ON A CONJECTURE OF FOX-KLEITMAN AND SOME RELATED QUESTIONS

S. D. ADHIKARI, R. BALASUBRAMANIAN, S. ELIAHOU, AND D. J. GRYNKIEWICZ

Abstract. The Fox and Kleitman conjecture [5] regarding the maximum degree of regularity of the equation $x_1 + \cdots + x_k - y_1 - \cdots - y_k = b_k$, as b_k runs over the positive integers, has recently been confirmed [9]. However we furnish a much simpler proof of a result establishing the right order of magnitude of the degree of regularity of the equation. Our result also gives information regarding the degree of regularity for some precise values of b_k, namely $b_k = c_{k-1} = \mathrm{lcm}\{i : i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$. We also consider the problem of finding the degree of regularity of some particular equations with a small number of variables.

1. Introduction

For given $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ and b in the set $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers, we consider the linear Diophantine equation L:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i x_i = b.$$

Following [8], given $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the set of positive integers, equation L is said to be *n-regular* if, for every n-coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a *monochromatic* solution $x = (x_1, \ldots, x) \in \mathbb{N}_+^k$ to L.

The *degree of regularity* of L is the largest integer $n \geq 0$, if any, such that L is n-regular. This (possibly infinite) number is denoted by $\mathrm{dor}(L)$. If $\mathrm{dor}(L) = \infty$, then L is said to be *regular*.

A well-known and challenging conjecture (known as *Rado's Boundedness Conjecture*) due to Rado [8] states that there is a function $r\colon \mathbb{N}_+ \to \mathbb{N}_+$ such that, given any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and any equation $\alpha_1 x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n x_n = 0$ with integer coefficients, if this equation is not regular over $\mathbb{N}_+$, then it fails to be $r(n)$-regular. Even though there is a more general version, we state it here for a single homogeneous equation, as it has been proved by Rado [8] that if the conjecture is true for a single equation, then it is true for a system of finitely many linear equations, and as Fox and Kleitman [5] have shown, if the conjecture is true for a linear homogeneous equation, then it is true for any linear equation.

The first nontrivial case of the conjecture has been proved by Fox and Kleitman [5] by establishing the bound $r(3) \leq 24$. In the same paper [5], the authors made the following conjecture for a very specific linear Diophantine equation.

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $k \geq 1$. There exists an integer $b_k \geq 1$ such that the degree of regularity of the $2k$-variable equation $L_k(b_k)$,*

$$x_1 + \cdots + x_k - y_1 - \cdots - y_k \;=\; b_k$$

is exactly $2k-1$.

Fox and Kleitman [5] had proved the following.

Proposition 1.2. *For any $b \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the equation $L_k(b)$ is not $2k$-regular.*

When $k = 2$, Adhikari and Eliahou [1] proved the Fox-Kleitman conjecture by establishing the following more general result:

Theorem 1.3 ([1])**.** *For all positive integers b, we have*

$$\mathrm{dor}(L_2(b)) \;=\; \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if } \; b \equiv 1 \bmod 2, \\ 2 & \textit{if } \; b \equiv 2, 4 \bmod 6, \\ 3 & \textit{if } \; b \equiv 0 \bmod 6. \end{cases}$$

A shorter proof of the above has been given in [2]. In [2], the following results were also established.

Theorem 1.4 ([2])**.** *We have* $\mathrm{dor}(L_3(24)) = 4$.

Theorem 1.5 ([2])**.** *We have* $\mathrm{dor}(L_3(120)) = 5$.

Though the full conjecture of Fox and Kleitman has been very recently established by Schoen and Taczala in [9] by generalizing a theorem of Eberhard, Green and Manners [4], in the next section, we give a very simple proof of Theorem 1.4 needing only Kneser's Theorem.

