

## CAUCHY-DAVENPORT TYPE INEQUALITIES, I

SALVATORE TRINGALI

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathbb{G} = (G, +)$  be a group (either abelian or not). Given  $X, Y \subseteq G$ , we denote by  $\langle Y \rangle$  the subsemigroup of  $\mathbb{G}$  generated by  $Y$ , and we set

$$\gamma(Y) := \sup_{y_0 \in Y} \inf_{y_0 \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y - y_0)$$

if  $|Y| \geq 2$  and  $\gamma(Y) := |Y|$  otherwise. We prove that if  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative,  $Y$  is non-empty, and  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + y$  for some  $y \in Y$ , then

$$|X + Y| \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y), |Y| - 1).$$

Actually, this is obtained from a more general result, which improves on previous work of the author on sumsets in cancellative semigroups, and yields a comprehensive generalization, and in some cases a considerable strengthening, of various additive theorems, notably including the Chowla-Pillai theorem (on sumsets in finite cyclic groups) and the specialization to abelian groups of the Hamidoune-Shatrowsky theorem.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{A} = (A, +)$  be, unless otherwise specified, an additively written semigroup, viz. an ordered pair consisting of a set and a binary associative operation on it; note that, in this paper, “additive” does not imply “commutative”. We address the reader to [6, § 1.1] for basic aspects of semigroup theory.

If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \subseteq A$ , we let  $X_1 + \dots + X_n$  denote, as usual, the sumset, relative to  $\mathbb{A}$ , of the  $n$ -tuple  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , namely

$$X_1 + \dots + X_n := \{x_1 + \dots + x_n : x_1 \in X_1, \dots, x_n \in X_n\};$$

we replace  $X_i$  with  $x_i$  in this notation if  $X_i = \{x_i\}$  for some  $i$ , provided it does not cause confusion, and we use  $nX_1$  for  $X_1 + \dots + X_n$  if  $X_1 = \dots = X_n$ .

We write  $\mathbb{A}^\times$  for the set of units (or invertible elements) of  $\mathbb{A}$ , and for  $X \subseteq A$  we set  $X^\times := X \cap \mathbb{A}^\times$  when there is no danger of ambiguity.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05E15, 11B13, 20D60; Secondary 20E99.

*Key words and phrases.* Additive theory, Cauchy-Davenport type inequalities, Chowla-Pillai theorem, Hamidoune-Shatrowski theorem, sumsets.

In particular,  $A^\times = A$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a group or  $A$  is empty, and  $A^\times \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid, i.e. there exists a (provably unique) element  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in A$ , labeled as the identity of  $\mathbb{A}$ , such that  $x + 0_{\mathbb{A}} = 0_{\mathbb{A}} + x = x$  for all  $x \in A$ .

For  $X, Y \subseteq A$  we let  $X - Y := \{z \in A : X \cap (z + Y) \neq \emptyset\}$  and  $-Y + X := \{z \in A : X \cap (Y + z) \neq \emptyset\}$ , which extends the notion of difference set from groups to semigroups, at the cost that  $X - Y$  or  $-Y + X$  may be empty even if  $X$  and  $Y$  are not. We use, respectively,  $X - y$  and  $-y + X$  in place of  $X - Y$  and  $-Y + X$  if  $Y = \{y\}$  and no confusion can arise; note that  $X - y = \{x + (-y) : x \in X\}$  if  $y \in A^\times$ , and similarly for  $-y + X$ .

Given  $X \subseteq A$ , we denote by  $\langle X \rangle$  the smallest subsemigroup of  $\mathbb{A}$  containing  $X$ , and we set  $\langle\langle X \rangle\rangle := \langle X \cup \{-x : x \in X^\times\} \rangle$  and  $\text{ord}(X) := |\langle X \rangle|$ . If  $X = \{x\}$  and there is no risk of misunderstanding, we just write  $\text{ord}(x)$  in place of  $\text{ord}(X)$ , and we use  $\langle x \rangle$  in an analogous way.

Lastly, we say that an element  $z \in A$  is cancellable (in  $\mathbb{A}$ ) if both the functions  $A \rightarrow A : x \mapsto x + z$  and  $A \rightarrow A : x \mapsto z + x$  are injective, and we refer to  $\mathbb{A}$  as a cancellative semigroup if every  $z \in A$  is cancellable.

## 2. THE CAUCHY-DAVENPORT CONSTANT OF AN $n$ -TUPLE

With the above in mind, we now introduce a quantity that happens to capture, as discussed below, interesting features of the ‘‘combinatorial structure’’ of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

To start with, we set, for every  $X \subseteq A$ ,  $\gamma(X) := |X|$  if  $|X| \leq 1$ , otherwise

$$\gamma(X) := \sup_{x_0 \in X^\times} \inf_{x_0 \neq x \in X} \text{ord}(x - x_0), \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{sup}(\emptyset) := 0$  and  $\text{inf}(\emptyset) := \infty$ ; note that (1) can be slightly simplified if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a group, by replacing  $X^\times$  with  $X$ .

