AUSTRALASIAN JOURNAL OF COMBINATORICS
Volume **68(2)** (2017), Pages 229–244

On two questions about restricted sumsets in finite abelian groups

Béla Bajnok Samuel Edwards

Department of Mathematics
Gettysburg College
300 N. Washington Street, Gettysburg, PA 17325-1486
U.S.A.
bbajnok@gettysburg.edu edwasa01@gettysburg.edu

Abstract

Let G be an abelian group of finite order n, and let h be a positive integer. A subset A of G is called *weakly h-incomplete* if not every element of G can be written as the sum of h distinct elements of A; in particular, if A does not contain h distinct elements that add to zero, then A is called *weakly h-zero-sum-free.* We investigate the maximum size of weakly h-incomplete and weakly h-zero-sum-free sets in G, denoted by $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$, respectively. Among our results are the following: (i) If G is of odd order and $(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n-2$, then $C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h+1$, unless G is an elementary abelian 3-group and $h = n-3$; (ii) If G is an elementary abelian 2-group and $n/2 \leq h \leq n-2$, then $C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h+2$, unless $h = n-4$.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, G denotes a finite abelian group of order $n \geq 2$, written in additive notation. As is well known, G has a unique *invariant decomposition*: that is, it can be written uniquely as the direct product of nontrivial cyclic terms with the order of each term dividing the order of the next; we let q and r denote the *exponent* (the order of the last term) and *rank* (the number of terms) of G, respectively. If G is *cyclic*, we identify it with $\mathbb{Z}_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$; more generally, if G is *homocyclic*, we write $G = \mathbb{Z}_q^r$. We let L denote the subset consisting of the identity element of G as well as of all involutions in G: that is, L contains all elements of G of order 1 or 2. Note that L is a subgroup of G; in fact, L is isomorphic to the elementary abelian 2-group whose rank equals the number of even-order terms in the invariant decomposition of G.

For a subset A of G we let $|A|$ denote the size of A and $s(A)$ denote the sum of the elements of A. For a positive integer h, the (unrestricted) *h-fold sumset* of A, denoted by hA, is the collection of all elements of G that can be written as the sum of h (not necessarily distinct) elements of A, and the *h-fold restricted sumset* of A, denoted by $h\hat{}A$, consists of the elements of G that can be written as the sum of h distinct elements of A.

Many questions in additive combinatorics focus on properties of sumsets; for example: How large can a subset of G be without its sumset yielding all of G? While the answer to this question is solved for unrestricted sumsets (see Theorem 2.1 below), we know much less about restricted sumsets. The two questions we address in this paper are as follows:

- How large can a subset A of G be if $h\hat{}A \neq G$?
- How large can a subset A of G be if $0 \notin h\hat{}A$?

In particular, we are interested in finding the quantities

$$C_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, h\hat{}A \neq G\}$$

and

$$Z_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, 0 \notin h\hat{}A\}.$$

We say that a subset A of G is *weakly h-incomplete* if $h\hat{}A \neq G$ and that A is *weakly h-zero-sum-free* if $0 \notin h\hat{}A$.

These questions can be traced back to the paper [6] of Erdős and Heilbronn, and variations have been investigated by several authors, including Balandraud [4]; Gao and Geroldinger [8]; Lev [12]; Nguyen, Szemerédi, and Vu [13]; and Nguyen and Vu [14]. (The terms 'h-incomplete' and 'h-zero-sum-free' have been used in the literature, though we added the word 'weakly' to signify the fact that we are considering restricted sumsets.)

One particularly well-researched special case is the problem of finding the largest weakly 3-zero-sum-free sets in the elementary abelian 3-group $\mathbb{Z}_3^r$, as it corresponds to *cap sets* in affine geometry; see [9] by Gao and Thangadurai and its references for $r \leq 5$ and [15] by Potechin for the case $r = 6$. The fact that $Z_3(\mathbb{Z}_3^r)$ is only known for $r \leq 6$ cautions us about the extreme difficulty of these questions; in his blog [17], Tao writes "Perhaps my favourite open question is the problem on the maximal size of a cap set."

At the present time, the only type of group for which $Z_h(G)$ and $C_h(G)$ are known for every value of h is the cyclic group of prime order, and this is due to the fact this is the only case when tight lower bounds for the size of h-fold restricted sumsets are known. Namely, solving a thirty-year open question of Erdős and Heilbronn, in 1994 Dias Da Silva and Hamidoune [5] proved that in the cyclic group of prime order p, for any nonempty subset A and positive integer $h \leq |A|$ we have

$$|h\hat{}A| \geq \min\{p, h|A| - h^2 + 1\}.$$

(Soon after, Alon, Nathanson, and Ruzsa provided a different proof; cf. [1] and [2].) The fact that this bound is tight can be seen by realizing that equality holds when A

is an interval (or, more generally, an arithmetic progression): one can readily verify that if A is an interval of size m in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ (with $m \geq h$), then $h\hat{}A$ is an interval of size $\min\{p, hm - h^2 + 1\}$. Consequently, in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, the maximum size of a weakly h-incomplete set is given by the largest integer m for which $hm - h^2 + 1$ is less than p, or $m = \lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor + h$. Furthermore, for this value of m, assuming also that $h < p$, we can choose an interval A in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ of size m for which the interval $h\hat{}A$ avoids zero. Therefore, we have the following:

Theorem 1.1 *For any prime p and positive integer $h \leq p - 1$ we have*

$$C_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = Z_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = \lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor + h.$$

We make the following observation: When

$$(p-1)/2 \leq h \leq p - 2,$$

then $\lfloor (p-2)/h \rfloor = 1$, and thus

$$C_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = Z_h(\mathbb{Z}_p) = h + 1.$$

One goal of this paper is to prove that the same equations hold in almost every group of odd order. Namely, we prove the following: If G is a group of odd order n that is not an elementary abelian 3-group, and h is an integer with

$$(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n - 2,$$

then

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 1.$$

More generally:

Theorem 1.2 *Let G be an abelian group of order n and exponent q, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions L has order l. Then for every integer h with*

$$(n+l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2,$$

we have

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 1,$$

with the following two exceptions:

- *If $h = n - 3$ and $q = 3$, then $C_h(G) = h + 1$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.*
- *If $h = n - 2$, $l = 2$, and $q \equiv 2$ mod 4, then $C_h(G) = h + 1$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.*

Note that Theorem 1.2 is vacuous if (and only if) G is an elementary abelian 2-group; for this case we have the following result:

Theorem 1.3 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, and suppose that h is an integer with*

$$n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2.$$

Then

$$C_h(G) = Z_h(G) = h + 2,$$

except when $h = n - 4$, in which case $C_h(G) = h + 2$ and $Z_h(G) = h$.

Given our theorems above—as well as related results such as those in [13] by Nguyen, Szemerédi, and Vu—we may get the impression that $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$ are usually equal or that at least they are close to one another. The following example shows that, actually, $C_h(G)$ and $Z_h(G)$ may be arbitrarily far from one another.

We say that an m-subset A of G is a *weak Sidon set* in G, if $2\hat{}A$ has size exactly $\binom{m}{2}$; in other words, if no element of G can be written as a sum of two distinct elements of A in more than one way (not counting the order of the terms). Weak Sidon sets were introduced and studied by Ruzsa in [16]; though the same concept under the name "well spread set" was investigated earlier; cf. [10] and [11].

Proposition 1.4 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group. Then a subset A of G is weakly 4-zero-sum-free if, and only if, it is a weak Sidon set.*

Proof: Let us suppose first that A is weakly 4-zero-sum-free in G, and that $a_1 + a_2 = a_3 + a_4$ for some elements a_1, a_2, a_3, and a_4 of A with $a_1 \neq a_2$ and $a_3 \neq a_4$. We then have

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 = 0,$$

which can only happen if the four terms are not pairwise distinct. By our assumption, this leads to $\{a_1, a_2\} = \{a_3, a_4\}$, which proves that A is a weak Sidon set in G. The other direction is similar. □

According to Proposition 1.4, if A is a weakly 4-zero-sum-free subset of size m in an elementary abelian 2-group G of order $n = 2^r$, then

$$\binom{m}{2} \leq n.$$

On the other hand, we clearly have $C_4(G) \geq n/2$. This yields the following result:

Proposition 1.5 *Let G be an elementary abelian 2-group of rank r. We then have*

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} (C_4(G) - Z_4(G)) = \infty.$$

2 Weakly h-incomplete sets

In this section we study the function

$$C_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, h\hat{\ }A \neq G\};$$

but first, we must mention that the related quantity

$$c_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, hA \neq G\}$$

has been completely determined in [3]. The result can be stated as follows:

Theorem 2.1 (Bajnok; cf. [3]) *For any abelian group G of order n and for every positive integer h, we have*

$$c_h(G) = \max\left\{(\lfloor (d-2)/h \rfloor + 1) \cdot n/d\right\},$$

where the maximum is taken over all divisors d of n.

Observe that—unlike $C_h(G)$—the value of $c_h(G)$ depends only on the order n of G and not on its structure.

