

Improved bounds on sizes of generalized caps in $AG(n, q)$

Michael Tait* Robert Won†

Abstract

An m -general set in $AG(n, q)$ is a set of points such that any subset of size m is in general position. A 3-general set is often called a capset. In this paper, we study the maximum size of an m -general set in $AG(n, q)$, significantly improving previous results. When $m = 4$ and $q = 2$ we give a precise estimate, solving a problem raised by Bennett.

1 Introduction

Throughout, let \mathbb{F}_q denote the field with q elements and let n be a positive integer. Let \mathbb{F}_q^n be n -dimensional affine space over \mathbb{F}_q , also denoted $AG(n, q)$. The n -dimensional projective space over \mathbb{F}_q is denoted $PG(n, q)$. A k -dimensional affine subspace of a vector space is called a k -dimensional *flat*.

An *affine combination* of t points $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_t \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is a linear combination $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j \mathbf{a}_j$ where each $c_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j = 1$. A set of points is called *affinely dependent* if one of the points is an affine combination of the others. Equivalently, $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_t\}$ is affinely dependent if there is a linear combination $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{0}$ where $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j = 0$ and the c_j are not identically zero.

Definition 1.1. Let m be a positive integer satisfying $3 \leq m \leq n + 2$ and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ have size at least m . Then A is called *m -general* if no m points of A lie on a single $(m - 2)$ -dimensional flat. Equivalently, A is *m -general* if and only if any subset of A of size m is in general position.

Remark 1.2. We remark that if A is m -general, then it is also $(m - 1)$ -general, so for each $k = 2, \dots, m$, no k points of A lie on a common $(k - 2)$ -dimensional flat—that is, every subset of A of size $k \leq m$ is affinely independent.

*Villanova University, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Villanova, PA 19085, michael.tait@villanova.edu. Michael Tait was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2011553.

†University of Washington, Department of Mathematics, Seattle, WA 98195, robwon@uw.edu. Robert Won was supported in part by an AMS–Simons Travel Grant.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B10, 05D99, 11B75, 51E15

The term m -general set was introduced by Bennett [3]. We adopt Bennett's terminology in this work, but note that m -general sets have been studied under different names. A 3-general set in \mathbb{F}_3^n (i.e., when $q = m = 3$) is often called a *cap* or *capset*. In [18], an m -general set in \mathbb{F}_3^n was called an $(m - 2)$ -*cap*. In this paper, we will work in affine space, but capsets and their generalizations have also been studied in $PG(n, q)$ (see [17, 30, 31]). Indeed, as Bennett notes, an m -general set in $AG(n, q)$ is essentially the same as what was called an $(|A|; m, m - 1; n, q)$ -set or simply an $(|A|, m - 1)$ -set in $PG(n, q)$ in [17].

For $m \geq 3$ an integer, let $r_m(n, q)$ denote the maximum size of an m -general set in $AG(n, q)$. Determining $r_3(n, 3)$, the maximum size of a capset in \mathbb{F}_3^n , is a notoriously difficult problem: the exact value of $r_3(n, 3)$ is known only when $n \leq 6$ [24, 12, 25]. However, the asymptotic behavior of $r_3(n, 3)$ has been studied extensively. In [21], Meshulam proved that $r_3(n, 3)$ is $O(3^n/n)$; this was improved by Bateman and Katz to $O(3^n/n^{1+\epsilon})$ for some fixed ϵ which is independent of n [2]. As in [3], let

$$\mu_m(q) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q(r_m(n, q))}{n}.$$

The best-known lower bound for $\mu_3(3)$ is 0.724851 due to Edel [13]. The aforementioned upper bounds on $r_3(n, 3)$ do not improve upon the trivial upper bound $\mu_3(3) \leq 1$.

In recent breakthrough work, Ellenberg and Gijswijt [14] (adapting a use of the polynomial method from Croot, Lev and Pach [11]) proved that $r_3(n, 3)$ is $O(2.756^n)$ and therefore that $\mu_3(3) \leq 0.923$. Further, they showed that $\mu_3(q) < 1$ for every prime power q . In [3], Bennett extended the methods of Ellenberg and Gijswijt to obtain bounds on $\mu_m(q)$ for every m and q . In particular, Bennett proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3 (Bennett, [3, Theorem 1.2]). *Let n be a positive integer, q a prime power, and m an integer such that $3 \leq m \leq n + 2$. Suppose also that q is odd, or m and q are both even. Then*

$$r_m(n, q) < 2m + m \cdot \min_{t \in (0,1)} \left(t^{-\frac{q-1}{m}} \cdot \frac{1-t^q}{1-t} \right)^n.$$

As a corollary, Bennett showed that

$$\mu_m(q) \leq 1 - \log_q \left(\frac{m^2 - \alpha m + \alpha}{m e^{1 - \frac{\alpha}{m}}} \right) + O((q \log q)^{-1})$$

for some α which depends on m .

