

When Almost All Sets Are Difference Dominated

Steven J Miller
Williams College

Steven.J.Miller@williams.edu
<http://www.williams.edu/go/math/sjmilller/>

Wesleyan University, November 20, 2008

Summary

- History of the problem.
- Examples.
- Main results and proofs.
- Describe open problems.

Introduction

Statement

A finite set of integers, $|A|$ its size. Form

- Sumset: $A + A = \{a_i + a_j : a_i, a_j \in A\}$.
- Difference set: $A - A = \{a_i - a_j : a_i, a_j \in A\}$.

Statement

A finite set of integers, $|A|$ its size. Form

- Sumset: $A + A = \{a_i + a_j : a_i, a_j \in A\}$.
- Difference set: $A - A = \{a_i - a_j : a_i, a_j \in A\}$.

Definition

We say A is **difference dominated** if $|A - A| > |A + A|$, **balanced** if $|A - A| = |A + A|$ and **sum dominated (or an MSTD set)** if $|A + A| > |A - A|$.

Questions

Expect **generic** set to be difference dominated:

- addition is commutative, subtraction isn't:
- Generic pair (x, y) gives 1 sum, 2 differences.

Questions

Expect **generic** set to be difference dominated:

- addition is commutative, subtraction isn't:
- Generic pair (x, y) gives 1 sum, 2 differences.

Questions

- Do there exist sum-dominated sets?
- If yes, how many?

Examples

Examples

- Conway: $\{0, 2, 3, 4, 7, 11, 12, 14\}$.
- Marica (1969): $\{0, 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15\}$.
- Freiman and Pigarev (1973): $\{0, 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29\}$.
- Computer search of random subsets of $\{1, \dots, 100\}$:
 $\{2, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 73, 74, 75, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88, 91, 93, 94, 95, 98, 100\}$.
- Recently infinite families (Hegarty, Nathanson).

Infinite Families

Key observation

If A is an arithmetic progression, $|A + A| = |A - A|$.

Infinite Families

Key observation

If A is an arithmetic progression, $|A + A| = |A - A|$.

Proof:

- WLOG, $A = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ as $A \rightarrow \alpha A + \beta$ doesn't change $|A + A|$, $|A - A|$.

Infinite Families

Key observation

If A is an arithmetic progression, $|A + A| = |A - A|$.

Proof:

- WLOG, $A = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ as $A \rightarrow \alpha A + \beta$ doesn't change $|A + A|, |A - A|$.
- $A + A = \{0, \dots, 2n\}$, $A - A = \{-n, \dots, n\}$, both of size $2n + 1$. □

Previous Constructions

Most constructions perturb an arithmetic progression.

Example:

- MSTD set $A = \{0, 2, 3, 4, 7, 11, 12, 14\}$.
- $A = \{0, 2\} \cup \{3, 7, 11\} \cup (14 - \{0, 2\}) \cup \{4\}$.

Example (Nathanson)

Theorem

$m, d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq 4$, $1 \leq d \leq m - 1$, $d \neq m/2$, $k \geq 3$ if $d < m/2$ else $k \geq 4$. Let

- $B = [0, m - 1] \setminus \{d\}$.
- $L = \{m - d, 2m - d, \dots, km - d\}$.
- $a^* = (k + 1)m - 2d$.
- $A^* = B \cup L \cup (a^* - B)$.
- $A = A^* \cup \{m\}$.

Then A is an MSTD set.

New Construction: Notation

- $[a, b] = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq k \leq b\}$.
- A is a P_n -set if its sumset and its difference set contain all but the first and last n possible elements (and of course it may or may not contain some of these fringe elements).

New Construction

Theorem (Miller-Scheinerman '09)

- $A = L \cup R$ be a P_n , MSTD set where $L \subset [1, n]$, $R \subset [n + 1, 2n]$, and $1, 2n \in A$.
- Fix a $k \geq n$ and let m be arbitrary.
- M any subset of $[n + k + 1, n + k + m]$ st no run of more than k missing elements. Assume $n + k + 1 \notin M$.
- Set $A(M) = L \cup O_1 \cup M \cup O_2 \cup R'$, where $O_1 = [n + 1, n + k]$, $O_2 = [n + k + m + 1, n + 2k + m]$, and $R' = R + 2k + m$.

