}(\bar{e})$, then $x + y \in B(\Sigma(\bar{e})).$

(ii) Given $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{a}_2 \bar{b}_2, \bar{a}_3 \bar{b}_3, \bar{a}_{12} \bar{b}_{12}, \bar{a}_{13} \bar{b}_{13}, \bar{a}_{23} \bar{b}_{23}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$, set

$$\Sigma_Q(\bar{d}) = \bar{b}_1 + \bar{b}_2 + \bar{b}_3 + 2\bar{b}_{12} + 2\bar{b}_{13} + 2\bar{b}_{23},$$
$$\Sigma_\mathcal{L}(\bar{d}) = \bar{a}_1 + \bar{a}_2 + \bar{a}_3, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\Sigma(\bar{d}) = \Sigma_\mathcal{L}(\bar{d})\Sigma_Q(\bar{d}).$$
Then the triad corresponding to $\bar{d}$ is the 3-partite graph

$$\Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d}) := (B(\bar{a}_1; \bar{b}_1) \cup B(\bar{a}_2; \bar{b}_2) \cup B(\bar{a}_3; \bar{b}_3), \beta_{12} \cup \beta_{13} \cup \beta_{23}),$$

where for each $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{ij}) \cap K_3[B(\bar{a}_i; \bar{b}_i) \cup B(\bar{a}_j; \bar{b}_j)]$. Note that if $(x, y, z) \in \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$, then $x + y + z$ is in $B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))$.

We next show that when a factor $B$ is high rank, the relative density of $E^{(2)}_A$ on the bipartite graph $\Delta^{(2)}(\bar{e})$ is approximately the density of the set $A$ on $B(\Sigma(\bar{e}))$. Similarly, the relative density of $E^{(3)}_A$ on the triad $\Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$ is approximately the density of $A$ on $B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))$. This can be seen as an analogue of part (i) of Lemma 4.11.

**Lemma 4.15.** For all functions $\tau : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there exists a rank function $\rho$ such that the following holds. Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$.

(i) Suppose $\bar{e} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{2\ell+3q}$, $G = \Delta^{(2)}(\bar{e})$, and $d = \frac{|E^{(2)}_A \cap E(G)|}{|E(G)|}$. Then

$$|d - \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}))|}{|B(\Sigma(\bar{e}))|}| < p^{-\tau(\ell+q)}.$$

(ii) Suppose that $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3, \bar{b}_1) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$, $G = \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$, and $d = \frac{|E^{(3)}_A \cap K_3^2(G)|}{|K_3^2(G)|}$. Then

$$|d - \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))|}{|B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))|}| < p^{-\tau(\ell+q)}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.15 appears in Appendix 4. We now turn towards a higher order analogue of part (ii) of Lemma 4.11. For this we will require the following definition of the balanced function of a set, relative to a triad as in Definition 4.14(ii).

**Definition 4.16.** Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3, \bar{b}_3) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$. Given a function $g : \mathbb{F}_p^3 \to [-1, 1]$, define

$$g_d(x, y, z) = g(x + y + z)1_{B(\bar{a}_1)}(x)1_{B(\bar{a}_2)}(y)1_{B(\bar{a}_3)}(z)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{12})}(x, y)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{13})}(x, z)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{23})}(y, z).$$

Note $g_d(x, y, z) = 0$ for all $(x, y, z) \notin \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$.

Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, let $f_d^A : G^3 \to [-1, 1]$ be the function where $f_d^A(x, y, z)$ defined by

$$(1_A(x + y + z) - \alpha_{\Sigma(\bar{d})})1_{B(\bar{a}_1)}(x)1_{B(\bar{a}_2)}(y)1_{B(\bar{a}_3)}(z)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{12})}(x, y)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{13})}(x, z)1_{\beta_{Q}(\bar{b}_{23})}(y, z),$$

where $\alpha_{B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))}$ is the density of $A$ on $B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))$.

Note that $f_d^A = g_d$ for $g(x) = 1_A(x) - \alpha_{\Sigma(\bar{d})}$. This function is also dependent on the factor $B$, so should rightly be denoted by $f_d^A_{\bar{d}B}$. However, when we use this notation, the factor in question will always be unambiguous. We can now give a useful criterion for when $E^{(3)}_A$ corresponds to a quasirandom hypergraph when restricted to a triad $\Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$. This can be seen as an analogue of part (ii) of Lemma 4.11.
Lemma 4.17. For all $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to (0, 1]$, there is a rank function $\rho$, such that the following holds. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$. Suppose that $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_{12}, \bar{b}_{13}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$, $G = \Delta(\bar{d})$, and $H = (B(\bar{a}_1) \cup B(\bar{a}_2) \cup B(\bar{a}_3), E_F^{(3)} \cap K_3^{(2)}(G))$. Then the following hold.

(i) If $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < \epsilon_1 p^{-12q} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$, then $(H, G)$ has $\text{dev}_2(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))$. 

(ii) If $(H, G)$ has $\text{dev}_2,3(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))$, then $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < \epsilon_1 p^{-12q} (1 + \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))^{12} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$.

Proof. Fix $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to (0, 1]$. Let $\rho_1$ be as in Lemma 4.13 for $\tau(x) = \epsilon_2(p^{-x})$, and let $\rho_2 = \rho_2(\epsilon_1^2)$ be as in Corollary 3.14. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$, and $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_{12}, \bar{b}_{13}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$.

By our choice of $\rho$, for each $ij \in \binom{[3]}{2}$, $G^{ij} := \Delta(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j\bar{b}_{ij})$ has $\text{dev}_2(\epsilon_2(p^{-q}), p^{-q})$, and by definition, this means $G^{ij}$ is also $\epsilon_2(p^{-q})$-quasirandom. Therefore, by definition, if $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < \epsilon_1 p^{-12q} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$, then $(H, G)$ has $\text{dev}_2(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))$ by definition. On the other hand, if $(H, G)$ has $\text{dev}_2(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))$, then there is some $d_2 = p^{-q} \pm \epsilon_2(p^{-q})$ such that $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < \epsilon_1 d_2^{12} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$. Consequently,

$\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < \epsilon_1 p^{-12q} (1 + \epsilon_2(p^{-q}))^{12} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$, which concludes the proof.

4.3. Translating the quadratic regularity lemma. In this section we show how to translate the quadratic arithmetic regularity lemma, applied to the balanced function of a set $A$, into a hypergraph regularity lemma for the ternary sum graph. This translation will allow us to later apply Proposition 4.10 in the group setting, to prove the main results of the section.

We begin with a lemma which shows that functions of small $\ell_2$-norm are quasirandom on most triads arising from a high rank factor. This will be used to deal with the “small $\ell_2$-norm” part of the decomposition given by the quadratic arithmetic regularity lemma.

Lemma 4.18. For all $\epsilon > 0$ there is a rank function $\rho$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq 1$ and $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to [-1, 1]$ satisfies $\|f\|_2 < \epsilon$. Assume $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$. Then there is a set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$ such that $|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) p^{3\ell+6q}$ and such that for every $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_{12}, \bar{b}_{13}, \bar{b}_{23}) \in \Gamma$, $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}) < 3\epsilon^{1/4} p^{-12q} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$.

The proof of Lemma 4.18 requires the following fact about the distribution of $K_{2,2,2}$s in a tripartite graph whose parts are quasirandom.

Lemma 4.19. For all $r, \mu > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose $G = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3, E)$ is a 3-partite graph such that for each $ij \in \binom{[3]}{2}$, $\|V_i| - |V_j|| \leq \delta |V_i|$
and \( G[V_i, V_j] \) has dev \(_2(\delta, r)\). Given \( u_0v_0w_0 \in K^3_3(G) \), define

\[ K_{2,2,2}[u_0, v_0, w_0] = \{ u_1v_1w_1 \in K_3[V_1, V_2, V_3] : \text{for each } \epsilon \in \{0, 1\}^3, (u_{\epsilon_1}, v_{\epsilon_2}, w_{\epsilon_3}) \in K^3_3(G) \}. \]

Then if \( J := \{uvw \in K^3_3(G) : |K_{2,2,2}[u_0, v_0, w_0]| \leq (1 + \mu)r^n|V_1||V_2||V_3| \}, \) we have that

\[ |J| \geq (1 - \mu)r^3|V_1||V_2||V_3|. \]

Informally, Lemma \(4.19\) says that in a 3-partite graph where each pair of parts is quasirandom, every triangle is in about the expected number of \( K_{2,2,2} \)-8. The proof of this is completely standard, and is included in Appendix \(\Box\) for completeness.

**Proof of Lemma \(4.18\)** Fix \( 0 < \epsilon < 1/4 \) and let \( \mu = \epsilon^4 \). Given \( q \) and \( \alpha > 0 \), let \( g(q, \alpha) \) be the \( \epsilon = \epsilon(p^{-q}, \alpha) \) from Lemma \(4.19\). Let \( \rho_1 = \rho_1(\mu^2) \) from Corollary \(3.14\) and let \( \rho_2 = \rho_2(\mu) \) be from Lemma \(4.13\) and set \( \rho = \max\{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \).

Suppose \( n \geq 1, f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow [-1, 1], B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) with complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \rho(\ell + q) \), and assume \( ||f||_2 < \epsilon \). We begin by defining a partition of \( G^3 \) according to the triads from Definition \(4.14\). Given \( d = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_3) \in \mathbb{F}^{3\ell+6q}_p \), define

\[ E_d := \{ (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in K_3[B(\bar{a}_1), B(\bar{a}_2), B(\bar{a}_3)] : \text{for each } ij \in \left( \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \end{array} \right), x_i x_j \in \beta_\mathcal{Q}(\bar{b}_ij) \}. \]

In other words, \( E_d = K^3_3(\Delta(3)(d)) \). For any such \( d \), Lemma \(4.13\) implies that for each \( ij \in \left( \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \end{array} \right) \), \( \Delta(3)(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j\bar{b}_{ij}) \) has dev \(_2(p^{-q})\). Consequently, by Lemma \(4.6\) and Corollary \(3.14\)

\[ |E_d| = (1 + \mu^2)^4 p^{3n-3\ell-6q}. \]

Observe that for every \((u, v, w) \in G^3\), there is a unique \( d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}\) such that \((u, v, w) \in E_d\). Therefore, \( \mathcal{P} = \{ E_d : d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}\} \) is a partition of \( G^3 \), whose parts have roughly equal size. We will shortly define \( \Gamma \) to be the set of \( d \) where almost all triples in \((u, v, w) \in E_d\) satisfy \( |f(u + v + w)|^2 < \epsilon^{1/4} \). Since \( ||f||_2 < \epsilon \), one should expect most \( d \) to be in \( \Gamma \).

To this end, for each \( d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}\), define

\[ I_d = \{ (u, v, w) \in E_d : |f(u + v + w)|^2 < \epsilon^{1/4} \}, \]

and set \( \Gamma := \{ d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q} : |I_d| > (1 - \epsilon^{1/4})|E_d| \}. \) We now show \( |\Gamma| > (1 - \epsilon^{1/2})p^{3\ell+6q}. \)

By assumption, \( \sum_{x \in G} |f(x)|^2 \leq \epsilon|G| \), and consequently \( \sum_{u, v, w \in G} |f(u + v + w)|^2 \leq \epsilon|G|^3 \). Combining these observations with the definition of \( I_d \) yields the following.

\[ \sum_{d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}} \epsilon^{1/4}|E_d \setminus I_d| \leq \sum_{d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}} \sum_{(u, v, w) \in E_d} |f(u + v + w)|^2 = \sum_{(u, v, w) \in G^3} |f(u + v + w)|^2 \leq \epsilon|G|^3. \]

By definition of \( \Gamma \), for all \( d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q} \setminus \Gamma \),

\[ \epsilon^{1/4}(1 - \mu^2)^4 p^{3n-3\ell-6q} \leq \epsilon^{1/4}|E_d| \leq |E_d \setminus I_d|, \]
where the first inequality is by our size estimate for $E_d$. Combining the last two displayed equations yields that

$$|\mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6g} \setminus \Gamma| \leq \epsilon^{1/4}(1 - \mu^2)^4 p^{3\ell-6\ell} \leq \sum_{d \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} \epsilon^{1/4} |E_d \setminus I_d| \leq \epsilon |G|^3.$$  

Rearranging, this implies $|\mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6g} \setminus \Gamma| \leq \epsilon^{3/4}(1 - \mu^2)^4 p^{3\ell+6g} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} p^{3\ell+6g}$, where the last inequality is by our choice of $\mu$. Therefore, we have $|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon}) p^{3\ell+6g}$, as desired.

Fix $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1 \bar{a}_2 \bar{a}_3 \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_2 \bar{b}_3) \in \Gamma$. We show $\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}) < 3\epsilon^{1/4} p^{-12q} |B(\bar{a}_1)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_2)|^2 |B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$. For ease of notation, let $B_i = B(\bar{a}_i)$ for each $i \in [3]$, and let $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{\tilde{Q}}(b_{ij}) \cap K_2[B_i, B_j]$ for each $ij \in \binom{[3]}{2}$. Given $u_0v_0w_0 \in E_d$, let

$$K^{\bar{d}}_{2,2,2}[u_0, v_0, w_0] = \{(u_1, v_1, w_1) \in K_3[B_1, B_2, B_3] : \text{for each } \epsilon \in \{0, 1\}^3, (u_\epsilon, v_\epsilon, w_\epsilon) \in E_d\}.$$  

Note $K^{\bar{d}}_{2,2,2}[u_0, v_0, w_0]$ is as in Lemma 4.19 with $G = \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d})$. Then define

$$J(\bar{d}) = \{(u, v, w) \in E_d : |K^{\bar{d}}_{2,2,2}[u, v, w]| \leq (1 + \mu) p^{-9q} |B_1||B_2||B_3|\}.$$  

By Lemma 4.13, each pair $(B_i \cup B_j, \beta_{ij})$ has dev$_2(g(q, \epsilon^4 p^{-12(\ell+q)}), p^{-q})$, so by definition of $g$ and Lemma 4.19, we have $|J(\bar{d})| \geq (1 - \mu^2) p^{-3q} |B_1||B_2||B_3|$.  

Given $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) \in \{0, 1\}^3$, let $|\epsilon| := \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3$. Define a partition $\{0, 1\}^3 = I_1 \cup I_2$, where $I_1 = \{\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}^3 : |\epsilon| \text{ is even}\}$ and $I_2 = \{\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}^3 : |\epsilon| \text{ is odd}\}$. Then observe the following holds, using Cauchy-Schwarz and symmetry.

$$\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}})^2 = \left( \sum_{u_0, u_1, v_0, v_1, w_0, w_1 \in G} \prod_{\epsilon \in I_1} f_{\bar{d}}(u_{\epsilon}, v_{\epsilon} + w_{\epsilon}) \prod_{\epsilon \in I_2} f_{\bar{d}}(u_{\epsilon}, v_{\epsilon}) \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{u_0, u_1, v_0, v_1, w_0, w_1 \in G} \prod_{\epsilon \in I_1} f_{\bar{d}}(u_{\epsilon}, v_{\epsilon} + w_{\epsilon})^2 \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{u_0, u_1, v_0, v_1, w_0, w_1 \in G} \prod_{\epsilon \in I_2} f_{\bar{d}}(u_{\epsilon}, v_{\epsilon} + w_{\epsilon})^2 \right)^2.$$

By definition of $f_{\bar{d}}$, if $u_0, u_1, v_0, v_1, w_0, w_1 \in G$ and $\prod_{\epsilon \in I_1} f_{\bar{d}}(u_{\epsilon}, v_{\epsilon} + w_{\epsilon})^2 \neq 0$, then $(u_0, v_0, w_0) \in E_d$ and $(u_1, v_1, w_1) \in K^{\bar{d}}_{2,2,2}[u_0, v_0, w_0]$. Combining this with the upper bound
for \( \text{oct}(f_d) \) given above, we obtain the following.

\[
\text{oct}(f_d) \leq \sum_{u_0, u_1 \in G} \sum_{v_0, v_1 \in G} \sum_{w_0, w_1 \in G} \prod_{e \in I_1} f(\epsilon_1 + v_2 + w_3)^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in E_d\}} \sum_{\{(u_1, v_1, w_1)\in K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]\}} \prod_{e \in I_1} |f(\epsilon_1, v_2 + w_3)|^2
\]

\[
\leq |E_d \setminus J(\tilde{d})||G|^3 + \sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in E_d\}} \sum_{\{(u_1, v_1, w_1)\in K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]\}} \prod_{e \in I_1} |f(\epsilon_1 + v_2 + w_3)|^2
\]

\[
= |E_d \setminus J(\tilde{d})||G|^3 + \sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d\}} |K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]| + \sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d\}} \sum_{\{(u_1, v_1, w_1)\in K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]\}} \prod_{e \in I_1} |f(\epsilon_1 + v_2 + w_3)|^2.
\]

We consider each of the three summands above individually. For the first summand, our lower bound on \( J(\tilde{d}) \) implies

\[
|E_d \setminus J(\tilde{d})||G|^3 \leq \epsilon^4 p^{-12(p+\ell)} p^{-3q} |B_1||B_2||B_3||G|^3 \leq \epsilon^4 (1 + \mu) p^{-9q} |B_1|^2 |B_2|^2 |B_3|^2 < \epsilon^4 (1 + \mu) p^{-12q} |B_1|^2 |B_2|^2 |B_3|^2.
\]

For the second summand, the definitions of \( J(\tilde{d}) \) and \( \Gamma \) imply the following holds,

\[
\sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d\}} |K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]| \leq |J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d| p^{-9q} (1 + \mu) |B_1||B_2||B_3|
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon^{1/4}(1 + \mu) |E_d| p^{-9q} |B_1||B_2||B_3| + (1 + \mu)^2 \epsilon^{1/4} p^{-12q} |B_1|^2 |B_2|^2 |B_3|^2,
\]

where the last inequality is by our size estimate on \( E_d \). Finally we consider the third summand. Given \( (u_0, v_0, w_0) \in J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d \), we have \( |f(\epsilon_1, v_2 + w_3)|^2 \leq \epsilon^{1/4} \) by definition of \( I_d \), so since \( \epsilon = (0,0,0) \in I_1 \), we have that for every \( (u_1, v_1, w_1) \in K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0] \),

\[
\prod_{e \in I_1} |f(\epsilon_1, v_2 + w_3)|^2 \leq |f(u_0, v_0, w_0)|^2 < \epsilon^{1/4}.
\]

Further, for any such \( (u_0, v_0, w_0) \), we know \( |K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]| \leq (1 + \mu) p^{-9q} |B_1||B_2||B_3| \), by definition of \( J(\tilde{d}) \). Consequently, we obtain the following bound for the third summand.

\[
\sum_{\{(u_0, v_0, w_0)\in J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d\}} \sum_{\{(u_1, v_1, w_1)\in K_{2,2,2}^d[u_0, v_0, w_0]\}} \prod_{e \in I_1} |f(\epsilon_1, v_2 + w_3)|^2
\]

\[
< \epsilon^{1/4} |J(\tilde{d})\setminus I_d|(1 + \mu) p^{-9q} |B_1||B_2||B_3|
\]

\[
< \epsilon^{1/4}(1 + \mu) |E_d| p^{-9q} |B_1||B_2||B_3|
\]

\[
< (1 + \mu)^2 \epsilon^{1/4} p^{-12q} |B_1|^2 |B_2|^2 |B_3|^2.
\]
Combining the upper bounds for each summand yields
\[
\text{oct}(f_d) \leq (1 + \mu)(\epsilon^4 + 2(1 + \mu)\epsilon^{1/4})p^{-12q}|B_1|^2|B_2|^2|B_3|^2 \leq 3\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q}|B_1|^2|B_2|^2|B_3|^2,
\]
where the last inequality is by our choice of \(\mu\). □

We can now prove a first repackaging of the arithmetic regularity lemma, where we conclude that most triads are uniform. We will use tools from Section 3 and the following equality for any \(f : G \to \mathbb{C}\), where \(G = \mathbb{F}_p^n\).
\[
||f||_{U^3}^8 = |G|^{-6} \sum_{x_0, x_1 \in G} \sum_{y_0, y_1 \in G} \sum_{z_0, z_1 \in G} \prod_{e \in \mathbb{G}} f(x_{e_1} + y_{e_2} + z_{e_3}).
\]
It is an exercise to derive this equality from Definition 3.7. A similar exercise gives us the following equality for the Gowers inner product (see Lemma 3.8).
\[
\langle f_{000}, f_{100}, \ldots, f_{011}, f_{111} \rangle_{U^3} = |G|^{-6} \sum_{x_0, x_1 \in G} \sum_{y_0, y_1 \in G} \sum_{z_0, z_1 \in G} \prod_{e \in \mathbb{G}} f(x_{e_1} + y_{e_2} + z_{e_3})
\]

**Proposition 4.20.** For all \(\epsilon > 0\), there is a rank function \(\omega_1\), such that for all rank functions \(\omega \geq \omega_1\), and all \(\ell, q_0 \geq 0\), there is a constant \(n_0\) such that the following holds. Suppose \(n \geq n_0\), \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\), and \(B_0 = (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{Q}_0)\) is a quadratic factor in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((\ell, q_0)\). Then there are \(\ell, q \leq D\), a quadratic factor \(B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and \(\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{6\ell+6q}_p\) such that the following hold.

1. \(B \leq B_0\) and \(B\) has rank at least \(\omega(\ell + q)\),
2. \(|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{3\ell+6q} - \epsilon^2\),
3. For all \(\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \in \Gamma\),
   \[
   \text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < 4\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2.
   \]

**Proof.** Fix \(\epsilon > 0\). Without loss of generality, assume \(0 < \epsilon < 1/32\). Apply Lemma 4.18 to \(\epsilon^2\) to obtain \(\rho_1\). Let \(\rho_2 = \rho_2(\epsilon^2)\) as in Corollary 3.14 and set \(\omega_1 = \max\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}\). Now suppose \(\omega \geq \omega_1\) and \(\ell, q_0 \geq 1\). Let \(\omega_2 = \epsilon^{-1/2}p^{3\ell+6q} - \epsilon^2\), and apply Theorem 3.16 to \(\epsilon, \omega, \omega_2\), \(\ell, q_0\) to obtain \(D = D(\omega, \omega_2, \ell, q_0)\) and \(n_0 = n_0(\epsilon, \omega, \omega_2, \ell, q_0)\).

Suppose \(n \geq n_0\), \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\), and \(B_0 = (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{Q}_0)\) is a quadratic factor in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((\ell, q_0)\). By Theorem 3.16 applied to \(f = 1_A\), there are \(\ell, q\) with \(\ell + q \leq D\), a quadratic factor \(B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(\ell + q)\), satisfying \(B \leq B_0\), and such that there exists a decomposition \(f = f_1 + f_2 + f_3\) such that \(f_1 = \mathbb{E}(f|B)\), \(||f_2||_{U^3} \leq 1/\omega(\ell + q)\), \(||f_3||_2 < \epsilon\), and where \(\max_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \{||f_2(x)||, ||f_3(x)||\} \leq 2\). Let \(\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{6\ell+q}_p\) be as in Lemma 4.18 applied to \(f_3\), \(A\), and \(B\). It suffices to show that for all \(\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3, \bar{b}_3) \in \Gamma\),
   \[
   \text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < 4\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2.
   \]

It is easy to see that on any \(B(\bar{a}) \in \text{At}(B)\), \(1_A(x) - \alpha_{B(\bar{a})} = (f_2(x) + f_3(x))1_{B(\bar{a})}(x)\).

Fix \(\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3, \bar{b}_3) \in \Gamma\). We show \(\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}^A) < 4\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2\).

For ease of notation, let \(\alpha_{\bar{d}} = |A \cap B(\bar{d})|/|B(\bar{d})|\), and set \(\beta_{ij} = \beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{b}_{ij})\) and \(B_i = B(\bar{a}_i)\) for each \(i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). By above,
\[
(1_A(x + y + z) - \alpha_{\bar{d}})1_{B(\bar{d})}(x + y + z) = (f_2(x + y + z) + f_3(x + y + z))1_{B(\bar{d})}(x + y + z).
\]
Consequently, by the definition of $f_d^A$,

$$f_d^A(x,y,z) = (f_2(x+y+z) + f_3(x+y+z) + f_3(x+y+z))1_{\beta_{23}}(y,z)1_{\beta_{13}}(x,z)1_{\beta_{12}}(x,y)1_{B_1}(x)1_{B_2}(y)1_{B_3}(z).$$

For $i = 2, 3$, define $f_i^j(x,y,z) = f_i(x+y+z)1_{\beta_{23}}(y,z)1_{\beta_{13}}(x,z)1_{\beta_{12}}(x,y)1_{B_1}(x)1_{B_2}(y)1_{B_3}(z)$ (in other words, $f_i^j(x,y,z) = (f_i)_d$ as in Definition 4.16). In order to estimate $\text{oct}(f_d^A)$, we will use that

$$(4.1) \quad \text{oct}(f_2^j + f_3^j) = |G|^6 \sum_{(i_1, \ldots, i_8) \in (2,3)^8} \langle f_{i_1}^j, f_{i_2}^j, f_{i_3}^j, f_{i_4}^j, f_{i_5}^j, f_{i_6}^j, f_{i_7}^j, f_{i_8}^j \rangle_{U^3}. $$

We will give an upper bound for each term in the summation from (4.1) in two cases: when $i_j = 2$ for some $j \in [8]$, or when $i_j = 3$ for all $j \in [8]$. We shall deal with the latter case first.

Indeed, by the Gowers-Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (Lemma 3.8) and the definition of $\Gamma$, we have

$$(4.2) \quad \langle f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j, f_3^j \rangle_{U^3} \leq \|f_3^j\|_{U^3}^8 \leq \frac{1}{|G|^6} \text{oct}(f_3^j) < 3e^{1/4}|G|^{-6}|B_1|^2|B_2|^2|B_3|^2.$$

We now deal with the other case.

**Claim 4.21.** If $i_j = 2$ for some $j \in [8]$, then

$$\langle f_{i_1}^j, f_{i_2}^j, f_{i_3}^j, f_{i_4}^j, f_{i_5}^j, f_{i_6}^j, f_{i_7}^j, f_{i_8}^j \rangle_{U^3} \leq \omega_2(\ell + q)^{-1}. $$

**Proof of Claim 4.21.** By relabeling if necessary, let us assume $i_1 = 2$. Recall that for any $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}^3$, $f_2^j(y^\epsilon_1, z^\epsilon_2, w^\epsilon_3) = f_2(y^\epsilon_1 + z^\epsilon_2 + w^\epsilon_3)h(y^\epsilon_1, z^\epsilon_2, w^\epsilon_3)$, where

$$h(y^\epsilon_1, z^\epsilon_2, w^\epsilon_3) = 1_{\beta_{23}}(z^\epsilon_2, w^\epsilon_3)1_{\beta_{13}}(y^\epsilon_1, w^\epsilon_3)1_{\beta_{12}}(y^\epsilon_1, z^\epsilon_2)1_{B_1}(y^\epsilon_1)1_{B_2}(z^\epsilon_2)1_{B_3}(w^\epsilon_3).$$

Note that none of the constituent parts of $h$ uses the triple $(y^\epsilon_1, z^\epsilon_2, w^\epsilon_3)$, and we can therefore redistribute the Gowers inner product as

$$\langle f_{i_1}^j, f_{i_2}^j, f_{i_3}^j, f_{i_4}^j, f_{i_5}^j, f_{i_6}^j, f_{i_7}^j, f_{i_8}^j \rangle_{U^3} = \langle f_2, f_{i_2}^j, h_2, f_{i_3}^j, h_3, f_{i_4}^j, h_4, f_{i_5}^j, f_{i_6}^j, f_{i_7}^j, f_{i_8}^j \rangle_{U^3},$$

with appropriately defined bounded functions $h_2, h_3, h_4$. By Lemma 3.8 our assumption on $f_2$, and since each of the functions in the inner product below are bounded in absolute value by 2 (since $f_2$ and $f_3$ are), this implies

$$\langle f_{i_1}^j, f_{i_2}^j, f_{i_3}^j, f_{i_4}^j, f_{i_5}^j, f_{i_6}^j, f_{i_7}^j, f_{i_8}^j \rangle_{U^3} \leq (2^8)^7\|f_2\|_{U^3} \leq 2^{56}\omega_2(\ell + q)$$

as claimed. \[\square\]

Combining (4.1), (4.2), and Claim 4.21 we have that

$$\text{oct}(f_d^A) = \text{oct}(f_2^j + f_3^j) \leq 3e^{1/4}|B_1|^2|B_2|^2|B_3|^2 + (2^8 - 1)2^{56}|G|\omega_2(\ell + q) < 4e^{1/4}|B_1|^2|B_2|^2|B_3|^2,$$

where the last inequality uses our choice of $\omega_2$ and Lemma 3.13. \[\square\]
Corollary 4.22 (Bounded VC2-dimension implies trivial density on regular triples of atoms). For all $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, there are $\eta > 0$ and rank function $\omega_1$ such that for all rank functions $\omega \geq \omega_1$ and all $\ell, q \geq 0$, there is $n_0(\ell, q, k, \epsilon, \omega)$ such that the following hold.

Suppose $n \geq n_0(\ell, q, k, \epsilon, \omega)$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has VC2(A) < $k$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$. For all $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$, if $\text{oct}(f^A_{\bar{d}}) \leq \eta \epsilon^{12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$, then the density of $A$ on the atom $B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))$ is in $[0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1]$.

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$. Choose $\mu = \delta_3$ as in Proposition 4.10 for $\epsilon$ and $k$. For each $d_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, let $\delta_2(d_2)$ and $m_0(d_2)$ be as in Proposition 4.10 for $\epsilon, k, \mu, d_2$. Define $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to (0, 1)$ by $\epsilon_2(m) = \delta_2(1/m)$. Let $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\epsilon^2)$ be from Lemma 4.15 and let $\rho_2 = \rho_2(\epsilon^2)$ be from Lemma 4.13. Set $\rho(x) = \max\{\rho_1(x), \rho_2(x)\}$. Now set $\omega_1 = \max\{\rho, \omega\}$ where $\omega = \omega(\eta, \epsilon_2)$ comes from Lemma 4.17. For each $\ell, q$ let $n_0 = p^{\ell+q}m_0(p^{-q})$.

Now assume $\ell, q \geq 0$, $n \geq n_0(\ell, q, k, \epsilon, \omega)$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has VC2(A) < $k$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega_1(\ell + q)$. Suppose $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$ and $\text{oct}(f^A_{\bar{d}}) \leq \eta \epsilon^{12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2$.

Let $G = \Delta(\bar{d})$, and set $H = (B(\bar{a}_1) \cup B(\bar{a}_2) \cup B(\bar{a}_3), E_A^{(3)} \cap K_2^{(2)}(G))$. By assumption $H$ has VC2(H) < $k$. Let $d$ be such that $|E_A^{(3)} \cap K_2^{(2)}(G)| = d|K_2^{(2)}(G)|$. By Lemma 4.17 (H, G) has dev23($\mu$, $\delta_2(p^{-q})$). Note our assumptions imply each $|B(\bar{a}_i)| \geq m_0(p^{-q})$. Thus, Proposition 4.10 implies that $\rho \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1]$. By Lemma 4.15 $|d - \alpha_{B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))}| < \epsilon^2$, and thus $\alpha_{B(\Sigma(\bar{d}))} \in [0, 2\epsilon) \cup (1 - 2\epsilon, 1]$.

We now have enough tools to prove the main structure theorem for sets of bounded VC2-dimension. Below, we will deduce it by applying Proposition 4.20 and then Corollary 4.22. One could also deduce it from Corollary 4.27, Proposition 4.10, and Lemma 4.15.

Proof of Theorem 1.18 Fix $k \geq 1$ and $\mu > 0$. Apply Corollary 4.22 to $k$ and $\mu/2$ to obtain $\eta > 0$ and a rank function $\omega_1$. Suppose $\omega \geq \omega_1$. Let $\epsilon = \mu^2 \eta^4/64$ and choose $\omega_2 = \omega_2(\epsilon)$ as in Proposition 4.20 and set $\omega_3 = \max(\omega, \omega_2)$. Let $n_1 = n_1(\epsilon, \omega_3)$ and $C_1 = C_1(\epsilon, k, \omega_3)$ be from Proposition 4.20, and choose $n_2 = n_2(C_1, C_1, k, \mu/2, \omega_3)$ as in Corollary 4.22. Finally, set $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_0\}$ and $C = C_1$. Note that our choices of $n_0$ and $C$ depended only on $k, \mu, \omega$.

Suppose $n \geq n_0$ and $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has VC2(A) < $k$. By Proposition 4.20 there exists a quadratic factor $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega_3(\ell + q)$, and $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell+6q}$ such that the following hold.

(i) $\ell, q \leq C_1$,
(ii) $|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{3\ell+6q}$,
(iii) For all $\bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \in \Gamma$,

\[
\text{oct}(f^A_{\bar{d}}) \leq 4\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2 < \eta \epsilon^{12q}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2,
\]
where the last inequality is by our choice of \( \epsilon \). Let

\[
X = \{ B(\bar{b}) \in \operatorname{At}(\mathcal{B}) : \text{ there exists } \bar{d} \in \Gamma \text{ with } \Sigma(\bar{d}) = \bar{b} \}.
\]

By Corollary 4.22, every \( B \in X \) satisfies \(|A \cap B|/|B| \in [0, \mu/2) \cup (1 - \mu/2, 1]|. It is straightforward to show that \(|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{3\ell+6q}\) implies \(|X| \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{\ell+q}\). Consequently, \( \mathcal{B} \) is almost \( \mu \)-atomic with respect to \( A \). \( \square \)

As an immediate corollary, we obtain Theorem 1.19, which says that an NIP_2 epGP is almost quadratically atomic.

**Proof of Theorem 1.19** Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is a epGP with bounded VC_2-dimension, say VC_2(\( \mathcal{P} \)) < \( k \). Fix \( \epsilon > 0 \) and a rank function \( \rho \). Let \( \omega_1 = \omega_2(k, \epsilon) \) be from Theorem 1.18 and set \( \omega = \max\{\omega_1, \rho\} \). Let \( n_0 = n_0(k, \epsilon, \omega) \) and \( C = C(k, \epsilon, \omega) \) be from Theorem 1.18.

Suppose \( n \geq n_0 \) and \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P} \). Then VC_2(\( \mathbb{F}_p^n, A \)) < \( k \), so by Theorem 1.18 there is a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \), so that \( \mathcal{B} \) is almost \( \epsilon \)-atomic and \( \ell, q \leq C \). This shows \( \mathcal{P} \) is almost quadratically atomic, as desired. \( \square \)

We end this subsection with a proof of Corollary 1.20 which says that sets of bounded VC_2-dimension look approximately like unions of quadratic atoms.

**Proof of 1.19 and Corollary 1.20** Fix \( \epsilon > 0 \) and a rank function \( \rho \). Without loss of generality, we may assume \( \epsilon < 1 \) (since otherwise the statement is trivial). Let \( \omega_1 = \omega_1(k, \epsilon^2) \) be from Theorem 1.18 and let \( \omega_2 = \omega_2(\epsilon^4) \) be as in Corollary 3.14. Let \( \omega = \max\{\rho, \omega_1, \omega_2\} \), and let \( n_0 = n_0(k, \epsilon^2, \omega) \) and \( D = D(k, \epsilon^2, \omega) \) be from Theorem 1.18.

Suppose \( n \geq n_0 \) and \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) has VC_2(\( \mathbb{F}_p^n, A \)) < \( k \). By Theorem 1.18 there are \( \ell, q \leq D \), and a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \) which is almost \( \epsilon^2 \)-atomic. This means there is a set \( \Gamma \subseteq \operatorname{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) satisfying \(|\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon^2)p^{\ell+q}\), and for all \( B \in \Gamma \), \(|A \cap B|/|B| \in [0, \epsilon^2) \cup (1 - \epsilon^2, 1]|.

Let \( I_1 = \{ B \in \Gamma : |A \cap B|/|B| \in (1 - \epsilon^2, 1]|, I_0 = \{ B \in \Gamma : |A \cap B|/|B| \in [0, \epsilon^2)\}, \) and set \( I_2 = \operatorname{At}(\mathcal{B}) \setminus \Gamma \). Let \( S = \bigcup_{B \in I_1} B \). We show that \(|A \Delta S| \leq \epsilon|\mathbb{F}_p^n|\), which will finish the proof. Observe that

\[
A \Delta S = \left( \bigcap_{B \in I_1} (A \setminus B) \right) \cup \left( \bigcap_{B \in I_1} (B \setminus A) \right) = \left( \bigcup_{B \in I_0} A \cap B \right) \cup \left( \bigcap_{B \in I_1} (B \setminus A) \right).
\]

Using this along with our assumptions on \( I_0, I_1, I_2 \), we obtain the following,

\[
|A \Delta S| = \sum_{B \in I_0 \cup I_2} |A \cap B| + \sum_{B \in I_1} |B \setminus A| \leq \left| \bigcup_{B \in I_2} B \right| + \sum_{B \in I_0} \epsilon^2|B| + \sum_{B \in I_1} \epsilon^2|B| \\
\leq (1 + \epsilon^2)p^{n-\ell-q}\left(|I_2| + \epsilon^2(|I_0| + |I_1|)\right) \\
\leq (1 + \epsilon^2)p^{n-\ell-q}2\epsilon^2p^{\ell+q} \\
\leq \epsilon p^n,
\]

where the second inequality is from Corollary 3.14 and the last is because \( \epsilon < 1 \). \( \square \)
4.5. Hypergraph formulations of the main theorems. Using the previous subsections, we show how our main theorems translate into regular decompositions for ternary sum graphs. The main purpose of this section is to show how the results here relate to the results of [56].

We begin with some definitions from hypergraph regularity. Our notation will largely follow [56], with some minor deviations.

**Definition 4.23.** Suppose $V$ is a set. A $(t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$-decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ of $V$ is a partition $V = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_t$, along with, for each $ij \in \binom{[t]}{2}$, a partition $V_i \times V_j = \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell} P_{ij}^\alpha$ such that for each $1 \leq i, j \leq t$, $||V_i| - |V_j|| \leq \epsilon_2(\ell)|V|$, and for each $\alpha \leq \ell$, $P_{ij}^\alpha$ has dev$_2(\epsilon_2(\ell), 1/\ell)$.

A triad of $\mathcal{P}$ is a 3-partite graph of the form $G_{ijk}^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} := (V_i \cup V_j \cup V_k, P_{ij}^\alpha \cup P_{jk}^\beta \cup P_{ik}^\gamma)$.

Given a $(t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$-decomposition as in Definition 4.23, we let $\mathcal{P}_{vert} = \{V_i : i \in [t]\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{edge} = \{P_{ij}^\alpha : ij \in \binom{[t]}{2}, \alpha \leq \ell\}$. We now define a regular triad.

**Definition 4.24.** Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-graph and $\mathcal{P}$ is a $(t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$-decomposition of $V$. A triad of $\mathcal{P}$ is called regular if $(H_{ijk}^\alpha, G_{ijk}^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma})$ has dev$_{2,3}(\epsilon_2(\ell), \epsilon_1)$, where $H_{ijk}^\alpha = (V_i \cup V_j \cup V_k, E \cap K_3^{(2)}(G_{ijk}^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}))$.

We now define a regular decomposition of a 3-graph.

**Definition 4.25.** Suppose $H = (V, E)$ is a 3-graph. Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is a $(t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$-decomposition of $V$ consisting of $\{V_i : i \in [t]\}$ and $\{P_{ij}^\alpha : ij \in \binom{[t]}{2}, \alpha \leq \ell\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}$ is $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$-regular with respect to $H$, if at least $(1 - \epsilon_1)|V|^3$ many triples $xyz \in \binom{V}{3}$ are contained in an $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell))$-regular triad of $\mathcal{P}$.

We now state a regularity lemma for 3-graphs. This particular version can be found, with minor tweaks, as Theorem 1.1 in [56].

**Theorem 4.26.** For all $\epsilon_1 > 0$, every function $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to (0, 1]$, and every $\ell_0, t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist positive integers $T_0$ and $n_0$ such that for any 3-graph $H = (V, E)$ on $n \geq n_0$ vertices, there exists a $(t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell))$-decomposition $\mathcal{P}$ of $V$ which is $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell))$-regular with respect to $H$, and where $t_0 \leq t \leq T_0$ and $\ell_0 \leq \ell \leq T_0$.

We note here that our definition of a decomposition is slightly non-standard, as the usual definition (see e.g. [56]) requires the vertex partition to be an equipartition, and also allows for a small number of pairs of vertices to be contained in a $P_{ij}^\alpha$ which fails disc$_2(\epsilon_2(\ell), 1/\ell)$. The requirement of an equipartition is somewhat superficial, as one can always create one from Definition 4.23 by redistributing vertices. Further, it is no loss of generality to make the assumption that all $P_{ij}^\alpha$ satisfy disc$_2(\epsilon_2(\ell), 1/\ell)$ (see for example [26] or Proposition 1.23). We choose to use Definition 4.23 as it will line up more precisely with our theorems.

Our next goal is to prove a hypergraph regularity lemma for ternary sum graphs in elementary $p$-groups, where the parts in the partition have special algebraic structure. This can be seen as a quadratic analogue of results of [35, Section 9].

**Corollary 4.27** (Hypergraph regularity with quadratic partitions). For all $\epsilon_1 > 0$, $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to [0, 1]$, and $t_0, \ell_0 \geq 1$, and all rank functions $\tau$, there are $L$, $T$, and $N$ such that the
following hold. Suppose \( n \geq N \) and \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Then there exists \( t_0 \leq t \leq T, \ell_0 \leq \ell \leq \ell \leq L \), a \((t, \ell, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell))\)-decomposition \( \mathcal{P} \) of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) which is \((\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell))\)-regular with respect to \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, E_A)\).

