

SOME NEGATIVE ANSWERS TO THE BERGELSON-HINDMAN'S QUESTION

QINQI WU

ABSTRACT. Let p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials vanishing at 0. It was asked by Bergelson and Hindman whenever A is large, whether the set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$ be large in the same sense. In this paper, we give negative answers to this question when “large” being the notions of “central*”, “IP*”, “IP_n*”, “IP_{<ω}*” and “Δ*”.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper integers, nonnegative integers and natural numbers are denoted by \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Z}_+ and \mathbb{N} respectively. An *integral polynomial* is polynomial taking integer values at the integers.

Van der Waerden’s theorem states that each piecewise syndetic subset of \mathbb{Z} contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions. That is, if $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is piecewise syndetic, then for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : m, m + n, \dots, m + (d - 1)n \in A, n \neq 0\}$ is not empty. Furstenberg and Glasner [4] obtained the following result using the Stone-Ćech compactification of \mathbb{Z} .

Theorem (Furstenberg-Glasner) *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and A be piecewise syndetic in \mathbb{Z} , then*

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : m, m + n, \dots, m + (d - 1)n \in A\}$$

is piecewise syndetic in \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Later Beiglböck [1] provided a combinatorial proof for the Furstenberg-Glasner’s result just using van der Waerden’s theorem. Bergelson and Hindman [2] extended this result to apply to many notions of largeness in arbitrary semigroups and to partition regular structures other than arithmetic progressions. One of their results is,

Theorem (Bergelson-Hindman) *Let $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let “large” be any of “piecewise syndetic”, “central”, “central*”, “thick”, “PS*”, “IP*”, “IP_{<ω}*”, “IP_n*”, or “Δ*”. If B is large in \mathbb{N} , then $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m, m + n, \dots, m + (d - 1)n \in B\}$ is large in \mathbb{N}^2 .*

In [2], the authors also gave an polynomial extension of van der Waerden’s theorem: Let p_1, \dots, p_d be polynomials with $p_i(n) \in \mathbb{Z}, p_i(0) = 0$, if $S \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is piecewise syndetic, then the set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in S, n \neq 0\}$ is not empty. They asked a question [2, Question 4.7] as follows

Date: September 6, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 03E05.

Key words and phrases. integral polynomial, central*, IP*-set, Δ*-set.

Question 1. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$. For which, if any, of the notions of “piecewise syndetic”, “central”, “central*”, “thick”, “PS*”, “IP*”, “IP_{<ω}*”, “IP_n*”, or “Δ*”, is it true that whenever A is a large subset of \mathbb{N} , $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$ is large in the same sense?

There is an obstacle to solve Question 1 directly with combinatorial methods since the fact that $\{(m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n)) : m, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is not a semigroup when $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$.

Recently, Huang, Shao and Ye [6] confirmed the question for subsets with “piecewise syndeticity” by showing the density of minimal points of a dynamical system of \mathbb{Z}^2 action associated with the piecewise syndetic set S and polynomials $\{p_1, \dots, p_d\}$. Wu [9] confirmed the question for subsets with “thickly syndeticity (PS*)” also by the method of dynamical systems.

In this paper, we study the rest of the Bergelson-Hindman’s question. It is unexpected that the answer turns negatively for the most of rest subsets. The following theorem is our main result.

Theorem 1.1. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be any integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$.

- (1) If A is thick in \mathbb{N} , then $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$ is thick in \mathbb{N}^2 .
- (2) Let “large” be any of “central*”, “IP*”, “IP_{<ω}*”, “IP_n*”, or “Δ*”. If $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$, then there exists a large set A in \mathbb{N} (resp. \mathbb{Z}) such that the set

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \text{ (resp. } \mathbb{Z}^2) : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is not large.

The proofs of Theorem 1.1 are done by combinatorial arguments. It remains to be a question for central sets, since we have no suitable way to determine whether a given set is central or not.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state some necessary notions and some known facts used in the paper. In Section 3, we first confirm Question 1 for “thick” subsets and then we construct suitable large sets to prove Theorem 1.1 (2).

