J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, 115(2008), no. 2, 345–353.

DETERMINATION OF THE TWO-COLOR RADO NUMBER FOR $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = x_0$

Song Guo[1] and Zhi-Wei Sun[2,*]

[1]Department of Mathematics, Huaiyin Teachers college
Huaian 223001, People's Republic of China
guosong77@sohu.com

[2]Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University
Nanjing 210093, People's Republic of China
zwsun@nju.edu.cn
http://math.nju.edu.cn/~zwsun

Abstract. For positive integers $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$, we determine the least positive integer $R(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ such that for every 2-coloring of the set $[1, n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with $n \geqslant R(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ there exists a monochromatic solution to the equation $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = x_0$ with $x_0, \ldots, x_m \in [1, n]$. The precise value of $R(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ is shown to be $av^2 + v - a$, where $a = \min\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ and $v = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$. This confirms a conjecture of B. Hopkins and D. Schaal.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, and $[a, b] = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : a \leqslant x \leqslant b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$, we call a function $\Delta : [1, n] \to [0, k-1]$ a *k-coloring* of the set $[1, n]$, and $\Delta(i)$ the *color* of $i \in [1, n]$. Given a k-coloring of the set $[1, n]$, a solution to the linear diophantine equation

$$a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = 0 \quad (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z})$$

with $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m \in [1, n]$ is called *monochromatic* if $\Delta(x_0) = \Delta(x_1) = \cdots = \Delta(x_m)$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. In 1916, I. Schur [S] proved that if $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is sufficiently large then for every *k-coloring* of the set $[1, n]$, there exists a monochromatic solution to

$$x_1 + x_2 = x_0$$

Key words and phrases. Rado number; coloring; linear equation; Ramsey theory.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05D10; Secondary 11B75, 11D04.

*This author is responsible for communications, and supported by the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars (No. 10425103) and a Key Program of NSF (No. 10331020) in China.

with $x_0, x_1, x_2 \in [1, n]$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Provided that $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = 0$ for some $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, m\}$, R. Rado showed that for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ the equation $a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = 0$ always has a monochromatic solution when a k-coloring of $[1, n]$ is given; the least value of such an n is called the *k-color Rado number* for the equation. Since $-1 + 1 = 0$, Schur's theorem is a particular case of Rado's result. The reader may consult the book [LR] by B. M. Landman and A. Robertson for a survey of results on Rado numbers.

In this paper, we are interested in precise values of 2-color Rado numbers. By a theorem of Rado [R], if $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ contain both positive and negative integers and at least three of them are nonzero, then the homogeneous linear equation

$$a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = 0$$

has a monochromatic solution with $x_0, \ldots, x_m \in [1, n]$ for any sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a 2-coloring of $[1, n]$. In particular, if $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ($m \geqslant 2$) then there is a least positive integer $n_0 = R(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ such that for any $n \geqslant n_0$ and a 2-coloring of $[1, n]$ the diophantine equation

$$a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_mx_m = x_0 \tag{1.0}$$

always has a monochromatic solution with $x_0, \ldots, x_m \in [1, n]$.

In 1982, A. Beutelspacher and W. Brestovansky [BB] proved that the 2-color Rado number $R(1, \ldots, 1)$ for the equation $x_1 + \cdots + x_m = x_0$ ($m \geqslant 2$) is $m^2 + m - 1$. In 1991, H. L. Abbott [A] extended this by showing that for the equation

$$a(x_1 + \cdots + x_m) = x_0 \quad (a \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \text{ and } m \geqslant 2)$$

the corresponding 2-color Rado number $R(a, \ldots, a)$ is $a^3m^2 + am - a$; that $R(a, \ldots, a) \geqslant a^3m^2 + am - a$ was first obtained by L. Funar [F], who conjectured the equality. In 2001, S. Jones and D. Schaal [JS] proved that if $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ($m \geqslant 2$) and $\min\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\} = 1$ then $R(a_1, \ldots, a_m) = b^2 + 3b + 1$ where $b = a_1 + \cdots + a_m - 1$; this result actually appeared earlier in Funar [F].