Moreover, there is a quadratic factor \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) of complexity \((\ell', q')\) and rank at least \( \tau(\ell' + q') \), such that \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{vert}} = \text{At}(B) \) and \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{edge}} = \{K_2[V_i, V_j] \cap \beta_Q(\bar{a}) : \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^Q\} \).

The main difference between this theorem and what one would obtain by applying Theorem 4.26 to \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, E_A^{(3)})\) is of course the “moreover” statement, which says the regular partition exhibits extremely strong algebraic structure.

**Proof of Corollary 4.27** Fix \( \epsilon_1 > 0, \epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to [0, 1], \ell_0, t_0 \geq 1 \), and a rank function \( \omega \).

Given \( x \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \mu(x) := \mu(3, \epsilon_1/4, p^{-2\epsilon}) \) be from Lemma 4.6. Without loss of generality assume \( \epsilon_2(x) < \mu(x)^2/2 \) for all \( x \). Let \( \ell_1 = \max\{\ell_0, (4\epsilon_1)^{-1}\} \), and choose \( p_1 = \rho_1(\epsilon_2) \) as in Lemma 4.13 and \( p_2 = \rho_2(\epsilon_2) \) as in Corollary 3.14. Let \( \omega_1 \) be as in Proposition 4.20 for \( \epsilon = \epsilon_1^4/10 \), and let \( \omega = \max\{\tau, \omega, \rho_1, \rho_2\} \). Let \( N_1 = N_1(\omega, \epsilon, \ell_1, t_0) \) and \( D = D(\omega, \epsilon, \ell_1, t_0) \) be from Proposition 4.20 and set \( T = L = p^{2D} \). Let \( N_2 \) be as in Lemma 4.6 for \( 3, \epsilon_1/4, \) and \( \mu(2D)^2 \). Let \( N \) be sufficiently large compared to \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \).

Now suppose \( n \geq N \) and \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Choose any quadratic factor \( B_0 \) of complexity \((\ell_1, t_0)\).

By Proposition 4.20, there are \( \ell', \ell' \leq D \), a quadratic factor \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq B_0 \) of complexity \((\ell', q')\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell' + q') \), and \( \Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell' + 6q'} \) with \( |\Gamma| \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{3\ell' + 6q'} \), such that for all \( \bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \subseteq \Gamma \),

\[
\text{oct}(f_{\bar{d}}) < 4\epsilon^{1/4}p^{-12q'}|B(\bar{a}_1)|^2|B(\bar{a}_2)|^2|B(\bar{a}_3)|^2.
\]

Let \( \ell = p^{t_0} \) and \( t = p^{\ell' + q'} \). Let \( V_1, \ldots, V_t \) be any enumeration of At(\( B \)), and for each \( ij \in \binom{[t]}{2} \), let \( \{P_{ij}^\alpha : \alpha \in [\ell]\} \) be any enumeration of \( \{K_2[V_i, V_j] \cap \beta_Q(\bar{a}) : \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^Q\} \). By Lemma 4.13, for every \( ij, (V_i \cup V_j) \) has \( \text{dev}_2(\epsilon_1(\ell), 1/\ell) \). By Lemma 4.17 for all \( \bar{d} \in \Gamma \), \( (E_A^{(3)}, K_3^{(2)}(\Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d}))) \) has \( \text{dev}_{2,3}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell)) \). Let

\[
\Gamma' = \left\{xyz \in \left(\mathbb{F}_p^n \right) : xyz \in \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d}) \text{ for some } \bar{d} \in \Gamma \right\}.
\]

Clearly if \( xyz \in \Gamma \), then there are \( ijk \in \binom{[3]}{2} \) and \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [\ell] \) such that \( (H^\alpha_{ijk}, G^\alpha_{ijk}) \) has \( \text{dev}_{2,3}(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(\ell)) \). Now the size of \( \Gamma' \) is equal to the size of \( \Gamma \), minus any \( \bar{d} = (\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_3) \) where \( \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \bar{a}_3 \) are not pairwise distinct. Thus

\[
|\Gamma'| \geq |\Gamma| - p^{\ell' + q'}(p^{(\ell' + q')+3\ell'} - p^{2\ell' + 5q'}) = (1 - \epsilon - p^{-\ell'} - q')p^{3\ell' + 6q'}.
\]

Since \( B \leq B_0 \), \( \ell' + q' \leq \ell_1 + q_0 \), so the above is at least \( (1 - \epsilon - \epsilon_1/4)p^{3\ell' + 6q'} \geq (1 - \epsilon_1/2)p^{3\ell' + 6q'} \), where the inequality uses the definition of \( \epsilon \). To compute the size of \( \Gamma' \), we only have left to give a lower bound estimate on the size of \( \Delta^{(3)}(\bar{d}) \) for \( \bar{d} \in \Gamma \). It follows immediately from Lemma 4.6 and the quasirandomness of each \( P_{ij}^\alpha \) that for all \( \bar{d} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell' + 6q'} \),

\[
|K_3^{(2)}(\Delta^{(3)}(\Gamma))| \geq (1 - \epsilon_1/2)^4p^{3n - 3\ell' - 3q}.
\]

Thus \( |\Gamma'| \geq (1 - \epsilon_1/2)p^{3\ell' + 6q'}(1 - \epsilon_1/2)^4p^{n - 3\ell' - 3q} = (1 - \epsilon_1/2)^5p^{3n} \), as desired. \( \square \)
We can obtain a stronger version for NIP₂ sets. Given a \((t, ℓ, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-decomposition \(\mathcal{P}\) of a set \(V\), and a 3-uniform hypergraph \(H = (V, E)\), we say \(\mathcal{P}\) is disc₂,₃-homogeneous with respect to \(H\) if it is \((\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-regular with respect to \(H\), and moreover, every regular triad has density in \([0, \epsilon_1) \cup (1 - \epsilon_1, 1]\). In [70] Theorem 1.31 we show that 3-graphs of bounded VC₂-dimension admit disc₂,₃-homogeneous decompositions. We easily obtain the same result here for ternary sum graphs of sets with bounded VC₂-dimension, with additional algebraic structure built into the decompositions.

**Corollary 4.28** (NIP₂-Hypergraph regularity with quadratic partitions). For all \(k \geq 1, \epsilon_1 > 0, \epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to [0, 1], t_0, \ell_0 \geq 1\) and rank functions \(\tau\), there are \(L, T, \) and \(N\) such that the following hold. Suppose \(n \geq N\) and \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\) has no \(k\)-IP₂. Then there exists \(t_0 \leq t \leq T, \ell_0 \leq \ell \leq L, \) a \((t, ℓ, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-decomposition \(\mathcal{P}\) of \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) which is disc₂,₃-homogeneous and \((\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-regular with respect to \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, E_A^{(3)} )\).

Moreover, there is a quadratic factor \(\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) of complexity \((ℓ', q')\) and rank at least \(\tau(ℓ' + q')\), such that \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{vert}} = \text{At}(\mathcal{B})\) and \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{edge}} = \{ K_2[V_i, V_j] \cap \beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) : a \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \mathcal{Q} \}\).

**Proof.** Mimic the proof of Corollary 4.27 above, using Theorem 1.18 in place of Proposition 4.20.

In [70] we also consider decompositions whose irregular triads can be controlled in an efficient way. Specifically, given a \((t, ℓ, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-decomposition \(\mathcal{P}\) of a set \(V\) and a 3-uniform hypergraph \(H = (V, E)\), we say that \(\mathcal{P}\) has linear disc₂,₃-error if there is a set \(\Omega \subseteq \binom{\text{P}_{\text{vert}}}{3}\) such that \(|\Omega| \leq e\epsilon_1 t^3\), and every irregular triad of \(\mathcal{P}\) is contained in a triple \(V_iV_jV_k\) from \(\Omega\). This nomenclature is no coincidence. If \(V = \mathbb{F}_p^n\) and \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{vert}}\) consists of the atoms of a high-rank factor, then such sets \(\Omega\) arise naturally from a small set of linear atoms.

**Fact 4.29.** For all \(\epsilon > 0\) there is a rank function \(\omega\) so that if \(\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) is a quadratic factor in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((ℓ, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(ℓ + q)\), then the following holds. If \(\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{L})\) satisfies \(|\Sigma| \leq p^\ell\), and \(\Omega = \{ B(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2)B(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2)B(\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2) : L(\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{c}_1) \in \Sigma \}\), then \(|\Omega| \leq e\epsilon p^3(ℓ + q)\).

**Proof.** This is immediate from Lemma 3.13.

It is straightforward to see that our results about NFOP₂ sets give rise to regular decompositions for the ternary sum graph with linear disc₂,₃-error.

**Corollary 4.30** (FOP₂ hypergraph regularity with quadratic partitions and linear error). For all \(k \geq 1, \epsilon_1 > 0, \epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to [0, 1], t_0, \ell_0 \geq 1, \) and rank functions \(\omega\), there are \(L, T, \) and \(N\) such that the following hold. Suppose \(n \geq N\) and \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\) has no \(k\)-FOP₂. Then there exists \(t_0 \leq t \leq T, \ell_0 \leq \ell \leq L, \) a \((t, ℓ, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-decomposition \(\mathcal{P}\) of \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) which is disc₂,₃-homogeneous and \((\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2(ℓ))\)-regular with respect to \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, E_A^{(3)} )\) and which has linear error, say witnessed by \(\Omega \subseteq \binom{\text{P}_{\text{vert}}}{3}\).

Moreover, there is a quadratic factor \(\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) of complexity \((ℓ', q')\) and rank at least \(\omega(ℓ' + q')\), such that \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{vert}} = \text{At}(\mathcal{B})\) and \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{edge}} = \{ K_2[V_i, V_j] \cap \beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) : a \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \mathcal{Q} \}\).

Further, there is a set \(\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{L})\) such that \(V_iV_jV_k \in \Omega\) if and only if \(V_iV_jV_k\) has the form \(B(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2)B(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2)B(\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2)\), for some \(L(\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1 + \bar{c}_1) \in \Sigma\).
Proof. Mimic the proof of Corollary 4.27 above, using Theorem 1.33 in place of Proposition 4.20. □

In [76, Theorem 1.57], we show that NFOP₂ in fact characterizes the hereditary properties of 3-graphs which admit regular decompositions with linear error. Thus Corollary 4.30 lines up closely with what occurs in the hypergraph setting.

5. NFOP₂-properties are almost quadratically atomic with linear error

In this section we prove the main theorems about about NFOP₂ properties. Our strategy will be to work with reduced structures associated to a set $A$ and a quadratic factor $B$ (see Definition 5.1 below). We will show that when the set $A$ has no $k$-FOP₂, then the reduced structure exhibits a weak, approximate version of stability. In particular, the reduced structure will contain many copies of the order property with one side in a special distinguished subgroup (see Section 5.1). We will then prove a structure theorem for sets omitting order properties of this kind, Theorem 5.20, which is a generalization of the stable regularity lemma of [72]. We will prove the section’s main result, Theorem 1.33, by applying Theorem 5.20 to the reduced structure associated to an NFOP₂ set $A$ and a quadratic factor $B$ which is highly uniform with respect to $A$ (see Section 5.3). Sections 5.4 and 5.5 are then devoted to proving Theorem 5.20.

5.1. Sufficient conditions for $k$-IP₂ and $k$-FOP₂. In this subsection, we give sufficient conditions for when a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has $k$-FOP₂ and $k$-IP₂. While we will only use the result about FOP₂ in the subsequent subsections, we include the discussion of IP₂ as it is helpful to consider both together. We begin by defining a notion of a reduced structure associated to a set $A$ and quadratic factor $B$.

Definition 5.1. Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and a quadratic factor $B$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, set

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \{ \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} : |A \cap B(\bar{a})|/|B(\bar{a})| \geq 1 - \epsilon \}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_0 = \{ \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} : |A \cap B(\bar{a})|/|B(\bar{a})| \leq \epsilon \}.$$

Then the $\epsilon$-reduced pair associated to $A$ and $B$ is the pair $\text{Red}_{B,\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) := (\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q})$.

Note that in Definition 5.1 $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_0$ depend on both $B$ and $\epsilon$, but we suppress these from the notation as they will be clear from the context. Observe further that in Definition 5.1, $\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q}$ need not be equal to $\mathbf{A}_0 \cup \mathbf{A}_1$, as there could be atoms in $\text{At}(B)$ where the density with respect to $A$ is not near 0 or 1. We will informally refer to these as “error atoms.” However, when $B$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$, there will be very few error atoms, in which case the reduced pair $\text{Red}_{B,\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ will contain a great deal of structural information about the set $A$.

It would be natural to define a reduced pair where $\mathbf{A}_1$ is replaced with the set of $\bar{a}$ satisfying $|A_1 \cap B(\bar{a})| \geq \epsilon |A_1|$, and such that $B(\bar{a})$ is sufficiently uniform with respect to $A$ (meaning $\text{oct}(f, \bar{a})$ is very small). This definition would work equally well for us, and would be in keeping with graph theoretic convention (see e.g. Section 3 of [50]). However, when the set $A$ has bounded VC₂-dimension, “sufficiently uniform with respect to $A$” is
roughly interchangeable with “density near 0 or 1” (by Corollary 4.22 and Proposition 5.9). So we would, in effect, end up with Definition 5.1. In light of this, we choose to start with the less general definition, namely Definition 5.1 as it will simplify some aspects of the exposition.

Our sufficient conditions for $k$-FOP and $k$-IP will deal with certain copies of bipartite graphs in reduced pairs.

**Definition 5.2.** Given $B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^m$, and a bipartite graph $F = (U \cup W,E)$, a copy of $F$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^m, B)$ is a tuple $(x_u)_{u \in U}(y_w)_{w \in W} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^m)^{|U|+|W|}$ such that $x_u + y_w \in B$ if and only if $uw \in E$.

Note that in Definition 5.2, we impose no requirements on sums of the form $x_u + x'_u$ or $y_w + y'_w$. This suits our purposes, as both $k$-OP and $k$-IP can be phrased in this way, using the appropriate bipartite graphs.

**Definition 5.3.** Given $k \geq 1$, define the bipartite graphs

$$H(k) = (\{a_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{a_i b_j : i \in [k]\}, \{b_i : i \in [k]\}, \{a_i b_j : i \leq j\})$$

and

$$U(k) = (\{a_i : i \in [k]\} \cup \{b_S : S \subseteq [k]\}, \{a_i b_j : i \in S\}).$$

Observe that by definition, a set $B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^m$ has $k$-OP (respectively $k$-IP) if and only if there is a copy of $H(k)$ (respectively $U(k)$) in $(\mathbb{F}_p^m, B)$. For our applications, it will be important to distinguish when copies of bipartite graphs in $\text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ avoid the “error atoms.”

**Definition 5.4.** Suppose $F = (U \cup W,E)$. Suppose $n \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $\mathcal{B}$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$.

A **good copy** of $F$ in $\text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ is a tuple $(\tilde{a}_u)_{u \in U}(\tilde{b}_w)_{w \in W} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q})^{|U|+|W|}$ such that if $uw \in E$, then $|A \cap B(\tilde{a}_u + \tilde{b}_w)| \geq (1-\epsilon)B(\tilde{a}_u + \tilde{b}_w)$, and if $uw \notin E$, then $|A \cap B(\tilde{a}_u + \tilde{b}_w)| \leq \epsilon B(\tilde{a}_u + \tilde{b}_w)$.

Note that in a good copy of $F$, if $uw \notin E(F)$, then $\tilde{a}_u + \tilde{b}_w \in A_0$, while in general $uw \notin E(F)$ implies only that $\hat{a}_u + \hat{b}_w \notin A_1$. Consequently, when $\text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \neq A_1 \cup A_0$, it is possible for there to exist copies of $F$ in $\text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ that are not good. We will use reduced copies of $H(k)$ and $U(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ to produce sufficient conditions for when the set $A$ has FOP$_2$ and IP$_2$, respectively. However, for this idea to work, care must be taken when selecting the atoms used to build the good copy.

For example, to show a set $A$ has $k$-FOP$_2$, it is not enough to merely find a good copy of $H(k)$ in a reduced pair associated to $A$, even if the reduced pair comes from a high rank quadratic factor. Indeed, we show in Proposition 5.5 below, that a large linear Green-Sanders example will have many good copies of $H(k)$ in its reduced pairs, yet has no 4-FOP$_2$ (see Section 2.3).

**Proposition 5.5.** For all $k \geq 1$, there are $\epsilon > 0$, $\ell_0 \geq 1$, and a rank function $\omega$, so that for all $\ell \leq \ell_0$ and $0 \leq q$, there is $N$ so that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq N$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A_{\text{GS}}(p,n)$. Then there are at least $(\epsilon p^n)^{2k}$-many good copies of $H(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(A_{\text{GS}}(p,n))$. 
Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small so that $\epsilon \leq p^{-2k(k+1)/4}$, and let $\omega_1$ as in Corollary 3.14 for $\epsilon$. Set $\ell_0 = 2k$ and $\omega(x) = \omega_1(x + 2)$. Suppose $\ell \geq \ell_0$ and $q \geq 0$. Let $N = \ell + 2k$.

Suppose $n \geq N$ and $B = (\mathcal{L}, Q)$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, with rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$, and which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A = A_{GS}(p, n)$. Let $\Gamma_{\text{err}}$ denote the set of $\mathcal{L}$-atoms which are not $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

Given $i \in [n]$, let $e_i$ denote the $i$-th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, and for each $i \in [n]$, set $\mathcal{L}_i = \{e_j : j < i\}$ (so $\mathcal{L}_1 = \emptyset$). Choose $i_0 \in [n]$ minimal such that $\mathcal{L}_{i_0} \subseteq \text{Span}(\mathcal{L})$, but $e_{i_0} \notin \text{Span}(\mathcal{L})$. Note $i_0 \leq \ell + 1$, since $\text{Span}(\mathcal{L})$ has dimension $\ell$. Clearly we may choose some $\mathcal{L}' \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\text{At}((\mathcal{L}')) = \text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{i_0} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'$. Set $B' = (\mathcal{L}', Q)$. By construction, $\text{At}(B) = \text{At}(B')$, so $B'$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$ and $\text{Red}_{B', \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \cong \text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$.

Fix any $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell - i_0}$. By Corollary 3.14

\[
\min\{|L'(\bar{0}x) \cap Q(\bar{b}) \cap L_{i_0+1}(\bar{0}1)|, |L'(\bar{0}x) \cap Q(\bar{b}) \cap L_{i_0+1}(\bar{0}2)|\} \geq (1 - \epsilon)p^{-1}|L'(\bar{0}x) \cap Q(\bar{b})|.
\]

Since $L_{i_0+1}(\bar{0}1) \subseteq A$ and $L_{i_0+1}(\bar{0}2) \subseteq \neg A$, this shows that $L'(\bar{0}x) \cap Q(\bar{b}) \in \Gamma_{\text{err}}$. By assumption, $|\Gamma_{\text{err}}| \leq \epsilon p^{\ell - i_0}$, so we must have that $p^{\ell - i_0} \leq \epsilon p^{\ell}$. By our choice of $\epsilon$, this implies $i_0 \geq 2k$. Let $\bar{e}_1, \ldots, \bar{e}_{\ell - q}$ be the standard basis vectors in $\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell - q}$. Fix any tuple $(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_i)_{i \in [k]} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell - q - k - 1})^{2k}$, and for each $i \in [k]$, set $\bar{a}_i = \bar{e}_i + \bar{e}_{i+1} + \bar{0}x_i$ and $\bar{b}_i = (p-1)(\bar{e}_i + \bar{0}y_i)$. Then $B'((\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_i))$ is contained in $A$ if $i \leq j$ and disjoint from $A$ otherwise, so $(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_i)_{i \in [k]}$ is a good copy of $H(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{B', \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$. The number of such copies is the number of ways to choose the $(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_i)_{i \in [k]}$, which is at least $(p^{\ell - q - k - 1})^{2k} \geq p^{-2k(k+1)}(p^{\ell + q})^{2k} \geq \epsilon(p^{\ell + q})^{2k}$. □

We see from the proof of Proposition 5.5, that we can build many good copies of $H(k)$ in the reduced pair associated to $GS(p, n)$ using the linear part of the factor, with the purely quadratic part not contributing much. It turns out that in order for a good copy of $H(k)$ in a reduced pair to give rise to an instance of $k$-FOP2, it must use the purely quadratic structure in a more fundamental way. Formally, this can be accomplished by considering good copies of $H(k)$ where one side of the bipartite graph sits inside a distinguished subspace.

**Definition 5.6.** Suppose $F = (V \cup W, E)$ is a bipartite graph. Suppose $n \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $H \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is a subspace. If $(\bar{a}_v)_{v \in V}(\bar{b}_w)_{w \in W} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^{|V| + |W|}$ is a copy of $F$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, we say it has the right side in $H$ if $\{\bar{b}_w : w \in W\} \subseteq H$.

When ambiguity could arise, we will always specify which side of a bipartite graph we consider to be the “right hand” side. In applications, we will be considering copies of $H(k)$ and $U(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ which have right side in a special subspace defined using the linear part of the factor $B$.

**Definition 5.7.** Suppose $n \geq 1$ and $B$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$. Define $H_B := \{\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell + q} : \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\}$.

Note that in Definition 5.7 $H_B$ is always a subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell + q}$ of codimension $q$. Our sufficient conditions for FOP2 and IP2 will say roughly the following: If there exists a good copy of $H(k)$ (respectively $U(k)$) in $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, with right side in $H_B$, then $A$ has $k$-FOP2 (respectively $k$-IP2). The “right side in $H_B$” assumption forces the copy of $H(k)$
Corollary 5.8 (Embedding lemma for induced 3-graphs in quadratic atoms). For all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ exists and a rank function $\tau$ such that for all $D$ there exists $N$ such that the following holds for every 3-partite 3-graph $F = (U \cup W \cup Z, R_F)$ where for some $t_u + t_w + t_z = t$, $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{t_u}\}$, $W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{t_w}\}$, and $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{t_z}\}$.

Suppose $n \geq N$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\tau(\ell + q)$ where $\ell + q \leq D$. Suppose

$$\{B(\bar{a}_i) : i \in [t_u]\}, \{B(\bar{b}_j) : i \in [t_w]\}, \{B(\bar{c}_k) : i \in [t_z]\} \subseteq \text{At}(B),$$

and

$$\{d_{ij}^{xy} : xy \in \left(\binom{a, b, c}{2}\right), 1 \leq i \leq t_x, 1 \leq j \leq t_y\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^q.$$

For each $(i, j, s) \in [t_u] \times [t_w] \times [t_z]$, let $e_{ijs} = \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_j \bar{c}_k \bar{d}_{ij}^{xy} \bar{d}_{ks}^{yz}$, and define $\alpha_{ijs} = 1$ if $u_iw_jz_s \in R_F$ and $\alpha_{ijs} = 0$ if $u_iw_jz_s \notin R_F$. Suppose for each $(i, j, s) \in [t_u] \times [t_w] \times [t_z]$,

$$\left| \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(e_{ijs}))|}{|B(\Sigma(e_{ijs}))|} - \alpha_{ijs} \right| \leq \epsilon$$

Then there exists $(g_i, h_i) \in [t_u], (f_i) \in [t_w] \in \prod_{i=1}^{t_u} B(\bar{a}_i) \times \prod_{i=1}^{t_w} B(\bar{b}_i) \times \prod_{i=1}^{t_z} B(\bar{c}_i)$ such that $g_i + h_j + f_k \in A$ if and only if $u_iv_jw_k \in R_F$.

The proof of Corollary 5.8 will also use a well known fact, namely that sparse quasirandom triads are quasirandom (for a proof see e.g. [76]).

Proposition 5.9. For all $\epsilon > 0$ there is $\epsilon' > 0$ such that for all $d_2 > 0$, there is $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for all $\delta \leq \delta_2$, the following holds. Suppose $H = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3; R)$ is a 3-partite 3-graph such that $|V_1| \geq n$, and for each $ij \in \left(\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \end{array}\right)$, $||V_i| - |V_j|| \leq \delta|V_i|$. Suppose $G = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3; E)$ is a 3-partite graph such that for each $ij \in \left(\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \end{array}\right)$, $G[V_i, V_j]$ has dev$_3(\delta, d_2)$ and suppose

$$|R \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)| \leq \epsilon'|K_3^{(2)}(G)|.$$

Then $(H', G)$ has dev$_3(\delta, \epsilon)$ where $H' = (U \cup V \cup W, R \cap K_3^{(2)}(G))$.

Proof of Corollary 5.8 Fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\delta_3 = \delta_3(1/2, 1/2, 3t)$ be from Lemma 4.18 and set $\epsilon_1 = \delta_3^2$. Given $x \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\epsilon_2(x) = \delta_2(p^x, \epsilon_1^2)$ where $\delta_2(p^x, \epsilon_1^2)$ is from Proposition 5.9. Let $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\epsilon)$ be from Lemma 4.13. Let $\tau_2 = \tau_2(\epsilon^2)$ from Lemma 4.15. Let $\tau(x) = \max\{\tau_1(x), \tau_2(x)\}$. Given $D$, choose $n_0 = n_0(1/2, 1/2, 3t, \delta_3, p^{-D})$ as in Lemma 4.8 and let $N = 2p^{D+n_0}$.

Suppose $n \geq N$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\tau(\ell + q)$. Assume we are given subsets $\{B(\bar{a}_i) : i \in [t_u]\}$, $\{B(\bar{b}_j) : i \in [t_w]\}$, $\{B(\bar{c}_k) : i \in [t_z]\}$ of At$(B)$, and a subset $\{d_{ij}^{xy} : xy \in \left(\binom{a, b, c}{2}\right), 1 \leq i \leq t_x, 1 \leq j \leq t_y\}$ of $\mathbb{F}_p^q$. (respectively $U(k)$) to use the purely quadratic structure in a nontrivial way. The proofs will be very short once we have the following lemma, which is a straightforward corollary of Lemma 4.8.
For each \((i, j, k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]\), let \(\bar{e}_{ijk} = a_i b_j c_k d_{ij} d_{ik} d_{jk}\), and set \(\alpha_{ijk} = 1\) if \(u_i w_j z_k \in R_F\) and \(\alpha_{ijk} = 0\) if \(u_i w_j z_k \notin R_F\). Assume that for each \((i, j, k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]\),

\[
\left| \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{ijk}))|}{|B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{ijk}))|} - \alpha_{ijk} \right| \leq \epsilon.
\]

Our next step is to define a \(t\)-partite hypergraph \(H = (V, E)\) and underlying \(t\)-partite graph \(G = (V, E')\), to which we will apply Lemma \ref{lem:4.8} The vertex set for both \(G\) and \(H\) will be \(V = \bigcup_{(i,j,k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]} B(\bar{a}_i) \cup B(\bar{b}_j) \cup B(\bar{c}_k)\), and the vertex partition will be given by \(P = \{B(\bar{a}_i) : i \in [t_a]\} \cup \{B(\bar{b}_j) : j \in [t_b]\} \cup \{B(\bar{c}_k) : k \in [t_c]\}\).

Now for each \(x \neq y \in \{a, b, c\}\), \(1 \leq i \leq t_x\), and \(1 \leq j \leq t_y\), set \(G[B(\bar{x}_i), B(\bar{y}_j)] = \Delta^{(2)}(\bar{x}_i\bar{y}_j d_{ij}^{2n})\). By Lemma \ref{lem:4.13}, each such \(G[B(\bar{x}_i), B(\bar{y}_j)]\) has dev\(_2(\delta_2(p^{-q}, \epsilon_2^n), p^{-q})\). Then for each \((i, j, k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]\), set \(G_{ijk} = G[B(\bar{a}_i), B(\bar{b}_j), B(\bar{c}_k)]\), and define \(H[B(\bar{a}_i), B(\bar{b}_j), B(\bar{c}_k)] = (B(\bar{a}_i) \cup B(\bar{b}_j) \cup B(\bar{c}_k), E_A^{(3)} \cap K_3^{(2)}(G_{ijk}))\).

This finishes our definition of \(G\) and \(H\). By \ref{eq:5.1}, Lemma \ref{lem:4.15} and the definition of \(H\) above, we have that for all \((i, j, k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]\),

\[
\left| \frac{|E \cap K_3^{(2)}(G_{ijk})|}{|K_3^{(2)}(G_{ijk})|} - \alpha_{ijk} \right| \leq 2\epsilon.
\]

By Proposition \ref{prop:5.9} each \((H_{ijk}, G_{ijk})\) has dev\(_3(\delta_3, \epsilon_3)\). By Lemma \ref{lem:4.8} because \(n\) is sufficiently large, and by Corollary \ref{cor:3.11} there exists some

\[
(\alpha_{i})_{i \in [t_a]}(\beta_{j})_{j \in [t_b]}(\gamma_{k})_{k \in [t_c]} \in \prod_{i=1}^{t_a} B(\bar{a}_i) \times \prod_{j=1}^{t_b} B(\bar{b}_j) \times \prod_{k=1}^{t_c} B(\bar{c}_k)
\]

such for all \((i, j, k) \in [t_a] \times [t_b] \times [t_c]\), \(\alpha_{i}\beta_{j}\gamma_{k} \in E_A^{(3)}\) if and only if \(ijk \in R_F\), i.e. \(\alpha_{i} + \beta_{j} + \gamma_{k} \in A\) if and only if \(u_i w_j z_k \in R_F\).

We now prove a sufficient condition for IP\(_2\). Recall that \(U(k) = (V \cup W, E)\) where \(V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}\), \(W = \{w_S : S \subseteq [k]\}\) and \(v_i w_S \in E\) if and only if \(i \in S\). In this notation, we consider \(W\) to be the “right side” of the graph.

**Theorem 5.10.** For all \(k\), there is \(\epsilon > 0\) and a rank function \(\omega\) such that for all \(\ell, q \geq 1\) there is \(N\) such that the following holds. Suppose \(n \geq N\) and \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\). Suppose \(B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) is a factor of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(\ell + q)\). If there exists a good copy of \(U(k)\) in \(\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) with right side in \(H_B\), then \(A\) has k-IP\(_2\).

**Proof.** Fix \(k \geq 1\) and set \(t = 2k^2 + 2k\). Let \(\epsilon > 0\) and \(\omega\) be as in Corollary \ref{cor:5.8} for \(t\), set \(N = N(\epsilon, t, \ell + q)\) as in Corollary \ref{cor:5.8}. Suppose \(n \geq N\), \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\), \(B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\) is a quadratic factor in \(\mathbb{F}_p^n\) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \(\omega(\ell + q)\), and assume there exists a good copy of \(U(k)\) in \(\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) with right side in \(H_B\).

This means there are \(\{\bar{f}_S : S \subseteq [k]\} \cup \{\bar{g}_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{t+q}\) with \(\{\bar{f}_S : S \subseteq [k]\} \subseteq H_B\), and such that for all \(i \in [k]\) and \(S \subseteq [k]\), if \(i \in S\), then \(|A \cap B(\bar{g}_i + \bar{f}_S)|/|B(\bar{g}_i + \bar{f}_S)| \geq 1 - \epsilon\), and if \(i \notin S\), then \(|A \cap B(\bar{g}_i + \bar{f}_S)|/|B(\bar{g}_i + \bar{f}_S)| \leq \epsilon\). For each \(i \in [k]\), let \(a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\) and
Proof. Let \( \bar{g}_i = \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_i \), and for each \( S \subseteq [k] \), let \( \bar{d}_S \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \) be such that \( \bar{f}_S = \bar{u} \bar{d}_S \) (we know each \( \bar{f}_S \) has this form since \( \bar{f}_S \in H_B \)).

For each \( i \in [k] \) and \( X \subseteq [k]^2 \), set \( \bar{v}_i = \bar{w}_X = \overline{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \). Given \( X \subseteq [k]^2 \), and \( i \in [k] \), define \( N_X(i) = \{ j \in [k] : (i, j) \in X \} \). Then for each \( i, j \in [k] \) and \( X \subseteq [k]^2 \), define \( \bar{u}^{wv}_{ij} = \bar{u}_{ij} \bar{w}_X = \overline{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( \bar{u}^{wv}_{ij} = \bar{d}_{ij}(i) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and set \( \bar{e}_{i,j,X} = \bar{v}_i \bar{g}_j \bar{w}_X \bar{u}_{ij} \bar{w}_X \bar{u}^{wv}_{ij} \). Note that
\[
B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,X})) = L(\bar{a}_j) \cap Q(\bar{u}_{N_X(i)} + \bar{b}_j) = B(\bar{g}_j + \bar{f}_{N_X(i)}).
\]
By assumption, the density of \( A \) on \( B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,S})) \) is at least \( 1 - \epsilon \) if \( j \in N_X(i) \), and at most \( \epsilon \) if \( j \notin N_X(i) \). By Corollary 5.8 there are \( \bar{s}_i = (\bar{r}_i)_{i \in [k]}(\bar{r}_S)_{S \subseteq [k]^2} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^t \) such that for each \( i, j \in [k] \) and \( S \subseteq [k]^2 \), \( \bar{s}_i + \bar{t}_j + \bar{r}_S \in A \) if and only if \( j \in N_S(i) \), i.e., if and only if \( (i, j) \in S \). Thus, \( A \) has VC\(_2\)-dimension at least \( k \). \( \square \)

A similar result gives us our sufficient condition for k-FOP\(_2\).

**Theorem 5.11.** For all \( k \geq 1 \), there are \( \epsilon > 0 \) and a rank function \( \omega \) such that for all \( \ell, q \geq 1 \) there is \( N \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( n \geq N \), \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \( (\ell, q) \) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \). Suppose there is a good copy of \( H(k) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with right side in \( H_B \). Then \( A \) has k-FOP\(_2\).

**Proof.** Fix \( k \geq 1 \) and let \( t = 2k + k^2 \). Let \( \epsilon \) and \( \omega \) be as in Corollary 5.8 for \( k \). Given \( q, \ell \), let \( N = N(t, \epsilon, \omega, \ell + q) \) be as in Corollary 5.8.

Now suppose \( n \geq N \), \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a factor of complexity \( (\ell, q) \) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \) where \( \ell + q \leq D \). Assume there exists a good copy of \( H(k) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B},\epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with right side in \( B \). Then there are \( \{\bar{u}_i, \bar{w}_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \) such that \( \{\bar{w}_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq H_B \), and so that if \( i \leq j \), then \( |A \cap B(\bar{u}_i + \bar{w}_j)|/|B(\bar{u}_i + \bar{w}_j)| \geq 1 - \epsilon \), and if \( i > j \), then \( |A \cap B(\bar{u}_i + \bar{w}_j)|/|B(\bar{u}_i + \bar{w}_j)| \leq \epsilon \). For each \( i \in [k] \), let \( \bar{a}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell} \) and \( \bar{b}_i \), \( \bar{c}_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \) be such that \( \bar{u}_i = \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_i \) and \( \bar{w}_i = \overline{0} \bar{c}_i \) (each \( \bar{w}_i \) has this form since \( \bar{w}_i \in H_B \)). Let \( I = \{ f : [k]^2 \rightarrow [k] \} \).

For each \( i \in [k] \) and \( (i, f) \in [k] \times I \), define \( \bar{x}_i = \bar{y}_i^f = \overline{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \). Then for each \( i, j \in [k] \) and \( f \in I \), set \( \bar{d}^{wv}_{ij} = \bar{d}^{wv}_{ij} = \overline{0} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( \bar{d}^{wv}_{ij} = \bar{d}^{wv}_{ij} = \bar{d}^{wv}_{ij} \). Observe that \( B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,s})) = B(\bar{a}_s ; \bar{b}_s + \bar{c}_{f(i,j)}) = B(\bar{a}_s + \bar{w}_{f(i,j)}) \).

Thus,
\[
|A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,s}))| \geq |A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,s}))| \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ if } s \leq f(i, j) \text{ and } |A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}_{i,j,s}))| \leq \epsilon \text{ if } s > f(i, j).
\]

By Corollary 5.8 there are \( (s_i)_{i \in [k]}(t_j^f)_{(i,f) \in [k] \times I}(r_i)_{i \in [k]} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^t \) such that \( s_i + t_j^f + r_m \in A \) if and only if \( m \leq f(i, j) \). Thus \( A \) has k-FOP\(_2\). \( \square \)

**Theorem 5.11** is crucial for our results about FOP\(_2\). For example, we prove as an immediate corollary that for any \( k \), a sufficiently large quadratic Green-Sanders example must have k-FOP\(_2\).

**Corollary 5.12.** \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{QS}(p)} \) has FOP\(_2\).
Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$, and let $\epsilon, \omega$ be as in Theorem 5.11 for $k$. Let $N = N(0, k)$ be from Theorem 5.11 for $k, \epsilon, \omega$. Now suppose $n \geq N$, and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) = QGS(n, p)$. Recall this means $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n Q_i(e_i)$, where for each $i \in [n]$, $Q_i = \{M_1, \ldots, M_i\}$, for some set $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ of rank $n$. Note $Q_i$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(0, k)$ and rank $n \geq \omega(1)$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $b_i = (p - 1)e_i$ and $\bar{a}_i = e_i + e_{i+1}$. Then for any $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $Q_k(\bar{a}_i + \bar{b}_j) = Q_k(e_i + e_{i+1} + (p - 1)e_j)$.

If $i < j$, then $Q_k(\bar{a}_i + \bar{b}_j) \subseteq Q_i(e_i) \subseteq A$. If $i = j$, then $Q_k(\bar{a}_j + \bar{b}_j) \subseteq Q_{i+1}(e_{i+1}) \subseteq \neg A$. Therefore, $(\bar{a}_i)_{i \in [k]}(\bar{b}_j)_{j \in [k]}$ is a good copy of $H(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{\epsilon, \omega}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ with right side in $H_B$. By Theorem 5.11 $A$ has $k$-FOP$_2$. □

5.2. Translation to trees. In this subsection, we prove a key corollary of Theorem 5.11 which will tell us, roughly speaking, that if a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ has no $k$-FOP$_2$, then for any high rank quadratic factor $B$ which is almost $c$-atomic with respect to $A$, the reduced pair $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ will contain very few copies of $H(k)$ with right side in $H_B$. For technical reasons, we will state and prove this corollary using an equivalent formulation of the order property involving trees.

Given an integer $d \geq 1$, let $2^d = \{0, 1\}^d$. In other words, $2^d$ consists of sequences of 0s and 1s of length $d$. By convention, $2^0 = \{<>\}$, where $<>$ denotes the so-called empty string. Then for $d \geq 1$, $2^{<d} := \bigcup_{i=0}^{d-1} 2^i$. Given $0 \leq i < j$, $\sigma \in 2^i$ and $\tau \in 2^j$, we write $\sigma \triangleleft \tau$ to denote that $\sigma$ is a proper initial segment of $\tau$, and $\sigma \triangleleft \tau$ denotes that either $\sigma = \tau$ or $\sigma \triangleleft \tau$. By convention, $<> \triangleleft \sigma$ holds for any $\sigma \in 2^d$ and $d \geq 0$. For any $\sigma \in 2^d$ and $\tau \in 2^j$, we let $\sigma \land \tau$ denote the element of $2^{i+j}$ obtained by adjoining $\tau$ to the end of $\sigma$ (so e.g. $(01) \land (001) = (01001)$).

Definition 5.13. Given $d \geq 1$, define $T(d)$ to be the bipartite graph with vertex set $\{a_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \cup \{b_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\}$ and edge set $\{a_\eta b_\sigma : \sigma \land 1 \leq \eta\}$.

We think of $T(d)$ as a binary branching tree, and refer to the elements $\{a_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\}$ as the leaves, and the elements $\{b_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\}$ as the nodes. We will use throughout that there are $2^d$ leaves and $2^{d-1} - 1$ nodes in $T(d)$. A foundational result in stability theory, due to Shelah [64], says that there is a correspondence between certain instances of $T(d)$ and the order property. We will describe here only what is needed for this paper, and refer the reader to the literature for more details (see [17, 53, 72] for treatments in a finitary setting).

In this correspondence, it is only really important to know what happens along branches in $T(d)$, i.e. that $\sigma \land 1 \leq \eta$ implies $b_\sigma a_\eta \in E(T(d))$ and $\sigma \land 0 \leq \eta$ implies $b_\sigma a_\eta \notin E(T(d))$.

For this reason, we will work with the following notion, which is somewhat weaker than the notion of a copy of $T(d)$.

Definition 5.14. Suppose $n \geq 1$ and $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$. An encoding of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ is a tuple $(g_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d}(h_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{<d}} \in (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^{2^d + 2^{d-1}}$ such that if $\sigma \land 1 \leq \eta$, then $g_\eta + h_\sigma \in A$, and if $\sigma \land 0 \leq \eta$, then $g_\eta + h_\sigma \notin A$.

Clearly, any copy of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ is also an encoding of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$. However, an encoding of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ need not be a copy, as the definition of an encoding specifies nothing about the sums the form $g_\eta + h_\sigma$ with $\sigma \not\in \eta$. 
The version of the correspondence between trees and the order property we shall use is stated below. We have made a small translation into the notation of this paper, but the result can be deduced directly from [17].

**Theorem 5.15** (Shelah [64], Hodges (quantitative) [17]). For all \( k \geq 1 \), there exists an integer \( d = d(k) \geq 1 \) so that the following holds. Suppose \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) and \( (g_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d} (h_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^d} \) is an encoding of \( T(d) \) in \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \). Then there are \( \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\} \subseteq \{g_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \) and \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_k\} \subseteq \{h_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\} \) such that \( c_i + b_j \in A \) if and only if \( i \leq j \).