Below, we will employ the fact that $c_h(G)$ is known in the case when G has even order. Namely, by letting

$$f_h(d) = (\lfloor (d-2)/h \rfloor + 1) \cdot n/d,$$

we see that $f_h(1) = 0$, $f_h(2) = n/2$, and for $d \geq 3$, we get

$$f_h(d) \leq ((d-2)/h + 1) \cdot n/d = ((h-2)/d + 1) \cdot n/h \leq ((h-2)/3 + 1) \cdot n/h \leq n/2.$$

Therefore, we have the following:

Corollary 2.2 *For any abelian group G of even order n and for every integer $h \geq 2$, we have $c_h(G) = n/2$.*

Let us now turn to the function $C_h(G)$. These values are easy to find for $h = 1$, $h = n-1$, and $h = n$:

Proposition 2.3 *For any abelian group G of order n we have $C_1(G) = n-1$, $C_{n-1}(G) = n-1$, and $C_n(G) = n$.*

Proof: Each of these claims is quite obvious; for example, to see that $C_{n-1}(G) = n-1$, note that for any subset A of G of size $n-1$, $(n-1)\hat{\ }A$ consists of a single element, and, on the other hand, $(n-1)\hat{\ }G = G$, since for each $g \in G$, the sum of the $n-1$ elements in $G \setminus \{s(G) - g\}$ equals $s(G \setminus \{s(G) - g\}) = g$. □

Next, we determine $C_h(G)$ for $h = 2$:

Theorem 2.4 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. We then have $C_2(G) = (n+l)/2$.*

Proof: First, we prove that $C_2(G) \geq (n+l)/2$ by finding a subset A of G with

$$|A| = (n+l)/2$$

for which $2\hat{\ }A \neq G$. Observe that the elements of $G \setminus L$ are distinct from their inverses, so we have a (possibly empty) subset K of $G \setminus L$ with which

$$G = L \cup K \cup (-K),$$

and L, K, and $-K$ are pairwise disjoint. Now set $A = L \cup K$. Clearly, A has the right size; furthermore, it is easy to verify that $0 \not\in 2\hat{\ }A$ and thus $2\hat{\ }A \neq G$.

To prove that $C_2(G) \leq (n+l)/2$, we need to prove that for every subset A of G of size larger than $(n+l)/2$, we have $2\hat{\ }A = G$. Since this trivially holds when $L = G$, we assume that $L \neq G$.

To continue, we need the following property.

Claim: For a given $g \in G$, let $L_g = \{x \in G \mid 2x = g\}$. If $L_g \neq \emptyset$, then $|L_g| = l$.

Proof of Claim: Choose an element $x \in L_g$. Then, for every $y \in L_g$, we have $2(x-y) = 0$, and thus $x - y \in L$. Therefore, $x - L_g \subseteq L$, so $|x - L_g| = |L_g| \leq l$. Similarly, $x + L \subseteq L_g$, so $|x + L| = l \leq |L_g|$. This proves our claim.

Now let $m = (n+l)/2+1$. Note that our assumption on G implies that $3 \leq m \leq n$.

Let A be an m-subset of G, let $g \in G$ be arbitrary, and set $B = g - A$. Then $|B| = m$, and thus

$$|A \cap B| = |A| + |B| - |A \cup B| \geq 2m - n = l + 2.$$

By our claim, we must have an element $a_1 \in A \cap B$ for which $a_1 \not\in L_g$. Since $a_1 \in A \cap B$, we also have an element $a_2 \in A$ for which $a_1 = g - a_2$ and thus $g = a_1 + a_2$. But $a_1 \not\in L_g$, and therefore $a_2 \neq a_1$. In other words, $g \in 2\hat{\ }A$; since g was arbitrary, we have $G = 2\hat{\ }A$, as claimed. □

The value of $C_3(G)$ is not known in general and is, in fact, the subject of active interest—see [3]. Here we present the result for elementary abelian 2-groups:

Theorem 2.5 *If G is the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, then $C_3(G) = n/2 + 1$.*

Proof: Let H be a subgroup of index 2 in G, select an arbitrary element $g \in G \setminus H$, and let $A = H \cup \{g\}$. Clearly, $g \not\in 3\hat{\ }H$; furthermore, since no two distinct elements of H add to zero, we have $g \not\in 3\hat{\ }A$. Therefore, $C_3(G) \geq n/2 + 1$.

Now let B be a subset of G of size $n/2 + 2$; we need to show that $3\hat{\ }B = G$. (This part of our argument is based on the proof of Theorem 1 in [12].) Suppose, indirectly, that this is not so. Let $g \in G \setminus 3\hat{\ }B$, and $C = (g + B) \setminus \{0\}$. Since

$|C| = |B| - 1 = n/2 + 1$, by Corollary 2.2, we must have $3C = G$, in particular, $0 \in 3C$. Therefore, we have elements c_1, c_2, and c_3 that add to 0, and thus elements b_1, b_2, and b_3 in B for which

$$(g + b_1) + (g + b_2) + (g + b_3) = 0.$$

But $2g = 0$ in G, so we get $g = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$. Since $g \in G \setminus 3\hat{}B$, this can only happen if two of b_1, b_2, or b_3, say b_1 and b_2, equal each other. Therefore, $b_1 + b_2 = 0$, so $g = b_3$, and thus $g + b_3 = 0$. But this is a contradiction, since $0 \notin C$. □

Regarding the general case, we present an immediate lower bound for $C_h(G)$. Observe that, if A is any subset of size $h + 1$ in G, then $h\hat{}A$ has size $h + 1$ as well. This yields:

Proposition 2.6 *For any abelian group G of order n and for every positive integer $h \leq n - 2$, we have $C_h(G) \geq h + 1$.*

We are now ready to establish our results for $C_h(G)$ for 'large' h. The following lemma will prove useful.