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Professors Song Shao and Xiangdong Ye for helpful discussions and remarks.

2. PRELIMINARY

Given a semigroup (S, \cdot) . Let $\mathcal{P}(S)$ be the collection of non-empty subsets of S and $\mathcal{P}_f(S)$ be the collection of finite non-empty subsets. A subset \mathcal{F} of $\mathcal{P}(S)$ is a *family*, if it is hereditary upwards, i.e. $F_1 \subset F_2$ and $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ imply $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$. A family \mathcal{F} is proper if it is a proper subset of \mathcal{P} , i.e. neither empty nor all of \mathcal{P} . If a proper family \mathcal{F} is closed under finite intersections, then \mathcal{F} is called a filter. For a family \mathcal{F} , the dual family is

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \{F \in \mathcal{P} : S \setminus F \notin \mathcal{F}\} = \{F \in \mathcal{P} : F \cap F' \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } F' \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Let us recall some notions related to families.

Definition 2.1. Let (S, \cdot) be a semigroup. A subset A of S is called

- (1) *syndetic* if there is a finite subset $F \in \mathcal{P}_f(S)$ such that $S = \cup_{s \in F} s^{-1}A$.
- (2) *thick* if for every $F \in \mathcal{P}_f(S)$, there is $s \in S$ such that $Fs \subset A$.
- (3) *piecewise syndetic* if there exists some $G \in \mathcal{P}_f(S)$ such that for every $F \in \mathcal{P}_f(S)$ there exists $s \in S$ such that $Fs \subset \cup_{t \in G} t^{-1}A$.
- (4) *thickly syndetic* if it has non-empty intersection with any piecewise syndetic set.

It is clear syndetic*=thick and PS*=thickly syndetic, where PS is the family of piecewise syndetic subsets.

Definition 2.2. A subset $A \subset S$ is called a Δ -set if it contains $\Delta(\{x_n\}) = \{x_n - x_m : n > m\}$ for some infinite sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$; is called a Δ^* -set if it has non-empty intersection with any Δ -set.

In this paper, the operation in S is denoted by “+”. Given a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset S$. Let

$$FS(\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \alpha} s_i : \alpha \text{ is a finite non-empty subset of } S \right\}.$$


Definition 2.3. Let $A \subset S$. The set A is an *IP-set* if and only if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset S$ such that $FS(\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty) \subset A$. $B \subset S$ is an *IP*-set* if and only if $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every IP-set A .

The notion of central sets was introduced by Furstenberg [3], who defined them in terms of notions of topological dynamics. By a *dynamical system* we mean a pair (X, T) , where X is a compact metric space with a metric ρ and $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a homeomorphism.

Let (X, T) be a dynamical system and $x \in X$. We denote the orbit of x by $\mathcal{O}x := \{Tx : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. A point $x \in X$ is called a *transitive point* if $\overline{\mathcal{O}x} = X$. We say that a point $x \in X$ is *minimal* if any points in $(\overline{\mathcal{O}x}, T)$ is transitive. A pair Let $x, y \in X$, we say x proximal to y if there is a sequence $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\rho(T^{n_i}x, T^{n_i}y) \rightarrow 0$.

Definition 2.4. A subset $A \in G$ is a *central set* if there exists a dynamical system (X, G) , a point $x \in X$, and a minimal point y proximal to x , and a neighborhood U of y such that $A \supset N(x, U) := \{g \in G : gx \in U\}$. B is a *central* set* if and only if $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every central set A .

We have the following implications (see [3] for detailed proofs), which will be used to give counterexamples in the next sections



Definition 2.5. Let $n \geq 2$. A set $A \subset S$ is an *IP_n-set* if whenever \mathcal{F} is a finite partition of A , there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in S$ such that $FS(\{x_t\}_{t=1}^n) \subset F$. A set $B \subset S$ is an *IP_n*-set* if and only if $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for every IP_n set A .

Definition 2.6. A set $A \subset S$ is an $IP_{<\omega}$ -set if whenever \mathcal{F} is a finite partition of A and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in S$ such that $FS(\{x_t\}_{t=1}^n) \subset F$. A set $B \subset S$ is an $IP_{<\omega}^*$ set if and only if $B \cap A = \emptyset$ for every $IP_{<\omega}$ set A .

