

Milan Paštéka; Tibor Šalát

Buck's measure density and sets of positive integers containing arithmetic progression

*Mathematica Slovaca*, Vol. 41 (1991), No. 3, 283--293

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/136532>

## Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1991

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

## BUCK'S MEASURE DENSITY AND SETS OF POSITIVE INTEGERS CONTAINING ARITHMETIC PROGRESSION

MILAN PAŠTÉKA — TIBOR ŠALÁT

ABSTRACT. The concept of measure density  $\mu$  was introduced by R. C. Buck in 1946. In this paper some further properties of  $\mu$  are established.

In [1] the concept of measure density of sets  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n, \dots\}$  is introduced. Denote by  $\mathcal{D}_0$  the class of all sets  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  which are finite unions of arithmetic progressions, or which differ from these by finite sets (the empty set  $\emptyset$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_0$ , too).

If  $A = \{an + b : n \geq 0, a, b \in \mathbf{N}\}$ , then we put  $\Delta(A) = \frac{1}{a}$  and if  $A = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_m$  where the sets  $A_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) are mutually disjoint and of the previous form, then we put  $\Delta(A) = \sum_{j=1}^m \Delta(A_j)$ . For  $\emptyset$  we put  $\Delta(\emptyset) = 0$ .

The symbol  $A \overset{\cdot}{\subseteq} B$  denotes that  $A \subseteq B$  holds if we omit a finite number of elements from  $A$  (i.e.  $A \overset{\cdot}{\subseteq} B$  means that the set  $A \setminus B$  is finite). Then  $A \overset{\cdot}{\doteq} B$  means that the set  $(A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$  is finite. If  $A \in \mathcal{D}_0$  and  $B \overset{\cdot}{\doteq} A$ , then  $B$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_0$ , too and we put  $\Delta(B) = \Delta(A)$ .

For  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  we define

$$\mu^*(S) = \inf_{A \in \mathcal{D}_0, S \overset{\cdot}{\subseteq} A} \Delta(A).$$

The number  $\mu^*(S)$  is said to be the outer measure density of the set  $S$ . The function  $\mu^* : 2^{\mathbf{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  has the following properties:

- a)  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$
- b) If  $S \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^m S_j$ , then  $\mu^*(S) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mu^*(S_j)$ .

Denote by  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  the class of all  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  which satisfy the following condition:

$$\mu^*(Z) = \mu^*(Z \cap S) + \mu^*(Z \cap S') \quad \text{for all } Z \subseteq \mathbf{N} \quad (1)$$

AMS Subject Classification (1985): Primary 11B05

Key words: Buck's measure density, Arithmetic progression

where  $S' = \mathbf{N} \setminus S$ . Then the class  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  is an algebra of sets and the set function  $\mu = \mu^*/\mathcal{D}_\mu$  is a finitely additive measure on  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  (c.f. [8], pp. 226–228).

The number  $\mu(S) \in [0, 1]$  is called the measure density of the set  $S \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ .

It can be shown that the condition (1) is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\mu^*(S) + \mu^*(S') = 1. \tag{1'}$$

This fact is recalled (without proof) in [1] (p. 562 (i)). We shall prove it using the following simple observation.

**Proposition A.** *A set  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  satisfies the condition (1') if and only if*

$$\inf_{A \supseteq S, A \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(A) = \sup_{B \subseteq S, B \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(B). \tag{A}$$

**P r o o f.** The set  $S$  satisfies the condition (1') if and only if

$$\inf_{A \supseteq S, A \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(A) = 1 - \inf_{C \supseteq S', C \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(C).$$

Consider that  $C \supseteq S'$  holds if and only if  $\mathbf{N} \setminus C \subseteq S$ . Put  $B = \mathbf{N} \setminus C$ . Then  $B \in \mathcal{D}_0$  (c.f. [1], (A1), p. 561),  $B \subseteq S$  and  $\Delta(B) = 1 - \Delta(C)$ . It is obvious from this that the set  $S$  satisfies (1') if and only if the equality (A) holds.  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary.** (a) *The conditions (1), (1') are equivalent.*

