TRANSLATION INVARIANCE
IN GROUPS OF PRIME ORDER

VSEVOLOD F. LEV

Abstract. We prove that there is an absolute constant $c > 0$ with the following
property: if $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the group of prime order $p$, and a subset $A \subset \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ satisfies
$1 < |A| < p/2$, then for any positive integer $m < \min\{c|A|/\ln|A|, \sqrt{p/8}\}$ there are at
most $2m$ non-zero elements $b \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with $|(A + b) \setminus A| \leq m$. This (partially) extends
onto prime-order groups the result, established earlier by S. Konyagin and the present
author for the group of integers.

We notice that if $A \subset \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is an arithmetic progression and $m < |A| < p/2$, then
there are exactly $2m$ non-zero elements $b \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with $|(A + b) \setminus A| \leq m$. Furthermore,
the bound $c|A|/\ln|A|$ is best possible up to the value of the constant $c$. On the other
hand, it is likely that the assumption $m < \sqrt{p/8}$ can be dropped or substantially
relaxed.

1. Background and motivation

For a finite subset $A$ and an element $b$ of an additively written abelian group, let
$$\Delta_A(b) := |(A + b) \setminus A|.$$ If $A$ does not contain cosets of the subgroup, generated by $b$, then the quantity $\Delta_A(b)$
can be interpreted as the smallest number of arithmetic progressions with difference $b$ into which $A$ can be partitioned. We also note that $|A| - \Delta_A(b)$ is the number of
representations of $b$ as a difference of two elements of $A$; thus, $\Delta_A(b)$ measures the
“popularity” of $b$ as such a difference (with 0 corresponding to the largest possible
popularity).

The function $\Delta_A$ has been considered by a number of authors, the two earliest ap-
pearances in the literature we are aware of being [EH64] and [O68]. Evidently, we have
$\Delta_A(0) = 0$; other well-known properties of this function are as follows:

P1. $\Delta_A(-b) = \Delta_A(b)$ for any group element $b$.

P2. If the underlying group is finite and $\bar{A}$ is the complement of $A$, then $\Delta_A(b) =
\Delta_{\bar{A}}(b)$ for any group element $b$.

P3. $\Delta_A(b_1 + \cdots + b_k) \leq \Delta_A(b_1) + \cdots + \Delta_A(b_k)$ for any integer $k \geq 1$ and group
elements $b_1, \ldots, b_k$.
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P4. Any finite, non-empty subset $B$ of the group contains an element $b$ with $\Delta_A(b) \geq \left(1 - \frac{|A|}{|B|}\right) |A|$. The interested reader can find the proofs in [EH64, O68, HLS08] or work them out as an easy exercise. We confine ourselves to the remark that the last property follows by averaging over all elements of $B$.

The basic problem arising in connection with the function $\Delta_A$ is to show that it does not attain “too many” small values; that is, every set $B$ contains an element $b$ with $\Delta_A(b)$ large, with the precise meaning of “large” determined by the size of $B$. Accordingly, we let

$$\mu_A(B) := \max_{b \in B} \Delta_A(b).$$

Property P4 readily yields the simple lower-bound estimate

$$\mu_A(B) \geq \left(1 - \frac{|A|}{|B|}\right) |A|;$$

however, this estimate is far from sharp, and insufficient for most applications.

Notice, that if $d$ is a group element of sufficiently large order, $A$ is an arithmetic progression with difference $d$, and $B = \{d, 2d, \ldots, md\}$ with $m = |B| \leq |A|$, then $\mu_A(B) = |B|$. Thus,

$$\mu_A(B) \geq |B|$$

is the best lower-bound estimate one can hope to prove under the assumption $B \cap (-B) = \emptyset$ (cf. Property P1). In view of the trivial inequality $\mu_A(B) \leq |A|$, a necessary condition for (2) to hold is $|B| \leq |A|$, but this may not be enough to require: say, an example presented in [KL] shows that (2) fails in general for the group of integers, unless $|B| < c|A|/\ln |A|$ with a sufficiently small absolute constant $c$. As shown in [KL], this last assumption already suffices.

