

THE CHROMATIC NUMBER OF \mathbb{R}^n WITH MULTIPLE FORBIDDEN DISTANCES

ERIC NASLUND

ABSTRACT. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be a finite set of distances, and let $G_A(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the graph with vertex set \mathbb{R}^n and edge set $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - y\|_2 \in A\}$, and let $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A) = \chi(G_A(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Erdős asked about the growth rate of the m -distance chromatic number

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) = \max_{|A|=m} \chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A).$$

We improve the best existing lower bound for $\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$, and show that

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) \geq (\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{m+1} + o(1))^n$$

where $\Gamma_\chi = 0.79983\dots$ is an explicit constant. Our full result is more general, and applies to cliques in this graph. Let $\chi_k(G)$ denote the minimum number of colors needed to color G so that no color contains a $(k+1)$ -clique, and let $\bar{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$ denote the largest value this takes for any distance set of size m . Using the Partition Rank Method, we show that

$$\bar{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; m) > \left(\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\frac{m+1}{k}} + o(1) \right)^n.$$

We also discuss some open problems related to this paper, and provide some comments on the specific case of $n = 2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The chromatic number of Euclidean space, $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n)$, is the the minimum number of colors required to color \mathbb{R}^n so that no two points at distance 1 have the same color. When $n = 2$ determining $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is known as the Hadwiger-Nelson problem [13, 16, 17], and the best existing bounds are

$$5 \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 7,$$

where the lower bound is a recent improvement due to De Grey [6]. For large n , Frankl and Wilson proved that $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ grows exponentially [11], and the best bounds are

$$(1.239 \dots + o(1))^n < \chi(\mathbb{R}^n) \leq (3 + o(1))^n,$$

due to Raigorodskii [29], and Larman and Rogers [21], respectively.

Erdős [8] proposed a variant where the graph is based on multiple distances instead of one. For a set of distances A , let $G_A(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the graph with vertex set \mathbb{R}^n and edge set $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - y\|_2 \in A\}$, and let

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A) = \chi(G_A(\mathbb{R}^n)).$$

The m -distance chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^n is

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) = \max_{A: |A|=m} \chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A).$$

Note that by rescaling, for any set A with $|A| = 1$, we have that

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; 1) = \chi(\mathbb{R}^n; A) = \chi(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Erdős proved that for some constant $C > 0$,

$$(1.1) \quad \overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m) \geq Cm\sqrt{\log m},$$

and he asked whether $\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m)$ grows polynomially, and more generally whether we can determine $\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$ for any m , and $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A)$ for a given A [32, Open Problem 10 and 42].

In Section 2, we provide some results for the case of $n = 2$ and m growing, although the main results of this paper are for large n . In higher dimensions, Kupavskii [20] gave the upper bound

$$\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) \leq (3 + o_n(1))^{mn},$$

and Raigorodskii [30] proved that there exists $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) > (c_1 m)^{c_2 n}.$$

Berdnikov [2, 3] improved on Raigorodskii's lower bound, and showed that any $c_2 < \frac{1}{3}$ is admissible. In this paper we prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *We have that*

$$(1.2) \quad \overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) \geq \left(\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{m+1} + o_n(1) \right)^n,$$

where

$$(1.3) \quad \Gamma_\chi = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \max_{x>0} \frac{1 - e^{-x}}{\sqrt{x}} = 0.7998308498 \dots$$

We prove this theorem by examining the specific set of distances, $A_m = \{1, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \dots, \sqrt{m}\}$, and showing that

$$(1.4) \quad \chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq \left(\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{m+1} + o(1) \right)^n.$$

All of the best lower bounds for $\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$, including Erdős's bound (1.1), use this specific set of distances, or a large subset of it. In [20] Kupavskii showed that

$$(1.5) \quad \chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \leq \left(2(\sqrt{m} + 1) + o_n(1) \right)^n,$$

and so Theorem 1 implies that for the set of distances A_m , we understand exactly how $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m)$ grows with m .

Our full result is more general, and applies to m -distance k -cliques.

1.1. k -Cliques. Let $\chi_k(G)$ denote the minimum number of colors needed to color G so that no color contains a $(k+1)$ -clique. For a set of distances A , define

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A) = \chi_k(G_A(\mathbb{R}^n)),$$

where as before, $G_A(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the graph with vertex set \mathbb{R}^n where two vertices are connected if their distance is in A . Define

$$\overline{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; m) = \max_{A: |A|=m} \overline{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A).$$

In 1987 Frankl and Rodl [12, Theorem 1.18] proved that $\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n) := \overline{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; 1)$ grows exponentially with n for any k . For $m = 1$ and general k the best lower and upper bounds, due Sagdeev [31] and Prosanov [27], respectively, are

$$(1.6) \quad \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^{2^{k+4}}} + o(1) \right)^n < \overline{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; 1) \leq \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2(k+1)}{k}} + o(1) \right)^n.$$

For $k = 2$, the case of an equilateral triangle, better quantitative bounds are known [25] using the slice rank method developed in [33, 5, 7]. Using the Partition Rank Method, introduced in [26, 24] we provide a quantitative bound for case of cliques with multiple distances.

Theorem 2. *For $k \geq 1$, we have that*

$$(1.7) \quad \chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq \left(\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\frac{m+1}{k}} + o(1) \right)^n,$$

where $\Gamma_\chi = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \max_{x>0} \frac{1-e^{-x}}{\sqrt{x}}$.

Note where the result applies, that is for large m , the dependence on k in this lower bound is substantially better than in (1.6). This is because previous methods have been based on Frankl and Rodl's approach [12, Theorem 1.18], which inductively applies a result for the $k = 1$ case. The right hand side of (1.7) is nontrivial only when $m+1 > \Gamma_\chi^{-2}k$, however the method used yields a nontrivial result for $m \geq k$. Outside of this range, for k larger than m , the best lower bound comes from the one distance case due to Sagdeev [31].

1.2. Outline. In Section 2, we provide some results for the case of $n = 2$ and m growing, and show that for some explicit distance sets, χ can be calculated within a constant factor.

Theorem 3. *There exists a set of distances $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1 < d_2 < \dots\}$ such that the m -distance set $\mathcal{D}(m) = \{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ satisfies*

$$(1.8) \quad 1.4194(1 + o_m(1))m\sqrt{\log m} \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{D}(m)) \leq 2.0869(1 + o_m(1))m\sqrt{\log m}$$

where $o_m(1)$ denotes a term going to 0 as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 2. In section 3, we provide an introduction the Partition Rank method of [26, 24], and define the Distinctness Indicator Function which will be needed to generalize to $k \geq 2$. In section 4 we prove a lower a bound for $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m)$ in terms of a maximization involving a truncated theta function. Define

$$(1.9) \quad \theta(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} t^{\binom{l}{2}} = 1 + t + t^3 + t^6 + \dots$$

and define the truncation

$$\theta(t; l) = 1 + t + t^3 + t^6 + t^{10} + \dots + t^{\binom{l}{2}}.$$

Using partition rank method, we prove that

Theorem 4. *Let $m \geq 1$ be given. For any $l > 1$, and any $k \geq 1$, we have that*

$$(1.10) \quad \chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq \left(\max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta\left(t^{\frac{k}{m+1}}; l\right)}{1 + t + \dots + t^{l-1}} + o(1) \right)^n.$$

In section 5 we analyze the growth rate of the right hand side of (5), and prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5. For $0 < \gamma < 1$,

$$(1.11) \quad \max_{l \geq 1} \max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta(t^\gamma; l)}{1 + t + \dots + t^{l-1}} \geq \Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$$

where $\Gamma_\chi = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \max_{0 < u < \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}}$.