In 2005 B. Hopkins and D. Schaal [HS] showed the following result.

Theorem 1.0. *Let $m \geqslant 2$ be an integer and let $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then*

$$R(a, b) \geqslant R(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \geqslant a(a + b)^2 + b, \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$a = \min\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i - a. \tag{1.2}$$

Hopkins and Schaal ([HS]) conjectured further that the two inequalities in (1.1) are actually equalities and verified this in the case $a = 2$.

In this paper we confirm the conjecture of Hopkins and Schaal; namely, we establish the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $m \geqslant 2$ be an integer and let $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then*

$$R(a_1, \ldots, a_m) = a(a+b)^2 + b, \tag{1.3}$$

where a and b are as in (1.2).

By Theorem 1.1, if $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $n \geqslant av^2 + v - a$ with $a = \min\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ and $v = a_1 + \cdots + a_m$, then for any $X \subseteq [1, n]$ either there are $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in X$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^m a_ix_i \in X$ or there are $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in [1, n] \setminus X$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^m a_ix_i \in [1, n] \setminus X$.

In the next section we reduce Theorem 1.1 to the following weaker version.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $a, b, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $a \leqslant b$ and $n \geqslant av^2 + b$ with $v = a + b$. Suppose that $b(b-1) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $\Delta : [1, n] \to [0, 1]$ is a 2-coloring of $[1, n]$ with $\Delta(1) = 0$ and $\Delta(a) = \Delta(b) = \delta \in [0, 1]$. Then there is a monochromatic solution to the equation*

$$ax + by = z \quad (x, y, z \in [1, n]). \tag{1.4}$$

In Sections 3 and 4 we will prove Theorem 1.2 in the cases $\delta = 0$ and $\delta = 1$ respectively.

2. Reduction of Theorem 1.1 to Theorem 1.2

Let us first give a key lemma which will be used in Sections 2–4.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $k, l, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $l < n$, and let $\Delta : [1, n] \to [0, 1]$ be a 2-coloring of $[1, n]$. Suppose that $kx + ly = z$ has no monochromatic solution with $x, y, z \in [1, n]$. Assume also that u is an element of $[1, n - l]$ with $\Delta(u) = \delta$ and $\Delta(u + l) = 1 - \delta$.*

(i) *If $w \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $w \leqslant (n - ku)/l$ and $\Delta(w) = \delta$, then $\Delta(w - hk) = \delta$ whenever $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w - hk > 0$.*

(ii) *If $w \in [1, n]$ and $\Delta(w) = 1 - \delta$, then $\Delta(w + hk) = 1 - \delta$ whenever $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w + hk \leqslant (n - ku)/l$.*

Proof. It suffices to handle the case $h = 1$, since we can consider $w \mp (h-1)k$ instead of w if $h > 1$.

(i) As $\Delta(u) = \Delta(w) = \delta$ and $w \leqslant (n - ku)/l$, we have $\Delta(ku + lw) = 1 - \delta$. By $\Delta(u + l) = 1 - \delta$ and $k(u + l) + l(w - k) = ku + lw$, if $w - k > 0$ then $\Delta(w - k) = \delta$.

(ii) Since $\Delta(u+l)=\Delta(w)=1-\delta$ and $(w+k)l+ku\leqslant n$, we have $\Delta(k(u+l)+lw)=\delta$. Note that $\Delta(u)=\delta$ and $ku+l(w+k)=k(u+l)+lw$. So $\Delta(w+k)=1-\delta$.

The proof of Lemma 2.1 is now complete. □

Now we deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 1.0, it suffices to show that $R(a,b)\leqslant av^2+b$, where $v=a+b$. Since $m\geqslant 2$, we have $a\leqslant b$.

Let $n\geqslant av^2+b$ be an integer and let $\Delta:[1,n]\to[0,1]$ be a 2-coloring of $[1,n]$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Delta(1)=0$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there doesn't exist any monochromatic solution to the equation (1.4).