The case when $q = m = 3$ (the capset problem) has garnered particular interest for several reasons. One reason is because capsets are connected to coding theory (see e.g., [4, 17]). A second reason is the following connection to number theory. In \mathbb{F}_3^n , three points lie on a line if and only if they form a three-term arithmetic progression and so a 3-general set in \mathbb{F}_3^n can be equivalently described as a set which contains no three-term arithmetic progressions. The analogous problem of studying subsets A in $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ (or $[N]$) avoiding three-term arithmetic progressions was studied by Roth [26] who showed that $|A| = o(N)$. The best-known upper bound is due to Bloom [6] who proved that $|A| = O(N(\log \log N)^4 / \log N)$.

Similarly, while the definition of an m -general set is inherently geometric, we will show that it admits an arithmetic formulation. In [18, Theorem 3.2], it was shown that 4-general sets in \mathbb{F}_3^n also have an arithmetic interpretation; namely, 4-general sets are Sidon sets. A subset A of an abelian group G is called a *Sidon set* if the only solutions to $a + b = c + d$ with $a, b, c, d \in A$ are the trivial solutions when (a, b) is a permutation of (c, d) .

In this paper, we show that m -general sets in \mathbb{F}_q^n can be characterized arithmetically for any q, m , and n in Theorem 2.5. Using this arithmetic characterization and a counting argument, we give a general upper bound on the size of an m -general set in Theorem 3.1. In Section 4, we show that our upper bound significantly improves upon previous results. Finally, in Section 5, we answer a question raised by Bennett [3] in the case when $m = 4$ and $q = 2$. We conclude by giving some open problems and suggesting a possible approach to making progress on the capset problem in Section 6.

2 Arithmetic conditions for m -general sets

The impetus for this work is to understand the geometric notion of an m -general set via arithmetic conditions. As mentioned above, 3-general sets in \mathbb{F}_3^n are equivalent to sets which avoid three-term arithmetic progressions. We remark that when $q > 3$, the two notions are not equivalent: e.g., $\{1, 2, 4\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_5$ does not contain a three-term arithmetic progression but is not 3-general. In [18, Theorem 3.2], Huang and the authors showed that 4-general sets in \mathbb{F}_3^n are Sidon sets; in this work, it will be useful to consider the following generalization of the notion of a Sidon set.

Definition 2.1. Let k be a positive integer and let G be an abelian group. A subset $A \subseteq G$ is called a *weak B_k set* if the only solutions to the equation

$$a_1 + \cdots + a_k = b_1 + \cdots + b_k$$

where a_1, \dots, a_k are distinct elements of A and b_1, \dots, b_k are distinct elements of A are the trivial solutions where (a_1, \dots, a_k) is a permutation of (b_1, \dots, b_k) .

The set A is called simply a *B_k set* if the condition on $a_1, \dots, a_k \in A$ and $b_1, \dots, b_k \in A$ being distinct is removed from the definition.

A subset of an abelian group is a Sidon set if and only if it is a B_2 set. Understanding the size of B_k sets in the integers is a well-studied problem (see e.g., [29, 27, 9, 16, 28] and O’Byrant’s Dynamic Survey [23] on Sidon sets). In [18], by analyzing B_2 sets in \mathbb{F}_3^n , we were able to exactly determine $\mu_4(3)$. We remark that when $q > 3$, a 4-general set in \mathbb{F}_q^n is not equivalent to a B_2 set, e.g., the subset

$$\{(1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 0), (0, 2)\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_5^2$$

is a B_2 set which fails to be 4-general. In general, being a B_k set is a strong condition. For example, a two-element subset $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$ of \mathbb{F}_3^n is not a B_3 set since $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}$. There is, however, a relationship between m -general sets and *weak B_k sets*, as the following result demonstrates.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $m \geq 3$ be a positive integer and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. If A is m -general, then for all positive integers $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, A is a weak B_k set.*