**P r o o f.** Evidently (1) implies (1') (it suffices to put  $Z = \mathbf{N}$  in (1)). Assume that (1') holds. Then according to Proposition A we get for an arbitrary  $Z \subseteq \mathbf{N}$

$$\mu^*(Z \cap S) = \sup_{F \subseteq Z \cap S, F \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(F); \tag{2}$$

$$\mu^*(Z \cap S') = \sup_{E \subseteq Z \cap S', E \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(E); \tag{2'}$$

$$\mu^*(Z) = \sup_{G \subseteq Z, G \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(G). \tag{2''}$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . According to (2),(2') there exist  $F_1, E_1 \in \mathcal{D}_0$  such that

$$\mu^*(Z \cap S) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \Delta(F_1); \tag{3}$$

$$\mu^*(Z \cap S') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \Delta(E_1); \tag{3'}$$

$F_1 \dot{\subseteq} Z \cap S, E_1 \dot{\subseteq} Z \cap S'$ . But then  $F_1 \cup E_1 \dot{\subseteq} Z$  and  $F_1 \cap E_1 \dot{=} \emptyset$ . Therefore

$$\Delta(F_1 \cup E_1) = \Delta(F_1) + \Delta(E_1). \quad (3'')$$

Adding (3),(3') we get on account of (3'')

$$\mu^*(Z \cap S) + \mu^*(Z \cap S') - \varepsilon < \Delta(F_1 \cup E_1) \leq \mu^*(Z).$$

From this by  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  we get

$$\mu^*(Z) \geq \mu^*(Z \cap S) + \mu^*(Z \cap S').$$

The opposite inequality holds too because  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure. Thus (1) follows. ■

**Corollary.** (b) *A set  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  if and only if for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist two sets  $A, B \in \mathcal{D}_0$  such that  $B \dot{\subseteq} S \dot{\subseteq} A$  and  $\Delta(A) - \Delta(B) < \varepsilon$ .*

For  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  we define the asymptotic densities  $\underline{d}(A)$  (the lower density of  $A$ ),  $\overline{d}(A)$  (the upper density of  $A$ ) as follows: Denote by  $A(n)$  the number of elements of  $A$  not exceeding  $n$ . Then we put

$$\underline{d}(A) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A(n)}{n}, \quad \overline{d}(A) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A(n)}{n}.$$

If there exists  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A(n)}{n}$ , then we denote this limit by  $d(A)$ . The number  $d(A)$  is called the asymptotic density of the set  $A$ .

Denote by  $\mathcal{D}$  the class of all sets  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  for which  $d(S)$  exists. In [1] (p. 571) the inclusion  $\mathcal{D}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  is proved and if  $S \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ , then  $\mu(S) = d(S)$ .

In this paper we introduce some considerations about a possible extension of the class  $\mathcal{D}$ , further we prove that the measure density  $\mu$  has the Darboux-property and introduce some simple results concerning the relation between the positivity of  $\mu(S)$  and the fact that  $S$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression.

## 1. On an extension of the class $\mathcal{D}$

Put for  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$

$$\omega(S) = \inf_{A \supseteq S, A \in \mathcal{D}} d(A)$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{D}_\omega$  the class of all sets  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  for which

$$\omega(S) + \omega(S') = 1$$

holds.

It is proved in [1] (Theorem 8 in [1], p. 572) that  $\mathcal{D}_\omega = \mathcal{D}$ . We now give a new proof of the quoted result from [1] which shows that the class  $\mathcal{D}$  is not extendable in the described way.

