

# A generalization of Croot-Lev-Pach's Lemma and a new upper bound for the size of difference sets in polynomial rings

Gábor Hegedüs

Óbuda University

Bécsi út 96, Budapest, Hungary, H-1037

hegedus.gabor@nik.uni-obuda.hu

March 16, 2022

## Abstract

Croot, Lev and Pach used a new polynomial technique to give a new exponential upper bound for the size of three-term progression-free subsets in the groups  $(\mathbb{Z}_4)^n$ .

The main tool in proving their striking result is a simple lemma about polynomials, which gives interesting new bounds for the size of subsets of the vector space  $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$ .

Our main result is a generalization of this lemma. In the proof we combined Tao's slice rank bounding method with Gröbner basis technique.

As an application, we improve Green's results and present new upper bounds for the size of difference sets in polynomial rings. We give a new, more concrete upper bound for the size of arithmetic progression-free subsets in  $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$ .

---

<sup>0</sup> Keywords. Difference sets; Gröbner basis; slice rank bounding method  
**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05B10, 13P10, 15A69**

# 1 Introduction

It is a challenging old problem to find strong upper bounds for the size of progression-free subsets in finite Abelian groups.

Croot, Lev and Pach achieved a breakthrough in this research area and gave a new exponential upper bound for the size of three-term progression-free subsets in the groups  $(\mathbb{Z}_4)^n$  (see [6]), where  $n \geq 1$  is arbitrary.

The following simple statement was proved in [6] Lemma 1.

**Proposition 1.1** *Suppose that  $n \geq 1$  and  $d \geq 0$  are integers,  $P$  is a multilinear polynomial in  $n$  variables of total degree at most  $d$  over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ , and  $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$  is a subset with*

$$|A| > 2 \sum_{i=0}^{d/2} \binom{n}{i}.$$

*If  $P(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in A$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}$ , then  $P(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ .*

Our main result is the following generalization of Proposition 1.1.

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Define  $t_i := |A_i|$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$  be a finite subset. Suppose that there exists a polynomial*

$$P(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}, \dots, x_{m,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}) \in \mathbb{F}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}]$$

*satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i)  $P(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) \in \mathcal{F}^m$  is an arbitrary vector such that there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ , then  $P(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = 0$ .

*Let  $k := \deg(P)$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m \left| \{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t_i - 1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{k}{m}\} \right|. \quad (1)$$

The following Corollary is a clear special case.

**Corollary 1.3** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $|A_1| = \dots = |A_n| = t > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$  be a finite subset. Suppose that there exists a polynomial*

$$P(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}, \dots, x_{m,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}) \in \mathbb{F}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}]$$

*satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i)  $P(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) \in \mathcal{F}^m$  is an arbitrary vector such that there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ , then  $P(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = 0$ .

Let  $k := \deg(P)$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m |\{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{k}{m}\}|. \quad (2)$$

Let  $t, d \geq 2$  be integers. Define

$$J(t, d) := \frac{1}{t} \left( \min_{0 < x < 1} \frac{1 - x^t}{1 - x} x^{-\frac{t-1}{d}} \right).$$

**Remark.** Define  $J(q) := J(q, 3)$  for each  $q > 1$ .

$J(q)$  is the same constant which appeared in Ellenberg and Gijswijt's bound for the size of three-term progression-free sets (see [7]), and it was proved in [3] Proposition 4.12 that  $J(q)$  is a decreasing function of  $q$  and

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} J(q) = \inf_{z > 3} \frac{z - z^{-2}}{3 \log(z)} = 0.8414 \dots$$

It is easy to verify that  $J(3) = 0.9184$ , consequently  $J(q)$  lies in the range

$$0.8414 \leq J(q) \leq 0.9184$$

for each  $q \geq 3$ .

We use in our proof the following inequality.

**Theorem 1.4** Let  $n \geq 1$ ,  $t, s \geq 2$  be integers. Let  $B := \{0, 1, \dots, t-1\}$ . Consider the set

$$B(n, s, t) := \{\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in B^n : \sum_i v_i \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{s}\}.$$

Then

$$|B(n, s, t)| \leq (tJ(t, s))^n.$$

Finally we get the following result.

