

# ON THE MINIMUM OVERLAP PROBLEM

T. AGAMA

ABSTRACT. In this note we study the minimum overlap problem. We obtain the following crude inequality for the problem

$$M(n) < \mathcal{D}(k)(1 - o(1))\frac{n}{4}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}(k) > 1$ .

## 1. Introduction and problem statement

The minimum overlap problem was first posed by then then Hungarian mathematician Paul Erdős. The problem is often stated in the following way:

Let  $A = \{a_i\}$  and  $B = \{b_j\}$  be any two complementary subsets, a splitting of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|A| = |B| = \frac{n}{2}$ . Let  $M_k$  denotes the number of solutions to the equation  $a_i - b_j = k$ , where  $-n \leq k \leq n$ . Let us denote by  $M(n) := \min_{A,B} \max_k M_k$ . Then the problem asks for an estimate for  $M(n)$  for sufficiently large values of  $n$ . There has been significant progress in estimating from below and above the quantity  $M(n)$ . Erdős [1] managed to obtain the following upper and lower bounds

$$M(n) < (1 + o(1))\frac{n}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad M(n) > \frac{n}{4}.$$

The lower bound was improved to (see [2])

$$M(n) > (1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{2}})n$$

and latter to (see [2])

$$M(n) > \sqrt{(4 - \sqrt{15})(n - 1)}$$

the most recent of which is [2]

$$M(n) > \sqrt{(4 - \sqrt{15})n}.$$

The upper bound, to the contrary, developed quite steadily overtime in the aftermath of Erdős's result (see [1])

$$M(n) < (1 + o(1))\frac{2n}{5},$$

a result due to Motzkin, Ralston and Selfridge. The best known upper bound concerning this problem is due to Haugland [3], given by

$$M(n) < (1 + o(1))0.38093n.$$

---

*Date:* August 15, 2020.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54C40, 14E20; Secondary 46E25, 20C20.

*Key words and phrases.* minimum; overlap.

In this note we obtain the following crude upper bound to the problem

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $A = \{a_i\}$  and  $B = \{b_j\}$  be any two complementary subsets, a splitting of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|A| = |B| = \frac{n}{2}$ . Let  $M_k$  denotes the number of solutions to the equation  $a_i - b_j = k$ , where  $-n \leq k \leq n$ . Let us denote by  $M(n) := \min_{A,B} \max_k M_k$ , then for a fixed  $k$  we have the inequality*

$$M(n) < \mathcal{D}(k)(1 - o(1))\frac{n}{4}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}(k) > 1$ .

## 2. Preliminary result

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^n$  and  $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^n$  be any sequence of real numbers, and let  $r$  and  $h$  be any real numbers satisfying  $\sum_{j=1}^n r_j = r$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^n h_j = h$ , and*

$$(r^2 + h^2)^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^n (r_j^2 + h_j^2)^{1/2},$$

then

$$\sum_{j=2}^n r_j h_j = \sum_{j=2}^n h_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^j r_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} r_i \right) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} r_j \sum_{k=1}^{n-j} h_{j+k}.$$

*Proof.* Consider a right angled triangle, say  $\triangle ABC$  in a plane, with height  $h$  and base  $r$ . Next, let us partition the height of the triangle into  $n$  parts, not necessarily equal. Now, we link those partitions along the height to the hypotenuse, with the aid of a parallel line. At the point of contact of each line to the hypotenuse, we drop down a vertical line to the next line connecting the last point of the previous partition, thereby forming another right-angled triangle, say  $\triangle A_1 B_1 C_1$  with base and height  $r_1$  and  $h_1$  respectively. We remark that this triangle is covered by the triangle  $\triangle ABC$ , with hypotenuse constituting a proportion of the hypotenuse of triangle  $\triangle ABC$ . We continue this process until we obtain  $n$  right-angled triangles  $\triangle A_j B_j C_j$ , each with base and height  $r_j$  and  $h_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . This construction satisfies

$$h = \sum_{j=1}^n h_j \text{ and } r = \sum_{j=1}^n r_j$$

and

$$(r^2 + h^2)^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^n (r_j^2 + h_j^2)^{1/2}.$$

Now, let us deform the original triangle  $\triangle ABC$  by removing the smaller triangles  $\triangle A_j B_j C_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Essentially we are left with rectangles and squares piled on each other with each end poking out a bit further than the one just above,

and we observe that the total area of this portrait is given by the relation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1 &= r_1 h_2 + (r_1 + r_2) h_3 + \cdots + (r_1 + r_2 + \cdots + r_{n-2}) h_{n-1} + (r_1 + r_2 + \cdots + r_{n-1}) h_n \\ &= r_1 (h_2 + h_3 + \cdots + h_n) + r_2 (h_3 + h_4 + \cdots + h_n) + \cdots + r_{n-2} (h_{n-1} + h_n) + r_{n-1} h_n \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} r_j \sum_{k=1}^{n-j} h_{j+k}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we observe that the area of this portrait is the same as the difference of the area of triangle  $\Delta ABC$  and the sum of the areas of triangles  $\Delta A_j B_j C_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . That is

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \frac{1}{2} r h - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n r_j h_j.$$

This completes the first part of the argument. For the second part, along the hypotenuse, let us construct small pieces of triangle, each of base and height  $(r_i, h_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) so that the trapezoid and the one triangle formed by partitioning becomes rectangles and squares. We observe also that this construction satisfies the relation

$$(r^2 + h^2)^{1/2} = \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i^2 + h_i^2)^{1/2},$$

