

NONCOVERING OF MULTIPLES

TORLEIV KLØVE

1.

In this paper we consider a combinatorial problem which arose in coding theory. Let $q > 1$ be an integer. We define a partial ordering on the non-negative integers by m covers n if and only if each coefficient in the q -ary expansion of m is greater than or equal to the corresponding coefficient in the q -ary expansion of n . Our problem is to find how many of the integers less than q^m do not cover any multiple of b where b is some fixed integer dividing $q^m - 1$. The number of such integers is the number of information symbols in some codes of length $q^m - 1$ over $\text{GF}(q)$, where q is a prime power. The codes are in a class of codes defined by Lin and Yiu [3]. We do not make use of this fact, however, and so we will treat the problem as a purely combinatorial problem.

2.

We will use the following notations:

The elements of an m -dimensional vector \mathbf{u} will be denoted u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{m-1} ,

$\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ if and only if $u_i \leq v_i$ for $i=0, 1, \dots, m-1$,

$$|\mathbf{u}| = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} u_i, \quad \|\mathbf{u}\| = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} u_i q^i.$$

The columns of an $n \times m$ matrix E will be denoted by e^0, e^1, \dots, e^{m-1} , the rows by e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m and the elements by e_{ij} .

Let b be a positive integer which is prime to q and let $s = \text{ord}_b(q)$, that is, s is the least positive integer such that $q^s \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$. Let

$$M = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\},$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \{\mathbf{l} \in M^{\lambda s} \mid \text{if } \mathbf{0} < \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{l}, \text{ then } \|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}\},$$

$$P(\lambda) = \#\mathcal{L}(\lambda), \text{ that is number of elements in } \mathcal{L}(\lambda).$$

Then $P(\lambda)$ is the number of integers $< q^{\lambda s}$ which do not cover any multiple of b .

Further let

Received August 18, 1977.

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in \mathbf{N}^s \mid \text{if } \mathbf{0} < g \leq f, \text{ then } \|g\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}\}$$

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ E \in \mathbf{N}^{(q-1) \times s} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i \in \mathcal{F} \right\},$$

$$A_E(\lambda) = \{l \in M^{\lambda s} \mid \#\{\mu \mid l_\mu = i \ \& \ \mu \equiv j \pmod{s}\} = e_{ij}\},$$

$$A(\lambda) = \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} A_E(\lambda).$$

The multinomial coefficients are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{c}{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m} &= \frac{c!}{c_1! c_2! \dots c_m! (c - \sum_{i=1}^m c_i)!} && \text{if } m > 0, c_i \geq 0 \text{ for} \\ & && \text{all } i, \text{ and } \sum c_i \leq c, \\ &= 1 && \text{if } m = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\binom{c}{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m} = \binom{\sum c_i}{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}} \binom{c}{\sum c_i}.$$

LEMMA 1. We have $A(\lambda) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$.

PROOF. Let $l \in A(\lambda)$. Then $l \in A_E(\lambda)$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathbf{0} < u \leq l$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\| &= \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} \sum_{\mu=0}^{s-1} q^{\sigma s + \mu} u_{\sigma s + \mu} \\ &\equiv \sum_{\mu=0}^{s-1} q^\mu \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} u_{\sigma s + \mu} \pmod{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|u\| \equiv \left\| \left(\sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} u_{\sigma s}, \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} u_{\sigma s+1}, \dots, \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} u_{\sigma s+s-1} \right) \right\| \pmod{b}.$$

Further

$$\sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} u_{\sigma s + \mu} \leq \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} l_{\sigma s + \mu} = \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} i e_{i\mu}.$$

By the definition of \mathcal{E} it follows that $\|u\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Therefore $l \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$.

LEMMA 2. We have $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \subseteq A(\lambda)$.