Similarly, in Theorem 3.3 of Section 3, we give a very short proof of the fact that, writing $c_{k-1} = \mathrm{lcm}\{i : \; i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$, the equation $L_k(c_{k-1})$ is $(k-1)$-regular. Our much simpler proof (which uses a result of Lev [11]), nonetheless achieves the correct order of magnitude, with a linear constant of 1 rather than the precise value 2, which is much improved as compared to earlier knowledge (as has been mentioned in [5], from a result of Strauss [10], it followed that, for an appropriate b_k, the equation $L_k(b_k)$ was $\Omega(\log k)$-regular). Our result also gives information regarding the degree of regularity of $L_k(b)$ with the particular value $b = c_{k-1}$, and we show that, apart from the first few values $k \leq 5$, it suffices to color the first $c_{k-1} + 1$ positive integers to find a monochromatic solution to $L(c_{k-1})$, with the solution occurring in the densest color class.

In [3], Bialostocki et al. considered equation L, that is $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i x_i \;=\; b$, where $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = 0$ and $b \neq 0$. Among other things, the paper [3] established $\mathrm{dor}(x_1 + x_2 - 2y_1 = b)$ under the condition $x_1 < y_1 < x_2$. Here in Section 4, following some line of arguments in [1], we furnish a somewhat different proof for the result on $\mathrm{dor}(x_1 + x_2 - 2y_1 = b)$; because of Proposition 1.2, the result here is unconditional.

In what follows, for integers a, b with $a \le b$, the set of integers x with $a \le x \le b$ will be denoted by the integer interval $[a, b]$. For a finite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, we shall write $\operatorname{diam} A = \max A - \min A$ to denote the diameter of A. Given two subsets A and B from an additive abelian group, we let $A + B = \{a + b : \ a \in A,\, b \in B\}$ denote their sumset and $A - B = \{a - b : \ a \in A,\, b \in B\}$ denotes their difference set. If $n \ge 0$ is an integer, then $nA = \underbrace{A + \ldots + A}_{n}$ denotes the n-fold iterated sumset, where $0A := \{0\}$, while $n \cdot A = \{na : \ a \in A\}$ denotes the dilation of A.

Let G be an abelian group and let $A,\, B \subseteq G$ be nonempty subsets. We let $\mathsf{H}(A) = \{h \in G : h + A = A\}$ denote the stabilizer of A, which is a subgroup of G. Note $H = \mathsf{H}(A)$ is equivalent to H being the maximal subgroup for which A is a union of H-cosets. The set A is called *periodic* if $\mathsf{H}(A)$ is nontrivial, and otherwise is called *aperiodic*. We will make use of Kneser's Theorem (see [6, Chapter 6]), which states that $|A + B| \ge |A + H| + |B + H| - |H|$ for $H = \mathsf{H}(A + B)$. Equivalently, $|A+B| \ge |A| + |B| - 1$ when $A+B$ is aperiodic. Iterating Kneser's Theorem gives $|\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i| \ge \sum_{i=1}^{n} |A_i + H| - (n-1)|H|$ for $H = \mathsf{H}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i)$.

2. $\operatorname{dor}(L_3(24)) = 4$

For the sake of completeness, we now give an expanded version of the proof of Proposition 1.2 due to Fox and Kleitman [5].

Proof. If b is not a multiple of k, then considering the coloring given by the residue class modulo k, there is no monochromatic solution to the equation $L_k(b)$ and the equation not even being k-regular, we are through.

So, we assume that b is a multiple of k and consider the following $2k$-coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$:
for $1 \le i \le 2k$, the set of integers colored i is defined to be

$$X_i = \bigcup_{j \ge 0} \big(\big[(i-1)b/k + 1, ib/k\big] + 2bj \big).$$

Now, the set $X_i - X_i$ is independent of i. Since the set $k(X_1 - X_1) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} ([-b+k, b-k] + 2jb)$ is a union of translates of $[-b+k, b-k]$ by integer multiples of $2b$, it cannot contain b. Therefore, for any $i,\ 1 \le i \le 2k$, $k(X_i - X_i)$ does not contain b. This shows that $L_k(b)$ is not $2k$-regular. $\square$

We proceed to prove that $\operatorname{dor}(L_3(24)) = 4$ using Kneser's Theorem. Since 5 does not divide 24, considering the mod 5 coloring shows that $L_3(24)$ is not 5-regular, and hence we only have to show that $L_3(24)$ is 4-regular, which in turn will follow from the result below and the pigeonhole principle. That result was first stated and proved in [2].

