

174. Structure of Maximal Sum-free Sets in Groups of Order $3p$

By Hian-Poh YAP

Department of Mathematics, University of Singapore, Singapore

(Comm. by Kinjirô KUNUGI, M. J. A., Sept. 12, 1970)

1. Introduction. In [5] and [6], we studied the structure of maximal sum-free sets of elements in groups of prime orders $p=3k+2$ and $p=3k+1$ respectively. In this paper, we shall study the structure of maximal sum-free sets in groups G (both abelian and non-abelian) of order $3p$, where $p=3k+1$ is a prime. We shall use the same terminologies and notations as used in [1]. In particular, we let S be a maximal sum-free set in G and $|S|$ be the cardinal of S .

2. Abelian groups. Throughout this section G is abelian. We first prove that $|S+S| \neq 2|S|$ in Theorem 4 of [1]. In fact, we shall prove

Lemma 1. *If S is a maximal sum-free set in G , then S is a union of cosets of some subgroup H , of order p or 1 , such that*

$$|S+S| = 2|S| - |H|.$$

Proof. Write $G = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 3p-1\}$. Let $H_0 = H = \{0, 3, 6, \dots, 3(p-1)\}$, $H_1 = p + H$, $H_2 = 2p + H$, $S_i = S \cap H_i$, $i=0, 1, 2$.

If $S = H_1$, say, then it is clear that $|S+S| \neq 2|S|$.

Assume now that $S \neq H_1$ and $S_1 \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 5 of [1], $|S_0| \leq k$. Thus $|S_1| + |S_2| \geq 2k+1$ and without loss of generality, we may assume that $|S_1| \geq k+1$.

Now $(S_1+S_1) \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ and $(S_1+S_1) \cup S_2 \subseteq H_2$. Hence, by Cauchy-Davenport theorem ([2], p. 3), if $S_1+S_1 \neq H_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} p &\geq |S_2| + |S_1+S_1| \geq |S_2| + 2|S_1| - 1 \\ &\geq k + |S_1| + |S_2| \geq |S_0| + |S_1| + |S_2| = p, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$|S_0| = k, \quad |S_1| = k+1, \quad \text{and} \quad |S_2| = k.$$

(If $S_1+S_1 = H_2$, then we can prove that $S_0 = \emptyset$ and so $S = H_1$, which contradicts the assumption.)

Let $S^* = -S \cup S$. Then $S^* \neq S$. But from Theorem 4 of [1], we have (i) $|S+S| = 2|S| - 1$ or (ii) $|S+S| = 2|S|$ and $S \cup (S+S) = G$. Thus from $S^* \cap (S-S) = \emptyset$ it follows that $|S+S| \neq 2|S|$.

Hence, in any case $|S+S| \neq 2|S|$.

The proof of Lemma 1 is complete.

Next, we prove

Theorem 1. *Let S be a maximal sum-free set in G such that S is*

not a coset of $H, H = \{0, 3, 6, \dots, 3(p-1)\}$, then S is given by $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{id; i = k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k\}, \\ S_1 &= p + \{id; i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, \\ S_2 &= 2p + \{id; i = 2k+1, 2k+2, \dots, 3k\}, d \in H. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the number of maximal sum-free sets S in G such that S is not a coset of H is $p-1$. Moreover, if S and S' are two maximal sum-free sets in G such that S and S' are not cosets of H , then there exists an automorphism θ of G such that $S' = S\theta$.

Proof. From the proof of Lemma 1 above, we know that if $S \neq H_1$ and $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ then $|S_0| = k, |S_1| = k+1, |S_2| = k$, and $|S_1 + S_1| = 2|S_1| - 1$. Hence by Vosper's theorem ([2], p. 3), S_1 is in arithmetic progression. Let

$$S_1 = p + \{a + id; i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, a, d \in H. \tag{1}$$

Then $S_1 - S_1 = \{id; i = 0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm k\}$ and from the fact that $S_0 \cap (S_1 - S_1) = \emptyset$ and $|S_0| = k$ it follows that

$$S_0 = \{id; i = k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k\}. \tag{2}$$