**Corollary 1.5** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $|A_1| = \dots = |A_n| = t > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$  be a finite subset. Suppose that there exists a polynomial

$$P(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}, \dots, x_{m,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}) \in \mathbb{F}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}]$$

satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $P(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) \in \mathcal{F}^m$  is an arbitrary vector such that there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ , then  $P(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = 0$ .

Let  $d := \frac{mn(t-1)}{\deg(P)}$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m(tJ(t, d))^n.$$

**Proof.** Corollary 1.5 follows easily from Corollary 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

Namely

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m \left| \{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{\deg(P)}{m}\} \right| \quad (3)$$

by Corollary 1.3.

But

$$\frac{\deg(P)}{m} = \frac{n(t-1)}{d},$$

hence

$$B(n, d, t) = \{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and}$$

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{\deg(P)}{m} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Consequently

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m|B(n, d, t)| = m(tJ(t, d))^n$$

by Theorem 1.4. □

**Corollary 1.6** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $|A_1| = \dots = |A_n| = t > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$  be a finite subset. Suppose that there exists a polynomial*

$$P(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{2,n}, \dots, x_{m,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}) \in \mathbb{F}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}]$$

satisfying the following conditions:

- (i)  $P(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) \in \mathcal{F}^m$  is an arbitrary vector such that there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ , then  $P(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = 0$ .

Let  $d := \frac{mn(t-1)}{\deg(P)}$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m \left( \frac{d+t-1}{d} \left( \frac{d+t-1}{t-1} \right)^{\frac{t-1}{d}} \right)^n.$$

As an illustrative example, we prove the following application of Corollary 1.6.

**Corollary 1.7** *Let  $q > 2$  denote a prime power. Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  be a three-term arithmetic progression-free subset. Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 3 \left( \frac{q+2}{3} \left( \frac{q+2}{q-1} \right)^{\frac{q-1}{3}} \right)^n.$$

**Proof.** Consider the polynomial

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n, z_1, \dots, z_n) := \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - (x_i - 2y_i + z_i)^{q-1}).$$

Then

$$P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}) = 1$$

for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3 \in \mathcal{F}$  be three elements of the subset  $\mathcal{F}$  such that there exist indices  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ . Then

$$P(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3) = 0,$$

because  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  is a three-term progression-free subset.

Consequently we can apply Corollary 1.6 with the choices  $m := 3$ ,  $t := q$ . Then  $\deg(P) = n(q - 1)$ ,  $d = 3$  and we get our result.  $\square$

In Section 2 we collected all the preliminaries which we used in our proofs. In Section 3 we present the proofs of our main results.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Slice rank

First we define the slice rank of functions. This notion appeared first in Tao's blog, where Tao gave a new argument to prove Ellenberg and Gijswijt's upper bound for the size of arithmetic progression-free subsets in the groups  $(\mathbb{Z}_3)^n$  (see the details in [10]).

Let  $A$  be a fixed finite set,  $m \geq 1$  be a fixed integer and  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. By definition a function  $F : A^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  has *slice-rank* one, if it has the following form:

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto f(x_i)g(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_m),$$

for some  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and some functions  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ ,  $g : A^{m-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ . Then the slice rank  $\text{slice-rank}(F)$  of a function  $F : A^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is the least number of rank one functions needed to generate  $F$  as a linear combination. It is easy to check that if  $m = 2$ , then the slice rank  $\text{slice-rank}(F)$  of a function  $F : A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is precisely the usual definition of the rank of a function  $F : A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ .

Let  $\delta_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$  denote the usual Kronecker delta function. Tao proved the following result about the slice rank of diagonal hyper-matrices in [10] Lemma 1 (see also [3] Lemma 4.7).