**Theorem 1** ([KL, Theorem 1]). There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that if $A$ is a finite set of integers with $|A| > 1$, and $B$ is a finite set of positive integers satisfying $|B| < c|A|/\ln |A|$, then $\mu_A(B) \geq |B|$.

2. **The main result**

It is natural to expect that an analogue of Theorem 1 remains valid for groups of prime order, particularly since the arithmetic progression case is “worst in average” for these groups: namely, it is easy to derive from [L98, Theorem 1] that for all sets $A$ and $B$ of given fixed size in such a group, satisfying $B \cap (-B) = \emptyset$, the sum $\sum_{b \in B} \Delta_A(b)$ is minimized when $A$ is an arithmetic progression, and $B = \{d, 2d, \ldots, md\}$, where $m$ is a positive integer and $d$ is the difference of the progression. The goal of this note is to establish the corresponding supremum-norm result.
Throughout, we denote by $\mathbb{Z}$ the group of integers, and by $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with $p$ prime the group of order $p$.

**Theorem 2.** There exists an absolute constant $c > 0$ with the following property: if $p$ is a prime and the sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ satisfy $1 < |A| < p/2$, $B \cap (-B) = \emptyset$, and $|B| < \min\{c|A|/\ln|A|, \sqrt{p/8}\}$, then $\mu_A(B) \geq |B|$.

As Property P2 shows, the assumption $|A| < p/2$ of Theorem 2 does not restrict its generality. In contrast, the assumption $|B| < \sqrt{p/8}$ seems to be an artifact of the method and it is quite possible that the assertion of Theorem 2 remains valid if this assumption is substantially relaxed or dropped altogether.

We notice that Theorem 2 is formally stronger than Theorem 1. However, the proof of the former theorem (presented in Section 4) relies on the latter one, used “as a black box”. The proof also employs a rectification result of Freiman, and elements of the argument used in [KL] to prove Theorem 1, in a somewhat modified form.

The rest of this paper is divided into three parts: having prepared the ground in the next section, we prove Theorem 2 in Section 4, and present an application to the problem of estimating the size of a restricted sumset in the last section.

### 3. The toolbox

In this section we collect some auxiliary results, needed in the course of the proof of Theorem 2.

Given a subset $B$ of an abelian group and an integer $h \geq 1$, by $hB$ we denote the $h$-fold sumset of $B$:

$$hB := \{b_1 + \cdots + b_h : b_1, \ldots, b_h \in B\}.$$

Our first lemma is an immediate consequence of Property P3.

**Lemma 1.** For any integer $h \geq 1$ and finite subsets $A$ and $B$ of an abelian group we have

$$\mu_A(hB) \leq h\mu_A(B).$$

The following lemma of Hamidoune, Lladó, and Serra gives an estimate which, looking deceptively similar to (1), for $B$ small is actually rather sharp. We quote below a slightly simplified version, which is marginally weaker than the original result.

**Lemma 2** ([HLS08, Lemma 3.1]). Suppose that $A$ and $B$ are non-empty subsets of a finite cyclic group such that $B \cap (-B) = \emptyset$ and the size of $A$ is at most half the size of the group. If every element of $B$ generates the group, then

$$\mu_A(B) > \left(1 - \frac{|B|}{|A|}\right)|B|.$$
Yet another ingredient of our argument is a rectification theorem due to Freiman.

**Theorem 3** ([N96, Theorem 2.11]). Let $p$ be a prime and suppose that $B \subset \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is a subset with $|B| < p/35$. If $|2B| \leq 2.4|B| - 3$, then $B$ is contained in an arithmetic progression with at most $|2B| - |B| + 1$ terms.

Finally, we need a lemma showing that if $B$ is a dense set of integers, then the difference set $B - B := \{b' - b'' : b', b'' \in B\}$ contains a long block of consecutive integers.

**Lemma 3** ([L06, Lemma 3]). Let $B$ be a finite, non-empty set of integers. If $\max B - \min B < \frac{2k-1}{k} - 1$ with an integer $k \geq 2$, then $B - B$ contains all integers from the interval $(-|B|/(k-1), |B|/(k-1))$.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 2

For real $u < v$ and prime $p$, by $\varphi_p$ we denote the canonical homomorphism from $\mathbb{Z}$ onto $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, and by $[u, v]_p$ the image of the set $[u, v] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ under $\varphi_p$. In a similar way we define $[u, v)_p$ and $(u, v)_p$.