To prove Theorem 5, we first analyze how

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta(t^\gamma; l)}{1 + t + \dots + t^{l-1}}$$

depends on l , and prove that this quantity is bounded from below by $\max_{0 < t < 1} (1 - t)\theta(t^\gamma)$. The Poisson summation formula yields a functional equation for $\theta(t)$, and we use this functional equation to lower bound $\max_{0 < t < 1} (1 - t)\theta(t^\gamma)$ and prove Theorem 5. Theorem 2 follows directly from Theorem 4 and Theorem 5.

In section 6, we mention a handful of related open problems and discuss their significance.

In the Appendix we use the methods of this paper to prove Theorem 10, stated in the Open Problems section, which relates a minimization involving the Theta function of an even integral lattice to the constant in the Double Cap Conjecture.

1.3. Exact Maximization. In section 5, we show that when $k = 1$, the right hand side of equation (1.10) is maximized for $l \leq 2m + 1$. This disproves Conjecture 1 of Gorskaya, Mitricheva, Protasov, and Raigorodskii [14]. The explicit nature of (5) has some advantages. When $k = m = 1$, this quantity is maximized when $l = 3$, and we retrieve Raigorodskii's lower bound

$$(\chi(\mathbb{R}^n))^{\frac{1}{n}} \gtrsim \max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1 + t + t^2}{1 + \sqrt{t} + t^{\frac{3}{2}}} = 1.23956674\dots,$$

expressed as a maximization of an explicit rational function. For $k = 1$ and small values of m , we improve upon the calculations of Gorskaya, Mitricheva, Protasov, and Raigorodskii [14] for $\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^m, m)$. Define

$$\zeta_m = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m))^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

For $m = 2$ and $m = 3$ for example, Theorem 4 yields the lower bounds

	Lower bound from Theorem 4	Lower bound from [14]
$m = 2$	$\zeta_2 \geq 1.466299$	$\zeta_2 \geq 1.465869$
$m = 3$	$\zeta_3 \geq 1.667508$	$\zeta_3 \geq 1.667462$

For the case of k -simplices define

$$\zeta_m^k = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{\chi}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; m))^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Theorem 4 yields the following table for small values of k, m :

	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 4$
$m = 1$	$\zeta_1^1 \geq 1.239566$			
$m = 2$	$\zeta_2^1 \geq 1.466299$	$\zeta_2^2 \geq 1.118433$		
$m = 3$	$\zeta_3^1 \geq 1.667508$	$\zeta_3^3 \geq 1.239566$	$\zeta_3^3 \geq 1.083024$	
$m = 4$	$\zeta_4^1 \geq 1.848150$	$\zeta_4^2 \geq 1.356230$	$\zeta_4^3 \geq 1.158048$	$\zeta_4^4 \geq 1.063933$
$m = 5$	$\zeta_5^1 \geq 2.013079$	$\zeta_5^2 \geq 1.466299$	$\zeta_5^3 \geq 1.239566$	$\zeta_5^4 \geq 1.118433$

2. DIMENSION 2

In this section, we show that for some specific distance sets in \mathbb{R}^2 , we can determine $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, A)$ quite accurately, with upper and lower bounds differing by a small constant factor. We begin by discussing the Erdős distinct distances problem.

2.1. Distinct Distances. In 1946, Erdős asked about the growth rate of $g(N)$, the minimal number of distinct distances between N points in the plane [9]. In that paper, Erdős proved that for some constant C

$$(2.1) \quad g(N) \leq C \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}},$$

and he conjectured that there is a lower bound of the form $N^{1-o(1)}$, a result that was proven by Guth and Katz in 2015 [15]. The upper bound for distinct distances immediately implies a lower bound for $\overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m)$, since if $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has m distinct distances $\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ then X is an independent set in $G_{\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Consequently,

$$(2.2) \quad \overline{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m) \geq g^{-1}(m).$$

Erdős originally proved the upper bound in (2.1) by considering the $\sqrt{N} \times \sqrt{N}$ grid, and using Landau's theorem counting the number of integers less than X that can be written as a sum of two squares. This example shows that

$$g(N) \lesssim \sqrt{2} b_{\square} \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}},$$

where $b_{\square} = 0.764223\dots$ is the Landau-Ramanujan constant, and where we write $f \lesssim g$ if $f \leq (1 + o(1))g$ and $f \sim g$ if $f = (1 + o(1))g$. Erdős and Fishburn observed that the hexagonal lattice yields slightly better bounds, and conjectured that it is optimal [10, Conjecture 1] in the sense that for sufficiently large n , there exists a set of $g(n)$ points in the hexagonal lattice with n distances. Let

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Delta} = \{ \sqrt{n} : n = x^2 + xy + y^2, x, y \in \mathbb{Z} \},$$

and let

$$L_{\Delta} = \left\{ x(1, 0) + y \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \right\},$$

and note that if $x, y \in L_{\Delta}$ then $\|x - y\|_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}$. The method of Ramanujan and Landau (see [22]) implies that

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{n \leq X, n \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}} 1 \sim b_{\Delta} \frac{X}{\sqrt{\log X}}$$

where

$$b_{\Delta} = \frac{\pi 3^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{2}}{9} \prod_{p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.638909\dots$$

The following theorem is well known, but I could not find a reference with the exact constant calculated. The upper bound for $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}(m))$ appearing in the next subsection is tight enough that we have interest in this exact constant.

Theorem 6. (*Corollary of Erdős's 1948 paper*) *We have that*

$$g(N) \lesssim C_{\Delta} \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}}$$

where

$$(2.4) \quad C_\Delta = \frac{2\sqrt{3}b_\Delta}{\pi} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3^{\frac{5}{4}}} \prod_{p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.704498\dots$$

Proof. Let X denote the set of lattice points of L_Δ that lie in the disk of radius R around $(0, 0)$. Let $N = |X|$. Then $N = \pi R^2 \cdot \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} + E(R)$ where $E(R) = o(R^2)$ is an error term. The maximum squared distance between two elements of X is $4R^2 = 2\sqrt{3}N/\pi$. Since every distance between elements of the hexagonal lattice is in \mathcal{D}_Δ , it follows that

$$\{\|x - y\|_2 : x, y \in X\} \lesssim \frac{2\sqrt{3}b_\Delta}{\pi} \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}}.$$

□

Since the disk has the largest volume for a shape of a fixed diameter, for large N Erdős and Fishburn's conjecture on the optimality of the hexagonal lattice implies the following conjecture:

Conjecture. (Erdős and Fishburn [10, Conjecture 1]) *As $N \rightarrow \infty$ we have that*

$$g(N) \sim C_\Delta \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}}$$

where $C_\Delta = 0.704498\dots$ is defined in (2.4).

2.2. Bounds for Certain Distance Sets. Equation (2.2) implies a lower bound for chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^n using the hexagonal lattice. In the other direction, we have the following upper bound on the Chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^2 , where the distance set consists of the interval $[1, l]$.