**Theorem 2.1** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a fixed field,  $A$  be a finite subset and let  $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$  denote a coefficient for each  $\alpha \in A$ . Let  $m \geq 2$  be a fixed integer. Consider the function

$$F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) := \sum_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha \delta_\alpha(\mathbf{x}_1) \dots \delta_\alpha(\mathbf{x}_m) : A^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}.$$

Then

$$\text{slice-rank}(F) = |\{\alpha \in A : c_\alpha \neq 0\}|.$$

## 2.2 Gröbner basis theory

We give here a short summary about Gröbner basis theory.

We say that a linear order  $\prec$  on the monomials over variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  is a *term order*, if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) 1 is the minimal element of  $\prec$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{w} \prec \mathbf{v}\mathbf{w}$  holds for any monomials  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$  with  $\mathbf{u} \prec \mathbf{v}$ .

The *leading monomial*  $\text{lm}(f)$  of a nonzero polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  is the  $\prec$ -largest monomial which appears with nonzero coefficient in the canonical form of  $f$  as a linear combination of monomials. Similarly,  $\text{lc}(f)$  denotes the leading coefficient of  $f$ , where  $f \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  is a nonzero polynomial.

Let  $I$  be an ideal of the ring  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ . Recall that a finite subset  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq I$  is a *Gröbner basis* of  $I$  if for every  $f \in I$  there exists a polynomial  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\text{lm}(g)$  divides  $\text{lm}(f)$ . This means that the leading monomials  $\text{lm}(g)$  for  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  generate the semi-group ideal of monomials  $\{\text{lm}(f) : f \in I\}$ . It follows easily that  $\mathcal{G}$  is actually a basis of  $I$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{G}$  generates  $I$  as an ideal of  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  (cf. [5] Corollary 2.5.6). It is a well-known result (cf. [4, Chapter 1, Corollary 3.12] or [1, Corollary 1.6.5, Theorem 1.9.1]) that every nonzero ideal  $I$  of  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  has a Gröbner basis.

We say that a monomial  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}[\mathbf{x}]$  is a *standard monomial* for  $I$  if it is not a leading monomial for any  $f \in I$ . We denote by  $\text{Sm}(I)$  the set of standard monomials of  $I$ .

Finally we introduce here shortly the notion of reduction. Let  $\prec$  be a fixed term order. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a set of polynomials in  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  and let  $f \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a fixed polynomial. We can reduce  $f$  by the set  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to  $\prec$ . This gives us a new polynomial  $h \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .

The term *reduction* means that we possibly repeatedly replace monomials in  $f$  by smaller ones (with respect to  $\prec$ ). This reduction process is the following: if  $w$  is a monomial occurring in  $f$  and  $\text{lm}(g)$  divides  $w$  for some  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  (i.e.  $w = \text{lm}(g)u$  for some monomial  $u$ ), then we replace  $w$  in  $f$  with  $u(\text{lm}(g) - \frac{g}{\text{lc}(g)})$ . It is easy to check that the monomials in  $u(\text{lm}(g) - \frac{g}{\text{lc}(g)})$  are  $\prec$ -smaller than  $w$ .

It is a basic fact that  $\text{Sm}(I)$  constitutes a basis of the  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector-space  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$  in the sense that every polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  can be uniquely expressed as  $h + f$  where  $f \in I$  and  $h$  is a unique  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear combination of monomials from  $\text{Sm}(I)$ . Consequently if  $g \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is an arbitrary polynomial and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a Gröbner basis of  $I$ , then we can reduce  $g$  with  $\mathcal{G}$  into a linear combination of standard monomials for  $I$ .

The next Lemma is well-known fact.

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$ . Define  $t_i := |A_i|$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Define the subset  $\mathcal{M} := \prod_{i=1}^n A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ . Then*

$$\text{Sm}(I(\mathcal{M})) = \{\mathbf{x} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t_i - 1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{K} := \{\mathbf{x} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t_i - 1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

We need in our proofs for the following Lemma.

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an arbitrary field. Let  $A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  be fixed subsets of  $\mathbb{F}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Define the subset  $\mathcal{M} := \prod_{i=1}^n A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$  and consider  $(\mathcal{M})^m \subseteq (\mathbb{F}^n)^m$ . Then*

$$\text{Sm}(I(\mathcal{M}^m)) = \{\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbf{x}_m : \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \in \mathcal{K}\}.$$

### 3 Proofs

We state here first Sondow and Zudilin's upper bound for the binomial coefficient (see [9]).