Then $A(M)$ is an MSTD set, and $\exists C > 0$ st the percentage of subsets of $\{0, \dots, r\}$ that are in this family (and thus are MSTD sets) is at least C/r^4 .

Results

Probability Review

X random variable with density $f(x)$ means

- $f(x) \geq 0$;
- $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) = 1$;
- $\text{Prob}(X \in [a, b]) = \int_a^b f(x) dx$.

Key quantities:

- Expected (Average) Value: $\mathbb{E}[X] = \int xf(x) dx$.
- Variance: $\sigma^2 = \int (x - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 f(x) dx$.

Binomial model

Binomial model, parameter $p(n)$

Each $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ is in A with probability $p(n)$.

Consider uniform model ($p(n) = 1/2$):

- Let $A \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Most elements in $\{0, \dots, 2n\}$ in $A + A$ and in $\{-n, \dots, n\}$ in $A - A$.
- $\mathbb{E}[|A + A|] = 2n - 11$, $\mathbb{E}[|A - A|] = 2n - 7$.

Martin and O'Bryant '06

Theorem

Let A be chosen from $\{0, \dots, N\}$ according to the binomial model with constant parameter p (thus $k \in A$ with probability p). At least $k_{\text{SD};p} 2^{N+1}$ subsets are sum dominated.

Martin and O'Bryant '06

Theorem

Let A be chosen from $\{0, \dots, N\}$ according to the binomial model with constant parameter p (thus $k \in A$ with probability p). At least $k_{\text{SD};p} 2^{N+1}$ subsets are sum dominated.

- $k_{\text{SD};1/2} \geq 10^{-7}$, expect about 10^{-3} .

Martin and O'Bryant '06

Theorem

Let A be chosen from $\{0, \dots, N\}$ according to the binomial model with constant parameter p (thus $k \in A$ with probability p). At least $k_{\text{SD};p} 2^{N+1}$ subsets are sum dominated.

- $k_{\text{SD};1/2} \geq 10^{-7}$, expect about 10^{-3} .
- Proof ($p = 1/2$): Generically $|A| = \frac{N}{2} + O(\sqrt{N})$.
 - ◇ about $\frac{N}{4} - \frac{|N-k|}{4}$ ways write $k \in A + A$.
 - ◇ about $\frac{N}{4} - \frac{|k|}{4}$ ways write $k \in A - A$.
 - ◇ Almost all numbers that can be in $A \pm A$ are.
 - ◇ Win by controlling fringes.

Notation

- $X \sim f(N)$ means $\forall \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0, \exists N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$ st $\forall N \geq N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$

$$\text{Prob}(X \notin [(1 - \epsilon_1)f(N), (1 + \epsilon_1)f(N)]) < \epsilon_2.$$

Notation

- $X \sim f(N)$ means $\forall \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0, \exists N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$ st $\forall N \geq N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$

$$\text{Prob}(X \notin [(1 - \epsilon_1)f(N), (1 + \epsilon_1)f(N)]) < \epsilon_2.$$

- $\mathcal{S} = |A + A|, \mathcal{D} = |A - A|,$
 $\mathcal{S}^c = 2N + 1 - \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}^c = 2N + 1 - \mathcal{D}.$

Notation

- $X \sim f(N)$ means $\forall \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0, \exists N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$ st $\forall N \geq N_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$

$$\text{Prob}(X \notin [(1 - \epsilon_1)f(N), (1 + \epsilon_1)f(N)]) < \epsilon_2.$$

- $\mathcal{S} = |A + A|, \mathcal{D} = |A - A|,$
 $\mathcal{S}^c = 2N + 1 - \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}^c = 2N + 1 - \mathcal{D}.$

New model: Binomial with parameter $p(N)$:

- $1/N = o(p(N))$ and $p(N) = o(1)$;
- $\text{Prob}(k \in A) = p(N).$

Conjecture (Martin-O'Bryant)

As $N \rightarrow \infty$, A is a.s. difference dominated.