Theorem 2.1. *For any subset $X \subset [0, 32]$ of cardinality $|X| = 9$,*

$$24 \in 3(X - X).$$

Proof. Suppose the result is not true and let $X \subset [0, 32]$ be a counter example.

Now, writing $S = X - X$, we have

$$24 \notin S + S + S,$$

which forces that none of the numbers $8, 12, 24$ are in S as $0 \in S$.

If $4 \in S$, then none of the numbers $16, 20, 28, 32$ are in S. Therefore, $4 \in S$ would imply $S \cap [0, 32] \cap 4\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 4\}$. Hence, $4 \in S = X - X$ implies that, for all $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$,

$$|X \cap (4\mathbb{N} + i)| \leq 2$$

and hence $|X| \leq 8$, a contradiction to our assumption.

Therefore, none of the numbers 4, 8, 12 nor 24 are in S.

From the above observation, the difference between consecutive elements of $X_i := X \cap (4\mathbb{Z}+i)$, for any $i \in [0, 3]$, is at least 16. Thus, if $|X_i| \geq 3$, then this is only possible if $i = 0$ and $X_0 = \{0, 16, 32\}$. Since $|X| \geq 9$ ensures by the pigeonhole principle that $|X_i| \geq 3$ for some i, we must have $|X_1| = |X_2| = |X_3| = 2$ and $X_0 = \{0, 16, 32\}$.

Now, $X_0 \subset X$, and therefore it follows that $\{16, 32\} \subset S$.

Since $24 = 20 + 20 - 16 = 28 + 28 - 32$, it follows that 20, $28 \notin S$ and hence

$$S \cap 4\mathbb{N} \cap [0, 32] = \{0, 16, 32\}.$$

Therefore,

$$X = \{0, 16, 32\} \cup \{a, a + 16\} \cup \{b, b + 16\} \cup \{c, c + 16\},$$

where $a \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, $b \equiv 2 \pmod 4$, $c \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ and $1 \leq a, b, c \leq 15$.

Writing $Y = X \cap [0, 15]$, we have $Y = \{0, a, b, c\}$. Let $A = (Y - Y) + (Y - Y) + (Y - Y)$. Since $Y - Y \subset [-15, 15]$, we have

$$A \subset [-45, 45].$$

Suppose there exists $\alpha \in A$ with $\alpha \equiv 8 \pmod{16}$. Since $A = -A$, we can assume $\alpha \in \{8, 24, 40\}$.

If $\alpha = 24$, then $24 \in A \subset S + S + S$, and we are through.

If $\alpha = (y_1 - y_1') + (y_2 - y_2') + (y_3 - y_3') = 8$ with y_i, $y_i' \in Y$, then $y_1 + 16 \in X$ and

$$\alpha + 16 = (y_1 + 16 - y_1') + (y_2 - y_2') + (y_3 - y_3') = 24 \in S + S + S,$$

and once again we are through.

Finally, if $\alpha = 40$, then observing that $y_1' + 16 \in X$, we have

$$\alpha - 16 = (y_1 - (y_1' + 16)) + (y_2 - y_2') + (y_3 - y_3') = 24 \in S + S + S.$$

Therefore, if we can show that A contains an element $\equiv 8 \pmod{16}$, the theorem will be proved.

For a subset $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, let $\overline{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}$ denote its image modulo 16. Now, considering Y modulo 16, as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}$, $\overline{Y}$ has 4 elements and $0 \in \overline{A}$. If $\overline{A}$ is periodic, it must contain 8 as all nontrivial subgroups of $\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}$ contain 8.