In other words, for \( d \) sufficiently large, an encoding of \( T(d) \) in \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) always produces a copy of \( H(k) \) in \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \), with “left side” contained in the nodes of \( T(d) \) and “right side” contained in the leaves of \( T(d) \). For the curious, Hodges showed one can take \( d(k) = 2k^2 - 2 \) in Theorem 5.15. We will not use it here, but there is a similar result going in the reverse direction, i.e. if one has a sufficiently large copy of \( H(k) \), then one has an encoding of \( T(d) \) (see [17]). We will often need to keep track of where the leaves and nodes of our encodings end up.

**Definition 5.16.** Suppose \( A, X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( (a_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d} (b_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{<d}} \in G^{2d + 2^{<d}} \) is an encoding of \( T(d) \) in \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \). The encoding has leaves in \( X \) if \( \{a_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \subseteq X \) and nodes in \( Y \) if \( \{b_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\} \subseteq Y \).

The following is an encoding analogue of a good copy in a reduced pair, where all the important sums avoid the error atoms.

**Definition 5.17.** Suppose \( n \geq 1, \epsilon > 0, A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( B \) is a quadratic factor of complexity \((\ell, q)\). A good encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) is an encoding \((a_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d} (b_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{<d}} \) of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \), where moreover for all \( \eta \in 2^d \) and \( \sigma \in 2^{<d} \), \( \frac{|A \cap B(a_\eta + b_\sigma)|}{|B(a_\eta + b_\sigma)|} \in [0, \epsilon) \cup (1 - \epsilon, 1] \).

Note that in a good encoding, \( \bar{a}_\eta + \bar{b}_\sigma \in A_1 \cup A_0 \) for all \( \eta \in 2^d \) and \( \sigma \in 2^{<d} \) (not just those satisfying \( \sigma \leq \eta \)). If \( \operatorname{At}(B) \neq A_1 \cup A_0 \), it may be the case that there are encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) which are not good. We also point out that a good encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) need not be a good copy of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \). Indeed, a good copy would insist that \( \bar{a}_\eta + \bar{b}_\sigma \in A_0 \) for all \( \sigma \leq \eta \), while a good encoding merely requires that \( \bar{a}_\eta + \bar{b}_\sigma \in A_1 \cup A_0 \) for all \( \sigma \leq \eta \). As an immediate corollary of Theorem 5.15, we obtain the following rephrasing of Theorem 5.11.

**Corollary 5.18.** For all \( k \geq 1 \) there is \( d = d(k) \) such that the following holds. There are \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \omega : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) such that for all \( \ell, q \geq 1 \) there is \( N \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( n \geq N \) and \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Suppose \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a factor of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank at least \( \omega(\ell + q) \) where \( \ell + q \leq D \).

If there exists a good encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{\mathcal{B}, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_\mathcal{B} \), then \( A \) has \( k\text{-FOP}_2 \).

**Proof.** Fix \( k \geq 1 \), and let \( d = d(k) \) be as in Theorem 5.15. Choose \( \epsilon \) and \( \omega \) as in the proof of Theorem 5.11. Fix \( \ell, q \geq 1 \), and choose \( N = N(k, \epsilon, \rho, \ell, q) \) as in the proof of Theorem 5.11.
Suppose $n \geq N$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n_p$, and $B$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}^n_p$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, with rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$. Assume there exists a good encoding of $T(d)$ in $\text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A)$ with leaves in $H_B$. This means there are $\{\bar{v}_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\} \cup \{\bar{w}_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}$ satisfying $\{\bar{w}_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \subseteq H_B$, and such that for all $\eta$ and $\sigma$, $\bar{v}_\sigma + \bar{w}_\eta \in A_1 \cup A_0$, such that $\sigma \wedge 1 \leq \eta$ implies $\bar{v}_\sigma + \bar{w}_\eta \in A_1$, $\sigma \wedge 0 \leq \eta$ implies $\bar{v}_\sigma + \bar{w}_\eta \in A_0$.

By Theorem 5.15 there are $\{\tilde{c}_1, \ldots, \tilde{c}_k\} \subseteq \{\bar{v}_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{<d}\}$ and $\{\tilde{e}_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}_k\} \subseteq \{\bar{w}_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\}$ such that $\tilde{c}_i + \tilde{e}_j \in A_1$ if $i \leq j$, and $\tilde{c}_i + \tilde{e}_j \in A_0$ if $i > j$. Consequently, $(\tilde{c}_i)_{i \in [k]}(\tilde{e}_i)_{i \in [k]}$ is a good copy of $H(k)$ in $\text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A)$. It has right side in $H_B$ because $\{\tilde{e}_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}_k\} \subseteq \{\bar{w}_\eta : \eta \in 2^d\} \subseteq H_B$, so by Theorem 5.11 $A$ has $k$-FOP$_2$.

We now state and prove the main corollary of Theorem 5.11 which gives strong restrictions on the locations of encodings of $T(d)$ in reduced pairs associated to sets with no $k –$ FOP$_2$. Informally, we will see that if $A$ has no $k$-FOP$_2$, and $B$ is a high rank quadratic factor which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$, then there are many encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H_B$, and further, for almost all cosets $C$ of $H_B$, there are very few encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H_B$ and nodes in $C$. The idea behind that Corollary 5.18 says there can be no good encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H_B$, so any such encoding must use an error atom. Since $B$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic, there are few error atoms, and thus very few such encodings.

**Corollary 5.19.** For all $k$ there is $\epsilon^*$ and $\omega^*$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon^*$, there is $\mu$ so that for all $\rho \geq \omega^*$, and $\ell, q \geq 1$, there is $N$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq N$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n_p$ has no $k$-FOP$_2$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}^n_p$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ which is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$. Then the following hold.

1. There are at most $\epsilon |H_B|^2^d |\mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}| |2^d - 1|$ many good encodings of $T(d)$ in $\text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A)$ with leaves in $H_B$.
2. There is a set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}/H_B$ such that $|\Omega| \leq \epsilon \rho^n$ and for all $g \notin \Omega$, the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $\text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A)$ with leaves in $H_B$ and nodes in $H_B + g$ is at most $\epsilon |H_B|^2^d + 2^d - 1$.

**Proof.** Fix $k \geq 1$ and let $d = d(k)$ be as in Theorem 5.15. Let $\epsilon^*$ and $\omega^*$ be as in Theorem 5.11 for $k$. Given $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon^*$, let $\mu = \epsilon (2^{|d^2|} + 2^{|d^2|} - 1)$. Fix a rank function $\rho \geq \omega^*$, and $\ell, q \geq 1$. Let $N = N(\mu, \rho, d)$ be from Corollary 5.18.

Suppose $n \geq N$, $(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A)$ does not have $k$-FOP$_2$, and $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}^n_p$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ which is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$. By assumption, there is a partition $\text{At}(B) = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_{\text{err}}$ satisfying $|\Gamma_{\text{err}}| \leq \mu \ell^{\ell+q}$, and so that for each $u \in \{0,1\}$ and $B \in \Gamma_u$, $|A_u \cap B|/|B| \geq 1 - \mu$. As usual, we set $A_0 = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p : B(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_0\}$ and $A_1 = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p : B(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_1\}$, and we also let

$$\Sigma = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p : B(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_{\text{err}}\}.$$ 

Recall $\text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}^n_p, A) = (A_1, \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p)$. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ be a linear factor in $\mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p$ such that $L_1(0) = H_B$. Note $\mathcal{L}_1$ has complexity $\ell$ as $H_B$ has codimension $\ell$. For ease of notation, let $G' = \mathbb{F}^{\ell+q}_p$. 

Then define
\[ \Omega = \{ L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}_1) : |L \cap \Sigma| \geq \mu^{1/2}p^q \}. \]

Note that every element of \( \Omega \) is a coset of \( H_B \), and since \( |\Sigma| = |\Gamma_{err}| \leq \mu p^{\ell+q} \), we have \( |\Omega| \leq \mu^{1/2}p^d \).

We claim that there are at most \( \varepsilon |H_B|^2d|G'|^{2d-1} \) many encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \), and that for all \( H_B + g \notin \Omega \), there are at most \( \varepsilon |H_1|^2d+2d-1 \) many encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \) and nodes in \( H_B + g \).

Since \( A \) does not have \( k \)-FOP2, Corollary 5.18 implies that for any encoding, \( (\bar{a}_\eta)_{\eta \in 2d}((\bar{b}_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^d} \) of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \), there must be some \( \sigma \in 2^d \) and \( \eta \in 2^d \), such that \( \bar{b}_\sigma + \bar{a}_\eta \in \Sigma \). Thus each encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \) will be constructed in the following procedure.

- Choose \( \sigma \in 2^d \) and \( \eta \in 2^d \). There are \( (2^d)(2^d-1) \) choices.
- Choose \( g \in \Sigma \). There are at most \( \mu p^{\ell+q} \) choices.
- Choose \( \bar{a}_\eta \in H_B \). There are \( |H_B| \) choices.
- Set \( \bar{b}_\sigma = \bar{g} - \bar{a}_\eta \). There is one choice.
- Choose any \( \bar{b}_{\sigma'} \in G' \) for each \( \sigma' \in 2^d \setminus \{\sigma\} \) and any \( \bar{a}_{\eta'} \in H_B \) for each \( \eta \in 2^d \setminus \{\eta\} \). There are \( |G'|2^{d-2}|H_B|^{2d-1} \) choices.

This yields the following bound for the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \).

\[ (2^d)(2^d-1)\mu p^{\ell+q}|H_B|^{2d}|G'|^{2d-2} = (2^d)(2^d-1)\mu |H_B|^{2d}|G'|^{2d-1} \leq \varepsilon |H_B|^{2d}|G'|^{2d-1}, \]

where the last inequality is by our choice of \( \mu \). This finishes the verification of (1). We now show (2). We have already shown \( |\Omega| \leq \mu^{1/2}p^d < \varepsilon p^d \), where the second inequality is by our choice of \( \mu \). Assume now \( H_B + g \notin \Omega \) and \( (\bar{a}_\eta)_{\eta \in 2d}((\bar{d}_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^d} \) is an encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \) and nodes in \( H_B + g \). Since \( A \) has no \( k \)-FOP2, Corollary 5.18 implies there must be some \( \sigma \in 2^d \) and \( \eta \in 2^d \) such that \( \bar{b}_\sigma + \bar{a}_\eta \in \Sigma \). Note that since \( \bar{b}_\sigma \in H_B + g \) and \( \bar{a}_\eta \in H_B \), \( \bar{b}_\sigma + \bar{a}_\eta \in \Sigma \cap (H_B + g) \). This shows that for every \( g \notin \Omega \), every encoding of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \) and nodes in \( H_B + g \) will be constructed in the following procedure.

- Choose some \( \sigma \in 2^d \) and \( \eta \in 2^d \). There are \( (2^d)(2^d-1) \) choices.
- Choose some \( f \in \Sigma \cap (H_B + g) \). Since \( H_B + g \notin \Omega \), the number of choices is at most \( \mu^{1/2}p^d \).
- Choose \( \bar{a}_\eta \in H_B \). There are \( |H_B| \) choices.
- Set \( \bar{b}_\sigma = \bar{f} - \bar{a}_\eta \). There is one choice.
- Choose any \( \bar{b}_{\sigma'} \in H_B + g \) for each \( \sigma' \in 2^d \setminus \{\sigma\} \) and any \( \bar{a}_{\eta'} \in H_B \) for each \( \eta' \in 2^d \setminus \{\eta\} \). There are \( |H_B|^{2d+2d-3} \) choices.

Thus, for every \( g \notin \Omega \), the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( \text{Red}_{B,\mu}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) with leaves in \( H_B \) and nodes in \( H_B + g \) is at most the following.

\[ (2^d)(2^d-1)\mu^{1/2}|H_B|^2p^d|H_B|^{2d+2d-3} = (2^d)(2^d-1)\mu^{1/2}|H_B|^{2d+2d-1} < \varepsilon |H_B|^{2d+2d-1}, \]

where the last inequality is by definition of \( \mu \). This finishes the verification of (2).
In light of Corollary 5.19, it is a good time to state the generalized regularity lemma we will use to prove Theorem 5.20. Its hypotheses are designed to reflect the conclusions of Corollary 5.19, and it will later be applied to structures of the form $\text{Red}_{B_{\epsilon}}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, where $A$ is a set with no $k$-FOP$_2$.

**Theorem 5.20.** For all $d \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, and increasing functions $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, there exists $D = D(\epsilon, \psi, d)$, $N = N(\epsilon, \psi, d)$, $\mu_0 = \mu_0(\epsilon, \psi, d)$, and $C = C(\epsilon, \psi, d)$ such that for all $0 < \mu < \mu_0$, the following holds.

Suppose $\ell \geq 0$, $n - \ell \geq N$, $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $\Omega \subseteq G/H$ satisfy the following.

(i) $|H| = p^{n-\ell}$ and $|\Omega| \leq \mu p^\ell$,

(ii) The number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ with leaves in $H$ is at most $\mu^C |H|^{2^{d}} |G|^{2^{d}-1}$.

(iii) For all $H + g \notin \Omega$, the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $H + g$ is at most $\mu |H|^{2^{d}+2^{d}-1}$.

Then there exists a subspace $H' \leq H$ of codimension $m \leq D$ in $H$, and a set $\Omega' \subseteq G/H'$ satisfying $|\Omega'| \leq (\mu + \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}) p^{m+\ell}$, such that for every $C \in (G/H') \setminus \Omega'$, 

$$|A \cap C|/|C| \in [0, \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}) \cup (1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}, 1].$$

The proof of this theorem is based on the proof of the main theorem in [73], and appears in Section 5.4. We end this subsection with a brief discussion of the important features of Theorem 5.20. First, it is extremely important that the codimension of $H'$ in $H$ depends only on $\epsilon$, $\psi$, and $d$, and not on $\ell$ or on $\mu$. For instance, this is crucial for showing Theorem 5.20 implies Theorem 1.5 for elementary $p$-groups, as we now show.

**Theorem 5.21** (Theorem 1.5 for elementary $p$-groups). If $\mathcal{P}$ is a stable epGP, then $\mathcal{P}$ is strongly linearly atomic.

*Proof.* Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is a stable epGP. By definition, there is some $k \geq 1$ such that every $(G, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ is $k$-stable. Fix any increasing function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$. Let $d = d(k)$ be as in Theorem 5.15, and let $D, N, \mu_0, C$ be as in Theorem 5.20 for $d$, $1/2$, and $\psi'(x) = \psi(x) + 2x$. Choose any $0 < \mu < \mu_0 p^{-2D}$.

Suppose $n \geq N$ and $A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ is $k$-stable. Observe the hypotheses of Theorem 5.20 are satisfied with $A$, $H = G$ (so $\ell = 0$), and $\mu$. Indeed, because $A$ is $k$-stable, there are be no encodings at all of $T(d)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$. Theorem 5.20 yields a subspace $H' \leq G$ of codimension $m \leq D$ which is $p^{-\psi(m)}$ atomic with respect to $A$ on all but at most $(\mu + \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}) p^m$ many cosets. By our choice of $\mu$ and $\psi'$, $(\mu + \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}) p^m < 1$, so there are in fact no cosets which are not $\epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}$ atomic with respect to $A$. \qed

Note that in this proof, it was crucial that we could choose $\mu$ last among the parameters. While Theorem 5.20 implies Theorem 1.5 for elementary $p$-groups, Theorem 5.20 also applies in a wider range of circumstances, where the set $A$ is not necessarily stable, a fact which will be important for our applications.

On the other hand, it is still important that the hypotheses in Theorem 5.20 limit instances of instability, rather than, for example, instances of the independence property. Specifically, one cannot replace instances of $T(d)$ by copies of $U(k)$, as we now show.
Recall that given $A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H \leq G$, a copy of $U(k)$ with right side in $H$ is a tuple $(a_i)_{i \in [k]}(b_S)_{S \subseteq [k]} \in G^k \times H^k$ such that $a_i + b_S \in A$ if and only if $i \in S$. We will also say the copy has left side in $H + g$ if $\{a_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq H + g$. We now show one cannot prove an analogue of Theorem 5.20 with $U(k)$ replacing $T(d)$, while maintaining the same relationships among the parameters.

**Proposition 5.22.** There is an increasing function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $D > 0$, there is $\mu > 0$ such that for all $n \geq \ell$, there exists $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_3^n$ and a subspace $H \leq \mathbb{F}_3^n$ of codimension $\ell$, such that the following hold. There are no copies of $U(4)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_3^n, A)$ with right side in $H$, and for all $H' \leq H$ of codimension $m \leq D$, there strictly more than $(\mu + \epsilon 3^{-\psi(m)}) 3^{m+\ell}$ cosets of $H'$ which are not $\epsilon 3^{-\psi(m)}$ atomic with respect to $A$.

**Proof.** Choose any increasing function $\psi$ satisfying $\psi(x) > 3x$. Fix any $D > 0$ and $0 < \mu < 3^{-2D}$. Fix any $n \geq \ell$. Let $e_1, \ldots, e_\ell$ be the standard basis vectors in $G = \mathbb{F}_3^n$. Set $\mathcal{L} = \{e_1, \ldots, e_\ell\}$ in $\mathbb{F}_3^n$, and $H = L(0)$. For each $g + H \in G/H$, define $A_g + H = A' + g$, and then set $A = \bigcup_{g \in G/H} A' + g$. Since $(A-g) \cap H = (A-g') \cap H$ for all $g, g' \in G$, if there exists any copy of $U(4)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_3^n, A)$ with right side in $H$, we may assume the left side in a single translate $H + g$. However, for all $g \in G/H$, $(A-g) \cap H = A'$, so since $\text{GS}(3, n-\ell)$ has VC-dimension at most 3 (by Proposition 2.19), there are no copies of $U(4)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_3^n, A)$ with right side in $H$ and left side in $H + g$, for all $g \in G/H$. Thus, there are no copies of $U(4)$ in $(\mathbb{F}_3^n, A)$ with right side $H$.

Suppose $H'$ is a subspace of $H$ of codimension $m \leq D$. By Proposition 2.22 in Section 2.3, $|A' \cap H'|/|H'| \in (1/3, 2/3)$. Consequently, for all $g \in G/H$, $|(A-g) \cap H'|/|H'| \in (1/3, 2/3)$. Therefore, the number of cosets of $H'$ which are not 1/3-atomic with respect to $A$ is at least $3^\ell = 3^{-m}(3^{m+\ell})$. By our choice of $\psi$ and $\mu$, $3^{-m} > (\mu + \epsilon 3^{-\psi(m)})$, so $H'$ cannot satisfy the conclusions of Theorem 5.20, i.e. strictly greater than $(\mu + \epsilon 3^{-\psi(m)})$-many cosets of $H'$ are not $\epsilon 3^{-\psi(m)}$-atomic with respect to $A$. □

### 5.3. Proof of main NFOP\textsubscript{2} theorems

In this subsection we prove our main results of the section. We begin with an informal outline of the strategy. Given a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ with no $k$-FOP\textsubscript{2}, we will first choose a high rank quadratic factor $B$ of bounded complexity $(\ell, q)$, such that $B$ is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$ (such a $B$ will exist by Theorem 1.18). We will then consider the reduced pair $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) = (A_1, \mathbb{F}_{p+q})$. By Corollary 5.18, we will find that in $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ there are very few encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H_B$, as well as a small set $\Omega$ of cosets of $H_B$, so that for all $H_B + g \notin \Omega$, there are very few encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H_B$ and nodes in $H_B + g$. We will then apply Theorem 5.20 to $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ and $H_B$, from which we will obtain a subspace $H \leq H_B$ of bounded codimension in $H_B$, with the property that almost all cosets of $H$ are $\epsilon'$-atomic with respect to $A_1$ for a very small $\epsilon'$. We will then “pull back” the partition generated by the cosets of $H$ to find a partition of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ that is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$, which is defined by the atoms of a high rank factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, and which has linear error.

There are two remaining technicalities to be addressed before we can carry out this plan. First, we will be applying Theorem 5.20 to $\text{Red}_{B, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$, a pair of the form $(A_1, \mathbb{F}_{p+q})$, where $(\ell, q)$ is the complexity of $B$. Theorem 5.20 contains a necessary lower bound on the
size of the vector space involved, so we will need to be able to ensure this \( \ell + q \) is sufficiently large. We will deal with this in Theorem 5.28. The second technicality is “pulling back” a linear factor in a reduced pair to obtain a quadratic factor in the original vector space. This will be dealt with in Lemma 5.25.

We begin with Lemma 5.25. Given a quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B} \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), any linear factor in the configuration space of \( \mathcal{B} \) naturally gives rise to a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \).

**Definition 5.23.** Suppose \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\), and \( \mathcal{R} \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \) of complexity \( k \). For each \( R \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R}) \), set \( X_R = \bigcup_{\bar{a} \in R} B(\bar{a}) \). Then define

\[
\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} = \{X_R : R \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R})\}.
\]

Note for each \( R \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R}) \), \( X_R \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Clearly \( \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} \) is a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), since \( \text{At}(\mathcal{R}) \) is a partition of \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) and \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) is a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Thus Definition 5.23 gives us a way of building a partition \( \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} \) of \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) from the atoms of the linear factor \( \mathcal{R} \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \). We now show that each such \( \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} \) is in the set of atoms of a more general type of quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \).

**Definition 5.24.** A general quadratic factor is a pair \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) where \( \mathcal{L} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\} \) is a set vectors, and \( \mathcal{Q} = \{(M_1, u_1), \ldots, (M_q, u_q)\} \) is a set of pairs, where each \( M_i \) is a symmetric \( n \times n \) matrix over \( \mathbb{F}_p \), and each \( u_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \).

The atoms of \( \mathcal{B} \) are the sets of the following form,

\[
\{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \forall i, x \cdot v_i = r_i, x^T M_i x + x \cdot u_i = s_i\}
\]

for \( r_1, \ldots, r_\ell, s_1, \ldots, s_q \in \mathbb{F}_p \).

As usual, we let \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \) denote the set of atoms of \( \mathcal{B} \). The complexity of \( \mathcal{B} \) is \((\ell', q')\) where \( \ell' \) is the dimension of \( \text{span}(\mathcal{L}) \). The rank of \( \mathcal{B} \) is the rank of the factor \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\} \). Note that any quadratic factor is also a general quadratic factor. Given two general quadratic factors, we write \( \mathcal{B} \preceq \mathcal{B}' \) to denote that the partition generated by \( \mathcal{B} \) refines that generated by \( \mathcal{B}' \). If \( \mathcal{Q} = \emptyset \), then we say \( \mathcal{B} \) is purely linear. We now show that each set \( \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} \) as in Definition 5.23 is the set of atoms of a general quadratic factor of complexity at most \( k \).

**Lemma 5.25.** Suppose \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) is a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank \( \rho \), and \( \mathcal{R} \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \) of complexity \( k \). Then there is a general quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B}' \) in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), such that \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}') = \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} \), and such that one of the following holds.

(i) \( \mathcal{B}' \) has complexity \((\ell', q')\) and rank at least \( \rho \), where \( \ell' + q' \leq k \) and \( q' > 0 \).

(ii) \( \mathcal{B}' \) is a purely linear factor with complexity at most \( k - 1 \), and \( \mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{B}' \).

**Proof.** Fix \( \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) a quadratic factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \((\ell, q)\) and rank \( \rho \), and suppose \( \mathcal{R} = \{\bar{r}_1, \ldots, \bar{r}_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} \) of complexity \( k \). Fix enumerations \( \mathcal{L} = \{\bar{s}_1, \ldots, \bar{s}_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) and \( \mathcal{Q} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\} \). For each \( R \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R}) \), recall \( X_R = \bigcup_{\bar{a} \in R} B(\bar{a}) \), and \( \mathcal{X}_\mathcal{R} = \{X_R : R \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R})\} \).

By definition, for any \( \bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^k \) and \( \bar{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \), \( \bar{x} \in X_{R(\bar{a})} \) if and only if there is \( \bar{d}c \in R(\bar{a}) \) such that \( \bar{x} \in B(\bar{d}; c) \). Note \( \bar{x} \in B(\bar{d}; c) \) holds if and only if \( (\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s}_i)_{i \in [\ell]} (\bar{x}^T M_j \bar{x})_{j \in [q]} = \bar{d}c \),
so \( \bar{x} \in X_{R(\bar{a})} \) if and only if \((\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s}_i)_{i \in [q]}(\bar{x}^TM_j\bar{x})_{j \in [q]} \in R(\bar{a})\), if and only if for all \(1 \leq \alpha \leq k\), \((\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s}_i)_{i \in [q]}(\bar{x}^TM_j\bar{x})_{j \in [q]} \cdot \bar{r}_\alpha = a_\alpha\). Expanding this, we have that \( \bar{x} \in X_{R(\bar{a})} \) if and only if for each \(1 \leq \alpha \leq k\),

\[
a_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} r_\alpha^i(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{s}_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{q} r_\alpha^{\ell+j}(\bar{x}^TM_j\bar{x}) = \bar{x} \cdot \bar{\tau} + \bar{x}^TM^\alpha \bar{x},
\]

where

\[
\bar{\tau}^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} r_\alpha^i \bar{s}_i \text{ and } M^\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{q} r_\alpha^{\ell+j} M_j.
\]

Therefore, \( \mathcal{A}_R = \text{At}(\mathcal{B}_1) \), where \( \mathcal{B}_1 = \{(M^\alpha, \bar{\tau}^\alpha) : \alpha \in [k]\} \). We claim there is a (possibly different) general quadratic factor \( \mathcal{B}' \) which generates the same atom decomposition, and such that (i) or (ii) holds.

**Step 1:** If \( \mathcal{B}_1 \) has rank at least \( \rho \), then set \( \mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}_1 \). Since (i) holds, we are done. If \( \mathcal{B}_1 \) has rank less than \( \rho \), go to step 2.

Step \( i+1 \) for \( i < k-1 \): Suppose \( 1 \leq i < k-1 \) and assume by induction we have defined \( \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_i \) so that \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}_i) = \text{At}(\mathcal{B}) \), \( \text{rk}(\mathcal{B}_i) < \rho \), and \( \mathcal{B}_i = (\mathcal{Q}_i, \mathcal{L}_i) \) where \( \mathcal{Q}_i = \{(M^\alpha, \bar{\tau}^\alpha) : i \leq \alpha \leq k\} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_i \), a set of at most \( i-1 \) linearly independent elements of \( \mathbb{F}_p^\alpha \), all of which are linear combinations of the elements of \( \{\bar{\tau}, \ldots, \bar{\tau}^k\} \). Since \( \mathcal{B}_i \) has rank less than \( \rho \), there are \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \), not all 0, such that \( \text{rk}(\lambda_i M^i + \ldots + \lambda_k M^k) < \rho \). By reindexing if necessary, we may assume \( \lambda_i \neq 0 \). Note

\[
\lambda_i M^i + \ldots + \lambda_k M^k = \sum_{j=1}^{q} (\sum_{\alpha=i}^{k} \lambda_\alpha r_\alpha^{\ell+j}) M_j.
\]

Since \( \mathcal{B} \) has rank \( \rho \), we therefore must have that for all \( j \in [q] \), the coefficient of \( M_j \) in the summation above must be zero, i.e. \( \sum_{\alpha=i}^{k} \lambda_\alpha r_\alpha^{\ell+j} = 0 \). Consequently, for each \( j \in [q] \),

\[
r_\alpha^{\ell+j} = \frac{-1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha r_\alpha^{\ell+j},
\]

so

\[
M^i = \sum_{j=1}^{q} (\frac{-1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha r_\alpha^{\ell+j}) M_j = \frac{-1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{q} (r_\alpha^{\ell+j} M_j) = \frac{-1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha M^\alpha.
\]

We then set \( \mathcal{Q}_{i+1} = \mathcal{Q}_i \setminus \{(M^i, \bar{\tau}^i)\} \), along with

\[
\mathcal{L}'_{i+1} = \mathcal{L}_i \cup \{\bar{\tau} + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha \bar{\tau}^\alpha\}, \text{ and } \mathcal{B}'_{i+1} = (\mathcal{L}'_{i+1}, \mathcal{Q}_{i+1}).
\]

We claim \( \text{At}(\mathcal{B}'_{i+1}) = \text{At}(\mathcal{B}_i) \). For ease of notation, say \( \mathcal{L}_i = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\} \) and \( \mathcal{L}'_{i+1} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m, a_{m+1}\} \), where \( a_{m+1} = \bar{\tau} + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha \bar{\tau}^\alpha \). Fix \( B_i(\bar{c}; \bar{d}) \in \text{At}(\mathcal{B}_i) \). We claim \( B_{i+1}(\bar{c}; \bar{d}') = B_i(\bar{c}; \bar{d}) \) where \( \bar{c}' = (c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_k) \), and \( \bar{d}' = (d_1, \ldots, d_m, d_{m+1}) \), where \( d_{m+1} := c_i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{\alpha=i+1}^{k} \lambda_\alpha c_\alpha \). Suppose \( \bar{x} \in B_i(\bar{c}; \bar{d}) \). By definition of \( \bar{c}' \), we have \( \bar{x} \in \mathcal{Q}_{i+1}(\bar{c}') \).
Further, for all $1 \leq u \leq m$, $\bar{x} \cdot a_u = d_u$, and we have

\[
\bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^a = c_i - \bar{x}^T M^i \bar{x} + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a (c_a - \bar{x}^T M^a \bar{x})
\]

\[
= c_i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a \bar{x}^T M^a \bar{x} + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a (c_a - \bar{x}^T M^a \bar{x})
\]

\[
= c_i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a c_a
\]

\[
= d_{m+1}^i,
\]

which shows $\bar{x} \in L_{i+1}(\bar{d})$. Thus $\bar{x} \in B_{i+1}(\bar{c}; \bar{d})$. Conversely, suppose $\bar{x} \in B_{i+1}(\bar{c}; \bar{d})$. Clearly $\bar{x} \in L_i(\bar{d})$ by definition. Further, for each $i + 1 \leq \alpha \leq k$, $\bar{x} \cdot M^\alpha \bar{x} + \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^\alpha = c_\alpha$, and

\[
\bar{x}^T M^i \bar{x} + \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^i = \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^i - \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a \bar{x}^T M^a \bar{x} = \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^i - \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a (c_a - \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^a)
\]

\[
= \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a \bar{x} \cdot \bar{t}^a - \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a c_a
\]

\[
= d_{m+1}^i - \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \lambda_a c_a
\]

which shows $\bar{x} \in Q_i(\bar{c})$. Thus $\bar{x} \in B_i(\bar{c}; \bar{d})$. This finishes our verification that $B_{i+1}(\bar{c}; \bar{d}) = B_i(\bar{c}; \bar{d})$ and therefore, that $At(B_{i+1}) = At(B_i)$.

Choose $L_{i+1}$ a maximal linearly independent subset of $L'_{i+1}$ containing $\bar{t}^i + \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \sum_{a=i+1}^{k} \bar{t}^a$. Setting $B_{i+1} = (L_{i+1}, Q_{i+1})$ we have $At(B_{i+1}) = At(B'_i) = At(B_i)$. If $B_{i+1}$ has rank at least $\rho$, set $B' = B_{i+1}$. Then (i) holds and we are done. Otherwise, go to the next step.

Step $i + 1$ for $i = k - 1$: Suppose that we have made it all the way to step $k - 1$, so we have defined $B_1, \ldots, B_{k-1}$ satifying $At(B_{k-1}) = At(B)$, $rk(B_{k-1}) < \rho$, and $B_{k-1} = (L_{k-1}, Q_{k-1})$, where $Q_{k-1} = \{ (M^k, \bar{t}^k) \}$ and $L_{k-1}$ is a set of at most $k - 1$ linearly independent elements of $R^\rho$, all of which are linear combinations of the elements of $\{ \bar{t}^1, \ldots, \bar{t}^k \}$. Since $B_{k-1}$ has rank less than $\rho$, $M^k = \sum_{j=1}^{q} r_{k+j}^j M_j$, and $B$ has rank $\rho$, we must have that for each $j \in [q]$, $r_{k+j}^j = 0$. Consequently, $M^k = 0$. Set $B' = L_{k-1}$. Then $B'$ is a purely linear factor of complexity at most $k - 1$ and $At(B') = At(B_{k-1}) = At(B)$. By assumption, $B'$ is made up of linear combinations of $\{ \bar{t}^1, \ldots, \bar{t}^k \}$, which are in turn linear combinations of the $\{ \bar{s}_1, \ldots, \bar{s}_\ell \}$, so $L \subseteq B'$. Thus (ii) holds, so we are done.

We now turn to proving Theorem 5.28, which will show that we can ensure the necessary lower bounds on the complexity of almost atomic quadratic factors in almost quadratically
atomic properties of elementary $p$-groups. These results rely largely on the following fact about refinements of almost $\epsilon$-atomic partitions.

**Fact 5.26.** Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $\mu < \epsilon/2$, $X$ is a finite set, $A \subseteq X$, and $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_t\}$ is a partition of $X$ which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$, and where for each $1 \leq i, j \leq t$, $||Y_i| - |Y_j|| \leq \mu |X|/t$. Suppose $\mathcal{Y}' = \{Y_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq t, 1 \leq j \leq s\}$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{Y}$, where for each $1 \leq i \leq t$, $Y_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^s Y_{ij}$, and for each $1 \leq j, j' \leq t$, $||Y_{ij} - Y_{ij'}|| \leq \mu |X|/ts$. Then $\mathcal{Y}'$ is almost $2\sqrt{\epsilon}$-atomic with respect to $A$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \{Y_i \in \mathcal{Y} : |A \cap Y_i| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|Y_i|\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_0 = \{Y_i \in \mathcal{Y} : |A \cap Y_i| \leq \epsilon|Y_i|\}$. By assumption, if $\Sigma = \mathcal{Y} \setminus (\mathcal{Y}_0 \cup \mathcal{Y}_1)$, then $|\Sigma| \leq et$. Given $u \in \{0,1\}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}_u$, let $I_i = \{Y_{ij} : j \in [s], |A^u \cap Y_{ij}| < (1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon})|Y_{ij}|\}$. Then

$$(1 - \epsilon)|Y_i| \leq |A \cap Y_i| \leq \sum_{j \in I_i} (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|Y_{ij}| + \sum_{j \not\in I_i} |Y_{ij}| \leq (1 + \mu)\frac{|Y_i|}{s}((1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon})|I_i| + s - |I_i|)$$

$$= (1 + \mu)\frac{|Y_i|}{s}(s - \sqrt{\epsilon}|I_i|).$$

Rearranging $(1 - \epsilon)|Y_i| \leq (1 + \mu)\frac{|Y_i|}{s}(s - \sqrt{\epsilon}|I_i|)$, we have that $|I_i| \leq 2^{-1}\epsilon^{-1/2}s^{\epsilon+\mu}s^{-1+\mu}$. By our choice of $\mu$, this is at most $\sqrt{\epsilon}s$. Thus if we set $\Sigma' = \{Y_{ij} \in \mathcal{Y}' : |A \cap Y_{ij}||/|Y_{ij}| \in (2\sqrt{\epsilon}, 1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon})\}$, then

$$|\Sigma'| \leq |\Sigma|s + \sqrt{\epsilon}s(t - |\Sigma|) = \sqrt{\epsilon}st + |\Sigma|s(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon}) \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}st,$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $|\Sigma| \leq et$. \qed

We can easily use the above to show that in an almost linearly atomic elementary $p$-group property $\mathcal{P}$ and a constant $d$, any sufficiently large element form $\mathcal{P}$, will have an almost atomic *linearly* factor for complexity at least $d$.

**Theorem 5.27.** Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is an almost linearly atomic epGP. For all $\mu > 0$ and $f_1 \geq 1$, there are $D$ and $N$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq N$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P}$. Then there is $f_1 \leq \ell \leq D$ and a linear factor $\mathcal{L}$ of complexity $\ell$ which is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$.

**Proof.** Choose $N_1$ and $D_1$ for $\mu^2/2$ from the definition of $\mathcal{P}$ being almost linearly atomic. Choose $N_2 \gg f_1N_1$ and let $D_2 = \max\{D_1, f_1\}$. Suppose $n \geq N_2$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P}$. By assumption, there exists a linear factor, $\mathcal{L}$, of complexity $\ell \leq D_1$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ which is almost $\mu^2/2$-atomic with respect to $A$. If $\ell \geq f_1$, then we are done. So assume $\ell < f_1$. Since $n \geq N_2$ and $N_2$ is sufficiently large, there exists a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ of size $f_1 - \ell$ such that $\mathcal{L}' = X \cup \mathcal{L}$ is a set of linearly independent vectors. By Fact 5.26, $\mathcal{L}'$ is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$. \qed

We want to show the following analogous result for almost quadratically atomic elementary $p$-group properties.

**Theorem 5.28.** Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is an almost quadratically atomic epGP. For all $\mu > 0$, $f_1, f_2 \geq 1$, and $\omega$, there are $D$ and $N$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq N$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P}$. \qed
Then there is a quadratic factor $B = (L, Q)$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$ such that $f_1 \leq \ell \leq D$ and $f_2 \leq q \leq D$, and which is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$.

The proof of this will be more complicated than in the linear setting, due to rank considerations. In particular, we require the following lemma about adding high rank matrices to an existing factor.

**Lemma 5.29.** For all $q, q' \geq 1$ there is $N = N(q, q')$ such that the following holds. Suppose $n \geq N$, and $S = \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of rank $n$. Suppose $Q$ is a quadratic factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ of rank at least $r$ and complexity $q$. Then there are $1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_{q'} \leq n$ such that $Q \cup \{M_1, \ldots, M_{i_{q'}}\}$ has rank $r$.

**Proof.** We induct on $q \geq 1$.

**Case** $q = 1$: Fix $q' \geq 1$. Set $N = 2q' + r + 1$. Suppose $n \geq N$ and we have $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ and $Q = \{R\}$ as in the hypotheses. We claim that one of $N_1 = \{M_1, \ldots, M_{q}\} \cup Q$ or $N_2 = \{M_{q+1}, \ldots, M_{2q}\} \cup Q$ has rank $r$. Since $Q$ is a subset of both $N_1$ and $N_2$, each has rank at most $r$, so it suffices to show one has rank at least $r$. Suppose towards a contradiction that both $N_1$ and $N_2$ have rank less than $r$. Then there are $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{q'}, \lambda$ not all zero and $\lambda_{q'+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{q'} + \lambda'$ not all zero so that

$$\text{rk}(\lambda_1 M_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{q'} M_{q'} + \lambda R) < r \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rk}(\lambda_1' M_{q'+1} + \ldots + \lambda_{2q'} M_{2q'} + \lambda' R) < r.$$ 

Since $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ has rank $n \geq N > r$, we must have that both $\lambda$ and $\lambda'$ are non-zero. This implies that

$$\lambda_1 M_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{q'} M_{q'} + \lambda R - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda'}(\lambda_1' M_{q'+1} + \ldots + \lambda_{2q'} M_{2q'} + \lambda' R)$$

has rank less than $r$, a contradiction.

**Case** $q = 1$: Fix $q' \geq 1$. Set $N = 2q' + r + 1$. Suppose $n \geq N$ and we have $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ and $Q = \{R\}$ as in the hypotheses. We claim that one of $N_1 = \{M_1, \ldots, M_{q}\} \cup Q$ or $N_2 = \{M_{q+1}, \ldots, M_{2q}\} \cup Q$ has rank $r$. Since $Q$ is a subset of both $N_1$ and $N_2$, each has rank at most $r$, so it suffices to show one has rank at least $r$. Suppose towards a contradiction that both $N_1$ and $N_2$ have rank less than $r$. Then there are $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{q'}, \lambda$ not all zero and $\lambda_{q'+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{q'} + \lambda'$ not all zero so that

$$\text{rk}(\lambda_1 M_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{q'} M_{q'} + \lambda R) < r \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rk}(\lambda_1' M_{q'+1} + \ldots + \lambda_{2q'} M_{2q'} + \lambda' R) < r.$$ 

Since $\{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ has rank $n \geq N > r$, we must have that both $\lambda$ and $\lambda'$ are non-zero. This implies that

$$\lambda_1 M_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{q'} M_{q'} + \lambda R - \frac{\lambda}{\lambda'}(\lambda_1' M_{q'+1} + \ldots + \lambda_{2q'} M_{2q'} + \lambda' R)$$

has rank less than $r$, a contradiction.

**Case** $q > 1$: Suppose $q \geq 1$ and the claim holds for $q$. Fix $q' \geq 1$. Let $h(x) = qN(q, x)$, and let $N(q+1, q') = h^{(q+1)}(q')$ (i.e. the function you get by composing $h$ with itself $q+1$ times, applied to $q'$). Suppose $n \geq N$ and we have $S = \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\}$ a quadratic factor of complexity $n$ and rank $n$ and $Q = \{R_1, \ldots, R_{q+1}\}$ a quadratic factor of complexity $q+1$ and rank $r$. For each $1 \leq i \leq q+1$, let $Q_i = Q \setminus \{R_i\}$. By the induction hypothesis, and our definition of $h$, there is $S_1 \subseteq S$ of size at least $h^{(q)}(q')$ so that $Q_1 \cup S_1$ has rank $r$.

Suppose $1 \leq i < q$ and assume we have constructed $S_1 \supseteq \ldots \supseteq S_{i+1}$ so that for each $i$, $S_i \cup Q_i$ has rank $r$ and $|S_i| \geq h^{(q-i)}(q')$. Then by our induction hypothesis, and definition of $h$, there is $S_{i+1} \subseteq S_i$ so that $S_{i+1} \cup Q_{i+1}$ has rank $r$ and $|S_{i+1}| \geq h^{(q-i)}(q')$.