Main Result

Theorem (Hegarty-Miller)

$p(N)$ as above, $g(x) = 2 \frac{e^{-x} - (1-x)}{x}$.

- $p(N) = o(N^{-1/2})$: $\mathcal{D} \sim 2\mathcal{S} \sim (Np(N))^2$;
- $p(N) = cN^{-1/2}$: $\mathcal{D} \sim g(c^2)N$, $\mathcal{S} \sim g\left(\frac{c^2}{2}\right)N$
($c \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{S} \rightarrow 2$; $c \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{S} \rightarrow 1$);
- $N^{-1/2} = o(p(N))$: $\mathcal{S}^c \sim 2\mathcal{D}^c \sim 4/p(N)^2$.

Can generalize to binary linear forms, still have **critical threshold**.

Inputs

Key input: recent strong concentration results of Kim and Vu (Applications: combinatorial number theory, random graphs, ...).

Inputs

Key input: recent strong concentration results of Kim and Vu (Applications: combinatorial number theory, random graphs, ...).

Example (Chernoff): t_i iid binary random variables,
 $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, then

$$\forall \lambda > 0 : \text{Prob} \left(|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]| \geq \sqrt{\lambda n} \right) \leq 2e^{-\lambda/2}.$$

Inputs

Key input: recent strong concentration results of Kim and Vu (Applications: combinatorial number theory, random graphs, ...).

Example (Chernoff): t_i iid binary random variables,
 $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, then

$$\forall \lambda > 0 : \text{Prob} \left(|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]| \geq \sqrt{\lambda n} \right) \leq 2e^{-\lambda/2}.$$

Need to allow dependent random variables.

Inputs

Key input: recent strong concentration results of Kim and Vu (Applications: combinatorial number theory, random graphs, ...).

Example (Chernoff): t_i iid binary random variables,
 $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, then

$$\forall \lambda > 0 : \text{Prob} \left(|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]| \geq \sqrt{\lambda n} \right) \leq 2e^{-\lambda/2}.$$

Need to allow dependent random variables.

Sketch of proofs: $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S}^c, \mathcal{D}^c\}$.

- 1 Prove $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}]$ behaves asymptotically as claimed;
- 2 Prove $\mathcal{X}$ is strongly concentrated about mean.

Proofs

Setup

Note: only need strong concentration for $N^{-1/2} = o(p(N))$.

Setup

Note: only need strong concentration for $N^{-1/2} = o(p(N))$.

Will assume $p(N) = o(N^{-1/2})$ as proofs are elementary (i.e., Chebyshev: $\text{Prob}(|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]| \geq k\sigma_Y) \leq 1/k^2$)).

Setup

Note: only need strong concentration for $N^{-1/2} = o(p(N))$.

Will assume $p(N) = o(N^{-1/2})$ as proofs are elementary (i.e., Chebyshev: $\text{Prob}(|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]| \geq k\sigma_Y) \leq 1/k^2$)).

For convenience let $p(N) = N^{-\delta}$, $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$.

i.i.d binary indicator variables:

$$X_{n;N} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } N^{-\delta} \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - N^{-\delta}. \end{cases}$$

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N X_{n;N}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X] = N^{1-\delta}.$$

Proof

Lemma

$$P_1(N) = 4N^{-(1-\delta)},$$

$$\mathcal{O} = \#\{(m, n) : m < n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \cap A\}.$$

With probability at least $1 - P_1(N)$ have

1 $X \in \left[\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}, \frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}\right].$

2 $\frac{\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}(\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}-1)}{2} \leq \mathcal{O} \leq \frac{\frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}(\frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}-1)}{2}.$

Proof

Lemma

$$P_1(N) = 4N^{-(1-\delta)},$$

$$\mathcal{O} = \#\{(m, n) : m < n \in \{1, \dots, N\} \cap A\}.$$

With probability at least $1 - P_1(N)$ have

① $X \in \left[\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}, \frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}\right].$

② $\frac{\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}(\frac{1}{2}N^{1-\delta}-1)}{2} \leq \mathcal{O} \leq \frac{\frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}(\frac{3}{2}N^{1-\delta}-1)}{2}.$

Proof:

- (1) is Chebyshev: $\text{Var}(X) = N\text{Var}(X_{n;N}) \leq N^{1-\delta}.$
- (2) follows from (1) and $\binom{r}{2}$ ways to choose 2 from r .