PROOF. Let $l \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ and let

$$e_{ij} = \#\{\mu \mid l_\mu = i \ \& \ \mu \equiv j \pmod{s}\}.$$

Let $E = (e_{ij})$. Then $l \in \Lambda_E(\lambda)$. We will show that $E \in \mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{g} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i$. Then

$$g_\mu \leq \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_{i\mu} = \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\lambda-1} l_{\sigma s + \mu}.$$

For $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, s-1$, let

$$k_\mu = \max \left\{ k \left| g_\mu > \sum_{\sigma=0}^{k-1} l_{\sigma s + \mu} \right. \right\} \quad \text{if } g_\mu > 0.$$

$$= -1 \quad \text{if } g_\mu = 0.$$

Then $-1 \leq k_\mu \leq \lambda - 1$. Let

$$u_{\sigma s + \mu} = l_{\sigma s + \mu} \quad \text{for } \sigma < k_\mu,$$

$$u_{k_\mu s + \mu} = g_\mu - \sum_{\sigma=0}^{k_\mu-1} l_{\sigma s + \mu},$$

$$u_{\sigma s + \mu} = 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma > k_\mu.$$

By the definition of k_μ , $0 \leq u_{k_\mu s + \mu} \leq l_{k_\mu s + \mu}$. Hence $\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{l}$ and so $\|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Further

$$\|\mathbf{g}\| = \sum_{\mu=0}^{s-1} g_\mu q^\mu = \sum_{\mu=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\sigma=1}^{q-1} u_{\sigma s + \mu} q^\mu \equiv \|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}.$$

Therefore $\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and so $E \in \mathcal{E}$.

LEMMA 3. If $E \neq E'$, then $\Lambda_E(\lambda) \cap \Lambda_{E'}(\lambda) = \emptyset$.

PROOF. Obvious.

LEMMA 4. We have

$$\#\Lambda_E(\lambda) = \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} \binom{|\mathbf{e}^j|}{e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{q-2,j}} \binom{\lambda}{|\mathbf{e}^j|}.$$

PROOF. For a given j there are

$$\binom{\lambda}{e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{q-1,j}} = \binom{|\mathbf{e}^j|}{e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{q-2,j}} \binom{\lambda}{|\mathbf{e}^j|}$$

ways to choose the elements $l_j, l_{s+j}, \dots, l_{j+(\lambda-1)s}$ such that e_{ij} elements are equal to i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, q-1$. Further, the choices for different j 's are independent.

We can now prove our main theorem.

THEOREM 1. *We have*

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} \binom{|e^j|}{e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{q-2,j}} \binom{\lambda}{|e^j|}$$

PROOF. By lemmata 1, 2 and 3

$$P(\lambda) = \#\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \#A(\lambda) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \#A_E(\lambda)$$

and so the theorem follows by lemma 4.

LEMMA 5 (Gould [2, identity no. 6. 44]).

$$\binom{\lambda}{m} \binom{\lambda}{n} = \sum_{j=0}^{\min(m,n)} \binom{n+m-j}{m-j, n-j} \binom{\lambda}{n+m-j}.$$

Using lemma 5 s times on each term in the sum in theorem 1 we get the next theorem.

THEOREM 2. *There exist non-negative integers $A_i = A_i(q, b)$ such that*

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{i \geq 0} A_i \binom{\lambda}{i}.$$

We could, by theorem 1 and lemma 5, get explicit expressions for the A_i 's. In general they will be very complicated however. In the remaining part of this

Table 1. $A_i(2, b)$

$i \backslash b$	3	5	7	9	11	13	15
1	2	8	6	26	150	336	14
2	2	20	24	144	1660	5160	146
3		16	48	324	5480	22176	896
4		4	45	414	8130	42504	3244
5			18	336	6810	46152	7464
6			3	168	3990	35616	11816
7				48	1760	22356	13696
8				6	530	10692	12012
9					100	3720	8008
10					10	912	4004
11						144	1456
12						12	364
13							56
14							4

paper we will give simpler expressions for the A_i 's in special cases. In particular, we have computed all $A_i(2, b)$ for $b=3, 5, \dots, 35$. The values for $b \leq 15$ are given in table 1. Since $A_0(2, b)=1$ for all b this is omitted in the table. In the next section we prove that $A_i(2, b)=0$ for $i \geq b$, these values are also omitted in the table.

3.

In this section we take a closer look at \mathcal{F} to get more information about the $A_i(q, b)$'s.