After $q$ steps, we will have $S_q \subseteq S_{q-1} \subseteq \ldots \subseteq S_1 \subseteq S$ so that for each $i \in [q]$, $S_i \cup Q_i$ has rank $r$ and $|S_i| \geq h(q') \geq qN(q, q') \geq 2q'$. Choose two disjoint subsets $S', S''$, each of size $q'$, and which are both contained in $S_q$. Enumerate them as $S' = \{M'_1, \ldots, M'_{q'}\}$ and $S'' = \{M''_1, \ldots, M''_{q''}\}$. We claim that one of $S' \cup Q$ or $S'' \cup Q$ has rank $r$. Note that because $Q \subseteq S' \cap S''$, both $S'$ and $S''$ have rank both at most $r$, so it suffices to show one has rank at least $r$. Suppose towards a contradiction this is not the case. Then there are
\( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_q', \rho_1', \ldots, \rho_q' \) not all zero and \( \lambda_1'', \ldots, \lambda_q'', \rho_1'', \ldots, \rho_q'' \) not all zero such that
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rk}(\lambda_1'M_1' + \ldots + \lambda_q'M_q' + \rho_1'R_1 + \ldots + \rho_q'R_q) &< r \\
(\lambda_1''M_1'' + \ldots + \lambda_q''M_q'' + \rho_1''R_1 + \ldots + \rho_q''R_q) &< r.
\end{align*}
\]
By construction, we must have that all of \( \rho_1', \ldots, \rho_q' \) are non-zero and all of \( \rho_1'', \ldots, \rho_q'' \) are non-zero (since \( S_q \cup Q_i \) has rank \( r \) for each \( i \in [q] \)). Further, at least one \( \lambda_i' \) and at least one \( \lambda_i'' \) are non-zero, since \( R \) has rank \( r \). Therefore,
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_1'M_1' + \ldots + \lambda_q'M_q' + \rho_1'R_1 + \ldots + \rho_q'R_q - \frac{\rho_1'}{\rho_1'}(\lambda_1''M_1'' + \ldots + \lambda_q''M_q'' + \rho_1''R_1 + \ldots + \rho_q''R_q) \\
= \lambda_1'M_1' + \ldots + \lambda_q'M_q' + \rho_1'R_2 + \ldots + \rho_q'R_q - \frac{\rho_1'}{\rho_1'}(\lambda_1''M_1'' + \ldots + \lambda_q''M_q'' + \rho_1''R_2 + \ldots + \rho_q''R_q)
\end{align*}
\]
has rank less than \( r \). This is a contradiction, since by assumption, \( S_q \cup Q_1 \) has rank \( r \). This finishes the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 5.28** Fix \( \mu > 0 \), \( f_1, f_2 \geq 1 \), and \( \omega \). Let \( \omega_1 = \omega_1(\mu^2/2) \) from Corollary 3.14. Choose \( N_1 \) and \( D_1 \) from the definition of \( \mathcal{P} \) being almost quadratically atomic applied to \( \epsilon = \mu^2/2 \) and \( \omega_2(x) = \max\{\omega(x + f_1 + f_2), \omega_1(x + f_1 + f_2)\} \). Let \( D' = D_1 + f_1 + f_2 \). Let \( N_2 = N_2(D_1, f_2) \) as in Lemma 5.29 and choose \( N \gg N_1, N_2, f_1 \).

Suppose \( n \geq N \), and \((\mathbb{P}_n, A) \in \mathcal{P} \). By assumption, there exists \((\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}')\), a quadratic factor of complexity \((\ell', q')\) and rank at least \( \omega_2(\ell' + q') \), for some \( \ell' + q' \leq D_1 \), and which is almost \( \epsilon \)-atomic with respect to \( A \). Choose a set \( \mathcal{L} \) (possibly empty) so that \( \mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}' \cup X \) is linearly independent and has size at least \( f_1 \) (this is possible because \( n \) is large). Let \( \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\} \) be a purely quadratic factor of complexity \( n \) with rank \( n \) (which exists by Subsection 3.4).

By Lemma 5.29, there exists a set \( \mathcal{S} \subseteq \{M_1, \ldots, M_n\} \) of size \( f_2 \) so that the rank of \( \mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}' \cup \mathcal{S} \) is the same as the rank of \( \mathcal{Q}' \). Then \( (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q}) \) has complexity \((\ell, q)\) for some \( f_1 \leq \ell \leq D_1 \leq D' \), and \( f_2 \leq q' \leq f_1 + f_2 \leq D' \), and rank at least \( \omega_2(\ell' + q') \geq \omega(\ell + q) \). By Fact 5.26, this factor will be almost \( \mu \)-atomic with respect to \( A \) (since it refined \((\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{Q}')\)).

We can now carry out our strategy to prove Theorem 1.33.

**Proof of Theorem 1.33** Fix \( k \geq 1 \). Let \( d = d(k) \) be as in Theorem 5.15. Let \( \epsilon^* \) and \( \omega^* \) be as in Corollary 5.18 for \( d \).

Fix \( \epsilon > 0 \), a rank function \( \rho \), and an increasing function \( \psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \). Without loss of generality, assume \( \epsilon \leq \epsilon^* \) and \( \psi(x) \geq 2x \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{N} \). Define \( \psi' : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) by setting \( \psi'(x) = 4\psi(x) \), and choose \( K, N_0, D_0, \) and \( C \) from Theorem 5.20 applied to \( d, \epsilon, \) and \( \psi' \). Let \( \tau = \epsilon^2/\rho^{4\psi'(K)} \) and let \( \omega_2 = \omega_2(\tau) \) be from Corollary 3.14. Define a rank function \( \omega \) by setting \( \omega(x) = \max\{\rho(x), \omega^*(x), \omega_1(x), \omega_2(x)\} \).

Choose \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) sufficiently large compared to \( D_1C + N_0C + N_1C \) and let \( g \) be sufficiently large compared to \( 2\psi'(K)C + e^C \). Then let \( \mu_0 = \mu_0(\epsilon^2g/2c) \) be from Corollary 5.18 and set \( \mu = \min\{\mu_0, \epsilon^2g/2c\} \). Choose \( D_2 = D_2(\delta, \omega, f_1, f_2, \mu) \) and \( N_1 = N_1(\delta, \omega, f_1, f_2, \mu) \) as in
Theorem 5.28. Now given $f_1 \leq \ell \leq D_2$ and $f_2 \leq q \leq D_2$, let $N_3(\ell, q) = N_3(\ell, q, \mu, d, \omega)$ be from Corollary 5.18. Finally, set $N = \max\{|N_1| \cup \{N_3(\ell, q) : f_1 \leq \ell \leq D_1, f_2 \leq q \leq D_2\}\}.$

Suppose $n \geq N$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ does not have $k$-FOP$_2$. By Theorem 5.28, there exist $(\ell, q)$ satisfying $f_1 \leq \ell \leq D_2$, $f_2 \leq q \leq D_2$, and a quadratic factor $B = (L, Q)$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, with rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$, and which is almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$. Let $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_{err} = At(B)$ be as in the definition of $B$ being almost $\mu$-atomic with respect to $A$. For ease of notation, set $G' = \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q}$, and let $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{e_1, \ldots, e_r\}$, where $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ denote the first $\ell$ standard basis vectors in $\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q}$. Clearly $\mathcal{R}_1$ is a linear factor in $\mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q}$ of complexity $\ell$, and $R_1(\bar{0}) = H_B$. Define $A_0 = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} : \bar{B}(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_0\}$, $A_1 = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} : \bar{B}(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_1\}$, and $\Gamma_{err} = \{\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\ell+q} : \bar{B}(\bar{a}) \in \Gamma_{err}\}$.

By Corollary 5.18, there are at most $\epsilon p^{-\gamma}|H_B|^2|G'|^{2\tau-1}$ many encodings of $T(d)$ in $\text{Red}_{G, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ with leaves in $H_B$, and there is a set $\xi \subseteq G'/H_B$ of size at most $\epsilon p^{-\gamma}p^\ell$ such that for all $\bar{g} + H_B \in \xi$, there are at most $\epsilon p^{-\gamma}|H_B|^{2\tau+2\tau-1}$ many encodings of $T(d)$ in $\text{Red}_{G, \epsilon}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ with leaves in $H_B$ and nodes in $H_B + \bar{g}$.

Consequently, by Theorem 5.20 there some $0 \leq m \leq K$, a linear factor $\mathcal{R}_2 \preceq_{\text{syn}} \mathcal{R}_1$ of complexity $\ell_2 = \ell + m$, and a partition $At(\mathcal{R}_2) = \Omega_{err} \cup \Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1$ such that $|\Omega_{err}| \leq (\epsilon p^{-\gamma(m)} + \epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C})p^\ell_2$, such that for each $R \in \Omega_1$, $|A_1 \cap R|/|R| \geq 1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma(m)}$, and such that for each $R \in \Omega_0$, $|A_1 \cap R|/|R| \leq \epsilon p^{-\gamma(m)}$.

Suppose first $\mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_2$ (so $m = 0$). We show $L$ is $\epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}$-almost $\epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}$-atomic with respect to $A$. By definition, each atom of $\mathcal{R}_1$ has the form $R_1(\bar{a}) = \{\bar{b} : \bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\}$ for some $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{F}_p^\ell$. For each $u \in \{0, 1\}$ set $\Sigma_u = \{L(\bar{a}) : R_1(\bar{a}) \in \Omega_u\}$, and let $\Sigma_{err} = At(L) \setminus (\Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1)$. By assumption, $|\Sigma_{err}| \leq (\epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)} + \epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C})p^\ell \leq \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}p^\ell$. Suppose $L(\bar{a}) \in \Sigma_1$. Then by definition of $\Omega_1$ and Corollary 3.14,

$$|A \cap L(\bar{a})| \geq \sum_{\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \bar{a} \in \Gamma_1} |A \cap B(\bar{a}\bar{b})| \geq |A_1 \cap R_1(\bar{a})|(1 - \mu)(1 - \tau)p^{n-\ell-q}$$

$$\geq (1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)})p^q(1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C}(1 - \tau)p^{n-\ell-q}$$

$$= (1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)})(1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C})(1 - \tau)|L(\bar{a})|$$

$$\geq (1 - \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)})|L(\bar{a})|,$$

where the last inequality is by our choices of parameters. On the other hand, if $L(\bar{a}) \in \Sigma_0$, then

$$|A \cap L(\bar{a})| \leq \sum_{\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \bar{a} \in \Gamma_{err} \cup \Gamma_1} |A \cap B(\bar{a}\bar{b})| + \sum_{\bar{b} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : \bar{a} \in A_0} |A \cap B(\bar{a}\bar{b})|$$

$$\leq |R_1(\bar{a}) \cap (\Gamma_{err} \cup A_1)|(1 + \tau)p^{n-\ell-q} + |R_1(\bar{a}) \cap A_0|\mu(1 + \tau)p^{n-\ell-q}$$

$$\leq \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}p^q(1 + \tau)p^{n-\ell-q} + \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}p^q\epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C}(1 + \tau)p^{n-\ell-q}$$

$$= \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}(1 + \epsilon p^{-\gamma/2C})(1 + \tau)|L(\bar{a})|$$

$$\leq \epsilon p^{-\gamma(0)}|L(\bar{a})|$$,
where the last inequality is by our choices of parameters. In this case we are done.

Assume now that \( \mathcal{R}_2 \subsetneq \mathcal{R}_1 \). Consider \( \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_2} = \{ X_{R'} : R' \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}_2) \} \), where for each \( R' \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}_2) \), \( X_{R'} = \bigcup_{\bar{a} \in \mathcal{R}} B(\bar{a}) \). Note that for all \( R' \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R}_2) \), Corollary 3.14 implies

\[
(5.2) \quad |X_{R'}| = (1 \pm \tau) p^{n-\ell-q}|R'| = (1 \pm \tau) p^{n-\ell-q} p^{\ell+q+m} = (1 \pm \tau) p^{n-m-\ell} = (1 \pm \tau) p^{\ell_2}.
\]

We show \( \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}_2} \) is \( \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} \)-almost \( \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} \)-atomic with respect to \( A \). Let

\[
\Omega'_{\text{err}} = \Omega_{\text{err}} \cup \{ R' \in \text{At}(\mathcal{R}_2) : |R' \cap \Gamma_{\text{err}}| \geq \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C} p^{\ell+\ell_2} \}.
\]

Since \( |\Gamma_{\text{err}}| \leq \mu p^{\ell+q} \),

\[
|\Omega'_{\text{err}}| \leq |\Omega_{\text{err}}| + \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C} p^{\ell_2} \leq (\epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} + 2 \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C}) p^{\ell_2} \leq \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} p^{\ell_2},
\]

where the last inequality is by our choices of parameters. Now set \( \Omega_0 = \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega'_{\text{err}} \) and \( \Omega'_1 = \Omega_1 \setminus \Omega'_{\text{err}} \).

Fix \( R' \in \Omega'_0 \). Since \( R' \in \Omega_0 \), we have \( |A_1 \cap R'|/|R'| \leq \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} \), and since \( R' \notin \Omega'_{\text{err}} \), we have \( |R' \cap \Gamma_{\text{err}}| \leq \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C} p^{\ell+\ell_2} \). Observe

\[
|A \cap X_{R'}| = \sum_{\bar{d} \in R'} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})| = \sum_{\bar{d} \in R' \cap A_1} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})| + \sum_{\bar{d} \in R' \setminus A_1} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})|.
\]

Using our assumptions, Corollary 3.14 and (5.2), we can bound the first summand as follows.

\[
\sum_{\bar{d} \in R' \cap A_1} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})| \leq (1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell-q}|R' \cap A_1| \leq \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} (1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell_2} \leq \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} |X_{R'}|/2.
\]

On the other hand, using Corollary 3.14 (5.2), and our choices of parameters, we have the following bound for the second summand.

\[
\sum_{\bar{d} \in R' \setminus A_1} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})| = \sum_{\bar{d} \in \Gamma_{\text{err}} \cap R'} |A \cap B(\bar{d}; \bar{c})| \leq |\Gamma_{\text{err}} \cap R'|(1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell-q} + |A_0 \cap R'| \mu (1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell-q}
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C} p^{\ell+\ell_2} (1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell-q} + \mu |R'|(1 + \tau) p^{n-\ell-q}
\]

\[
= p^{n-\ell_2} (1 + \tau) \left( \epsilon^{1/2} p^{-g/2C} + \mu \right)
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} |X_{R'}|/2.
\]

Combining these, we obtain that \( |A \cap X_{R'}| \leq \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} |X_{R'}| \). Suppose now that \( R' \in \Omega'_1 \). Then since \( R' \in \Omega_1 \), \( |A_1 \cap R'|/|R'| \geq 1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} \). Then using Corollary 3.14 we have the following.
\[ |A \cap X_R| \geq \sum_{\vec{c} \in R \cap A} |A \cap B(\vec{c}, \vec{d})| \geq (1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)})|R'| (1 - \mu) (1 - \tau) p^{n - \ell - q} \]

\[ = (1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}) (1 - \mu) (1 - \tau) p^{n - \ell_2} \]

\[ \geq (1 - \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)}) |X_R|, \]

where the last inequality is by our choice of \( \mu, \psi, \) and (5.2). This finishes the verification that  \( X_{R_3} \) is \( \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} \)-almost \( \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} \)-atomic with respect to  \( A \).

Note that  \( X_{R_3} \) is the common refinement of  \( \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \) and  \( X_{R_3} \), where  \( R_3 = R_1 \setminus R_2 \). By Lemma 5.25, there is  \( B_3 = (\mathcal{L}_3, Q_3) \) a general quadratic factor in  \( F^n_p \) of complexity  \( (m_1, m_2) \) for some  \( m_1 + m_2 \leq m \), and such that  \( \text{At}(B_3) = X_{R_3} \). Further, either (i) or (ii) in the conclusion of Lemma 5.25 hold.

If (ii) from Lemma 5.25 holds, then  \( B_3 = \mathcal{L}_3 \) is a purely linear of complexity at most  \( m - 1 \) satisfying  \( \mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{L}_3 \), and  \( \text{At}(B_3) = X_{R_3} \). Then in this case,  \( X_{R_2} = \text{At}(\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3) \) and  \( \mathcal{L} \preceq \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3 \). Obviously,  \( \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3 \preceq \mathcal{L} \) also holds, so we must have that  \( \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) = \text{At}(\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3) = X_{R_2} \). Thus  \( \mathcal{L} \) itself is an \( \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} \)-almost \( \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)} \)-atomic factor with respect to  \( A \).

If (i) from Lemma 5.25 holds, then  \( B_3 = (\mathcal{L}_3, Q_3) \) has complexity  \( (m_1, m_2) \), where  \( m_2 > 0, m_1 + m_2 \leq m \). Further,  \( B_3 \) has rank at least   \( \text{rk}(B) = \text{At}(\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3, Q_3) \). Fix enumerations  \( \mathcal{L}_3 = \{ s_i : i \in [m_1] \} \) and  \( Q_3 = \{(M_i, t_i) : i \in [m_2] \} \). Then define  \( Q' = \{ M_i : i \in [m_2] \} \) and let  \( \mathcal{L}' \) be any linearly independent set of vectors such that  \( \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L}' \) and

\[ \mathcal{L}' \preceq \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3 \cup \{ t_i : i \in [m_2] \}. \]

Note that if  \( \ell' = |\mathcal{L}'| \), then  \( \ell \leq \ell' \leq \ell + m_1 + m_2 \leq \ell + m \). Then define  \( B' = (\mathcal{L}', Q') \). By construction,  \( B' \preceq (\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{L}_3, Q_3) \), and  \( B' \) has complexity  \( (\ell', m_2) \) and rank at least  \( \omega(\ell + q) \). Note  \( \ell' + m_2 \leq \ell + 2m \leq \ell + 2K \), so since  \( q \geq f_2 \gg K \) and  \( \omega \) is non-decreasing, we have that  \( \omega(\ell + q) \geq \omega(\ell' + m_2) \), so  \( B' \) has rank at least  \( \omega(\ell' + m_2) \).

Now define

\[ \Sigma'_{err} = \{ L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}') : L \subseteq X_{R'} \text{ for some } R' \in \Omega'_{err} \}. \]

Note that for each  \( R' \in \text{At}(R_2) \), the number of  \( L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}') \) with  \( L \subseteq X_{R'} \) is  \( \frac{p^{n - \ell_2}}{p^n - p} = p^{\ell - \ell_2} \).

Consequently,

\[ |\Sigma_{err}'| \leq p^{\ell - \ell - m} |\Omega'_{err}| \leq (p^{\ell - \ell_2})(\epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} p^{\ell_2}) = \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} p^{\ell}. \]

Now suppose  \( B = L \cap Q \in \text{At}(B') \), and  \( L \notin \Sigma_{err}' \). Then there is some  \( u \in \{0, 1\} \) and  \( R' \in \Omega'_u \) with  \( L \subseteq X_{R'} \). Then, using Corollary 3.14, we have that

\[ |A^u \cap B| \geq |B| - |X_{R'} \setminus A^u| \geq |B| - \epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} p^{n - \ell_2} \geq |B| (1 + (1 + \tau)\epsilon p^{-2\psi(m)} p^{\ell' + m_2 - \ell_2}) \]

\[ \geq |B| (1 + (1 + \tau)\epsilon p^{m - 2\psi(m)}) \]

\[ \geq |B| (1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(m)}), \]

where the second to last inequality is because  \( \ell' + m_2 - \ell_2 = \ell' + m_2 - \ell - m \leq m \) (recall  \( \ell' + m_2 \leq \ell + 2m \)), and the last inequality is by our choice of  \( \psi \), and since  \( m_2 \leq m \). This shows that  \( B' \) is almost \( \epsilon p^{-\psi(m_2)} \)-atomic with respect to  \( A \), with linear error, as desired.
Proof of Theorem 5.32. Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is NFOP$_2$. Then there exists a $k \geq 1$, so that every $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P}$ has no $k$-FOP$_2$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and $\omega$. Let $D_1$ be as in Theorem 1.33 for $\epsilon$, $\psi$, and $k$. Let $D_2$ and $N_2$ be as in Theorem 1.33 for $\omega$, $\epsilon$, $\psi$ and $k$.

Suppose $n \geq N_2$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{P}_n$. By Theorem 1.33 there is a quadratic factor $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\omega(\ell + q)$ so that $\ell \leq D_2$, $q \leq D_1$, and there is a set $\Sigma \subseteq \text{At}(\mathcal{L})$ so that $|\Sigma| \leq c \rho^\ell$ for all $L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \Sigma$ and all $Q \in \text{At}(\mathcal{Q})$, $L \cap Q$ is $c \rho^{-\psi(q)}$-atomic with respect to $A$. This shows $\mathcal{P}$ is AQALE. □

5.4. A preliminary generalized stable regularity lemma. The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 5.20. We will first set out some preliminaries, after which we will prove a weak version of Theorem 5.20 (see Theorem 5.33 below). We will then iterate the weak version to obtain the full theorem. We will use Lemma 5.30 below, which is a particular instance of the graph counting lemma.

Lemma 5.30. For all $k \geq 2$ and $\epsilon, r \in (0, 1/2)$, there are $D = D(k, \epsilon) > 0$ and $N = N(k, \epsilon, r)$ such that the following hold. Suppose $k_1, k_2 \geq 1$ and $k_1 + k_2 = k$. Assume $G = (U \cup W, \beta)$ is a bipartite graph, and let $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_1} U_i$, $W = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_2} W_i$ be partitions of $U$ and $W$ into parts of size $n \geq N$.

Assume that for each $(i, j) \in [k_1] \times [k_2]$, $G[U_i, W_j]$ is $r^D$-regular with density $r_{ij} \geq r$. Then there are at least $(1 - \epsilon) r^{k_1 k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |U_i| \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j|$ many tuples $(u'_i, w'_j)_{i \in [k_1], j \in [k_2]} \in \prod_{i \in [k_1]} U_i \times \prod_{j \in [k_2]} W_j$ such that $u'_i w'_j \in \beta$ for each $(i, j) \in [k_1] \times [k_2]$.

We include a proof of Lemma 5.30 in Appendix E. The form of the bounds in Lemma 5.30 is important for us. In particular, they are needed to obtain the dependence of $D$ on only $d$ in Fact 5.31 below.

Fact 5.31 (Finding a dense subspace). For each $d \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there are $m = m(d)$, $D = D(d)$ and $N = N(d, \epsilon)$, so that the following holds. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $|H| \geq N$, and $|A \cap H| \geq \epsilon |H|$. Assume there are at most $\epsilon^D |H|^{2d+2d-1}$ many encodings of $T(d)$ in $(H, A \cap H)$. Then there is a subspace $H' \leq H$ of codimension at most $\epsilon^{-m}$ in $H$, and $y \in H$ such that $|(A - y) \cap H'| \geq (1 - \epsilon) |H'|$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\epsilon \leq 1/2$. Let $D_1 = D_1(2d + 2d - 1, 1/2)$ be from Lemma 5.30. Then set $D = (3D_1 + 1)(2d + 2d - 1) + 1$, $m = 3D_1$, and let $N = N(\epsilon^2 D_1)$ be from Fact 3.6.

Assume $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $|H| \geq N$, $|A \cap H| \geq \epsilon |H|$, and assume there are at most $\epsilon^D |H|^{2d+2d-1}$ many encodings of $T(d)$ in $(H, A \cap H)$. By Fact 3.6 there are $H' \leq H$, and $y \in H$ so that $H' + y$ is $\epsilon^2 D_1$-uniform with respect to $A$, so that $H'$ has codimension at most $[2 \epsilon^{-2D_1}] < \epsilon^{-m}$ in $H$, and so that $\rho := \frac{|A \cap (H' + y)|}{|H' + y|} \geq \epsilon |H'|$.

If $\rho \geq 1 - \epsilon$, then we are done. So we may assume $\rho \in (\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$. By Lemma 4.11 the bipartite graph, $(H' \cup H' + y, E_A^{(2)} \cap K_2[H', H' + y])$, is $\epsilon^{D_1}$-regular with density $\rho$. For each $\eta \in 2^d$, set $X_\eta = H'$, and for each $\sigma \in 2^{<d}$, set $Y_\sigma = H' + y$. Now consider the bipartite
Informally, Theorem 5.33 tells us the following. Suppose \( \epsilon > H \) and in \( (G,A) \) is a graph, and encodings of \( H \) only on \( \epsilon \). Theorem 5.33.

\[
E = \bigcup_{\sigma \leq \eta} E_A^{(2)}[\sigma, X_\eta] \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \leq \eta} (K_2[\sigma, X_\eta] \setminus E_A^{(2)}).
\]

Note that each pair in this bipartite graph \( (Y_\sigma, X_\eta) \) is \( \epsilon D_1 \)-regular with density \( r_{\sigma, \eta} \geq \epsilon \). By Lemma 5.30, there are at least \( \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{2d+2d-1} |H|^2d+2d-1 \) many encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (H, A \cap H) \). Then

\[
\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{2d+2d-1} |H|^2d+2d-1 \geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{2d+2d-1} \epsilon^{3D_1(2d+2d-1)} |H|^2d+2d-1 \geq \epsilon^D |H|^2d+2d-1,
\]

where the last inequality is by definition of \( D \). But this contradicts our assumption on the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (H, A \cap H) \). □

We will use yet another variant of the graph counting lemma, which can be deduced from Lemmas 5.30 and the fact that graphs with densities near 0 or 1 are \( \epsilon \)-regular.

**Lemma 5.32.** For all \( k \geq 2 \) and \( \epsilon > 0 \) there are \( \delta > 0 \) and \( N \) such that the following hold. Suppose \( F = (U \cup W, R) \) is a bipartite graph with \( |U| + |W| = k \). Assume \( G = (V, E) \) is a graph, and \( V = \bigcup_{u \in U} V_u \cup \bigcup_{w \in W} V_w \) is a partition of \( V \) into parts of size at least \( N \). Suppose that for each \( uw \in R, |E \cap K_2[V_u, V_w]| \geq (1 - \delta)|V_u||V_w| \), and for each \( uw \notin R, |E \cap K_2[V_u, V_w]| \leq \delta|V_u||V_w| \). Then there are at least \( (1 - \epsilon) \prod_{u \in U \cup W} |V_x| \) many tuples \( (v_u)_{u \in U}(v_w)_{w \in W} \in \bigcup_{u \in U} V_u \times \bigcup_{w \in W} V_w \) such that \( v_u v_w \in E \) if and only if \( uw \in R \).

We include proof in Appendix E.

We now ready to prove Theorem 5.33, the base step for the proof of Theorem 5.20. Informally, Theorem 5.33 tells us the following. Suppose \( \epsilon > 0, d \geq 1, A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n \) and \( H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) satisfy the following two criteria: first, that there are few encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (G, A) \) with leaves in \( H \), and second, that for almost all cosets \( H + g \), there are few encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (G, A) \) with leaves in \( H \) and nodes in \( H + g \). Then there is a subspace \( H' \) of \( H \), which is almost \( \epsilon \)-atomic with respect to \( A \), and whose codimension in \( H \) depends only on \( \epsilon \) and \( d \). The form of this dependence is crucial for later applications.

**Theorem 5.33.** For all \( d \geq 1 \), there are \( C = C(d) \) and \( \epsilon^* > 0 \) such that for all \( 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon^* \), there exist \( L = L(d, \epsilon) \), and \( N = N(\epsilon, d) \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n \), \( H \leq G \), and \( \Omega \subseteq G/H \) satisfy the following.

1. \( |H| \geq p^N \).
2. The number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (G, A) \) with leaves in \( H \) is at most \( \epsilon^C |G|^{2d-1}|H|^{2d} \).
3. \( |\Omega| \leq \epsilon |G|/2|H| \) and for all \( K \in (G/H) \setminus \Omega \), the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \( (G, A) \) with leaves in \( H \) and nodes in \( K \) is at most \( \epsilon^{C+1} |H|^{2d+2d-2} \).

Then there exists \( H' \leq H \), of codimension at most \( L \) in \( H \), so that \( H' \) is almost \( \epsilon \)-atomic with respect to \( A \).

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on \( d \). Suppose first \( d = 1 \). In this case, set \( C = C(1) = 4 \), \( L = L(1) = 1 \), and \( \epsilon^* = \epsilon^*(1) = 1/2 \). Given \( 0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon^* \), set \( N = \epsilon^{-1} \). Suppose \( A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n, H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n \), and \( \Omega \subseteq G/H \) satisfy the following.
(i) \(|\Omega| \leq \epsilon|G|/2|H|\) and \(|H| \geq p^n\), 
(ii) The number of \(A\)-encodings of \(T(1)\) with leaves in \(H\) is at most \(\epsilon^4|G||H|^2\), 
(iii) For all \(g + H \notin \Omega\), the number of encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\) and nodes in \(g + H\) is at most \(\epsilon^3|H|^3\).

Let \(Y = \{K \in G/H : \min\{|A \cap K|, |(\neg A) \cap K|\} \geq \epsilon|H|\}\). We show \(|Y| \leq \epsilon|G|/|H|\).

Suppose towards a contradiction that \(|Y| > \epsilon|G|/|H|\). Then setting \(Y' = Y \setminus \Omega\), we have \(|Y'| > \epsilon|G|/2|H|\). We construct many encodings of \(T(1)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\) as follows.

- Choose \(K \in Y'\). There are more than \(\epsilon|G|/2|H|\) choices.
- Choose \((g', g'') \in (A \cap K) \times ((\neg A) \cap K)\). There are at least \(\epsilon^2|H|^2\) choices (since \(K \in Y'\)).
- Choose \(g \in K\) and set \((a_{<, >}, b_0, b_1) := (g, g' - g, g'' - g)\). Note this triple is an encoding of \(T(1)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\). There are \(|H|\) many choices for this step.

Thus the number of encodings of \(T(1)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\) is strictly greater than \(\epsilon^3|G||H|^2/2 \geq \epsilon^4|G||H|^2\), a contradiction. Thus we must have that \(|Y| \leq \epsilon|G|/|H|\), so taking \(H' = H\), this finishes case \(d = 1\).

Suppose now \(d > 1\), and assume by induction that the conclusion of Theorem 5.33 holds for \(d - 1\). Choose \(C' = C(d - 1)\) and \(\epsilon' = \epsilon^4(d - 1)\), and from the inductive hypothesis, let \(D = D(d)\) be from Fact 5.31. Set \(\epsilon^* = \epsilon'/2^d\). Let \(m = m(d)\) be from Fact 5.31 and define \(C = 12(2^d + 2^d + 1)(C'D)m\). Given \(0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon^*\), \(L'(d - 1, \epsilon^{4C'})\) be from the inductive hypothesis, set \(L = \epsilon^{-2m} + L'\), let \(N_1 = N_1(\epsilon^{4C'}, d)\) from Fact 5.31 and choose \(N\) sufficiently large compared to \(N_1, \epsilon^{-2m}\).

Suppose now that \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n, H \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n,\) and \(\Omega \subseteq G/H\) satisfy the following.

(i) \(|\Omega| \leq \epsilon|G|/2|H|\) and \(|H| \geq p^n\), 
(ii) The number of encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\) is at most \(\epsilon^C|G|^{2d-1}|H|^d\), 
(iii) For all \(g + H \notin \Omega\), the number of encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H\) and nodes in \(g + H\) is at most \(\epsilon^{C+1}|H|^{2d-2d-1}\).

Define \(Y = \{K \in G/H : \min\{|A \cap K|, |(\neg A) \cap K|\} \geq \epsilon|H|\}\). If \(|Y| \leq \epsilon|G|/|H|\), then taking \(H' = H\), we are done. So assume \(|Y| > \epsilon|G|/|H|\). Setting \(Y' = Y \setminus \Omega\), we have that \(|Y'| \geq \epsilon|G|/2|H|\).

Fix any \(K \in Y'\) and \(g \in K\). Since \(g + H = K \in Y\), both \((A-g) \cap H\) and \((\neg A-g) \cap H\) have size at least \(\epsilon|H|\). On the other hand, \(K \notin \Omega\) implies there are at most \(\epsilon^{C+1}|H|^{2d+2d-1} < (\epsilon^{12C'})^H|H|^{2d+2d-1}\) encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((H, (A-g) \cap H)\). Therefore, we may apply Fact 5.31 to \(H\) and \(\epsilon^{12C'}\), with respect to both \(A-g\) and \(\neg A-g = \neg(A-g)\). This yields subspaces \(H_g(0), H_g(1) \leq H\), each of codimension at most \(\epsilon^{-m}\) in \(H\), and \(y_0^g, y_1^g \in H\), such that \(|(A-g-y_0^g) \cap H_1(g)| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{4C'}/4)|H_1(g)|\) and \(|(A-g-y_0^g) \cap H_0(g)| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{4C'}/4)|H_0(g)|\). Set \(H_g = H_0(g) \cap H_1(g)\). Note \(H_g\) has codimension at most \(2\epsilon^{-m} < \epsilon^{-2m}\) in \(H\). By averaging, there are \(z_1^g, z_0^g \in H\) such that for each \(u \in \{0, 1\}\), \(|(A^u_g - y_0^g - z_0^g) \cap H_g| \geq \epsilon^{4C').
\((1 - \epsilon^{4C'}/4)|H_g|\). Setting \(x_0^g = y_0^g + z_0^g\) and \(x_1^g = y_1^g + z_1^g\), we have
\begin{equation}
(5.3) \quad |(A - g - x_1^g) \cap (\neg A - x_0^g) \cap H_g| \geq (1 - \epsilon^{4C'}/2)|H_g|.
\end{equation}
Define \(\Omega_g\) to be the set of \(K' \in G/H_g\) such that there are at least \(\epsilon^{C'+1}|H_g|^{2d-1} + 2^{d-1}-1\)-many encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H_g\) and nodes in \(K'\).

**Claim 5.34.** For all \(K \in Y'\) and \(g \in K\), \(\Omega_g = \emptyset\).

**Proof.** Suppose towards a contradiction, that \(K \in Y'\), \(g \in K\) and \(K' \in \Omega_g\). Let \(R\) be the set of encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H_g\) and nodes in \(K'\). Set
\[R_1 = \{(a_{\sigma})_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (H_g)^{2d-1} : \{(b_{\sigma})_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} : (a_{\eta})_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \cap \sigma \in 2^{d-1} \in R)\}| \geq \epsilon^{2(C'+1)}|H_g|^{2d-1}-1\}.
\]
Note that
\[\epsilon^{C'+1}|H_g|^{2d-1} + 2^{d-1}-1 \leq |R| \leq |R_1||H_g|^{2d-1}-1 + \epsilon^{2(C'+1)}|H_g|^{2d-1}-1|(H_g)^{2d-1} \setminus R_1|,
\]
where the first inequality is by assumption, and the second is by definition of \(R_1\). Rearranging, this yields
\[
\frac{\epsilon^{C'+1} - \epsilon^{2(C'+1)}}{1 - \epsilon^{2(C'+1)}}|H_g|^{2d-1} \leq |R_1|.
\]
Consequently, \(|R_1| \geq \epsilon^{2(C'+1)}|H_g|^{2d-1} - 1\). Now define
\[W_g = \{\bar{x} \in (H_g)^{2d-1} : \{x_1, \ldots, x_{2d-1}\} \setminus ((A - g - y_0 - y_0') \cap (A - g - y_1 - y_1')) \neq \emptyset\}.
\]
By \((5.3)\), \(|W_g| \leq 2^{d-1}(|A|^{4C'}/2)|H_g|^{2d-1} = \epsilon^{4C' 2^{d-2}}|H_g|^{2d-1} - 1\). Thus if \(W'_{g} := (H_g)^{2d-1} \setminus W_g\), then \(|W'_g| \geq |H_g|^{2d-1} (1 - \epsilon^{4C' 2^{d-2}})\). Consequently,
\[|R_1 \cap W'_g| \geq |H_g|^{2d-1} (\epsilon^{2(C'+1)} - \epsilon^{4C' 2^{d-2}}) > \epsilon^{3C'} |H_g|^{2d-1},
\]
where the last inequality is because \(\epsilon < \epsilon'\). We can now construct many encodings of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H \) and nodes in \(K\) as follows.

- Choose \((a_{\sigma}^1)_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (H_g)^{2d-1}\) \((a_{\eta}^1)_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \in R_1 \cap W'_g\). There are \(|R_1 \cap W'_g| \geq \epsilon^{6C'}|H_g|^{2d-1}\) choices.
- Choose \((b_{\sigma}^0)_{\sigma} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (H_g)^{2d-1}\) \((b_{\sigma}^1)_{\sigma} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (H_g)^{2d-1}\) with \((a_{\eta}^0)_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (b_{\sigma}^0)_{\sigma} \in 2^{d-1} \in R\) and \((a_{\eta}^1)_{\eta} \in 2^{d-1} \cap (b_{\sigma}^1)_{\sigma} \in 2^{d-1} \in R\). By definition of \(R_1\), there are at least \(\epsilon^{4(C'+1)}|H_g|^{2d-1}\) choices.

Set \(c_{<} = g\), and given \(\eta \in 2^{d-1}, \sigma \in 2^{d-1}\), and \(u \in \{0, 1\}\), set \(e_{u \wedge \eta} = x^0_u + a^1_\eta\), and \(e_{u \wedge \sigma} = b^1_u - x^0_u\). There is one way to do this.

We claim that every tuple \((c_{\mu})_{\mu} \in 2^{<d} (e_{\lambda})_{\lambda} \in 2^{d}\) constructed above is an encoding of \(T(d)\) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \(H \) and nodes in \(K\). By construction, each \(c_{\mu} \in H\) and each \(e_{\lambda} \in H + g = K\).

Now fix \(\mu \in 2^{<d}\) and \(\lambda \in 2^{d}\) with \(\mu \ll \lambda\). Let \(u \in \{0, 1\}\) and \(\eta \in 2^{d-1}\) be such that \(\lambda = u\eta\). Suppose first \(\mu = <\), then
\[c_{\mu} + e_{\lambda} = g + e_{u\eta} = g + x^0_u + a^1_{\eta}.
\]
By construction, \(a^1_{\eta} \in W'_g \subseteq A^u - g - x^0_u\), so \(g + x^0_u + a^1_{\eta} \in A^u\). Thus \(c_{\mu} + e_{\lambda} \in A\) if and only if \(\mu \wedge 1 \ll 1\) and \(\lambda\).
Suppose now $\mu \neq <\cdot>$. Then $\mu \triangleleft \lambda$ implies there is a unique $\sigma \in 2^{<d-1}$ such that $\sigma \triangleleft \eta$ and $\mu = u\sigma$. Note that for each $v \in \{0, 1\}$, $\sigma \land v \leq \eta$ if and only if $\mu \land v \leq \lambda$. In this case,

$$c_\mu + e_\lambda = c_{u\sigma} + e_{u\eta} = b_\sigma^u + a_\eta^u.$$ 

By assumption, $b_\sigma^u + a_\eta^u \in A$ if and only if $\sigma \land 1 \leq \eta$. By above, this holds if and only if $\mu \land 1 \leq \lambda$. Thus each $(c_\mu)_{\mu \in 2^{<d}}(e_\lambda)_{\lambda \in 2^d}$ constructed above is an encoding of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$, so we have constructed at least the following number of such encodings, all with $c_{<\cdot>} = g$.

$$(\epsilon^{6C'}|H_g|^{2d})(\epsilon^{4(C'+1)}|H_g|^2) \geq \epsilon^{10C'+4+2m(2^d+2^{d-1})}|H|^{2d^2+2^{d-1}}$$

where the first inequality is because $H_g$ has codimension at most $\epsilon^{-2m}$ in $H$, and the last inequality is by definition of $C$. However, this contradicts that $K \in \Omega$. 

By the induction hypothesis, for all $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$, one of the following holds.

(a) The number of encodings of $T(d - 1)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H_g$ is at least $\epsilon^{C'}|G|^{2^{d-1}-1}|H_g|^{2d-1}$, 

(b) $|\Omega| > \epsilon|G|/2|H_g|$, 

(c) There is $H'_g \leq H_g$ of codimension at most $L'$ in $H_g'$, which is almost $\epsilon$-atomic with respect to $A$.

By Claim 5.33 for all $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$, (b) never holds. If there is some $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$ such that (c) holds, then we are done, since the codimension of that $H'_g$ in $H$ would be at most $\epsilon^{-2m} + L' \leq L$.

Thus we may assume that for all $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$, (a) holds. Fix $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$. We will show there are too many encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$. Let $S \subseteq G^{2^{d-1}-1}H^{2d-1}$ be the set of encodings of $T(d - 1)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H_g$. Then define

$$S_1 = \{(a_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^{d-1}} \in (H_g)^{2^{d-1}} : |(b_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{<d-1}} : (a_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^{d-1}}(b_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{<d-1}} \in S| \geq \epsilon^{2C'}|G|^{2d-1-1}\}.$$

Observe that

$$|S| \leq ||S_1||G|^{2d-1-1} + \epsilon^{2C'}|G|^{2^{d-1}-1}||(H_g)^{2d-1} \setminus S_1|.$$

By (a), we have that $|S| \geq \epsilon^{C'}|G|^{2d-1-1}|H_g|^{2^{d-1}}$, and therefore the equation above implies that $|S_1| \geq \epsilon^{2C'}|H_g|^{2d-1}$. Recall

$$W'_g = \{\bar{x} \in (H_g)^{2d-1} : \{x_1, \ldots, x_{2d-1}\} \subseteq ((-A - g - y_0 - y'_0) \cap (A - g - y_1 - y'_1))\},$$

and we showed in the proof of Claim 5.33 that $|W'_g| \geq |H_g|^{2d-1}(1 - \epsilon^{4C'2d-2})$. Combining our lower bounds on $S_1$ and $W'_g$, we have

$$|W'_g \cap S_1| \geq |H_g|^{2d-1}(\epsilon^{2C'} - \epsilon^{4C'2d-2}) \geq |H_g|^{2d-1} \epsilon^{3C'},$$

where the second inequality is by our choice of $\epsilon < 1/2d$. We now give a procedure for generating many encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$, where $c_{<\cdot>} = g$. 