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $s \geq 1$  be a positive integer and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrary real. Then*

$$\binom{(r+1)s}{s} \leq \left( \frac{(r+1)^{r+1}}{r^r} \right)^s.$$



□

We use the following combinatorial Lemma in the proofs of our main results.

**Lemma 3.2** *Consider the set of monomials*

$$D(n, k) := \{\mathbf{x} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_n^{\alpha_n} : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq k\}.$$

Then

$$|D(n, k)| = \binom{n+k}{n}.$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.2:**

Define the subset  $\mathcal{M} := \prod_{i=1}^n A_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  denote the deglex reduced Gröbner basis of the ideal  $I((\mathcal{M})^m)$ . Let  $H$  denote the reduction of the polynomial  $P$  via  $\mathcal{G}$ . Clearly

- (i)  $H(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) = G(\mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{a}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) \in \mathcal{F}^m$  is an arbitrary vector such that there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  with  $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{a}_j$ , then  $H(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = G(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = 0$ ;
- (iii)  $\deg(H) \leq k$ ;
- (iv) if we expand  $H$  as a linear combination of monomials

$$H = \sum_{\underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^{nm}} c_{\underline{\alpha}} x^{\underline{\alpha}},$$

then  $x^{\underline{\alpha}} \in \text{Sm}(I(\mathcal{M}^m))$  for each  $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^{nm}$ , where  $c_{\underline{\alpha}} \neq 0$ .

We can derive easily property (iii), since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a deglex Gröbner basis of the ideal  $I((\mathcal{M})^m)$ .

It follows from Theorem 2.1 that

$$\text{slice-rank}(H) = |\mathcal{F}|.$$

On the other hand if we expand  $H$  as a linear combination of monomials, then we get

$$H(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{m,n}) = \sum_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)} \beta(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_m,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j &= (\alpha_{j,1}, \dots, \alpha_{j,n}), \\ \mathbf{x}_j &= x_{j,1}^{\alpha_{j,1}} \dots x_{j,n}^{\alpha_{j,n}} \end{aligned}$$

and  $0 \leq \alpha_{j,i} \leq t_i - 1$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Here we used the description of the standard monomials appearing in Lemma 2.3.

Clearly  $\deg(\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_m) \leq k$ .

It follows from the pigeonhole principle that at least one of  $|\alpha_1|, \dots, |\alpha_m|$  is at most  $\frac{k}{m}$ .

First consider the contribution of the monomials for which  $|\alpha_1| \leq \frac{k}{m}$ .

We regroup this contribution as

$$\sum_{\alpha_1} x^{\alpha_1} g_{\alpha_1}(\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m),$$

where  $\alpha_1$  ranges over those  $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \prod_{j=1}^n \{0, 1, \dots, t_j - 1\}$  with  $\sum_{s=1}^n i_s \leq \frac{k}{m}$ . Here  $g_{\alpha_1}(\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m)$  stand for some explicitly computable functions.

The number of such  $\alpha_1$  is

$$|\{x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_n^{\beta_n} : 0 \leq \beta_i \leq t_i - 1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \leq \frac{k}{m}\}|.$$

The remaining contributions arising from the cases  $|\alpha_2|, \dots, |\alpha_m|$ .

Hence we get that

$$\text{slice-rank}(P) = \text{slice-rank}(H) \leq m |\{x_1^{\beta_1} \dots x_n^{\beta_n} : 0 \leq \beta_i \leq t_i - 1$$

$$\text{for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \leq \frac{k}{m}\}|.$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 1.4:**

Theorem 1.4 follows from [3] Prop 4.12. For the reader's convenience we include here a short proof.

We use here a Chernoff type technique to give an upper bound for the size of  $B(n, s, t)$ .