Throughout, we will see how to use  $\gamma(X)$  to obtain, for  $X, Y \subseteq A$ , non-trivial lower bounds on  $|X + Y|$ . But first, for all  $X_1, \dots, X_n \subseteq A$  let

$$\gamma(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X_i = \emptyset \text{ for some } i; \\ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \gamma(X_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases};$$

we refer to  $\gamma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  as the *Cauchy-Davenport constant*, relative to  $\mathbb{A}$ , of the  $n$ -tuple  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . Occasionally, we may add a subscript ‘ $\mathbb{A}$ ’ to the right of the letter  $\gamma$  in the above definitions if we need, for any reason, to be explicit about the semigroup on which they do actually depend.

The Cauchy-Davenport constant of a tuple was first introduced in [10], though in a different notation and in a somewhat different form, and further investigated in [11], as part of a broader program aimed at the extension of aspects of the theory on Cauchy-Davenport type inequalities from groups to more abstract settings, where certain properties (of groups) are no longer necessarily true.

In particular, the author proposed in [11] to prove (or disprove) the following:

**Conjecture 1.** *If  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup and  $X_1, \dots, X_n \subseteq A$ , then*

$$|X_1 + \dots + X_n| \geq \min(\gamma(X_1, \dots, X_n), |X_1| + \dots + |X_n| + 1 - n).$$

This is plainly true if  $n = 1$  or  $X_1^\times = \dots = X_n^\times = \emptyset$ , is straightforward when  $|X_i| \geq \gamma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , and especially  $|X_i| = \infty$ , for some  $i = 1, \dots, n$  (see Lemma 7(ii) below), and has been so far confirmed in a couple more of cases:

- (i) if  $n = 2$  and each of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  generates a commutative subsemigroup of  $\mathbb{A}$ , see [10, Theorem 8 and Corollary 10];
- (ii) if  $\gamma(X_1) = \dots = \gamma(X_n)$  and  $\mathbb{A}$  is commutative (in addition to being cancellative), see the note added in proof at the end of [11, § 6].

The conjecture was first motivated by point (i) above and the following theorem, see [11, Theorem 7]: if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup and  $X, Y \subseteq A$ , then

$$|X + Y| \geq \min(\gamma(X + Y), |X| + |Y| - 1). \quad (2)$$

In fact, (2) is weaker than the bound provided by Conjecture 1 in the case of two summands, as  $\gamma(X, Y) \geq \gamma(X + Y)$  in general, and actually  $\gamma(X, Y) \gg \gamma(X + Y)$  in many common situations, see [11, Lemma 3 and Example 4]. (The symbol ‘ $\gg$ ’ means that, for a suitable choice of the semigroup  $\mathbb{A}$  and the sets  $X$  and  $Y$ , the left-hand side can be made larger than the right-hand side by an arbitrary factor.)

With all this said, here comes the main contribution of the present work, which is, in the first place, a strengthening of the Cauchy-Davenport theorem [1, 3, 4].

**Theorem 2.** *Assume  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup, and let  $X, Y \subseteq A$  such that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $Y \neq \emptyset$ . Then at least one of the following holds:*

- (i)  $|X + Y| \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y), |Y| - 1)$ ;
- (ii)  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y}$  for some  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ .

Loosely speaking, the theorem says that, for all  $X, Y \subseteq A$ , and in the presence of cancellativity,  $|X + Y|$  cannot be “too small”, unless  $X + Y$  has “structure”, which is made more precise by the next statement, whose proof we defer to the end of § 3.

**Proposition 3.** *Assume  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup, and let  $X, Y \subseteq A$  be finite sets such that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $Y^\times \neq \emptyset$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y}$  for some  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ ;
- (ii)  $X + 2Y = X + Y + y$  for all  $y \in Y$ ;
- (iii)  $X + \langle\langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle\rangle = X + \langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle = X + Y - \bar{y}$  for every  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ .

We use Theorem 2 and Proposition 3 to prove a couple of corollaries: the first has essentially the same content of [10, Theorem 8], and deriving it from Theorem 2 shows, in the end, that the results of this paper subsume and strengthen

all those obtained in [10]; the second is reminiscent of an addition theorem of Y. O. Hamidoune [5, p. 249] we refer to as the Hamidoune-Shatrowsky theorem, as it is a generalization of an earlier (and weaker) result of L. Shatrowsky [9].