• Fix any two elements, $a^1 = (a^1_\sigma : \eta \in 2^{d-1}), a^0 = (a^0_\sigma : \eta \in 2^{d-1}) \in W'_g \cap S_1$. There are at least $|W'_g \cap S_1|^2 \geq |H'_g|^d \epsilon^{6C'}$ choices.

• Choose $b^1 = (b^1_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{d-1})$ and $b^0 = (b^0_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{d-1})$ such that $b^1 a^1$ and $b^0 a^0 \in S$.

Since $a^1, a^0 \in S_1$, there are at least $|H'_g|^d |G|^d \epsilon^{6C'} |G|^d - 1$ many choices.

• Set $c_{<,>} = g$, and for each $\eta \in 2^{d-1}, \sigma \in 2^{d-1}$ and $u \in \{0,1\}$, set $e_u = x_u^g + a_u^\eta$, and $c_{u \sigma} = b_u^\sigma - x_u^g$.

We now check that every $(\bar{\epsilon}_\mu)_{\mu \in 2^d(\bar{\epsilon}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in 2^d}}$ is an encoding of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$. First, by construction, for each $\eta \in 2^d, e_\eta \in H$, and for each $\sigma \in 2^{d-1}, c_\sigma \in K$. Now fix $\eta \in 2^d$ and $\sigma \leq \eta$. There is some $u \in \{0,1\}$ and $\rho \in 2^{d-1}$ so that $\eta = u \land \rho$, and some $w \in \{0,1\}$ so that $\sigma \land w \leq \eta$. If $\sigma = <,>$, then we must have $u = v$, and in this case,

$$c_{\sigma} + e_\eta = c_{<,>} + e_u \eta = g + x_u^g + a_u^\eta \in A^u.$$  

Assume now $\sigma \neq <, >$. Since $\sigma \leq \eta$ and $\eta = u \land \rho$, there is $\lambda \in 2^{d-1}$ such that $\lambda \leq \rho$, and $\sigma = u \land \lambda$. Note we also have $\lambda \land w \leq \eta$. Then

$$c_{\sigma} + e_\eta = c_{u \lambda} + e_u \rho = x_u^g + a_u^\rho + b_\lambda - x_u^g = a_u^\rho + b_\lambda \in A^u,$$

where the inclusion in $A^u$ is by construction. So if $\sigma \land 1 \leq \eta$, then $c_{\sigma} + e_\eta \in A$ and if $\sigma \land 0 \leq \eta$, then $c_{\sigma} + e_\eta \notin A$. This shows $(\bar{\epsilon}_{\sigma})_{\sigma \in 2^{<d}(\bar{\epsilon}_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d}}$ is an encoding of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$, and by construction $c_{<,>} = g$.

Consequently, we can construct at least the following number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$ with $c_{<,>} = g$.

$$|H'_g|^2 - |G|^{2d - 2} \geq \epsilon^{10C'} |H|^d |G|^{d-1},$$

where the inequality is since $H_g$ has codimension in $H$ at most $\epsilon^{-2m}$ in $H$. Clearly the encodings produced are distinct for difference choices of $K \in Y'$ and $g \in K$. Consequently, the total number encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ is at least

$$|H||G||H_g/2|H||G|^{d-1} \geq \epsilon^{10C'} |H|^d |G|^{d-2} = \epsilon^{10C'} |H|^d |G|^{d-1} > \epsilon^C |H|^d |G|^{d-1},$$

where the last inequality is by definition of $C$ and because $H \geq N$. But this contradicts our original assumption about the number of such encodings. \hfill \square

5.5. Iterating to obtain a stronger version. In this subsection prove a stronger version of Theorem 5.33, where the error on the atoms outside the error set can be made arbitrarily small with respect to codimension of $H'$ in $H$. We will do this by iteratively applying Theorem 5.33 to produce a “factor chain”, as defined below.

**Definition 5.35.** Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, integer $\ell_0, T \geq 1, f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, and $N, D \geq 1$. Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$, an $(\epsilon, D, \ell_0, T, g, f)$-linear factor chain for $A$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ consists of

- for each $0 \leq i \leq T$, a linear factor $L_i$ of complexity $\ell_i$,
- for each $1 \leq i \leq T$, a partition $\text{At}(L_i) = \Gamma_i^b \cup \Gamma_i^1 \cup \Gamma_i^\text{err}$, satisfying

  1. $L_T \prec_{\text{syn}} \ldots \prec_{\text{syn}} L_1 \prec_{\text{syn}} L_0$,
  2. for each $1 \leq i \leq T$, $f(\ell_{i-1} - \ell_0) < \ell_i - \ell_0 \leq D$,
Lemma 5.36. For all $d \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $T \geq 1$, and increasing functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there are $L = L(d, \epsilon, T, f, g)$, $\mu = \mu(d, \epsilon, T, f, g)$ and $N = N(d, \epsilon, T, f, g)$ such that the following hold. Suppose $\ell \geq 0$, $n - \ell \geq N$, $A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear factor of complexity $\ell$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, and $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ satisfy the following, where $H = L(0)$.

(i) $|\Omega| \leq \epsilon p^\ell/2$,

(ii) The number of $A$-encodings of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H$ is at most $\mu |H|^{2^\ell} |G|^{2^\ell - 1}$,

(iii) For all $K \in (G/H) \setminus \Omega$, the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ and nodes in $K$ is at most $\mu H^{2^\ell + 2^\ell - 1}$.

Then there exists a $(T, \epsilon, L, f, g)$-factor chain for $A$, and with $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Fix $d \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $T \geq 1$, and increasing functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Set $C = C(d)$ from Theorem 5.33. We inductively define parameters $\rho_i, \epsilon_i, N_i, N_i', D_i, D_i', L_i, L_i'$ for each $0 \leq i \leq T$ as follows.

Step $i = 0$. Set $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon$, $\rho_0 = 1$, $N_0 = N_0' = 1$, and $L_0' = L_0 = 0$.

Step $i + 1$. Suppose $0 \leq i < T$ and assume we have defined, for each $0 \leq s \leq i$, $N_s, N_s', D_s, D_s', L_s, L_s'$, so that each for each $0 \leq s \leq i$, $N_s'$, $L_s'$, and $L_s$ only depend on $\epsilon, d, s$, and $L_1, \ldots, L_{s-1}$. Set $\epsilon_{i+1} = \epsilon_{i+1} = \epsilon_{i+1} = \epsilon_{i+1} = \epsilon_{i+1}$, $L_{i+1} = L_{i+1} = L_{i+1} = L_{i+1} = L_{i+1} = L_{i+1} = L_{i+1}$, and assume by induction we have chosen $\mathcal{L}_i \supseteq \ldots \supseteq \mathcal{L}_i$ forming an $(\epsilon, L_i, \ell, i, g, f)$-factor chain for $A$, where for each $1 \leq j \leq i$, $\ell_j - f(L_j) \leq \ell_j - f(L_{j-1}) + f(L_i)$.

Since $N$ is large, there exists a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $\mathcal{L}_i' = X \cup \mathcal{L}_i$ is linearly independent, and has complexity $\ell_i' = \ell_i + f(L_i)$. Set $\rho_i' = |\mathcal{L}_i'(0)|/|H|$, and let $M_i$ be the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $L_i(0)$. Since, by assumption, $n - \ell_i' \geq N_i'$, and since any encoding of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $L_i(0)$ is also an encoding of $T(d)$ in
(G, A) with leaves in H, we have the following,
\[ M_i \leq \mu |H|^{2d} |G|^{2d - 1} = \mu(\rho_i)^{2d} |L_i'(0)|^{2d} |G|^{2d - 1} \leq \mu(\rho_i)^{2d} |L_i'(0)|^{2d} |G|^{2d - 1} \leq \epsilon_{i+1}^{C+1} |L_i'(0)|^{2d} |G|^{2d - 1}, \]
where the second inequality is by definition of \( \rho_i \) and the definition of an \((\epsilon, L_i, \ell, i, g, f)\)-factor chain, and the third inequality is by definition of \( \mu \). Now let \( \Omega_i \) be the set of cosets of \( L_i'(0) \) such that the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \( L_i'(0) \) and nodes in \( K \) is at least \( \epsilon_{i+1}^{C+1} |L_i'(0)|^{2d+2d - 1} \). We claim that for all \( H + g \notin \Omega \) and \( L_i'(0) + h + g \subseteq L_i'(0) + h + g \notin \Omega_i \). Indeed, suppose towards a contradiction there exists some \( H + g \notin \Omega \) and \( L_i'(0) + h + g \subseteq L_i'(0) + h + g \in \Omega_i \). Then the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \( H \) is at least
\[ \epsilon_{i+1}^{C+1} |L_i'(0)|^{2d+2d - 1} = (\rho_i)^{2d+2d - 1} \epsilon_{i+1}^{C+1} |H|^{2d+2d - 1} \geq (\rho_i)^{2d+2d - 2} \epsilon_{i+1}^{C+1} |H|^{2d+2d - 1}, \]
where the inequality is by definition of \( \rho_i \), the definition of an \((\epsilon, L_i, \ell, i, g, f)\)-factor chain, and the definition of \( \mu \). This is a contradiction. Thus, the hypotheses of Theorem 5.33 are satisfied by \( A \) and \( \mathcal{L}_i' \).

By Theorem 5.33, there is \( \mathcal{L}_{i+1} \preceq_{syn} \mathcal{L}_i' \) of complexity \( \ell_{i+1} \leq \ell_i + L_{i+1} \leq D_i + f(L_i) + L_{i+1} = D_{i+1} \), such that \( A \) is almost \( \epsilon_{i+1} \)-atomic with respect to \( \mathcal{L}_{i+1} \). Clearly \( \ell_{i+1} - \ell_i \geq f(L_i) \) as well, since \( \mathcal{L}_i' \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{i+1} \). Further, note \( \epsilon_{i+1} = e_p^{-\bar{g}(\sum_{j=0}^{L_i} f(L_i))} \leq e_p^{-\bar{g}(\ell_i - \ell_i)} \). Thus \( (\mathcal{L}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_{i+1}) \) forms an \((\epsilon, L_{i+1}, \ell, i + 1, g, f)\)-factor chain.

After step \( T, \mathcal{L}_0 \supseteq \ldots \supseteq \mathcal{L}_T \) will be the desired \((\epsilon, L, \ell, T, g, f)\)-factor chain for \( A \). \( \square \)

We now use Lemma 5.36 to prove the strong version of Theorem 5.33. Theorem 5.11.

**Proof of Theorem 5.11**. Fix \( d \geq 1, \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \). Define \( g, f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) by setting \( g(x) = 5x \psi(dx) \) and \( f(x) = 0 \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \( \rho = \rho(e_p^{-\bar{g}(0)}, 2^d + 2^d - 1) \) and \( N_2 = N_2(e_p^{-\bar{g}(0)}, 2^d + 2^d - 1) \) be as in Lemma 5.32. Choose \( \mu_1, D_1, \) and \( N_1 \) as in Lemma 5.36 for \( \epsilon, d, g \) and \( f \). Define \( D_0 = D_1 d \), set \( C = (D_0 + \psi(D_0) + 2^d)2^d \), and choose \( \mu_0 = \min(\epsilon/2^d, 1/p, \mu) \). Finally, set \( N = D_0^d N_1 \).

Now suppose \( 0 < \mu \leq \mu_0, \ell \geq 0, n - \ell \geq N, A \subseteq G = \mathbb{F}_p^n, L \) is a linear factor in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \) of complexity \( \ell \), and \( \Omega \subset G/L(0) \) satisfy the following, where \( H = L(0) \).

(i) \( |\Omega| \leq \mu^p \) and \( |H| \geq p^N, \)
(ii) The number of \( A \)-encodings of \( T(d) \) with leaves in \( H \) is at most \( \mu^C |H|^{2d} |G|^{2d - 1}, \)
(iii) For all \( K \in (G/H) \setminus \Omega \), the number of encodings of \( T(d) \) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \( H \) and nodes in \( K \) is at most \( \mu |H|^{2d+2d - 1} \).

Since \( \mu < \mu_1 \), Lemma 5.36 implies there exists an \((\epsilon, D_1, \ell, d, g, f)\)-linear factor chain for \( A \) where \( \mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L} \). Say the chain consists of, for each \( 0 \leq i \leq d \), a linear factor \( \mathcal{L}_i \) of complexity \( \ell_i \), and a partition \( \mathrm{At}(\mathcal{L}_i) = \Gamma_i^{\mathcal{L}} \cup \Gamma_i^{1} \cup \Gamma_i^{0} \). For each \( 0 \leq i \leq d - 1 \), let
\[ \Sigma_i^{\mathcal{L}} = \{ L_i(\bar{a}) \in \mathrm{At}(\mathcal{L}_i) : \text{for each } u \in \{0, 1\}, \{ L \in \mathrm{At}(\mathcal{L}_i + 1) : L \subseteq L_i(\bar{a}) \} \cap \Gamma_i^{u} \} \]
\[ \geq e_p^{\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i - 2\psi(\ell_i - \ell_0)} \} \].

We claim there is \( 0 \leq i \leq d - 1 \) such that \( |\Sigma_i^{\mathcal{L}}| \leq \mu p^d \). Suppose towards a contradiction this is false, i.e. that for every \( 0 \leq i \leq d - 1 \), \( |\Sigma_i^{\mathcal{L}}| \geq \mu p^d \). We can construct many distinct encodings of \( T(d) \) in \((G, A)\) with leaves in \( H \) as follows.
For each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$, choose a set $I_i = \{ L_i(\bar{a}_\sigma) : \sigma \in 2^i \} \in (\Sigma^{'\text{err}}_i)_2$. By assumption there are at least $\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \left( \frac{\mu^{\ell_i}}{2^{2^i}} \right) \geq \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} (\mu/2^i)^2 p^{2^i \ell_i}$ ways to do this.

For each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\sigma \in 2^i$, choose any $L_{i+1}(\bar{a}_\sigma c_{\sigma \wedge 0}) \in \Gamma^1_{i+1}$, and $L_{i+1}(\bar{a}_\sigma c_{\sigma \wedge 0}) \in \Gamma^0_{i+1}$. For each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\sigma \in 2^i$, since $L_i(\bar{a}_\sigma) \in \Sigma^{'\text{err}}_i$, there are at least $(\epsilon p^{\ell_i + 1 - \ell_i - 2d(\ell_i - \ell_0)})^2$ ways to do this. Therefore the number of choices for this step is at least $\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} (\epsilon p^{\ell_i + 1 - \ell_i - 2d(\ell_i - \ell_0)})^2$.

For each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\sigma \in 2^i$, let $h^\sigma_i$ be such that $L_i(\bar{a}_\sigma) = h^\sigma_i + L_i(0)$, and for each $u \in \{0, 1\}$, let $g^{\sigma \wedge u}_i \in L_i(0)$ be such that $L_{i+1}(\bar{a}_\sigma c_{\sigma \wedge u}) = h^\sigma_i + g^{\sigma \wedge u}_i + L_{i+1}(0)$. Now for each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\sigma \in 2^i$, and each $\eta \in 2^d$, set

$$V_\sigma = L_{i+1}(0) + h^\sigma_i - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} g^{\sigma(1) \wedge \sigma(j) \wedge \sigma(j+1)}_j,$$

and

$$W_\eta = L_d(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} g^{\eta(1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \eta(j+1)}_j.$$

We give a lower bound for the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ where for each $\sigma$, $b_\sigma \in V_\sigma$, and for each $\eta$, $a_\eta \in W_\eta$. Note that each $W_\eta \subseteq H$, so each such encoding will have leaves in $H$.

For all $\sigma \in 2^i$ and $\eta \in 2^d$, if $\sigma \wedge 1 \not\leq \eta$, then we have

$$\frac{|E^2_A[V_\sigma, W_\eta]|}{|K^2_2[V_\sigma, W_\eta]|} = \frac{|A \cap (L_{i+1}(0) + h^\sigma_i + g^{\sigma(1)}_i)|}{|(L_{i+1}(0) + h^\sigma_i + g^{\sigma(1)}_i)|} \geq 1 - \epsilon p^{-g(\ell_i - \ell_0)}$$

and if $\sigma \wedge 0 \not\leq \eta$ then we have

$$\frac{|E^2_A[V_\sigma, W_\eta]|}{|K^2_2[V_\sigma, W_\eta]|} = \frac{|A \cap (L_{i+1}(0) + h^\sigma_i + g^{\sigma(0)}_i)|}{|(L_{i+1}(0) + h^\sigma_i + g^{\sigma(0)}_i)|} \leq \epsilon p^{-g(\ell_i - \ell_0)}$$

Let $(V \cup W, E)$ be the bipartite graph with parts $V = \bigcup_{\sigma \in 2^{d-1}} V_\sigma$, $W = \bigcup_{\eta \in 2^d} W_\eta$, and where for each $\sigma \wedge \eta$, $E[V_\sigma, W_\eta] = E^2_A[V_\sigma, W_\eta]$ and for all other $\sigma, \eta$, $E[V_\sigma, W_\eta] = \emptyset$. Choose a tuple $(v_\sigma)_{\sigma \in 2^{d-1}}(w_\eta)_{\eta \in 2^d} \in \prod_{\sigma \in 2^{d-1}} V_\sigma \times \prod_{\eta \in 2^d} W_\eta$ such that if $\sigma \wedge 0 \not\leq \eta$, then $v_\sigma w_\eta \not\in E$ and if $\sigma \wedge 1 \not\leq \eta$, then $v_\sigma w_\eta \in E$. Note this tuple is an $A$-encoding of $T(d)$ with leaves in $H$, and where each $b_\sigma \in V_\sigma$ and each $a_\eta \in W_\eta$.

By Lemma 5.32, the number of such tuples is at least $(1 - \rho) \prod_{\sigma \in 2^{d-1}} |V_\sigma| \prod_{\eta \in 2^d} |W_\eta|$, so we have at least $(1 - \rho)|L_d(0)|^{2^d} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} |L_{i+1}(0)|^{2^i}$-many choices.
Combining these, we have that the number of encodings of $T(d)$ in $(G, A)$ with leaves in $H$ is at least the following.

\[
\left( \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \left( \mu / 2 \right)^{2^i} p^{2^i} \right) \left( \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \left( \epsilon p^{\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i-2\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)} \right)^{2^i} \right) \left( 1 - \rho \right) |L_d(0)|^{2^d} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} |L_{i+1}(0)|^{2^i} \\
= (1 - \rho) |L_d(0)|^{2^d} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \left( \mu / 2 \right)^{2^i} p^{2^i} \left( \epsilon p^{\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i-2\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)} |L_{i+1}(0)| \right)^{2^i} \\
= (1 - \rho) |L_d(0)|^{2^d} (\mu \epsilon)^{2^d} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \left( p^{-2\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)} |G| \right)^{2^i} \\
\geq (1 - \rho) p^{-2dD_0} |L_0(0)|^{2^d} (\mu \epsilon / 2)^{2^d} |G|^{2^d} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} p^{-2^{i+1}\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)} \\
\geq (1 - \rho) p^{-2dD_0} (\mu \epsilon / 2)^{2^d} p^{-2d\psi(D_0)} |L_0(0)|^{2^d} |G|^{2^d-1} \\
\geq \mu^C |L_0(0)|^{2^d} |G|^{2^d-1},
\]

where the last inequality is by definition of $C$ and our assumptions on $\mu$. But this contradicts our assumption (iii).

Thus there is some $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$ where $|\Sigma_i^{err}| \leq \mu p^{\ell_i}$. Let

\[
\Omega = \Sigma_i^{err} \cup \{ L \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}_i) : |\{ L' \subseteq L : L' \in \Gamma_i^{err} \}| \geq \epsilon p^{\ell_{i+1}-\ell_i-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)/2} \}.
\]

Then

\[
|\Omega| \leq |\Sigma_i^{err}| + \epsilon p^{\ell_i-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)/2} \leq \mu p^{\ell_i}/2 + p^{\ell_i-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)/2} = p^{\ell_i}(\mu/2+p^{-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)/2}) \leq p^{\ell_i}(\mu/2+p^{-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)}).
\]

Then for all $L \notin \Omega$, it is straightforward to see there is $u \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $|A^u \cap L|/|L| \geq 1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)/2} - \epsilon p^{-2\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)} \geq 1 - \epsilon p^{-\psi(\ell_i-\ell_0)}$, as desired. \(\square\)

**Appendix A. Hereditary properties**

In this appendix we prove several standard results about hereditary group properties.

**A.1. Equivalent definitions.** In this subsection we show there are two additional equivalent definitions of a hereditary group property, one in terms of forbidden substructures and one in terms of universal axioms.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{ \cdot, P \}$ be the language consisting of a single binary function $\cdot$ and a unary relation symbol $P$, and let $T_G$ be the axioms for a group in the language $\mathcal{L}_G = \{ \cdot \}$. Observe that an $\mathcal{L}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying $T_G$ is a group $G$ equipped with a distinguished subset $P^G \subseteq G$, the interpretation of $P$ in $\mathcal{M}$. We will denote $\mathcal{L}$-structures satisfying $T_G$ as pairs $(G, A)$, where $G$ is a group and $A \subseteq G$. Recall the following definition.

**Definition A.1.** Suppose $H$ and $G$ are groups, $A' \subseteq H$, and $A \subseteq G$. If there is no affine $\mathcal{L}$-embeddings from $(H, A')$ into $(G, A)$, then $(G, A)$ omits $(H, A')$. 
Given a finite $\mathcal{L}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$, say with underlying set $M = \{m_1, \ldots, m_n\}$, we define the atomic diagram of $\mathcal{M}$ to be the conjunction of all atomic $\mathcal{L}$-formulas $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \phi(m_1, \ldots, m_n)$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is finite, this is a formula.

**Remark A.2.** Suppose $(G, A)$ and $(G', A')$ are a finite $\mathcal{L}$-structures and $G, G'$ are finite groups with say, $G = \{g_1, \ldots, g_n\}$. Let $\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be the atomic diagram of $(G, A)$. Then $(G', A') \models \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_n \theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ if and only if there is an affine $\mathcal{L}$-embedding from $(G, A)$ into $(G', A')$.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, assume $g_1 = 1_G$. Suppose that

$$(G', A') \models \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_n \theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Then there are $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in G'$ such that $(G', A') \models \theta(h_1, \ldots, h_n)$. Let $f : G \to G'$ be the map sending $g_i$ to $h_i$ for each $i \in [n]$. We claim $f$ is an affine embedding from $(G, A)$ into $(G', A')$. Clearly $f$ is an injection, since the formula $x_1 \neq x_j$ will appear in $\theta$ for each $i \neq j$.

Further, $\theta$ will contain $P(x_i)$ for each $g_i \in A$ and $\neg P(x_j)$ for all $g_j \in G \setminus A$, so we will have that for each $i \in [n]$. $f(g_i) \in A'$ if and only if $g_i \in A$ and if and only if $f(g_i) \in A'$. We only have left to verify that for all $i, j \in [n]$ $f(g_i \cdot g_j) = f(g_i)f(1_G)^{-1}f(g_j)$.

Given $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\rho(i)$ be the $j \in [n]$ such that $g_j = g_i^{-1}$. Given $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, and let $\tau(i, j)$ be the $k$ such that $g_i \cdot g_j = g_k$. Note that for all $i \in [n]$, $x_\rho(i) \cdot x_i = x_1$ and $x_i \cdot x_\rho(i) = x_1$ will be a conjunct of $\theta$, so we will have $h_{\rho(i)} \cdot h_i = h_i \cdot h_{\rho(i)} = h_1$. Similarly, for all $i, j \in [n]$ $x_i \cdot x_j = k$ will be a conjunct of $\theta$, so we will have that $h_i \cdot h_j = h_{\tau(i, j)}$. By definition of $f$, we also have $h_{\tau(i, j)} = f(g_{\tau(i,j)}) = h_{\tau(i, j)}$.

Now fix $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. The formula $x_\tau(i,j) \cdot x_\rho(i) = x_i$ is implied by $\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Consequently, in $G'$, $h_{\tau(i,j)} \cdot h_{\rho(i)} = h_i$. Therefore, $h_{\tau(i,j)} = h_i \cdot h_{\rho(i)}^{-1}$. By above, $h_j \cdot h_{\rho(j)} = h_1$, so we have that $h_{\rho(j)}^{-1} \cdot h_j = h_{\rho(j)}^{-1}$. Combining things, we have the following:

$$f(g_i \cdot g_j) = f(g_{\tau(i,j)}) = h_i \cdot h_{\rho(j)}^{-1} = h_i \cdot h_{\rho(j)}^{-1} \cdot h_j.$$  

Since $h_1 = f(g_1)$ and by assumption $g_1 = 1_G$, this tells us that $f(g_i \cdot g_j) = f(g_1)f(1_G)^{-1}f(g_j)$.

Conversely, suppose there is an affine $\mathcal{L}$-embedding $f$ from $(G, A)$ into $(G', A')$. Say $f(g_1) = h_1, \ldots, f(g_n) = h_n$. Since $\theta$ is quantifier-free, we may assume there is some finite $m$, and for each $\alpha \leq m$, sets $K_\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}^2)$, and $I_\alpha, J_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})$ such that theta is equivalent to the following formula:

$$\bigvee_{\alpha=1}^m \left( \bigwedge_{S \in I_\alpha} P(\prod_{i \in S} x_i) \land \bigwedge_{S \in J_\alpha} \neg P(\prod_{i \in S} x_i) \land \left( \prod_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} b_i = \prod_{i \in S_1} x_i \right) \land \left( \prod_{i \in S_1} x_i \neq \prod_{j \in S_2} x_j \right) \right).$$

Since $(G, A) \models \theta(g_1, \ldots, g_n)$, there is some $\alpha$ between 1 and $m$ such that

$$(G, A) \models \bigwedge_{S \in I_\alpha} P(\prod_{i \in S} g_i) \land \bigwedge_{S \in J_\alpha} \neg P(\prod_{i \in S} g_i) \land \left( \prod_{i \in S_1, j \in S_2} g_i = \prod_{i \in S_1} g_i \right) \land \left( \prod_{i \in S_1} g_i \neq \prod_{j \in S_2} g_j \right).$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $c_i = f(g_i)f(g_i)^{-1}$. Note that for all $t$ and $(i_1, \ldots, i_t) \subseteq [n]^t$, $f(\prod_{j \in S} b_i) = \prod_{j \in S} c_j$. Since $f$ is an affine $\mathcal{L}$-embedding, the above implies that for all
\[ S \in I_{\alpha}, f(\prod_{i \in S} b_i) = \prod_{i \in S} c_i \in A' \] and for all \( S' \in J_{\alpha}, f(\prod_{i \in S'} b_i) = \prod_{i \in S'} c_i \notin A \). Similarly, for all \( S_1, S_2 \in K_{\alpha}, \) and \( S_3, S_4 \in W_{\alpha}, \)

\[
\prod_{i \in S_1} c_i = f(\prod_{i \in S_1} b_i) = \prod_{i \in S_2} b_i = \prod_{i \in S_2} c_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{i \in S_3} c_i = f(\prod_{i \in S_3} b_i) \neq f(\prod_{i \in S_3} b_i) = \prod_{i \in S_4} c_i.
\]

This shows \((G', A') \models \theta(c_1, \ldots, c_n), \) so \((G', A') \models \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_n \theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n). \quad \square

**Proposition A.3.** Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is a class of finite \( \mathcal{L} \)-structures, all of which are groups. The following are equivalent.

(i) \( \mathcal{P} \) is the class of finite models of a \( T_G \cup T_\mathcal{P} \) for some universal \( \mathcal{L} \)-theory \( T_\mathcal{P}. \)

(ii) For every \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) and finite group \( H, \) if \( f : H \to G \) is an affine embedding, then \((H, f^{-1}(A)) \in \mathcal{P}. \)

(iii) \( \mathcal{P} \) is closed under isomorphism, and for every \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) and finite group \( H, \) if \((H, A')\) is an affine substructure of \((G, A), \) then \((H, A') \in \mathcal{P}. \)

(iv) There is a set \( \mathcal{F} \) of finite \( \mathcal{L} \)-structures such that \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) if and only if \( G \) is a group under \( \cdot \) and \((G, A) \) omits every element of \( \mathcal{F}. \)

**Proof.** (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii): Suppose (i) holds. Fix \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) and a finite group \( H, \) say \( H = \{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}. \) Suppose there exists an injection \( f : H \to G \) such that for all \( x, y \in H, f(x \cdot y) = f(x) \cdot f(1_H)^{-1} \cdot f(y). \) We want to show \((H, f^{-1}(A)) \in \mathcal{P}. \) Suppose towards a contradiction this is false. Therefore \((H, f^{-1}(A)) \notin T_G \cup T_\mathcal{P}. \) Since \( H \) is a group, \( H \models T_G, \) so we must have that there is some \( \phi \in T_\mathcal{P} \) such that \((H, f^{-1}(A)) \models \neg \phi. \) By assumption, we may assume \( \phi = \forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_k \theta(x_1, \ldots, x_k), \) where \( \theta \) is quantifier-free. Thus there are \( i, \ldots, i_k \) such that \((H, f^{-1}(A)) \models \neg \theta(h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_k}). \) Let \( \tau(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) be the atomic diagram of \((H, f^{-1}(A)). \) Then \( \tau(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) implies \( \theta(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}). \) By Remark \( \text{A.2} \) \((G, A) \models \exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_n \tau(x_1, \ldots, x_n). \) Say \((G, A) \models \tau(g_1, \ldots, g_n). \) Then \((G, A) \models \theta(g_{i_1}, \ldots, g_{i_k}), \) which implies \((G, A) \models \neg \phi, \) a contradiction since \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( \phi \in T_\mathcal{P}. \)

(ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii): Suppose (ii) holds. Fix \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P}. \) If \((G', A')\) is isomorphic to \((G, A), \) then there is an affine embedding \( f : (G', A') \to (G, A) \) which is also a bijection. By (ii), \((G', f^{-1}(A)) = (G', A') \in \mathcal{P}. \) Assume now that \((H, A')\) is an affine substructure of \((G, A). \) Then the inclusion map \( \text{in} : (H, A') \to (G, A) \) is an affine embedding, so by (ii), \((H, f^{-1}(A)) = (H, A') \in \mathcal{P}. \) Thus (iii) holds.

(iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iv): Suppose (iii) holds. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the set of all finite \( \mathcal{L} \)-structures \((H, A')\) such that \( H \) is a group, and such that every \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) omits \((H, A'). \) Clearly if \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) then \( G \) is a group and \((G, A) \) omits every \((H, A') \in \mathcal{F}. \) Conversely, suppose \( G \) is a group and \((G, A) \) is a finite \( \mathcal{L} \)-structure, omitting every \((H, A') \in \mathcal{F}. \) Suppose towards a contradiction that \((G, A) \notin \mathcal{P}. \) I claim that \((G, A) \in \mathcal{F}. \) Indeed, suppose not. Then there is some \((G', A') \in \mathcal{P} \) and an affine \( \mathcal{L} \)-embedding \( f : (G, A) \to (G', A') \). The image of \( f \) is an affine substructure of \((G', A'), \) so by (iii), \((f(G), f(A)) \) is in \( \mathcal{P}. \) Since (iii) tells us \( \mathcal{P} \) is closed under isomorphism, this implies \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P}, \) a contradiction. Thus \((G, A) \in \mathcal{F}. \) But this is also a contradiction because we assumed \((G, A) \) omits every element of \( \mathcal{F}. \)

(iv) \( \Rightarrow \) (i): Assume (iv) holds. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the class of finite \( \mathcal{L} \)-structures. For each \((H, A) \in \mathcal{F}, \) let \( \phi_{(H,A)} \) be \( \forall \bar{x} \neg \theta(\bar{x}) \) where \( \theta(\bar{x}) \) is the atomic diagram of \((H, A). \) Let \( T \) be
the set of \( \phi_{(H,A)} \) for \((H,A) \in \mathcal{F}\). Clearly \(T\) is a set of universal sentences. Clearly every 
\((G,A) \in \mathcal{P}\) satisfies \(T_G \cup T\). Conversely, suppose \((G,A)\) satisfies \(T_G \cup T\). So \(G\) is a group 
under \(-\), and \((G,A) \models \neg\phi_{(H,A')}\) for all \((H,A') \in \mathcal{F}\). By Remark \[A.2\] \((G,A)\) omits every 
\((H,A') \in \mathcal{F}\). Thus by (iv), \((G,A) \in \mathcal{P}\).

A.2. Closeness. Here we show that all the atomicity properties defined in the introduction 
depend only on the \(\sim\)-class of a property. In fact, we can show this for all the various 
decompositions properties at once after making a few definitions.

For each \(n \geq 1\), let \(G_n\) be the class of finite groups on \(n\) elements. A partition class 
for \(n\) is a class \(X_n\), consisting of partitions of groups in \(G_n\). A partition class is a class 
\(X = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} X_n\) where for each \(n\), \(X_n\) is a partition class for \(n\).

**Definition A.4.** Suppose \(\mathcal{P}\) is a group property, and \(X = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} X_n\) is a partition class. Suppose \(\psi : \mathbb{N} \to (0,1]\) and \(\theta : \mathbb{N} \to [0,1]\) are non-increasing. We say \(\mathcal{P}\) has \((\psi,\theta,X)\)-partitions if for all \(\epsilon > 0\) there are \(D \geq 0\) and \(N \geq 1\) so that for all \((G,A) \in \mathcal{P}\) with 
\(|G| \geq N\), there is a partition \(B\) of \(G\) and \(\Sigma \subseteq B\) such that \(B \in S\) and the following hold.

1. \(|B| \leq D\).
2. \(|\Sigma| \leq \epsilon \theta(|B|)|B|\).
3. For all \(B \in B\), \(|B| - |G|/|B| \leq \epsilon |G|/|B|\).
4. For all \(B \in B \setminus \Sigma\), \(|A \cap B|/|B| \in [0, \epsilon \psi(|B|)) \cup (1 - \epsilon \psi(|B|), 1]\).

This definition covers all the notions we are interested in. For instance, let \(X_{lin}^n\) denote 
the class of all partitions of elements of \(G_n\) into cosets of a single subgroup, and let \(X_{lin} = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} X_{lin}^n\). Then the following hold.

(i) \(\mathcal{P}\) is linearly atomic if and only if it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{lin})\)-partitions for \(\psi(x) = 1\) and \(\theta(x) = 0\).
(ii) \(\mathcal{P}\) is almost linearly atomic if and only if it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{lin})\)-partitions for \(\psi(x) = 1\) and \(\theta(x) = 1\).
(iii) \(\mathcal{P}\) is strongly linearly atomic if and only if for all \(\psi\), it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{lin})\)-partitions for \(\theta(x) = 0\).
(iv) \(\mathcal{P}\) is almost strongly linearly atomic if and only if for all \(\psi\), it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{lin})\)-partitions for \(\theta(x) = 1\).

Let \(EP(n)\) be the class of elementary \(p\) groups of size \(p^n\). Given a rank function \(\omega\), let \(X_{p}^\omega\) be 
the class of all partitions of an element of \(EP(n)\) consisting of the atoms of a quadratic 
factor of some complexity \((\ell,q)\) and with rank at least \(\omega(\ell + q)\). It is straightforward to 
show that the following hold (note one will use Corollary \[A.13\] to verify (3) in Definition 
[A.4]).

(i) \(\mathcal{P}\) is quadratically atomic if and only if for all \(\omega\), it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{p}^\omega)\)-partitions for 
\(\psi(x) = 1\) and \(\theta(x) = 0\).
(ii) \(\mathcal{P}\) is almost quadratically atomic if and only if for all \(\omega\), it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{p}^\omega)\)-partitions for 
\(\psi(x) = 1\) and \(\theta(x) = 1\).
(iii) \(\mathcal{P}\) is strongly quadratically atomic if and only if for all \(\omega\) and \(\psi\), it has \((\psi,\theta,X_{p}^\omega)\)-partitions for \(\theta(x) = 0\).
Thus, Propositions 1.10 and 1.22 are immediate from the following general fact.

**Proposition A.5.** Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{P}' \) are group properties and \( \mathcal{X} \) is a partition class. Suppose \( \mathcal{P} \) is close to \( \mathcal{P}' \) and \( \mathcal{P}' \) has \((\psi, \theta, \mathcal{X})\)-partitions. Then so does \( \mathcal{P} \).

**Proof.** Fix \( \epsilon > 0 \). Choose \( D \) and \( N_1 \) as in the definition of \( \mathcal{P}' \) having \((\psi, \theta, \mathcal{X})\)-partitions for \( \epsilon/2 \). By assumption, there is \( N_2 \) such that for all \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) with \(|G| \geq N_2\), there is \((G, A') \in \mathcal{P}' \) with \(|A' \Delta A| \leq \delta |G| \), where \( \delta = \epsilon \psi(D)/2D \). Let \( N = \max\{N_1, N_2\} \).

Suppose \((G, A) \in \mathcal{P} \) and \(|G| \geq N\). Then there is \((G, A') \in \mathcal{P}' \) with \(|A' \Delta A| \leq (\epsilon \psi(D)/2D)|G|\). By assumption, there is \( B \in \mathcal{X} \), a partition of \( G \) with \(|B| = b \leq D\), which is \( \epsilon \theta(b)/2 \)-almost, \( \epsilon \psi(b)/2 \)-atomic with respect to \( A' \), and whose parts differ in size by at most \( \epsilon |G|/b \). Let \( \Sigma = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : |A' \cap B|/|B| \in (\epsilon \psi(b)/2, 1 - \epsilon \psi(b)/2)\} \). Given \( B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \Sigma \), there is \( \mu \in \{0, 1\} \) so that \(|(A')^\mu \cap B| \geq (1 - \epsilon \psi(b)/2)|B| \). Then

\[
|A^n \cap B| - |A' \Delta A| \geq (1 - \epsilon \psi(b)/2)|B| - \epsilon \psi(D)/2D \\
\geq (1 - \epsilon \psi(b)/2 - \epsilon \psi(D)/2)|B| \geq (1 - \epsilon \psi(b))|B|. 
\]

Thus \( B \) is \( \epsilon \theta(b) \)-almost, \( \epsilon \psi(b) \)-atomic with respect to \( A \). \( \square \)

### A.3. An unstable property which is close to stable.

**Fact A.6.** Suppose \( A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n \) contains \( k \) linearly independent non-zero vectors and \( g \in \mathbb{F}_{p}^n \). Then \( A - g \) contains at least \( k - 1 \) linearly independent vectors.

**Proof.** Suppose \( \bar{v}_1, \ldots, \bar{v}_k \in A \) are non-zero, linearly independent, but \( \bar{v}_1 - g, \ldots, \bar{v}_k - g \) are not linearly independent. Then there are \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k \in \mathbb{F} \) not all 0 such that

\[
0 = \lambda_1(\bar{v}_1 - g) + \ldots + \lambda_k(\bar{v}_k - g) = (\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i g_1^i, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_n^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i g_n^i) 
\]

Thus for all \( j \in [n] \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_j^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i g_j^i = 0 \). We claim \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \neq 0 \). Suppose towards a contradiction \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i = 0 \). Then for all \( j \in [n] \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_j^i = 0 \). But now \( \lambda_1 \bar{v}_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k \bar{v}_k = 0 \), contradicting that \( v_1, \ldots, v_k \) are linearly independent. Thus \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \neq 0 \), so we can conclude that for all \( j \in [n] \), \( g_j = (\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_j^i)/(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i) \).

Suppose without loss of generality that \( \lambda_k \neq 0 \). Suppose \( \bar{v}_1 - g, \ldots, \bar{v}_{k-1} - g \) are also not linearly independent. Then there are \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{k-1} \in \mathbb{F}_p \), not all 0 such that

\[
0 = \mu_1(\bar{v}_1 - g) + \ldots + \mu_{k-1}(\bar{v}_{k-1} - g) = (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_1^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i g_1^i, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_n^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i g_n^i) 
\]

Thus for all \( j \in [n] \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_j^i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i g_j^i = 0 \). Using the same logic as above, since \( \bar{v}_1, \ldots, \bar{v}_{k-1} \) are linearly independent, we may assume \( \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i \), so for each \( j \in [n] \), \( g_j = \ldots \)
\((\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_i^j) / (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i)\). Let \(\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i\) and \(\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i\). Then for all \(j \in [n]\),

\[ g^j = (\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_i^j) / \lambda = (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_i^j) / \mu. \]

Thus

\[ \frac{\mu(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i v_i^j)}{\mu} = \frac{\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_i^j)}{\lambda}. \]

so \(v_k^j = \frac{1}{\mu}(\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i v_i^j) - \mu(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda_i v_i^j))\). But now \(\bar{v}_k = \frac{1}{\mu}(\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i \bar{v}_i) - \mu(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \lambda_i \bar{v}_i)) = 0\), a contradiction. \(\square\)

**Fact A.7.** Suppose \(A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n\) is a linearly independent set. Then for any \(g \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\) and \(K \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n, |(A - g) \cap K|/|K| \leq (\dim(K) + 1)/|K|\).

**Proof.** Follows immediately from above. \(\square\)

**Fact A.8.** If \(f : (H, A') \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)\) is an affine embedding, then there is a subspace \(K \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n\) and \(g \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\) so that \((H, A') \cong (K, (A - g) \cap K)\).