Proof. Suppose that A is a subset of \mathbb{F}_q^n which is not a weak B_k set for some $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. Being a weak B_1 set is a trivial condition, so we may assume $k \geq 2$. Then there exist distinct $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k \in A$ and distinct $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k \in A$ such that

$$\mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{b}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{b}_k$$

and $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k)$ is not a permutation of $(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k)$. Hence, there is some index $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i \neq \mathbf{b}_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then, we have that

$$\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{b}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{b}_k - \mathbf{a}_1 - \dots - \mathbf{a}_{i-1} - \mathbf{a}_{i+1} - \dots - \mathbf{a}_k$$

so \mathbf{a}_i is a nontrivial affine combination of the rest of the points. Therefore the set

$$\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k, \mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_k\}$$

is not affinely independent and so A is not m -general. □

The converse to the above result does not hold. As an example, in the case that $m = 3$ and $q \geq 3$, a weak B_1 set is just a set, while being 3-general is a nontrivial condition. As mentioned above, when $m = 4$ and $q = 3$, a 4-general set is a B_2 set, which is stronger than being a weak B_2 set. Below, we give exact arithmetic conditions which are equivalent to being m -general. In order to do this, we first need some definitions.

Definition 2.3. Given a function $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) : (\mathbb{F}_q^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we say that a subset A of \mathbb{F}_q^n *weakly avoids* the equation $f = \mathbf{0}$ if, whenever $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k$ are k distinct elements of A , we have $f(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Let $t \geq 3$ be a positive integer and let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_t) \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$ be a vector of coefficients. Define a function $f_{\mathbf{c}} : (\mathbb{F}_q^n)^t \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ by

$$f_{\mathbf{c}}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t) = c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 + \dots + c_t x_t.$$

Further define

$$\mathcal{C}_0^t := \{(c_1, \dots, c_t) \in \mathbb{F}_q^t : c_1 + \dots + c_t = 0 \text{ with } c_1, \dots, c_t \text{ not identically } 0\},$$

the set of nonzero vectors of coefficients of length t whose entries sum to 0.

Remark 2.4. With this notation, a set in an abelian group which is three-term arithmetic progression-free is one that weakly avoids the equation

$$f_{(1,1,-2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1 + x_2 - 2x_3 = 0$$

while a weak B_k set weakly avoids the equation

$$f_{(1,1,\dots,1,-1,-1,\dots,-1)}(x_1, \dots, x_{2k}) = 0.$$

In [27], Ruzsa observed this connection and studied subsets of $[N]$ which avoid the equation $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j x_j = 0$ where the c_j are integers which sum to 0. The difficulty of these problems is highly variable depending on the vector (c_1, \dots, c_t) . For example, the best bounds on the largest size of a subset of $[N]$ avoiding $f_{(2,2,-3,-1)} = 0$ are frustratingly far apart [27].

Theorem 2.5. *Let m be a positive integer satisfying $3 \leq m \leq n$ and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ have size at least m . Then A is m -general if and only if for all $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_0^m$ we have that A weakly avoids $f_{\mathbf{c}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. First, assume that for some $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m) \in \mathcal{C}_0^m$, that A does not weakly avoid $f_{\mathbf{c}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \mathbf{0}$. Then there are m distinct elements $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m \in A$ so that $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{0}$ with the c_j not identically zero but $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j = 0$. Therefore, $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\}$ is affinely dependent so A is not an m -general set.

Conversely, assume that A is not an m -general set. Then for some $3 \leq t \leq m$, A contains t distinct points $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_t$ which are affinely dependent. That is, there exist coefficients $c_1, \dots, c_t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ so that $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j \mathbf{a}_j = \mathbf{0}$ with $\sum_{j=1}^t c_j = 0$ and the c_j are not identically zero. Letting $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_t, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$, and choosing any other $m - t$ distinct points $\mathbf{a}_{t+1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m$ of A , we have that $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_0^m$ and $f_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m) = \mathbf{0}$ so A does not weakly avoid $f_{\mathbf{c}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \mathbf{0}$. \square

Remark 2.6. We remark that if a set A weakly avoids $f_{\mathbf{c}}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_0^m$, then for all $1 \leq t \leq m$, by considering those coefficient vectors whose last $m - t$ entries are identically zero, we have that A also weakly avoids $f_{\mathbf{d}}(x_1, \dots, x_t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{C}_0^t$

3 A bound on the size of an m -general set

We are now prepared to prove our main result, which is a bound on the size of an m -general set in \mathbb{F}_q^n .