Theorem 7. *Let $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, [1, l])$ denote the chromatic number of $G_{[1, l]}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the graph where any two points at any distance $1 \leq d \leq l$ are connected. Then we have that*

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, [1, l]) \leq \left(\lfloor 2(l+1)/\sqrt{3} \rfloor + 1\right)^2.$$

Proof. Let $h \geq 1$ be an integer. Consider the hexagonal lattice

$$L_\Delta = \left\{ x(1, 0) + y \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \right\}.$$

By placing an open disk of radius $(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2})/\sqrt{3}$ at each point, we obtain a covering of \mathbb{R}^2 . Consider the sublattice $h \cdot L_\Delta$. This is a sublattice of index h^2 and L_Δ is equal to the union of h^2 translates of $h \cdot L_\Delta$. For each of these h^2 lattices, let X_i be the set obtained by placing a disk of radius $(1 + \epsilon)/\sqrt{3}$ around each point. Then X_1, \dots, X_{h^2} cover \mathbb{R}^2 , and for each $x, y \in X_i$, either $\|x - y\|_2 \leq \frac{2+2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}$ or $\|x - y\|_2 \geq h - \frac{2+2\epsilon}{\sqrt{3}}$. Rescaling by a factor of $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2(1+\epsilon)}$, we have colored \mathbb{R}^2 with h^2 colors such that each color does not contain a distance in $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2(1+\epsilon)}h - 1)$. Letting $h = \lceil 2(l+1)(1 - \epsilon)/\sqrt{3} \rceil + 1$, we obtain the bound

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, [1, l]) \leq \left(\lceil 2(1 + \epsilon)(l + 1)/\sqrt{3} \rceil\right)^2.$$

The stated result follows by observing that if $2l/\sqrt{3}$ is not an integer, then for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\lceil 2(1 + \epsilon)(l + 1)/\sqrt{3} \rceil = \lfloor 2(l + 1)/\sqrt{3} \rfloor + 1$, and if $2l/\sqrt{3}$ is an integer, then every value of $\epsilon > 0$ causes the ceiling function to increase the value of the right hand side above, and once again $\lceil 2(1 + \epsilon)(l + 1)/\sqrt{3} \rceil = \lfloor 2(l + 1)/\sqrt{3} \rfloor + 1$. □

For a set of distances $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1 < d_2 < \dots\}$, let $\mathcal{D}(m) = \{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ denote the m smallest distances in \mathcal{D} . The following theorem (with constants defined explicitly) is identical to equation (1.8).

Theorem 8. *We have that*

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}b_\Delta} m \sqrt{\log m} \lesssim \chi(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{D}_\Delta(m)) \lesssim \frac{4}{3b_\Delta} m \sqrt{\log m}$$

where $\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}b_\Delta} = 1.4194\dots$ and $\frac{4}{3b_\Delta} = 2.0868\dots$

Proof. The lower bound is a consequence of the upper bound for distinct distance in Theorem 6. To prove the upper bound, let l denote the largest element of $\mathcal{D}_\Delta(m)$. Applying Theorem 7, since $\mathcal{D}_\Delta(m) \subset [1, l]$, we have that

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{D}_\Delta(m)) \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^2, [1, l]) \leq \left(\lfloor 2(l+1)/\sqrt{3} \rfloor + 1 \right)^2.$$

Equation (2.3) implies that $l^2 \sim \frac{1}{b_\Delta} m \sqrt{\log m}$, and the theorem follows. \square

The same methods imply similar bounds for the square grid. Let $\mathcal{D}_\square = \{\sqrt{n} : n = x^2 + y^2, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and let b_\square denote the Landau-Ramanujan constant. Then we have the bounds

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{\pi}{4b_\square} m \sqrt{\log m} \lesssim \chi(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{D}_\square(m)) \lesssim \frac{4}{3b_\square} \cdot m \sqrt{\log m}.$$

Theorem 7 implies that if $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2; m)$ grows polynomially, the ratio between the smallest distance and the largest must grow like a polynomial of \sqrt{m} .

3. THE PARTITION RANK

The Partition Rank method is a multivariable version of the linear algebraic method, and allows us to prove our main result for $(k+1)$ -cliques. The Partition Rank was introduced by the author in [24, 26], and we refer the reader to those papers for a more comprehensive overview. To motivate the definition, we first revisit the definition of *tensor rank*. For finite sets X_1, \dots, X_n , a function $h: X_1 \times \dots \times X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is called a *rank 1 function* if it takes the form

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_1(x_1) f_2(x_2) \cdots f_n(x_n),$$

and the tensor rank of $F: X_1 \times \dots \times X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is defined to be the minimal r such that

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^r g_i$$

where the g_i are rank 1 functions. Given variables x_1, \dots, x_k , and a set $S \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$, let \vec{x}_S denote the m -tuple

$$x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_m},$$

so that for a function g of m variables, we have

$$g(\vec{x}_S) = g(x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_m}).$$

For example, if $k = 5$, and $S = \{1, 2, 4\}$, then $g(\vec{x}_S) = g(x_1, x_2, x_4)$, and $f(\vec{x}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S}) = f(x_3, x_5)$. A partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ is a collection P of non-empty pairwise disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$\bigcup_{A \in P} A = \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

We say that P is the *trivial* partition if it consists only of a single set, $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

Definition 1. Let X_1, \dots, X_k be finite sets, and let

$$h : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}.$$

We say that h has *partition rank* 1 if there exists some non-trivial partition P of the variables $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{A \in P} f_A(\vec{x}_A)$$

for some functions f_A . We say that h has *slice rank* 1, if in addition one of the sets $A \in P$ is a singleton.

The tensor $h : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ will have partition rank 1 if and only if it can be written in the form

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_k) = f(\vec{x}_S)g(\vec{x}_T)$$

for some f, g and some $S, T \neq \emptyset$ with $S \cup T = \{1, \dots, k\}$. Additionally, h will have slice rank 1 if it can be written in the above form with either $|S| = 1$ or $|T| = 1$. In other words, a function h has partition rank 1 if the tensor can be written as a non-trivial outer product, and it has slice rank 1 if it can be written as the outer product between a vector and a $k - 1$ dimensional tensor.

Definition 2. Let X_1, \dots, X_k be finite sets. The *partition rank* of

$$F : X_1 \times \dots \times X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{F},$$

is defined to be the minimal r such that

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^r g_i$$

where the g_i have partition rank 1. The *slice rank* of F is the minimal r such that

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^r g_i$$

where the g_i have slice rank 1.

The partition rank is the minimal rank among all possible ranks obtained from partitioning the variables. The slice rank can be viewed as the rank which results from the partitions of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ into a set of size 1 and a set of size $k - 1$, and so we have that

$$\text{partition-rank} \leq \text{slice-rank}.$$

For two variables, the slice rank, partition rank, and tensor rank are equivalent since there is only one non-trivial partition of a set of size 2. For three variables, the partition rank and the slice rank are equivalent, and for 4 or more variables, all three ranks are different. A key property of the partition rank is the following lemma, given in [26, Lemma 11], which generalizes [33, Lemma 1].

Lemma 1. *Let X be a finite set, and let X^k denote the k -fold Cartesian product of X with itself. Suppose that*

$$F : X^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$$

is the diagonal identity tensor, that is

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & x_1 = \dots = x_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then

$$\text{partition-rank}(F) = |X|.$$

Proof. See [26, Lemma 11]. □

3.1. The Distinctness Indicator. Let X be a finite set, \mathbb{F} a field, and let $X^k = X \times \dots \times X$ denote the Cartesian product of X with itself k times. For every $\sigma \in S_k$, define

$$f_\sigma : X \times \dots \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$$

to be the function that is 1 if (x_1, \dots, x_k) is a fixed point of σ , and 0 otherwise. We will make use of the following Lemma, proven in [26]:

Lemma 2. *Let $Cyc \subset S_k$, be the k -cycles in S_k , and define*

$$H_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_k \\ \sigma \notin Cyc}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) f_\sigma(x_1, \dots, x_k).$$

Then

$$H_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_1, \dots, x_k \text{ are distinct,} \\ (-1)^{k-1} (k-1)! & \text{if } x_1 = \dots = x_k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. See [26, Lemma 15]. □

This function can be used to zero-out those tuples of vectors with repetitions. Suppose that we are interested in the size of the largest set $A \subset X$ that does not contain k distinct vectors satisfying some condition \mathcal{K} . Then if $F_k : X^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is some function satisfying

$$F_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} c_1 & \text{if } x_1, \dots, x_k \text{ satisfy } \mathcal{K} \\ c_2 & \text{if } x_1 = \dots = x_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $c_2 \neq 0$, then

$$I_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) := F_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) H_k(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

when restricted to A^k will be a diagonal tensor, and hence by lemma 1

$$|A| \leq \text{partition-rank}(I_k).$$

Let

$$(3.1) \quad \delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_1 = \dots = x_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and for a partition P of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ define

$$\delta_P(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{A \in P} \delta_A(\vec{x}_A).$$

For every σ , we have that $f_\sigma = \delta_P$ for some partition P , it follows that we can write

$$(3.2) \quad H_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_k} c_P \prod_{A \in P} \delta_A(\vec{x}_A)$$

where \mathcal{P}_k is the set of non-trivial partitions of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ and c_P are constants. Furthermore, since the definition of H specifically excludes the cycles, it follows that only non-trivial partitions will appear with non-zero coefficients in the sum above. That is, every product of delta functions contains two or more terms in the product.