**Proof.** Let \((L, B) = \text{Im}(f)\). Let \(g = f(0)\). Let \(L - g\) is a subspace. It contains 0 by assumption. Suppose \(g_1, g_2 \in L\). Then there are \(h_1, h_2 \in H\) with \(g_1 = f(h_1) - g\) and \(g_2 = f(h_2) - g\). Then \(g_1 + g_2 = f(h_1 + h_2) - 2g = f(h_1 + h_2)\) (since \(f\) is affine). By definition, \(f(h_1 + h_2) - g \in L\). Thus \(L\) is a subspace.

Further, we have shown the \(f' : H \rightarrow L\) defined by \(f'(h_1) = f(h_1) - g\) is a group isomorphism. Thus \((H, A') \cong (L, f'(A')) = (L, (A - g) \cap L)\). \(\square\)

We now define sets which are unstable but very sparse.

**Definition A.9.** Let \(\mathcal{H}_\text{example}\) be the smallest HepGP containing \((\mathbb{F}_p^n, A_n)\) for all \(n\), where

\[ A_n = \{ e_i + e_j : 1 \leq i \leq n/2, n/2 + 1 \leq j \leq n/2 + i\}. \]

Suppose \(X \subseteq A_n\). We claim that \(\dim(\text{span}(X)) \geq |X|^{1/2}\). Consider the graph \(G = (V, E)\) where \(V = \{ a_i, b_j : 1 \leq i \leq n/2, n/2 + 1 \leq j \leq n\}\) and \(E = \{ a_i, b_j : e_i + e_j \in X\}\). Note \(|X| = |E| = \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} d(a_i)\). Let \(s_1\) be the number of \(a_i\) with \(d(a_i) \neq 0\) and \(s_2\) the number of \(b_j\) with \(d(b_j) \neq 0\). Then clearly

\[ \dim(\text{span}(X)) \geq \max \left\{ \{d(a_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n/2\} \cup \{d(b_j) : n/2 + 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{s_1\} \cup \{s_2\} \right\} \]

\[ \geq \max \left\{ \frac{|X|}{s_1}, \frac{|X|}{s_2}, s_1, s_2 \right\}. \]

If \(s_1 \geq |X|^{1/2}\) or \(s_2 \geq |X|^{1/2}\) then we are done by above. On other hand, if \(s_1 \leq |X|^{1/2}\) and \(s_2 \leq |X|^{1/2}\) then \(|X|/s_1 \) and \(|X|/s_2\) are at least \(|X|^{1/2}\).

**Corollary A.10.** \(\mathcal{H}_\text{example}\) is unstable and linearly atomic.
\textbf{Proof.} That $\mathcal{H}_{\text{example}}$ is unstable is obvious. Now fix $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $n_0$ sufficiently large such that $n_0 + 1 \leq \epsilon p^{n_0}$.

Suppose $m \geq n_0$ and $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{example}}$. Then there is an affine embedding $f: (\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \to (\mathbb{F}_p^n, A_n)$ for some $n$, by definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{example}}$. Thus there is $K \leq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $g \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $(\mathbb{F}_p^n, A)$ is isomorphic to $((A_n, g) \cap K, K)$.

By the above, $(A_n, g) \cap K$ contains at least $(|A_n, g) \cap K|^{1/2}/2$ many linearly independent vectors, so since $(A_n, g) \cap K \subseteq K$, $|K| \geq p(|A_n, g) \cap K|^{1/2}/2$. Thus $|(A_n, g) \cap K| \leq 4 \log_p(|K|)^2$. Thus

$$\frac{|(A_n - g) \cap K|}{|K|} \leq \frac{4 \log_p(|K|)^2}{|K|} \leq \epsilon,$$

where the last inequality stems from $m \geq n_0$. Thus we can take our $\epsilon$-atomic linear factor to be $L = \emptyset$. \hfill $\square$

\textbf{APPENDIX B. BOOLEAN COMBINATIONS OF QUADRATIC ATOMS ARE NHOP$_2$}

In this section we prove Lemma \textbf{2.16} which shows that a disjunction of sets with no 2-HOP$_2$ has no $k$-HOP$_2$ for some $k$ depending only on the number of disjuncts. We will in fact prove this for general ternary relation symbols, not only those arising as ternary sum graphs.

\textbf{Definition B.1.} Suppose $R$ is a ternary relation symbol and $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\{R\}$-structure. We say $R$ has $\ell$-HOP$_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$ if there are $\{a_i, b_i, c_i : i \in [\ell]\} \subseteq M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{R}(a_i, b_j, c_k)$ if and only if $i < j + k$.

We will use throughout the following re-indexing of $\ell$-HOP$_2$, which makes it clear that the role of all three variables is symmetric.

\textbf{Fact B.2.} Suppose $R$ is a ternary relation and $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\{R\}$-structure. Then the following are equivalent.

1. There is a set $\{a_u, b_u, c_u : u \in [k]\} \subseteq M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{R}(a_u, b_v, c_w)$ holds if and only if $u < v + w$.

2. There is a set $\{a_u, b_u, c_u : u \in [k]\} \subseteq M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{R}(a_u, b_v, c_w)$ holds if and only if $k + 2 \leq u + v + w$.

\textbf{Proof.} Suppose first there are $a_u, b_u, c_u \in M$ for each $u \in [k]$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{R}(a_u, b_v, c_w)$ holds if and only if $u \leq v + w$. For each $u \in [k]$, let $a'_u = a_{k-u+1}$, $b'_u = b_u$, and $c'_u = c_u$. Then $\text{R}(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)$ holds if and only if

$$k - u + 1 < v + w \iff k + 2 \leq u + v + w.$$ 

Suppose on the other hand that there are $a_u, b_u, c_u \in M$ for each $u \in [k]$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{R}(a_u, b_v, c_w)$ holds if and only if $u \leq v + w$. For each $u \in [k]$, let $a'_u = a_{k-u+1}$, $b'_u = b_u$, and $c'_u = c_u$. Then $\text{R}(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)$ holds if and only if

$$k - u + 1 + v + w \geq k + 2 \iff v + w \geq u + 1 \iff v + w > u,$$

which concludes the proof. \hfill $\square$
To ease notation, we will use the indexing from (2) above for the remainder of this section. We will first show that if \( R_1 \lor R_2 \) has a large \( n \)-HOP, and further \( R_1 \) is very dense, then \( R_2 \) has a large instance of HOP. For this, will use the following theorem of Gowers [30, Theorem 10.3].

**Theorem B.3.** For every \( \delta > 0 \), every positive integer \( r \) and every finite subset \( X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^r \), there is a positive integer \( N = N(\delta, r, X) \) such that every subset \( A \) of the grid \([N]^r\) of size at least \( \delta N^r \) has a subset of the form \( a + dX \) for some positive integer \( d \).

**Lemma B.4.** For all \( t \) there is \( \delta > 0 \) and \( N \geq 1 \) such that the following holds. Suppose \( n \geq N \), \( R_1 \cup R_2 = \{(i, j, k) \in [n]^3 : i + j + k \geq n + 2 \} \), and \( |R_1| < \delta n^3 \). Then there are subsequences \( 1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_t \leq n \), \( 1 \leq j_1 < \ldots < j_t \leq n \), \( 1 \leq k_1 < \ldots < k_t \leq n \) such that for each \( 1 \leq u, v, w \leq t \), \((i_u, j_u, k_u) \in R_2 \) if and only if \( u + v + w \geq t + 2 \).

**Proof.** If \( t = 1 \), this is trivial.

Assume now \( t \geq 2 \). If \( t = 2 \), let \( \alpha = 1/8 \), and if \( t > 2 \), let \( \alpha := \frac{2t^3-6t^2+9}{8t^5(t-1)(t-2)} \). Note that for all \( t \geq 2 \), \( \alpha > 0 \). Choose any \( \delta = \delta(t) < \frac{\alpha}{130000} \) and \( N \) sufficiently large so that \( N > 12\alpha^{-1} \) and \((N/4t^3 - 2)^3 > N^3/65t^9 \).

Suppose \( n \geq N \), \( R_1 \cup R_2 = \{(i, j, k) \in [n]^3 : i + j + k \geq n + 2 \} \), and \( |R_1| < \delta n^3 \). We say that \((i, j, k) \in ([n]^3) \) is an **good tuple** if the following hold.

(i) There is some \( d \geq 1 \) such that for each \( 1 \leq u \leq t \), \( i_u = i_1 + (u-1)d \), \( j_u = j_1 + (u-1)d \), and \( k_u = k_1 + (u-1)d \), and

(ii) For each \( 1 \leq u, v, w \leq t \), \( i_u + j_v + k_w \geq n + 2 \) if and only if \( u + v + w \geq t + 2 \).

We first give a lower bound on the number of good tuples. Below is a procedure for generating good tuples.

- Fix \((i_1, j_1, k_1) \in [n]^3\) such that \([n/4 - n/8t^2] \leq i_1, j_1, k_1 \leq [n/4 + n/8t^2]\). The number of choices is at least

\[
([n/4 + n/8t^3] - [n/4 - n/8t^3])^3 \geq ([n/4t^3 - 2])^3 \geq [n^3/65t^9],
\]

where the last inequality is by assumption on \( n \geq N \).

- Choose an integer \( d \) such that

\[
(t-2)d + i_1 + j_1 + k_1 \leq n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad n + 2 \leq (t-1)d + i_1 + j_1 + k_1.
\]

We show there are at least \([\alpha n/2]\) many choices for this. If \( t = 2 \), we want to choose \( d \) such that \([n+2-i_1-j_1-k_1]/t-1] \leq d \leq n \), and if \( t > 2 \), we want to choose \( d \) such that \([n+2-i_1-j_1-k_1]/t-1] \leq d \leq [n+1-i_1-j_1-k_1]/t-2]. \) Observe that

\[
n + 2 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1 \geq n + 2 - 3[n/4 + n/8t^3] \geq n\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{3}{8t^3}\right) + 2 \quad \text{and} \quad n + 1 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1 \leq n + 1 - 3[n/4 - n/8t^3] \leq n\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{8t^3}\right) + 1.
\]
Therefore, if \( t = 2 \), the number of choices is at least

\[
\begin{align*}
n - \left\lfloor \frac{n + 2 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 1} \right\rfloor & \geq n - \left( \frac{1}{t - 1} \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{8t^3} \right) + 2 \right) + 1 \\
& = n \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{8t^3} \right) - \frac{2}{t - 1} - 1 \\
& \geq n \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{3}{8} \right) - 2 - 1 \\
& \geq \lfloor \alpha n/2 \rfloor,
\end{align*}
\]

where the last inequality is because \( n \) is large, and \( \alpha = 1/8 \) when \( t = 2 \). On the other hand, if \( t > 2 \), the number of choices is at least

\[
\begin{align*}
\left\lfloor \frac{n + 1 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 2} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n + 2 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 1} \right\rfloor & \geq \left( \frac{n(1 - \frac{3}{8t^3}) + 2}{t - 2} - 1 \right) - \left( \frac{n(1 + \frac{3}{8t^3}) + 1}{t - 1} + 1 \right) \\
& = n \left( \frac{1}{4(t - 2)} - \frac{3}{8t^3(t - 2)} - \frac{1}{4(t - 1)} - \frac{3}{8t^3(t - 1)} \right) + \frac{2}{t - 2} - \frac{1}{t - 1} - 2 \\
& = \alpha n + \frac{2}{t - 2} - \frac{1}{t - 1} - 2 \\
& \geq \lfloor \alpha n/2 \rfloor,
\end{align*}
\]

where the last inequality is because \( n \) is large, and definition of \( \alpha \) when \( t > 2 \).

- For each \( 1 \leq u \leq t \), let \( i_u = i_1 + (u - 1)d, j_u = j_1 + (u - 1)d \), and \( k_u = k_1 + (u - 1)d \). We claim the resulting tuple \((i, j, k)\) is good. Suppose first that \( u + v + w < t + 2 \). We show \( i_u + j_v + k_w < n + 2 \). If \( t = 2 \), then \( u + v + w < 4 \) implies \( u = v = w = 1 \), so \( i_u + j_v + k_w = i_1 + j_1 + k_1 \leq 3\lfloor n/4 + n/8t^2 \rfloor < n + 2 \). If \( t > 2 \), then

\[
\begin{align*}
i_u + j_v + k_w &= (i_1 + j_1 + k_1) + (u + v + w - 3)d \\
& \leq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 2)d \\
& \leq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 2) \left( \frac{n + 1 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 2} \right) \\
& \leq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 2) \left( \frac{n + 1 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 2} \right) < n + 2.
\end{align*}
\]
On the other hand, assume \( u + v + 2 \geq t + 2 \). We show \( i_u + j_v + k_w \geq n + 2 \). Observe
\[
i_u + j_v + k_w = (i_1 + j_1 + k_1) + (u + v + w - 3)d
\geq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 1)d
\geq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 1)\left\lfloor \frac{n + 2 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 1} \right\rfloor
\geq i_1 + j_1 + k_1 + (t - 1)\left( \frac{n + 2 - i_1 - j_1 - k_1}{t - 1} \right)
= n + 2.
\]

This completes the verification that \((\bar{i}, \bar{j}, \bar{k})\) is a good tuple.

This shows the number of good triples is at least \(|\alpha n/2|\lfloor n^3/65t^9 \rfloor \geq \alpha n^4/131t^9\). On the other hand, we claim that for any point \((i, j, k) \in [n]^3\), there are at most \(nt^3\) many good triples containing \((i, j, k)\). Clearly any good triple \((\bar{i}, \bar{j}, \bar{k})\) containing \((i, j, k)\) is determined by its common distance \(d\) (for which there are at most \(n\) choices), along with the position \((u, v, w) \in [t]^3\) such that \((i, j, k) = (i_u, j_v, k_w)\) (for which there are at most \(t^3\) choices). Thus the number good triples containing \((i, j, k)\) is at most \(t^3n\).

Consequently, the number of good triples \((\bar{i}, \bar{j}, \bar{k})\) for which there is \((u, v, w) \in [t]^3\) with \((i_u, j_v, k_w) \in R_1\) is at most \(|R_1|nt^3 \leq \delta t^3n^4\). Thus if \(\delta < \frac{\alpha n}{131nt^9}\), there is a good triple \((\bar{i}, \bar{j}, \bar{k})\) such that for all \((u, v, w) \in [t]^3\), \((i_u, j_v, k_w) \notin R_1\). By assumption, and because it is a good tuple, this implies that for all \(1 \leq u, v, w \leq t\), \((i_u, j_v, k_w) \in R_2\) if and only if \(u + v + w \geq t + 2\). This finishes the proof.  

We now prove our desired result for a disjunction of one relation with no 2-HOP\(_2\) and another with no \(t - \text{HOP}\_2\). This will provide the inductive step in the proof of our main result.

**Lemma B.5.** For all \(t \geq 1\) there is an \(k = k(t)\) such that the following holds. Suppose \(\mathcal{L} = \{R_1, R_2\}\) where each \(R_i\) is a ternary relation symbol. If \(\mathcal{M}\) is a sufficiently large \(\mathcal{L}\)-structure such that \(R_1(x, y, z)\) does not have 2-HOP\(_2\) in \(\mathcal{M}\), and \(R_2\) does not have \(t\)-HOP\(_2\) in \(\mathcal{M}\). Then \(R_1 \lor R_2\) does not have \(k\)-HOP\(_2\) in \(\mathcal{M}\).

**Proof.** Choose first \(\delta = \delta(t)\) and \(N_1 = N_1(t)\) as in Lemma [B.4](#). Given \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), let \(X_m = [m]^2 \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2\). Now let \(N_2\) be the smallest even integer which is greater than \(\max\{2N(\delta, 2, X_{N_1}), 2N(\delta, 2, X_{4t})\}\), where \(N(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\) is from Theorem [B.3](#). Finally, set \(k = 2N_2\).

Suppose towards a contradiction \(\mathcal{M}\) is an \(\mathcal{L}\)-structure where \(R_1\) has no 2-HOP\(_2\), where \(R_2\) has no \(t\)-HOP\(_2\), but where \(R_1 \lor R_2\) has \(k\)-HOP\(_2\). Let \(\{a_i, b_i, c_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq M\) be such that \(\mathcal{M} \models (R_1 \lor R_2)(a_i, b_i, c_i)\) if and only if \(u + v + w \geq k + 2\). Recall that given an \(\mathcal{L}\)-formula \(\varphi(x, y, z)\), \(\varphi^\mathcal{M} = \{(a, b, c) \in M^3 : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, b, c)\}\).

**Case 1:** Suppose for every \(k/2 + 1 \leq i \leq k\), \(|R_1^\mathcal{M} \cap \{(a_i, b_i, c_i) : (v, w) \in [k/2]^2\}| < \delta(k/2)^2\). In this case, for each \(1 \leq i \leq k/2\), let \(a_i' = a_{k/2+i}, b_i' = b_i\), and \(c_i' = c_i\). Then
\[
|R_1^\mathcal{M} \cap \{(a_i', b_j', c_l') : (i, j, l) \in [k/2]^3\}| \leq \delta(k/2)^3.
\]
On the other hand, we claim that \((R_1 \lor R_2)(a'_i, b'_j, c'_j)\) holds if and only if \(i + j + t \geq k/2 + 2\). Indeed, given \(i, j, t \in \lbrack [k/2] \rbrack\),

\[
a'_i + b'_j + c'_j = a_{k/2+i} + b_j + c_j.
\]

Thus by assumption \((R_1 \lor R_2)(a'_i, b'_j, c'_j)\) holds if and only if \(k/2 + i + j + t \geq k + 2\), i.e. if and only if \(i + j + t \geq k/2 + 2\). Since \(k/2 \geq N_2 > N_1\), Lemma \[\text{B.4}\] implies that \(R_2\) has \(t\)-HOP, a contradiction.

**Case 2:** Suppose we are not in Case 1. Then there is \(k/2 \leq i_s \leq k\) such that

\[
|R_1^M \cap \{(a_{i_s}, b_v, c_w) : (v, w) \in \lbrack [k/2] \rbrack^2\}| \geq \delta(k/2)^2.
\]

Since \(k/2 \geq N_2\), Theorem \[\text{B.3}\] implies there is \((\beta, \gamma) \in [k/2]^2\) and \(d \geq 1\) such that for each \(1 \leq s, s' \leq N_1\), \((a_{i_s}, b_{\beta+s}, c_{\gamma+s}) \in R_1^M \cap \{(a_{i_s}, b_v, c_w) : (v, w) \in \lbrack [k/2] \rbrack^2\}\).

Now for each \(1 \leq s \leq N_1\), define \(b_s' = b_{\beta+s}\) and \(c_s' = c_{\gamma+s}\). Set \(a_{N_1} = a_{i_s}\) and for each \(1 \leq s \leq N_1 - 1\), let \(a_s = a_{k+2-\beta-\gamma-(N_1+2)d+s}\). Note this last definition makes sense because \(\beta + N_1d \leq k/2\) and \(\gamma + N_1d \leq k/2\), so for each \(1 \leq s \leq N_1 - 1\),

\[
k \geq k + 2 - \beta - \gamma - (N_1+2)d + sd \geq 1.
\]

We claim that given \(u, v, w \in [N_1]\), \((R_1 \lor R_2)(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)\) holds if and only if \(u + v + w \geq N_1 + 2\).

Suppose \(1 \leq u, v, w \leq N_1\). If \(u = N_1\) then we already know that \(R_1(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)\). So assume \(u \neq N_1\). Then

\[
(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w) = (a_{k+1-\beta-\gamma-(N_1+2)d+ud}, b_{\beta+vd}, c_{\gamma+wd}).
\]

By assumption, \((R_1 \lor R_2)(a_{k-\beta-\gamma-(N_1+2)d+ud}, b_{\beta+vd}, c_{\gamma+wd})\) holds if and only if

\[
k + 2 - \beta - \gamma - (N_1+2)d + ud + \beta + vd + \gamma + wd = k + 2 + d(u + v + w - N_1 - 2) \geq k + 2.
\]

Note this holds if and only if \(u + v + w - N_1 - 2 \geq 0\), which holds if and only if \(u + v + w \geq N_1 + 2\), as desired. Thus we have \(\{(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w) : u \in [N_1]\}\) such that \((R_1 \lor R_2)(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)\) holds if and only if \(u + v + w \geq N_1 + 2\), and further, for all \(v, w \in [N_1]\), \(R_1(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w)\).

**Subcase 2.1:** Suppose that for all \(N_1/2 + 1 \leq j \leq N_1\),

\[
|R_1^M \cap \{(a'_u, b'_v, c'_w) : (u, w) \in [N_1/2]^2\}| < \delta(N_1/2)^2.
\]

In this case, for each \(1 \leq j \leq N_1/2\), let \(a'_j = c'_j, c'_j = c'_j\) and \(b'_j = b'_{N_1/2+j}\). Then

\[
|R_1^M \cap \{(a'_{i'}, b'_{j}, c''_j) : (i, j, t) \in [N_1/2]^3\}| < \delta(N_1/2)^3.
\]

Further, given \(u, v, w \in [N_1/2]\), \(R_1 \lor R_2(a''_u, b'_v, c''_w)\) holds if and only if \(u + v + N_1/2 + v \geq N_1 + 2\), which holds if and only if \(u + v + w \geq N_1/2 + 2\). Consequently, we may apply Lemma \[\text{B.4}\] to \(\{(a''_u, b'_v, c''_w) : u, v, w \in [N_1/2]\}\), to obtain that \(R_2\) must have \(t\)-HOP, a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** There exists \(N_1/2 + 1 \leq j_2 \leq N_2\), such that

\[
|R_1^M \cap \{(a'_u, b'_{j_2}, c'_w) : (u, w) \in [N_1/2]^2\}| \geq \delta(N_1/2)^2.
\]

By Theorem \[\text{B.3}\] there are \((\sigma, \tau) \in [N_1/2]^2\) and \(d' \geq 1\) such that for each \(1 \leq s, s' \leq 4t, (a'_{\sigma+sd'}, b'_{j_s}, c'_{\tau+s'd'}) \in R_1^M \land \{(a'_u, b'_{j_2}, c'_w) : (v, w) \in [4t]^2\}$. 


Given $1 \leq v \leq t$, let $x_v = a'_{\sigma + (v+t)d'}, z_v = c'_{\tau + (v+t)d'}$, and $y_v = b'_{N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)}$. Note the last definition makes sense because $\sigma + 4td' \leq N_1/2$ and $\tau + 4td' \leq N_1/2$ so for each $1 \leq v \leq t$,

$$N_1 \geq N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1) \geq 1.$$ 

Now for $u,v,w \in [t]$, $R_1 \lor R_2(x_u,y_v,z_w)$ holds if and only if

$$N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(u-3t-1) + \sigma + (v+t)d' + \tau + (w+t)d' = N_1 + 1 + d'(-1 - t + u + v + w) \geq N_1 + 2.$$

This holds if and only if $-t-1+u+v+w \geq 1$, which holds if and only if $u+v+w \geq t+2$. Now I claim that in fact, in each case where $u+v+w \geq t+2$, we have that $R_2(x_u,y_v,z_w)$ holds.

Indeed, fix $1 \leq u,v,w \leq t$ and assume $u+v+w \geq t+2$. By definition, $x_u = a'_{\sigma + (u+t)d'}, y_v = b'_{N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)}$, and $z_w = c'_{\tau + (w+t)d'}$.

Let $x'_1 = x_u, y'_1 = y_v$ and $z'_1 = z_w$. Now let $x'_2 = a'_{N_2} = a_i, y'_2 = b'_i$, and $z'_2 = c_i$. Clearly $R_1(x'_1,y'_2,z'_1) \land R_1(x'_2,y'_1,z'_2)$ holds for each $i,j \in \{1,2\}$. Consider now $(x'_1,y'_1,z'_1) = (a'_{\sigma + (u+t)d'}, b'_{N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)}, c_i)$. Note

$$(\sigma + (u+t)d') + (N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)) + 1 = N_1 + 2 + d'(u + v - 2t - 1) \leq N_1 + 2 - d',$$

where the last inequality is because $1 \leq u,v \leq t$. Thus since the above sum is less than $N_1 + 2$, we have $\neg R_1(x'_1,y'_1,z'_1)$. Consider now $(x'_1,y'_2,z'_1) = (a'_{\sigma + (u+t)d'}, b'_{N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)}, c_{\tau + d'(w+t)})$.

Observe that

$$(\sigma + (u+t)d') + (N_1 + 1 - \sigma - \tau + d'(v-3t-1)) + (\tau + d'(w + t)) = N_1 + 1 + d'(-t + u + v + w - 1) \geq N_1 + 1 + d' \geq N_1 + 2,$$

where the second to last inequality is because $u + v + w \geq t+2$ by assumption. Thus $(R_1 \lor R_2)(x'_1,y'_1,z'_2)$. Observe that if $R_1(x'_1,y'_1,z'_2)$ held, then $R_1$ would have 2-HOP$_2$ (as witnessed by $\{x'_1, x'_2, y'_1, y'_2, z'_1, z'_2\}$), a contradiction. Thus we must have that $R_2(x'_1,y'_1,z'_2)$, i.e. $R_2(x_u,y_v,z_w)$ holds.

Thus we have shown that for all $1 \leq u,v,w \leq t$, $R_2(x_u,y_v,z_w)$ holds if and only if $u + v + w \geq t+2$, and consequently, $R_2$ has $t$-HOP$_2$, a contradiction.

It is now easy to deduce that any arbitrary disjunction of ternary relations with no 2-HOP$_2$ has no $k$-HOP$_2$ for some $k$.

**Corollary B.6.** For all $t$ there is $s = s(t)$ such that if $\mathcal{L} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_t\}$, where each $R_i$ is a ternary relation symbol, and $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\mathcal{L}$-structure in which each $R_i$ is does not have 2-HOP$_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$, then $R_1 \lor \ldots \lor R_t$ does not have $s$-HOP$_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$.

**Proof.** Let $s(1) = 2$. Now suppose by induction $t \geq 1$ and you have defined $s(t)$. Let $s(t + 1) = k(s(t))$, where $k(x)$ is as in Lemma B.5 above. Suppose $R_1, \ldots, R_{t+1}$ are each ternary relations which each have no 2-HOP$_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$. By induction $R_1 \lor \ldots \lor R_t$
We now prove a lemma which tells us precisely how a translate of $C.1$ has no $s(t)$-HOP$_2$, and by assumption $R_{t+1}$ has no 2-HOP$_2$. Therefore, by Lemma [3.3] $R_1 \vee \ldots \vee R_t \vee R_{t+1}$ has no $k(s(t)) = s(t+1)$-HOP$_2$, as desired. \hfill $\square$

**APPENDIX C. PROPERTIES OF THE LINEAR GREEN-SANDERS EXAMPLE**

In this section, we will show that $GS(p,n)$ has no 4-IP$_2$ (see Section [C.1]), and then we will show that $GS(3,n)$ has no 4-HOP$_2$ (see Section [C.2]). Throughout this section, for $x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $i \in [n]$, $x_i$ denotes the $i$th coordinate of $x$, and $e^i$ denotes the $i$th basis vector in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$.

**C.1. No 4-IP in $GS(p,n)$**. We begin with some preliminaries. Recall that given $p \geq 3$, $GS(n,p) = (\mathbb{F}_p^n, A_{GS}(n,p))$, where $A_{GS}(n,p) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i + e^i$ and

$$H_i = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x_j = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq i\}.$$ 

By convention, $H_0 = \mathbb{F}_p^n$. We want to understand what the translates of $A_{GS}(n,p)$ look like, since these are crucial for understanding the sum graph. Given $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p$, define

$$\tau^\alpha_i(a) := \alpha e^i - a.$$ 

Note $A_{GS}(p,n) - a = \bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i + \tau^1_i(a)$. Give $x,y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ let

$$\lambda(x,y) = \max\{i \in \{0, \ldots, n\} : x,y \text{ are in the same coset of } H_i\}$$ 

and

$$d(x,y) = (\lambda(x,y) + 1)^{-1}.$$ 

Note that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $x_{\lambda(x,y)} + 1 \neq y_{\lambda(x,y)} + 1$ and for all $1 \leq j \leq \lambda(x,y)$, $y_j = x_j$. We now prove a lemma which tells us precisely how a translate of $A_{GS}(p,n)$ intersects a translate of $\neg A_{GS}(p,n)$.

**Lemma C.1.** Suppose $p \geq 3$ is a prime, $n \geq 1$, and $A = A_{GS}(p,n)$. For any $b \neq c \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, one of the following holds, where $m = 1/d$, and $d = d(b,c)$.

1. $1 - b_m = 2 - c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = (H_m + \tau^1_m(b))$,
2. $1 - b_m = \beta - c_m$ and for some $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0,1,2\}$, we have

$$(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau^1_i(b),$$

3. $1 - b_m = -c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0,1\}} H_i + \tau^\beta_i(c)$.

**Proof.** For ease of notation, let $\Omega = (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c)$. By the comments preceding Lemma C.1 we know that

$$\Omega = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i + \tau^1_i(b)\right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0,1\}} H_i + \tau^\beta_i(c)\right).$$

Observe that for all $i, i' \in [n]$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0,1\}$, $(H_i + \tau^1_i(b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau^\beta_{i'}(c)) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if for all $j \leq \min\{i,i'\} - 1$, $-b_j = -c_j$, and one of the following holds.

(a) $i = i'$ and $1 - b_i = \beta - c_i$, 

(b) $i \neq i'$.
Observe that in any of these cases, \( (H_j + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_{j'} + \tau_m^\beta(c)) \neq \emptyset \) implies \( b_j = c_j \) for all \( j \leq \min\{i, i'\} - 1 \) and \( b_{\min\{i, i'\}} \neq c_{\min\{i, i'\}} \). Consequently, \( \lambda(b, c) = \min\{i, i'\} - 1 \), \( d = (\min\{i, i'\})^{-1} \), and \( m = \min\{i, i'\} \). Thus we have that

\[
\Omega = \bigcup_{i = m}^{n} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \cup ((H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c))).
\]

Suppose first there is \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \) such that \( (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) \neq \emptyset \). In this case we must have \( 1 - b_m = \beta - c_m \). We claim that for all \( m < i \leq n \) and \( \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \). Indeed, suppose towards a contradiction there was some \( m < i \leq n \) and \( \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), such that \( (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^{\beta'}(c)) \neq \emptyset \). Then \( 1 - b_m = -c_m \), contradicting that \( 1 - b_m = \beta - c_m \). Consequently, we can conclude that in this case

\[
\Omega = \bigcup_{i = m}^{n} (H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)).
\]

Let us consider the intersections of the form \((H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c))\) where \( m < i \leq n \) and \( \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \). In order for such an intersection to be nonempty, we require \(-b_m = \beta' - c_m\). Since \( 1 - b_m = \beta - c_m \), this can only hold for \( \beta' = \beta - 1 \). If \( \beta = 2 \), then no such \( \beta' \) exists. So we have two outcomes.

(i) \( 1 - b_m = 2 - c_m \) and \( \Omega = (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) = (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)). \)
(ii) \( 1 - b_m = \beta - c_m \) for some \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1, 2\} \), and for \( \beta' = \beta - 1 \), we have

\[
\Omega = (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) \cup \bigcup_{i = m+1}^{n} (H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) = \bigcup_{i = m}^{n} (H_i + \tau_i^1(b)).
\]

Thus, when there is some \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \) such that \( (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) \neq \emptyset \), we have shown that either (1) or (2) hold.

Suppose now that for all \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \). In this case we must have that for all \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( 1 - b_m \neq \beta - c_m \). Thus, either \( 1 - b_m = -c_m \) or \( 1 - b_m = 1 - c_m \). Since \( b_m \neq c_m \) (by definition of \( m \)), we must have \( 1 - b_m = -c_m \).

We claim that for all \( m < i \leq n \) and all \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( (H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \). Indeed, suppose towards a contradiction there was \( m < i \leq n \) and \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), such that \( (H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_m^\beta(c)) \neq \emptyset \). Then \(-b_m = \beta - c_m \). But combining this with \( 1 - b_m = -c_m \) implies \( \beta = 1 \), a contradiction. Therefore, we have in this case

\[
\Omega = \bigcup_{i = m+1}^{n} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} (H_m + \tau_m^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \bigcup_{i = m+1}^{n} (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c),
\]

so (3) holds. \( \square \)
Our next lemma gives us information about the intersection of two translates of $A_{\text{GS}}(p, n)$ and the intersection of two translates of $\neg A_{\text{GS}}(p, n)$. The proof is a case analysis similar to Lemma C.1.

**Lemma C.2.** Suppose $p \geq 3$ is a prime, $n \geq 1$, and $A = A_{\text{GS}}(p, n)$. Suppose $b \neq c \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, $m = 1/d$, and $d = d(b, c)$. Then one of the following holds,

1. $1 - b_m = -c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m} H_i + \tau_i^1(c) \cup \bigcup_{i = m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$,
2. $-b_m = 1 - c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \cup \bigcup_{i = m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(c)$,
3. $1 - b_m \neq -c_m$, $-b_m \neq 1 - c_m$, and $(A - b) \cap (A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$,

and one of the following holds.

4. For some $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$ and
   $$(\neg A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c) \cup \bigcup_{i = m, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta'(b),$$
5. For some $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $-b_m = \beta_0 - c_m$ and
   $$(\neg A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b) \cup \bigcup_{i = m, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta'(c),$$
6. For all $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta - b_m \neq -c_m$ and $-b_m \neq \beta - c_m$, and
   $$(\neg A - b) \cap (A - c) = \bigcup_{i < m, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c).$$

**Proof.** For ease of notation, let $\Omega_1 = (A - b) \cap (A - c)$ and $\Omega_0 = (\neg A - b) \cap (\neg A - c)$. Then

$$\Omega_1 = \left( \bigcup_{i = 1}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{i = 1}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(c) \right).$$

Observe that for all $i, i' \in [n]$ $(H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(c)) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if for all $j \leq \min\{i, i'\} - 1$, $-b_j = -c_j$, and one of the following holds.

(a) $i = i'$ and $1 - b_i = 1 - c_i$,
(b) $i < i'$ and $1 - b_i = -c_i$, or
(c) $i' < i$ and $-b_{i'} = 1 - c_{i'}$.

Observe that in any of these cases, $(H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(c)) \neq \emptyset$ implies $b_j = c_j$ for all $j \leq \min\{i, i'\} - 1$, so $\min\{i, i'\} - 1 \leq \lambda(b, c)$, and $\min\{i, i'\} \leq m$. Therefore,

$$\Omega_1 = \bigcup_{i = 1}^m \bigcup_{i' = i}^n ((H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^1(c)) \cup ((H_i + \tau_i^1(b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(c))).$$

We claim that if $1 \leq i' < m$ and $i < i'$, then $(H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^1(c)) = \emptyset$. Suppose towards a contradiction this was not the case. Then there is some $1 \leq i' < m$ and $i < i'$ with $(H_{i'} + \tau_{i'}^1(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^1(c)) \neq \emptyset$. Then $1 - c_i = -b_i$, contradicting $i < m$. Thus for all
\[1 \leq i' < m \text{ and } i < i', \ (H_{i'} + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) = \emptyset. \] An identical argument shows that for all \(1 \leq i < m\) and \(i' < i\), \((H_{i'} + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) = \emptyset\) also holds. Thus

\[\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)).\]

We claim that if \(1 - c_m = -b_m\), then for all \(i \geq m\), \((H_m + \tau_1^m (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) = \emptyset\). Indeed, suppose towards a contradiction that \(1 - c_m = -b_m\) and there is \(i \geq m\) such that \((H_m + \tau_1^m (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) \neq \emptyset\). This implies \(1 - b_m = -c_m\), a contradiction. A similar argument shows that if \(1 - b_m = -c_m\), then for all \(i \geq m\), \((H_m + \tau_1^m (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) = \emptyset\). This leaves us with the following three options.

(i) \(1 - c_m = -b_m\) and \(\Omega_1\) is equal to

\[\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} ((H_m + \tau_1^m (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (c)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} H_i + \tau_1^i (c),\]

(ii) \(1 - b_m = -c_m\) and \(\Omega_1\) is equal to

\[\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} ((H_m + \tau_1^m (b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} H_i + \tau_1^i (b),\]

(iii) \(1 - b_m \neq -c_m\) and \(1 - c_m \neq -b_m\) and \(\Omega_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b))\).

This shows that either (1), (2), or (3) holds, as desired.

We now consider \(\Omega_0\). Note

\[\Omega_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bigcup_{i'=1}^{n} \bigcup_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \{0,1\}} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (c)).\]

Observe that for all \(i, i' \in [n]\) \((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (c)) \neq \emptyset\) if and only if for all \(j \leq \min\{i, i'\} - 1, -b_j = -c_j\), and one of the following holds.

(a) \(i = i'\) and \(\beta - b_i = \beta' - c_i\),
(b) \(i < i'\) and \(\beta - b_i = -c_i\), or
(c) \(i' < i\) and \(\beta - b_{i'} = -b_i\).

Observe that in any of these cases, \((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (c)) \neq \emptyset\) implies \(b_j = c_j \) for all \(j \leq \min\{i, i'\} - 1, \) so \(\min\{i, i'\} - 1 \leq \lambda(b, c)\), and \(\min\{i, i'\} \leq m\). Therefore,

\[\Omega_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \bigcup_{i'=i}^{n} \bigcup_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \{0,1\}} ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (b)) \cup ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (c)) \cup ((H_i + \tau_1^i (b)) \cap (H_{i'} + \tau_1^{i'} (c)).\]
We claim that if $1 \leq i < m$ and $i < i'$ then for any $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $(H_i + \tau^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset$. Indeed, suppose not. Then $(H_i + \tau^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\beta - b_i = -c_i$, contradicting that $i < m$. Consequently,

$$\Omega_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_i + \tau^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau^\beta(c)))$$

$$\bigcup_{i=m}^n \bigcup_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \cup ((H_m + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c))).$$

We claim that if there is $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$, then for all $\beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, and $i \geq m$, $(H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset$. Indeed, if $(H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c))$ were nonempty, then either $i = m$ and $\beta' - c_m = \beta_0 - b_m$, or $i > m$ and $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$. In the first case, this implies $\beta' = 0$ (a contradiction), and in the second case, this implies $\beta_0 = 0$ (also a contradiction). Thus, if there is $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$, then for all $\beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $i \geq m$, $(H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset$. A symmetric argument shows that if there is $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta_0 - c_m = -b_m$, then for all $\beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $i \geq m$, $(H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(b)) = \emptyset$. This leaves us with the following options.

(i) There is $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$. In this case, $\Omega_0$ is equal to

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_i + \tau^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau^\beta(c)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n \bigcup_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_m + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)).$$

(ii) There is $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $\beta_0 - c_m = -b_m$. In this case, $\Omega_0$ is equal to

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n \bigcup_{\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)).$$

(iii) For all $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta - c_m \neq -b_m$ and $\beta - b_m \neq -c_m$. In this case,

$$\Omega_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m-1} \bigcup_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} ((H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)).$$

This shows one of (5), (6), or (7) hold, as desired. \qed

**Lemma C.3.** Suppose $p \geq 3$ is a prime, $n \geq 1$, and $A = A_{GS}(p, n)$. Suppose $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^m$ and $b, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are such that

- $S_1 \cap S_2$, $S_1 \setminus S_2$ and $S_2 \setminus S_1$ are all nonempty, and
- $S_1 = (A - b) \cap (S_1 \cup S_2)$ and $S_2 = (-A - c) \cap (S_1 \cup S_2)$.

Then for all $x, y \in S_1 \cap S_2$, $z \in S_1 \setminus S_2$, and $w \in S_2 \setminus S_1$, $d(x, y) > d(z, w)$.

**Proof.** Let $d = d(b, c)$, $\lambda = \lambda(b, c)$, and $m = 1/d$. By the preceding lemma, one of the following holds.

1. **Case 1:** \[ (H_i + \tau^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \] for all $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$.
2. **Case 2:** \[ (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_m + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \] for all $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$.
3. **Case 3:** \[ (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)) \cap (H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c)) = \emptyset \] for all $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

For each case, we can show that $d(x, y) > d(z, w)$ for all $x, y \in S_1 \cap S_2$, $z \in S_1 \setminus S_2$, and $w \in S_2 \setminus S_1$, as desired. \qed
(i) $1 - b_m = 2 - c_m$ and $S_1 \cap S_2 \subseteq (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = H_m + \tau_i^1(b)$.

(ii) There is some $\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $1 - b_m = \beta - c_m$ and the following holds.

$$S_1 \cap S_2 \subseteq (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$$

(iii) $1 - b_m = -c_m$ and $S_1 \cap S_2 \subseteq (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n \bigcup_{\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b)$.

Fix $x, y \in S_1 \cap S_2$, $z \in S_1 \setminus S_2$, and $w \in S_2 \setminus S_1$. Note $z \in (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c)$ and $w \in (\neg A - b) \cap (\neg A - c)$. Let $\lambda_1 = \lambda(z, x)$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda(w, y)$. Because (1), (2), or (3) holds, $\lambda(x, y) \geq m$, and consequently, $d(x, y) \leq (m + 1)^{-1} < d$.

Clearly, if $d(z, x) \leq d(x, y)$, then we would also have $z \in S_1 \cap S_2$. Thus $d(z, x) > d(x, y)$. Similarly, we can deduce that $d(w, y) > d(x, y)$, since otherwise we would have $x \in S_1 \cap S_2$.

By Lemma [C.1], one of the following holds,

(a) $1 - b_m = -c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(c) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$,

(b) $-b_m = 1 - c_m$ and $(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(c)$,

(c) $1 - b_m \neq -c_m$, $-b_m \neq 1 - c_m$, and $(A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$, and one of the following holds.