Otherwise, $\overline{A}$ is aperiodic and hence Kneser's Theorem (see remarks after the statement of Kneser's theorem in Section 6.1 in [6]) implies

$$|\overline{A}| \geq 6|\overline{Y}| - 6 + 1 = 24 - 6 + 1 = 19,$$

which is not possible. □

3. The Equation $L_k(c_{k-1})$

Here we improve upon the result of Strauss mentioned in the introduction by establishing that, for some integer b_k, the degree of regularity of the equation $L_k(b_k)$: $(x_1-y_1)+\ldots+(x_k-y_k) = b_k$ is at least $k-1$. Specifically, we show that this holds with $b_k = c_{k-1} = \operatorname{lcm}\{i : \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$.

The following is a result of Lev [Corollary, [11]]. Here, the case $h = 1$ is trivial.

Theorem A. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set of integers with $|A| \geq 2$ and $\gcd(A - A) = 1$, let $s = \lfloor \frac{\operatorname{diam} A - 1}{|A|-2} \rfloor$ (for $|A| \geq 3$), and set $s = 1$ for $|A| = 2$. Let $h_1, h_2 \geq 0$ be integers with $h := h_1 + h_2 \geq 1$.*

1. *If $h \leq s$, then $|h_1 A - h_2 A| \geq \frac{h(h+1)}{2}|A| - h^2 + 1$.*
2. *If $h \geq s$, then $|h_1 A - h_2 A| \geq \frac{s(s+1)}{2}|A| - s^2 + 1 + (h - s) \operatorname{diam} A$.*

The following is a basic consequence of the pigeonhole principle [Lemma 1, [12]].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite, nonempty set of integers with $\operatorname{diam} A \leq 2|A| - 2$. Then*

$$[-(2|A| - 2 - \operatorname{diam} A), 2|A| - 2 - \operatorname{diam} A] \subseteq A - A.$$

Using the above, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $r \geq 1$ and $n > r$ be integers. Suppose $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is a subset of integers with $|X| \geq n + 1$, $\operatorname{diam} X \leq rn$ and $d = \gcd(X - X)$. Then*

$$d\mathbb{Z} \cap [-rdn, rdn] \subseteq (r + 1)X - (r + 1)X.$$

Proof. Observing that the lemma is translation invariant, we may w.l.o.g. assume $0 = \min X$. If $r = 1$, then $X = [0, rn] = [0, n]$, in which case $(r + 1)X - (r + 1)X = 2X - 2X = [-2n, 2n]$, and the lemma holds. Therefore we may assume $r \geq 2$, and thus $|X| \geq n + 1 \geq r + 2 \geq 4$. Let $N = \max X = \operatorname{diam} X \leq rn$.

Suppose $d \geq 2$. Then all elements of X will be divisible by d (in view of $0 \in X$). Let $X' = \frac{1}{d} \cdot X = \{x/d : \ x \in X\}$ and observe that $\gcd(X' - X') = 1$ with $X' \subseteq [0, \lfloor \frac{rn}{d} \rfloor] \subseteq [0, rn]$ and $|X'| = |X| \geq n + 1$. Consequently, if we knew the lemma held whenever $d = 1$, then we could apply this case to X' to conclude that $[-rn, rn] \subseteq (r + 1)X' - (r + 1)X'$, implying (by multiplying everything by d) that $d\mathbb{Z} \cap [-rdn, rdn] \subseteq (r + 1)X - (r + 1)X$, as desired. So we see that it suffices to consider the case when $d = 1$, i.e., when $\gcd(X - X) = 1$, which we now assume.

Since $|X| \geq n + 1$, $N \leq rn$, and $n > r \geq 2$, we have

$$s := \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{|X|-2} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{N-1}{|X|-2} \leq \frac{N-1}{n-1} \leq \frac{rn-1}{n-1} < r + 1. \tag{1}$$