4. LOWER BOUNDS FOR $\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a finite set such that $\|x - y\|_2^2$ is even for any $x, y \in S$. Let p be a prime satisfying

$$p > \max_{x, y \in S} \frac{\|x - y\|_2^2}{2}.$$

Consider the polynomials $F_r : S^r \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ defined by

$$F_r(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \prod_{i < j} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\|x_i - x_j\|_2^2}{2} \right)^{p-1} \right),$$

and note that

$$(4.1) \quad \deg F_r = 2 \binom{r}{2} (p-1).$$

Our results are most naturally stated when the domain of F_r is a cube-like subset of a lattice.

Definition 3. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We say that a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an l^n -cube if for some constant $k \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$A = \{k + c_0 v_0 + \dots + c_n v_n : c_i \in \{0, \dots, l\}\}.$$

To prove the main result, we need only consider the specific l^n -cube $\{0, 1, \dots, l\}^n$, however we state our results in this section with this generality to prove Theorem 10 from Section 6 in the Appendix. Note that if S is any subset of an l^n -cube, then

$$(4.2) \quad \dim \{f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}, \deg f \leq d\} \leq \# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq d \right\}.$$

Let $A_m = \{1, \sqrt{2}, \dots, \sqrt{m}\}$. Then

$$F_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \|x_i - x_j\|_2 \in \sqrt{2p}A_m \cup \{0\} \forall i, j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

In other words, F_{k+1} is nonzero if and only if x_1, \dots, x_{k+1} form a (possibly degenerate) k -simplex with distances in $\sqrt{2p}A_m$. The distinctness indicator function from the previous section will help construct an indicator function that captures when x_1, \dots, x_{k+1} are a non-degenerate simplex. Define the function

$$(4.3) \quad J_k = H_{k+1} R_{k+1}.$$

Then J_k will satisfy

$$(4.4) \quad J_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_1, \dots, x_{k+1} \text{ are distinct and form a } k\text{-simplex,} \\ (-1)^k k! & \text{if } x_1 = \dots = x_{k+1}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $A \subset S$ does not contain a k -simplex, and n is large enough to insure that $p > k$, we have that

$$J_k|_{A^{k+1}} = (-1)^k k! \cdot \delta(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}).$$

That is, J_k restricted to A^{k+1} is diagonal, and hence by Lemma 1, $|A| \leq \text{partition-rank}(J_k)$.

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq \frac{|S|}{\text{partition-rank}(J_k)}.$$

Lemma 3. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a subset of an l^n -cube such that $\|x - y\|_2^2 \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $x, y \in S$, and let $p > \max_{x, y \in S} \frac{1}{2}\|x - y\|_2^2$. Then the function $J_k : S^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ defined by $J_k = F_{k+1}H_{k+1}$ satisfies*

$$\text{partition-rank}(J_k) \leq 2^{k+1} \cdot \# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq k(p-1) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{P}_{k+1} denote the set of non-trivial partitions of $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$. By lemma 2, and (3.2), H_{k+1} can be written as

$$H_{k+1} = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1}} c_P \prod_{A \in P} \delta(\vec{x}_A)$$

where c_P is a constant depending on the partition P . In the construction of H_{k+1} , only non-trivial partitions were included, and so we can split the product $J_k = H_{k+1}R_{k+1}$ into a linear combination of terms of the form

$$(4.5) \quad R_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) \prod_{A \in P} \delta(\vec{x}_A)$$

where the product of delta functions term always contains two or more delta functions. For such a term, the product of delta functions forces many variables among x_1, \dots, x_{k+1} to be equal. For a set A and any element $a \in A$, and a polynomial function Q of $|A|$ variables, the product $\delta(\vec{x}_A)Q(\vec{x}_A)$ will be exactly equal to $\delta(\vec{x}_A)Q(x_a, x_a, \dots, x_a) = \delta(\vec{x}_A)\tilde{Q}(x_a)$, where \tilde{Q} is a single variable polynomial obtained from Q by making all the variables equal. For our purposes, a_i need only be some representative member of A_i , where the choice is made in a way that is consistent across different partitions. For simplicity, we choose $a_i = \min(A_i)$ for $i \leq r-1$ and $a_r = k+1$. Let $P = \{A_1, \dots, A_r\}$ be a non-trivial partition of $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$. Let $a_i = \min(A_i)$ denote the minimal element of A_i for each $i \leq r-1$, and suppose without loss of generality that $k+1 \in A_r$, and let $a_r = k+1$. Then

$$F_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) \prod_{A \in P} \delta(\vec{x}_A) = F_r(x_{a_1}, \dots, x_{a_r}) \prod_{A \in P} \delta(\vec{x}_A).$$

We can expand F_r in the above as a sum of monomials of the form

$$(\delta(\vec{x}_{A_1})x_{a_1,1}^{\epsilon_{1,1}} \cdots x_{a_1,n}^{\epsilon_{1,n}}) \cdots (\delta(\vec{x}_{A_r})x_{a_r,1}^{\epsilon_{r,1}} \cdots x_{a_r,n}^{\epsilon_{r,n}})$$

Since F_r has degree $2\binom{r}{2}(p-1)$, for each such term, we must have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \leq \deg F_r \leq \binom{r}{2}(p-1),$$

and so, there exists $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \leq (r-1)(p-1).$$

Proceeding in this manner for every non-trivial partition of $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$, it follows that we can decompose

$$J_k = \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\} \\ 1 \leq |A| \leq k}} \delta(\vec{x}_A) \sum_{\substack{f \\ \deg f \leq k(p-1)}} f(x_a) G_f(\vec{x}_{\{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus A})$$

where for each set $a = \min A$, and G_f is some function, possibly depending on f . This implies that

$$\text{partition-rank}(J_k) \leq (2^{k+1} - 2) \dim \{f \mid f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \text{ and } \deg f \leq k(p-1)\},$$

and the result follows by (4.2) since

$$\dim \{f \mid f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \text{ and } \deg f \leq k(p-1)\} \leq \# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq k(p-1) \right\}.$$

□

Remark 1. In the statement of Lemma 3, the constant in front depending on k is crude. Proceeding more carefully, taking into account each subset $A \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, in a similar manner to [26, Lemma 22, Prop 23], the bound can be improved to

$$\text{partition-rank}(J_k) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq k(p-1) \right\}.$$

However, for our purposes, Lemma 3 as stated is sufficient.

Proposition 1. *Let $k \geq 1$, and let $m \geq 1$ be the number of colors. Let S be a subset of an l^n -cube where $\|x - y\|_2^2 \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $x, y \in S$. Suppose that the maximum distance between elements of S is*

$$d_{\max} = \max_{x, y \in S} \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2.$$

Then

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq |S| 2^{k+1} \max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t^{\frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0}}{(1 + t + \dots + t^l)^n}$$

where $\epsilon_0 \leq C(d_{\max})^{0.525}$ for a fixed constant $C > 0$, where $A_m = \{1, \sqrt{2}, \dots, \sqrt{m}\}$.