Now, $S_1 + S_1 = 2p + \{2a + jd; j = 0, 1, \dots, 2k\}$ and from the fact that $S_2 \cap (S_1 + S_1) = \emptyset$ and $|S_2| = k$ it follows that

$$S_2 = 2p + \{2a + id; i = 2k+1, 2k+2, \dots, 3k\}. \tag{3}$$

Next,

$$S_1 + S_2 = \{3a + jd; j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1, 2k+1, 2k+2, \dots, 3k\}$$

and $S_0 \subseteq H_0 \setminus (S_1 + S_2)$, the set complement of $S_1 + S_2$ with respect to H_0 . Hence

$$S_0 \subseteq \{3a + id; i = k, k+1, \dots, 2k\}. \tag{4}$$

Now by the following lemmas,

Lemma 2. Let $A = \{a + jd; j = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$ be a set of residues modulo m with $(d, m) = 1$ and $1 \leq r \leq m-3$. If $A = \{b + jd'; j = 0, 1, \dots, r\}$, then $d' \equiv \pm d \pmod{m}$ ([3]).

Lemma 3. Let $A = \{a + jd; j = 1, 2, \dots, r\}$ be a set of residues modulo m with $(d, m) = 1$ and $2 \leq r \leq (m+1)/2$. Then A can be written in only two essentially different ways in arithmetic progression form, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \text{either } A &= \{a + jd; j = 1, 2, \dots, r\} \\ \text{or } A &= \{(a + (r+1)d) + j(-d); j = 1, 2, \dots, r\} \end{aligned} \tag{[6]}$$

we have either $S_0 = \{3a + id; i = k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k\}$, or $S_0 = \{3a + id; i = k, k+1, \dots, 2k-1\}$.

Case (i). $S_0 = \{3a + id; i = k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k\}. \tag{5}$

In this case, compare (5) with (2), we have $a=0$ and thus

$$S_0 = \{id; i = k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k\}, \tag{2}$$

$$S_1 = p + \{id; i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, \tag{6}$$

$$S_2 = 2p + \{id; i = 2k+1, 2k+2, \dots, 3k\}. \tag{7}$$

Case (ii). $S_0 = \{3a + id; i = k, k + 1, \dots, 2k - 1\}$. (8)

In this case compare (8) with (2), we have $d = 3a$ and therefore $a = -kd$. Thus

$$S_0 = \{id; i = k + 1, k + 2, \dots, 2k\}, \tag{2}$$

$$S_1 = p + \{id; i = 0, 2k + 1, 2k + 2, \dots, 3k\}, \tag{9}$$

$$S_2 = 2p + \{id; i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}. \tag{10}$$

On the other hand, we can verify that $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$, where S_0, S_1, S_2 are given by (2), (6), and (7) (or (2), (9), and (10)) is sum-free in G and hence is a maximal sum-free set in G .

Now, let

$$S'_0 = \{id_0; i = k + 1, k + 2, \dots, 2k\}, \tag{2'}$$

$$S'_1 = p + \{id_0; i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, \tag{6'}$$

$$S'_2 = 2p + \{id_0; i = 2k + 1, 2k + 2, \dots, 3k\}. \tag{7'}$$

We can show that the mapping θ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (id)\theta &= id_0, & (p + id)\theta &= p + id_0, \\ (2p + id)\theta &= 2p + id_0, & i &= 0, 1, \dots, p - 1 \end{aligned}$$

is an automorphism of G such that $S\theta = S'$, where $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2, S_0, S_1, S_2$ are given by (2), (6), (7), and $S' = S'_0 \cup S'_1 \cup S'_2, S'_0, S'_1, S'_2$ are given by (2)', (6)', (7)'.

It is clear that the mapping φ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (id)\varphi &= i(-d), & (p + id)\varphi &= p + i(-d), \\ (2p + id)\varphi &= 2p + i(-d), & i &= 0, 1, \dots, p - 1 \end{aligned}$$

is an automorphism of G that maps the maximal sum-free set given by (2), (6), and (7) onto the maximal sum-free set given by (2), (9), and (10).