Theorem 3.1. *Let $m \geq 4$ be an integer, q be a prime power, and $k = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$. If A is an m -general set in \mathbb{F}_q^n then*

$$|A| \leq \frac{k \cdot q^{n/k}}{(q-1)^{1-2/k} (q-2)^{1/k}} \quad \text{if } q > 2$$

and

$$|A| \leq (k!)^{1/k} \cdot 2^{n/k} + k \quad \text{if } q = 2.$$

Proof. First assume that $q > 2$. Let γ be any fixed non-zero element of \mathbb{F}_q and let $(\mathbb{F}_q, <)$ be any total ordering of \mathbb{F}_q . Let \mathcal{C}_γ^* be the set of all sequences $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$ which satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j = \gamma$ and where all α_j are nonzero.

Let $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ be a sequence of k distinct points in A such that $\mathbf{x}_1 < \mathbf{x}_2 < \dots < \mathbf{x}_k$ and let $(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k)$ be a sequence of k distinct points in A such that $\mathbf{y}_1 < \mathbf{y}_2 < \dots < \mathbf{y}_k$ (we are not assuming that $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$ is disjoint or distinct from $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k\}$). Now, since A is an

m -general set, we must have that $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k\}$ is an affinely independent set. We claim that for any $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ and $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ in \mathcal{C}_γ^* , we must have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j \neq \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \mathbf{y}_j, \quad (3.2)$$

unless $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ and $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k)$. To see this, we consider two cases. In the first case, let $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k)$. Assume that $\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j = \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \mathbf{x}_j$. Then we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_j - \beta_j) \mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{0}.$$

Since the set $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$ is affinely independent and $\sum (\alpha_j - \beta_j) = 0$, this implies that $\alpha_j = \beta_j$ for all j .

In the second case, if $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) \neq (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k)$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \mathbf{y}_j$$

is a nontrivial linear combination of at most $2k$ elements of A where the coefficients sum to 0. Since these points are affinely independent, this implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \mathbf{y}_j \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Now for each $\mathbf{c} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma^*$, define a function $f_{\mathbf{c}} : (\mathbb{F}_q^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ by $f_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \mathbf{x}_j$. By (3.2), this implies that

$$\left| \bigcup_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma^*} f_{\mathbf{c}}(A^k) \right| \geq |\mathcal{C}_\gamma^*| \binom{|A|}{k},$$

where $f(A^k)$ denotes the image of f restricted to inputs from A .

We show that $|\mathcal{C}_\gamma^*| \geq (q-1)^{k-2}(q-2)$. When $k=2$, we will show the inequality in a slightly more general setting where we may allow γ to be 0. To prove the inequality, choose any nonzero a_1 ; then there is a unique $a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $a_1 + a_2 = \gamma$. Exactly one choice of a_1 will correspond to $a_2 = 0$, namely, $a_1 = \gamma$. Therefore, when $\gamma \neq 0$ there are $q-2$ sequences of length 2 in \mathcal{C}_γ^* and when $\gamma = 0$ there are $q-1$ sequences of length 2 in \mathcal{C}_0^* , showing the inequality in either case. For larger k , choose a_1, \dots, a_{k-2} arbitrarily from $\mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$ and let $\eta = \gamma - (a_1 + \dots + a_{k-2})$. By the $k=2$ case (applied to η), there are at least $q-2$ choices of a_{k-1} and a_k which complete to a sequence in \mathcal{C}_γ^* .

Since, for each $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma^*$, the outputs of $f_{\mathbf{c}}$ live in \mathbb{F}_q^n , we have

$$(q-1)^{k-2}(q-2)\frac{|A|^k}{k^k} < (q-1)^{k-2}(q-2)\binom{|A|}{k} \leq q^n,$$

which gives the result when $q > 2$.