**Theorem 1.1.** *We have  $\mathcal{D}_\omega = \mathcal{D}$ .*

**Proof.** Since evidently  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\omega$ , it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega \subseteq \mathcal{D} \quad (4)$$

Let  $S \in \mathcal{D}_\omega$ . Then  $\omega(S) + \omega(S') = 1$  ( $S' = \mathbf{N} \setminus S$ ). Hence

$$\inf_{B \supseteq S, B \in \mathcal{D}} d(B) = 1 - \inf_{C \supseteq S', C \in \mathcal{D}} d(C). \quad (5)$$

From  $C \supseteq S'$  we get  $A = \mathbf{N} \setminus C \subseteq S$  and  $1 - d(C) = d(\mathbf{N} \setminus C) = d(A)$ . From this we get

$$\sup_{A \subseteq S, A \in \mathcal{D}} d(A) = 1 - \inf_{C \supseteq S', C \in \mathcal{D}} d(C). \quad (5')$$

The equalities (5),(5') yield

$$\inf_{B \supseteq S, B \in \mathcal{D}} d(B) = \sup_{A \subseteq S, A \in \mathcal{D}} d(A) \quad (= v). \quad (6)$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . According to (6) there exist two sets  $A_0, B_0 \in \mathcal{D}$  such that

$$A_0 \subseteq S \subseteq B_0 \quad (7)$$

$$d(B_0) < v + \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad d(A_0) > v - \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \quad (7')$$

From (7),(7') we get

$$v - \frac{\epsilon}{2} < d(A_0) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(n)}{n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(n)}{n} \leq d(B_0) < v + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

This is true for each  $\epsilon > 0$ . Therefore there exists  $d(S)$  and  $d(S) = v$ . Hence (4) holds. ■

Finally we mention the cardinalities of the investigated classes. Denote by  $|M|$  the cardinal number of the set  $M$ . Already in [1], p. 580, the equalities

$$|\mathcal{D}_0| = \aleph_0, \quad |\mathcal{D}_\mu| = |\mathcal{D}| = c$$

are proved ( $c$  is the cardinal number of the continuum).

Further, we have seen that  $\mathcal{D}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . Therefore the question arises how large the cardinalities of the classes  $\mathcal{D}_\mu \setminus \mathcal{D}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_\mu$  are. We have

$$|\mathcal{D}_\mu \setminus \mathcal{D}_0| = |\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_0| = c$$

on the basis of the well-known result of the set theory according to which, if  $P$  is an uncountable set and  $M$  is a countable set, then the set  $P \setminus M$  and  $P$  have the same cardinality.

The cardinality of  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_\mu$  is also equal to  $c$ . This follows from the fact that each set of the form  $A = \{[an + \beta] : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$  ( $[t]$  denotes the integer part of  $t$ ), where  $\alpha > 1$ ,  $\beta \geq 0$ ,  $\beta$  is real and  $\alpha$  irrational, belongs to  $\mathcal{D}$  (the density of  $A$  being  $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ ), but does not belong to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  (cf. [1], Theorem 7, p. 570).

## 2. Darboux property of the measure density

In this part of the paper we shall give a proof of the fact that  $\mu$  has the Darboux property. This proof is quite different from that given in [6].

We use the concept of the Darboux property in agreement with the terminology contained in [2] pp. 25–32. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a class of sets and  $\nu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  a set function on  $\mathcal{S}$ . The set  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  is said to have the Darboux property with respect to  $\nu$  provided that for each  $a \in [0, \nu(E)]$  there exists a set  $A \subseteq E$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\nu(A) = a$ . The set function  $\nu$  is said to have the Darboux property provided that each set  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  has the Darboux property with respect to  $\nu$ .

Instead of “the Darboux property of  $\nu$ ” also the terminology “ $\nu$  is full-valued” can be used (cf. [5]).

The proof of the following theorem is based on a modification of a procedure used in [5]. This method enables us to prove a more general result (see Theorem 2.2).

**Theorem 2.1.** *The measure density  $\mu$  has the Darboux property.*

The proof is based on the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $M \subseteq E$ ,  $M, E \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then there exist mutually disjoint sets  $D_j \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ) such that*

$$M = \bigcup_{j=1}^s D_j, \quad \mu(D_j) < \epsilon \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, s).$$

**Proof.** Choose an  $s \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{s} < \epsilon$ . Put

$$D_j = R_j \cap M \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, s),$$

where  $R_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ) denotes the set of positive elements of the residue class  $\bar{j} \pmod{s}$ . Then evidently  $D_j \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  since  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  is an algebra of sets. It is easy to check that the sets  $D_j$  have the desired properties. ■

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Let  $E \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  and  $0 < a < \mu(E)$ . Suppose that there is no  $M \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ ,  $M \subseteq E$  such that  $\mu(M) = a$ .