DEFINITION. If E is an $n \times m$ matrix, then

$$\sigma E = (e^{m-1}, e^0, e^1, \dots, e^{m-2}).$$

LEMMA 6. (i) If $\mathbf{u} \in N^s$, then $\|\sigma \mathbf{u}\| = q\|\mathbf{u}\| - u_{s-1}(q^s - 1)$,

(ii) if $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\sigma \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$,

(iii) if $E \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\sigma E \in \mathcal{E}$,

(iv) $\#A_{\sigma E}(\lambda) = \#A_E(\lambda)$.

PROOF. (i) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma \mathbf{u}\| &= u_{s-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{s-2} u_i q^{i+1} = u_{s-1} - u_{s-1} q^s + q \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} u_i q^i \\ &= -u_{s-1}(q^s - 1) + q\|\mathbf{u}\|. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $\mathbf{u}' \leq \sigma \mathbf{f}$, then $\mathbf{u} = \sigma^{-1} \mathbf{u}' \leq \mathbf{f}$. Hence $\|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Further by (i),

$$\|\mathbf{u}'\| = \|\sigma \mathbf{u}\| \equiv q\|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$$

since $\gcd(q, b)=1$.

(iii) If $E \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i \sigma e_i = \sigma \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i \in \mathcal{F}$$

by (ii) and so $\sigma E \in \mathcal{E}$.

(iv) This follows immediately from Lemma 4.

LEMMA 7 (Bovey, Erdős, and Niven [1]). Let $b > 0$ and $k \geq 0$ be integers with $b - 2k \geq 1$. Given any $n - k$ integers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-k} there is a non-empty subset of subscripts I such that $\sum_{i \in I} a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$ if at most $n - 2k$ of the integers lie in the same residue class modulo b .

Putting $k=0$ in lemma 7, we see that any sequence of b (or more) integers has a subsequence with sum congruent to zero modulo b . Hence we get the following corollary.

- COROLLARY. (i) If $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $|f| \leq b-1$,
(ii) $A_i(q, b) = 0$ for $i \geq b$.

By lemma 6 iv, to find $\#A_E(\lambda)$ it is enough to find $\#A_{\sigma^j E}(\lambda)$ for some j . We may for instance choose j such that if $\sigma^j E = (e'_{ij})$ then $\sum_i i e'_{i0} \geq \sum_i i e'_{ik}$ for all k . This motivates the next definition.

DEFINITION.

$$\mathcal{F}_r = \{f \in \mathcal{F} \mid f_0 \geq f_i \text{ for } i=1, 2, \dots, s-1 \text{ \& } |f|=r\}.$$

DEFINITION. To each $f \in \mathcal{F}_r$, we associate the sequence a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r with f_0 1's followed by f_1 q_1 's, f_2 q_2 's etc. where $q_i \equiv q^i \pmod{b}$ and $0 \leq q_i < b$. Then any subsequence has a sum $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$.

LEMMA 8. If $k \leq (b+1)/3$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$, then

- (i) $f_0 \geq b-2k+1 \geq (b+1)/3$,
(ii) $f_0 > \frac{1}{2}(b-k)$.

PROOF. (i) By Lemma 7, if $f_0 \leq b-2k$ then $f \notin \mathcal{F}$. Hence $f_0 \geq b-2k+1 \geq (b+1)/3$ when $k \leq (b+1)/3$.

(ii) By (i),

$$2f_0 - (b-k) \geq 2b-4k+2-b+k = b+1-3k+1 \geq 1.$$

LEMMA 9. If $k \leq (b+1)/3$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i q_i < b$.

PROOF. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{b-k} be the sequence associated with f , and let A be the set of integers that appears in the sequence. Let $S = S_\nu$ denote the sum of some arbitrary subsequence with ν elements, all > 1 .

The proof of the lemma is done in several steps.

- (I) If $S \leq \lambda b$, then $S \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1 \leq (\lambda-1)b + 2k - 2$.

Suppose $S \geq \lambda b - f_0$. Let $a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots, a_{i_\nu}$ be the subsequence with sum S . Since $\lambda b - S \leq f_0$,

$$a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{\lambda b - S}, a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots, a_{i_\nu}$$

is a subsequence also and its sum is

$$(\lambda b - S) \cdot 1 + S = \lambda b \equiv 0 \pmod{b}.$$

This is a contradiction. Hence

$$S \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1 \leq (\lambda - 1)b + 2k - 2$$

by lemma 8i.

