CONNECTING SCHNIRELMANN DENSITY WITH FOURIER ANALYSIS AND THE HARDY–LITTLEWOOD CIRCLE METHOD

PU JUSTIN SCARFY YANG

Abstract. We explore possible bridges between Schnirelmann density and analytic number theory methods, particularly Fourier analysis and the Hardy–Littlewood circle method. The goal is to develop a hybrid framework where density arguments can be sharpened through harmonic techniques.

1. Introduction

While Schnirelmann density is a powerful combinatorial tool, its non-analytic nature limits its precision. On the other hand, Fourier analysis has enabled deep progress in additive number theory. In this paper, we propose new ideas and methods to connect these paradigms.

2. Fourier Analysis and Indicator Functions

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a set of interest. We define the *density Fourier transform* as follows:

Definition 2.1 (Density Fourier Transform)**.** Let $f_A(n) = 1$ if $n \in A$, and $f_A(n) = 0$ otherwise. The (finite) Fourier transform of f_A on $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ is given by

$$\hat{f}_A(\theta) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f_A(n) e^{-2\pi i n\theta}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *If $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with Schnirelmann density $\sigma(A) > 0$, then for any large N we have*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f_A(n) \geq \sigma(A),$$

and the zero Fourier coefficient satisfies

$$\hat{f}_A(0) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f_A(n) \geq \sigma(A)N.$$

3. Circle Method Interpretation

The Hardy–Littlewood circle method partitions the unit interval into *major arcs* and *minor arcs*.

Date: May 5, 2025.

Definition 3.1 (Major and Minor Arcs)**.** Let $Q > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. Define the major arcs $\mathfrak{M}$ by

$$\mathfrak{M} := \bigcup_{\substack{1\le q\le Q \\ (a,q)=1}} \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} : \left| \theta - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{\delta}{qN} \right\},$$

and let $\mathfrak{m} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathfrak{M}$ be the minor arcs.

We consider the generating function

$$S_A(\theta) := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f_A(n) e^{2\pi i n\theta}$$

and examine its L^2 mass.

Proposition 3.2 (Mass Distribution Estimate)**.** *Let $A \subseteq [0, N)$ with density $\delta = \frac{|A\cap[0,N)|}{N}$. Then*

$$\int_0^1 |S_A(\theta)|^2 \, d\theta = N \cdot \delta.$$

Proof. Parseval's identity implies

$$\int_0^1 |S_A(\theta)|^2 \, d\theta = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |f_A(n)|^2 = \sum_{n\in A\cap[0,N)} 1 = \delta N.$$

□

4. Toward an Analytic Schnirelmann Density

Definition 4.1 (Analytic Schnirelmann Density)**.** We define an *analytic density profile* by the normalized Fourier mass at low frequency:

$$\sigma_{\text{analytic}}(A) := \sup_{\theta\in\mathfrak{M}} \left| \frac{1}{N} S_A(\theta) \right|^2.$$

Proposition 4.2. *If A is an interval, then $\sigma_{analytic}(A) \to 1$ as $|A|/N \to 1$.*

Remark 4.3. This suggests that $\sigma_{\text{analytic}}(A)$ interpolates between full arithmetic structure (major arc concentration) and randomness (minor arc dispersion), possibly allowing an analytic substitute for Schnirelmann density.

5. Future Work

We propose to develop:

- Correlations between $\sigma(A)$ and $\sigma_{\text{analytic}}(A)$.
- Fourier-analytic characterizations of additive closure.
- Hybrid bounds for sumsets using both combinatorial and analytic tools.