Symbolic Sets for Proving Bounds on Rado Numbers

Tanbir Ahmed, Lamina Zaman, Curtis Bright

University of Windsor

August 2, 2025

Rado numbers

For a linear equation \mathcal{E} , the 3-colour Rado number $R_3(\mathcal{E})$ is the smallest integer n, if it exists, such that every 3-colouring of the integers $[1,n]=\{1,\ldots,n\}$ contains a monochromatic solution to \mathcal{E} .

For
$$\mathcal{E}$$
: $x + 3y = 3z$, we have $R_3(\mathcal{E}) = 27$, since

00100100200100100200100100

provides a 3-colouring of [1,26], but there is no way to colour [1,27] without introducing a monochromatic solution to $\mathcal E$.

Results

We focused on the equations ax + ay = bz and ax + by = bz.

We have computed a number of previously unknown exact values using SAT solvers, extending the results presented by Chang, De Loera, and Wesley (ISSAC 2022) to the values of

- $R_3(ax + ay = bz)$ for $1 \le b \le 15$ and $1 \le a \le 30$, and
- $R_3(ax + by = bz)$ for $1 \le a \le 15$ and $1 \le b \le 25$.

Results

Guided by the satisfying assignments generated by the SAT solver in the process of computing these values, we proved the following two theorems.

• For coprime positive integers a, b with $a > b \ge 3$ and $a^2 + a + b > b^2 + ba$,

$$R_3(ax + by = bz) \ge a^3 + a^2 + (2b + 1)a + 1.$$

• For odd integers $a \ge 7$,

$$R_3(ax + ay = (a+1)z) \ge a^3(a+1).$$

The Rado Value Problem in SAT

The formula: Given positive integers n and a linear equation \mathcal{E} , we construct a formula in CNF that is satisfiable if and only if there exists a 3-colouring of [1,n] avoiding monochromatic solutions of \mathcal{E} . Therefore, if the formula for [1,n-1] is satisfiable then $R_3(\mathcal{E}) \geq n$; and if the formula for [1,n] is unsatisfiable then $R_3(\mathcal{E}) \leq n$.

Variables: Variables are denoted by $v_{0,j}$, $v_{1,j}$, and $v_{2,j}$ with $1 \le j \le n$ and the meaning that $v_{i,j}$ is true if and only if colour i is assigned to integer j. There are 3n variables in the formula.

SAT Clauses for Rado

• At least one colour is assigned to every integer: For each integer $j \in [1, n]$, the clause

$$v_{0,j} \vee v_{1,j} \vee v_{2,j}$$

ensures at least one colour is assigned to j.

• At most one colour is assigned to every integer: For each integer $j \in [1, n]$, the clauses

$$\bigwedge_{0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < 3} (\neg v_{i_1,j} \vee \neg v_{i_2,j})$$

ensure at most one colour $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ is assigned to j.

• There is no monochromatic solution to \mathcal{E} : For each colour $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and for each solution (x, y, z) to \mathcal{E} , the clause

$$\neg v_{i,x} \lor \neg v_{i,y} \lor \neg v_{i,z}$$

6/17

ensures the solution (x, y, z) is not monochromatic in colour i.

New Values for $R_3(ax + by = bz)$

a b	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	14	14	27	64	125	216	343	512	729	1000	1331	1728	2197	2744	3375
2	43 94	14	31	14 73	125 125	27	343	64 512	729	125 1000	1331	216	2197 2197	343 2744	3375
-		61	14			14	343		27			64			125
4	173	43	109	14	141	31	343	14	729	125	1331	27	2197	343	3375
5	286	181	186	180	14	241	343	512	729	14	1331	1728	2197	2744	<u>27</u>
6	439	94	43	<u>61</u>	300	14	379	<u>73</u>	31	125	1331	14	2197	343	125
7	638	428	442	456	470	462	14	561	729	1000	1331	1728	2197	14	3375
8	889	<u>173</u>	633	43	665	109	644	14	793	141	1331	31	2197	343	3375
9	1198	856	94	892	910	<u>61</u>	896	896	14	1081	1331	<u>73</u>	2197	2744	125
10	1571	286	1171	181	43	186	1190	180	1206	14	1431	241	2197	343	31
11	2014	1508	1530	1552	1574	1596	1618	1584	1575	1580	14	1849	2197	2744	3375
12	2533	439	173	94	2005	43	2053	61	109	300	2024	14	2341	379	141
13	3134	2432	2458	2484	2510	2536	2562	2588	2574	2530	2541	2544	14	2913	3375
14	3823	638	3039	428	3095	442	43	456	3207	470	3113	462	3146	14	3571
15	4606	3676	286	3736	94	181	3826	3856	186	<u>61</u>	3795	180	3835	3836	14
16	5489	889	4465	173	4529	633	4593	43	4657	665	4576	109	4602	644	4620
17	6478	5288	5322	5356	5390	5424	5458	5492	5526	5560	5594	5424	5447	5474	5475
18	7579	1198	439	856	6355	94	6427	892	43	910	6571	61	6409	896	300
19	8798	7316	7354	7392	7430	7468	7506	7544	7582	7620	7658	7696	7488	7518	7530
20	10141	1571	8541	286	173	1171	8701	181	8781	43	8861	186	8941	1190	109
21	11614	9808	638	9892	9934	428	94	10060	442	10144	10186	456	10270	61	470
22	13223	2014	11287	1508	11375	1530	11463	1552	11551	1574	43	1596	11727	1618	11535
23	14974	12812	12858	12904	12950	12996	13042	13088	13134	13180	13226	13272	13318	13364	13110
24	16873	2533	889	439	14665	173	14761	94	633	2005	14953	43	15049	2053	665
25	18926	16376	16426	16476	286	16576	16626	16676	16726	181	16826	16876	16926	16976	186
26	21139	3134	18435	2432	18539	2458	18643	2484	18747	2510	18851	2536	43	2562	19059
27	23518	20548	1198	20656	20710	856	20818	20872	94	20980	21034	892	21142	21196	910
28	26069	3823	22933	638	23045	3039	173	428	23269	3095	23381	442	23493	43	23605
29	28798	25376	25434	25492	25550	25608	25666	25724	25782	25840	25898	25956	26014	26072	26130
30	31711	4606	1571	3676	439	286	28351	3736	1171	94	28591	181	28711	3826	43