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  denote independent uniform random variables on  $\{0, 1, \dots, t-1\}$  and let  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . Then clearly  $|B(n, s, t)|$  is at most

$$t^n \mathbb{P}\left(X \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{s}\right),$$

and by Markov's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{s}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}(x^X) x^{-\frac{n(t-1)}{s}}$$

for each  $0 < x < 1$ , consequently

$$\mathbb{E}(x^X) x^{-\frac{n(t-1)}{s}} = (\mathbb{E}(x^{X_i}))^n x^{-\frac{n(t-1)}{s}},$$

since  $X_i$  are independent random variables. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{s}\right) \leq t^{-n} \left(\frac{1-x^t}{1-x} x^{-\frac{t-1}{s}}\right)^n,$$

since

$$\mathbb{E}(x^{X_i}) = \frac{t(1-x^t)}{1-x}$$

and finally this implies that

$$|B(n, s, t)| \leq \left(\min_{0 < x < 1} \frac{1-x^t}{1-x} x^{-\frac{t-1}{s}}\right)^n = (tJ(t, s))^n.$$

□

### Proof of Corollary 1.6:

It follows from Corollary 1.3 that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m |\{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{\deg(P)}{m}\}|. \tag{5}$$

But

$$\frac{\deg(P)}{m} = \frac{n(t-1)}{d},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{\deg(P)}{m}\} = \\ & = \{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{d}\} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

But then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq t-1 \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n, \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{d}\}| \leq \\ & |\{x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \leq \frac{n(t-1)}{d}\}| = \binom{n + \frac{n(t-1)}{d}}{n} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.2, hence

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m \binom{\frac{n(t-1)+nd}{d}}{n}.$$

It follows from Theorem 3.1 with the choices  $s := n$  and  $r := \frac{n(p-1)}{d}$  that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq m \left( \frac{d+t-1}{d} \left( \frac{d+t-1}{t-1} \right)^{\frac{t-1}{d}} \right)^n.$$

□

## 4 Application

Let  $q$  be a prime power and  $n \geq 1$  be a fixed integer. Denote by  $P(q, n)$  the  $n$ -dimensional vector space over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of all polynomials  $a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + a_0$  of degree less than  $n$ .

Green proved the following result in [8].

**Theorem 4.1** *Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer and let  $q$  be a prime power. Define*

$$c(k, q) := (2k^2 D_q(k)^2 \log(q))^{-1},$$

*where  $D_q(k)$  is the sum of the digits of  $k$  in base  $q$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq P(q, n)$  is a subset with  $|\mathcal{F}| > 2q^{(1-c(k,q))n}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  contains distinct polynomials  $p(x), q(x)$  such that  $p(x) - q(x) = h(x)^k$  for some  $h(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ .*

In [8] Green derived Theorem 4.1 from the following result.

**Theorem 4.2** *Let  $d' \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose that  $0 < m' \leq n$ . Let  $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) : (\mathbb{F}_q)^{m'} \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  be a polynomial map, in which each  $\phi_i$  is a polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $m'$  variables with total degree at most  $d'$ . Suppose that  $\gcd(|\Phi^{-1}(0)|, q) = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  be a subset such that  $(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}) \cap \text{im}(\Phi) = \{0\}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2q^n \exp\left(\frac{-m'^2}{2nd'^2}\right).$$

Theorem 4.2 is based on the following Lemma.

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $d' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 < m' \leq n$  be integers. Suppose that  $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) : (\mathbb{F}_q)^{m'} \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  is a polynomial map of degree at most  $d'$ , i.e. each  $\phi_i$  is a polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $m'$  variables with total degree at most  $d'$ . Suppose that  $\gcd(|\Phi^{-1}(0)|, q) = 1$ . Then there exists a polynomial  $Q \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with no variable having degree greater than  $q - 1$  such that*

- (i)  $\deg(Q) \leq (q - 1)(n - \frac{m'}{d'})$ ;
- (ii)  $Q(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{im}(\Phi)$ ;
- (iii)  $Q(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$ .

Our main result is the following new upper bound for the size of difference sets in polynomial rings.