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} IP &\rightarrow IP_{<\omega} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow IP_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow IP_4 \rightarrow IP_3 \rightarrow IP_2, \\ IP_2^* &\rightarrow IP_3^* \rightarrow IP_4^* \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow IP_n^* \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow IP_{<\omega}^* \rightarrow IP^*. \end{aligned}$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we give the proof to our main theorem. We will prove Theorem 1.1 (1) first and Theorem 1.1 (2) follows from Theorems 3.3, 3.7, 3.10, and 3.11.

3.1. The case for a thick set.

Theorem 3.1. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$. If A is thick in \mathbb{N} , then

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is thick in \mathbb{N}^2 .

Proof. Assume that $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ is thick. There exists a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$[a_n, a_n + n] := \{a_n, a_n + 1, \dots, a_n + n\} \subset A.$$

For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, denote

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\min} &:= \min\{p_i(n) : 0 \leq n \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq d\}, \\ N_{\max} &:= \max\{p_i(n) : 0 \leq n \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq d\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we take suitable $n(N) \in \mathbb{N}$ and constant $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a_{n(N)} < b + N_{\min}, b + N_{\max} + N < a_{n(N)} + n(N).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} [b, b + N] \times [0, N] &= \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : b \leq m \leq b + N, 0 \leq n \leq N\} \\ &\subset \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), m + p_2(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

So the set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$ contains arbitrarily size blocks of integers, and hence, is thick. \square

Naturally, we can consider the dual notion of thick: syndetic. It is known that Bergelson-Hindman's theorem doesn't hold for syndetic subsets (remarked in [4], see also [2, Theorem 3.9]). For polynomials we have the following result.

Theorem 3.2. Let $p(n)$ be an integral polynomial with $p(0) = 0$. If A is syndetic in \mathbb{Z} , then $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : m + p(n) \in A\}$ is syndetic in \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Proof. Let $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be any thick set. It is clear that $B' := \{p(n) + m : (m, n) \in B\}$ is a thick set in \mathbb{Z} , so we have $A \cap B' \neq \emptyset$. Thus,

$$\{(m, n) : p(n) + m \in A \cap B'\} = \{(m, n) : p(n) + m \in A\} \cap B \neq \emptyset,$$

which implies that set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ is syndetic. \square

Remark. (1) Theorem 3.2 doesn't hold for $d = 2$ in general, since we may choose a thick subset $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and integral polynomials p_1, p_2 such that $B'_1 \cap B'_2 = \emptyset$, where $B'_i := \{p_i(n) + m : (m, n) \in B\}, i = 1, 2$. Thus, for any syndetic set A ,

$$\begin{aligned} \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : p_1(n) + m, p_2(n) + m \in A\} \cap B \subset \\ \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : p_1(n) + m, p_2(n) + m \in B'_1 \cap B'_2\} = \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

It deduces that $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : p_1(n) + m, p_2(n) + m \in A\}$ is not syndetic.

(2) The same result holds for \mathbb{N} if and only if the first coefficient of $p(n)$ is positive. Let A be syndetic in \mathbb{N} . Suppose the first coefficient of $p(n)$ is positive, it deduces that $|\{n : p(n) \leq 0\}| < +\infty$. Then for cofinite $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A - p(n)$ is syndetic with the same gap as A . Thus,

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p(n) \in A\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A - p(n)) \times \{n\}$$

is syndetic.

Otherwise, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is n_N such that $A - p(n) > N$ whenever $n > n_N$. Then

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p(n) \in A\} \cap \left(\bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} [n_N + 1, +\infty] \times [0, N] \right) = \emptyset,$$

where $\bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} [n_N + 1, +\infty] \times [0, N]$ is thick in \mathbb{N}^2 .