Lemma 2.7 *Let G be a finite abelian group, and suppose that m and h are integers for which*

$$C_{h+1}(G) \leq m \leq C_h(G).$$

Then $C_{m-h}(G) = m$.

Proof: Since $m \leq C_h(G)$, there exists a subset A of G of size m for which $h\hat{}A \neq G$. But $(m - h)\hat{}A$ and $h\hat{}A$ have the same size, so we must have $(m - h)\hat{}A \neq G$ as well, and thus $C_{m-h}(G) \geq m$.

Now let B be any subset of G of size $m+1$; we need to prove that $(m-h)\hat{}B = G$. Since $(m - h)\hat{}B$ and $(h + 1)\hat{}B$ have the same size, we can show that $(h + 1)\hat{}B = G$ instead. Since that follows from $C_{h+1}(G) \leq m$, our proof is complete. □

According to the following result, our lower bound of Proposition 2.6 is actually exact when h is 'large':

Theorem 2.8 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. Then for every integer h with*

$$(n + l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2,$$

we have $C_h(G) = h + 1$.

Proof: Our claim follows from Proposition 2.3, Theorem 2.4, and Lemma 2.7, since

$$C_2(G) = (n + l)/2 \leq h + 1 \leq n - 1 = C_1(G).$$

□

We should point out that, when the order of G is odd, then $L = \{0\}$, so we have $C_h(G) = h+1$ for all $(n-1)/2 \leq h \leq n-2$. More generally, when $L \neq G$, then, since L is a subgroup of G, $(n+l)/2$ is at most $3n/4$, so Theorem 2.8 establishes the function $C_h(G)$ for at least when $h \in [3n/4, n-2]$. However, Theorem 2.8 is void when $L = G$; in this case we have the following two results:

Theorem 2.9 *Suppose that G is the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$.*

1. *For each integer h with $n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2$, we have $C_h(G) = h+2$.*
2. *For each integer h with $4 \leq h \leq n/2 - 2$, we have*

$$n/2 \leq C_h(G) \leq n/2 + h - 2.$$

Proof: Our first claim follows from Theorem 2.4, Theorem 2.5, and Lemma 2.7, since

$$C_3(G) = n/2 + 1 \leq h + 2 \leq n = C_2(G).$$

The first inequality of the second claim follows from Corollary 2.2, since $c_h(G) \leq C_h(G)$. To prove the second inequality, let A be a subset of G of size $n/2 + h - 1$. Let us fix a subset B of A of size $h-3$, and let $C = A \setminus B$. Then C has size $n/2 + 2$, so $3\hat{}C = G$ by Theorem 2.5, and thus $(h-3)\hat{}B + 3\hat{}C = G$ as well. But $(h-3)\hat{}B + 3\hat{}C \subseteq h\hat{}A$, so $h\hat{}A = G$, which proves our claim. □

3 Zero-sum sets of given size

In this section we develop some results that lay the groundwork for our study of $Z_h(G)$ in Section 4. Namely, given an arbitrary abelian group G of order n, we present complete answers to the following three questions:

- What are the values of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ for which an m-subset A of G exists whose elements sum to zero?
- What are the values of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ for which an m-subset A of $G \setminus \{0\}$ exists whose elements sum to zero?
- What are the values of $m \in \mathbb{N}$ for which an m-subset A of G exists whose elements sum to an element of $G \setminus A$?

We believe these results are of independent interest. (We note that some partial answers to the first two questions appeared in Section 7 of [7].)

We start with the following easy lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that G is a finite abelian group with L as the subgroup of involutions; let $|L| = l$.*

1. If $l = 2$ with $L = \{0, e\}$, then the sum $s(G)$ of the elements of G equals e.

2. If $l \neq 2$, then $s(G) = 0$.

Proof: Recall that L is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, hence $s(L) = 0$, unless $l = 2$, in which case $s(L)$ equals the unique element of order 2. Our claims follow from the fact that we have $s(G) = s(L)$. □

We now classify all positive integers m for which one can find m nonzero elements in a given abelian group G that add to 0. We separate the cases when G is an elementary abelian 2-group and when it is not.

Theorem 3.2 *Let G be the elementary abelian 2-group of order $n = 2^r$, and let m be a positive integer. Then $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m if, and only if, $3 \leq m \leq n - 4$ or $m = n - 1$.*

Proof: For a given positive integer k, let $M(k)$ denote the set of nonnegative integers m for which $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m. We start by stating and proving three easy claims about $M(k)$.

Claim 1: Suppose that $k \geq 2$. We then have $m \in M(k)$ if, and only if, $2^k - 1 - m \in M(k)$.