Concentration

Lemma

- $f(\delta) = \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3\delta-1}{2}\right)$, $g(\delta)$ any function st $0 < g(\delta) < f(\delta)$.
- $p(N) = N^{-\delta}$, $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$, $P_1(N) = 4N^{-(1-\delta)}$,
 $P_2(N) = CN^{-(f(\delta)-g(\delta))}$.

With probability at least $1 - P_1(N) - P_2(N)$ have $\mathcal{D}/S = 2 + O(N^{-g(\delta)})$.

Concentration

Lemma

- $f(\delta) = \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3\delta-1}{2}\right)$, $g(\delta)$ any function st $0 < g(\delta) < f(\delta)$.
- $p(N) = N^{-\delta}$, $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$, $P_1(N) = 4N^{-(1-\delta)}$, $P_2(N) = CN^{-(f(\delta)-g(\delta))}$.

With probability at least $1 - P_1(N) - P_2(N)$ have $\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{S} = 2 + O(N^{-g(\delta)})$.

Proof: Show $\mathcal{D} \sim 2\mathcal{O} + O(N^{3-4\delta})$, $\mathcal{S} \sim \mathcal{O} + O(N^{3-4\delta})$.

As $\mathcal{O}$ is of size $N^{2-2\delta}$ with high probability, need $2 - 2\delta > 3 - 4\delta$ or $\delta > 1/2$.

Analysis of $\mathcal{D}$

Contribution from ‘diagonal’ terms lower order, ignore.

Analysis of $\mathcal{D}$

Contribution from ‘diagonal’ terms lower order, ignore.

Difficulty: (m, n) and (m', n') could yield same differences.

Analysis of $\mathcal{D}$

Contribution from ‘diagonal’ terms lower order, ignore.

Difficulty: (m, n) and (m', n') could yield same differences.

Notation: $m < n$, $m' < n'$, $m \leq m'$,

$$Y_{m,n,m',n'} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n - m = n' - m' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Analysis of $\mathcal{D}$

Contribution from ‘diagonal’ terms lower order, ignore.

Difficulty: (m, n) and (m', n') could yield same differences.

Notation: $m < n, m' < n', m \leq m',$

$$Y_{m,n,m',n'} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n - m = n' - m' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$\mathbb{E}[Y] \leq N^3 \cdot N^{-4\delta} + N^2 \cdot N^{-3\delta} \leq 2N^{3-4\delta}$. As $\delta > 1/2$,
 $\#\{\text{bad pairs}\} \lll \mathcal{O}$.

Analysis of $\mathcal{D}$

Contribution from ‘diagonal’ terms lower order, ignore.

Difficulty: (m, n) and (m', n') could yield same differences.

Notation: $m < n$, $m' < n'$, $m \leq m'$,

$$Y_{m,n,m',n'} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n - m = n' - m' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$\mathbb{E}[Y] \leq N^3 \cdot N^{-4\delta} + N^2 \cdot N^{-3\delta} \leq 2N^{3-4\delta}$. As $\delta > 1/2$,
 $\#\{\text{bad pairs}\} \lll \mathcal{O}$.

Claim: $\sigma_Y \leq N^{r(\delta)}$ with $r(\delta) = \frac{1}{2} \max(3 - 4\delta, 5 - 7\delta)$. This and Chebyshev conclude proof of theorem.

Proof of claim

Cannot use CLT as $Y_{m,n,m',n'}$ are not independent.

Proof of claim

Cannot use CLT as $Y_{m,n,m',n'}$ are not independent.

Use $\text{Var}(U + V) \leq 2\text{Var}(U) + 2\text{Var}(V)$.

Proof of claim

Cannot use CLT as $Y_{m,n,m',n'}$ are not independent.

Use $\text{Var}(U + V) \leq 2\text{Var}(U) + 2\text{Var}(V)$.