**Corollary 4.** *Assume  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup, and let  $X, Y \subseteq A$  such that  $X \neq \emptyset$  and  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative. Then  $|X + Y| \geq \min(\gamma(Y), |X| + |Y| - 1)$ .*

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a cancellative monoid with identity  $0_{\mathbb{A}}$ , and let  $X, Y \subseteq A$  such that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $X \cup (X + Y) \neq X + \langle\langle Y \rangle\rangle$ . Then*

$$|X \cup (X + Y)| \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y \cup \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\}), |Y| - \mathbf{1}_Y(0_{\mathbb{A}})), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_Y(0_{\mathbb{A}}) := 1$  if  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y$ , otherwise  $\mathbf{1}_Y(0_{\mathbb{A}}) := 0$ .

As long as  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative, Corollary 5 is indeed stronger, and can be *much* stronger, than the Hamidoune-Shatrowsky theorem, according to which we would rather have that if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a group,  $Y \neq \emptyset$ , and  $X \cup (X + Y) \neq X + \langle\langle Y \rangle\rangle$ , then

$$|X \cup (X + Y)| \geq |X| + \min(v(Y), |Y|), \quad (4)$$

where  $v(Y)$  is the minimal order of the elements of  $Y$ . In fact, there are two cases:

- (i)  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y$ . Then  $X \subseteq X + Y$  and  $v(Y) = 1$ , hence (4) simplifies to  $|X + Y| \geq |X| + 1$ . If  $|Y| \geq 2$ , this is (strictly) weaker than (3), and actually *much* weaker than (3) for (comparatively) large values of both  $\gamma(Y \cup \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\})$  and  $|Y|$  (which can be easily attained). Otherwise,  $Y = \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\}$  and  $X + \langle\langle Y \rangle\rangle = X + Y = X$ , which, however, would be a contradiction.
- (ii)  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \notin Y$ . Then  $|Y| - \mathbf{1}_Y(0_{\mathbb{A}}) = |Y|$ , and of course  $\gamma(Y \cup \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\}) \geq v(Y)$ .

On the other hand, the Hamidoune-Shatrowsky theorem holds, provided  $\mathbb{A}$  is a group, without the additional assumption on  $\langle Y \rangle$  made in Corollary 5, which leads us to believe that a more general version of Theorem 2 should be true.

Incidentally, let us mention here that, while the original proof of the Hamidoune-Shatrowsky theorem relies on Hamidoune's theory of atoms, our proof of Theorem 2, and hence of Corollary 5, is essentially based on a non-commutative variant of the Davenport transform first considered, to our knowledge, in [10, § 4].

Our last result is a special case of Theorem 2 and a strengthening of [10, Corollary 15], which is in turn a generalization of the Chowla-Pillai theorem (on sumsets in finite cyclic groups), see [2, Theorem 1] and [8, Theorems 1–3].

**Corollary 6.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$ . Denote by  $(\mathbf{Z}_n, +)$  the additive group of the integers modulo  $n$  and by  $\pi$  the canonical projection  $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_n$ . Let  $X, Y \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_n$  be non-empty sets such that  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + \bar{y}$  for some  $\bar{y} \in Y$ . Then*

$$|X + Y| \geq |X| + \min(\delta_Y^{-1}n, |X| + |Y| - 1),$$

where  $\delta_Y := 1$  if  $|Y| = 1$ , otherwise

$$\delta_Y := \min_{y_0 \in \pi^{-1}(Y)} \max_{y \in \pi^{-1}(Y), \pi(y) \neq \pi(y_0)} \gcd(n, y - y_0).$$

We will prove Theorem 2 and its corollaries in § 4, but first we need to gather together a few facts that play a role in the proofs: this is done in the next section.

### 3. PREPARATIONS

We start with basic properties of semigroups that are readily adapted from the case of groups and used repeatedly in the sequel (with or without a comment).

**Lemma 7.** *The following hold:*

- (i) *If  $z \in A$  is cancellable and  $X \subseteq A$ , then  $|z + X| = |X + z| = |X|$ .*
- (ii) *If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \subseteq A$  and  $X_i$  contains at least one cancellable element for each  $i$ , then  $|X_1 + \dots + X_n| \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_i|$ .*
- (iii) *Let  $z \in A$ , and assume  $z$  is cancellable and  $n := \text{ord}(z) < \infty$ . Then  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid and  $nz$  is the identity of  $\mathbb{A}$ .*
- (iv) *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a monoid and  $X \subseteq A$ , and let  $z \in \mathcal{C}(X) \cap A^\times$ , where*

$$\mathcal{C}(X) := \{z \in A : x + z = z + x \text{ for all } x \in X\}$$

*is the center of  $X$  (in  $\mathbb{A}$ ). Then  $-z \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , and  $\langle X - z \rangle$  and  $\langle -z + X \rangle$  are both commutative subsemigroups if  $\langle X \rangle$  is.*

*Proof.* (i)–(ii) Units are cancellable elements, and for a cancellable  $z \in A$  both the functions  $A \rightarrow A : x \mapsto x + z$  and  $A \rightarrow A : x \mapsto z + x$  are injective.