(d) For some $\beta_0 \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta_0 - b_m = -c_m$ and

$$\neg (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m, \beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c) \cup \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n \bigcup_{\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b),$$

(e) For some $\beta_0 \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $-b_m = \beta_0 - c_m$ and

$$\neg (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m, \beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(b) \cup \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n \bigcup_{\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c),$$

(f) $\beta - b_m \neq -c_m$, $-b_m \neq \beta - c_m$ for all $\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$, and

$$\neg (A - b) \cap (\neg A - c) = \bigcup_{i<m} \bigcup_{\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c).$$

Suppose first we are in case (a). Then we must be in case (f). So

$$z \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(c) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \text{ and } \bar{w} \in \bigcup_{i<m} \bigcup_{\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c).$$

Clearly if $z \in \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b)$, then $d(z, w) > d(b, c) > d(x, y)$ and we are done. So assume $z \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(c)$. Then there are $1 \leq i, i' < m$ and $\beta \in F_p \setminus \{0, 1\}$ so that $z_i = 1 - b_i = 1 - c_i$ and $w_{i'} = \beta - b_{i'} = \beta - c_{i'}$. If $i = i'$, then $z_i \neq w_i$ and $d(z, w) > d(b, c) > d(x, y)$, so we are done. If $i < i'$, then $z_i = 1 - b_i$ while $w_i = b_i$, so $d(z, w) > d(b, c) > d(x, y)$. A similar argument shows that if $i' < i$ then we also have $d(z, w) > d(b, c) > d(x, y)$. So
Suppose now we are in case (b). Then we must be in case (f). So
\[ z \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(c) \text{ and } w \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c). \]
Clearly if \( z \in \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \), then \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \), so we are done. So assume \( z \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \). Then there are \( 1 \leq i, i' < m \) and \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \) so that \( z_i = 1 - b_i = 1 - c_i \) and \( w_{i'} = \beta - b_{i'} = \beta - c_{i'} \). If \( i = i' \), then \( z_i \neq w_i \), so \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \). If \( i < i' \), then \( z_i = 1 - b_i \) while \( w_i = b_i \), so \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \). A similar argument shows that if \( i' < i \) then \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \).

Suppose now we are in case (c). Then either (d) or (e) hold. Say we are in case (d). Then we have
\[ z \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \]
and
\[ w \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^\beta(c) \cup \bigcup_{i=m}^n H_i + \tau_i^{\beta'}(b). \]
Clearly if \( w \in \bigcup_{i=m}^n \bigcup_{\beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^{\beta'}(b) \) this implies \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \). So assume that for some \( i, i' < m \), and \( \beta \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\} \), \( w \in H_i + \tau_i^{\beta}(b) \) and \( z \in H_{i'} + \tau_i^{1}(b) \). If \( i = i' \), this would imply \( \beta = c_i = 1 - b_i \), which is not possible, since \( i < m \). Therefore either \( i < i' \) or \( i' < i \), both of which imply \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \).

Suppose we are in (e). Then \( \bar{z} \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^1(b) \) and
\[ \bar{w} \in \bigcup_{i<m} H_i + \tau_i^{\beta}(b) \cup \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n H_i + \tau_i^{\beta'}(c) \]
Clearly if \( w \in \bigcup_{i=m+1}^n \bigcup_{\beta' \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0, 1\}} H_i + \tau_i^{\beta'}(b) \) this implies \( d(z, x) > d(b, c) \). So assume that for some \( i, i' < m \), and \( \beta, \bar{w} \in H_i + \tau_i^{\beta}(b) \) and \( \bar{z} \in H_{i'} + \tau_i^{1}(b) \). If \( i = i' \), this would imply \( \beta = c_i = 1 - b_i \), which is not possible. Therefore either \( i < i' \) or \( i' < i \), both of which imply \( d(z, w) > d(b, c) \). \( \square \)

**Corollary C.4.** For all \( n \geq 1 \) and primes \( p \geq 3 \), \( \text{GS}(n, p) \) has VC-dimension at most 3.

**Proof.** Suppose towards a contradiction \( \text{GS}(n, p) = (\mathbb{F}_p^n, A) \) has VC-dimension at least 3. By definition, there is \( X \subseteq Y \) a set of size 4, and for each \( Y \subseteq X \), \( e_Y \in V \) such that for all \( x \in X \), \( x + e_Y \in A \) if and only if \( x \in Y \). Say \( X = \{x, y, z, w\} \). By construction, \( (A - e_{\{x,y,z\}}) \cap X = \{x, y, z\} \) and \( (\neg A - e_{\{z\}}) \cap X = \{x, y, w\} \). By Lemma C.3 (with \( S_1 = \{x, y, z\} \) and \( S_2 = \{x, y, w\} \), this implies that in \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \), \( d(x, y) > d(z, w) \)).

On the other hand, \( (A - e_{\{x,z,w\}}) \cap X = \{x, z, w\} \) and \( (\neg A - e_{\{x\}}) \cap X = \{y, z, w\} \). By Lemma C.3 (with \( S_1 = \{x, z, w\} \) and \( S_2 = \{y, z, w\} \), this implies that \( d(z, w) > d(x, y) \)). Clearly this is a contradiction. \( \square \)
C.2. **No 4-HOP** in **GS(3, n)**. We now turn to investigating to what extent GS(n, 3) is HOP2-free. Firstly, observe that

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= 2220 & y_1 &= 2220 & z_1 &= 2221 \\
x_2 &= 2210 & y_2 &= 2200 & z_2 &= 2011 \\
x_3 &= 2120 & y_3 &= 0220 & z_3 &= 2021
\end{align*}
\]

determine a 3-HOP in GS(4, 3). Indeed, it is easy to check by hand that \(x_i + y_j + z_k \in A_{GS(n, 3)}\) if and only if \(i < j + k\). This immediately gives rise to a 3-HOP in GS(3, 3) for any \(n \geq 4\).

We now prove that GS(n, 3) has no 4-HOP. We begin with some lemmas about how certain small configurations can arise in GS(n, 3). Throughout the remainder of this section, \(A = A_{GS(3, n)} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_3^n\). Recall the following definition.

**Definition C.5.** Given \(x \in \mathbb{F}_3^n\), define

\[
f(x) := \max \left( \{1\} \cup \{2 \leq j \leq n : \text{for all } 1 \leq i < j, x_i = 0\} \right).
\]

Our proofs will rely heavily on proving restrictions on the behavior of \(f\) on sums arising from various combinatorial configurations. We begin with such a lemma regarding additive quadruples.

**Lemma C.6** (What an additive quadruple must look like). **Suppose** \(a^1, a^2, b^1, b^2 \in \mathbb{F}_3^n\) **and for each** \((i, j) \in \{0, 1\}^2\), \(a^i + b^j \in A\). **Then one of the following holds**, where \(u_{ij} = f(a^i + b^j)\).

(i) \(u_{11} = u_{12} = u_{21} = u_{12}\),

(ii) \(u_{11} = u_{12} < u_{21}, u_{22}\),

(iii) \(u_{11} = u_{21} < u_{12}, u_{22}\),

(iv) \(u_{22} = u_{12} < u_{21}, u_{11}\),

(v) \(u_{22} = u_{21} < u_{12}, u_{11}\).

**Proof.** Let \(y = (a^1 + b^2) + (a^2 + b^1) = (a^1 + b^1) + (a^2 + b^2)\), and each \(a^i + b^j \in A\), we have the following.

\[
e^{u_{12}} + e^{21} + \sum_{s=u_{12}+1}^{n} (a^1_s + b^2_s)e^s + \sum_{s=u_{21}+1}^{n} (a^2_s + b^1_s)e^s
\]

\[
= e^{u_{11}} + e^{u_{22}} + \sum_{s=u_{11}+1}^{n} (a^1_s + b^1_s)e^s + \sum_{s=u_{22}+1}^{n} (a^2_s + b^2_s)e^s.
\]

This shows that \(f(y) = \min\{u_{12}, u_{21}\} = \min\{u_{11}, u_{22}\}\). Suppose first \(u_{12} = u_{21}\). Then

\[
y = 2e^{u_{12}} + \sum_{s=u_{21}+1}^{n} (a^2_s + b^1_s + a^1_s + b^2_s)e^s = e^{u_{11}} + e^{u_{22}} + \sum_{s=u_{11}+1}^{n} (a^1_s + b^1_s)e^s + \sum_{s=u_{22}+1}^{n} (a^2_s + b^2_s)e^s.
\]

This shows \(u_{11} = u_{22} = u_{12} = u_{21}\). Similarly if \(u_{11} = u_{22}\), then \(u_{11} = u_{22} = u_{12} = u_{21}\). Suppose now \(u_{12} < u_{21}\). By what we just showed, we must have \(u_{11} \neq u_{22}\) (since \(u_{11} = u_{22}\) would imply \(u_{12} = u_{21}\)). Since \(\min\{u_{12}, u_{21}\} = \min\{u_{11}, u_{22}\}\), we have that
either \( u_{12} = u_{11} < u_{21}, u_{22} \) or \( u_{12} = u_{22} < u_{21}, u_{11} \). Similarly, if \( u_{21} < u_{12} \), then either \( u_{21} = u_{11} < u_{12}, u_{22} \) or \( u_{21} = u_{22} < u_{12}, u_{11} \). □

**Lemma C.7** (What a 2-OP must look like). Suppose \( a^1, a^2, b^1, b^2 \in \mathbb{F}_3^2 \) and for each \((i, j) \in \{1, 2\}^2 \setminus \{(2, 2)\}, a^i + b^j \in A, \) and \( a^2 + b^2 \notin A \). Then one of the following holds, where for each \( i, j \in \{1, 2\}, u_{ij} = f(a^i + b^j) \).

(i) \( u_{12} = u_{21} = u_{22} < u_{11} \),
(ii) \( u_{11} = u_{22} < u_{12}, u_{21} \),
(iii) \( u_{11} = u_{12} < u_{22}, u_{21} \),
(iv) \( u_{11} = u_{21} < u_{22}, u_{12} \).

**Proof.** Let \( y = a^1 + b^1 + a^2 + b^2 \). For ease of notation, let \( a = u_{11}, b = u_{12}, c = u_{21}, \) and \( d = u_{22} \). Then we can write \( a^1 + b^1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i e^i, a^1 + b^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i e^i, a^2 + b^1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i e^i, \) and \( a^2 + b^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i e^i, \) where \( r_i = 0 \) for all \( i < a, s_i = 0 \) for all \( i < b, t_i = 0 \) for all \( i < c, \) and \( v_i = 0 \) for all \( i < d \). By our assumption, that \((i, j) \in \{1, 2\}^2 \setminus \{(2, 2)\}, a^i + b^j \in A, \) and \( a^2 + b^2 \notin A, \) we have \( r_a = s_b = t_c = 1 \) and \( v_d = 2 \). Therefore,

\[
y = 2e^d + e^a + \sum_{i=a+1}^{n} r_i e^i + \sum_{j=d+1}^{n} v_j e^j = e^b + e^c + \sum_{i=b+1}^{n} s_i e^i + \sum_{j=c+1}^{n} t_j e^j.
\]

Suppose first that \( b = c, \) this implies that either \( b = c = d < a \) (so (i) holds), or \( a = d < b = c \) (so (ii) holds).

Suppose now that \( b < c \). Then the above equation for \( y \) implies that either \( a = b < c, d \) (so (iii) holds), or \( a = d < b < c \) (so (ii) holds). The case \( c < b \) proceeds in an analogous way to show that either (iv) or (ii) holds, so we are done. □

Our next step is a crucial lemma about any instance of 2-HOP_2.

**Lemma C.8** (What a 2-HOP_2 must look like). Suppose \( a^1, a^2, b^1, b^2, c^1, c^2 \) are such that \( a^i + b^j + c^k \in A \) if and only if \( i + j + k \ge 4 \). Then one of the following holds, where \( u_{ijk} = f(a^i + b^j + c^k) \).

1. \( u_{112} = u_{122} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{111} = u_{121} = u_{211} < u_{221} \).
2. \( u_{112} = u_{122} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{111} = u_{221} < u_{121}, u_{211} \).
3. \( u_{112} = u_{122} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{121} = u_{221} < u_{111}, u_{211} \).
4. \( u_{112} = u_{122} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{221} < u_{111}, u_{121} \).
5. \( u_{212} = u_{221} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{111} = u_{121} = u_{212} < u_{122} \).
6. \( u_{212} = u_{221} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{111} = u_{122} < u_{212}, u_{112} \).
7. \( u_{212} = u_{221} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{122} < u_{111}, u_{112} \).
8. \( u_{212} = u_{221} = u_{222} = u_{212} < u_{122} < u_{112}, u_{212} \).
9. \( u_{212} = u_{222} = u_{221} = u_{121} < u_{111} = u_{121} = u_{211} < u_{212} \).
10. \( u_{212} = u_{222} = u_{221} = u_{121} < u_{111} = u_{212} < u_{112}, u_{211} \).
11. \( u_{212} = u_{222} = u_{221} = u_{121} < u_{121} < u_{221} < u_{212}, u_{211} \).
12. \( u_{122} = u_{212} = u_{222} = u_{121} < u_{121} < u_{212} = u_{221} < u_{111}, u_{121} \).

While the statement of Lemma C.8 looks very complicated, each of (1)-(4), (5)-(8), and (9)-(12) are equivalent up to relabeling, and have a simple geometric interpretation. For
example, setting $a = u_{112} = u_{122} = u_{222} = u_{212}$, $c = u_{121}$, $b = u_{112}$, and $\gamma = u_{211}$, we have the following diagram of (1) (filled in circles represent a sum in $A$ and the open circles represent sums not in $A$).

![Diagram of (1)](image)

Note that one face of the cube has the same value for $f$, and this face does not touch the corner which is not in $A$ (i.e. the open circle). All cases in Lemma C.8 look like this up to relabeling.

**Proof of Lemma C.8** For ease of notation, let $u_{111} = a$, $u_{112} = b$, $u_{122} = c$, $u_{121} = d$, $u_{221} = e$, $u_{211} = f$, $u_{212} = g$, $u_{222} = h$. The diagram below will be helpful to the reader as we proceed.

![Diagram for proof of Lemma C.8](image)

Note that $a^1 + c^1, a^2 + c^1, b^1, b^2$ forms a 2-OP, and $f((a^1 + c^1) + b^1) = a$, $f((a^1 + c^1) + b^2) = d$, $f((a^2 + c^1) + b^1) = f$, and $f((a^2 + c^1) + b^2) = e$. Applying Lemma C.8 we have that one of the following holds.

(a) $d = f = a < e$
(b) $e = d < f, a,$
(c) $e = a < d, f$
(d) $e = f < a, d.$

Similarly, $a^1 + b^1, a^2 + b^1, c^1, c^2$ forms a 2-OP, so one of the following holds.
(a') \ b = f = a < g
(b') \ a = g < b, f
(c') \ b = g < a, f
(d') \ f = g < b, a.

Similarly, \ c_1 + a_1, c_2 + a_1, b_1, b_2 forms a 2-OP, which implies one of the following holds.

(a'') \ b = d = a < c
(b'') \ c = a < b, d
(c'') \ c = b < d, a
(d'') \ c = d < a, b

Consider now \ a_1, a_2, b_1 + c_2, b_2 + c_2. This forms a \ C_4, so by Lemma \ C.6 one of the following holds.

(i) \ b = c = g = h
(ii) \ b = g < c, h
(iii) \ b = c < g, h
(iv) \ c = h < g, b
(v) \ c = h < b, c.

Observe that \ a_1, a_2, b_1 + c_1, b_2 + c_2 is a \ C_4, so one of the following hold

(i') \ c = e = d = h
(ii') \ c = h < d, e
(iii') \ c = d < h, e
(iv') \ d = e < h, c
(v') \ e = h < c, d

Consider \ b_1, b_2, c_1 + a_2, c_2 + a_2. This forms a \ C_4, so one of the following holds.

(i') \ g = h = e = f
(ii') \ g = h < e, f
(iii') \ g = f < h, e
(iv') \ e = h < g, f
(v') \ e = f < g, h.

Suppose first that (a) holds, i.e. \ d = f = a < e. Then we have to have that either (a') or (c') hold, and either (a'') or (c'') hold. Suppose (a') holds. So we have that \ d = f = a = b < g, c. But none of (i)-(v) are consistent with this, so (a') cannot hold. A symmetric argument shows (a'') also cannot hold. So we must have (c') and (c''), i.e. \ b = g < a, f and \ c = b < a, d. Combining these we have \ e > d = f = a > b = g = c. This is (1). By symmetry, it is easy to see that if (a') holds, then (9) holds, and if (a'') holds, then (5) holds. This takes care of the cases where one of (a), (a'), or (a'') hold.

Assume now none of (a), (a'), or (a'') hold.

Suppose (b) holds, so \ e = d < f, a. Note we cannot have \ (b''), which leaves us that (c'') or (d'') hold, i.e. either \ c = b < d, a or \ c = d < a, b.

Suppose first (d'') holds, i.e. \ c = d < a, b. So we have \ e = c = d < a, b, f. The only possibility from (i')-(v') consistent with \ e = c = d is (i'), so we have \ e = c = d = h. Combining with (b'),(c'), or (d'), we have the following possibilities.
• $c = d = e = h < a = g < b, f$
• $c = d = e = h < b = g < a, f$
• $c = d = e = h < f = g < a, b$.

These correspond to (10), (11), and (12) respectively.

Suppose now (c’’) holds, i.e. $c = b < d, a$. Combining (c’’) and (b), we have $c = b < d = e < f, a$. Since one of (i’)-(iv’’) holds, and $c < d$, the only option is $c = h < d, e$. Overall we now have $c = b = h < d = e < f, a$. The only option among (i)-(iv) which is consistent with $c = b = h < d = e < f, a$ is (i), so we have that $c = b = h = g < d = e < f, a$. This is (10).

This deals with all the cases where (a), (a’), (a’’) do not hold and (b) holds. By symmetry, this finishes all cases where none of (a), (a’), (a’’), or (b), (b’), or (b’’) hold.

Suppose (c) holds, i.e. $e = a < d, f$. Then neither (d’), nor (d’’), nor (c’), (c’’), (c’’’) can hold, so we are left with (c’), and (c’’), (c’’’) holding. Combining these we have that $c = b = g < e = a < f, d$. The only one of (i’)-(iv) hold consistent with $c = b = g$ is (i), so we have $c = b = g = h < e = a < f, d$. This is (8).

This deals with the case where none of (a), (a’), (a’’), (b), (b’), or (b’’) hold, and where (c) holds. By symmetry, this finishes all cases where none of (a), (a’), (a’’), (b), (b’), or (b’’), or (c), (c’), (c’’), (c’’’) hold. We are left with the case where (d), (d’), and (d’’), and (d’’’), hold. Combining these together we have that $e = f = g < c = d < b, a$. The only one of (i’’)-(v’’) consistent with $e = f = g$ is (i’’), so we have that $e = f = g = h < c = d < b, a$. This is (6).

Lemma C.9 (What a 3-HOP must look like). Suppose \{a’’, b’, c’ : \(i \leq 3\)\} are such that $a^i + b^i + c^i \in A$ if and only if $i + j + k \geq 5$. Then one of the following hold, where $u_{ijk} = f(a^i + b^i + c^i)$ and $\gamma := \min\{u_{ijk} : i, j, k \in \{3\}\}$.

(i) For all $i, j \in \{3\}$, $u_{ij3} = \gamma$ and $u_{ij1}, u_{ij2} > \gamma$.

(ii) For all $i, k \in \{3\}$, $u_{ik3} = \gamma$ and $u_{i1k}, u_{i2k} > \gamma$.

(iii) For all $j, k \in \{3\}$, $u_{3jk} = \gamma$ and $u_{1jk}, u_{2jk} > \gamma$.

Proof. Consider $a^1, b^1, c^1, a^3, b^3, c^3$. This makes a 2-HOP, so by Lemma C.8 after relabeling, we may assume $u_{131} = u_{331} = u_{333} = u_{333} < u_{111}, u_{311}, u_{113}, u_{313}$.

Observe that $a^2, b^1, c^1, a^3, b^3, c^3$ also forms a 2-HOP. We already know that $u_{333} = u_{331} < u_{313}, u_{311}, u_{313}$, so we cannot have $u_{331} = u_{313} = u_{311} = u_{331}$ or $u_{333} = u_{231} = u_{213} = u_{213}$. The only possibility for the four equal terms in Lemma C.8 is then $u_{333} = u_{331} = u_{231} = u_{233}$, so we have $u_{333} = u_{331} = u_{231} = u_{233} < u_{211}, u_{211}, u_{213}, u_{313}$.

Now consider $a^1, a^2, b^1, b^3, c^2, c^3$. This also forms a 2-HOP. We already know that $u_{233} = u_{133} < u_{213}, u_{113}$ so it is not possible to have either $u_{233} = u_{213} = u_{212} = u_{232}$ or $u_{233} = u_{213} = u_{113} = u_{313}$. So this leaves only one possibility for the face of four equal terms from Lemma C.8, namely $u_{233} = u_{133} = u_{132} = u_{232}$. Thus we have $u_{233} = u_{133} = u_{132} = u_{232} < u_{212}, u_{213}, u_{212}, u_{113}$.

Now consider $a^1, a^2, b^1, b^3, c^2, c^3$. Again this makes a 2-HOP. Note we already know that $u_{133} = u_{333} = u_{132} < u_{113}, u_{313}, u_{312}$. This leaves only one possibility for face of four
equal terms from Lemma \[C.8\] namely \(u_{333} = u_{133} = u_{332} = u_{132} \) so \(u_{333} = u_{133} = u_{332} = u_{132} < u_{112}, u_{313}, u_{312}, u_{113}\).

Observe we now know that there is some \(a\) such that for all \(i, k \in [3], u_{3ik} = \gamma\), and for all \(i, k \in [3], \gamma < u_{4ik}\). The following sets also form 2-HOP_2:\

- \(\{a^2, a^3, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^2\}\).
- \(\{a^2, a^3, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^3\}\).
- \(\{a^1, a^2, b^3, c^1, c^3\}\).
- \(\{a^1, a^2, b^2, c^1, c^2\}\).

Based on what we already know, and Lemma \[C.8\] there is only one compatible choice for \(u\) conclusion, we have that for all \(i, k \in [3], u_{3ik} = \gamma\), and for all \(i, k \in [3], \gamma < u_{4ik}\).

In conclusion, we have that \(u_{3ik} = \gamma\) for all \(i, k \in [3]\) and \(u_{ijk} > \gamma\) for all \(i, k \in [3]\) and \(j \in [2]\).

The following lemma gives us some restrictions for how things can align in a 4-HOP_2.

**Lemma C.10.** Suppose \(\{x_i, y_i : i \in [3]\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\) and \(z, z', w \in \mathbb{R}^n\) are such that

- \(w + x^i + y^j \in A\) if and only if \(i + j \geq 3\),
- \(z + x^i + y^j \in A\) if and only if \(i + j \geq 5\), and
- \(z' + x^i + y^j \in A\) if and only if \(i + j \geq 4\).

Then none of the following can hold.

1. \(f(w + y^1 + x^3) = f(w + y^2 + x^3) < f(w + y^1 + x^1)\) for all \(i \in [3]\) and \(j \in [2]\).
2. \(f(w + x^1 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^2) < f(w + x^3 + y^3) = f(w + x^1 + y^3)\).
3. \(f(w + x^3 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^2 + y^2) > f(w + x^1 + y^3)\).
4. \(f(w + x^3 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^1 + y^3)\).
5. \(f(w + x^1 + y^3) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^3) > f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^2) = f(w + x^1 + y^2)\).
6. \(f(w + x^1 + y^3) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^2) = f(w + x^1 + y^1)\).

**Proof.** Suppose first (1) holds. Note

\((z - w) + (w + y^1 + x^3) \notin A\) and \((z - w) + (w + y^2 + x^3) \in A\).

Since \(f(w + y^1 + x^3) = f(w + y^2 + x^3) := \gamma\), this implies that

\(f(z - w) = f(w + y^1 + x^3) = f(w + y^2 + x^3) = \gamma\).

Further since \(w + y^1 + x^3, w + y^2 + x^3 \in A\) and have \(f(w + y^1 + x^3) = f(w + y^2 + x^3) = \gamma\), they are both in \(H_\gamma + e\gamma\). So for the above to happen, we have to have that \(z - w \in H_\gamma + 2e\gamma\).

But now since \(f(w + y^3 + x^2) > \gamma, (z - w) + w + y^3 + x^2 \in H_\gamma + 2e\gamma\) so \((z - w) + w + y^3 + x^2 = z + y^3 + x^2 \notin A\), a contradiction.

Suppose now (2) holds. Since \((z - w) + w + x^3 + y^2 \in A\) while \((z - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A\), and \(f(w + x^3 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^2) := \gamma\), we must have that \(f(z - w) = \gamma\) as well. And moreover, we have to have \((z - w) \gamma = 2\). But then since \(\gamma < f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^1 + y^3)\), we have to have \((z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3\), and \((z - w) + w + x^1 + y^3 \in H_\gamma + 2e\gamma\) so both \(z + x^2 + y^3, z + x^1 + y^3 \notin A\), a contradiction.
Suppose now (3) holds. Since \( a := f(w + x^2 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) \) and \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A \) while \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3 \in A \), we must have that \( f(z - w) = \gamma \) and further, \( (z - w)_\gamma = 2 \) (to cancel the 1). But then \( f(w + x^1 + y^3) < \gamma \) implies \( (z - w) + w + x^1 + y^3 = z + x^1 + y^3 \in A \), a contradiction.

Suppose now (4) holds. As above, since \( \gamma := f(w + x^2 + y^2) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) \) and \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A \) while \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3 \in A \), so we must have that \( f(z - w) = \gamma \) and further, \( (z - w)_\gamma = 2 \) (to cancel the 1). But since \( f(w + x^1 + y^1) = \gamma \) and \( w + x^1 + y^1 \notin A \) we know that \( f(w + x^1 + y^1) = \gamma \) and \( (w + x^1 + y^1)_\gamma = 2 \). But then \( (z - w) + (w + x^1 + y^1) = z + x^1 + y^1 \) is in \( A \) (since the first nonzero coordinate will be \( 2 + 2 = 1 \)).

Suppose (5) holds. Since \( \gamma := f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^3) \) and \( w + x^3 + y^3 \in A \) and \( w + x^2 + y^3 \in A \), but \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3 \notin A \) while \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3 \notin A \), we must have that \( f(z - w) = \gamma \) and \( (z - w)_\gamma = 2 \). Similarly, since \( \gamma' := f(w + x^3 + y^3) = f(w + x^2 + y^3) \) and \( w + x^2 + y^2 \in A \) and \( w + x^3 + y^2 \in A \) and since \( (z - w) + w + x^3 + y^2 \in A \) while \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A \), we must have \( \gamma' = (z - w) \). Thus \( \gamma = \gamma' \), a contradiction to (5).

Suppose (6) holds. Since \( \gamma := f(w + x^2 + y^3) = f(w + x^3 + y^3) \) and both \( w + x^2 + y^2 \in A \), \( w + x^3 + y^3 \in A \), and \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A \) while \( (z - w) + w + x^2 + y^3 \notin A \), we must have that \( f(z - w) = \gamma \) and \( (z - w)_\gamma = 2 \). By (6), \( \gamma = f(w + x^2 + y^2) = f(w + x^3 + y^3) \), both \( w + x^2 + y^2 \in A \), \( w + x^3 + y^3 \notin A \), but \( (z' - w) + w + x^2 + y^2 \notin A \) while \( (z' - w) + w + x^3 + y^3 \in A \), we must have that \( \gamma = f(z' - w) \) and \( (z' - w)_\gamma = (z - w)_\gamma = 2 \) (to cancel the 1). But (6) implies \( \gamma < f(w + x^3 + y^1) \), which implies that \( (z' - w) + w + x^3 + y^4 = z' + x^3 + y^4 \notin A \), a contradiction.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma C.11.** Suppose we have \( a^i, b^i, c^i \) for \( i \in [3] \) forming an instance of a 3-HOP. Then none of the following hold.

(1) There exist \( c^1, a^i, b^i \in \mathbb{F}_3^n \), such that if we set \( c^2 = c^1, c^3 = c^2, c^4 = c^3 \) and for each \( i \in [3] \), we set \( a^i = a^i, b_i = b^i \), then \( \{a^i, b^i, c^i : i \in [4]\} \) is a 4-HOP.

(2) There exist \( a^i, c^i, b^i \in \mathbb{F}_3^n \), such that if we set \( a^2 = a^1, a^3 = a^2, a^4 = a^3 \) and for each \( i \in [3] \), we set \( b^i = b^i, c^i = c^i \), then \( \{a^i, b^i, c^i : i \in [4]\} \) is a 4-HOP.

(3) There exist \( b^1, c^i, a^i \in \mathbb{F}_3^n \), such that if we set \( b^2 = b^1, b^3 = b^2, b^4 = b^3 \) and for each \( i \in [3] \), we set \( a^i = a^i, c^i = c^i \), then \( \{a^i, b^i, c^i : i \in [4]\} \) is a 4-HOP.

**Proof.** By Lemma C.9, one face of the 3-HOP has the same \( f \)-value. Without loss of generality, assume assume \( a = u_{i3k} \) each \( i, k \in [3] \) and \( a < u_{ijk} \) for all \( i, k \in [3] \) and \( j \in \{1, 2\} \). Let \( d = u_{113}, s = u_{123}, p = u_{122}, t = u_{223}, h = u_{222}, f = u_{221}, v = u_{323}, u = u_{322}, r = u_{321}, m = u_{213}, d = u_{212}, e = u_{312}, b = u_{311}, g = u_{122}, \alpha = u_{211}, \beta = u_{112}, \delta = u_{121}, \) and \( \gamma = u_{111} \). See the diagram below for a geometric representation of the cube with these labels.
Suppose towards a contradiction (1) holds. So we have new elements $c^1, a^4, b^4 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and setting $c^2 = c^1, c^3 = c^2, c^4 = c^3$ and $a^i = a^i, b^i = b^i$ for $i \in [3]$, we have $a^i + b^i + c^k \in A$ if and only if $i + j + k \geq 6$.

Consider now $a^1, a^2, a^3, a^4, b^1, b^2, b^3, b^4$. Let $y^i = a^i$ and $x^i = b^i$, and let $w = c^2$ and $z = c_1$. It is straightforward to check that $w + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 3$ and $z + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 5$. However, we also have that $f(w + x^1 + x^3) = a = f(w + y^1 + x^3) < f(w + y^1 + x^3)$ for all $i \in [3]$ and $j \in [2]$. Thus condition (1) of Lemma C.10 holds, a contradiction. Thus (1) cannot hold.

Suppose towards a contradiction (2) holds. So we have new elements $a^1, b^4, c^4 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that, setting, $a^2 = a^1, a^3 = a^2, a^4 = a^3$ and for each $i \in [3], \ b^i = b^i,$ and $c^i = c^i$, we have $a^i + b^i + c^k \in A$ if and only if $i + j + k \geq 6$. Consider $b^1, b^2, b^3, b^4, c^1, c^2, c^3, c^4$. Let $x^i = b^i$, $y^i = c^i$ for $i \in [3], \ w = a^2$ and let $z = a^1$. Then $w + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 3$ while $z + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 5$. However, we also have that $f(w + y^1 + x^3) = a = f(w + y^1 + x^3) < f(w + y^1 + x^3)$ for all $i \in [3]$ and $j \in [2]$. Thus condition (1) of Lemma C.10 holds, a contradiction. Thus (2) cannot hold.

Suppose towards a contradiction (3) holds. So we have new elements $b^1, a^1, c^4 \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, and setting $b^2 = b^1, b^3 = b^2, b^4 = b^3$, and for each $i \in [3]$, setting $a^i = a^i, c^i = c^i$, we have $a^i + b^i + c^k \in A$ if and only if $i + j + k \geq 6$. Setting $x^i = a^i$ and $y^i = c^i$ for $i \in [3], \ w = b^2$ and $z = b^4$, we have that $w + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 3$ while $z + x^i + y^j \in A$ if and only if $i + j \geq 5$. Consequently, Lemma C.10 implies that none of the following hold.

(i) $r = u < t$
(ii) $t = s < u$
(iii) $u = h < t = s$
(iv) $t = s < u = h$
(v) $v = t = u = h > s$
(vi) $v = t = u = h = \delta.$
(vii) $s = t = v > u = h = p$
(viii) $v = t = s = h = p < r$
Suppose first that \( t \neq s \) and \( r \neq u \). Note the following forms a 2-HOP\(_2\): \( \{a^2, a^1, b^1, b^2, c^2, c^3\} \). Consequently, since \( t \neq s \), Lemma C.8 implies we must have \( t = m = g = h < s, d, p, \beta \). Note the following is also a 2-HOP\(_2\): \( \{a^2, a^3, b^1, b^2, c^1, c^2\} \). Since \( r \neq u \), Lemma C.8 implies we must have \( e = u = g = h < b, r, f, \alpha \). So in this case \( t = m = g = h = u = e \). Note the following are C\(_4\): \( \{a^3 + b^1, a^3 + b^2, c^2, c^3\} \) and \( \{b^1 + a^3, b^2 + a^3, c^2, c^3\} \), which correspond to \( e, c, g, m \) and \( e, c, v, u \). Therefore, Lemma C.6 along with the equalities we have already established implies that \( e = u = g = h = e = c = m = t = v \). Since (v) and (vi) cannot hold, and \( t \neq s \), we have that \( v = t = u = h < s \) and \( v = t = u = h \neq \delta \). Note the following form a 2-HOP\(_2\): \( \{a^1, a^3, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^3\} \). Consequently, Lemma C.8 along with the fact we know \( a < \delta, s, v, r \), and \( t = v = u \neq s, r \), we either have \( \delta = r = s < v \) or \( \delta = v < s, r \). The first is incompatible with \( v = t = u = h < s \), so we must have \( \delta = v \). But we now have \( \delta = t = v = u = h \), contradicting the fact that (vi) cannot hold.

Suppose now \( t = s \) and \( u \neq r \). Since (ii) cannot hold, we have \( t = s \geq u \neq r \). Note \( \{a^2 + b^2, a^3 + b^2, c^2, c^3\} \) forms a C\(_4\), and \( t \geq u = h \), Lemma C.6 implies that either \( t, v > u = h \) or \( t = v = u = h \). In the latter case we would have \( t = s > u = h \), contradicting that (iii) cannot hold. Thus \( t = v = u = h \). Similarly since \( \{a^3 + b^2, a^2 + b^2, c^2, c^3\} \) is a C\(_4\) and \( t = s \geq h \), we must have that either \( t = s = h = p \) or \( t = s > h = p \). In the latter case we would have \( t = s > h = u \), again contradicting that (iii) cannot hold. Thus \( t = s = h = p \). Overall we have that \( t = s = h = p = u = v \). Since (vi) cannot hold, \( t = s = h = p = u = v \neq \delta \).

Note \( \{a^1, a^2, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^3\} \) forms a 2-HOP\(_2\). Since we already know \( a < h, p, f, \delta \), and \( p, h, \neq \delta \), Lemma C.8 implies that \( h = p < \delta, f \). So we have \( h = p = u = h = t = s = v < \delta, f, r \).

We also have a 2-HOP\(_2\) here: \( \{a^1, a^2, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^3\} \). So Lemma C.8 along with the fact that \( a < v, s, r, \delta \) and \( s = v < \delta, r \), we have \( s = v < \delta, r \). Thus we have \( h = p = u = h = t = s = v < \delta, f, r \). This contradicts that (viii) cannot hold.

A symmetric argument deals with the case where \( t \neq s \) and \( u = r \).

So we are left with the case where \( t = s \) and \( u = r \). Since (i) and (ii) cannot hold, we must have that \( r = u \geq t = s \geq u = r \), so \( u = r = s = t \). Since \( \{a^2 + b^2, a^3 + b^2, c^2, c^3\} \) forms a C\(_4\), and \( t = u \), Lemma C.6 implies \( v = t = u = h \), so \( u = r = s = t = u = h = v \). Since \( \{a^2 + b^2, a^3 + b^2, c^1, c^2\} \) forms a C\(_4\) and \( r = h \), Lemma C.6 implies \( u = h = r = f \), so we have that \( u = r = s = t = h = v = f \). Similarly, since \( \{a^3 + b^2, a^2 + b^2, c^2, c^3\} \) is a C\(_4\) and \( s = h \), Lemma C.6 implies \( t = s = p = h \). Consequently, we have that \( u = r = s = t = h = v = f = p \). But now the following 2-HOP\(_2\) fits none of the possibilities in Lemma C.8 \( \{a^1, a^2, b^2, b^3, c^1, c^2\} \). In particular, it has \( a < h = p = f \) while Lemma C.8 implies that, e.g. once you know \( a < h = p \), then \( h = p < f, \delta \). This is a contradiction. \( \square \)

We are now able to prove Proposition 2.20.

Proof of Proposition 2.20. Suppose towards a contradiction there are \( \{a^i, b^i, c^i : i \in [4]\} \) so that \( a^i + b^j + c^k \in A = A_{GS}(n, p) \) if and only \( i + j + k \geq 6 \). Setting \( c^1 = c^2, c^2 = c^3, c^3 = c^4 \) and for each \( i \in [3], a^i = a^i \) and \( b^i = b^i \), we have a contradiction to Lemma C.11. Thus no such \( \{a^i, b^i, c^i : i \in [4]\} \) exists. This shows \( A \) has no 4-HOP\(_2\). \( \square \)
Appendix D. Density lemmas

In this section we prove Lemma D.1 below. The proof technique is entirely standard, and the reader who has faith that high-rank quadratic factors exhibit quasirandom behaviour will find nothing surprising here.

Recall that given sets $X, Y$, the bipartite graph between $X$ and $Y$ is denoted by $K_2[X, Y] = \{xy : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. Recall also that given a quadratic factor $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ of complexity $(\ell, q)$, with $\mathcal{Q} = \{M_1, \ldots, M_q\}$, and $c \in \mathbb{F}_p^q$, we write

$$\beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(c) = \{xy : x^T M_i y = c_i \text{ for each } i \in [q]\}.$$

The majority of calculations rely on the following basic Gauss sum estimate (see e.g. 

**Fact D.1** (Gauss sum estimate). Let $M$ be a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix over $\mathbb{F}_p$ of rank $r$, and let $b \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Then

$$|E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{x^T M x + b^T x}| \leq p^{-r/2}.$$  

**Lemma D.2.** There are constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ be a sufficiently fast growing rank function so that for all $\rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^\alpha$ with $Q \in \mathbb{F}_p^q$, we write

$$\beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(c) = \{xy : x^T M_i y = c_i \text{ for each } i \in [q]\}.$$  

The proof of Lemma D.2 then gives the proof of Lemma D.1.

**Proof of Lemma D.1**. Let $C_1, C_2$ be as in Lemma D.2. Given $\epsilon_2 : \mathbb{N} \to (0, 1]$ non-increasing, let $\rho(x)$ be a sufficiently fast growing rank function so that for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_3 p^{16x - \rho(x)/2} < \epsilon_2(p^{2x})$. Suppose $B = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. Suppose $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $B_1, B_2 \in \text{At}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})$. By Lemma D.2(ii), $(B_1 \cup B_2, \beta_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) \cap K_2[B_1, B_2])$ has dev$_2(C_2 p^{16(\ell+q) - \rho(\ell+q)/2})$. By assumption,
By Lemma D.2 (iii), if $\bar{e}$ and rank at least $d \in \rho$ where the last inequality is by our choice of $\bar{a}$ as desired.

Proof of Lemma D.2 Let $C_3, C_4$ be as in Lemma D.2. Given $\tau : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ non-decreasing, let $\rho(x)$ be a sufficiently fast growing rank function so that for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$, $(C_4 + C_3)p^{12(\ell + q) - \rho(\ell + q)/2} < p^{-\tau(2x)}$. Suppose $d = (\ell, Q)$ is a quadratic factor of complexity $(\ell, Q)$ and rank at least $\rho(\ell + q)$ in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $d = (a_1, a_2, a_3, b_{12}, b_{13, b_{23}}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{3\ell + 6q}$.

By Lemma D.2 (iii), if $\bar{e} = \bar{a}_1\bar{a}_2\bar{b}_{12}$ and $G = \Delta^{(2)}(\bar{e})$, then the following holds, where $d = \frac{|E^{(2)} \cap E(G)|}{|E(G)|}$,

$$|d - \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(\bar{e}))|}{|B(\Sigma(\bar{e}))|}| < C_3p^{8(\ell + q) - \rho(\ell + q)/2} < p^{-\tau(\ell + q)},$$

where the last inequality is by our choice of $\rho$. This shows (i) of Lemma 4.15 holds. For (ii), let $H = \Delta^{(3)}(d)$ and $d' = \frac{|E^{(3)} \cap K^{(3)}(H)|}{|K^{(3)}(H)|}$. Then Lemma 4.13 (iv) implies

$$|d - \frac{|A \cap B(\Sigma(d))|}{|B(\Sigma(d))|}| < C_4p^{12(\ell + q) - \rho(\ell + q)/2} < p^{-\tau(\ell + q)},$$

where the last inequality is by our choice of $\rho$. This shows (ii) of Lemma 4.15 holds.