Consequently, applying Theorem A to X (using $h = h_1 = r + 1$ and $h_2 = 0$), we find that

$$|(r+1)X| \geq \frac{s(s+1)}{2}|X| - s^2 + 1 + (r + 1 - s)N.$$

Note that $\operatorname{diam}\big((r+1)X\big) = (r+1)N$, $(s+1)(|X|-2) \geq N$, $N \geq s(n-1)+1$ and $r \geq s$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} M : &= 2|(r+1)X| - 2 - \operatorname{diam}\big((r+1)X\big) = 2|(r+1)X| - 2 - (r+1)N \\ &\geq s(s+1)(|X|-2) + 2s + (r+1-2s)N \\ &\geq sN + 2s + (r+1-2s)N = 2s + (r+1-s)N \\ &\geq 2s + (r+1-s)(s(n-1)+1). \end{aligned}$$

The above bound is quadratic in s with the coefficient of s^2 negative (since $n > 1$). The bound for M is thus minimized at a boundary value for s. As a result, since $1 \leq s \leq r$ in view of (1), we conclude that $M \geq rn + 2 > 0$. Hence we can apply Lemma 3.1 using $A = (r+1)X$ to conclude that $[-rn, rn] \subseteq [-M, M] \subseteq (r+1)X - (r+1)X$, completing the proof. □

The least common multiple of the first r integers has been well studied. Bounds from Hong and Feng [7] give

$$c_r := \operatorname{lcm}\{i : \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, r\} \geq 2^{r-1},$$

for instance, while the first few values are easily computed to be $c_1 = 1$, $c_2 = 2$, $c_3 = 6$, $c_4 = 12$, $c_5 = 60$, $c_6 = 60$, and $c_7 = 420$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $k \geq 2$ be a integer and let $c_{k-1} = \operatorname{lcm}\{i : \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$. Then the equation*

$$(x_1 - y_1) + \ldots + (x_k - y_k) = c_{k-1}$$

is $(k-1)$-regular.

Proof. Let $r = k - 1 \geq 1$, let $c = c_r$ for $r \geq 5$, let $c = 3c_r = 3c_2$ when $r = 2$, and let $c = 2c_r$ for $r \leq 4$ with $r \neq 2$. Thus c_r is divisible by every integer from $[1, r]$ and $n := \frac{c}{r} > r$ (in view of the basic lower bound mentioned above for c_r as well as the first few explicit values given above). Let $\chi : [1, c+1] \to [1, r]$ be an arbitrary r-coloring. We will show that there is a monochromatic solution to the equation $(x_1 - y_1) + \ldots + (x_k - y_k) = c_r$, which will show the equation to be r-regular, as desired.

Observe that $[1, c+1] = [1, rn+1]$ with $n = \frac{c}{r} > r$. Thus, by the pigeonhole principle, there is a monochromatic subset $X \subseteq [1, rn+1]$ with $|X| \geq n + 1 \geq r + 2 \geq 3$ and $\operatorname{diam} X \leq rn$.

Let $d = \gcd(X - X)$. Then $X \subseteq [1, rn+1]$ is contained in an arithmetic progression with difference d. However, since $|X| \geq n+1$, this is only possible if $d \in [1, r]$. Thus $d \mid c_r$ by construction with $c_r \leq c = rn$, ensuring that $c_r \in d\mathbb{Z} \cap [1, rn]$. Applying Lemma 3.2 to X now yields $c_r \in (r+1)X - (r+1)X = kX - kX$. Thus there are $x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_k \in X$ such that $(x_1 - y_1) + \ldots + (x_k - y_k) = c_r = c_{k-1}$, and since all elements in X are monochromatic, this provides a monochromatic solution, completing the proof. ☐

4. The Equation $x_1 + x_2 - 2y_1 = b$

As mentioned in the introduction, Bialostocki et al. [3] established $\text{dor}(x_1 + x_2 - 2y_1 = b)$, under the condition $x_1 < y_1 < x_2$. Here, following the line of arguments in [1], we give a proof of the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider the equation $L'(b)$:*

$$x_1 + x_2 - 2y_1 = b.$$

For all positive integers b, we have

$$\text{dor}(L'(b)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b \equiv 1 \bmod 2, \\ 2 & \text{if } b \equiv 2, 4 \bmod 6, \\ 3 & \text{if } b \equiv 0 \bmod 6. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Because of Proposition 1.2, $\text{dor}(L'(b)) \leq \text{dor}(L_2(b)) \leq 3$. Again, since $L'(b)$ is solvable in $\mathbb{N}_+$, we have $1 \leq \text{dor}(L'(b))$.