(iii) By hypothesis,  $(n + 1)z = kz$  for some  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . We claim that  $k = 1$ . Indeed, if  $k \geq 2$  then  $z$  being cancellable (in  $\mathbb{A}$ ) implies  $(n + 2 - k)z = z$ , which is impossible, since  $2 \leq n + 2 - k \leq n$  and  $z, \dots, nz$  are pairwise distinct.

So, for all  $x \in A$  we have  $x + z = (x + nz) + z$  and  $z + (nz + x) = z + x$ , which, by using again that  $z$  is cancellable, yields  $x + nz = nz + x = x$ , and ultimately means that  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid with identity  $nz$ .

(iv) Let  $z \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  and  $x \in X$ , and for ease of notation denote by  $\tilde{z}$  the inverse of  $z$ . By the cancellativity of  $\mathbb{A}$ , it is immediate that  $x + \tilde{z} = \tilde{z} + x$  if and only if  $x = (x + \tilde{z}) + z = \tilde{z} + x + z$ , which is true, as  $\tilde{z} + x + z = \tilde{z} + z + x = x$  by the assumptions on  $x$  and  $z$ . It follows that  $\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ .

With this in hand, suppose  $\langle X \rangle$  is a commutative subsemigroup of  $\mathbb{A}$  and pick  $v, w \in \langle X - z \rangle$ . Then, there exist  $k, \ell \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell \in X$  such that  $v = \sum_{i=1}^k (x_i + \tilde{z})$  and  $w = \sum_{i=1}^\ell (y_i + \tilde{z})$ , with the result that  $v + w = w + v$  by induction on  $k + \ell$  and the observation that, for all  $u_1, u_2 \in X$ , it holds

$$(u_1 + \tilde{z}) + (u_2 + \tilde{z}) = u_1 + u_2 + 2\tilde{z} = u_2 + u_1 + 2\tilde{z} = (u_2 + \tilde{z}) + (u_1 + \tilde{z}),$$

where we have used, in particular, that  $\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , as proved in the above. Hence  $\langle X - z \rangle$  also is commutative, and the case of  $\langle -z + X \rangle$  is analogous.  $\blacksquare$

We omit the proof of the next elementary lemma, but the interested reader can refer to [11, Lemma 12 and Remark 13] for details.

**Lemma 8.** *If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \subseteq A$ , then  $X_1^\times + \dots + X_n^\times \subseteq (X_1 + \dots + X_n)^\times$ , and the inclusion is actually an equality provided that  $\mathbb{A}$  is cancellative.*

*Moreover, if  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid and  $x_1 \in X_1^\times, \dots, x_n \in X_n^\times$ , then  $x := x_1 + \dots + x_n$  is too an invertible element and  $-x = (-x_n) + \dots + (-x_1)$ .*

The following result reveals a certain invariance of the Cauchy-Davenport constant; we address the reader to [11, Proposition 14] for a proof.

**Lemma 9.** *Assume  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid, and let  $X \subseteq A$  and  $z \in A^\times$ . Then*

$$\gamma(X) = \gamma(X - z) = \gamma(-z + X).$$

Given  $X, Y \subseteq A$ , we say that a pair  $(X_0, Y_0)$  of subsets of  $A$  is an invariant transform, relative to  $\mathbb{A}$ , of  $(X, Y)$  if:

- (s1)  $|X + Y| = |X_0 + Y_0|$ ;
- (s2)  $|X| = |X_0|$  and  $|Y| = |Y_0|$ ;
- (s3)  $\gamma(X) = \gamma(X_0)$  and  $\gamma(Y) = \gamma(Y_0)$ .

This notion is motivated by the next lemma, cf. [11, Corollary 15].

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a cancellative monoid with identity  $0_{\mathbb{A}}$ , and pick  $X, Y \subseteq A$ . Assume that  $Y^\times \neq \emptyset$  and  $|Y| \geq 2$ , and let  $\kappa$  be an integer  $\leq \gamma(Y)$ . Then, there exists an invariant transform  $(X_0, Y_0)$  of  $(X, Y)$  such that:*

- (i)  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y_0$  and  $\gamma(Y_0) \geq \text{ord}(y) \geq \kappa$  for every  $y \in Y_0 \setminus \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\}$ ;
- (ii) if  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative, then so is  $\langle Y_0 \rangle$ ;
- (iii) if  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + \bar{y}$  for every  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ , then  $X_0 + 2Y_0 \neq X_0 + Y_0 + \bar{y}_0$  for all  $\bar{y}_0 \in Y_0^\times$ .