Now, we compute the area of the triangle in two different ways. By direct strategy, we have that the area of the triangle, denoted  $\mathcal{A}$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = 1/2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \right).$$

On the other hand, we compute the area of the triangle by computing the area of each trapezium and the one remaining triangle and sum them together. That is,

$$\mathcal{A} = h_n/2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n r_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i \right) + h_{n-1}/2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} r_i \right) + \cdots + 1/2 r_1 h_1.$$

By comparing the area of the second argument, and linking this to the first argument, the result follows immediately.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.2.** Let  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , then we have the decomposition

$$\sum_{n \leq x-1} \sum_{j \leq x-n} f(n) f(n+j) = \sum_{2 \leq n \leq x} f(n) \sum_{m \leq n-1} f(m).$$

*Proof.* Let us take  $f(j) = r_j = h_j$  in Theorem 2.1, then we denote by  $\mathcal{G}$  the partial sums

$$\mathcal{G} = \sum_{j=1}^n f(j)$$

and we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{(h_j^2 + r_j^2)} &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{(f(j)^2 + f(j)^2)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sqrt{2} f(j) \\ &= \sqrt{2} \sum_{j=1}^n f(j). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sqrt{(\mathcal{G}^2 + \mathcal{G}^2)} = \mathcal{G}\sqrt{2} = \sqrt{2} \sum_{j=1}^n f(j)$  our choice of sequence is valid and, therefore the decomposition is valid for any arithmetic function.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** (*Area method*) *Let  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . If*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n + l_0) > 0$$

*then there exist some constant  $1 > \mathcal{C}(l_0) > 0$  such that*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n + l_0) < \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}(l_0)x} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq x} f(n) \sum_{m \leq n-1} f(m).$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 2.2, we obtain the identity by taking  $f(j) = r_j = h_j$

$$\sum_{n \leq x-1} \sum_{j \leq x-n} f(n)f(n+j) = \sum_{2 \leq n \leq x} f(n) \sum_{m \leq n-1} f(m).$$

Next we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x-1} \sum_{j \leq x-n} f(n)f(n+j) &\gg \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{j \leq x} f(n)f(n+j) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+1) + \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+2) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) + \cdots + \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+x) \\ &\geq |\mathcal{M}(l_0)| \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) \\ &\quad + |\mathcal{N}(l_0)| \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) + \cdots + |\mathcal{R}(l_0)| \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) \\ &= \left( |\mathcal{M}(l_0)| + |\mathcal{N}(l_0)| + \cdots + 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \cdots + |\mathcal{R}(l_0)| \right) \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+l_0) \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}(l_0)x \sum_{n < x} f(n)f(n+l_0). \end{aligned}$$

where  $\min\{|\mathcal{M}(l_0)|, |\mathcal{N}(l_0)|, \dots, |\mathcal{R}(l_0)|\} = \mathcal{C}(l_0)$ . By inverting this inequality, the result follows immediately.  $\square$

### 3. Main result

We begin this section by introducing an arithmetic function on particular sets of integers.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $A = \{a_i\}$  and  $B = \{b_j\}$  be any two complementary subsets, a splitting of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|A| = |B| = \frac{n}{2}$ . Then we consider the following arithmetic function

$$\vee(c_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c \in A \cup B \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $A = \{a_i\}$  and  $B = \{b_j\}$  be any two complementary subsets, a splitting of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|A| = |B| = \frac{n}{2}$ , then we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) = \frac{n}{2}$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \vee(b_j) = \frac{n}{2}.$$

*Proof.* This is an easy consequence of the size of  $|A \cup B| = n$  and the size of each complementary subset.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $A = \{a_i\}$  and  $B = \{b_j\}$  be any two complementary subsets, a splitting of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|A| = |B| = \frac{n}{2}$ . Let  $M_k$  denotes the number of solutions to the equation  $a_i - b_j = k$ , where  $-n \leq k \leq n$ . Let us denote by  $M(n) := \min_{A,B} \max_k M_k$ , then for a fixed  $k$  we have the inequality

$$M(n) < \mathcal{D}(k)(1 - o(1))\frac{n}{4}$$

where  $\mathcal{D}(k) > 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $k$  be fixed with  $-n \leq k \leq n$ , then the underlying problem is to estimate the correlation

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \vee(a_i + k).$$

Applying the area method, there exist some constant  $1 > \mathcal{R}(k) > 0$  such that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \vee(a_i + k) < \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(k)2n} \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \sum_{s \leq i-1} \vee(a_s).$$

Applying partial summations on the right-hand side of the inequality, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \sum_{s \leq i-1} \vee(a_s) &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (i-1) \vee(a_i) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} i \vee(a_i) - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \\
&= n \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) - \int_{i=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \vee(a_i) dk - \frac{n}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \vee(a_i) \vee(a_i + k) < \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}(k)2n} \left( \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \right)$$

and the claim upper bound follows, where  $0 < \mathcal{R}(k) < 1$ . □

1.

#### REFERENCES

1. Finch, Steven, *Erdős' minimum overlap problem*, Citeseer, 2004.
2. Guy, Richard, *Unsolved problems in number theory*, Springer Science & Business Media, vol.1, Taylor & Francis, 2004.
3. Haugland, Jan Kristian, *The minimum overlap problem revisited*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08000, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES  
*E-mail address:* theophilus@aims.edu.gh/ emperordagama@yahoo.com