(II) If $a \in A$, then $a \leq b - f_0 - 1$.

Since $a < b$ this follows from (I).

(III) If $S = S' + a$ where a is a summand of S , $a \leq f_0 + 1$, and $S' \leq \lambda b$, then $S \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1$.

By (I), $S' \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1$ and so $S \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1 + f_0 + 1 = \lambda b$. Again by (I), $S \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1$.

(IV) $S_{2\lambda+1} \leq \lambda b + b - f_0 - 1$.

We prove this by induction on λ . By (II) it is true for $\lambda = 0$. Suppose it is true for $\lambda - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} S_{2\lambda+1} &= S_{2\lambda-1} + a + a' \leq \lambda b - f_0 - 1 + 2(b - f_0 - 1) \\ &= \lambda b + b + b - 3f_0 - 1 \leq \lambda b + b - 2 \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis, (I), and lemma 8i. By (I), $S_{2\lambda+1} \leq \lambda b + b - f_0 - 1$.

(V) The sequence a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{b-k} has at most one element in $[f_0, b/2]$.

Suppose a, a' are two elements from the sequence which both are in $[f_0, b/2]$. Then $S_2 = a + a' \in [2f_0, b]$. By (I) $2f_0 \leq S_2 \leq b - f_0 - 1$ and so $3f_0 \leq b - 1$. This is a contradiction to lemma 8i.

(VI) If $a \in A$, then $a \leq b/2$.

First we notice that if $a > b/2$, then $a \geq (b+1)/2$. Let

α = number of elements of (a_i) in $[(b+1)/2, b)$,

β = number of elements of (a_i) in $[f_0, b/2]$,

γ = $[(\alpha - 1)/2]$ (the integer value),

δ = $\alpha - 1 - 2\gamma$.

Suppose $\alpha > 0$. Let $a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots, a_{i_{2\gamma+1}}$ be the $2\gamma + 1$ largest elements of (a_i) and let

$$U = \sum_{j=1}^{2\gamma+1} \{a_{i_j} - (b+1)/2\}, \quad V = \sum_{a_i \in [2, f_0 - 1]} a_i, \quad W = \sum_{j=1}^{2\gamma+1} a_{i_j},$$

$$T = \sum_{a_i=1} 1 + V + W = f_0 + V + W.$$

First we show that $U + 1 \geq \beta + \delta$. By (IV), $\beta \leq 1$, and by definition $\delta \leq 1$. Suppose $U + 1 < \beta + \delta$. Then $\beta = \delta = 1$ and $U < 1$. We will show that this gives a contradiction. Since $\beta = 1$, there exists an $a \in A \cap [f_0, b/2]$. We consider the cases b even and b odd separately. First b even. Then $U < 1$ implies $U = 1/2$, $a_i = b/2 + 1$, and $\gamma = 0$. If $a < b/2$, then $a \leq b/2 - 1$ and $b/2 - 1 - a \leq b/2 - 1 - f_0 < f_0$. Hence

$$S = (b/2 - 1 - a) \cdot 1 + a + a_i = b \equiv 0 \pmod{b},$$

a contradiction. If $a = b/2$, then the elements of $A \cap [f_0, b)$ are $a = b/2$ and $c = b/2 + 1$; a appear once in A and c twice since $\delta = 1$. Since $a + 2c < 2b$, $a + 2c + V \leq 2b - f_0 - 1$ by (III) and induction. Therefore

$$V \leq 2b - a - 2c - f_0 - 1 = b/2 - f_0 - 3.$$

Since $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 1$,

$$V \geq 2(b - k - f_0 - \alpha - \beta) = 2(b - k - f_0 - 3).$$

Combining we get $b/2 - f_0 - 3 \geq 2b - 2k - 2f_0 - 6$ and so

$$f_0 \geq 3b/2 - 2k - 3 \geq 3b/2 - 2(b+1)/3 - 3 = (b/2 - 2) + (b-5)/3.$$

Therefore, if $b \geq 5$, then $f_0 \geq b/2 - 2$ and so

$$S = (b/2 - 2) \cdot 1 + a + 2c = 2b \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$$

a contradiction. For $b = 2$ and $b = 4$ it is obvious that $\alpha = 0$, and in particular $\delta = 0$ and we have a contradiction. The case b odd is similar to the first subcase since $a \leq (b-1)/2 < b/2$. We omit the details.

