

# The Maximum Size of Weak $(k, l)$ -Sum-Free Sets

Peter Francis

Department of Mathematics, Gettysburg College  
Gettysburg, PA 17325-1486 USA  
E-mail: franpe02@gettysburg.edu

May 22, 2019

## Abstract

A subset  $A$  of a given finite abelian group  $G$  is called weakly  $(k, l)$ -sum-free if the set of all sums of  $k$  distinct elements of  $A$  is disjoint with set of all sums of  $l$  distinct elements of  $A$ . We are interested in finding the size  $\mu(G, \{k, l\})$  of the largest weak  $(k, l)$ -sum-free subset in  $G$ . Here, we provide a new upper bound for  $\mu(G, \{k, l\})$  as well as present new constructions for weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free sets in some noncyclic groups.

## 1 Introduction

Suppose that  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$  is a subset of an abelian group  $G$ , with  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $h$  be a non-negative integer.

We will write  $hA$  for the (ordinary)  $h$ -fold sumset of  $A$ , which consists of sums of exactly  $h$  (not necessarily distinct) terms of  $A$ . More formally,

$$hA = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i a_i \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = h \right\}.$$

For positive integers  $k > l$ , a subset  $A$  of a given finite abelian group  $G$  is  $(k, l)$ -sum-free if and only if

$$kA \cap lA = \emptyset.$$

We denote the maximum size of a  $(k, l)$ -sum-free subset of  $G$  as  $\mu(G, \{k, l\})$ . That is,

$$\mu(G, \{k, l\}) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, (kA) \cap (lA) = \emptyset\}.$$

Similarly, we will write  $hA$  for the *restricted*  $h$ -fold sumset of  $A$ , which consists of sums of exactly  $h$  *distinct* terms of  $A$ :

$$hA = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i a_i \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = h \right\}.$$

For positive integers  $k > l$ , a subset  $A$  of a given finite abelian group  $G$  is weakly  $(k, l)$ -sum-free if and only if

$$kA \cap lA = \emptyset.$$

We denote the maximum size of a weak  $(k, l)$ -sum-free subset of  $G$  as  $\hat{\mu}(G, \{k, l\})$ . That is,

$$\hat{\mu}(G, \{k, l\}) = \max\{|A| \mid A \subseteq G, (kA) \cap (lA) = \emptyset\}.$$

In this paper, we will be mainly interested in  $\hat{\mu}$ . The following have been established.

**Theorem 1 (Bajnok; [2] (G.63))** *Suppose that  $G$  is an abelian group of order  $n$  and exponent  $\kappa$ . Then, for all positive integers  $k$  and  $l$  with  $k > l$  we have*

$$\hat{\mu}(G, \{k, l\}) \geq \mu(G, \{k, l\}) \geq v_{k-l}(\kappa, k+l) \cdot \frac{n}{\kappa}.$$

**Theorem 2 (Green and Ruzsa; [2] (G.18))** *Let  $\kappa$  be the exponent of  $G$ . Then*

$$\mu(G, \{2, 1\}) = \mu(\mathbb{Z}_\kappa, \{2, 1\}) \cdot \frac{n}{\kappa} = v_1(\kappa, 3) \cdot \frac{n}{\kappa}.$$

**Theorem 3 (Zannier; [2] (G.67))** *For all positive integers we have*

$$\hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{2, 1\}) = \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{n}{3} & \text{if } n \text{ has prime divisors congruent to } 2 \pmod{3}, \\ & \text{and } p \text{ is the smallest such divisor;} \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 4 (Bajnok; [2] (G.21))** *For all positive integers  $r$ ,  $k$ , and  $l$  with  $k > l$ , we have*

$$\mu(\mathbb{Z}_2^r, \{k, l\}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \equiv l \pmod{2}; \\ 2^{r-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following lemma will be useful in Section 3. We denote the sum of all of the elements of a group  $G$  to be  $s(G)$ .