Since $a\cdot 1+b\cdot 1=v$, we have $\Delta(v)\neq\Delta(1)=0$, and hence

$$\Delta(v)=1. \tag{2.1}$$

Similarly, as $av+bv=v^2$, we must have

$$\Delta(v^2)=0 \quad\text{and}\quad \Delta(av^2+b\cdot 1)=1. \tag{2.2}$$

Claim 2.1. $\Delta(a)=\Delta(b)\neq\Delta(av)=\Delta(bv)$.

As $aa+ba=av$ and $ab+bb=bv$, we have

$$\Delta(av)\neq\Delta(a) \quad\text{and}\quad \Delta(bv)\neq\Delta(b).$$

If $\Delta(a)\neq\Delta(b)$, then

$$\Delta(av)=\Delta(b)\neq\Delta(a)=\Delta(bv)$$

and hence

$$\Delta(a)=\Delta(ab+b(av))=\Delta(abv+ab)=\Delta(a(bv)+ba)=\Delta(b),$$

which contradicts $\Delta(a)\neq\Delta(b)$.

Below, we let $\delta=\Delta(a)=\Delta(b)$ and hence $\Delta(av)=\Delta(bv)=1-\delta$.

In view of Claim 2.1 and Theorem 1.2, a divides $b(b-1)$ since (1.4) has no monochromatic solution.

Claim 2.2. $\Delta(ab+bv+(1-\delta)av)=0$.

Recall that $\Delta(v)=1$ by (2.1). If $\delta=1$, then $\Delta(b)=1=\Delta(v)$, and hence $\Delta(ab+bv)=0$. When $\delta=0$, we have $\Delta(b)=0<\Delta(b+a)=\Delta(v)=1$, and hence $\Delta(v+b)=1$ by Lemma 2.1(ii) (with $k=u=b$, $l=a$ and $w=v$) since $v+b=a+2b\leqslant(n-b^2)/a$; therefore, $\Delta(a(v+b)+bv)=0$. This completes the proof of Claim 2.2.

Observe that

$$ab(v-1) + ab + b + (1-\delta)av \leqslant abv + b + av \leqslant av^2 + b \leqslant n.$$

Claim 2.3. For every $i = 1, \dots, a$ we have

$$\Delta(ib(v-1) + ab + b + (1-\delta)av) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

When $i = 1$, (2.3) holds by Claim 2.2. Now let $1 < i \leqslant a$ and assume that (2.3) holds with i replaced by $i-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta\left(a\left((i-1)\frac{b(b-1)}{a} + ib + (1-\delta)v\right) + b\cdot 1\right)\\ =&\Delta((i-1)b(v-1) + ab + b + (1-\delta)av) = 0 = \Delta(1)\end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis. Therefore,

$$\Delta\left((i-1)\frac{b(b-1)}{a} + ib + (1-\delta)v\right) = 1 = \Delta(v),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta(ib(v-1) + ab + b + (1-\delta)av)\\ =&\Delta\left(a\left((i-1)\frac{b(b-1)}{a} + ib + (1-\delta)v\right) + bv\right) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the induction proof of Claim 2.3.

Putting $i = a$ in (2.3) we find that

$$\Delta\left(abv + b + (1-\delta)av\right) = 0 = \Delta(1).$$

If $\delta = 1$, then $\Delta(a(bv) + b\cdot 1) = 0 = \Delta(1)$, and hence $\Delta(bv) = 1 = \Delta(b)$, which is impossible by Claim 2.1. Thus $\delta = 0$ and

$$\Delta(aa + b(av + a + 1)) = \Delta(abv + b + av) = 0 = \Delta(a).$$

It follows that $\Delta(av + a + 1) = 1$. Also, if $a = 1$ then $\Delta(av^2 + b) = \Delta(abv + b + av) = 0$. Since $\Delta(av^2 + b) = 1$ by (2.2), and

$$a(av - b) + b(av + a + 1) = av^2 + b,$$

we must have $a \geqslant 2$ and $\Delta(av - b) = 0$. As $\Delta(b) = 0 < \Delta(b + a) = 1$ and