By (IV), $W \leq \gamma b + b - f_0 - 1$. Hence by (III) and induction we get $V + W \leq \gamma b + b - f_0 - 1$, and so $T \leq \gamma b + b - 1$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} T &\geq \sum_{a_i \in \{1, f_0 - 1\}} 1 + U + (2\gamma + 1)(b + 1)/2 \\ &= (b - k - 2\gamma - 1 - \delta - \beta) + U + \gamma b + \gamma + (b + 1)/2 \\ &\geq \gamma b + b - 1 + (b + 1)/2 - \gamma - k - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two inequalities involving T we get

$$\gamma \geq (b + 1)/2 - k - 1.$$

Further

$$(2\gamma + 1)(b + 1)/2 \leq W \leq \gamma b + b - f_0 - 1 \leq \gamma b + 2k - 2$$

and so

$$\gamma \leq 2k - 2 - (b + 1)/2.$$

Combining the two inequalities involving γ we get $3k \geq b+2$ contradicting our assumption that $k \leq (b+1)/3$. Hence $\alpha=0$ and the proof of (VI) is complete.

$$(VII) \quad S_{b-k-f_0} \leq b-f_0-1.$$

By (VI) there are no elements $> b/2$ and at most one element $\geq f_0$ in the sequence (a_i) . Let S_ν be the sum of the ν largest elements in (a_i) . Then $S_1 \leq b/2$ and by (III) and induction $S_\nu \leq b-f_0-1$ for $\nu=1, 2, \dots, b-k-f_0$. Note that S_{b-k-f_0} is the sum of all the elements > 1 .

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{b-k} a_i = f_0 \cdot 1 + S_{b-k-f_0} \leq b-1$$

by (VII) and the proof of lemma 9 is complete.

THEOREM 3. Let $k \leq (b+1)/3$. Then \mathcal{F}_{b-k} can be characterized as follows:

Let $q_i \equiv q^i \pmod{b}$, $0 < q_i < b$. Then $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{s-1}) \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} f_i(q_i-1) < k$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i = b-k$.

PROOF. By lemma 9, if $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{s-1}) \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$, then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i = b-k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i q_i < b.$$

Hence

$$k > \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i(q_i-1) = \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} f_i(q_i-1)$$

since $q_0=1$. On the other hand, if $\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} f_i(q_i-1) < k$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i = b-k$ then $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i q_i < b$. If $0 < \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{f}$, then $0 < \sum u_i q_i \leq \sum f_i q_i < b$ and so

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| \equiv \sum u_i q_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}.$$

Hence $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. Further

$$k-1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} f_i(q_i-1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} f_i = b-k-f_0$$

and so $f_0 \geq b-2k+1 > (b-k)/2$. Therefore $f_0 > f_i$ for $i=1, 2, \dots, s-1$ and $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$.

Theorem 3 gives a very simple method to find the elements of \mathcal{F}_{b-k} . To illustrate this we give the leading coefficients of $P(\lambda)$ for $q=2$. We notice that if $q=2$, then $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}$.

THEOREM 4. *If $b \geq 3$, then $A_{b-1}(2, b) = s$.*

If $b \geq 5$, then $A_{b-2}(2, b) = s(b-1)$.

If $b \geq 7$, then

$$A_{b-3}(2, b) = s \left\{ \binom{b-1}{2} + b - 3 \right\} \quad \text{if } 2^i \equiv 3 \pmod{b} \text{ is solvable,}$$

$$= s \binom{b-1}{2} \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

If $b \geq 9$, then

$$A_{b-4}(2, b) = s \left\{ \binom{b-1}{3} + 2 \binom{b-4}{2} + 2(b-4) \right\} \quad \text{if } 2^i \equiv 3 \pmod{b} \text{ is solvable,}$$

$$= s \binom{b-1}{3} \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

PROOF. From the proof of theorem 2 it follows that only those f for which $|f| \geq b-k$ will contribute to $A_{b-k}(2, q)$.