Thus,

$$1 \leq \text{dor}(L'(b)) \leq 3.$$

The proof will be complete with the following observations.

Observation 1. Consider the 2-coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$ given by coloring each integer according to its residue class modulo 2. Let $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ be a monochromatic solution to $L'(b)$ under this coloring.

This will imply

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 2\lambda_3 \equiv 0 \bmod 2.$$

Therefore, if b is odd, there cannot be a monochromatic solution in $\mathbb{N}_+^4$ and hence

$$\text{dor}(L'(b)) = 1$$

in this case.

Observation 2. Let b be even and write $h = b/2$ with $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

The following three vectors in $\mathbb{N}_+^4$ are solutions to $L'(b)$:

$$(b+1, 1, 1),$$
$$(h+1, h+1, 1),$$
$$(b+1, b+1, h+1).$$

Since, for any 2-coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$, at least two elements in the set $\{b+1, h+1, 1\}$ must be of the same color, at least one of the above three solutions must be monochromatic, and hence $\mathrm{dor}(L'(b)) \geq 2$ when b is even.

Observation 3. If $b \not\equiv 0 \bmod 3$, then coloring each integer according to its residue class modulo 3 gives a coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$ for which there cannot be any monochromatic solution to $L'(b)$, and hence $\mathrm{dor}(L'(b)) \leq 2$ in this case.

Observation 4. Here we consider the case $b \equiv 0 \bmod 6$. Since the sum of coefficients is zero, it is easy to see that if $L'(6)$ is proved to be 3-regular, then so is $L'(b)$.

Let $c\colon \mathbb{N}_+ \to \{0,1,2\}$ be an arbitrary 3-coloring of $\mathbb{N}_+$.

Consider the following families of special solutions to $L'(6)$ parametrized by $a \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a+6, a, a),\\
&(a+5, a+1, a),\\
&(a+4, a+2, a),\\
&(a+3, a+3, a),\\
&(a+8, a, a+1),\\
&(a+1, a+9, a+2).
\end{aligned}$$

The underlying sets for each of these solutions can be assumed to be multi-chromatic, and thus all sets from

$$\mathcal{E} = \big\{\{a, a+3\},\ \{a, a+6\},\ \{a, a+2, a+4\},\ \{a, a+1, a+5\},\ \{a, a+1, a+8\}, \{a+1, a+9, a+2\}\big\},$$

where a ranges through $\mathbb{N}_+$, are multi-chromatic sets under c.

As just observed, the integer a must be colored distinctly from both $a+3$ and $a+6$. Moreover, if $c(a+6) = c(a+3)$, then we would obtain the monochromatic solution $(a+6, a+6, a+3)$. It follows that

$$\{c(a), c(a+3), c(a+6)\} \;=\; \{0,1,2\} \;=\; \{c(a+3), c(a+6), c(a+9)\},$$

with the second equality following by the same argument used for the first, only replacing a by $a+3$. Hence

$$c(a) = c(a+9).$$

Thus the color of an integer depends only on its residue class modulo 9. So, denoting the elements of $\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$ by $0, 1, \ldots, 8$ and their respective colors under c by $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_8$ (with indices modulo 9), we may depict the distribution of colors by the following table:

TABLE 1. The color table C

c_0	c_1	c_2
c_3	c_4	c_5
c_6	c_7	c_8

Since the sets $\{a, a+2, a+4\}$, $\{a, a+1, a+5\}$ and $\{a+1, a+2, a+9\}$ belong to $\mathcal{E}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and are assumed to be multichromatic under c, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\big|\{c_i, c_{i+2}, c_{i+4}\}\big| \geq 2, \tag{2}$$

$$\big|\{c_i, c_{i+1}, c_{i+5}\}\big| \geq 2, \tag{3}$$

$$\big|\{c_i, c_{i+1}, c_{i+2}\}\big| \geq 2. \tag{4}$$

We may assume that the first column (c_0, c_3, c_6) of C is equal to $(0, 1, 2)$ and the table is as follows:

Table 2

0	c_1	c_2
1	c_4	c_5
2	c_7	c_8

The second and third columns of C being permutations of its first column, there are nine possible pairs holding the remaining two 0's in C:

$$\begin{array}{c} (c_1, c_2),\ (c_1, c_5),\ (c_1, c_8); \\ (c_4, c_2),\ (c_4, c_5),\ (c_4, c_8); \\ (c_7, c_2),\ (c_7, c_5),\ (c_7, c_8). \end{array} \tag{5}$$

However, recalling that $c_0 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{array}{lll} \big|\{c_0, c_1, c_2\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (4), & \big|\{c_0, c_1, c_5\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (3), & \big|\{c_8, c_0, c_1\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (4); \\ \big|\{c_0, c_2, c_4\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (2), & \big|\{c_4, c_5, c_0\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (3), & \big|\{c_8, c_0, c_4\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (3); \\ \big|\{c_7, c_0, c_2\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (2), & \big|\{c_5, c_7, c_0\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (2), & \big|\{c_7, c_8, c_0\}\big| \geq 2 \text{ by } (4). \end{array}$$

Hence none of the pairs from (5) can equal $(0, 0)$, contradicting that the two remaining 0's in C must lie in one of the pairs from (5). □

References

[1] S. D. Adhikari, S. Eliahou, *On a conjecture of Fox and Kleitman on the degree of regularity of a certain linear equation*, To appear in Combinatorial and Additive Number Theory II: CANT, New York, NY, USA, 2015 and 2016, Springer, New York, 2017.

[2] S. D. Adhikari, L. Boza, S. Eliahou, M. P. Revuelta, M. I. Sanz, *Equation-regular sets and the Fox-Kleitman conjecture*, Discrete Math. (2017), `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2017.08.040`.

[3] A. Bialostocki, H. Lefmann, T. Meerdink, *On the degree of regularity of some equations*, Discrete Math., **4**, 49–60 (1996).

[4] S. Eberhard, B. Green and F. Manners, *Sets of integers with no large sum-free subset*, Annals of Math. **180**, 621–652 (2014).

[5] J. Fox and D. J. Kleitman, *On Rado's Boundedness Conjecture*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **113**, 84–100 (2006).
[6] David J. Grynkiewicz, *Structural Additive Theory*, (Springer, 2013).
[7] S. Hong and W. Feng, *Lower bounds for the least common multiple of finite arithmetic progressions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, **343**, no. 11-12, 695–698 (2006).
[8] Rado, R., *Studien zur Kombinatorik*, Math. Z., **36**, 424–480 (1933).
[9] T. Schoen, and K. Taczala, *The degree of regularity of the equation* $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i + b$, Moscow J. Combin. and Number Th. **7**, 74–93 [162–181] (2017).
[10] E. G. Straus, *A Combinatorial Theorem in Group Theory*, Math Comput. **29**, 303–309 (1975).
[11] V. F. Lev, *Addendum to: "Structure Theorem for Multiple Addition"*, J. Number Theory, **65**, 96–100 (1997).
[12] V. F. Lev, *Large Sum-Free Sets in* $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, Israel J. Math., **154**, 221–233 (2006).

(S. D. Adhikari) (Formerly at HRI, Allahabad) Department of Mathematics, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda University, Belur Math, Howrah - 711202, W.B., INDIA

E-mail address: adhikari@hri.res.in

(R. Balasubramanian) Institute of Mathematical Sciences, CIT Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India

E-mail address: balu@imsc.res.in

(S. Eliahou) Univ. Littoral Côte d'Opale, EA 2597 - LMPA - Laboratoire de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées Joseph Liouville, F-62228 Calais, France and CNRS, FR 2956, France

E-mail address: eliahou@univ-littoral.fr

(D. J. Grynkiewicz) University of Memphis, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Memphis, TN 38152, USA

E-mail address: djgrynkw@memphis.edu