$$av - b = v^2 - b(v+1) < v^2 - b(b-1) \leqslant v^2 - \frac{b(b-1)}{a} \leqslant \frac{n - b^2}{a},$$

we have $\Delta(a^2 + b) = \Delta(av - b - (a-2)b) = 0$ by Lemma 2.1(i) with $k = u = b$, $l = a$ and $w = av - b$. However, $\Delta(a^2 + b) = \Delta(aa + b\cdot 1) = 1$ since $\Delta(a) = 0 = \Delta(1)$, so we get a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2 with $\delta = 0$

To prove Theorem 1.2 in the case $\delta = 0$, we should deduce a contradiction under the assumption that (1.4) has no monochromatic solution. Recall the condition $\Delta(1) = \Delta(a) = \Delta(b) = 0$. It is clear that $\Delta(a \cdot 1 + b \cdot 1) \neq \Delta(1) = 0$.

Note that $a(v-1) + b(v-1) = v^2 - v \leqslant av^2 + b \leqslant n$. We make the following claim first.

Claim 3.1. $\Delta(ai + bj) = 1$ for any $i, j \in [1, a]$.

Since $\Delta(a) = 0 < \Delta(a+b) = 1$ and

$$v + (i-1)a \leqslant a^2 + b \leqslant \frac{ab^2 + 2a^2b + a^3 - a^2}{b} < \frac{av^2 + b - a^2}{b} \leqslant \frac{n - a^2}{b},$$

we have $\Delta(ai + b) = 1$ by Lemma 2.1(ii) with $k = u = a$, $l = b$ and $w = v$. Similarly, as

$$(ai + b) + b(j-1) \leqslant a^2 + ab = av = v^2 - bv < v^2 - b\frac{b-1}{a} \leqslant \frac{n - b^2}{a},$$

by Lemma 2.1(ii) with $k = u = b$, $l = a$ and $w = ai + b$ we get that

$$\Delta(ai + bj) = \Delta(ai + b + b(j-1)) = \Delta(ai + b) = 1.$$

This proves Claim 3.1.

Claim 3.2. $\Delta(c) = 0$ for any $c \in [1, v-1]$.

Suppose that $c \in [b+1, v-1]$ and $\Delta(c) = 1$. Then $\Delta(av+bc) = 0 = \Delta(a)$ since $\Delta(v) = 1 = \Delta(c)$. Therefore,

$$\Delta(a(av + bc) + ba) = 1.$$

Clearly,

$$a(av + bc) + ba = a(a^2 + b(c - b + 1)) + b(a^2 + ba),$$

and $\Delta(a^2 + b(c - b + 1)) = 1 = \Delta(a^2 + ba)$ by Claim 3.1. Thus we get a monochromatic solution to (1.4), contradicting our assumption. So, $\Delta(c) = 0$ for all $c \in [b+1, v-1]$.

Now let $c \in [1, b]$. Then there is $\bar{c} \in [b, v-1]$ such that $\bar{c} - c = ha$ for some $h \in \mathbb{N}$ (e.g., $\bar{c} = c$ when $c = b$). Recall that $\Delta(a) = 0 < \Delta(a+b) = \Delta(v) = 1$ and also $\Delta(b) = 0$. As $\Delta(\bar{c}) = 0$ and

$$\bar{c} < v < \frac{v^2 - a}{b} < \frac{av^2 + b - a^2}{b} \leqslant \frac{n - a^2}{b},$$

by Lemma 2.1(i) with $k = u = a$, $l = b$ and $w = \bar{c}$, we have $\Delta(c) = \Delta(\bar{c} - ha) = 0$. This concludes the proof of Claim 3.2.

Claim 3.3. $\Delta(ai + bj) = 1$ for any $i, j \in [1, v-1]$.

By Claim 3.2 we have $\Delta(i) = \Delta(j) = 0$. Thus $\Delta(ai + bj) = 1$ since (1.4) has no monochromatic solution. So Claim 3.3 holds.