If $k \leq (b+1)/3$, then $f_0 > f_i$ for $i=1, 2, \dots, s-1$ by lemma 8 (ii). Hence $f, \sigma f, \dots, \sigma^{s-1} f$ are all distinct and by lemma 6(iv) give the same contribution to

Table 2.

k	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	γ_4
1	$b-1$	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
2	$b-2$ $b-3$	0 1	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 $b-2$	0 $b-3$	0 0
3	$b-3$ $b-4$ $b-5$ $b-4$	0 1 2 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 $b-3$ $\binom{b-3}{2}$ $b-3$	0 $b-4$ $(b-4)(b-5)$ $b-4$
4	$b-4$ $b-5$ $b-6$ $b-5$ $b-7$ $b-6$ $b-5$	0 1 2 0 3 1 0	0 0 0 1 0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 $b-4$ $\binom{b-4}{2}$ $b-4$ $\binom{b-4}{3}$ $(b-4)(b-5)$ $b-4$

A_{b-k} . Hence to find A_{b-k} for $k \leq (b+1)/3$ it is enough to find the contribution from $f \in \mathcal{F}_{b-k}$ and multiply by s . Further the elements of \mathcal{F}_{b-k} are found by theorem 3. In table 2 we give the possible elements of \mathcal{F}_{b-k} for $k \leq 4$ and we list their contributions to A_{b-k} . In the table, β_i is the number of i 's in the sequence associated with f and γ_j is the contribution to A_{b-j} .

Adding up the contributions we get theorem 4 for $b \leq 3k-1$. The remaining cases, $k=3$ and $b=7$, $k=4$ and $b=9$ are true by table 1.

By the same method we can get expressions for $A_i(2, b)$ for $i=b-5, b-6$, etc. By a similar method we can also find $A_i(q, b)$ for $q > 2$. We notice that if $q \equiv q' \pmod{b}$ and $q > b, q' > b$ then $A_i(q, b) = A_i(q', b)$. We will use this fact in section 5 to find explicit formulae for $P(\lambda)$ when $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{b}$.

4.

In lemma 6 iv we proved that $\#A_{\sigma E}(\lambda) = \#A_E(\lambda)$. Therefore there are several equal terms in the sum in theorem 1 and we may bring them together. Formally, let

$$E \text{ eqv } E' \text{ if and only if } E = \sigma^i E' \text{ for some } i.$$

Then eqv is an equivalence relation. Let $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ denote the set of equivalence classes and $\langle \bar{E} \rangle$ the number of elements in the class \bar{E} . Then we can restate theorem 1 as follows.

THEOREM 5. *We have*

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{E \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}} \langle \bar{E} \rangle \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} \binom{|e^j|}{e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{q-2,j}} \binom{\lambda}{|e^j|}.$$

The advantage of theorem 5 over theorem 1 is that in some cases we may be able to give a characterization of one member in an equivalence class which is simpler than the definition of \mathcal{E} . For instance in theorem 3 we showed that if $q=2$ and $|f| \geq b - (b+1)/3$ then the equivalence class of f contains a member f' such that $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} f_i q_i < b$. In the remainder of this section we consider the case $q=2$ and $b=2^s-1$. The reason is twofold. The case is interesting from a coding theory point of view and we can show that each equivalence class contains a member f such that $\|f\| < b$.

DEFINITION. For $i=0, 1, \dots, s-2$ let q_i be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q_i(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_i, f_{i+1}, \dots, f_{s-1}) \\ = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_i - 2d_i, f_{i+1} + d_i, \dots, f_n) \end{aligned}$$

where $d_i = [(f_i - 1)/2]$.

Then ϱ_i will leave 1 (if f_i is odd) or 2 (if f_i is even) at position i and carry the exceeding to position $i+1$ where half of it is added.

LEMMA 10. For $i=0, 1, \dots, s-1$ we have

- (i) $\|\varrho_i f\| = \|f\|$ for all f ,
- (ii) if $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\varrho_i f \in \mathcal{F}$.