**Lemma 5 (Bajnok and Edwards; [3])** *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  $s(G) = 0$ .*

## 2 A New Upper Bound

**Lemma 6** *For any set  $A$  and positive integer  $h \leq |A|$ ,  $|h\hat{A}| \geq |A| - h + 1$ .*

PROOF. Write  $A = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ . Then observe that

$$\begin{aligned} b_h &= a_0 + \dots + a_{h-1} + a_h, \\ b_{h+1} &= a_0 + \dots + a_{h-1} + a_{h+1}, \\ &\vdots \\ b_{m-1} &= a_0 + \dots + a_{h-1} + a_{m-1}, \\ b_m &= a_0 + \dots + a_{h-1} + a_m \end{aligned}$$

are all distinct since  $a_h, \dots, a_m$  are all distinct. Since,

$$\{b_h, b_{h+1}, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_m\} \subseteq h\hat{A},$$

$$|h\hat{A}| \geq m - (h - 1) = |A| - h + 1. \quad \square$$

**Proposition 7** *For all groups  $G$  with order  $n$ , and for all positive integers  $k > l$ ,*

$$\mu(G, \{k, l\}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 2 + l + k}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

PROOF. Write  $A$  for a  $(k, l)$ -sum-free subset of  $G$  where  $|A| = m = \mu^\wedge(G, \{k, l\})$  and  $n = |G|$ . Using Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq |k^\wedge A| + |l^\wedge A| \\ &\geq m - k + 1 + m - l + 1 \\ &\geq 2m - (k + l) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$m \leq \frac{n - 2 + k + l}{2},$$

and so

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{k, l\}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 2 + k + l}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

□

### 3 Some $n$ -dependent values of $k$

Here we will explore where  $k$  is dependent on  $n$  and  $l = 1$ . The following useful corollary follows immediately from Lemma 5.

**Corollary 8** For any  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$  (written invariantly), with  $|G| = n$ , the sum of the elements of  $G$  is,

$$s(G) = \begin{cases} (0, \dots, 0, \frac{n_r}{2}) & \text{if } n_r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}, \text{ with } n_{r-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \text{ or } r = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 9** For all  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$  (written invariantly) with  $|G| = n > 2$ ,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) = \begin{cases} n - 2 & \text{if } s(G) \neq 0 \text{ and } n_r \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \\ n - 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. First note that trivially,  $\mu^\wedge \geq n - 2$ . By Proposition 7,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 2 + n - 1 + 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{2n - 2}{2} \right\rfloor = n - 1.$$

Let  $A = G \setminus \{\xi\}$  for some  $\xi \in G$ , so  $|A| = n - 1$ . Then  $(n - 1)\hat{A} \cap 1\hat{A} = \emptyset$  is only satisfied if the sum of the elements of  $A$  is  $\xi$ . Thus,  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) = n - 1$  if only if there exists some  $\xi \in G$  such that  $s(G) - \xi = \xi$ . In other words, there must be some  $\xi \in G$  such that

$$s(G) = 2\xi.$$

1.  $s(G) = 0$ . Then  $0 = s(G) = 2\xi$  is satisfied with  $\xi = 0$ , so  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) = n - 1$ .

2.  $s(G) \neq 0$ .

i  $n_r \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ . Then  $\frac{n_r}{2} = s(G) = 2\xi$  is satisfied with  $\xi = \frac{n_r}{4}$ . Thus,  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) = n - 1$ .

ii  $n_r \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ . Since 2 does not divide  $\frac{n_r}{2} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , there is no such  $\xi \in G$ . For all  $A \subseteq G$  such that  $|A| = n - 2$ , we have

$$(n - 1)\hat{A} \cap 1\hat{A} = \emptyset \cap A = \emptyset,$$

$$\text{so } \mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 1, 1\}) = n - 2. \quad \square$$

**Proposition 10** For all  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$  (written invariantly) with  $|G| = n > 3$ ,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 2, 1\}) = \begin{cases} n - 3 & \text{if } n_r = 3; \\ n - 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. By Proposition 7,

$$\mu^\wedge(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{n - 2, 1\}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 2 + n - 2 + 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor n - \frac{3}{2} \right\rfloor = n - 2.$$

Let  $A = G \setminus \{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$  for some distinct  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in G$ . So,  $|A| = n - 2$ . Then

$$(n - 2)\hat{A} \cap 1\hat{A} = \emptyset$$

is only satisfied if the sum of the elements of  $A$  is  $\xi_1$ , WLOG. Then,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 2, 1\}) = n - 2$$

if only if there exists some distinct  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in G$  such that  $s(G) - \xi_1 - \xi_2 = \xi_1$ . That is, there must be some distinct  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in G$  such that

$$s(G) = 2\xi_1 + \xi_2.$$

1.  $s(G) = 0$ .