Proof of Lemma D.2 Before we begin, we set some more notation for the proof. For $k \in [5]$, we write $B_k = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T r_j = b^{(j)}_k \text{ for all } j \in [\ell], x^T M_x = a^{(i)}_k \text{ for all } i \in [q]\}$. For all $k, m \in [3]$ with $k < m$, we write $b_{km} = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n : x^T M_x = c^{(i)}_{km} \text{ for all } i \in [q]\}$. Using orthonormality of the characters on $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, we may express the indicator functions of these sets by

$$1_{B_k}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{q} \mathbb{E}_{u^{(i)}_k \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{u^{(i)}_k(x^T M_x - a^{(i)}_k)} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{v^{(j)}_k \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{v^{(j)}_k(x^T r_j - b^{(j)}_k)},$$

for $k \in [5]$, and for $k, m \in [3]$ with $k < m$, $1_{b_{km}}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^{q} \mathbb{E}_{w^{(i)}_{km} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{w^{(i)}_{km}(x^T M_y - e^{(i)}_{km})}$.

Here the notation $\mathbb{E}_{u^{(i)}_k \in \mathbb{F}_p}$ stands for $\mathbb{E}_{u^{(1)}_k, u^{(2)}_k, \ldots, u^{(q)}_k \in \mathbb{F}_p}$. Where there is no ambiguity we may drop or otherwise modify the subscripts on the $\mathbb{F}_p$-variables $u, v,$ and $w$ to make the calculations (marginally) more readable. We first compute the degree of $x \in B_1$, which is $|B_2|\mathbb{E}_{y \in B_2}1_{b_{12}}(x, y) = p^n\mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p}1_{B_2}(y)1_{b_{12}}(x, y)$.

Substituting for $k = 1, 2$ and $km = 12$ the expressions for the indicator functions above, we find that $\mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p}1_{B_2}(y)1_{b_{12}}(x, y)$ equals $\mathbb{E}_{u^{(1)}_2, u^{(2)}_2, \ldots, u^{(q)}_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p}$ of

$$\mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{y^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} u^{(i)}_2 M_y - \sum_{i=1}^{q} u^{(i)}_2 M_y + y^T \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v^{(j)}_2 r_j - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v^{(j)}_2 r_j + x^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} w^{(i)}_2 M_y - \sum_{i=1}^{q} w^{(i)}_2 c^{(i)}_{12}},$$
which can be rearranged as

\[ \mathbb{E}_{u_2^{(1)}, \ldots, u_2^{(q)}, v_2^{(1)}, \ldots, v_2^{(f)}, w^{(1)}, \ldots, w^{(q)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \]

\[ \omega - \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} v_2^{(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^q v_2^{(i)} w^{(i)} \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} y^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} M_i y + y^T (\sum_{i=1}^q v_2^{(i)} r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} M_i x). \]

Now by the Gauss sum lemma (Fact [D.1]), because all non-trivial linear combinations of the matrices \( M_i \) have rank at least \( p \), the expectation in \( y \) is \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \) unless \( u_2^{(i)} = 0 \) for all \( i \in [q] \). Therefore, \( \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_2}(y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x, y) \) is

\[ p^{-q} \mathbb{E}_{u_2^{(1)}, \ldots, u_2^{(q)}, w^{(1)}, \ldots, w^{(q)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega - \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} v_2^{(i)} \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} v_2^{(i)} \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} y^T (\sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} M_i x) + O(p^{-\rho/2}). \]

Next, we observe that the expectation in \( y \) is zero unless \( \sum_{j=1}^\ell v_2^{(j)} r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} M_i x \) is the zero vector. This certainly happens if \( v_2^{(j)} = 0 \) for all \( j \in [\ell] \) and \( w^{(i)} = 0 \) for all \( i \in [q] \), and the contribution of this case to \( \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_2}(y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x, y) \) is \( p^{-(\ell+2q)} \). If the \( w^{(i)} \) are not all zero, then for the expectation in \( y \) to be non-zero, \( x \) has to lie in a fixed (for a given choice of \( v_2^{(j)} \)) coset of the kernel of a non-trivial combination of the \( M_i \), which happens with probability \( O(p^{-\rho}) \). We also observed that because of the assumed linear independence of the \( r_j \), it cannot be the case that \( w^{(i)} \) equals zero for all \( i \in [q] \) while \( v_2^{(j)} \) is non-zero for at least one \( j \in [\ell] \). This means that

\[ \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_2}(y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x, y) = p^{-(\ell+2q)} + \theta(x) + O(p^{-\rho/2}), \]

where

\[ \theta(x) := p^{-q} \mathbb{E}_{u_2^{(1)}, \ldots, u_2^{(q)}, w^{(1)}, \ldots, w^{(q)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega - \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} v_2^{(i)} \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} v_2^{(i)} \mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p} y^T (\sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} M_i x = 0 \text{ not all } w^{(i)} = 0) \]

is such that \( \mathbb{E}_x |\theta(x)| = O(p^{-q-\rho}) \). We may therefore compute

\[ \frac{|\beta_{12}|}{|B_1||B_2|} = \mathbb{E}_{x \in B_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{x \in B_1} \frac{p^n}{|B_2|} (p^{-(\ell+2q)} + \theta(x) + O(p^{-\rho/2})), \]

which, noting that

\[ \frac{p^n}{|B_2|} = p^{\ell+q}(1 + O(p^{\ell+q-\rho/2})) \]

and

\[ \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in B_1} \theta(x) \right| \leq \frac{p^n}{|B_1|} \mathbb{E}_x |\theta(x)| = O(p^{2\ell+q-\rho}), \]

equals

\[ p^{\ell+q}(1 + O(p^{\ell+q-\rho/2}))(p^{-(\ell+2q)} + O(p^{2\ell+q-\rho})) = p^{-q}(1 + O(p^{4\ell+q-\rho/2})). \]

This completes the proof of (i).

To verify dev\( _2(\epsilon, d) \) for part (ii) with \( d = p^{-q} \) and \( \epsilon = C p^{4\ell+q-\rho/2} \) for some constant \( C > 0 \), write \( g(x, y) = 1_{\beta_{12}}(x, y) - d_2 \) with \( d_2 = \frac{|\beta_{12}|}{|B_1||B_2|} \). We need to compute

\[ (D.1) \sum_{x_1, y_1 \in B_1} \sum_{x_2, y_2 \in B_2} g(x_1, x_2) g(y_1, x_2) g(x_1, y_2) g(y_1, y_2), \]
which can be renormalised and expressed as
\[ |B_1|^2|B_2|^2 E_{x_1,y_1 \in B_1} E_{x_2,y_2 \in B_2} (1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) - d_2)(1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,x_2) - d_2)(1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,y_2) - d_2)(1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,y_2) - d_2). \]
We will need to consider all terms arising from this product when expanded term-by-term. We begin by noting that \( E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) = d_2 \in (d - \epsilon, d + \epsilon) \) by (i), and similarly for all other terms that contain a single copy of the edge indicator. Likewise,
\[ E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,x_2) = E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) E_{y_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,y_2), \]
where by our preceding calculation, \( E_{y_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,y_2) = p^n/|B_2| \left( p^{-(\ell+2q)} + \theta(x_1) + O(p^{-\rho/2}) \right). \)
It follows that
\[ E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,x_2) = d^2 + O(p^{6(\ell+q) - \rho/2}). \]
In the same vein, a direct but lengthy calculation using the above estimates yields
\[ E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,y_2) = d^3 + O(p^{12(\ell+q) - \rho/2}). \]
It therefore remains to compute
\[ E_{x_1 \in B_1, x_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x_1,y_2) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y_1,y_2), \]
which we shall do using a strategy similar to the one employed for part (i). We start by calculating, for fixed \( x \) and \( z \),
\[ \frac{|B_1|}{p^\mu} E_{x \in B_1} 1_{\beta_{12}}(x,y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x,z) = E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_1}(x) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x,y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x,z), \]
we can, as before, expand as \( E_{u(1),\ldots,u(q),v(1),\ldots,v(q),w(1),w(2),...,u(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \) of
\[ E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^T \sum_{i=1}^q u(i) M_i x - \sum_{i=1}^q u(i) a_{1}^{(i)} + x^T \sum_{j=1}^T v(j) r_j - \sum_{i=1}^q v(j) b_{1}^{(i)} + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q w_{1}^{(i)} M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q w_{2}^{(i)} M_i z - \sum_{i=1}^q (u(i) + w(i)) c_{12}. \]
Rewriting this as \( E_{u(1),\ldots,u(q),v(1),\ldots,v(q),w(1),w(2),...,u(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \) of
\[ \omega - \sum_{i=1}^q u(i) a_{1}^{(i)} - \sum_{j=1}^T v(j) b_{1}^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^q (w(i) + w_{2}^{(i)}) c_{12} \]
we see that the expectation in \( x \) is \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \) unless all \( u(i) \) are equal to zero, and hence \( E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_1}(x) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(z) \) equals, up to an additive error of \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \), the scaled expectation \( p^{-\ell} \mathbb{E}_{u(1),\ldots,u(q),w(1),w(2),...,u(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \) of
\[ \omega - \sum_{j=1}^T v(j) b_{1}^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^q (w(i) + w_{2}^{(i)}) c_{12} E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^T \sum_{j=1}^T v(j) r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q u(i) M_i y + \sum_{i=1}^q w_{2}^{(i)} M_i z. \]
The expression \( E_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_{B_1}(x) 1_{\beta_{12}}(y) 1_{\beta_{12}}(z) \) can thus be written as
\[ p^{-(\ell+3q)} + \phi(y,z) + O(p^{-\rho/2}), \]
where \( \phi(y,z) \) is defined to be \( p^{-\ell} \mathbb{E}_{u(1),\ldots,u(q),w(1),w(2),...,u(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \) of
\[ \omega - \sum_{j=1}^T v(j) b_{1}^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^q (w(i) + w_{2}^{(i)}) c_{12} 1_{\sum_{j=1}^T v(j) r_j + \sum_{i=1}^q u(i) M_i y + \sum_{i=1}^q w_{2}^{(i)} M_i z = 0, \text{not all of } v(j),w_{1}^{(i)},w_{2}^{(i)} = 0}. \]
Note that the function \( \phi \) thus defined satisfies \( \mathbb{E}_{y,z} |\phi(y,z)| = O(p^{-\rho}). \) Indeed, given a tuple \( w_{1}^{(1)},\ldots,w_{1}^{(q)},w_{2}^{(1)},\ldots,w_{2}^{(q)} \), not all of which are zero, one of \( w_{1}^{(1)},\ldots,w_{1}^{(q)} \) and
$w_2^{(1)},\ldots,w_2^{(q)}$ must contain a non-zero element. In the former case, take the expectation in $y$, in the latter case, take the expectation in $z$, and use the fact that this variable must be confined to a fixed coset of the kernel of a non-trivial combination of the $M_i$. If, on the other hand, $w_1^{(1)},\ldots,w_1^{(q)},w_2^{(1)},\ldots,w_2^{(q)}$ are all zero, then one of the $v^{(j)}$ must be non-zero, contradicting the linear independence of the $r_1,\ldots,r_\ell$.

Equipped with this estimate, we compute
\[
\mathbb{E}_{y_1 \in B_1,x_2,y_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_1}(y_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_2}(y_1,y_2) \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \in B_1} 1_{\beta_1}(x_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_2}(x_1,y_2)
\]
as
\[
\frac{p^n}{|B_1|} \mathbb{E}_{y_1 \in B_1,x_2,y_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_1}(y_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_2}(y_1,y_2) (p^{-(\ell+3q)} + \phi(x_2,y_2) + O(p^{-\rho/2})).
\]
The main term in this expression is
\[
\frac{p^n}{|B_1|^2} p^{-(\ell+3q)} \mathbb{E}_{y_1 \in B_1,x_2,y_2 \in B_2} 1_{\beta_1}(y_1,x_2) 1_{\beta_2}(y_1,y_2) = \frac{p^{2n}}{|B_1|^2} p^{-(\ell+3q)} + \mathbb{E}_{x_2,y_2 \in B_2} \phi(x_2,y_2) + O(p^{-\rho/2}),
\]
which, noting that
\[
|\mathbb{E}_{y,z \in B_2} \phi(y,z)| = O(p^{2n-\rho} / |B_2|^2) = p^{2\ell+q-\rho}(1 + O(p^{\rho-\rho/2})) = O(p^{3\ell+2q-\rho}),
\]
equals
\[
\frac{p^{2n}}{|B_1|^2} p^{-(2\ell+6q)} (1 + O(p^{5(\ell+q) - \rho/2})) = p^{2(\ell+q)} (1 + O(p^{\rho-\rho/2})) p^{-(2\ell+6q)} (1 + O(p^{5(\ell+q) - \rho/2})).
\]
This in turn is
\[
p^{-4q} (1 + O(p^{6(\ell+q) - \rho/2})) = d^4 + O(p^{6(\ell+q) - \rho/2}).
\]
Observing that the lower-order terms in (D.2) are of order at most $O(p^{A(\ell+q) - \rho/2})$, this implies that (D.2) equals $O(p^{6(\ell+q) - \rho/2})$, and thus, on collecting all terms, (D.1) is $O(p^{16(\ell+q) - \rho/2})$. This concludes the proof of (ii).

We now turn to (iii), and begin by writing
\[
d_A|\beta_1| = |E_A^{(2)} \cap \beta_1| = (p^n)^2 \mathbb{E}_{x,y \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(x+y)1_{B_1}(x)1_{B_2}(y)1_{\beta_1}(x,y).
\]
Using the same expressions for $1_{B_1}$, $1_{B_2}$, and $1_{\beta_1}$ as before, we perform a change of variable $z = x + y$ to find that
\[
d_A|\beta_1| = p^{2n} \mathbb{E}_{u_1^{(1)},u_2^{(1)},u_1^{(2)},u_2^{(2)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{\sum_{i=1}^q u_1^{(i)} u_1^{(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} u_2^{(i)} - \sum_{j=1}^f u_1^{(j)} b_1^{(j)} - \sum_{j=1}^f u_2^{(j)} b_2^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} v_1^{(i)} v_2^{(i)}} \times \mathbb{E}_{x,z \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(z) \omega^{x^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_1^{(i)} M_i (z-x)^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} M_i (z-x)} \times \mathbb{E}_{x,z \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{x^T \sum_{j=1}^f u_1^{(j)} r_j + (z-x)^T \sum_{j=1}^f u_2^{(j)} r_j + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} M_i (z-x)}
\]
\[
= p^{2n} \mathbb{E}_{u_1^{(1)},u_2^{(1)},u_1^{(2)},u_2^{(2)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{\sum_{i=1}^q u_1^{(i)} u_1^{(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} u_2^{(i)} - \sum_{j=1}^f u_1^{(j)} b_1^{(j)} - \sum_{j=1}^f u_2^{(j)} b_2^{(j)} - \sum_{i=1}^q w^{(i)} v_1^{(i)} v_2^{(i)}} \times \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(z) \omega^{z^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} M_i z + z^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_2^{(i)} r_j}
\]
\[
\times \mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_1^{(i)} + u_2^{(i)} - w^{(i)}) M_i x + x^T \sum_{j=1}^f (v_1^{(j)} - v_2^{(j)}) r_j + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (w^{(i)} - 2u_2^{(i)}) M_i z}.
\]
By the Gauss sum lemma (Fact [D.1]) and the assumption on the rank of \((\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\), the expectation in \(x\) is \(O(p^{-n/2})\) unless for all \(i \in [q]\), \(w^{(i)} = u_1^{(i)} + u_2^{(i)}\). It follows that up to an error of \(O(p^{-n/2})\), \(d_A|\beta_{12}|/p^{2n}\) equals

\[
P^{-q} \mathbb{E}_{u_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{-\sum_{i=1}^{q} u_1^{(i)}(a^{(i)}_1 + c^{(i)}_2) - \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)}(a^{(i)}_2 + c^{(i)}_2) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_1^{(j)}(b_1^{(j)} + b_2^{(j)}) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)}(b_2^{(j)})} \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} 1_A(z) \omega^{z^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)} M_i z + z^T \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} r_j} \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \omega^{z^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)} M_i z + z^T \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)} r_j}.
\]

The expectation in \(x\) is zero unless \(\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (v_1^{(j)} - v_2^{(j)}) r_j + \sum_{i=1}^{q} (u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)}) M_i z\) is the zero vector, in which case it equals 1. However, if the \(u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)}\) are not all zero, then the latter is an exceedingly rare event, as \(z\) is forced to lie in a fixed coset of the kernel of \(\sum_{i=1}^{q} (u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)}) M_i\). Since non-trivial combinations of \(M_i\) have rank at least \(p\), this situation arises for a proportion of at most \(p^{-p}\) of all \(z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n\). Similarly, if the \(u_1^{(i)} - u_2^{(i)}\) are all zero, then since the \(r_j\) are independent, the only way to obtain a non-zero contribution from the expectation in \(x\) is if \(v_1^{(j)} = v_2^{(j)}\) for all \(j \in [\ell]\). We therefore have that up to an error of \(O(p^{-n/2})\), \(d_A|\beta_{12}|/p^{2n}\) equals

\[
P^{-q-\ell} \mathbb{E}_{u_2^{(i)}, v_2^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{-\sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)}(a^{(i)}_1 + a^{(i)}_2 + 2c^{(i)}_2) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)}(b_1^{(j)} + b_2^{(j)})} \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} 1_A(z) \omega^{z^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)} M_i z + z^T \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)} r_j}.
\]

But now notice that this expression can be rearranged as \(p^{-2q-\ell} \mathbb{E}_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n}\) of

\[
1_A(z) \mathbb{E}_{u_2^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{z^T \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)} M_i z - \sum_{i=1}^{q} u_2^{(i)}(a^{(i)}_1 + a^{(i)}_2 + 2c^{(i)}_2)} \mathbb{E}_{v_2^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{z^T \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)} r_j - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} v_2^{(j)}(b_1^{(j)} + b_2^{(j)})},
\]

where the product of the expectations in \(u_2^{(i)}\) and \(v_2^{(j)}\) is exactly the indicator function of \(B_1\), as the labels of \(B_1\) are given by \((a^{(i)}_1 + a^{(i)}_2 + 2c^{(i)}_2)\), and \((b_1^{(j)} + b_2^{(j)})\), for the quadratic and the linear part, respectively. Now by (i), \(|\beta_{12}| = p^{-q}(1 + O(p^{4(q + \ell)/4}))|B_1||B_2| = p^{2n-(3q+2\ell)(1 + O(p^{6(q + \ell)/4}))}\), whence

\[
d_A = \frac{|A \cap B_1|}{|B_1|} + O(p^{7(q + \ell)/4}),
\]

proving (iii).

The same technique allows us to prove (iv): we compute \(|E_A^{(3)} \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|/(p^n)^3\) as

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x,y,z \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(x + y + z) 1_{B_1}(x) 1_{B_2}(y) 1_{B_3}(z) 1_{\beta_{13}}(x,z) 1_{\beta_{13}}(x) 1_{\beta_{12}}(x,y).
\]
Substituting for the indicator functions as before, and applying a change of variable \( z \mapsto w = x + y + z \), we find that \( |E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}|/(p^n)^3 \) equals

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x,y,w \in \mathbb{F}_p} I_A(w) E_{u_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, u_3^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} E_{v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}, v_3^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} E_{w_1^{(1)}, w_2^{(1)}, w_3^{(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{x^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i x + y^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i y + (w-x-y)^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i (w-x-y) \\
\omega^{y^T \sum_{j=1}^q v_j^{(j)} r_j + y^T \sum_{j=1}^q v_j^{(j)} r_j + (w-x-y)^T \sum_{j=1}^q v_j^{(j)} r_j} \\
\omega^{w^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i (w-x-y) + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i (w-x-y) + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i y} \\
- \sum_{k=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^q u_k^{(i)} - \sum_{k=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^q v_k^{(j)} - \sum_{k,m=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^q w_{km}^{(i)} c_{km},
\]

which in turn can be rearranged to give

\[
\mathbb{E}_{u_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{u^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i w - \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} v_1^{(j)} w_1^{(1)} + w^T \sum_{j=1}^q v_1^{(j)} r_j - \sum_{j=1}^q v_1^{(j)} c_{13}^{(j)}} \\
\mathbb{E}_{v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}, w_1^{(1)}, w_2^{(1)}, w_3^{(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{v^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + y^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w} \\
\omega^{x^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j + y^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j + x^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j} \\
\omega^{w^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w} \\
\omega^{w^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w}
\]

Now again by the Gauss sum lemma and the assumption on the rank of \((\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Q})\), the expectation in \( x \) is going to be \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \), unless \( u_1^{(1)} + u_3^{(1)} = u_1^{(1)} \) for all \( i \in [q] \). Similarly, the expectation in \( y \) is \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \) unless \( u_2^{(1)} + u_3^{(1)} = u_2^{(1)} \) for all \( i \in [q] \). This means that up to an error of \( O(p^{-\rho/2}) \), \( |E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|/(p^n)^3 \) equals

\[
p^{-2q} \mathbb{E}_{u_1^{(i)}, u_2^{(i)}, v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{u^T \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} M_i w - \sum_{i=1}^q u_i^{(i)} v_1^{(j)} w_1^{(1)} + w^T \sum_{j=1}^q v_1^{(j)} r_j - \sum_{j=1}^q v_1^{(j)} c_{13}^{(j)}} \\
\mathbb{E}_{v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}, w_1^{(1)}, w_2^{(1)}, w_3^{(1)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{v^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + y^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w} \\
\omega^{x^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j + y^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j + x^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j} \\
\omega^{w^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w}
\]

Considering again the expectation in \( x \) (holding the remaining variables fixed), we note that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i y + x^T \sum_{i=1}^q (u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(1)}) M_i w + x^T \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j} 
\]

is zero unless \( y \) and \( w \) happen to satisfy

\[(D.3) \sum_{i=1}^q (w_{12}^{(i)} - u_1^{(1)} - u_2^{(i)}) M_i y + \sum_{i=1}^q (u_1^{(1)} - u_3^{(1)}) M_i w = \sum_{j=1}^q (v_j^{(j)} - v_j^{(j)}) r_j.
\]

When \( u_{12}^{(i)} - u_1^{(1)} - u_2^{(i)} \) are not all zero, for any given \( w \) this happens for at most an \( O(p^{-\rho}) \)-proportion of \( y \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \). When the \( u_{12}^{(i)} - u_1^{(1)} - u_2^{(i)} \) are all zero but the \( u_1^{(1)} - u_3^{(1)} \) are not, then for any given \( y \), \([D.3]\) is satisfied for at most an \( O(p^{-\rho}) \)-proportion of \( w \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \). Non-negligible contributions to the overall expression must therefore come from the case that
$w_{12}^{(i)} - u_{1}^{(i)} - u_{2}^{(i)} = 0$ and $u_{1}^{(i)} - u_{3}^{(i)} = 0$ for all $i \in [q]$. In that case, the exponential sum in $x$ evaluates to 1 (by linear independence of the $r_j$) if and only if $u_{1}^{(j)} = u_{2}^{(j)}$ for all $j \in [\ell]$.

Putting all this together, we have that up to an error of $O(p^{-\rho/2})$, $|E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|/(p^n)^3$ equals

$$p^{-\ell-4q} \mathbb{E}_{w \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(w) \mathbb{E}_{u_{i_1}^{(i)}, \ldots, u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{u_{i_1}^{(i)} + u_{i_2}^{(i)} + \cdots + u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} r_{i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} b_{i}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_{i}^{(i)} c_{i}^{(i)} + c_{i}^{(i)}}$$

$$= p^{-\ell-4q} \mathbb{E}_{u_{i_1}^{(i)}, \ldots, u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (u_{i}^{(i)} + v_{i}^{(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_{i}^{(i)} (c_{2i}^{(i)} + c_{2i+1}^{(i)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_{i}^{(i)} c_{i}^{(i)} + c_{i}^{(i)}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} b_{i}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} r_{i}}.$$

Repeating the same reasoning as above, the exponential sum in $y$ will make a non-trivial contribution if and only if $u_{2}^{(i)} = u_{3}^{(i)}$ for all $i \in [q]$, and if $v_{2}^{(j)} = v_{3}^{(j)}$ for all $j \in [\ell]$. Hence, up to an error of $O(p^{-\rho/2})$, $|E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|/(p^n)^3$ equals

$$p^{-2\ell-5q} \mathbb{E}_{w \in \mathbb{F}_p} 1_A(w) \mathbb{E}_{u_{i_1}^{(i)}, \ldots, u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{u_{i_1}^{(i)} + u_{i_2}^{(i)} + \cdots + u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} r_{i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} b_{i}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} (c_{2i}^{(i)} + c_{2i+1}^{(i)})}$$

$$= p^{-2\ell-5q} \mathbb{E}_{u_{i_1}^{(i)}, \ldots, u_{i_{\ell}}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \omega^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} r_{i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} b_{i}^{(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{i}^{(i)} (c_{2i}^{(i)} + c_{2i+1}^{(i)})}.$$

But $B_5$ is labelled by $a_5^{(i)}$, $b_5^{(i)}$ satisfying $a_5^{(i)} = a_1^{(i)} + a_2^{(i)} + a_3^{(i)} + 2(c_{2i}^{(i)} + c_{2i+1}^{(i)})$ and $b_5^{(i)} = b_1^{(i)} + b_2^{(i)} + b_3^{(i)}$, whence by the above

$$\frac{|E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|}{(p^n)^3} = p^{-2\ell-5q} \frac{|A \cap B_5|}{p^n} + O(p^{-\rho/2}) = p^{-2\ell+6q} \frac{|A \cap B_5|}{|B_5|} + O(p^{-\rho/2}),$$

where the final equality stems from the fact that $|B_5| = p^n-(\ell+q)(1 + O(p^{\ell+q-\rho/2}))$.

A straightforward computation along now hopefully familiar lines confirms that

$$|K_3^{(2)}(G)|/(p^n)^3 = \mathbb{E}_{x,y,z} 1_{B_1}(x) 1_{B_2}(y) 1_{B_3}(z) 1_{\beta_{12}(x,y)} 1_{\beta_{13}(x,z)} 1_{\beta_{23}(y,z)} = p^{-2\ell+6q} + O(p^{-\rho/2}).$$

It follows that

$$d_A = \frac{|E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|}{|K_3^{(2)}(G)|} = \frac{|E_A \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)|}{(p^n)^3} \frac{(p^n)^3}{|K_3^{(2)}(G)|}$$

equals

$$\left( p^{-2\ell+6q} \frac{|A \cap B_5|}{|B_5|} + O(p^{-\rho/2}) \right) \left( p^{-2\ell+6q} + O(p^{-\rho/2}) \right)^{-1} = \frac{|A \cap B_5|}{|B_5|} + O(p^{12(\ell+q)-\rho/2}),$$

completing the proof of (iv).

\[ \square \]

**APPENDIX E. COUNTERING LEMMAS AND COROLLARIES**

The goal of this section is to prove various counting lemmas and related corollaries. In this section, we will write $a \ll b$ to mean $a$ is sufficiently small as a function of $b$, and similarly, we will write $a \gg b$ to mean $a$ is sufficiently large as a function of $b$. We begin by proving Lemma 4.19, which is required for Lemma 4.18. It will be convenient to work with $\epsilon$-regularity here, which is no loss of generality by the following (see e.g. [16]).
**Fact E.1.** For all $\epsilon, r > 0$ the following hold.  

1. There is $\delta > 0$ so that if $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is a bipartite graph with $\operatorname{dev}_2(\delta, r)$, then $G$ is an $\epsilon$-regular pair with density in $(r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$.  
2. There is $\delta > 0$ so that if $G = (U \cup V, E)$ is an $\epsilon$-regular pair with density in $(r - \delta, r + \delta)$, then it has $\operatorname{dev}_2(\epsilon, r)$.

We will use the following well known lemma (see e.g. [30]).

**Lemma E.2** (Sub-pairs lemma). Suppose $G = (A \cup B, E)$ is a bipartite graph and $|E|/|A||B| = d$. If $A' \subseteq A, B' \subseteq B$ satisfy $|A'| \geq \gamma|A|$ and $|B'| \geq \gamma|B|$ for some $\gamma \geq \epsilon$, and $G$ is an $\epsilon$-regular pair, then $G' := (A' \cup B', G[A', B'])$ is $\epsilon'$-regular where $\epsilon' = 2\gamma^{-2}\epsilon$.

**Proof of Lemma E.1.** Fix $r, \mu > 0$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mu < 1/4$. Let $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(r, \mu^3, 3)$ and $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_2(r, \mu^2, 3)$ be from Lemma E.1. Let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\epsilon_2, r)$ as in Fact E.1. Then choose $\epsilon \ll \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \mu, r, \delta_1$, let $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\epsilon, r)$ be as in Fact E.1, and set $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$.

Suppose $G = (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3, E)$ is a 3-partite graph such that for all $ij \in \binom{[3]}{2}$, $||V_i|| - ||V_j|| \leq \delta||V_i||$ and $G[V_i, V_j]$ has $\operatorname{dev}_2(\delta_1)$, and density $r_{ij} \in (r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)$. By Fact E.1 each $G[V_i, V_j]$ is $\epsilon$-regular, and by Lemma E.6 $K_3^{(2)}(G) = (1 + \mu^3)r^3||V_1||||V_2||||V_3||$. $\epsilon' = 2\epsilon(r - 2\epsilon)^2$.

Given $(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3$, let $V_1(v_2v_3) = V_1 \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_2)$, $V_2(v_1v_3) = V_2 \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_3)$, and $V_3(v_1v_2) = V_3 \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_2)$. We then define $I = \{(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 : \max\{||V_1(v_2v_3)|| - r^2||V_1||, ||V_2(v_1v_3)|| - r^2||V_2||, ||V_3(v_1v_2)|| - r^2||V_3||\} \leq 4\epsilon'}$.

**Claim E.3.** $|I| \geq (1 - \mu^2)||V_1||||V_2|||V_3||$.

**Proof.** Define $V'_2 = \{v \in V_2 : ||N(v_2) \cap V_1|| - r_{12}||V_1|| \leq \epsilon||V_1||, ||N(v_2) \cap V_3|| - r_{23}||V_3|| \leq \epsilon||V_3||\}$. Since $G[V_2, V_1]$ and $G[V_2, V_3]$ are $\epsilon$-regular, $|V'_2| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon)||V_2||$.

Fix any $v_2 \in V'_2$, and set $V'_1(v_2) = V_1 \cap N(v_2)$ and $V'_3(v_2) = V_3 \cap N(v_2)$. Clearly, $|V'_1(v_2)| \geq (r - 2\epsilon)||V_1||$ and $|V'_3(v_2)| \geq (r - 2\epsilon)||V_3||$. By Lemma E.2 $G[V'_1, V'_3(v_2)]$ is $\epsilon'$-regular. Let $r_{13}'$ denote the density of $G[V'_1, V'_3(v_2)]$. By regularity of $G[V'_1, V'_3], |r_{13}' - r_{13}| \leq \epsilon$. Now define $V'_1(v_2) = \{v \in V_1 : ||N(v) \cap V'_3(v_2)|| - r_{13}'||V'_1|||V'_3(v_2)|| \leq \epsilon||V'_3(v_2)||$ and $||N(v) \cap V'_2|| - r_{12}||V'_2|| \leq \epsilon||V'_2||\}$. By $\epsilon'$-regularity of $G[V'_1, V'_3(v_2)]$ and $\epsilon$-regularity of $G[V_1, V_3], |V'_1(v_2)| \geq (r - 2\epsilon - 2\epsilon)||V'_1||$.

Fix $v_1 \in V'_1(v_2)$, and set $V'_2(v_1) = V_2 \cap N(v_1)$. Clearly $|V'_2(v_1)| \geq (r_{12} - \epsilon)||V'_2||$. Let $r_{13}'$ be the density of $G[V'_2, V'_1(v_1)]$. By $\epsilon$-regularity of $G[V'_2, V'_1], |r_{13}' - r_{13}| \leq \epsilon$, and by Lemma E.2 $G[V_3, V'_2(v_1)]$ is $\epsilon$-regular. Finally, consider $V'_3(v_1v_2) := \{v \in V_3 : ||N(v) \cap V'_3(v_2)|| - r_{13}'||V'_3(v_2)|| \leq \epsilon||V'_3(v_2)||$ and $||N(v) \cap V'_2(v_1)|| - r_{13}'||V'_2(v_1)|| \leq \epsilon||V'_2(v_1)||\}$. Since $G[V_3, V'_2(v_1)]$ and $G[V_3, V'_3(v_2)]$ are $\epsilon'$-regular, $|V'_3(v_1v_2)| \geq |V_3||r^2 - 4\epsilon'|$. Now it is not difficult to check that for any $v_3 \in V'_3(v_1v_2), (v_1, v_2, v_3) \in I$ (this will use our choice of $\epsilon \ll r, \mu$).

Thus we have the following process for constructing distinct elements of $I$.  

\[\]
Therefore, we have that
\[ |I| \geq (1 - 4\epsilon)(r - 2\epsilon - 2\epsilon')(r^2 - 4\epsilon')|V_1||V_2||V_3| \geq r^3(1 - \mu^3)|V_1||V_2||V_3|, \]
where the second inequality is since \( \epsilon \ll r, \mu \).

Combining Claim \[E.3\] with the estimate on the size of \( K_3^{(2)}(G) \), we have that
\[ |I \cap K_3^{(2)}(G)| \geq r^3(1 - 2\mu^3)|V_1||V_2||V_3| \geq r^3(1 - \mu^2)|V_1||V_2||V_3|. \]
We claim that \( I \cap K_3^{(2)}(G) \subseteq J \), which will finish the proof. Indeed, suppose \( v_1v_2v_3 \in I \cap K_3^{(2)}(G) \). Clearly
\[ K_2.2.2[v_1, v_2, v_3] = K_3^{(2)}(G) \cap [V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)]. \]
By definition of \( I \), each of \( V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2) \) have sizes \((r^2 \pm 4\epsilon')|V_1|\), \((r^2 \pm 4\epsilon')|V_2|\), and \((r^2 \pm 4\epsilon')|V_3|\), respectively. By Lemma \[E.2\], each of \( G[V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3)], G[V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)], \) and \( G[V_1(v_2v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)] \) are \( \epsilon''\)-regular, where \( \epsilon'' = 2\epsilon(r^2 - 4\epsilon')^{-2} \).
Since \( r^2 - 4\epsilon' \geq \epsilon \), and since each of \( G[V_1, V_2], G[V_1, V_3], \) and \( G[V_2, V_3] \) are \( \epsilon\)-regular with density in \((r - \epsilon, r + \epsilon)\), each of each of \( G[V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3)], G[V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)], \) and \( G[V_1(v_2v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)] \) have density in \((r - 2\epsilon, r + 2\epsilon)\). By Fact \[E.1(2)\], each of \( G[U_{uw}, W_{uw}], G[U_{uw}, W_{uw}] \), and \( G[U_{uw}, W_{uw}] \) has \( \text{dev}_2(\epsilon, r) \). By Lemma \[E.6\],
\[ |K_3^{(2)}(G) \cap K_3[V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2)]| \leq r^3(1 + \mu^3)|V_1(v_2v_3)||V_2(v_1v_3)||V_3(v_1v_2)| \]
\[ \leq r^9(1 + \mu)|V_1||V_2||V_3|, \]
where the final inequality is by our assumption on the sizes of \( V_1(v_2v_3), V_2(v_1v_3), V_3(v_1v_2) \) and because \( \epsilon' \ll \mu \). Thus we have shown \( v_1v_2v_3 \in I \cap K_3^{(2)}(G) \), which finishes the proof.

We now give a proof of Lemma \[5.30\].

Proof of Lemma \[5.30\]. We proceed by induction on \( k \). For \( k = 2 \), let \( D(k, \epsilon) = N(k, \epsilon, r) = 2 \) for all \( \epsilon, r \in (0, 1/2) \). Then the conclusion of Lemma \[5.30\] is trivial from the assumptions.

Suppose now \( k \geq 2 \), and assume by induction that for all \( \epsilon, r \in (0, 1/2) \), we have chosen \( D = D(k, \epsilon) \) and \( N = N(k, \epsilon, r) \) such that the conclusions of Lemma \[5.30\] holds.

Fix \( k_1, k_2 \geq 1 \) such that \( k_1 + k_2 = k + 1 \) and fix \( \epsilon, r > 0 \). Set \( \epsilon' = \epsilon^{2k} \), and let \( D_1 = D_1(k, \epsilon') \) and \( N_1 = N_1(k, \epsilon', r - r^{D_1}) \) be chosen using the inductive hypothesis. Given \( r \in (0, 1/2) \), define \( f_r(x) = (1 - r - x)^{(k+1)2}/2 \). Note that \( f_{1/2} \) is increasing on \([2, \infty)\) and \( \lim_{x \to \infty} f_{1/2}(x) = 1 \). Choose \( D_2 \) sufficiently large so that \( f_{1/2}(x) \geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon')^{-1} \). Note \( D_2 \) depends only on \( k \) and \( \epsilon \). Observe that if \( 0 < r \leq 1/2 \) and \( x \geq 1 \), \( f_r(x) \geq f_{1/2}(x) \). Now define \( D = D(k + 1, \epsilon) = \max\{D_2, 2 + 2(k + 1)D_1\} \), and set \( N = N(k + 1, \epsilon, r) = r^{-1}\epsilon^{-1}N_1 \).

Suppose \( G = (U \cup W, \beta) \) be a bipartite graph, and let \( U = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_1} U_i, W = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_2} W_i \) be partitions of \( U \) and \( W \) into parts of size \( n \geq N \). Assume that for each \( (i, j) \in [k_1] \times [k_2] \), \( G[U_i, W_j] \) is \( r^D \)-regular with density \( r_{ij} \geq r \).
By regularity of the pairs \((V_1, W_1), \ldots, (V_r, W_r)\), there is a set \(V'_1 \subseteq V_1\) of size at least 
\((1 - k2rD)|V_1|\) such that for all \(v \in V'_1\), and \(j \in [k_1], |N(v) \cap W_j| \geq (r - rD)|W_j|\). 
Note that because \(D \geq 2 + k\) and \(r \leq 1/2\), \(r - rD \geq rD\), and \(1 - k2rD \geq rD\).

Fix \(v \in V'_1\), and for each \(j \in [k_1]\), define \(W'_j = N(v) \cap W_j\). For each \(2 \leq i \leq k_1\) and \(1 \leq j \leq k_2\), by regularity of \((V_i, W_j)\), the density of \(\beta\) on \((V_i, W'_j)\) is at least \(r_{ij} - rD \geq rD\).

Further, by the slicing lemma, \((V_i, W'_j)\) is at least \(\epsilon'\)-regular, where

\[
\epsilon' = 2(r - rD)^{-2}rD \leq 4rD^{-1} \leq (r - rD)^{D_1},
\]

where the inequality is since \(D \geq 2 + 2(k + 1)D_1\) and \(r \leq 1/2\).

By the inductive hypothesis applied to \(r' = r - rD\), \(\epsilon'\), and \(k\), there is a set \(I_v \subseteq \prod_{i=2}^{k_1} V_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} W'_j\) of size at least 
\((1 - \epsilon')(r')^{(k_1 - 1)k_2} \prod_{i=2}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W'_j|\) such that for all \((v_i)_{2 \leq i \leq k_1}(w_j)_{j \in [k_2]} \in I_v\), \(v_iw_j \in \beta\) for all \(2 \leq i \leq k_1\) and \(1 \leq j \leq k_2\). By construction, for all \((v_i)_{2 \leq i \leq k_1}(w_j)_{j \in [k_2]} \in I_v\), setting \(v = v_1\), we have that the tuple \((v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k_1}(w_j)_{j \in [k_2]} \in I_{v_1}\).

Let \(I = \bigcup_{v \in V'_1} I_v\). Then \(I \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} V_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} W_j\), and for all \((v_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k_1}(w_j)_{j \in [k_2]} \in I, v_iw_j \in \beta\) for all \(i \in [k_1], j \in [k_2]\). By above, we have that

\[
|I| \geq (1 - k2rD)(r - rD)^{k_2} \cdot (1 - \epsilon')(r')^{(k_1 - 1)k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j| = (1 - k2rD)(1 - \epsilon')(1 - rD)^{k_1k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j| = (1 - \epsilon')(1 - rD^{2/3})^{k_1k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j| \geq (1 - \epsilon')f_r(D)^{k_1k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j|,
\]

where the last inequality uses the AM-GM inequality to conclude \(k_1k_2 \leq (k + 1)^2/2\), and consequently, \((1 - rD^{2/3})^{k_1k_2} \geq f_r(D)\). By our choice of \(D\), \(f_r(D) \geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon')^{-1}\), and consequently \(|I| \geq (1 - \epsilon)r^{k_1k_2} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} |V_i| \times \prod_{j=1}^{k_2} |W_j|\), as desired. \(\square\)

The following is an exercise.

**Fact E.4.** Suppose \(H = (U \cup V; R)\) is a bipartite graph. For all \(\epsilon > 0\), if \(|R \cap K_2[U, V]| \leq \epsilon|K_2[U, V]|\). Then \(H\) is \(\epsilon^{1/4}\)-regular.

**Proof of Lemma 5.32** Fix \(k \geq 2\) and \(\epsilon > 0\). Without loss of generality, assume \(0 < \epsilon < 1/4\). Let \(D = D(k, \epsilon^2)\) be from Lemma 5.30. Set \(\delta = \epsilon^{8kD}\), and let \(N = N(k, \epsilon^2, 1 - \delta)\) be from Lemma 5.30.

Now suppose \(F = (U \cup W, R)\) satisfies \(|U| + |W| = k\), say \(U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{k_1}\}\) and \(W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{k_2}\}\) for some \(k_1 + k_2 = k\). Suppose \(G = (V, E)\) is a graph and \(V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k_1}\}\) and \(W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{k_2}\}\) for some \(k_1 + k_2 = k\).
Higher-Order Generalizations of Stability and Arithmetic Regularity


References


**Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA**
*Email address: terry.376@osu.edu*

**Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK**
*Email address: julia.wolf@dpmms.cam.ac.uk*