PROOF. (i) We have

$$\|\varrho_i f\| = \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} f_j 2^j - 2d_i \cdot 2^i + d_i \cdot 2^{i+1} = \|f\|.$$

(ii) Suppose $\mathbf{u} \leq \varrho_i f$. Let \mathbf{u}' be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} u'_j &= u_j && \text{if } j \neq i, i+1, \\ u'_i &= u_i + 2d_i && \text{if } u_{i+1} \geq d_i, \\ &= u_i + 2u_{i+1} && \text{if } u_{i+1} < d_i, \\ u'_{i+1} &= u_{i+1} - d_i && \text{if } u_{i+1} \geq d_i, \\ &= 0 && \text{if } u_{i+1} < d_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathbf{u}' \leq \mathbf{f}$ and so $\|\mathbf{u}'\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Further $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{u}'\|$. Hence $\|\mathbf{u}\| \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Therefore $\varrho_i f \in \mathcal{F}$.

DEFINITION. Let $f \in N^s$, $f_{s-1} = 0$, and let $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r = s-1$ be the subscripts of the elements of f which are zero, i.e., $f_j = 0$ for $j = j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r$, $f_j \neq 0$ otherwise. Let

$$v[f|i] = \varrho_{j_{i-1}} \circ \varrho_{j_{i-2}} \circ \dots \circ \varrho_{j_{i-1}+1}$$

for $i=1, 2, \dots, r$, where $j_0+1=0$,

$$v[f] = v[f|1] \circ v[f|2] \circ \dots \circ v[f|r].$$

LEMMA 11. If $f_j = 0$, then $v[\sigma^{s-1-j} f] \circ \sigma^{s-1-j} f = \sigma^{s-1-j} \circ v[f] f$.

PROOF. First we note that the last element of $\sigma^{s-1-j} f$ is $f_j = 0$ so that $v[\sigma^{s-1-j} f]$ is defined. Let $f = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_r)$ where F_1, F_2, \dots, F_r are blocks of elements, the last element in each block being 0, that is, $F_i = (f_{j_{i-1}}, \dots, f_{j_i})$. If $j = j_i$ then

$$v[f] f = (F'_1, F'_2, \dots, F'_r)$$

and

$$\sigma^{s-1-j}(v[f] f) = (F'_{i+1}, \dots, F'_r, F'_1, \dots, F'_i).$$

On the other hand

$$\sigma^{s-1}jf = (F_{i+j}, \dots, F_r, F_1, \dots, F_i)$$

and so

$$v[\sigma^{s-1}jf] \circ \sigma^{s-1}jf = (F'_{i+1}, \dots, F'_r, F'_1, \dots, F'_i).$$

LEMMA 12. *If $\|f\| \leq \|\sigma f\|$ and $\|f\| < b$, then $f_{s-1} = 0$.*

PROOF. By lemma 6i

$$\|f\| \leq \|\sigma f\| = 2\|f\| - f_{s-1}(2^s - 1) = \|f\| + \|f\| - f_{s-1}b.$$

Hence $f_{s-1} \leq \|f\|/b < 1$ and so $f_{s-1} = 0$.

THEOREM 6. *Let $q=2$ and $b=2^{s-1}$. If $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\|\sigma^i f\| < b$ for some i .*

PROOF. The proof is by induction on $r = \#\{j \mid f_j = 0\}$. Since $\|(1, 1, \dots, 1)\| = b$, $r \geq 1$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, the basis $r=0$ for the induction is empty. Let $r \geq 1$ and suppose that the theorem is true for all lower values. We may assume that $f_{s-1} = 0$ since otherwise we could use σ repeatedly until the last element is 0. Let $f_j = 0$ for $j = j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r = s-1$. From lemma 10i it follows that $\|v[f]f\| = \|f\|$. From the definition of $v[f]$ it follows that the elements of $v[f]f$ are 1 or 2 except possibly those with subscripts j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r .