*Proof.* Fix an integer  $\kappa \leq \gamma(Y)$ , and using that  $Y^\times \neq \emptyset$  and  $|Y| \geq 2$ , let  $y_0 \in Y^\times$  such that  $\gamma(Y) \geq \inf_{y_0 \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y - y_0) \geq \kappa$ . Then, set

$$X_0 := X + y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad Y_0 := -y_0 + Y.$$

Clearly,  $0_{\mathbb{A}}$  is in  $Y_0$ , and a straightforward computation gives that

$$X + Y = (X + y_0) + (-y_0 + Y) = X_0 + Y_0. \tag{5}$$

In addition, since  $y_0 \in A^\times$  and units are cancellable, we have from Lemma 9 that  $\gamma(X) = \gamma(X_0)$  and  $\gamma(Y) = \gamma(Y_0)$ , and from Lemma 7(i) that  $|X| = |X_0|$  and

$|Y| = |Y_0|$ . Lastly, using that  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y_0$  and, on the other hand,  $v \in Y_0$  if and only if  $v = y - y_0$  for some  $y \in Y$ , we find

$$\gamma(Y_0) \geq \inf_{0_{\mathbb{A}} \neq v \in Y_0} \text{ord}(v) = \inf_{y_0 \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y - y_0) \geq \kappa.$$

Putting it all together, this shows that  $(X_0, Y_0)$  is an invariant transform of  $(X, Y)$ . So point (i) is proved, and (ii) follows from Lemma 7(iv).

As for (iii), suppose that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + \bar{y}$  for all  $\bar{y} \in \langle Y \rangle$ , yet  $X_0 + 2Y_0 = X_0 + Y_0 + \bar{v}$  for some  $\bar{v} \in Y_0^\times$ . Accordingly, note that  $Y_0^\times = -y_0 + Y^\times$  by Lemma 8, and let  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$  such that  $\bar{v} = -y_0 + \bar{y}$ . Then, we get from (5) and point (ii) above that

$$X + Y + \bar{y} - y_0 = X_0 + 2Y_0 = X + 2Y - y_0,$$

which yields  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y}$  (again, because  $-y_0$  is a unit, and hence we can cancel it out). This, however, is absurd and leads to the desired conclusion. ■

Last but not least, we will need the following proposition, which is essentially a revised version of [10, Proposition 23].

**Proposition 11.** *Assume  $\mathbb{A}$  is a cancellative semigroup, and let  $X, Y \subseteq A$  be such that  $X + 2Y \not\subseteq X + Y$  and  $\langle Y \rangle$  is a commutative subsemigroup of  $\mathbb{A}$ . Accordingly, fix  $z \in (X + 2Y) \setminus (X + Y) \neq \emptyset$ , and define*

$$\tilde{Y}_z := \{y \in Y : z \in X + Y + y\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_z := Y \setminus \tilde{Y}_z. \quad (6)$$

Then the following hold:

- (i)  $(X + Y_z) \cup (z - \tilde{Y}_z) \subseteq X + Y$ ;
- (ii)  $(X + Y_z) \cap (z - \tilde{Y}_z) = \emptyset$ ;
- (iii)  $|z - \tilde{Y}_z| \geq |\tilde{Y}_z|$ ;
- (iv)  $|X + Y| + |Y_z| \geq |X + Y_z| + |Y|$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $w \in z - \tilde{Y}_z$ . Then, there exists  $y \in \tilde{Y}_z$  such that  $z = w + y$ . But  $y \in \tilde{Y}_z$  if and only if  $z = \tilde{w} + y$  for some  $\tilde{w} \in X + Y$ , so  $w = \tilde{w}$  by cancellativity, and hence  $w \in X + Y$ . This shows that  $z - \tilde{Y}_z \subseteq X + Y$ , and then we are done, as it is clear, on the other hand, that  $X + Y_z \subseteq X + Y$ .

(ii) Suppose for a contradiction that  $W := (X + Y_z) \cap (z - \tilde{Y}_z)$  is non-empty, and let  $w \in W$ . Then  $w = x + y_1$  and  $z = w + y_2$  for some  $x \in X$ ,  $y_1 \in Y_z$ , and  $y_2 \in \tilde{Y}_z$ . Since  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative, it follows that

$$z = x + y_1 + y_2 = x + y_2 + y_1,$$

which implies by (6) that  $y_1 \in \tilde{Y}_z$ , because  $Y_z, \tilde{Y}_z \subseteq Y$ . This is, however, absurd, as  $Y_z$  and  $\tilde{Y}_z$  are obviously disjoint.

(iii) We have from (6) that for each  $y \in \tilde{Y}_z$  there exists  $w \in X + Y$  such that  $z = w + y$ , and hence  $w \in z - \tilde{Y}_z$ . On the other hand,  $\mathbb{A}$  being cancellative yields that  $w + y_1 \neq w + y_2$  for all  $w \in A$  and distinct  $y_1, y_2 \in \tilde{Y}_z$ . Thus, we see that there is an injection  $\tilde{Y}_z \rightarrow z - \tilde{Y}_z$ , with the result that  $|z - \tilde{Y}_z| \geq |\tilde{Y}_z|$ .