- i.  $n_r > 3$ . Then  $0 = s(G) = 2\xi_1 + \xi_2$  is satisfied with  $\xi_1 = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  and  $\xi_2 = (0, \dots, 0, n_r - 2)$  (if  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$ ,  $\xi_1 = 1$  and  $\xi_2 = n - 2$ ) which are distinct since  $n_r - 2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{n_r}$  for all  $n_r > 3$ . Thus,  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 2, 1\}) = n - 2$ .
- ii.  $n_r = 3$ . (This is the case where  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_3^r$  with  $r \geq 2$ ). Imagine there exists such  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$ . Then, since  $\xi_2 \equiv -2\xi_2 \pmod{3}$ , we have that  $0 = \xi_1 + 2\xi_2 = \xi_1 - \xi_2$ , which implies that  $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ , a contradiction. Thus, there are no such  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in G$ . For all  $A \subseteq G$  such that  $|A| = n - 3$ , we have

$$(n - 2)^\wedge A \cap 1^\wedge A = \emptyset \cap A = \emptyset,$$

so  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 2, 1\}) = n - 3$ .

- iii.  $n_r = 2$ . (This is the case where  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^r$  with  $r \geq 2$ ).  $0 = s(G) = 2\xi_1 + \xi_2$  is satisfied with  $\xi_1 = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  and  $\xi_2 = (0, \dots, 0)$

2.  $s(G) \neq 0$ .

- i.  $n_r \neq 6$ .

$$\left(0, \dots, 0, \frac{n_r}{2}\right) = s(G) = 2\xi_1 + \xi_2$$

is satisfied with  $\xi_1 = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  and  $\xi_2 = (0, \dots, 0, \frac{n_r}{2} - 2)$  (if  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$ ,  $\xi_1 = 1$  and  $\xi_2 = \frac{n}{2} - 2$ ) which are distinct since  $\frac{n_r}{2} - 2 \neq 1$  for all  $n_r \neq 6$ .

- ii.  $n_r = 6$ . Take  $\xi_1 = (0, \dots, 0, 5)$  and  $\xi_2 = (0, \dots, 0, 2)$  (if  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$ ,  $\xi_1 = 5$  and  $\xi_2 = 2$ ). Thus,  $\mu^\wedge(G, \{n - 2, 1\}) = n - 2$ .  $\square$

## 4 Weak $(2, 1)$ -sum-free sets in general finite abelian groups

**Proposition 11** For any  $G$  with  $|G| = n \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ ,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{2, 1\}) = \frac{n}{2}.$$

PROOF. Write  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$ . By Proposition 7,

$$\mu^\wedge(G, \{2, 1\}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 2 + 2 + 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \frac{n}{2}.$$

If  $n \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ ,  $n_r \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ , so we can take  $A \subseteq G$  to be the set with all the elements of  $G$  whose  $r$ th element is congruent to 1 mod 2. The  $r$ th entry of the sum of any two elements in  $A$  will be congruent to 0 mod 2, so  $2 \hat{A} \cap 1 \hat{A} = \emptyset$ . Thus,

$$\mu \hat{\mu}(G, \{2, 1\}) \geq |A| = n_1 \cdots n_{r-1} \cdot \frac{n_r}{2} = \frac{n}{2}.$$

□

NOTE: This means that by Proposition 4,  $\mu \hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_2^r, \{2, 1\}) = 2^{r-1} = \mu(\mathbb{Z}_2^r, \{2, 1\})$ .