CASE 1. $v[f]f$ has r elements which are 0. These are then the elements with subscripts $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r = s-1$. Hence

$$\|v[f]f\| \leq 2(1 + 2 + 2^2 + \dots + 2^{s-2}) = b-1$$

and so $\|f\| < b$ in this case.

CASE 2. $v[f]f$ has less than r elements which are 0. By the induction hypothesis $\|\sigma^{i_0}(v[f]f)\| < b$ for some i_0 and by lemma 12 we may assume that the last element of $\sigma^{i_0}(v[f]f)$ is 0. Then $i_0 = s-1-j_i$ for some i , $1 \leq i \leq r$. By lemmata 10i and 11 we get

$$\|\sigma^{i_0} f\| = \|v\sigma^{i_0} f\| = \|\sigma^{i_0}(v[f]f)\| < b$$

and the proof of theorem 6 is complete.

Combining theorems 5 and 6 it is simple to find $P(\lambda)$ for $q=2$ and $b=2^s-1$.

5.

In this section we give explicit expressions for $P(\lambda)$ in the cases when $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{b}$, $q > b$.

THEOREM 7. *If $q \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$, then $P(\lambda) = \binom{\lambda+b-1}{b-1}$.*

PROOF. Since $q \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$ we have $\|l\| \equiv |l| \pmod{b}$. Hence $l \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ if and only if $|l| \leq b-1$. The number of vectors $l \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ such that $|l|=i$ for $0 \leq i \leq b-1$ is equal to the number of ways i objects can be placed into λ boxes, i.e. $\binom{\lambda+i-1}{\lambda-1}$. Hence

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{b-1} \binom{\lambda+i-1}{\lambda-1} = \binom{\lambda+b-1}{\lambda} = \binom{\lambda+b-1}{b-1}.$$

THEOREM 8. *If $q \equiv -1 \pmod{b}$ and $q > b$, then*

$$P(\lambda) = 2 \binom{\lambda+b-1}{b-1} - 1.$$

PROOF. We have $s=2$ and

$$\|l\| \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{\lambda-1} l_{2i} - \sum_{i=0}^{\lambda-1} l_{2i+1} \pmod{b}.$$

If l has two non-zero elements with subscripts j_1, j_2 of opposite parity and $u_{j_1} = u_{j_2} = 1$, $u_i = 0$ otherwise, then $u \leq l$ and $\|u\| \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$. Hence $l \notin \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\lambda) &= \{(l_0, 0, l_2, 0, \dots, l_{2\lambda-2}, 0) \mid 0 \leq \sum l_i \leq b-1\} \\ &\cup \{(0, l_1, 0, l_3, \dots, 0, l_{2\lambda-1}) \mid 0 < \sum l_i \leq b-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with the proof of theorem 7 we see that

$$P(\lambda) = 1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} \binom{\lambda+i-1}{\lambda-1} = 2 \binom{\lambda+b-1}{b-1} - 1.$$

By [2] identity 3.20 we can rewrite theorem 7 as follows:

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{m=0}^{b-1} \binom{b-1}{m} \binom{\lambda}{m}.$$

By theorem 1

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{\sum |e_i| < b} \binom{|e|}{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{q-1}} \binom{\lambda}{|e|}.$$

Comparing the coefficients of $\binom{\lambda}{m}$ we get the following identity:

COROLLARY. *If $q \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$ and $m \leq b-1$, then*

$$\sum \binom{m}{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{q-2}} = \binom{b-1}{m}$$

where the summation is over those $(q-1)$ -tuples $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{q-1})$ of non-negative integers for which $\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} e_i = m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} i e_i \leq b-1$.

Finally I thank Shu Lin who put my attention to the main problem considered in this paper.

REFERENCES

1. J. D. Bovey, P. Erdős, and I. Niven, *Conditions for a zero sum modulo n* , *Canad. Math. Bull.* 18 (1975), 27–29.
2. H. W. Gould, *Combinatorial Identities*, Morgantown, W. Va., 1972.
3. Shu Lin and Kai-Ping Yiu, *An improvement to multifold Euclidean geometry codes*, *Information and Control* 28 (1975), 221–265.

MATEMATISK INSTITUTT
ALLÉGATEN 53–55
N-5014 BERGEN — UNIVERSITETET
NORWAY