Let d be the greatest common divisor of a and b. Since $a \nmid b$, we have $d < a < b$, hence both $a' = a/d$ and $b' = b/d$ are greater than one. By elementary number theory, there is $s \in [1, b'-1]$ such that $a's \equiv 1 \pmod{b'}$. Since $1 < a's < a'b'$, we have $t = (a's-1)/b' \in [1, a'-1]$ and $b't < a'b' \leqslant av$. Observe that

$$a(av + b's) + b(av - b't) = av(a + b) + b'd = av^2 + b \leqslant n.$$

As $\Delta(v^2) = \Delta(av + bv) \neq \Delta(v) = 1$, we have $\Delta(v^2) = 0 = \Delta(1)$ and hence $\Delta(av^2 + b \cdot 1) = 1$. Therefore,

$$\Delta(av + b's) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Delta(av - b't) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $a + s, a - t \in [1, v-1]$, we have

$$\Delta(av + bs) = \Delta(a^2 + b(a + s)) = 1 = \Delta(a^2 + b(a - t)) = \Delta(av - bt)$$

by Claim 3.3, which contradicts (3.1) if $b = b'$. So $b' \neq b$, and hence $d > 1$.

In view of (3.1), we distinguish two cases.

Case 3.1. $\Delta(av + b's) = 0$.

Choose $s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $1 \leqslant as_1 - b't \leqslant a$. Since $as_1 \leqslant a + b't \leqslant a + b(a-1) \leqslant ab$, we have $s_1 \leqslant b$. Clearly, $\Delta(aa + ba) = \Delta(as_1 + b \cdot 1) = 1$ by Claim 3.3, and

$$a(a^2 + ab) + b(as_1 + b) \leqslant a^2v + b(a + ba) \leqslant av^2 + b \leqslant n.$$

Therefore,

$$\Delta(a(a^2 + ab) + b(as_1 + b)) = 0.$$

However,

$$a(a^2 + ab) + b(as_1 + b) = a(av + b's) + b(as_1 - b't + b - 1)$$

and $\Delta(as_1 - b't + b - 1) = 0$ by Claim 3.2. This contradicts the assumption that (1.4) has no monochromatic solution.

Case 3.2. $\Delta(av - b't) = 0$.

Choose $s_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that $0 \leqslant a't - as_2 \leqslant a - 1$. Clearly, $0 \leqslant s_2 \leqslant t \leqslant a' - 1 < a - 1$. With the help of Claim 3.2, $\Delta(a't - as_2 + b) = 0 = \Delta(av - b't)$. Since

$$a(av - b't) + b(a't - as_2 + b) = a^2v - abs_2 + b^2 \leqslant av^2 + b \leqslant n,$$

we have $\Delta(a^2v - abs_2 + b^2) = 1$. Observe that

$$a^2v - abs_2 + b^2 = a(a^2 + b) + b(a(a - 1 - s_2) + b)$$

and $\Delta(a^2 + b) = \Delta(a(a - 1 - s_2) + b) = 1$ by Claim 3.3. So we get a monochromatic solution to (1.4), contradicting our assumption.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2 with $\delta = 1$

Assume the conditions of Theorem 1.2 with $\delta = 1$, and that (1.4) doesn't have a monochromatic solution. Our goal is to deduce a contradiction.

Since $\Delta(a) = \Delta(b) = \delta = 1$, $av = aa + ba$ and $bv = ab + bb$, we have

$$\Delta(av) = \Delta(bv) = 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Thus there is a positive multiple $u_1 \leqslant b(v-1)$ of b such that $\Delta(u_1) = 1$ and $\Delta(u_1 + b) = 0$; also there is a positive multiple $u_2 \leqslant a(v-1)$ of a such that $\Delta(u_2) = 1$ and $\Delta(u_2 + a) = 0$.