**Conjecture 12 (Bajnok [1])** For all positive integers  $n_1 \leq n_2$  ( $n = n_1 n_2$ ),

$$\mu \hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2}, \{2, 1\}) = \begin{cases} \mu & \text{if } n \text{ has prime divisors congruent to } 2 \pmod 3; \\ \mu + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that when  $\gcd(n_1, n_2) = 1$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \cong \mathbb{Z}_n$ , so by Theorem G.67, and Theorem G.18,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{2, 1\}) &= \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{n}{3} & \text{if } n \text{ has prime divisors congruent to } 2 \pmod 3, \\ & \text{and } p \text{ is the smallest such divisor;} \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} v_1(n, 3) \cdot \frac{n}{3} & \text{if } n \text{ has prime divisors congruent to } 2 \pmod 3, \\ v_1(n, 3) \cdot \frac{n}{3} + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ &\stackrel{2}{=} \begin{cases} \mu(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{2, 1\}) & \text{if } n \text{ has prime divisors congruent to } 2 \pmod 3; \\ \mu(\mathbb{Z}_n, \{2, 1\}) + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

When  $\gcd(n_1, n_2) > 1$  and  $n \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ , clearly the smallest prime divisor of  $n$  congruent to 2 mod 3 is 2, so by Proposition 11 and Theorem 2,

$$\mu \hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2}, \{2, 1\}) \stackrel{11}{=} \frac{n}{2} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{n}{3} = v_1(n, 3) \cdot \frac{n}{3} \stackrel{2}{=} \mu(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2}, \{2, 1\}).$$

Now we should consider when  $\gcd(n_1, n_2) > 1$  and  $n \equiv 1 \pmod 2$ .

**Theorem 13** For any positive integer  $w \equiv 1 \pmod 2$ ,

$$\mu \hat{\mu}(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_{3w}, \{2, 1\}) \geq 3w + 1.$$

PROOF. Consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \{0\} \times \{-w, -w+2, \dots, w-2, w\}, \\ A_1 &= \{1\} \times \{0, 2, \dots, 2w-4, 2w-2\}, \text{ and} \\ A_2 &= \{2\} \times \{-2w+2, -2w+4, \dots, -2, 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let  $A = A_0 \cup A_1 \cup A_2$ . Observe that  $A_0$ ,  $A_1$ , and  $A_2$  are disjoint, so

$$|A| = |A_0| + |A_1| + |A_2| = \left( \frac{w - (-w)}{2} + 1 \right) + (w-1-0+1) + (w-1-0+1) = 3w+1.$$

We can recognize the elements in  $A_0$ ,  $A_1$ , and  $A_2$  as arithmetic sequences (with a common difference of 2), so we can easily write

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \wedge A_0 &= \{0\} \times \{-2w+2, -2w+4, \dots, 2w-4, 2w-2\}, \\ A_1 + A_2 &= \{0\} \times \{-2w+2, -2w+4, \dots, 2w-4, 2w-2\}, \\ 2 \wedge A_2 &= \{1\} \times \{-4w+6, -4w+8, \dots, -4, -2\}, \\ A_0 + A_1 &= \{1\} \times \{-w, -w+2, \dots, 3w-4, 3w-2\}, \\ 2 \wedge A_1 &= \{2\} \times \{2, 4, \dots, 4w-8, 4w-6\}, \text{ and} \\ A_0 + A_2 &= \{2\} \times \{-3w+2, -3w+4, \dots, w-2, w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that since  $-4w \equiv -w \pmod{3w}$  and  $-3w \equiv 0 \pmod{3w}$ ,  $2 \wedge A_0 = A_1 + A_2$ ,  $2 \wedge A_2 \subset A_0 + A_1$ , and  $2 \wedge A_1 \subset A_0 + A_2$ . Now we only must show that

$$A_0 \cap (A_1 + A_2) = \emptyset, \quad A_1 \cap (A_0 + A_1) = \emptyset, \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 \cap (A_0 + A_2) = \emptyset.$$