Proof of Claim 1: Observe that by Lemma 3.1, $s(\mathbb{Z}_2^k) = 0$, and thus $s(\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}) = 0$. Therefore, for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$s(A) = s((\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}) \setminus A),$$

from which our claim follows.

Claim 2: If $m \in M(k)$ for some positive integer $k \geq 2$, then $m \in M(k + 1)$.

Proof of Claim 2: Clearly, if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(A) = 0$, then $B = \{0\} \times A$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(B) = 0$.

Claim 3: Let k and l be integers so that $2 \leq l \leq k$. If $m \in M(k)$, then $m + 2^l \in M(k + 1)$.

Proof of Claim 3: As in the proof of Claim 2, if A is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^k \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(A) = 0$, then $B = \{0\} \times A$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size m with $s(B) = 0$.

Let H be a subgroup of order 2^l in $\mathbb{Z}_2^k$. Then $C = \{1\} \times H$ is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ of size 2^l with $s(C) = 0$. Therefore, $B \cup C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}$ has size $m + 2^l$ and $s(B \cup C) = 0$, and thus $m + 2^l \in M(k + 1)$, as claimed.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.2. Suppose that G has rank $r \geq 2$; we need to prove that

$$M(r) = \{0\} \cup \{3, 4, \ldots, 2^r - 4\} \cup \{2^r - 1\}.$$

We trivially have $0 \in M(r)$ and $1 \not\in M(r)$. Furthermore, $2 \not\in M(r)$ follows from the fact that each element of $\mathbb{Z}_2^r$ is its own inverse. By Claim 1, we then have $2^r - 3 \not\in M(r)$, $2^r - 2 \not\in M(r)$, and $2^r - 1 \in M(r)$.

Assume now that $3 \leq m \leq 2^r - 4$; we need to prove that $m \in M(r)$. Our assumption implies that $r \geq 3$; we verify our claim for $r = 3$ and $r = 4$, then proceed by induction.

Recall that $2^r - 1 \in M(r)$ for each $r \geq 2$; in particular, $3 \in M(2)$ and $7 \in M(3)$. Therefore, by Claim 2, we have $3 \in M(3)$, $3 \in M(4)$, and $7 \in M(4)$. Furthermore, $3 \in M(3)$ implies that $4 \in M(3)$ by Claim 1, and thus $4 \in M(4)$ by Claim 2. By Claim 1, we then also have $\{8, 11, 12\} \subseteq M(4)$. This completes the case of $r = 3$, and leaves only $m = 5, 6, 9, 10$ to be verified for $r = 4$; by Claim 1, it suffices to do this for $m = 5$ and $m = 6$.

For $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we let e_i denote the element of $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$ with a 1 in the i-th position and 0 everywhere else. Then the sets

$$\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_1 + e_2 + e_3 + e_4\}$$

and

$$\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_1 + e_2, e_3 + e_4\}$$

show that $5 \in M(4)$ and $6 \in M(4)$. This completes our claim for $r = 4$.

Suppose now that $k \geq 4$ and $m \in M(k)$ for every $3 \leq m \leq 2^k - 4$; we will show that $m \in M(k + 1)$ for every $3 \leq m \leq 2^{k+1} - 4$. For $3 \leq m \leq 2^k - 4$, this follows from Claim 2. Since $k \geq 4$, we have $3 \leq 2^k - 7$, so $2^k - 7 \in M(k)$, and thus $2^k - 3 \in M(k + 1)$ by Claim 3; similarly, $2^k - 2 \in M(k + 1)$ and $2^k - 1 \in M(k + 1)$. Therefore, $m \in M(k+1)$ for every $3 \leq k \leq 2^k - 1$, and thus $m \in M(k+1)$ for every $2^k \leq m \leq 2^{k+1} - 4$ as well by Claim 1. This completes our proof. □

Theorem 3.3 *Let G be an abelian group of order n that is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer. Then $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m if, and only if, one of the following conditions holds:*

- $2 \leq m \leq n - 3$;
- $m = n - 2$ *and* $l = 2$; *or*
- $m = n - 1$ *and* $l \neq 2$.

Proof: We may clearly assume that $2 \leq m \leq n-1$. Let us write $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2) = L \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$G = \{0\} \cup \mathrm{Ord}(G, 2) \cup K \cup -K,$$

where the four components are pairwise disjoint and, since G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, K and $-K$ are nonempty. We examine three cases.

Case 1: $l = 1$.

In this case, the exponent q and the order n are odd, and $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2) = \emptyset$, and thus $G \setminus \{0\} = K \cup -K$. Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $m \leq n - 1$. Furthermore, we see that $G \setminus \{0\}$ does not have a zero-sum set of size $n-2$. It remains to be shown that $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every odd size $3 \leq m \leq n-4$.