Write

$$\sum Y_{m,n,m',n'} = \sum U_{m,n,m',n'} + \sum V_{m,n,n'}$$

with all indices distinct (at most one in common, if so must be $n = m'$).

$$\text{Var}(U) = \sum \text{Var}(U_{m,n,m',n'}) + 2 \sum_{\substack{(m,n,m',n') \neq \\ (\tilde{m}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{m}', \tilde{n}')}} \text{CoVar}(U_{m,n,m',n'}, U_{\tilde{m}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{m}', \tilde{n}'})$$

Analyzing $\text{Var}(U_{m,n,m',n'})$

At most N^3 tuples.

Each has variance $N^{-4\delta} - N^{-8\delta} \leq N^{-4\delta}$.

Thus $\sum \text{Var}(U_{m,n,m',n'}) \leq N^{3-4\delta}$.

Analyzing $\text{CoVar}(U_{m,n,m',n'}, U_{\tilde{m},\tilde{n},\tilde{m}',\tilde{n}'})$

- All 8 indices distinct: independent, covariance of 0.
- 7 indices distinct: At most N^3 choices for first tuple, at most N^2 for second, get

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{(1)} U_{(2)}] - \mathbb{E}[U_{(1)}] \mathbb{E}[U_{(2)}] = N^{-7\delta} - N^{-4\delta} N^{-4\delta} \leq N^{-7\delta}.$$

- Argue similarly for rest, get $\ll N^{5-7\delta} + N^{3-4\delta}$.

Open Problems

Probability k in an MSTD set (uniform model)

$$\gamma(k, n) := \text{Prob}(k \in A : A \subset [1, n] \text{ is an MSTD set})$$




Figure: Observed $\gamma(k, 100)$, random sample 4458 MSTD sets.

Conjecture

Fix a constant $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(k, n) = 1/2$ for $\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$.

Generalization of main result

Theorem (Hegarty-M): Binomial model with parameter $p(N)$ as before, u, v be non-zero integers with $u \geq |v|$, $\gcd(u, v) = 1$ and $(u, v) \neq (1, 1)$. Put $f(x, y) := ux + vy$ and let $\mathcal{D}_f$ denote the random variable $|f(A)|$. Then the following three situations arise:

① $p(N) = o(N^{-1/2})$: Then

$$\mathcal{D}_f \sim (N \cdot p(N))^2.$$

② $p(N) = c \cdot N^{-1/2}$ for some $c \in (0, \infty)$: Define the function $g_{u,v} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, u + |v|)$ by

$$g_{u,v}(x) := (u + |v|) - 2|v| \left(\frac{1 - e^{-x}}{x} \right) - (u - |v|)e^{-x}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{D}_f \sim g_{u,v} \left(\frac{c^2}{u} \right) N.$$

③ $N^{-1/2} = o(p(N))$: Let $\mathcal{D}_f^c := (u + |v|)N - \mathcal{D}_f$. Then $\mathcal{D}_f^c \sim \frac{2u|v|}{p(N)^2}$.

Generalization of main results (cont)

Let f, g be two binary linear forms. Say f **dominates** g for the parameter $p(N)$ if, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $|f(A)| > |g(A)|$ almost surely when A is a random subset (binomial model with parameter $p(N)$).

Theorem (Hegarty-M): $f(x, y) = u_1x + u_2y$ and $g(x, y) = u_2x + g_2y$, where $u_i \geq |v_i| > 0$, $\gcd(u_i, v_i) = 1$ and $(u_2, v_2) \neq (u_1, \pm v_1)$. Let

$$\alpha(u, v) := \frac{1}{u^2} \left(\frac{|v|}{3} + \frac{u - |v|}{2} \right) = \frac{3u - |v|}{6u^2}.$$

The following two situations can be distinguished :

- $u_1 + |v_1| \geq u_2 + |v_2|$ and $\alpha(u_1, v_1) < \alpha(u_2, v_2)$. Then f dominates g for all p such that $N^{-3/5} = o(p(N))$ and $p(N) = o(1)$. In particular, every other difference form dominates the form $x - y$ in this range.
- $u_1 + |v_1| > u_2 + |v_2|$ and $\alpha(u_1, v_1) > \alpha(u_2, v_2)$. Then there exists $c_{f,g} > 0$ such that one form dominates for $p(N) < cN^{-1/2}$ ($c < c_{f,g}$) and other dominates for $p(N) > cN^{-1/2}$ ($c > c_{f,g}$).