We begin with the important particular case where $B$ is a block of consecutive group elements, starting from 1. Thus, we assume that $p$ is a prime, $A \subset \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ satisfies $1 < |A| < p/2$, and $m < \min\{c|A|/\ln |A|, \sqrt{p/8}\}$ is a positive integer (where $c$ is the constant of Theorem 1), and show that, letting then $B := [1, m)_p$, we have $\mu_A(B) \geq m$.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\mu_A(B) < m$. Since $A$ is a union of $\Delta_A(1)$ blocks of consecutive elements of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, so is its complement $\bar{A} := (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}) \setminus A$, and we choose integers $u < v$ such that $[u, v)_p \subseteq \bar{A}$ and

$$v - u \geq \frac{|\bar{A}|}{\Delta_A(1)} > \frac{p}{2m} > m.$$  \hfill (3)

Rectifying the circle, we identify $A$ with a set of integers $A \subseteq [v, u + p)$, and $B$ with the set $B := [1, m] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Inequality (3) shows that an arithmetic progression in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with difference $d \in [1, m)_p$ cannot “jump over” the block $[u, v)_p$; hence, $\mu_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$. On the other hand, we have $\mu_A(B) \geq |B| = m$ by Theorem 1. It follows that $\mu_A(B) \geq m$, the contradicting sought.

We notice that so far instead of $m < \sqrt{p/8}$ we have only used the weaker inequality

$$m < \sqrt{p/2};$$  \hfill (4)

this observation is used below in the proof.
Having finished with the case where $B$ consists of consecutive elements of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, we
now address the general situation. Suppose, therefore, that $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ satisfy the
assumptions of the theorem and, again, assume that $\mu_A(B) < |B|.$

For a subset $S$ of an abelian group we write $S^\pm := S \cup \{0\} \cup (-S)$; thus, by
Property P1, we have $\mu_A(S^\pm) = \mu_A(S)$ for any finite subset $A$ of the group, and if
$S \cap (-S) = \emptyset$, then $|S^\pm| = 2|S| + 1$.

If $|2B^\pm| \geq \frac{1}{3} |A| + 1$, then by the well-known Cauchy-Davenport inequality (see, for
instance, [N96, Theorem 2.2]), we have $|12B^\pm| > 2|A|$. Thus, using Lemma 1 and
estimate (1), and assuming that $c$ is sufficiently small, we conclude that

$$
\mu_A(B) = \mu_A(B^\pm) \geq \frac{1}{12} \mu_A(12B^\pm) > \frac{1}{24} |A| \geq |B|,
$$
a contradiction; accordingly, we assume

$$
|2B^\pm| < \frac{1}{3} |A| + 1.
$$

Let $C := (2B^\pm) \cap [1, p/2)_p$. Observing that $|C| = ([2B^\pm| - 1]/2 < \frac{1}{6} |A|$, by Lemmas 2
and 1 and the assumption $\mu_A(B) < |B|$ we get

$$
\frac{5}{6} |C| \leq \mu_A(C) = \mu_A(B^\pm) \leq 2\mu_A(B^\pm) = 2\mu_A(B) \leq 2(|B| - 1) = |B^\pm| - 3;
$$
hence,

$$
|2B^\pm| = 2|C| + 1 < \frac{12}{5} |B^\pm| - \frac{31}{5} < 2.4 |B^\pm| - 3. \tag{5}
$$

We now apply Theorem 3 to derive that the set $B^\pm$ is contained in an arithmetic
progression with at most $|2B^\pm| - |B^\pm| + 1 < \frac{1}{3} |A| \leq p/2 + 1$ terms. Taking into account
that $0 \in B^\pm$ and dilating $A$ and $B$ suitably, we assume without loss of generality that
$B^\pm \subseteq (-p/4, p/4)_p$ and $B^\pm$ is actually contained in a block of at most $|2B^\pm| - |B^\pm| + 1$
consecutive elements of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