If $n=7$, then the set $\{1,2,4\}$ proves our claim, so let us assume that $n \geq 9$ or, equivalently, that $|K| \geq 4$. Let g_1 be any element of K; since $|K| \geq 4$, we can find another element $g_2 \in K$ so that $g_2 \neq -2g_1$ and $g_2 \neq \frac{q-1}{2}g_1$.

We first prove that the six elements $\pm g_1, \pm g_2$, and $\pm(g_1+g_2)$ are pairwise distinct. Indeed, g_1 and g_2 are distinct elements of K, so $-g_1$ and $-g_2$ are distinct elements of $-K$. So $g_1+g_2 \neq 0$, and thus one of g_1+g_2 or $-(g_1+g_2)$ is an element of K and the other is an element of $-K$. If g_1+g_2 is in K, then it must be distinct from both g_1 and g_2, since neither of these is 0, and so $-(g_1+g_2)$ is distinct from $-g_1$ and $-g_2$ as well. Furthermore, if g_1+g_2 is in $-K$, then it must be distinct from $-g_1$ since $g_2 \neq -2g_1$, and if it were equal to $-g_2$, then we would get $2g_2=-g_1$, so $\frac{q+1}{2} \cdot 2g_2 = \frac{q+1}{2} \cdot (-g_1)$, that is, $g_2 = \frac{q-1}{2}g_1$, which we ruled out.

Therefore, we are able to partition G as

$$G = \{0\} \cup \{\pm g_1, \pm g_2, \pm(g_1+g_2)\} \cup K' \cup -K',$$

where $K' \subset K$ and $|K'| = (n-7)/2$. Note that $(m-3)/2 \leq |K'|$; let $K_1 \subseteq K'$ of size $(m-3)/2$. Then

$$A = \{g_1, g_2, -(g_1+g_2)\} \cup K_1 \cup -K_1$$

has size m and its elements sum to 0.

Case 2: $l=2$.

In this case, q is even and n/q is odd, and $|\mathrm{Ord}(G,2)|=1$. Let $\mathrm{Ord}(G,2)=\{e\}$; we then have

$$G = \{0\} \cup \{e\} \cup K \cup -K.$$

Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $m \leq n-2$; we consider odd values of m next.

The case of $m=n-1$ is settled by the fact that the elements of $G \setminus \{0\}$ add up to e by Lemma 3.1. Next, we consider $m=n-3$, in which case we are looking for a set A of the form

$$A = G \setminus \{0, g_1, g_2\}$$

whose elements add to 0. Now $m \geq 3$, so $n \geq 6$, and since q is even and n/q is odd, we then must have $q \geq 6$ as well. Let g_1 be any element of G of order q, and let $g_2 = e - g_1$. Then g_1 and g_2 are distinct nonzero elements of G, since $g_1 = g_2$ would imply that g_1 has order at most 4. Thus A satisfies our requirements.

This leaves us with the cases of odd m values with $3 \leq m \leq n-5$. If $n=8$, then our assumptions imply that G is cyclic, in which case the set $\{1,3,4\}$ satisfies our claim. If $n \geq 10$, then $|K| \geq 4$, so this case can be handled as in Case 1 above.

Case 3: $l>2$.

In this case, q and n/q are even, and $|\mathrm{Ord}(G,2)|>1$. Note that the elements of G, and thus the elements of $G \setminus \{0\}$, sum to 0; this settles the cases of $m=n-1$

and $m = n - 2$. We need to show that a zero-sum subset of $G \setminus \{0\}$ of size m exists for every $2 \leq m \leq n - 3$.

Recall that L is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, so $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)|$ is 1 less than a power of 2; so, by assumption, it equals 3 or is at least 7.

Suppose first that $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| = 3$. Since the three elements of $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)$ add to 0, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every odd size $3 \leq m \leq 3+2|K| = n-1$. Clearly, $G \setminus \{0\}$ also contains a zero-sum subset of every even size $3 \leq m \leq 2|K| = n - 4$ as well, completing this case.

Suppose now that $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| \geq 7$. By Theorem 3.2, $\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)$, and thus $G \setminus \{0\}$, contains a zero-sum subset of size m for every $2 \leq m \leq |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 3$. If $|\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 2 \leq m \leq n - 4$, then we may write m as $m = m_1 + 2k_1$, with $0 \leq k_1 \leq |K|$ and $m_1 = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 3$ (if m is even) or $m_1 = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| - 4$ (if m is odd). Therefore, $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of every size m with $2 \leq m \leq n - 4$. Finally, if $m = n - 3$, then $m = |\mathrm{Ord}(G, 2)| + 2(|K| - 1)$, so again $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum subset of size m. This completes our proof. □

Corollary 3.4 *Let G be an abelian group of order n. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer with $m \leq n$. Then G contains a zero-sum subset of size m with the following exceptions:*

- *G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and $m \in \{2, n - 2\}$; or*
- *$l = 2$ and $m = n$.*