Observe that

$$a^2 + a + 1 < a^2 \cdot \frac{v}{b} + a + 1 = \frac{(av^2 + b) - ab(v-1)}{b} \leqslant \frac{n - au_1}{b}.$$

As $\Delta(1) = 0$ and $1 + a < a^2 + a + 1$, we have $\Delta(1 + a) = 0$ by Lemma 2.1(ii) with $k = a$, $l = b$, $u = u_1$ and $w = 1$. Thus,

$$\Delta(av + v) = \Delta(a(a+1) + b(a+1)) = 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Claim 4.1. $\Delta(a^2 + a) = 1 \Rightarrow \Delta(a) = \Delta(2a) = \cdots = \Delta(a^2) = 1$.

Recall that $\Delta(u_1) = 1 > \Delta(u_1 + b) = 0$ and $a^2 + a < (n - au_1)/b$. By Lemma 2.1(i) with $k = a$, $l = b$, $u = u_1$ and $w = a^2 + a$, if $\Delta(a^2 + a) = 1$ then $\Delta(a^2 + a - ha) = 1$ for all $h = 0, \ldots, a$. This proves Claim 4.1.

Claim 4.2. For $w \in [1, n]$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w + hb \leqslant av + b$, we have $\Delta(w) = 0 \Rightarrow \Delta(w + hb) = 0$.

Note that

$$av + b < av + b + \frac{b}{a} = \frac{(av^2 + b) - ab(v-1)}{a} \leqslant \frac{n - bu_2}{a}.$$

So we get Claim 4.2 by applying Lemma 2.1(ii) with $k = b$, $l = a$ and $u = u_2$.

Write $b = aq + r$ with $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r < a$. Since $a \leqslant b$ and $a \nmid b(b-1)$, we have $q \geqslant 1$ and $r \geqslant 2$.

Claim 4.3. $\Delta(r) = 0 \Longrightarrow \Delta(a^2) = 0$.

Assume that $\Delta(r) = 0$. As $\Delta(r + aq) = \Delta(b) = 1$, there is $u_3 \in \{r, r + a, \ldots, r + a(q-1)\}$ such that $\Delta(u_3) = 0$ and $\Delta(u_3 + a) = 1$. Since $\Delta(av) = 0$ (cf. (4.1)) and

$$av = v^2 - bv < v^2 - b^2 < v^2 + b - b(b-1) \leqslant \frac{(av^2 + b) - b(b-a)}{a} \leqslant \frac{n - bu_3}{a},$$

we have $\Delta(a^2) = \Delta(av - ab) = 0$ by Lemma 2.1(i) with $k = b$, $l = a$, $u = u_3$ and $w = av$.

Claim 4.4. $\Delta(r) = \Delta(ar) = 1 \Longrightarrow \Delta(av + a) = 0$.

Suppose that $\Delta(r) = \Delta(ar) = 1$. Then $\Delta(vr) = \Delta(ar + br) = 0$. So there is $u_4 \in \{ar, ar + b, \dots, ar + (r-1)b\}$ such that $\Delta(u_4) = 1$ and $\Delta(u_4 + b) = 0$. Since $\Delta(av) = 0$ by (4.1), and

$$av + a < av + a(a-r)\frac{v}{b} = av\frac{v-r}{b} < \frac{(av^2 + b) - a(vr - b)}{b} \leqslant \frac{n - au_4}{b},$$

we have $\Delta(av + a) = 0$ by Lemma 2.1(ii) with $k = a$, $l = b$, $u = u_4$ and $w = av$.

Claim 4.5. $\Delta(av + a) = 0$.

Clearly, $(a^2 + a) + ab = av + a \leqslant av + b$. If $\Delta(a^2 + a) = 0$, then we have $\Delta(av + a) = \Delta((a^2 + a) + ab) = 0$ by applying Claim 4.2 with $w = a^2 + a$ and $h = a$. In the case $\Delta(a^2 + a) = 1$, by Claim 4.1 we have $\Delta(a^2) = 1 = \Delta(ar)$, hence $\Delta(r) = \Delta(ar) = 1$ by Claim 4.3 and $\Delta(av + a) = 0$ by Claim 4.4.