In  $\mathbb{Z}_{3w}$ ,  $-2w \equiv w$ , so we can recognize that the elements of  $A_1 + A_2$  follow as the next terms of the arithmetic sequence in  $A_0$  and since  $2w \equiv -w$ , the elements of  $A_0$  follow as the next terms of the arithmetic sequence in  $A_1 + A_2$ . The same is true for  $A_0 + A_1$  with  $A_1$ , and  $A_0 + A_2$  with  $A_2$ . The three sequences are the same, since they all contain 0 and have a common difference of 2, and repeat in  $3w$  terms (because  $3w \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ ). Because the sequence has  $3w$  unique terms, our claims hold.  $\square$

NOTE: By Theorem 2, if  $w$  has no prime divisor congruent to 2 mod 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\wedge}(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_{3w}, \{2, 1\}) &\geq 3w + 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{3w}{3} \right\rfloor \cdot 3 + 1 \\ &= v_1(3w, 3) \cdot \frac{9w}{3w} + 1 \\ &\stackrel{2}{=} \mu(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_{3w}, \{2, 1\}) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 14** For all positive  $\kappa \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ ,

$$\mu^{\wedge}(\mathbb{Z}_{\kappa}^2, \{2, 1\}) \geq \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} \cdot \kappa + 1.$$

PROOF. Write

$$B = \left\{ 1 - \frac{\kappa - 1}{3}, 3 - \frac{\kappa - 1}{3}, \dots, \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} - 3, \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} - 1 \right\}$$

and consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \{0\} \times \left( B \cup \left\{ \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} + 1 \right\} \right), \\ A_1 &= \{1\} \times B, \\ A_2 &= \{2\} \times B, \\ &\vdots \\ A_{\kappa-2} &= \{\kappa - 2\} \times B, \text{ and} \\ A_{\kappa-1} &= \{\kappa - 1\} \times B, \end{aligned}$$

and take  $A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} A_i$ . We can see that

$$|A| = \left( \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} \right) + 1 + (\kappa - 1) \left( \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} \right) = \kappa \left( \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} \right) + 1.$$

We will show that  $A$  is weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free. Notice that elements of  $B$  form an arithmetic sequence with a common difference of 2, so any two elements of

$$A^* = A \setminus \left\{ \left( 0, \frac{\kappa - 1}{3} \right) \right\} = \mathbb{Z}_{\kappa} \times B$$

will sum to an element whose second coordinate is in

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \left\{ 2 - \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3}, 4 - \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3}, \dots, \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3} - 4, \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3} - 2 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ 2 - \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3}, 2 - \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3} + (2), \dots, 2 - \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3} + \left( \frac{4\kappa - 4}{3} - 4 \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

whose elements also form an arithmetic sequence with a common difference of 2. Observe that the first term in the sequence in  $C$  is 2 more than  $\frac{\kappa - 1}{3} + 1$ , which is 2 more than the last term in the sequence in  $B$ , and that the sequence in  $C$  has

$$\frac{\frac{4\kappa - 4}{3} - 4}{2} + 1 = \frac{2\kappa - 2}{3} - 1$$

terms, while the sequence in  $B$  has  $\frac{\kappa-1}{3}$  terms. The full sequence,  $(0, 2, \dots, \kappa-4, \kappa-2)$ , repeats in a minimum of  $\kappa$  terms (since  $\kappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ ), and because

$$|B| + |C| = \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + \frac{2\kappa-2}{3} - 1 = \frac{3\kappa-3}{3} - 1 = \kappa - 2 < \kappa,$$

we know that  $B \cap C = \emptyset$ . This shows that  $(A^* + A^*) \cap A = \emptyset$ . Now we just must show that

$$\left( A^* + \left\{ \left( 0, \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \right) \right\} \right) \cap A = \emptyset,$$

or equivalently, that for all  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \kappa-2, \kappa-1\}$ , for all  $x \in (A_i \cap A^*)$ ,

$$x + \left( 0, \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \right) \notin A_i.$$

Write

$$D = \left\{ 2, 4, \dots, \frac{2\kappa-2}{3} - 2, \frac{2\kappa-2}{3} \right\},$$

and observe that for all such  $i$ , for all  $x \in \{i\} \times B = (A_i \cap A^*)$ ,

$$x + \left( 0, \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \right) \in (\{i\} \times B) + \left\{ \left( 0, \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \right) \right\} = \{i\} \times D.$$