Let $B \subseteq [1, p/4)$ be the set of integers such that $B^\pm = \varphi_p(B^\pm)$, and write $l :=
\max(B^\pm) - \min(B^\pm)$. From (5) we conclude that

$$
l \leq |2B^\pm| - |B^\pm| \leq \frac{3}{2} |B^\pm| - 1 = \frac{3}{2} |B^\pm| - 1.
$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3 (applied with $k = 2$) we have

$$
[1, |B^\pm| - 1] \subseteq B^\pm - B^\pm = 2B^\pm,
$$
whence

$$
[1, |B^\pm| - 1]_p \subseteq 2B^\pm.
$$

Recalling that the result is already established for the consecutive residues case, and
observing that $|B^\pm| - 1 = 2|B| < \sqrt{p}/2$ (to be compared with (4)), we obtain

$$
\mu_A(2B^\pm) \geq \mu_A([1, |B^\pm| - 1]_p) \geq |B^\pm| - 1 = 2|B|.
$$
Using now Lemma 1 we get
\[ 2\mu_A(B) = 2\mu_A(B^\pm) \geq \mu_A(2B^\pm) \geq 2|B|, \]
a contradiction completing the proof of Theorem 2.

5. An application: restricted sumsets in abelian groups

Given two subsets \( A \) and \( B \) of an abelian group and a mapping \( \tau: B \to A \), let
\[ A \tau + B := \{ a + b: a \in A, b \in B, a \neq \tau(b) \}. \]
Restricted sumsets of this form, generalizing in a natural way the “classical” restricted sumset \( \{ a + b: a \in A, b \in B, a \neq b \} \), were studied, for instance, in [L00]. Since
\[ |(A + b_1) \cup (A + b_2)| = |A| + |(A + b_1 - b_2) \setminus A| \]
for any \( b_1, b_2 \in B \), we have
\[ |A + B| \geq |A| + \mu_A(B - B) \]
and, furthermore,
\[ |A \tau + B| \geq |A| + \mu_A(B - B) - 2; \]
hence, lower-bound estimates for \( \mu_A(B - B) \) translate immediately into estimates for the cardinalities of the sumset \( A + B \) and the restricted sumset \( A \tau + B \). Here we confine ourselves to stating three corollaries of estimate (1), Lemma 2, and Theorem 2, respectively.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose that \( A \) and \( B \) are finite subsets of an abelian group. If for some real \( \varepsilon > 0 \) we have \( |B| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)|A| \) and \( |B - B| \geq \varepsilon^{-1}|A| \), then
\[ |A + B| \geq |A| + |B| \]
and
\[ |A \tau + B| \geq |A| + |B| - 2 \]
for any mapping \( \tau: B \to A \).

**Theorem 5.** Suppose that \( p \) is a prime and \( A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \) are non-empty. If \( |A| < p/2 \) and \( |B| < \sqrt{|A|} + 1 \), then for any mapping \( \tau: B \to A \) we have
\[ |A \tau + B| \geq |A| + |B| - 3. \]
For the proof just notice that if \(2 \leq |B| \leq (p + 1)/2\), then by the Cauchy-Davenport inequality there exists a subset \(C \subseteq B - B\) with \(C \cap (-C) = \emptyset\) and \(|C| = |B| - 1\), whence, in view of Lemma 2,

\[
\mu_A(B - B) \geq \mu_A(C) \geq \left(1 - \frac{|C|}{|A|}\right)|C| = |B| - 1 - \frac{(|B| - 1)^2}{|A|} > |B| - 2.
\]

**Theorem 6.** Suppose that \(p\) is a prime and \(A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}\). If \(1 < |A| < p/2\) and \(0 < |B| < \min\{\sqrt{p/8}, c|A|/\ln|A|\}\), where \(c\) is a positive absolute constant, then for any mapping \(\tau: B \rightarrow A\) we have

\[
|A + \tau B| \geq |A| + |B| - 3.
\]

In connection with the last two theorems we notice that a construction presented in [L00] shows that for (non-empty) subsets \(A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}\) and a mapping \(\tau: B \rightarrow A\), the estimate \(|A + \tau B| \geq |A| + |B| - 3\) may fail in general, even if the right-hand side is substantially smaller than \(p\). A question raised in [L00] and remaining open till now is whether this estimate holds true under the additional assumption that \(\tau\) is injective and \(|A| + |B| \leq p\).
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