Hence, again, by Lemma 2, there are altogether $p - 1$ non-essentially different maximal sum-free sets S in G such that S is not a coset of H . Moreover, all these non-essentially different maximal sum-free sets in G can be obtained by automorphisms from S where $S = S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{i; i = k + 1, k + 2, \dots, 2k\}, \\ S_1 &= p + \{i; i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, & \text{and} \\ S_2 &= 2p + \{i; i = 2k + 1, 2k + 2, \dots, 3k\}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

3. Non-abelian groups. Theorem 8 of [1] states that if G is a non-abelian group of order $3p$, where $p = 3k + 1$ is a prime, then $\lambda(G) = p$. In this section, we shall study the structure of maximal sum-free sets S in G for this case. In fact, we shall prove

Theorem 2. *Let G be a non-abelian group of order $3p$, where $p = 3k + 1$ is a prime. If S is a maximal sum-free set in G , then S is a coset of a subgroup H , of order p , of G .*

Proof. We know that G is generated by a and b such that $3a = 0 = pb$ and $b + a = a + rb$, where $r^2 + r + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ ([4], p. 51). It is

known that in this case

$$H_0 = \{0, b, 2b, \dots, (p-1)b\}$$

is the only subgroup, of order p , of G ([4], p. 49).

From the proof of Theorem 8 in [1], if S is not a coset of H_0 , we can prove that $|S_0| = k$, $|S_1| = k + 1$, $|S_2| = k$, and $|S_1 + S_1| = 2|S_1| - 1$ ([1]). Hence, by Vosper's theorem, S_1 is in arithmetic progression. Let

$$S_1 = a + \{m + id; i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}b$$

where $m, d \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Now } S_1 + S_1 &= 2a + \{mr + i(dr); i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}b \\ &\quad + \{m + id; i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}b \end{aligned}$$

where $A = \{mr + i(dr); i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $B = \{m + id; i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are elements in the cyclic group C_p of order p .

Again, by Vosper's theorem, A and B should have the same difference. Hence, from Lemma 2, we have $dr \equiv \pm d \pmod{p}$. But since $d \neq 0$, therefore $r \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$, which contradicts the fact $r^2 + r + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

4. A conjecture. For the case that G is abelian of order 9, the second possibility in Theorem 8 of [1] cannot occur also, i.e., if S is a maximal sum-free set in G , then $|S + S| \neq 2|S|$.

Let H_0 be any subgroup, of order 3, of G . Let H_0, H_1, H_2 be distinct cosets of H_0 and $S_i = S \cap H_i, i = 0, 1, 2$.

If the second possibility in Theorem 8 of [1] occurs, then $0 \in S + S$ and thus $|(-S) \cap S| = 2$. Hence, if $S = \{s_0, s_1, s_2\}$, and $S \neq H_1$ or H_2 , then $s_0 \in S_0, s_1 \in S_1$, and $s_2 = -s_1 \in S_2$.

Now from $S \cup (S + S) = G$, we have

$$2s_0 + (s_0 + s_1) + (s_0 - s_1) + 2s_1 + (-2s_1) = -s_0,$$

from which it follows that $5s_0 = 0$, which is impossible.

We make the following

Conjecture: Let G be a finite abelian group such that $|G|$ has no prime factors $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ and such that $|G|$ has 3 as a factor. If S is a maximal sum-free set in G , then S is a union of cosets of a subgroup H , of order $|G|/3m$, of G , where m is an integer such that $3m |G|$, and $|S + S| = 2|S| - |H|$.

References

- [1] P. H. Diananda and H.-P. Yap: Maximal sum-free sets of elements of finite groups. Proc. Japan Acad., **45**, 1-5 (1969).
- [2] H. B. Mann: Addition Theorems. Interscience Publ., New York etc. (1965).
- [3] H. B. Mann and J. E. Olson: Sums of sets in the elementary abelian group of type (p, p) . J. of Combinatorial Theory, **2**, 275-284 (1967).

- [4] Marshall Hall, Jr.: The Theory of Groups. Macmillan Co., New York (1959).
- [5] H.-P. Yap: The number of maximal sum-free sets in C_p . Nanta Math., **2**, 68–71 (1968).
- [6] —: Structure of maximal sum-free sets in C_p . Acta Arith., **17** (to appear).