**Theorem 4.4** *Let  $d' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 < m' \leq n$  be integers. Suppose that  $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n) : (\mathbb{F}_q)^{m'} \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  is a polynomial map of degree at most  $d'$ , i.e. each  $\phi_i$  is a polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $m'$  variables with total degree at most  $d'$ . Suppose that  $\gcd(|\Phi^{-1}(0)|, q) = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$  be a subset such that  $(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}) \cap \text{im}(\Phi) = \{0\}$ . Let  $s := \frac{2nd'}{nd' - m'}$ . Then*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2(qJ(q, s))^n.$$

**Proof.**

By Lemma 4.3 there exists a polynomial  $Q \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with no variable having degree greater than  $q - 1$  such that

- (i)  $\deg(Q) \leq (q - 1)(n - \frac{m'}{d'})$ ;
- (ii)  $Q(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{im}(\Phi)$ ;
- (iii)  $Q(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$ .

Consider the polynomial  $P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := Q(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ , where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Then

- (i)  $P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}) = Q(\mathbf{0}) \neq 0$  for each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}$ ;
- (ii) if  $\mathbf{a}_1 \neq \mathbf{a}_2$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $P(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) = Q(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2) = 0$ .

Here (ii) follows easily from the facts that  $(\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}) \cap \text{im}(\Phi) = \{0\}$  and  $Q(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \notin \text{im}(\Phi)$ .

Hence we can apply Corollary 1.5 with  $m := 2$  and we get our result. Namely

$$d = \frac{2n(q - 1)}{\deg(P)} \geq \frac{2n}{n - \frac{m'}{d'}} = \frac{2nd'}{nd' - m'}.$$

□

**Theorem 4.5** *Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer and let  $q$  be a prime power. Define  $D_q(k)$  as the sum of the digits of  $k$  in base  $q$ . Let  $d := \frac{2kD_q(k)}{kD_q(k)-1}$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq P(q, n)$  is a subset with*

$$|\mathcal{F}| > 2(qJ(q, d))^n,$$

*then  $\mathcal{F}$  contains distinct polynomials  $p(x), q(x)$  such that  $p(x) - q(x) = h(x)^k$  for some  $h(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ .*

**Proof.** Theorem 4.5 is a simple application of Theorem 4.4 with the choices  $m' := \lfloor \frac{n-1}{k} \rfloor \geq \frac{n}{k}$  and  $d' := D_q(k)$ .

The proof of Theorem 4.5 goes on the same line as the proof of [8] Theorem 1.1 from [8] Theorem 1.2. □

**Acknowledgement.** I am indebted to Lajos Rónyai for his useful remarks.

## References

- [1] W. W. Adams and P. Lounstaunau, *An Introduction to Gröbner bases*. AMS (1994)
- [2] L. Babai and P. Frankl, *Linear algebra methods in combinatorics*, manuscript, September 1992.
- [3] J. Blasiak, T. Church, H. Cohn, J. A. Grochow, C. Umans (2016). On cap sets and the group-theoretic approach to matrix multiplication. arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06702.
- [4] A. M. Cohen, H. Cuypers and H. Sterk (eds.): *Some Tapas of Computer Algebra*. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999)
- [5] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O’Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992)
- [6] E. Croot, V. Lev and P. Pach, Progression-free sets in  $\mathbb{Z}_4^n$ . *Annals of Math.*, **185**, 331-337 (2017)
- [7] J. S. Ellenberg and D. Gijswijt. On large subsets of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  with no three-term arithmetic progression. *Annals of Mathematics*, **185(1)**, 339-343 (2017).
- [8] B. Green, Sárközy’s theorem in function fields. *The Quarterly J. of Math.*, **68(1)**, 237-242 (2016)
- [9] Sondow, J., and Zudilin, W. (2006). Eulers constant, q-logarithms, and formulas of Ramanujan and Gosper. *The Ramanujan J.*, **12(2)**, 225-244.
- [10] T. Tao. A symmetric formulation of the Croot-Lev-Pach-Ellenberg-Gijswijt capset bound, 2016. URL:<https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2016/05/18/a-symmetric-formulation-of-the-croot-lev-pachellenberg-gijswijt-capset-bound>