3.2. The case for \mathbf{IP}^* , \mathbf{IP}_n^* , $\mathbf{IP}_{<\omega}$ sets.

In this subsection, we give negative answers to Question 1 for \mathbf{IP}^* , \mathbf{IP}_n^* , $\mathbf{IP}_{<\omega}$ sets. We begin with the next lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $S = \{s_i : s_i < s_{i+1}\}$ be an infinite sequence of \mathbb{N} . If $s_{n+1} - s_n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an \mathbf{IP}^* -set.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is not an \mathbf{IP}^* -set. So there is an \mathbf{IP} -set $B = FS(\{t_i\})$ such that $(\mathbb{N} \setminus S) \cap B = \emptyset$. i.e., $B \subset S$. In particular, $t_n, t_n + t_1 \in S$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(s_{n+1} - s_n) \leq t_1 < \infty$, a contradiction. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$ and $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$. Then there exists an \mathbf{IP}^* -set A in \mathbb{N} such that the set*

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is not an \mathbf{IP}^ -set in \mathbb{N}^2 .*

Proof. It is enough to prove the case of $d = 1$ with $\deg p \geq 2$ since $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n) \in A\} \supset \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i n^i$ with $l \geq 2$ and $a_l > 0$ ¹. So there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p(n)$ is an increasing function whenever $n > 2^N$. Now we

¹As we know if $|\mathbb{N} \cap \{p(n) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}| < +\infty$, then $|\mathbb{N}^2 \cap \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : m + p(n) \in A \subset \mathbb{N}\}| < +\infty$ and the set would not be large. Thus, in the sequel, we always assume that $|\mathbb{N} \cap \{p(n) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}| = +\infty$. i.e., $a_l \geq 0$ when $p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i n^i, l \geq 2$.

begin to construct the IP^* -set we need. We take $(m_i, n_i) = (2^{iN}, 2^{iN}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \{p(n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_k}) + m_{i_1} + \cdots + m_{i_k} : i_1 < \cdots < i_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ &= \{s_n = p(n \cdot 2^N) + n \cdot 2^N : n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $s_{n+1} - s_n \rightarrow \infty$. Then by Lemma 3.3, $A = \mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an IP^* -set.

At the same time, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \notin S\} \\ &= \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \notin \{p(n_{i_1} + \cdots + n_{i_k}) + m_{i_1} + \cdots + m_{i_k} : i_1 < \cdots < i_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}\} \\ &\subset \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus FS(\{(m_i, n_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$FS\{(m_i, n_i)\} \cap \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \emptyset,$$

which means that $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\}$ is not an IP^* -set of \mathbb{N}^2 . \square

Next we consider the cases of IP_n^* ($n \geq 2$) and $\text{IP}_{<\omega}^*$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S = \{s_i : s_i < s_{i+1}\}$ be an infinite sequence of \mathbb{N} . If $\sum_{i=1}^n s_{k_i} \notin S$ for any $1 \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_n$, then $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an IP_n^* -set.*

Proof. Assume that there exists an IP_n^* -set B such that $(\mathbb{N} \setminus S) \cap B = \emptyset$, then we have $B \subset S$. By the definition, whenever \mathcal{F} is a finite partition of B , there exist $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B \subset S$ such that

$$\sum_{t=1}^n x_t \in FS(\{x_t\}_{t=1}^n) \subset F \subset B \subset S,$$

which contradicts with the hypothesis. \square

In the analogous way, we have

Lemma 3.6. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S = \{s_i : s_i < s_{i+1}\}$ be an infinite sequence of \mathbb{N} . If $\sum_{i=1}^n s_{k_i} \notin S$ for any $1 \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an $\text{IP}_{<\omega}^*$ -set.*

Theorem 3.7. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$ and $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$. Then there exists an IP_n^* -set (resp. $\text{IP}_{<\omega}^*$ -set) A in \mathbb{N} such that the set*

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is not an IP_n^ -set (resp. $\text{IP}_{<\omega}^*$ -set) in \mathbb{N}^2 .*

Proof. It is enough to prove the case of $d = 1$ with $p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i n^i$, $l \geq 2, a_l > 0$. Take $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p(\alpha), p'(\alpha) > 0$, and $p(2^{2^\alpha} + 2) > p(2^{2^\alpha}) + p(2^{2^1} + \cdots + 2^{2^{\alpha-1}})$ whenever $\alpha > \beta$.