The proof when $q = 2$ is similar but simpler. Every unordered set of k elements of A must have a unique sum, otherwise

$$(\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) - (\mathbf{y}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{y}_k) = (\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) + (\mathbf{y}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{y}_k) = \mathbf{0},$$

contradicting that A is an m -general set. Therefore, we have

$$\binom{|A|}{k} \leq 2^n.$$

Using the inequality $\frac{(|A| - k)^k}{k!} \leq \binom{|A|}{k}$ and rearranging gives the result. \square

4 Comparison with Theorem 1.3

In this section, we compare our main theorem to Theorem 1.3 in two regimes: (1) when q is fixed and m and n tend to infinity and (2) when m is fixed.

Let $B_m(n, q)$ be the upper bound for $r_m(n, q)$ in Theorem 1.3 ([3, Theorem 1.2]). That is

$$B_m(n, q) = 2m + m \cdot \min_{t \in (0,1)} \left(t^{-\frac{q-1}{m}} \cdot \frac{1 - q^t}{1 - q} \right)^n.$$

4.1 q fixed and $m, n \rightarrow \infty$

In this section we fix a constant q and consider what happens when m is large. To compare $B_m(n, q)$ with Theorem 3.1 in this regime, we first give a lower bound on $B_m(n, q)$. To do this, let

$$h_q(x) = x^{-\frac{q-1}{m}} \cdot \frac{1 - x^q}{1 - x}.$$

As noted in [3, Lemma 3.3], $h_q(x)$ is a convex function and so its minimum on $(0, 1)$ occurs anywhere where its derivative vanishes in the interval. We have (c.f. [3])

$$h'_q(x) = \frac{x^{-\frac{q-1}{m}-1}}{m(1-x)^2} \cdot [(q+m-1)x - (q-1) - x^q((q-1)(m-1)(1-x) + m)].$$

For m larger than a constant which depends only on q , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h'_q\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) &< 0 \\ h'_q\left(\frac{q}{m}\right) &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for m larger than a constant depending only on q ,

$$\min_{x \in (0,1)} h_q(x) = \min_{x \in (\frac{1}{m}, \frac{q}{m})} h_q(x) \geq \min_{x \in (\frac{1}{m}, \frac{q}{m})} x^{-\frac{q-1}{m}} = \left(\frac{q}{m}\right)^{-\frac{q-1}{m}}.$$

Therefore, for m large enough, we have

$$B_m(n, q) \geq m \left(\frac{m}{q}\right)^{(q-1)\frac{n}{m}}.$$

As m goes to infinity, we have

$$\frac{\log_q B_m(n, q)}{n} \geq \frac{\log_q m}{n} + \frac{q-1}{m} (\log_q m - 1) = \Omega\left(\frac{\log_q m}{m}\right).$$

Another way to say this is that the main result of [3] shows that

$$\mu_m(q) \leq (q-1 + o_m(1)) \frac{\log_q m}{m},$$

whereas Theorem 3.1 shows

$$\mu_m(q) \leq \frac{2 + o_m(1)}{m}. \tag{4.1}$$

We note that the best-known general lower bound on $\mu_m(q)$ is $\frac{1}{m-1}$, so (4.1) gives the correct dependence on m .

4.2 $m \geq 4$ fixed

We now consider the regime where m is fixed. For small m and small q , Bennett computes $B_m(n, q)$ to give bounds for $\mu_m(q)$. For the convenience of the reader, we provide these bounds in Table 1. When $m = 3$, the bounds on $\mu_3(q)$ were first given in [14].

Using Theorem 3.1, when $m \geq 4$ we obtain a nontrivial bound on $\mu_m(q)$ which is independent of q , namely

$$\mu_m(q) \leq \frac{1}{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}.$$

Note that $\mu_m(q) \geq \mu_{m+1}(q)$ since an $(m+1)$ -general set is automatically m -general. Table 2 shows that this bound significantly improves upon previous results.