Open Problems

- One unresolved matter is the comparison of arbitrary difference forms in the range where $N^{-3/4} = O(p)$ and $p = O(N^{-3/5})$. Note that the property of one binary form dominating another is not monotone, or even convex.
- A very tantalizing problem is to investigate what happens while crossing a sharp threshold.
- One can ask if the various concentration estimates can be improved (i.e., made explicit).

Programs

Mathematica Code: Computing Sum/Difference Set

```
setA = {1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19};  
sumset = {};  
diffset = {};  
n = Length[setA];  
For[i = 1, i <= n, i++,  
  For[j = 1, j <= n, j++,  
    {  
      sum = setA[[i]] + setA[[j]];  
      diff = setA[[i]] - setA[[j]];  
      If[MemberQ[sumset, sum] == False, sumset = AppendTo[sumset, sum]];  
      If[MemberQ[diffset, diff] == False, diffset = AppendTo[diffset, diff]];  
    }];  
sumset = Sort[sumset];  
diffset = Sort[diffset];  
Print[sumset];  
Print[diffset];  
Print["Size of sumset = ", Length[sumset], " and size of difference set = ",  
  Length[diffset], "."];
```

Bibliography

Bibliography

- N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, Wiley, 1992.
- G. A. Freiman and V. P. Pigarev, *The relation between the invariants R and T* , Numbertheoretic studies in the Markov spectrum and in the structural theory of set addition (Russian), Kalinin. Gos. Univ., Moscow, 1973, 172–174.
- A. P. Godbole, S. Janson, N. W. Locantore Jr. and R. Rapoport, *Random Sidon sequences*, J. Number Theory **75** (1999), no. 1, 7–22.
- P. V. Hegarty, *Some explicit constructions of sets with more sums than differences* (2007). To appear in Acta Arithmetica.
- P. V. Hegarty and S. J. Miller, *When almost all sets are difference dominated*, preprint. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.3417>
- J. H. Kim and V. H. Vu, *Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications*, Combinatorica **20** (2000), 417–434.
- J. Marica, *On a conjecture of Conway*, Canad. Math. Bull. **12** (1969), 233–234.

Bibliography (cont)

- G. Martin and K. O'Bryant, *Many sets have more sums than differences*. To appear in : Proceedings of CRM-Clay Conference on Additive Combinatorics, Montréal 2006.
- S. J. Miller and D. Scheinerman, *Explicit constructions of infinite families of MSTD sets*, preprint.
- M. B. Nathanson, *Problems in additive number theory, 1*. To appear in : Proceedings of CRM-Clay Conference on Additive Combinatorics, Montréal 2006.
- M. B. Nathanson, *Sets with more sums than differences*, *Integers : Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory* **7** (2007), Paper A5 (24pp).
- M. B. Nathanson, K. O'Bryant, B. Orosz, I. Ruzsa and M. Silva, *Binary linear forms over finite sets of integers* (2007). To appear in *Acta Arithmetica*.
- I. Z. Ruzsa, *On the cardinality of $A + A$ and $A - A$* , *Combinatorics year* (Keszthely, 1976), vol. 18, Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, North-Holland/Bolyai Tarsulat, 1978, 933–938.

Bibliography (cont)

- I. Z. Ruzsa, *Sets of sums and differences*, Seminaire de Theorie des Nombres de Paris 1982-1983 (Boston), Birkhauser, 1984, 267–273.
- I. Z. Ruzsa, *On the number of sums and differences*, Acta Math. Sci. Hungar. **59** (1992), 439–447.
- V. H. Vu, *New bounds on nearly perfect matchings of hypergraphs: Higher codegrees do help*, Random Structures and Algorithms **17** (2000), 29–63.
- V. H. Vu, *Concentration of non-Lipschitz functions and Applications*, Random Structures and Algorithms **20** (2002), no. 3, 262–316.