Proof. Let p be the smallest prime satisfying $p > \frac{1}{m+1} d_{\max}$. We will bound the maximum size of a set in \mathbb{R}^n avoiding any distances in $\{\sqrt{2p}, \sqrt{4p}, \dots, \sqrt{2mp}\}$, which is a scaling of A_m . We have that

$$p < \frac{1}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0$$

where $\epsilon_0 \leq C \left(\frac{d_{\max}}{m+1}\right)^{0.525}$ due to the best bounds on prime gaps [1]. Let J_k be defined as in 4.3. Then if $A \subset S$ does not contain a $(k+1)$ -clique, we must have that J_k restricted to A is diagonal, that is

$$J_k|_{A^{k+1}} = \delta(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}).$$

By Lemma 1, this implies that

$$|A| \leq \text{partition-rank}(J_k),$$

and by Lemma 3, we have

$$|A| \leq 2^{k+1} \cdot \# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq \frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0 \right\}.$$

Consider the expansion of

$$\frac{(1+t+\dots+t^l)^n}{t^C}.$$

The terms in this expansion are in one to one correspondence with the vectors $v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n$, and each vector v with $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq C$ will have a coefficient of t with a negative power. It follows that for $0 < t < 1$, we must have

$$\# \left\{ v \in \{0, \dots, l\}^n : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \leq \frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0 \right\} \leq \frac{(1+t+\dots+t^l)^n}{t^{\frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0}},$$

and hence

$$|A| \leq 2^{k+1} \min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(1+t+\dots+t^l)^n}{t^{\frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0}}.$$

Let \mathcal{A} be a coloring of S without $(k+1)$ -cliques. That is, let \mathcal{A} be collection of sets such that $S \subset \cup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$, and such that each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ does not contain a $(k+1)$ -clique of elements with pairwise distances in $\sqrt{2p}A_m$. Then, due to the upper bound on the possible size of each A , we must have that

$$|\mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{|S|}{2} 2^{k+1} \max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t^{\frac{k}{m+1} d_{\max} + \epsilon_0}}{(1+t+\dots+t^l)^n}.$$

□

Lemma 4. Let $0 < t < 1$, and suppose that $c = (c_0, \dots, c_l) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^l$ is fixed. Let

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,l} = \{a \in \mathbb{N}^l : a_0 + \dots + a_l = n, a_i \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,l}(c) = \{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n,l} : a_i \leq a_j \text{ if } c_i \geq c_j\}.$$

Then

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n,l}(c)} \binom{n}{a_0, \dots, a_l} t^{c_0 a_0 + \dots + c_l a_l} \geq \frac{(t^{c_0} + \dots + t^{c_l})^n}{n^l}.$$

Proof. The multinomial theorem states that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n,l}} \binom{n}{a_0, \dots, a_l} t^{c_0 a_0 + \dots + c_l a_l} = (t^{c_0} + \dots + t^{c_l})^n,$$

and so

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n,l}} \binom{n}{a_0, \dots, a_l} \geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_{n,l}|} (t^{c_0} + \dots + t^{c_l})^n.$$

We trivially have the bound $|\mathcal{A}_{n,l}| \leq n^l$, since a_l is determined by a_0, \dots, a_{l-1} , and since there are at most n choices for each of a_0, \dots, a_{l-1} . What remains to be shown is that the maximal a lies in the restriction of $\mathcal{A}_{n,l}$ to $\mathcal{A}_{n,l}(c)$. Indeed, since $0 < t < 1$, we have that

$$t^{c_i} \leq t^{c_j}$$

if $c_i \geq c_j$, and so, for the maximal tuple a , we must have $a_i \leq a_j$, since if $a_i > a_j$, transposing a_i and a_j would increase the quantity being maximized. \square

Using Lemma 4 and Proposition 1 we are now ready to prove 4.

Proof. (of Theorem 4) Let $S_n^a \subset \{0, 1, \dots, l\}^n$ be a set where each element contains a_i copies of element i , so that $\sum_{i=0}^l a_i = n$. Then

$$|S_n^a| = \binom{n}{a_0, \dots, a_l},$$

and every element of S_n^a will have norm of the same parity, and hence any two elements $x, y \in S_n^a$ will have even squared distance. Due to the convexity of x^2 , the maximum squared distance between two elements in S_n^a occurs when the l 's match up with the 0's, the remaining 0's match up with the $(k-1)$'s, the remaining $(k-1)$'s match up with the 1's, and so on. For ease of indexing, let $\{b_i\}_{i=0}^l$ be a permutation of the a_i , where $b_l = a_l$, $b_{l-1} = a_0$, $b_{l-2} = a_{l-1}$, $b_{l-3} = a_1$, and so on. Then it is possible to match coefficients in precisely the way described above if for each j

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{i>j} (-1)^{j+i+1} b_i \leq b_j.$$

Assume that $b_i \leq b_j$ for $i > j$, which implies this condition. Let

$$d_{\max} = \max_{x, y \in S_n^a} \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2.$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\max} &= l^2 b_l + (l-1)^2 (b_{l-1} - b_l) + (l-2)^2 (b_{l-2} - b_{l-1} + b_l) + \dots \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^l (l-i)^2 \sum_{j=l-i}^l (-1)^{j+l-i} b_j. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the assumption in (4.6) is equivalent to assuming that the inner sum is always nonnegative. Rearranging the order of summation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\max} &= \sum_{j=0}^l b_j \sum_{i=l-j}^l (l-i)^2 (-1)^{l-j-i} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^l b_j \sum_{i=0}^j i^2 (-1)^i (-1)^{i+j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^l b_j \binom{j+1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality is due to the identity

$$\sum_{i=0}^j (j-i)^2 (-1)^i = \binom{j+1}{2}.$$

Thus for $S_n^a \subset \{0, 1, \dots, l\}^n$ satisfying $b_i \leq b_j$ for $i > j$, we have that

$$d_{\max} = \max_{x, y \in S} \frac{1}{2} \|x - y\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=0}^l b_j \binom{j+1}{2},$$

and hence by Proposition 1

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq 2^{k+1} |S_n^a| \max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{t^{\frac{k}{m+1} \sum_{j=0}^l c_j a_j + \epsilon_0}}{(1+t+\dots+t^l)^n}$$

where the constants c_j are the binomials $\binom{j+1}{2}$. Maximizing over all possible sets S_n^a , Lemma 4 implies that

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n,l}} |S_n^a| t^{\frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{j=0}^l c_j a_j} \geq \frac{1}{n^l} \left(\sum_{j=0}^l t^{\frac{k \binom{j+1}{2}}{m+1}} \right)^n,$$

and hence

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq 2^{k+1} \left(\max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta\left(t^{\frac{k}{m+1}}, l+1\right) t^{\frac{\epsilon_0}{n}}}{1+t+\dots+t^l} \right)^n.$$

Since $\frac{\epsilon_0}{n} \ll_l n^{-0.475}$, $t^{\frac{\epsilon_0}{n}} = 1 + o(1)$, and $2^{\frac{k+1}{n}} = 1 + O(\frac{1}{n})$ and so we have that

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq \left(\max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta\left(t^{\frac{k}{m+1}}, l+1\right)}{1+t+\dots+t^l} + o(1) \right)^n$$

which proves the theorem. \square

5. ASYMPTOTICS

In this section, we prove Theorem 5. Let

$$\theta(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}},$$

and

$$\theta(t; l) = 1 + t + t^3 + t^6 + t^{10} + \dots + t^{\binom{l}{2}},$$

and define

$$F_\gamma(t, l) = \frac{\theta(t^\gamma; l)}{1+t+\dots+t^{l-1}}.$$

We begin by proving that $\max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l)$ is non-trivial for any $0 < \gamma < 1$.