Table 1

 $R_3(\mathcal{E}(3,0;a,b,b))$ for $1 \leq b \leq 15$ and $1 \leq a \leq 30$. The previously unknown values are presented in boldface, and the underlined entries correspond to equations whose coefficients are not coprime.

New Values for $R_3(ax + ay = bz)$

$b \setminus a$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	14	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
2	1	14	243	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞_	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞
3	54	54	14	384	2000	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>
4	∞	1	108	14	875	243	4459	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞
5	∞	105	135	180	14	864	3430	3072	12393	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>
6	∞	54	1	54	750	14	3087	384	243	2000	27951	<u>∞</u>	∞	<u>∞</u>	<u>∞</u>
7	∞	455	336	308	875	756	14	1536	8748	7500	23958	10368	54925	<u>∞</u>	∞
8	∞	<u>∞</u>	432	1	1000	108	2744	14	8019	875	21296	243	48334	4459	97875
9	∞	∞	54	585	1125	54	3087	1224	14	6000	18634	384	41743	30184	2000
10	∞	<u>∞</u>	1125	105	1	135	3430	180	7290	14	17303	864	37349	3430	243
11	∞	∞	2019	847	1958	1188	3773	1672	8019	5500	14	6048	35152	24696	77625
12	∞	<u>∞</u>	<u>∞</u>	54	2400	1	4116	54	108	750	15972	14	32955	3087	875
13	∞	∞	∞	1710	3445	1963	4459	1456	9477	6500	17303	5616	14	21952	60750
14	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	455	3675	336	1	308	10206	875	18634	756	30758	14	57375
15	∞	∞	∞	5408	54	105	6615	2760	135	54	19965	180	32955	20580	14
16	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	5725	432	7616	1	11664	1000	21296	108	35152	2744	54000
17	∞	∞	∞	∞	8330	4743	10064	3825	12393	8500	22627	7344	37349	23324	57375
18	∞	<u>∞</u>	<u>∞</u>	<u>∞</u>	12069	54	10962	585	1	1125	23958	54	39546	3087	<u>750</u>
19	∞	∞	∞	∞	16397	6726	14782	4332	16853	9500	25289	8208	41743	26068	60750
20	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>	1125	14700	105	19080	1	26620	135	43940	3430	108
21	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	455	54	6699	336	12579	27951	308	46137	54	875
22	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	∞	2019	20580	847	25047	1958	1	1188	48334	3773	74250
23	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	19056	27853	8556	32453	17250	35926	9936	50531	31556	77625
24	∞	<u>∞</u>	<u>∞</u>	∞	∞	∞	28956	54	432	2400	39600	1	52728	4116	1000
25	∞	∞	∞	∞	<u>∞</u>	∞	40163	10200	42975	105	47850	12850	54925	34300	135

Table 2

 $R_3(\mathcal{E}(3,0;a,a,b))$ for $1\leq a\leq 15$ and $1\leq b\leq 25$. The previously unknown values are presented in boldface, and the underlined entries correspond to equations whose coefficients are not coprime.

SAT Solvers and Resources

- Used CaDiCaL (Biere 2018) (via PySAT (SAT 2018)) for incremental SAT solving and Kissat (Biere 2021) for non-incremental runs.
- Approach: For each n, incrementally checked satisfiability until the first unsatisfiable instance, which determines the Rado number.
- The largest instance solved (showing $R_3(15x + 15y = 8z) = 97875$) contained 293,625 variables and 255,884,401 clauses, requiring 58.8 hours to solve.
- Total SAT instance generation time: ~ 11 hours.
- Total CPU time for unsatisfiable instances: ~251 hours; for satisfiable instances: \sim 53 hours.

Patterns in $R_3(ax + by = bz)$

Analysis of computed $R_3(ax + by = bz)$ reveals explicit formulas for each b.