Proof: The claim is trivial for $m = 1$, and is a restatement of Lemma 3.1 if $m = n$. If G and m are such that $G \setminus \{0\}$ contains a zero-sum set A of size m or $m - 1$, then either A or $A \cup \{0\}$ satisfies our claim. By Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, this leaves only the case when G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and $m = 2$ or $m = n - 2$, for which the claim follows from the fact that each element is its own inverse then. □

Corollary 3.5 *Let G be an abelian group of order n and exponent q. Suppose that the subgroup of involutions in G has order l, and let m be a positive integer. Then G contains a subset A of size m for which $s(A) \not\in A$ if, and only if, one of the following conditions holds:*

- *$2 \leq m \leq n - 4$;*
- *$m = n - 3$ and G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group;*
- *$m = n - 2$ and G is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 3-group; or*
- *$m = n - 1$ and $l \neq 2$; or $m = n - 1$, $l = 2$, and q is divisible by 4.*

Proof: We can clearly assume that $2 \leq m \leq n - 1$, and by Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, it suffices to consider the following cases:

(i) $m = n - 3$ and G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group;

(ii) $m = n - 2$ and $l \neq 2$; and

(iii) $m = n - 1$, $l = 2$.

If $m = n - 3$ and G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, then an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, we can find distinct elements a_1, a_2, and a_3 in G for which $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \in \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. This is not possible, since two distinct elements do not add to 0.

The cases to be considered for $m = n-2$ are exactly those where, by Lemma 3.1, $s(G) = 0$. Therefore, an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, we can find distinct elements a_1 and a_2 in G for which $-a_1 - a_2 \in \{a_1, a_2\}$, that is, $a_2 = -2a_1$ or $a_1 = -2a_2$. This is possible exactly when G has an element whose order is neither 1 nor 3.

Finally, suppose that $m = n - 1$ and $l = 2$. In this case, by Lemma 3.1, $s(G) = e$ where e is the unique element of G of order 2. Therefore, an m-set A with $s(A) \notin A$ exists if, and only if, G contains an element a for which $2a = e$, which is possible exactly when q is divisible by 4. □

4 Weakly h-zero-sum-free sets

We start by determining

$$Z_h(G) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, 0 \notin h\hat{}A\}$$

for $h = 1, 2, n-1$, and n.

Proposition 4.1 *Let G be an abelian group of order n, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. We have*

1. $Z_1(G) = n - 1$;
2. $Z_2(G) = (n + l)/2$;
3. $Z_{n-1}(G) = n - 1$;
4. $Z_n(G) = n$ *when* $l = 2$, *and* $Z_n(G) = n - 1$ *when* $l \neq 2$.

Proof: The first claim is trivial, since $G \setminus \{0\}$ is weakly 1-zero-sum-free. Let us write $G = L \cup K \cup (-K)$. Clearly, $A = L \cup K$ is weakly 2-zero-sum-free. On the other hand, if B has size more than $(n + l)/2$, then it contains at least $(n - l)/2 + 1 = |K| + 1$ elements of $K \cup (-K)$, so it is not weakly 2-zero-sum-free.

To prove that $Z_{n-1}(G) = n-1$, let $g = s(G)$. Then $s(G \setminus \{g\}) = 0$, so $Z_{n-1}(G) \leq n - 1$. But for every element $g' \in G \setminus \{g\}$, we have $s(G \setminus \{g'\}) = g - g' \neq 0$, so $Z_{n-1}(G) \geq n - 1$. Our last claim follows from Lemma 3.1. □

We can easily establish the following lower bound:

Proposition 4.2 *For any abelian group G of order n and all positive integers $h \leq n-1$ we have $Z_h(G) \geq h$.*

Proof: Let A be any subset of G of size h. If $s(A) \neq 0$, we are done. Otherwise, choose elements $a \in A$ and $b \in G \setminus A$. Then for $B = (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{b\}$ we have $|B| = h$ and

$$s(B) = s(A) - a + b = b - a \neq 0.$$

□

Next, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for $Z_h(G)$ to be at least $h+1$:

Proposition 4.3 *Let G be a finite abelian group and h be a positive integer with $h \leq n-1$. Then $Z_h(G) \geq h+1$ if, and only if, there exists a subset A in G of size $h+1$ for which $s(A) \not\in A$.*

Proof: Suppose first that A is a subset of G of size $h+1$ for which $s(A) \not\in A$; we prove that A is weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Let B be any subset of size h of A, and let a be the element of A for which $B = A \setminus \{a\}$. Then $s(B) = s(A) - a$; since $s(A) \not\in A$, we have $s(B) \neq 0$, as claimed. Therefore, $Z_h(G) \geq h+1$.