The fact that our bound on $\mu_m(q)$ is independent of q also provides the first nontrivial bound when $m \geq 4$ is fixed and q tends to infinity. By [3, Lemma 3.3],

$$B_m(n, q) = 2m + m \cdot (c_m \cdot q + O(1))^n,$$

where c_m is a constant depending only on m . Therefore, we have that

$$\frac{\log_q B_m(n, q)}{n} \geq \frac{\log_q m}{n} + \log_q(c_m + O(1)) + 1 = 1 - o_q(1).$$

		q								
		2	3	4	5	7	8	9	11	$q \rightarrow \infty$
m	3		.923		.930	.935		.938	0.941	$1 - \log_q(1.188)$
	4	.813	.821	.829	.836	.846	.851	.854	0.861	$1 - \log_q(1.504)$
	5		.735		.756	.771		.782	0.791	$1 - \log_q(1.853)$
	6	.651	.665	.679	.690	.708	.716	.722	0.734	$1 - \log_q(2.212)$
	7		.609		.636	.657		.673	0.685	$1 - \log_q(2.577)$
	8	.544	.562	.577	.591	.613	.622	.631	0.644	$1 - \log_q(2.944)$

Table 1: Upper bounds on $\mu_m(q)$ from [3] and [14].

		q any prime power	
m	3		
	4		.500
	5		.500
	6		.334
	7		.334
	8		.250

Table 2: Upper bounds on $\mu_m(q)$ from Theorem 3.1.

This tells us that for m constant the main result of [3] does not improve the trivial bound $\limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \mu_m(q) \leq 1$, whereas our theorem shows that

$$\limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \mu_m(q) \leq \frac{1}{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}.$$

5 Determining $\mu_4(2)$

In [3], Bennett raises the case $q = 2$ and $m = 4$ as a “particularly interesting case”. As 2-flats in \mathbb{F}_2^n have exactly 4 points, finding a 4-general set in \mathbb{F}_2^n of maximum size is the same as finding the largest subset which does not fully contain a 2-flat. Bennett shows that $r_4(n, 2) < 8 + 4(1.755)^n$, giving $\mu_4(2) < 0.813$. Theorem 5.1 determines $\mu_4(2)$ exactly and in this section we give its proof.

Theorem 5.1. *We have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 2^{n/2} \leq r_4(n, 2) \leq 1 + \sqrt{2} \cdot 2^{n/2},$$

and hence

$$\mu_4(2) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Before we give the proof, we establish some notation. Let \mathbb{k} be a finite field. A function $f : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ is called *almost perfect nonlinear* if for any $a, b \in \mathbb{k}$ with $a \neq 0$, the equation

$$f(x + a) - f(x) = b$$

has at most two solutions. When \mathbb{k} has characteristic 2, if x is a solution then $x + a$ is also a solution, and so the upper bound of 2 solutions is best possible. Almost perfect nonlinear functions have applications in cryptography [5, 22] and coding theory [8]. They can also be used to construct association schemes and strongly regular graphs [32, 33] and semi-planes [10]. For more background and applications of almost perfect nonlinear functions, we recommend [20].

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The upper bound follows from Theorem 3.1 when $m = 4$ and $q = 2$.

By Theorem 2.5, a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is 4-general if and only if it weakly avoids all equations

$$c_1\mathbf{x}_1 + c_2\mathbf{x}_2 + c_3\mathbf{x}_3 + c_4\mathbf{x}_4 = 0,$$

that satisfy $c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 = 0$ with the c_i not identically zero. Over \mathbb{F}_2 , if $c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 = 0$, then either exactly two or exactly four of the coefficients are 1. When exactly two coefficients are 1, every set weakly avoids the equation, and so determining $r_4(n, 2)$ is equivalent to determining the maximum size of a subset A in \mathbb{F}_2^n such that for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in A$, if $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}$ it implies that $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\} = \{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}\}$ or $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d}$. We will call this a Sidon set but we note that since we are in even characteristic we are also considering $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{c}$ to be a trivial solution.

For the lower bound, we construct 4-general sets using almost perfect nonlinear functions. First let n be even. Since \mathbb{F}_2^n is additively isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}} \times \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}$, we will construct a Sidon set in $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}} \times \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}$. If $f : \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}$ is an almost perfect nonlinear function, then the set $A = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}\}$ is a Sidon set. To see this (see also [7]), if

$$(x, f(x)) + (y, f(y)) + (w, f(w)) + (z, f(z)) = (0, 0),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} x + z &= y + w \\ f(x) + f(z) &= f(y) + f(w). \end{aligned}$$

If $x = z$ then $y = w$ and this is a trivial solution, so assume that $a \neq 0$ is defined so that $x = z + a$. Then $y + w = a$ and (noting that we are in characteristic 2)

$$f(z + a) - f(z) = f(w + a) - f(w).$$

Since f is almost perfect nonlinear, we must have $z = w$ or $z = w + a$, and so assume that $z = w + a$. But this mean $x = z + a = w$ and so this is a trivial solution again.