The elements of  $D$  also form an arithmetic sequence with a common difference of 2 and the elements of  $B$  follow as the next terms of the sequence in  $D$  since  $\frac{2\kappa-2}{3} + 2 = 1 - \frac{\kappa-1}{3}$ . Again, the full sequence,  $(0, 2, \dots, \kappa-4, \kappa-2)$ , repeats in a minimum of  $\kappa$  terms (since  $\kappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ ), and because

$$|B| + |D| = \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + \frac{\kappa-1}{3} = \frac{2\kappa-2}{3} < \kappa,$$

we know that  $B \cap D = \emptyset$ . Lastly, considering  $i = 0$ , we must show that  $\left\{ \frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \right\} \cap D = \emptyset$ : recognize that  $-1 - \frac{\kappa-1}{3} \equiv 2 \left( \frac{\kappa-1}{3} \right) \pmod{\kappa}$  and since  $\kappa \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ ,  $\frac{\kappa-1}{3} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . This means that

$$2 \left( \frac{\kappa-1}{3} \right) - \frac{\kappa-1}{3} = \frac{\kappa-1}{3} \in D.$$

Since  $|D| = \frac{\kappa-1}{3} < \kappa$ ,  $\frac{\kappa-1}{3} + 1 \notin D$ , so we are done.  $\square$

NOTE: By Theorem 2, for all  $\kappa$  with no prime divisors congruent to 2 mod 3,

$$\mu^{\wedge}(\mathbb{Z}_{\kappa}^2, \{2, 1\}) \geq \kappa \left( \frac{\kappa-1}{3} \right) + 1 = v_1(\kappa, 3) \cdot \frac{\kappa^2}{\kappa} + 1 \stackrel{2}{=} \mu(\mathbb{Z}_{\kappa}^2, \{2, 1\}) + 1.$$

## 5 Future work

The upper bound in Proposition 7 has been very useful for  $\{k, l\} = \{2, 1\}$ . We should try to find a different construction to establish a new upper bound that would be useful for different  $k$  and  $l$ .

The technique of using arithmetic sequences to construct weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free sets used in the Proofs of Theorems 13 and 14 should be further developed and used for other cases of  $n_1 n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod 2$  for  $\mu^\wedge(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2}, \{k, l\})$  to prove Conjecture 12.

Specifically,  $\mu^\wedge(\mathbb{Z}_7 \times \mathbb{Z}_{21}, \{2, 1\})$  is of interest. The group  $\mathbb{Z}_7^2$  has 98 weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free subsets with arithmetic sequences, so a weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free subset in  $\mathbb{Z}_7 \times \mathbb{Z}_{21}$  could provide insight for generalizing a weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_7 \times \mathbb{Z}_{21}$ , and this prove a new lower bound for  $\mu^\wedge(\mathbb{Z}_7 \times \mathbb{Z}_{7w}, \{2, 1\})$ , similarly to Proposition 13. This will most likely involve using a computer to check for all possible subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_7 \times \mathbb{Z}_{21}$  with arithmetic sequences similar to those for  $\mathbb{Z}_7^2$ .

The same technique could be useful for finding new constructions of weak  $(k, l)$ -sum free subsets of cyclic groups for  $k > 2$ , by treating the cyclic group as noncyclic.

Another area of interest is constructing tables of discrepancies between  $\mu$  and  $\mu^\wedge$ . It is also of interest to construct a table of the maximum of all of the lower bounds that are established for  $\mu^\wedge$  and compare with the computer generated table on page 300 of [2].

**Acknowledgments.** I would like to thank Professor Bajnok for the continued guidance and encouragement, as well as the opportunity and resources to conduct my own research. I would also like to thank Bailey Heath for his help in finding the first weak  $(2, 1)$ -sum-free subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_7^2$  and for his kind and accessible support, whenever it was needed.

## References

- [1] B. Bajnok. Personal communication. (2019)
- [2] B. Bajnok. Additive Combinatorics: A Menu of Research Problems. CRC Press (2019).
- [3] B. Bajnok. and S. Edwards On two questions about restricted sumsets in finite abelian groups Australian Journal of Combinatorics (2017).