We shall construct two sequences  $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ,  $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  of sets from  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  such that

$$B_1 \subseteq B_2 \subseteq \dots; \quad C_1 \supseteq C_2 \supseteq \dots \quad (8)$$

$$B_n \subseteq C_n \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots) \quad (9)$$

$$a - \frac{1}{n} < \mu(B_n) < a < \mu(C_n) < a + \frac{1}{n} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots) \quad (10)$$

$$B_n \subseteq E, \quad C_n \subseteq E \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots). \quad (11)$$

In the first step we put  $B_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $C_1 = E$ . Let us suppose that the construction of the sets  $B_k, C_k$  is already finished in such a way that the conditions (8)–(11) (for  $n = k$ ) are satisfied. We shall construct the sets  $B_{k+1}, C_{k+1}$ .

According to the assumption of induction we have

$$B_k \subseteq C_k, \quad B_k, C_k \in \mathcal{D}_\mu, \quad B_k, C_k \subseteq E$$

Put  $M = C_k \setminus B_k$  and

$$\epsilon = \min\left\{a - \mu(B_k), \frac{1}{k+1}\right\}$$

in Lemma 2.1. On account of Lemma 2.1 there exist mutually disjoint sets  $D_j \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ) such that  $D_j \subseteq E$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ) and

$$C_k \setminus B_k = \bigcup_{j=1}^s D_j \tag{12}$$

and for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$  we have  $\mu(D_j) < \epsilon$ .

Consider that

$$\mu(B_k \cup D_1) \leq \mu(B_k) + \mu(D_1) < \mu(B_k) + (a - \mu(B_k)) = a$$

and simultaneously according to (12)

$$\mu\left(B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^s D_j\right) = \mu(C_k) > a.$$

Therefore there exists a positive integer  $t$  such that  $1 \leq t < s$  and

$$\mu\left(B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^t D_j\right) < a; \tag{13}$$

$$\mu\left(B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1} D_j\right) \geq a. \tag{13'}$$

Since the set  $M = B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1} D_j$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  and  $M \subseteq E$  we cannot have  $\mu(M) = a$ . Therefore in (13') the strict inequality  $>$  holds.

Put

$$B_{k+1} = B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^t D_j \quad (14)$$

$$C_{k+1} = B_{k+1} \cup D_{t+1} = B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1} D_j. \quad (14')$$

It follows from (14),(14') that  $B_{k+1}, C_{k+1} \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ ,  $B_{k+1}, C_{k+1} \subseteq E$ . Further, from (13),(13') we get  $\mu(B_{k+1}) < \mu(C_{k+1})$ .

Consider that

$$\mu(C_{k+1}) \leq \mu(B_{k+1}) + \mu(D_{t+1}) < a + \frac{1}{k+1}$$

and according to (13),(13') we have

$$a < \mu(C_{k+1}) \leq \mu(B_{k+1}) + \mu(D_{t+1}) < \mu(B_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

From this we get

$$\mu(B_{k+1}) > a - \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

Hence we have

$$a - \frac{1}{k+1} < \mu(B_{k+1}) < a < \mu(C_{k+1}) < a + \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

Further, from (14),(14') we get  $B_{k+1} \subseteq C_{k+1}$  and evidently  $B_k \subseteq B_{k+1}$ . It follows from the definition of  $C_{k+1}$  that

$$C_{k+1} = B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^t D_j \cup D_{t+1} \subseteq B_k \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^s D_j = C_k,$$

hence  $C_{k+1} \subseteq C_k$ .

This ends construction (by induction) of the sequences  $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ,  $\{C_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

Put  $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty B_j$ . Then according to (11) we have  $A \subseteq E$ .

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have  $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^n B_j \cup \bigcup_{j=n+1}^\infty B_j$ . Since  $B_j \subseteq B_n \subseteq C_n$  for  $j \leq n$  and  $B_j \subseteq C_j \subseteq C_n$  for  $j > n$ , we see that  $A \subseteq C_n$ .