Thus, if f is almost perfect nonlinear, then there exists a Sidon set of size $2^{n/2}$ in $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}} \times \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}$. Almost perfect nonlinear functions exist for every n [20]. For completeness, we show

that $f(x) = x^3$ is almost perfect nonlinear. Fix $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{n/2}}$ with $a \neq 0$. Since we are in characteristic 2, the equation

$$(x + a)^3 - x^3 = b$$

simplifies to

$$ax^2 + a^2x = b.$$

Since this is quadratic in x it has at most 2 solutions. Hence, for even n , $r_4(n, 2) \geq 2^{n/2}$. Since $r_4(n, 2)$ is monotone in n , we have proved the lower bound. \square

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we improved previous bounds on $r_m(n, q)$ for most choices of m, n, q and gave a precise estimate in the case that $m = 4$ and $q = 2$. One case that our argument does not cover is the capset problem, when $m = 3$.

One possible approach to making progress on the capset problem is to generalize the function $r_m(n, q)$. In extremal graph theory, the *Turán number* of a graph F is the maximum number of edges in an n vertex F -free graph, and is denoted by $\text{ex}(n, F)$. This was recently systematically generalized by Alon and Shikhelmen [1] to the function $\text{ex}(n, H, F)$ which denotes the maximum number of copies of a graph H in an n vertex F -free graph. This function has been studied extensively since being introduced, helping us to understand the structure of F -free graphs. One could analogously study a generalization of $r_m(n, q)$ by fixing s and t and asking for the maximum number of sets of size s contained in a t -flat which are in a set A that is m -general. This combined with a saturation result (that there are many sets of m points not in general position if A larger than $r_m(n, q)$) could potentially improve bounds on the capset problem. A similar argument was sketched in [15] to give bounds on the maximum size of a subset of $AG(n, 3)$ that does not contain an entire m -flat.

One way to generalize sets with no 3-term arithmetic progression in \mathbb{F}_q^n is to ask for the maximum size of a set with no k -term arithmetic progression for some $k \geq 3$. This was studied in [19] and suggests another interesting way to generalize the study of $r_m(n, q)$. Instead of asking for the maximum size of a set avoiding m points in an $(m - 2)$ -flat, one could fix m and $t \leq m - 2$ and ask for the maximum size of a set with no m points that all lie on a t -flat.

Above, we showed that for both m fixed and $q \rightarrow \infty$ or for q fixed and $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $\mu_m(q)$ is bounded by roughly $\frac{1}{m-1}$ and $\frac{2}{m}$. Closing this factor of 2 for any choice of m and q would be very interesting. It is likely that for fixed m and q , the lower bound can always be improved. When m is even, it is possible that the upper bound is correct.

In the specific case when $q = 2$ and $m = 4$ there is also a factor of 2 difference between the upper and lower bound in Theorem 5.1. It is reasonable to guess that $r_4(n, 2) = 2^{n/2}$ when n is even. It would also be interesting to determine better bounds on $r_m(n, 2)$ for $m > 4$.

Acknowledgments

We thank Craig Timmons for leading us to references on almost perfect nonlinear functions and Lily Tait for inspiration.

References

- [1] Noga Alon and Clara Shikhelman. Many T copies in H -free graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 121:146–172, 2016.
- [2] Michael Bateman and Nets Hawk Katz. New bounds on cap sets. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 25(2):585–613, 2012.
- [3] Michael Bennett. Bounds on sizes of generalized caps in $AG(n, q)$ via the Croot-Lev-Pach polynomial method. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 168:255–271, 2019.
- [4] Juergen Bierbrauer. *Introduction to coding theory*. Discrete Mathematics and its Applications (Boca Raton). Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2005.
- [5] Eli Biham and Adi Shamir. Differential cryptanalysis of DES-like cryptosystems. *J. Cryptology*, 4(1):3–72, 1991.
- [6] Thomas F. Bloom. A quantitative improvement for Roth’s theorem on arithmetic progressions. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 93(3):643–663, 2016.
- [7] Claude Carlet. On APN exponents, characterizations of differentially uniform functions by the Walsh transform, and related cyclic-difference-set-like structures. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 87(2-3):203–224, 2019.
- [8] Claude Carlet, Pascale Charpin, and Victor Zinoviev. Codes, bent functions and permutations suitable for DES-like cryptosystems. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 15(2):125–156, 1998.
- [9] Javier Cilleruelo. New upper bounds for finite B_h sequences. *Adv. Math.*, 159(1):1–17, 2001.
- [10] Robert S. Coulter and Marie Henderson. A class of functions and their application in constructing semi-biplanes and association schemes. *Discrete Math.*, 202(1-3):21–31, 1999.
- [11] Ernie Croot, Vsevolod F. Lev, and Péter Pál Pach. Progression-free sets in \mathbb{Z}_4^n are exponentially small. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 185(1):331–337, 2017.
- [12] Y. Edel, S. Ferret, I. Landjev, and L. Storme. The classification of the largest caps in $AG(5, 3)$. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 99(1):95–110, 2002.