Claim. $A := \mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an IP_2^* -set (so an IP_n^* -set, $\text{IP}_{>\omega}^*$ -set) where

$$S = \{s_n : s_n < s_{n+1}\} := \{p(n) + m : m = n = 2^{2^{i_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{i_k}}, \beta < i_1 < \cdots < i_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

If the Claim holds, we have

$$FS\{(m_i, n_i)\} \cap \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \emptyset$$

where $(m_i, n_i) = (2^{2^{i+\beta}}, 2^{2^{i+\beta}})$. Thus, $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\}$ is not an IP^* -set of \mathbb{N}^2 , moreover, not an IP_n^* -set (resp. $\text{IP}_{<\omega}^*$ -set).

Now we are going to prove the Claim. Suppose $a = s_{n_t} < b = s_{n_r}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= p(2^{2^{c_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}}) + 2^{2^{c_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}}, \\ b &= p(2^{2^{d_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{d_r}}) + 2^{2^{d_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{d_r}} \end{aligned}$$

for some $\beta < c_1 < \cdots < c_t, \beta < d_1 < \cdots < d_r$. There are three cases:

Case 1: $c_t = d_r$. In this case, we have

$$p(2^{2^1} + 2^{2^2} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}}) + 2^{2^1} + 2^{2^2} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}} < a + b < p(2^{2^{c_t+1}}) + 2^{2^{c_t+1}}.$$

So there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$s_n = p(2^{2^1} + 2^{2^2} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}}) + 2^{2^1} + 2^{2^2} + \cdots + 2^{2^{c_t}}, s_{n+1} = p(2^{2^{c_t+1}}) + 2^{2^{c_t+1}}.$$

Case 2: $c_t < d_r$ with $\{d_1, \dots, d_r\} \neq \{1, 2, \dots, d_r\}$. In this case, it follows from the choice of β we have

$$s_{n_r} = b < a + b < p(2^{2^{d'}} + 2^{2^{d_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{d_r}}) + 2^{2^{d'}} + 2^{2^{d_1}} + \cdots + 2^{2^{d_r}} = s_{n_r+1}$$

where $d' = \min(\{1, 2, \dots, d_r\} \setminus \{d_1, \dots, d_r\})$.

Case 3: $c_t < d_r$ with $\{d_1, \dots, d_r\} = \{1, 2, \dots, d_r\}$. In this case,

$$s_{n_r} = b < a + b < p(2^{2^{d_r+1}}) + 2^{2^{d_r+1}} = s_{n_r+1}.$$

Among all cases above, $s_n < a + b < s_{n+1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which deduces that $a + b \notin S$. So $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ is an IP_2^* -set by Lemma 3.5. \square

3.3. The case for Δ^* and central* sets.

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.1 when “large” being “ Δ^* ” and “central*”.

Lemma 3.8. *If $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ (resp. \mathbb{Z}) doesn't contain any Δ -set, then $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z} \setminus S$) is a Δ^* -set.*

Proof. If $\mathbb{N} \setminus S$ isn't a Δ^* -set, there exists a Δ -set B such that $B \cap (\mathbb{N} \setminus S) = \emptyset$. Then we have $B \subset S$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $p(n)$ be an integral polynomial with $\deg p \geq 2$. Then $\{p(n) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ doesn't contain any Δ -set.*

Proof. Assume that $F = \{f_i\}$ be an infinite set such that $\Delta(F) \subset \{p(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then for $i < j$, we have $f_j - f_i = p(n_{i,j})$ for some $n_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$. So $p(n_{i,k}) = p(n_{i,j}) + p(n_{k,j}), \forall 1 \leq i < j < k$.