(iv) Note first that  $X$  and  $Y$  are non-empty, because otherwise we would have  $(X + 2Y) \setminus (X + Y) = \emptyset$ , in contrast to our assumptions.

Using that  $\mathbb{A}$  is cancellative, it follows from Lemma 7(ii) that  $|X + Y| \geq |Y|$ . This implies the claim if  $|Y| = \infty$ , so suppose from now on that  $Y$  is a finite set.

Then, the inclusion-exclusion principle and the above points (i)-(iii) give

$$|X + Y| \geq |X + Y_z| + |z - \tilde{Y}_z| \geq |X + Y_z| + |\tilde{Y}_z|.$$

But  $\tilde{Y}_z = Y \setminus Y_z$  and  $Y_z \subseteq Y$ , so in the end  $|X + Y| \geq |X + Y_z| + |Y| - |Y_z|$ , and the proof is thus complete.  $\blacksquare$

We conclude this section with the following:

*Proof of Proposition 3.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Assume that  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y}$  for some  $\bar{y} \in Y$ , and let  $y \in Y$ . Then  $X + Y + y \subseteq X + Y + \bar{y}$ , and on the other hand, we have from Lemma 7(i) that  $|X + Y + y| = |X + Y + \bar{y}|$ . But since  $X$  and  $Y$  are finite, this is possible only if  $X + Y + y = X + Y + \bar{y}$ , and we are done.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Pick  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ . By hypothesis, we have  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y}$ , and using that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative, this is equivalent to  $X + 2(Y - \bar{y}) = X + Y - \bar{y}$ .

It follows (by induction) that  $X + n(Y - \bar{y}) = X + Y - \bar{y}$  for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$ , and since  $\langle W \rangle = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} nW$  for every  $W \subseteq A$ , we obtain

$$X + \langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle = X + Y - \bar{y}. \quad (7)$$

Now, the conclusion is trivial if  $X$  is empty. Otherwise, we get by points (i) and (ii) of Lemma 7, equation (7), and the assumption that  $X$  and  $Y$  are finite that

$$\text{ord}(Y - \bar{y}) \leq |X + \langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle| = |X + Y - \bar{y}| = |X + Y| \leq |X| \cdot |Y| < \infty,$$

Thus,  $\text{ord}(y - \bar{y}) < \infty$  for all  $y \in Y$ , which, together with Lemma 7(iii), implies  $\langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle = \langle\langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle\rangle$ . This leads to the desired conclusion.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Let  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ . By hypothesis, we have  $X + \langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle = X + Y - \bar{y}$ . Together with the commutativity of  $Y$ , this implies

$$X + Y - \bar{y} \supseteq X + 2(Y - \bar{y}) = X + 2Y - 2\bar{y},$$

and hence  $X + 2Y \subseteq X + Y + \bar{y}$ , which is enough to conclude the proof (since, of course,  $X + Y + \bar{y} \subseteq X + 2Y$ ).  $\blacksquare$



## 4. PROOFS

We start with Theorem 2, whose proof is actually a “transformation proof”, extending to a non-commutative setting ideas first used by H. Davenport in [3].

In fact, the reasoning follows the same broad scheme of the proof of [10, Theorem 8], but differs from the latter in significant details.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Set  $\kappa := |X + Y|$  for brevity’s sake, and suppose that  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + \bar{y}$  for all  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ . We have to prove that

$$\kappa \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y), |Y| - 1). \quad (8)$$

This is obvious if  $Y^\times = \emptyset$  or  $|Y| = 1$ , since in that case the right-hand side of (8) equals  $|X|$ , and  $\kappa \geq |X|$  by Lemma 7(ii). So we assume for the sequel that  $Y^\times$  is non-empty and  $|Y| \geq 2$ .

Then, also  $X$  is non-empty, otherwise  $X + 2Y = X + Y + \bar{y} = \emptyset$  for every unit  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ , in contrast to our hypotheses (as  $Y^\times \neq \emptyset$ ). Hence, we are done if  $X$  or  $Y$  is infinite, since  $\kappa \geq \max(|X|, |Y|)$ , again by Lemma 7(ii).

Putting it all together, we are thus reduced to the case where

$$1 \leq |X| < \infty, \quad 2 \leq |Y| < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad Y^\times \neq \emptyset, \quad (9)$$

which means, among other things, that  $\mathbb{A}$  is (necessarily) a monoid; as usual, we will denote the identity of  $\mathbb{A}$  by  $0_{\mathbb{A}}$ .