Obviously we have  $B_n \subseteq A$  and therefore

$$B_n \subseteq A \subseteq C_n \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots). \quad (15)$$



We prove that the set  $A$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Choose an  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{n} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ . Since the sets  $B_n, C_n$  belong to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ , we can choose by Proposition A the sets  $B^*, C^* \in \mathcal{D}_0$  such that  $B^* \dot{\subseteq} B_n, C_n \dot{\subseteq} C^*$  and

$$\Delta(B^*) > \mu(B_n) - \frac{\epsilon}{4}, \quad \Delta(C^*) < \mu(C_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$$

According to (10) and (15) we get  $B^* \dot{\subseteq} A \dot{\subseteq} C^*$  and

$$\Delta(C^*) - \Delta(B^*) < \mu(C_n) - \mu(B_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{2}{n} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon.$$

On the basis of Proposition A the set  $A$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ .

We obtain a contradiction showing that  $\mu(A) = a$ .

Let  $n$  be an arbitrary positive integer. According to (10) and (15) we have  $|\mu(A) - a| < \frac{2}{n}$ . From this by  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we get  $\mu(A) = a$ . This ends the proof.

■

The detailed analysis of the foregoing proof shows that by an analogous procedure the following more general result can be proved.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $S \subseteq 2^{\mathbf{N}}$  be an algebra of sets and let  $\nu$  be a finitely additive measure on  $S$ . Let  $\nu$  satisfy the following two conditions:*

(i) *If  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  and*

$$\inf_{C \supseteq A, C \in S} \nu(C) = \sup_{B \subseteq A, B \in S} \nu(B) \quad (= v),$$

*then  $A$  belongs to  $S$  and  $\nu(A) = v$ .*

(ii) *For each  $M \in S$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist mutually disjoint sets  $D_j \in S$  such that  $M = \bigcup_{j=1}^s D_j$  and  $\nu(D_j) < \epsilon$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ).*

*Then the measure  $\nu$  has the Darboux property.*

### 3. The measure density $\mu$ and the sets $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ containing arithmetic progressions

The set  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  is said to contain an arithmetic progression of the length  $k \geq 3$  ( $k \in \mathbf{N}$ ) if there is an arithmetic progression  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k$  with  $k$  terms such that  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\} \subseteq A$ . Analogously we say that

$$B = \{b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_n < \dots\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$$

contains an infinite arithmetic progression if there exists a sequence  $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_n < \dots$  of indices such that

$$b_{k_1} < b_{k_2} < \dots < b_{k_n} < \dots$$

forms an arithmetic progression.

It is well known (cf. [9]) that a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  contains arithmetic progressions of the length  $k$  for each  $k \geq 3$  provided that  $\bar{d}(A) > 0$ . The following simple theorem gives a sufficient condition for a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression.

**Theorem 3.1.** *If  $S \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$  and  $\mu(S) > 0$ , then  $S$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression.*

**Proof.** According to Proposition A and Corollary (a) after it we have

$$0 < \mu(S) = \sup_{A \dot{\subseteq} S, A \in \mathcal{D}_0} \Delta(A)$$

Put  $\epsilon = \frac{\mu(S)}{2} > 0$ . Then on the basis of the definition of the least upper bound there exists a set  $A_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0$  such that  $A_0 \dot{\subseteq} S$  and

$$\Delta(A_0) > \mu(S) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0.$$

It is clear from this that  $A_0 \neq \emptyset$  and therefore  $A_0$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression. But then by  $A_0 \dot{\subseteq} S$  the set  $S$  contains such a progression, too.

■

We shall show that in Theorem 3.1 the measure density cannot be replaced by the outer measure  $\mu^*$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *There exists a set  $S_0 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu^*(S_0) = 1$  and  $S_0$  does not contain any arithmetic progression of the length 3.*

**Proof.** Put

$$S_0 = \{1 + 1!, 2 + 2!, \dots, n + n!, \dots\}.$$

Let  $\{aj + b\}_{j=1}^\infty$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ , be an arbitrary arithmetic progression. Denote by  $A$  the set of all its terms. Put  $n_k = ak + b$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Then it is easy to see that the elements  $n_k + n_k!$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ) of  $S_0$  belong to  $A$ . Thus the set  $A \cap S_0$  is infinite and so  $S_0$  cuts each arithmetic progression in infinitely many terms. From this we get obviously that  $\mu^*(S_0) = 1$ .