Proposition 2. *For $0 < \gamma < 1$ we have that*

$$(5.1) \quad \max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l) > 1$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \max_{0 < t < 1} (1-t) \theta(t^\gamma) > 1.$$

Proof. Let $\eta = \frac{1}{\gamma}$, and define $G_\eta(t, l) = F_\gamma(t^\eta, l)$. Then

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} G_\eta(t, l) = \max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l).$$

Observe that $G_\eta(0, l) = \frac{l}{l} = 1$, and since $\eta > 1$,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} G_\eta(t, l) \right|_{t=0} = 1.$$

This implies that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such $G_\eta(\epsilon, l) > G_\eta(0, l) = 1$, equation (5.1) follows. To prove the second part, let

$$G_\eta(t) = (1 - t^\eta)\theta(t).$$

Then $G_\eta(0) = 1$, and

$$\frac{d}{dt} G_\eta(t) = (1 - t^\eta) \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \binom{n}{2} t^{\binom{n}{2}-1} \right) - \eta t^{\eta-1} \theta(t).$$

Since $\eta > 1$, we have $\frac{d}{dt} G_\eta(0) = 1$, and equation (5.2) follows. \square

Next we try to understand for which l $\max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l)$ is largest, and then lower bound this quantity by a minimization in terms of $\theta(t)$.

Proposition 3. For $0 < \gamma < 1$,

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l)$$

is maximized by choosing $l < \frac{2}{\gamma}$.

Proof. Suppose that $l \geq \frac{2}{\gamma}$, and let $0 < t_0 < 1$ be chosen so that $F_\gamma(t_0, l)$ is maximized. The final coefficient of $\theta(t_0^\gamma; l)$ is $t_0^{\gamma \binom{l}{2}}$, and since $\gamma \binom{l}{2} \geq l - 1$, it follows that $t_0^{\gamma \binom{l}{2}} \leq t_0^{l-1}$. For $a, b, c, d > 0$, if $\frac{c}{d} < \frac{a}{b}$, then $\frac{a+c}{b+d} < \frac{a}{b}$, and so since $F_\gamma(t_0, l) > 1$, by setting $a = \theta(t_0^\gamma; l - 1)$, $b = 1 + \dots + t_0^{l-2}$, $c = t_0^{\gamma \binom{l}{2}}$, $d = t_0^{l-1}$, it follows that

$$F_\gamma(t_0, l - 1) > F_\gamma(t_0, l),$$

which proves the proposition. \square

Proposition 4. For $0 < \gamma < 1$, and for $l \geq \frac{2}{\gamma}$,

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} \frac{\theta(t^\gamma; l)}{1 + t + \dots + t^{l-1}} \geq \max_{0 < t < 1} (1 - t)\theta(t^\gamma).$$

Proof. Let $0 < t_1 < 1$ be such that $(1 - t_1)\theta(t_1^\gamma)$ is maximized. For any $j \geq l$, $\gamma \binom{j+1}{2} \geq j$, and hence

$$\sum_{j \geq l} t_1^{\gamma \binom{j+1}{2}} \leq \sum_{j \geq l} t_1^j,$$

since the inequality holds term by term. Since

$$(1 - t_1)\theta(t_1^\gamma) = \frac{\theta(t_1; l) + \sum_{j \geq l} t_1^{\gamma \binom{j+1}{2}}}{1 + \dots + t_1^{l-1} + \sum_{j \geq l} t_1^j},$$

the result again follows from the fact that $\max_{0 < t < 1} F_\gamma(t, l) \geq 1$ if $a, b, c, d > 0$ and $\frac{c}{d} < \frac{a}{b}$, then $\frac{a+c}{b+d} < \frac{a}{b}$. \square

To complete the proof of Theorem 5, $0 < \gamma < 1$ we need a general lower bound for

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} (1-t)\theta(t^\gamma).$$

To do so, we first use the Poisson Summation Formula to establish a functional equation for $\theta(t)$.

Proposition 5. *For $x > 0$, we have that*

$$\theta(e^{-\pi x}) = \frac{e^{\frac{\pi x}{8}}}{\sqrt{2x}} \vartheta_4\left(e^{-\frac{2\pi}{x}}\right),$$

where

$$\vartheta_4(q) = \left(1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{n^2}\right)$$

is a Jacobi Theta function.

Proof. We have that

$$\theta(e^{-2\pi x}) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{\pi x}{4}} \vartheta_2(e^{-\pi x})$$

where ϑ_2 is the Jacobi Theta function

$$\vartheta_2(e^{-\pi x}) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\pi x(n+\frac{1}{2})^2}.$$

Let $f(t) = e^{-\pi x(t+\frac{1}{2})^2}$, and consider the Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F}(f(t))(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i t \omega} f(t) dt.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{F}(f(t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi \omega^2}{x} + i\pi \omega\right),$$

and hence by the Poisson Summation formula

$$\vartheta_2(e^{-\pi x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \vartheta_4\left(e^{-\frac{\pi}{x}}\right).$$

□

Using this functional equation, we lower bound the maximum.

Theorem 9. *For $0 < \gamma < 1$ we have that*

$$(5.3) \quad \max_{0 < t < 1} (1-t)\theta(t^\gamma) > \Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$$

where

$$\Gamma_\chi = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \max_{0 < u < \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}} = 0.7998308498 \dots$$

Proof. Let $\eta = \frac{1}{\gamma}$. By replacing t with t^η , we need to show that for $\eta > 1$

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} (1-t)\theta(t^\eta) > \Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\eta}.$$

For $\eta < 1.56$ we have that $\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{\eta} < 1$, and so the result holds trivially by (5.2). Substituting $t = e^{-\pi x}$, by proposition 5, we have

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} (1-t^\eta)\theta(t) = \max_{0 < x < \infty} (1 - e^{-\pi \eta x}) \frac{e^{\frac{\pi x}{8}}}{\sqrt{2x}} \vartheta_4\left(e^{-\frac{2\pi}{x}}\right).$$

Letting $x = \frac{u}{\pi\eta}$, this becomes

$$\sqrt{\frac{\pi\eta}{2}} \max_{0 < u < \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}} e^{\frac{u}{8\eta}} \vartheta_4 \left(e^{-\frac{2\pi^2\eta}{u}} \right).$$

Since $\vartheta_4(q)$ is an alternating series,

$$\vartheta_4 \left(e^{-\frac{2\pi^2\eta}{u}} \right) \geq 1 - 2e^{-\frac{2\pi^2\eta}{u}}.$$

For $0 \leq u < 25\eta$ we have that

$$e^{\frac{u}{8\eta}} \left(1 - 2e^{-\frac{2\pi^2\eta}{u}} \right) \geq 1,$$

and so

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} (1 - t^\eta) \theta(t) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi\eta}{2}} \max_{0 < u < 25} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}}.$$

The function $\frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}}$ is maximized at $u = 1.25643\dots$, which implies that

$$\max_{0 < u < 25} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}} = \max_{0 < u < \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}} = 0.638172686\dots,$$

and the result follows. \square

Theorem 5 then follows from Theorem 9 and Proposition 4.

6. OPEN PROBLEMS

In this section we discuss some open problems related to the chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^n with multiple forbidden distances.

Sphere Packing. Kupavskii's upper bound from [20] can be restated in terms of the lattice sphere packing constant. Let Δ_n denote the density of the densest lattice packing of spheres in \mathbb{R}^n . The best bounds are (see [19])

$$2^{-n(1+o(1))} \leq \Delta_n \leq 2^{-0.5990n}.$$

Kupavskii proved that

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, [1, l]) \leq \frac{(l + 1 + o(1))^n}{\Delta_n}.$$

Theorem 4 along with Kupavskii's bound for $l = \sqrt{m}$, implies that for $A_m = \{1, \sqrt{2}, \dots, \sqrt{m}\}$,

$$\Gamma_\chi \sqrt{m+1} \leq \frac{(\sqrt{m} + 1 + o(1))^n}{\Delta_n}.$$

For n sufficiently large, this implies the upper bound

$$\Delta_n \leq \frac{1 + o(1)}{\Gamma_\chi^n}.$$

Sadly this is a trivial result since $\Gamma_\chi < 1$, however a 26% improvement to the constant in Theorem 1 would yield a non-trivial result.