Suppose $p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i n^i$ with $l \geq 2, a_l > 0$. When n big enough, the equation $p(n_{1,k}) - p(n_{2,k}) = n_{1,2}$ has at most finitely many solutions. So $|\{p(n_{1,k}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}| < \infty$. Thus, we have

$$F = \{f_k\} \subset \{f_1 + p(n_{1,k}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is finite, this is a contradiction with the assumption. \square

Theorem 3.10. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$ and $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$. There exists a Δ^* -set A in \mathbb{N} such that the set*

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is not a Δ^ -set in \mathbb{N}^2 .*

Proof. It is enough to prove the case when $d = 1$ with $\deg p \geq 2$. Let $\{(m_i, n_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be any infinite subsequence of \mathbb{N}^2 with $m_i = n_i$ and $n_i < n_j$ whenever $i < j$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= \{p(n) + m : (m, n) \in \Delta(\{(m_i, n_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty)\} \\ &= \{p(n_j - n_i) + n_j - n_i : i < j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \{p(n) + n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9 that the set $A := \mathbb{Z} \setminus S \supset \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{p(n) + n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a Δ^* -set. But meanwhile, we have

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \notin S\} \subset \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \Delta\{(m_i, n_i)\}.$$

i.e.,

$$\Delta(\{(m_i, n_i)\}) \cap \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \emptyset,$$

which means that $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\}$ is not a Δ^* -set of \mathbb{N}^2 . \square

Next, we solve the case for central* sets.

Theorem 3.11. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_1, \dots, p_d be integral polynomials with $p_i(0) = 0$ and $\max\{\deg p_i\} \geq 2$. Then there exists a central* set A in \mathbb{N} such that the set*

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m + p_1(n), \dots, m + p_d(n) \in A\}$$

is not central in \mathbb{N}^2 .*

Proof. Suppose that $d = 1, p(n) = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i n^i$ with $a_l > 0, l \geq 2$. We construct a special thick set first. We take $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p(s_0) > 1$. By induction we obtain s_n satisfying

$$\begin{cases} 2(p(s_n) + s_n + n) < p(s_n + 1) + s_n, \\ p(s_n + n) + s_n + n < 2(p(s_n) + s_n) < p(s_{n+1}) + s_{n+1}, \\ p(s_n) + s_n + n < p(s_{n-1}) + s_{n-1} + p(s_n) + s_n < p(s_n + 1) + s_n. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$S := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} [s_n, s_n + n] \times [s_n, s_n + n].$$

Then S is a thick subset in \mathbb{N}^2 , therefore a central set.

Denote $D := \{p(n) + m : (m, n) \in S\}$. By the construction of S , we have $a + b \notin D$ whenever $a, b \in D$. Hence, D contains no IP-set. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that the set $A := \mathbb{N} \setminus D$ is an IP*-set, therefore a central* set.

Now we consider set $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\}$. We have

$$\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \notin D\} \subset \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus S.$$

i.e.,

$$S \cap \{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\} = \emptyset.$$

which means that $\{(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p(n) + m \in A\}$ is not a central* subset in \mathbb{N}^2 . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Beiglböck, Arithmetic progression in abundance by combinatorial tools, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **137** (2009), no. 12, 3981–3983.
- [2] V. Bergelson and N. Hindman, Partition regular structures contained in large sets are abundant, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **93** (2001), no. 1, 18–36.
- [3] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in ergodic theory and combinatorial number theory*. M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981.
- [4] H. Furstenberg and E. Glasner, Subset dynamics and van der Waerden's theorem, *Contemp. Math.*, **215** (1998), 197–203.
- [5] W. Gottschalk and G. Hedlund, *Topological dynamics*, *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*, Vol. 36. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R. I., 1955.
- [6] W. Huang, S. Shao and X. Ye, Topological dynamical systems induced by polynomials and combinatorial consequences, arXiv:2301.07873, 2023.
- [7] A. Leibman, Multiple recurrence theorem for nilpotent group actions, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **4** (1994), no. 6, 648–659.
- [8] J. de Vries, *Elements of Topological Dynamics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [9] Q. Wu, Some dynamical properties related to polynomials, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **152** (2024), no. 4, 1633–1646.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI UNIVERSITY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMICS, YANGPU,
SHANGHAI, 200433, P.R. CHINA

Email address: wuqinqi@mail.shufe.edu.cn