We shall show that  $S_0$  does not contain any arithmetic progression of length 3.

We shall proceed indirectly. Suppose that

$$1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < a_3 \tag{16}$$

is an arithmetic progression such that  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \subseteq S_0$ . Then by definition of the set  $S_0$  there exist positive integers  $1 \leq n_1 < n_2 < n_3$  such that  $a_k = n_k + n_k!$  ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ). The difference of the sequence (16) is equal to  $d = n_2 + n_2! - (n_1 + n_1!)$ . The following simple estimation yields

$$\begin{aligned} a_3 &= a_1 + 2d = n_1 + n_1! + 2[(n_2 + n_2!) - (n_1 + n_1!)] = \\ &= 2n_2 + 2n_2! - n_1 - n_1! < 2n_2 + 2n_2! < \\ &< (n_2 + 1) + (n_2 + 1)! \leq n_3 + n_3! = a_3. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have a contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

Finally let us remark that even the positivity of the asymptotic density of a set  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  does not guarantee that  $A$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression. According to Theorem 3.1 such a sufficient condition is the following:  $d(A) > 0$  and simultaneously  $A \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ . An example of a set  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  with a positive  $d(A)$  which does not contain any infinite arithmetic progression is given in [3], pp. 159–160. Here we give another example of this kind.

**Example 3.1.** Denote by  $Q$  the set of all  $a \in \mathbf{N}$  such that there is no prime number  $p$  with  $p^2$  dividing the number  $a$  (quadratfreie Zahlen). It is well known that  $d(Q) = \frac{6}{\pi^2} > 0$  (cf. [4], p. 269). Suppose that  $Q$  contains an infinite arithmetic progression  $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . Then according to Exercise 1, pp. 243–244 from [7] there exists a geometric progression  $\{aq^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  ( $q \geq 2$ ) as a subsequence of  $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ . But then  $Q$  contains the numbers  $aq^n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ), which contradicts the definition of  $Q$ .

**Remark 3.1.** It follows from Example 3.1 and Theorem 3.1 that the set  $Q$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ . More generally, if  $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ ,  $d(A) > 0$  and  $A$  does not contain any infinite arithmetic progression, then  $A$  does not belong to the class  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ .

The authors are indebted to the Reviewer for his valuable comments improving the original version of the paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] BUCK, R. C.: The measure theoretic approach to density. *Amer. J. Math.* LXVIII (1946), 560–580.
- [2] DINCULEANU, N.: *Vector Measures*. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissen, Berlin, 1966
- [3] ERDÖS, P.—NATHANSON, M. B.—SÁRKÖZY, A.: Sumsets containing infinite arithmetic progressions. *J. Number Theory* 28 (1988), 159–166.

- [4] HARDY, G. H.—WRIGHT, E. M.: An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers. 3rd ed., Oxford, 1954.
- [5] MAHARAM, D.: Finitely additive measures on the integers. Sankhya: The Indian J. Stat. Ser. A 38 (1976), 44–59.
- [6] PAŠTÉKA, M.: Some properties of Buck's measure density. (To appear.).
- [7] SIERPIŃSKI, W.: Elementary Theory of Numbers. PWN, Warszawa, 1964.
- [8] SIKORSKI, R.: Funkcje rzeczywiste I. PWN, Warszawa, 1958.
- [9] SZEMERÉDI, E.: On sets of integers containing no  $k$  elements in arithmetic progression. Acta Arithm. 27 (1975), 199–245.

Received October 4, 1989.

*Matematický ústav SAV  
Štefánikova 49  
814 73 Bratislava  
Czecho-Slovakia*

*Katedra algebry a teórie čísel  
MFF UK  
Mlynská dolina  
842 15 Bratislava  
Czecho-Slovakia*