Observation: For coprime a and b, the Rado number often takes the form $a^3 + a^2 + (2b+1)a + 1$.

•
$$b = 2$$
, $a \in [7,30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 5a + 1$

•
$$b = 3$$
, $a \in [4, 30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 7a + 1$

•
$$b = 4$$
, $a \in [7,30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 9a + 1$

•
$$b = 5$$
, $a \in [7, 30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 11a + 1$

•
$$b = 6$$
, $a \in [11, 30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 13a + 1$

•
$$b = 7$$
, $a \in [11, 30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 15a + 1$

•
$$b = 8$$
, $a \in [13, 30]$: $a^3 + a^2 + 17a + 1$

Ahmed, Zaman & Bright Symbolic Sets for Proving Bounds on Rado Numbers 10/17

Pattern Discovery and Conjecture

- The table patterns were uncovered via curve fitting and analyzing differences in the sequences.
- Constant differences suggested linearity, while constant third differences indicated cubic dependence.
- Conjecture: For coprime a, b with $a^2 + a + b > b^2 + ba$ and $a > b \ge 3$, and \mathcal{E} representing ax + by = bz,

$$R_3(\mathcal{E}) = a^3 + a^2 + (2b+1)a + 1.$$

We prove the **lower bound** in this conjecture (replace = by \geq).

Automating Case-Based Analysis

The proofs of our theorems involve a large number of tedious proof by cases. Shallit (2021) proposed that such case-by-case analyses are better performed by automated search algorithms to enhance both efficiency and correctness.

In this direction, we employ an automated verification approach using our tool AutoCase to verify case-based proofs. To check the proofs the tool needs support for operations on *symbolic sets* of the form [1, n] where n is a *symbolic* integer.

Note that typical computer algebra systems like Maple or Mathematica seem to lack the ability to even express the set [1, n] when n is symbolic, let alone do operations like union and intersection on such sets.

Proof Strategy

Theorem: For coprime a, b with $a^2 + a + b > b^2 + ba$ and $a > b \ge 3$, and \mathcal{E} representing ax + by = bz,

$$R_3(\mathcal{E}) \ge a^3 + a^2 + (2b+1)a + 1.$$

Proof Strategy: Find a colouring of the set

$$[1, a^3 + a^2 + (2b + 1)a]$$

that has no monochromatic solutions of equation \mathcal{E} .

Issue: Note that a and b here are *symbolic*, so the set $[1, a^3 + a^2 + (2b+1)a]$ is a symbolic range of integers. The colouring of the integers in this set must also be symbolic.

An Example Bound

As an example, consider \mathcal{E} : ax + y = z and the bound

$$R_3(\mathcal{E}) > a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a + 1.$$

Divide the set $[1, a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a]$ into the following seven intervals.

$$P_0 = [1, a], \quad P_1 = [a + 1, a^2 + 2a],$$

$$P_2 = [a^2 + 2a + 1, a^2 + 3a],$$

$$P_3 = [a^2 + 3a + 1, a^3 + 4a^2 + 4a],$$

$$P_4 = [a^3 + 4a^2 + 4a + 1, a^3 + 4a^2 + 5a],$$

$$P_5 = [a^3 + 4a^2 + 5a + 1, a^3 + 5a^2 + 6a],$$

$$P_6 = [a^3 + 5a^2 + 6a + 1, a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a].$$

Colour the integers in $P_0 \cup P_2 \cup P_4 \cup P_6$ red, the integers in $P_1 \cup P_5$ blue, and the integers in P_3 green.

14/17

Ahmed, Zaman & Bright Symbolic Sets for Proving Bounds on Rado Numbers

An Example Colouring

In order to verify that this colouring provides a valid lower bound, we need to verify:

- All integers in $[1, a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a]$ are coloured red (R), blue (B), or green (G). No integer was coloured two different colours.
- There are no all-red, all-blue, or all-green solutions of the equation $\mathcal{E}: ax + y = z$.

That is, $R \cup G \cup B = [1, a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a]$, R, B and G are pairwise disjoint, and $\{(x, y, z) : ax + y = z\}$ is disjoint with R^3 , B^3 , and G^3 .

Proving with AutoCase

AutoCase takes as input the symbolic sets R, G, and B and verifies that the colouring meets all the required properties.

For example, in our last example, SymPy would verify that

$$|R| + |G| + |B| = a^3 + 5a^2 + 7a$$
.

To check that there are no all-red solutions to \mathcal{E} , a Z3 instance is created that says x, y, z are integers with ax + y = z, and $x, y, z \in R$. Z3 verifies that the instance is unsatisfiable.

Conclusion

The colourings that the SAT solvers find can be used to provide lower bounds of Rado numbers.

In some cases, we were able to generalize these lower bounds to theorems parameterized by a symbolic integer a.

Computer algebra systems we tried did not have sufficient support for symbolic sets (subsets of [1, a] where a is symbolic) so we developed a new SC^2 tool with support for the operations that we needed in order to automatically verify our general lower bounds.