Problem 1. Can the bound in Theorem 1 be improved to

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m) \geq (C\sqrt{m} + o(1))^n$$

for some $C > 1$, giving a new proof of a non-trivial upper bound for sphere packing?

Upper Bounds. Kupavskii’s upper bound for $\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m)$ is far from the lower bound established in this paper. Can any improvement be made? In particular, can the dependence on m be reduced from exponential to polynomial?

Problem 2. Does there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^n; m) \leq (c_1 m)^{c_2 n}?$$

Kupavskii’s upper bound for $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m)$ (1.5) differs from the Larman-Rogers bound when $m = 1$. Indeed, when $m = 1$, (1.5) becomes

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^n) \leq (4 + o(1))^n.$$

Problem 3. Can Kupavskii’s upper bound for $\chi(\mathbb{R}^n, A_m)$ be improved in such a way that $m = 1$ lines up with the Larman-Rogers bound of 3^n ?

Low Dimensions. Let $g(n)$ denote the minimal number of distinct distances between n points in the plane. Then $\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m) \geq g^{-1}(m)$. Can this simple lower bound be improved at all for large m ?

Problem 4. Does there exist $C > 1$ such that

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m) \geq C g^{-1}(m)?$$

Assuming a conjecture of Erdős and Fishburn (see Section 2), this is equivalent to asking if there exists $C > \frac{1}{C_\Delta}$ such that

$$\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m) \geq C m \sqrt{\log m}.$$

This is significantly weaker than Erdős’ question whether $\bar{\chi}(\mathbb{R}^2; m)$ grows polynomially in m . I believe that the answer to problem 4 is “yes”, but it seems like it would require a different approach to this problem.

Theta Functions and the Double Cap Conjecture. The *double cap conjecture* states that the set $A \subset S^{n-1}$ with the largest volume that does not contain two orthogonal vectors is the union of two spherical caps on either side of the sphere. Let V_{n-1} denote the maximum of $\text{vol}(A)/\text{vol}(S^{n-1})$ for any set $A \subset S^{n-1}$ avoiding two orthogonal vectors, and define

$$\mu_S = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (V_{n-1})^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Then we have that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \mu_S \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},$$

where the lower bound comes from the double cap, and the upper bound is due to Raigorodskii [28]. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an even integral lattice, and define

$$\theta_\Lambda(q) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} q^{-\|\lambda\|_2^2}.$$

Define

$$\mu_\Lambda = \left(\max_{0 < t < 1} \theta_\Lambda(t)(1-t)^d \right)^{-\frac{1}{d}}.$$

The methods of this paper yield the following result:

Theorem 10. *For any even integral lattice Λ*

$$(6.1) \quad \mu_S \leq \mu_\Lambda.$$

(See the Appendix for a proof) Let D_k denote the elements of \mathbb{Z}^k at even distance from the origin, and let $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{D_k}$. Then by [4, Chapter 4]

$$\theta_{D_n}(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\theta_3(t)^n + \theta_4(t)^n)$$

where $\theta_3(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} t^{n^2}$ and $\theta_4(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^n t^{n^2}$, and taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{Z}} = \min_{0 < t < 1} (\theta_3(t)(1-t))^{-1} = 0.883337\dots$$

Let Λ_{24} denote the Leech Lattice, and E_8 the E_8 lattice. Using [4, Chapter 4] we have the following calculations:

$$\mu_{E_8} = 0.88406\dots$$

and

$$\mu_{\Lambda_{24}} = 0.88407\dots$$

These all result in upper bounds for μ_S that are all worse than Raigorodskii's bound of $\sqrt{3}/2 = 0.866\dots$

Problem 5. Does there exist a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\mu_{\Lambda} < \mu_{\mathbb{Z}}?$$

If yes, it maybe be possible to work with a subset of such a lattice to obtain a new upper bound for the double cap conjecture.

APPENDIX: LATTICES AND THE DOUBLE CAP CONJECTURE

In Section 6, we looked at the *double cap conjecture*, and stated Theorem 10 relating the problem to the theta function of a lattice. In this appendix, we prove Theorem 10, which is a similar proof to that of Theorem 4. Let Λ be an even integral lattice, and let v_1, \dots, v_d be a basis for Λ . For $l \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\Lambda_l = \{c_1 v_1 + \dots + c_d v_d : c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, -l \leq c_i \leq l\}.$$

Let $\ell = (|\Lambda_l| - 1)/2$, and index the elements of Λ_l from $-\ell$ to ℓ , where elements indexed by $-i, i$ are antipodal for every $i \neq 0$. Then

$$\theta_{\Lambda}(t) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} t^{-\|\lambda\|_2^2}$$

and given a choice of basis, we can define the truncation

$$\theta_{\Lambda}(t, l) = \sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} t^{-\|\lambda_i\|_2^2}.$$

Proposition 6. *For any even integral lattice Λ and any $l \geq 1$, we have that*

$$\mu_S \leq \min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1 + t + \dots + t^{2l+1}}{\theta_{\Lambda}(t, l)^{\frac{1}{d}}}$$

for some choice of basis v_1, \dots, v_d .

Proof. Choose a basis for Λ . Consider the n -fold product of Λ_l with itself, $\Lambda_l^n = \Lambda_l \times \dots \times \Lambda_l \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$. By the assumption that the lattice is integral and even, $\frac{\|x-y\|_2^2}{2} \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for every $x, y \in \Lambda_l^n$. Let n be sufficiently large, and let $S \subset \Lambda_l^n$ be such that each element contains a_i copies of element i and $-i$ of Λ_l . Due to the convexity of x^2 , the maximum

squared distance between two elements in S_n^a occurs when antipodal points are paired. It follows that the maximum squared distance will be

$$\max_{x,y \in S} \frac{\|x-y\|_2^2}{2} = \sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2,$$

and this occurs exactly when x, y are antipodal. Let \tilde{S} be the set S where directly antipodal points are removed, so that $|\tilde{S}| > |S|/2$, and

$$d_{\max} = \max_{x,y \in \tilde{S}} \frac{\|x-y\|_2^2}{2} < \sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2.$$

Let

$$(6.2) \quad p = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2 \right)$$

and suppose that p is prime. Then the polynomial $F : \tilde{S} \times \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ defined by

$$F(x, y) = 1 - \left(\frac{\|x-y\|_2^2}{2} \right)^{p-1}$$

will be 1 if $x = y$ or if x, y are at a right angle. The proof of Proposition 1 implies that if $A \subset S$ satisfies

$$|A| \geq 4 \min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(1+t+\dots+t^{2l+1})^{nd}}{t^{d_{\max}}}$$

then it contains two elements $x \neq y$ with $F(x, y) = 1$, that is two elements at a right angle. If we could maximize over all possible sets \tilde{S} while ignoring the constraint that p must be prime, then Lemma 4 would imply that

$$\max_{\tilde{S}} |\tilde{S}| t^{n \sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2} \geq \frac{1}{nd} \left(\sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} t^{\|v_i\|_2^2} \right)^n = \frac{1}{nd} \theta_{\Lambda}(t, l)^n,$$

and hence that there exists \tilde{S} such that if $A \subset \tilde{S}$ does not contain two elements at a right angle, then

$$\frac{|A|}{|\tilde{S}|} \leq 4nd \min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(1+t+\dots+t^{2l+1})^{nd}}{\theta_{\Lambda}(t, l)^n}.$$