- [13] Yves Edel. Extensions of generalized product caps. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 31(1):5–14, 2004.
- [14] Jordan S. Ellenberg and Dion Gijswijt. On large subsets of \mathbb{F}_q^n with no three-term arithmetic progression. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 185(1):339–343, 2017.
- [15] Jacob Fox and Huy Tuan Pham. Popular progression differences in vector spaces II. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 16, 39, 2019.
- [16] Ben Green. The number of squares and $B_h[g]$ sets. *Acta Arith.*, 100(4):365–390, 2001.
- [17] J. W. P. Hirschfeld and L. Storme. The packing problem in statistics, coding theory and finite projective spaces: update 2001. In *Finite geometries*, volume 3 of *Dev. Math.*, pages 201–246. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2001.
- [18] Yixuan Huang, Michael Tait, and Robert Won. Sidon sets and 2-caps in \mathbb{F}_3^n . *Involve*, 12(6):995–1003, 2019.
- [19] Y. Lin and J. Wolf. On subsets of \mathbb{F}_q^n containing no k -term progressions. *European J. Combin.*, 31(5):1398–1403, 2010.
- [20] Mandi S Maxwell. *Almost perfect nonlinear functions and related combinatorial structures*. PhD thesis, Iowa State University, 2005. Digital Repository@ Iowa State University, <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu>.
- [21] Roy Meshulam. On subsets of finite abelian groups with no 3-term arithmetic progressions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 71(1):168–172, 1995.
- [22] Kaisa Nyberg. Perfect nonlinear S-boxes. In *Advances in cryptology—EUROCRYPT '91 (Brighton, 1991)*, volume 547 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 378–386. Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [23] Kevin O’Bryant. A complete annotated bibliography of work related to Sidon sequences. *Electron. J. Combin.*, Dynamic Survey 11, 2004.
- [24] Giuseppe Pellegrino. Sul massimo ordine delle calotte in $S_{4,3}$. *Matematiche (Catania)*, 25:149–157 (1971), 1970.
- [25] Aaron Potechin. Maximal caps in $AG(6, 3)$. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 46(3):243–259, 2008.
- [26] Klaus Roth. Sur quelques ensembles d’entiers. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 234:388–390, 1952.
- [27] Imre Z. Ruzsa. Solving a linear equation in a set of integers. I. *Acta Arith.*, 65(3):259–282, 1993.
- [28] Tomasz Schoen and Ilya D. Shkredov. An upper bound for weak B_k -sets. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 33(2):837–844, 2019.

- [29] S. Sidon. Verallgemeinerung der in meiner Arbeit: "Ein Satz über trigonometrische Polynome mit Lücken und seine Anwendung in der Theorie der Fourier-Reihen", Journal für die reine und angewandte Math. Bd. 163 bewiesenen Sätze. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 166:62–63, 1932.
- [30] J. A. Thas. On k -caps in $\mathbf{PG}(n, q)$, with q even and $n \geq 3$. *Discrete Math.*, 341(5):1459–1471, 2018.
- [31] J. A. Thas. On k -caps in $\mathbf{PG}(n, q)$, with q even and $n \geq 4$. *Discrete Math.*, 341(4):1072–1077, 2018.
- [32] E. R. van Dam and D. Fon-Der-Flaass. Uniformly packed codes and more distance regular graphs from crooked functions. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 12(2):115–121, 2000.
- [33] E. R. van Dam and D. Fon-Der-Flaass. Codes, graphs, and schemes from nonlinear functions. *European J. Combin.*, 24(1):85–98, 2003.