Building on these premises, we now suppose, towards a contradiction, that

$$\kappa < |X| + \min(\gamma(Y), |Y| - 1). \quad (10)$$

More precisely, we assume that  $(X, Y)$  is a minimal counterexample to (8), in the sense that if  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$  is another pair of non-empty subsets of  $A$  such that  $\langle \bar{Y} \rangle$  is commutative,  $|\bar{Y}| \geq 2$  and  $\bar{X} + 2\bar{Y} \neq \bar{X} + \bar{Y} + \bar{y}$  for every  $\bar{y} \in \bar{Y}^\times$ , and

$$|\bar{X} + \bar{Y}| < |\bar{X}| + \min(\gamma(\bar{Y}), |\bar{Y}| - 1),$$

then  $|Y| \leq |\bar{Y}|$ ; of course, this is always possible and involves no loss of generality. Lastly, we may further assume, as we do, that

$$0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(Y) \geq \inf_{0_{\mathbb{A}} \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y) \geq \kappa - |X| + 1, \quad (11)$$

for we get by (9), (10), and Lemma 10 that this, again, does not affect the generality of the reasoning. Accordingly, we have that

$$X + 2Y \not\subseteq X + Y.$$

In fact,  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y$  yields that  $X + Y \subseteq X + 2Y$ ; therefore,  $X + 2Y \subseteq X + Y$  would imply  $X + 2Y = X + Y + 0_{\mathbb{A}}$ , which is, however, impossible, as we are supposing  $X + 2Y \neq X + Y + \bar{y}$  for every  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ .

So, let  $z$  be some element in the non-empty set  $(X + 2Y) \setminus (X + Y)$ , and define

$$\tilde{Y}_z := \{y \in Y : z \in X + Y + y\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_z := Y \setminus \tilde{Y}_z.$$

Clearly,  $\tilde{Y}_z \neq \emptyset$  and  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \notin \tilde{Y}_z$ , so we have by (11) that  $0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y_z$  and  $1 \leq |Y_z| < |Y|$ . Then, exploiting that  $\langle Y \rangle$  is commutative and  $|Y| < \infty$ , we obtain by Proposition 11(iv) and equation (10) that

$$|X + Y_z| \leq |X + Y| + |Y_z| - |Y| < |X| + |Y_z| - 1. \quad (12)$$

It follows that  $|Y_z| \geq 2$ , as otherwise we would have from Lemma 7(i) and (12) that  $|X| = |X + Y_z| < |X|$ , which is absurd. To summarize, we have found that

$$0_{\mathbb{A}} \in Y_z \subsetneq Y, \quad 2 \leq |Y_z| < |Y|, \quad \text{and} \quad |X + Y_z| < |X| + |Y_z| - 1, \quad (13)$$

which, along with (10) and (11), gives

$$|X + Y_z| \leq \kappa < |X| + \inf_{0_{\mathbb{A}} \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y) \leq |X| + \inf_{0_{\mathbb{A}} \neq y \in Y_z} \text{ord}(y) \leq |X| + \gamma(Y_z), \quad (14)$$

where we have used, in particular, that  $|Y_z| \geq 2$  and  $Y_z^\times \neq \emptyset$  by (13), and that  $\inf(C) \leq \inf(B)$  provided  $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq C \subseteq \mathbf{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ .

This is, however, absurd, as (13) and (14) together contradict the minimality of the pair  $(X, Y)$ , and it concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Now we can proceed to prove the corollaries of Theorem 2.

*Proof of Corollary 4.* The claim is trivial if  $|X + Y| \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y), |Y| - 1)$ , or  $|Y| \leq 1$ , or  $Y^\times$  is empty. Otherwise, we have from Theorem 2 and Proposition 3(iii) that  $X + Y - \bar{y} = X + \langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle$  for some  $\bar{y} \in Y^\times$ . Consequently, points (i) and (ii) of Lemma 7, along with Lemma 8, give that

$$|X + Y| = |X + Y - \bar{y}| \geq |\langle Y - \bar{y} \rangle| \geq \text{ord}((y - \bar{y}) - (y_0 - \bar{y})) = \text{ord}(y - y_0)$$

for all  $y \in Y$  and  $y_0 \in Y^\times$ , and this yields  $|X + Y| \geq \gamma(Y)$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Corollary 5.* Of course,  $X$  is non-empty, otherwise  $X \cup (X + Y) = X + \langle Y \rangle$ . Consequently, the claim is trivial if  $X$  and  $Y$  is infinite, since in that case  $|X \cup (X + Y)| = \infty$  by Lemma 7(ii), and it is still trivial if  $Y$  is empty, since then either side of equation (4) is equal to  $|X|$ .

So, we assume for the sequel that  $X$  and  $Y$  are both finite and non-empty, in such a way that  $X \cup (X + Y)$  is finite too, and set  $Y_0 := Y \cup \{0_{\mathbb{A}}\}$ .