Claim 4.6. There exists $u \in [1, ab - a]$ such that $\Delta(u) = 1$ and $\Delta(u + a) = 0$.

As a does not divide b, the greatest common divisor d of a and b is smaller than a, and hence $1 < a' = a/d < b' = b/d$. If $\Delta(db) = 0$, then we have

$$\Delta(ab) = \Delta(db + (a - d)b) = 0 < 1 = \Delta(a)$$

by applying Claim 4.2 with $w = db$ and $h = a - d$, hence there is $u \in \{a, 2a, \dots, (b-1)a\}$ such that $\Delta(u) = 1$ and $\Delta(u+a) = 0$. Below we work under the condition $\Delta(db) = 1$.

Case 4.1. $\Delta(d) = 1$.

In this case, $d > 1$ since $\Delta(d) \neq \Delta(1)$. Note that $\Delta(dv) = \Delta(ad+bd) = 1-\Delta(d) = 0$. As $\Delta(db) = 1$, for some $u \in \{db, db+a, \dots, db+(d-1)a\}$ we have $\Delta(u) = 1 > \Delta(u+a) = 0$. Note that $a'b'-a'-b' = (a'-1)(b'-1)-1 \geqslant 0$ and

$$u \leqslant dv - a = d^2(a' + b') - a \leqslant d^2a'b' - a = ab - a.$$

Case 4.2. $\Delta(d) = 0$.

Choose $s \in [0, b-1]$ such that $as \equiv d \pmod{b}$. Clearly $s \neq 0, 1$ since $d < a < b$. For $t = (as - d)/b$, we have $0 < t < a$. As $\Delta(d) = 0$ and $d + bt = as < ab \leqslant av + b$, we have $\Delta(as) = \Delta(d + bt) = 0$ by Claim 4.2 with $w = d$ and $h = t$. Recall that $\Delta(a) = 1$. So there is $u \in \{a, 2a, \dots, (s-1)a\}$ such that $\Delta(u) = 1$ and $\Delta(u + a) = 0$. Clearly, $u \leqslant (s-1)a < ab - a$. This concludes the proof of Claim 4.6.

Let u be as required in Claim 4.6. Then

$$av + v = v^2 - (b-1)v \leqslant v^2 - b(b-1) < \frac{(av^2 + b) - b(ab - a)}{a} \leqslant \frac{n - bu}{a}.$$

Recall that $\Delta(av+v)=1$ by (4.2). Thus $\Delta(av+a)=\Delta((av+v)-b)=1$ by Lemma 2.1(i) with $k=b$, $l=a$, and $w=av+v$. This contradicts Claim 4.5 and we are done.

Acknowledgments. The authors are very grateful to Prof. B. Hopkins for reading the initial version carefully, Prof. L. Funar for informing the authors about the references [A] and [F], and the two referees for many helpful comments.

References

[A] H. L. Abbott, *On a conjecture of Funar concerning generalized sum-free sets*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk (4) **9** (1991), 249–252.

[BB] A. Beutelspacher, W. Brestovansky, *Generalized Schur numbers*, in: Combinatorial Theory (Schloss Rauischholzhausen, 1982), Lecture Notes in Math., 969, Springer, New York, 1982, pp. 30–38.

[F] L. Funar, *Generalized sum-free sets of integers*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk (4) **8** (1990), 49–54.

[HS] B. Hopkins and D. Schaal, *On Rado numbers for* $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i x_i = x_m$, Adv. in Appl. Math. **35** (2005), 433–441.

[JS] S. Jones and D. Schaal, *Some 2-color Rado numbers*, Congr. Numer. **152** (2001), 197–199.

[LR] B. M. Landman and A. Robertson, *Ramsey Theory on the Integers*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.

[R] R. Rado, *Studien zur Kombinatorik*, Math. Z. **36** (1933), 242–280.

[S] I. Schur, *Über die Kongruenz* $x^m + y^m \equiv z^m \pmod{p}$, Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein. **25** (1916), 114–116.