Using bounds for prime gaps, we can modify Lemma 4 to handle the constraint that p is prime, while only varying n a small amount. This is due to the fact that small perturbations of size $\ll n^{1-\epsilon}$ to the individual coefficients a_i will not affect the final asymptotic, but do allow us to modify the quantity

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(n \sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2 \right)$$

sufficiently to insure that it is prime. In particular, let i be such that $\alpha = \|v_i\|_2^2/2$ is minimal. If we increase n by 2 and increase the coefficients a_i, a_{-i} , corresponding to v_i and $-v_i$, each by 1, we will increase the value of p by exactly 2α . Heilbronn [18] showed that for any fixed modulus q , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\pi(x + x^{1-\delta}; q, a) - \pi(x; q, a) \sim \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \frac{x^{1-\delta}}{\log x}$$

where

$$\pi(x; q, a) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} 1$$

is the prime counting function, and $\phi(q)$ is the Euler-Totient function (See also [23, Page 141-142]). Applying this theorem with the modulus 2α , by modifying a_i, a_{-i} in the way described, it follows that there exists $\delta > 0$ and some constant C_1 depending on v_1, \dots, v_d and on l , such that there exists m such that

$$n \leq m \leq n + C_1 n^{1-\delta}$$

with $p = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=-\ell}^{\ell} a_i \|v_i\|_2^2 \right)$ prime. Consequently, there is a choice of a_i such that for any subset of $A \subset \tilde{S}$ of density

$$\frac{|A|}{|\tilde{S}|} \leq \left(\min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{(1 + t + \dots + t^{2l+1})^d}{\theta_\Lambda(t, l)} + o(1) \right)^n,$$

and it follows that

$$\mu_S \leq \min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1 + t + \dots + t^{2l+1}}{\theta_\Lambda(t, l)^{\frac{1}{d}}}.$$

□

For any l , since $1 + t + \dots + t^{2l+1} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} t^i$ for any $0 < t < 1$, it follows that

$$\min_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1 + t + \dots + t^{2l+1}}{\theta_\Lambda(t, l)^{\frac{1}{d}}} \leq \min_{0 < t < 1} \left(\theta_\Lambda(t, l)^{\frac{1}{d}} (1 - t) \right)^{-1},$$

and so

$$\mu_S \leq \min_{0 < t < 1} \left(\theta_\Lambda(t, l)^{\frac{1}{d}} (1 - t) \right)^{-1}$$

for every l . Taking the limit as $l \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain Theorem 4.

Acknowledgements

I would like thank Yufei Zhao for a number of helpful conversations.

REFERENCES

1. R. C. Baker, G. Harman, and J. Pintz, *The difference between consecutive primes. II*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **83** (2001), no. 3, 532–562. MR 1851081
2. A. V. Berdnikov, *Estimate for the chromatic number of euclidean space with several forbidden distances*, Mathematical Notes **99** (2016), no. 5, 774–778. MR 3507443
3. ———, *Chromatic number with several forbidden distances in the space with the ℓ_q -metric*, J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) **227** (2017), no. 4, 395–401. MR 3720203
4. J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere packings, lattices and groups*, third ed., Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 290, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999, With additional contributions by E. Bannai, R. E. Borcherds, J. Leech, S. P. Norton, A. M. Odlyzko, R. A. Parker, L. Queen and B. B. Venkov. MR 1662447
5. 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** (2017), no. 1, 331–337. MR 3583357
6. Aubrey D. N. J. de Grey, *The chromatic number of the plane is at least 5*, Geombinatorics **28** (2018), no. 1, 18–31. MR 3820926
7. 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** (2017), no. 1, 339–343. MR 3583358

8. P. Erdős, *Problems and results in combinatorial geometry*, Discrete geometry and convexity (New York, 1982), Ann. New York Acad. Sci., vol. 440, New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1985, pp. 1–11. MR 809186
9. P. Erdős, *On sets of distances of n points*, Amer. Math. Monthly **53** (1946), 248–250. MR 15796
10. Paul Erdős and Peter Fishburn, *Maximum planar sets that determine k distances*, Discrete Math. **160** (1996), no. 1-3, 115–125. MR 1417565
11. P. Frankl and R. M. Wilson, *Intersection theorems with geometric consequences*, Combinatorica **1** (1981), no. 4, 357–368. MR 647986
12. Peter Frankl and Vojtěch Rödl, *Forbidden intersections*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **300** (1987), no. 1, 259–286. MR 871675
13. Martin Gardner, *Martin Gardner's mathematical games*, MAA Spectrum, Mathematical Association of America, Washington, DC, 2005, The entire collection of his Scientific American columns, With a booklet containing a biography of the author by Donald J. Albers and Peter L. Renz. MR 2136847
14. E. S. Gorskaya, I. M. Mitricheva, V. Yu. Protasov, and A. M. Raĭ gorodskii, *Estimation of the chromatic numbers of Euclidean space by convex minimization methods*, Mat. Sb. **200** (2009), no. 6, 3–22. MR 2553072
15. Larry Guth and Nets Hawk Katz, *On the Erdős distinct distances problem in the plane*, Ann. of Math. (2) **181** (2015), no. 1, 155–190. MR 3272924
16. H. Hadwiger, *Ein Ueberdeckungssatz für den Euklidischen Raum*, Portugaliae Math. **4** (1944), 140–144. MR 0011108
17. ———, *Ueberdeckung des Euklidischen Raumes durch kongruente Mengen*, Portugaliae Math. **4** (1945), 238–242. MR 0013902
18. Hans Heilbronn, *Über den Primzahlsatz von Herrn Hoheisel*, Math. Z. **36** (1933), no. 1, 394–423. MR 1545353
19. G. A. Kabatjanskiĭ and V. I. Levenšteĭn, *Bounds for packings on the sphere and in space*, Problemy Peredači Informacii **14** (1978), no. 1, 3–25. MR 0514023
20. A. B. Kupavskii, *On the chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^n with a set of forbidden distances*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk **435** (2010), no. 6, 740–743. MR 2814571
21. D. G. Larman and C. A. Rogers, *The realization of distances within sets in Euclidean space*, Matematika **19** (1972), 1–24. MR 0319055
22. Pieter Moree and Herman J. J. te Riele, *The hexagonal versus the square lattice*, Math. Comp. **73** (2004), no. 245, 451–473. MR 2034132
23. Władysław Narkiewicz, *Rational number theory in the 20th century*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, London, 2012, From PNT to FLT. MR 3014464
24. Eric Naslund, *Exponential bounds for the Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv constant*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **174** (2020), 105185, 19. MR 4078996
25. ———, *Monochromatic equilateral triangles in the unit distance graph*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **52** (2020), no. 4, 687–692. MR 4171395
26. ———, *The partition rank of a tensor and k -right corners in \mathbb{F}_q^n* , J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **174** (2020), 105190, 25. MR 4078997
27. R. I. Prosanov, *Upper bounds for the chromatic numbers of Euclidean spaces with forbidden Ramsey sets*, Mat. Zametki **103** (2018), no. 2, 248–257. MR 3749609
28. A. M. Raĭ gorodskii, *On a bound in the Borsuk problem*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **54** (1999), no. 2(326), 185–186. MR 1711207
29. ———, *On the chromatic number of a space*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **55** (2000), no. 2(332), 147–148. MR 1781075
30. ———, *The Borsuk problem and the chromatic numbers of some metric spaces*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **56** (2001), no. 1(337), 107–146. MR 1845644
31. A. A. Sagdeev, *On a Frankl-Rödl theorem*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **82** (2018), no. 6, 128–157. MR 3881768
32. Alexander Soifer, *Chromatic number of the plane & its relatives, history, problems and results: an essay in 11 parts*, Ramsey theory, Progr. Math., vol. 285, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2011, pp. 121–161. MR 2759008

33. Terence 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-pach-ellenberg-gijswijt-capset-bound/>.
Email address: `naslund.math@gmail.com`