We claim that  $X + Y_0 = X \cup (X + Y) \neq X + \langle Y_0 \rangle$ . If  $\langle Y \rangle$  is infinite, this is clear from the above; otherwise,  $\langle Y_0 \rangle = \langle Y \rangle$  by Lemma 7(iii), and we have (by hypothesis)  $X \cup (X + Y) \neq X + \langle Y \rangle$ .

Therefore, we get from Theorem 2 and Proposition 3(iii) that

$$|X \cup (X + Y)| = |X + Y_0| \geq |X| + \min(\gamma(Y_0), |Y_0| - 1),$$

which concludes the proof, because  $|Y_0| - 1 = |Y| - \mathbf{1}_Y(0_{\mathbb{A}})$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Corollary 6.* To begin, let  $\tilde{w}$  denote, for every  $w \in \mathbf{Z}_n$ , the smallest non-negative integer in  $w$ . The claim is trivial if  $Y$  is a singleton. Otherwise, since  $\text{ord}(w - w_0) = n / \gcd(n, \tilde{w} - \tilde{w}_0)$  for all  $w, w_0 \in \mathbf{Z}_n$ , we have

$$\gamma(Y) = \max_{y_0 \in Y} \min_{y_0 \neq y \in Y} \text{ord}(y - y_0) = \frac{n}{\min_{y_0 \in Y} \max_{y_0 \neq y \in Y} \gcd(n, \tilde{y} - \tilde{y}_0)}.$$

It follows that  $\gamma(Y) = \delta_Y^{-1}n$ , because  $\gcd(n, \tilde{y}) = \gcd(n, \xi)$  for every  $y \in \mathbf{Z}_n$  and  $\xi \in \mathbf{Z}$  with  $\xi \equiv \tilde{y} \pmod{n}$ . So we are done by Theorem 2 and Proposition 3(ii).  $\blacksquare$

## 5. CLOSING REMARKS

The bound provided by Theorem 2(i) is meaningful only if  $\gamma(X) > 0$ , insofar as  $\mathbb{A}$  being a cancellative semigroup implies, by Lemma 7(ii), that  $|X + Y| \geq |X|$ . This means, in particular, that the theorem is not very useful unless  $\mathbb{A}$  is a monoid, and raises the challenge of further generalizing the result (and its corollaries) so as to replace  $X^\times$  in (1) with a subset of  $A$  that is significant also when  $A^\times = \emptyset$ .

On a similar note, every *commutative* cancellative semigroup can be embedded into a group. It was, however, proved by A. Malcev in [7] that there are finitely generated cancellative semigroups that do *not* embed into a group, which serves as a “precondition” for some aspects of the present work and its prequels [10, 11], as it shows that the study of sumsets in cancellative semigroups cannot be systematically reduced, in the absence of commutativity, to the case of groups (at least, not in an obvious way).

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the Austrian FWF Project M1900-N39, and partly by the French ANR Project ANR-12-BS01-0011. The author is grateful to Paolo Leonetti (Università Bocconi, Italy) for some useful comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. L. Cauchy, *Recherches sur les nombres*, J. École Polytech. **9** (1813), 99–116.
- [2] I. Chowla, *A Theorem on the Addition of Residue Classes: Application to the Number  $\Gamma(k)$  in Waring’s Problem*, Q. J. Math. (O.S.) **8** (1937), No. 1, 99–102.
- [3] H. Davenport, *On the Addition of Residue Classes*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **10** (1935), 30–32.
- [4] ———, *A Historical Note*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **22** (1947), 100–101.
- [5] Y. O. Hamidoune, *A Generalization of an Addition Theorem of Shatrowsky*, European J. Combin. **13** (1992), No. 4, 249–255.
- [6] J. M. Howie, *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*, London Math. Soc. Monogr. Ser. (N.S.) **12**, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2003 (reprinted ed.).
- [7] A. Malcev, *On the Immersion of an Algebraic Ring into a Field*, Math. Ann. **113** (1937), No. 1, 686–691.

- [8] S. S. Pillai, *Generalization of a Theorem of Davenport on the Addition of Residue Classes*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sc. (A) **6** (1937), No. 3, 179–180.
- [9] L. Shatrowsky, *A new generalization of Davenport's-Pillai's theorem on the addition of residue classes*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk **45** (1944), 315–317.
- [10] S. Tringali, *A Cauchy-Davenport theorem for semigroups*, Unif. Distrib. Theory **9** (2014), No. 1, 27–42.
- [11] ———, *Cauchy-Davenport type theorems for semigroups*, Mathematika **62** (2016), No. 1, 1–12.

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ —  
HEINRICHSTR. 36, 8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

*E-mail address:* `salvatore.tringali@uni-graz.at`

*URL:* `http://143.50.47.129/tringali/home.html`