Conversely, assume that all subsets of G of size $h+1$ contain their sum as an element. Let A be any subset of G of size $h+1$. By assumption, $s(A) \in A$; let $B = A \setminus \{s(A)\}$. Then B has size h and $s(B) = 0$, so A is not weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Therefore, $Z_h(G) \leq h$. □

Our next two results establish the value of $Z_h(G)$ for all 'large' h. First, we consider groups with exponent at least three:

Theorem 4.4 *Let G be an abelian group of order n that is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, and suppose that its subgroup of involutions has order l. For every integer h with*

$$(n+l)/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n-2,$$

we have

$$Z_h(G) = \begin{cases} h & \textit{if } h = n-3 \textit{ and } q = 3; \textit{ or} \\ & h = n-2,\ l = 2, \textit{ and } q \equiv 2 \textit{ mod } 4; \\ h+1 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: By Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 2.8, we have

$$h \leq Z_h(G) \leq h+1.$$

Thus our claim follows from Proposition 4.3 and Corollary 3.5. □

For groups of exponent two, we have the following result:

Theorem 4.5 *Suppose that G is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group and has order $n = 2^r$, and let h be an integer with $n/2 - 1 \leq h \leq n - 2$. We then have*

$$Z_h(G) = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } h = n-4; \\ h+2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: By Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 2.9, we have

$$h \leq Z_h(G) \leq h + 2.$$

Therefore, our result will follow from the following two claims.

Claim 1: If h is a positive integer with $h \leq n-2$ and $h \neq n-4$, then $Z_h(G) \geq h+2$.

Proof of Claim 1: Let $m = h + 2$; we then have $3 \leq m \leq n$ with $m \neq n - 2$. Thus, by Corollary 3.4, G contains an m-subset A with $s(A) = 0$; we will prove that A is weakly h-zero-sum-free in G. Let B be any h-subset of A; we assume that $B = A \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. Since a_1 and a_2 are distinct, we have $a_1 + a_2 \neq 0$, and therefore

$$s(B) = s(A) - (a_1 + a_2) = a_1 + a_2 \neq 0.$$

This proves our claim.

Claim 2: We have $Z_{n-4}(G) \leq n - 4$.

Proof of Claim 2: Suppose that A is an arbitrary subset of G with $|A| = n - 3$; we let $A = G \setminus \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. Note that a_1, a_2, and a_3 are pairwise distinct, so no two of them add to zero, and thus $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 \in A$. Let $B = A \setminus \{a_1 + a_2 + a_3\}$. We then have

$$s(B) = s(A) - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3),$$

where

$$s(A) = s(G) - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) = a_1 + a_2 + a_3.$$

Thus $s(B) = 0$, which proves our claim. □

References

[1] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson and I. Ruzsa, Adding distinct congruence classes modulo a prime, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **102** (1995) no. 3, 250–255.

[2] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson and I. Ruzsa, The polynomial method and restricted sums of congruence classes, *J. Number Theory* **56** (1996) no. 2, 404–417.

[3] B. Bajnok, The h-critical number of finite Abelian groups, *Unif. Distrib. Theory* **10** (2015) no. 2, 93–115.

[4] É. Balandraud, An addition theorem and maximal zero-sum free sets in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, *Israel J. Math.* **188** (2012), 405–429. Erratum, **192** (2012) no. 2, 1009–1010.

[5] J. A. Dias Da Silva and Y. O. Hamidoune, Cyclic space for Grassmann derivatives and additive theory, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **26** (1994) no. 2, 140–146.

[6] P. Erdős and H. Heilbronn, On the addition of residue classes mod p, *Acta Arith.* **9** (1964), 149–159.

[7] W. Gao and A. Geroldinger, On long minimal zero sequences in finite abelian groups, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **38** (1999) no. 3, 179–211.

[8] W. Gao and A. Geroldinger, Zero-sum problems in finite abelian groups: A survey, *Expo. Math.* **24** (2006) no. 4, 337–369.

[9] W. D. Gao and R. Thangadurai, A variant of Kemnitz conjecture, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **107** (2004) no. 1, 69–86.

[10] P. M. Kayll, Well-spread sequences and edge-labellings with constant Hamilton-weight, *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.* **6** (2004) no. 2, 401–408.

[11] A. Kotzig, On well spread sets of integers, Tech. Report CRM–161, Centre Res. Math., Université de Montréal (1972), 83pp.

[12] V. F. Lev, Three-fold restricted set addition in groups, *European J. Combin.* **23** (2002) no. 5, 613–617.

[13] N. H. Nguyen, E. Szemerédi and V. H. Vu, Subset sums modulo a prime, *Acta Arith.* **131** (2008) no. 4, 303–316.

[14] N. H. Nguyen and V. H. Vu, Classification theorems for sumsets modulo a prime, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **116** (2009) no. 4, 936–959.

[15] A. Potechin, Maximal caps in AG(6, 3), *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **46** (2008) no. 3, 243–259.

[16] I. Z. Ruzsa, Solving a linear equation in a set of integers I, *Acta Arith.* **65** (1993) no. 3, 259–282.

[17] T. Tao, Open question: best bounds for cap sets, Blog post at: `https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2007/02/23/open-question-best-bounds-for-cap-sets/`.

(Received 20 July 2016; revised 13 Apr 2017)