

A NOTE ON THE ERDŐS–GRAHAM THEOREM

WENHUI WANG and MIN TANG✉

(Received 10 December 2017; accepted 11 January 2018; first published online 23 April 2018)

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\}$ be a set of nonnegative integers. Put $D(\mathcal{A}) = \gcd\{a_{k+1} - a_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$. The set \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis if there exists h such that every sufficiently large integer is a sum of at most h (not necessarily distinct) elements of \mathcal{A} . We prove that if the difference of consecutive integers of \mathcal{A} is bounded, then \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis if and only if there exists an integer $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $(a, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$.

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 11B13; secondary 11B50.

Keywords and phrases: asymptotic basis, exact order.

1. Introduction

A set \mathcal{A} of nonnegative integers is said to be an asymptotic basis if there exists h such that every sufficiently large integer is a sum of at most h (not necessarily distinct) elements of \mathcal{A} . An asymptotic basis \mathcal{A} is said to have an exact order if there exists h' such that every sufficiently large integer is the sum of exactly h' (not necessarily distinct) elements taken from \mathcal{A} . Obviously, when $0 \in \mathcal{A}$, an asymptotic basis \mathcal{A} has an exact order.

For the remainder of the paper, we write $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\}$. For a positive integer h , define $h\mathcal{A}$ to be the h -fold sum set of \mathcal{A} , that is

$$h\mathcal{A} = \{n : n = a_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_h}, a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_h} \in \mathcal{A}\},$$

and define $D(\mathcal{A}) = \gcd\{a_{k+1} - a_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$.

In 1980, Erdős and Graham [2] provided a necessary and sufficient condition for an asymptotic basis of the nonnegative integers to possess an exact order.

THEOREM 1.1. *An asymptotic basis $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ has an exact order if and only if $D(\mathcal{A}) = 1$.*

REMARK 1.2. Put $\mathcal{A}(x) = |\{a \in \mathcal{A} : 1 \leq a \leq x\}|$. The density of \mathcal{A} is defined by $d(\mathcal{A}) = \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{A}(x)/x$. An asymptotic basis $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ has an exact order r if and only if the density of integers which can be represented as the sum of exactly r elements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.11471017).

© 2018 Australian Mathematical Publishing Association Inc.

taken from \mathcal{A} (allowing repetitions) is 1. The necessity is obvious. To prove the sufficiency, suppose that the density of integers which can be represented as the sum of exactly r elements taken from \mathcal{A} (allowing repetitions) is 1. If $D(\mathcal{A}) > 1$ and n is the sum of exactly r elements of \mathcal{A} , then $n \equiv ra_1 \pmod{D(\mathcal{A})}$. The density of such n is $1/D(\mathcal{A}) < 1$, a contradiction. Thus, we have $D(\mathcal{A}) = 1$. By Theorem 1.1, we know that the asymptotic basis \mathcal{A} has an exact order.

For related problems about exact orders and asymptotic bases, one may refer to [1, 3–6].

It is natural to consider the necessary and sufficient condition for a set of nonnegative integers to be an asymptotic basis. The results in this paper arise from two observations. First, if $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ is an asymptotic basis, then $(a_k, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$ for all positive integers k (see [7, Lemma 3]). Second, $\mathcal{A} = \{1\} \cup \{2, 2^2, 2^4, \dots, 2^{2^n}, \dots\}$ is not an asymptotic basis.

THEOREM 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots\}$ be a set of nonnegative integers such that the difference of consecutive integers of \mathcal{A} is bounded. Then \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis if and only if there exists an integer $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\gcd(a, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$.*

COROLLARY 1.4. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ be a set of nonnegative integers such that the difference of consecutive integers of \mathcal{A} is bounded. Let \mathcal{F} be a subset of \mathbb{N} . If $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}$ is an asymptotic basis and $D(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}) = D(\mathcal{A})$, then \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis.*

EXAMPLE 1.5. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 3, 5, \dots\}$. Then every positive integer can be represented as the sum of at most two elements of \mathcal{A} , and thus \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis. If there exists an integer s such that every sufficiently large integer is the sum of exactly s elements of \mathcal{A} , then the parity of every sufficiently large integer is the same as the parity of s , and thus \mathcal{A} does not have an exact order.

EXAMPLE 1.6. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{2, 4, \dots, 2n, \dots\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{1\}$, we know that every positive integer can be represented as the sum of at most two elements of $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}$, and thus $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}$ is an asymptotic basis. But \mathcal{A} is not an asymptotic basis because any sum of elements taken from \mathcal{A} is even.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.3

PROOF OF NECESSITY. If for all positive integers k we have $\gcd(a_k, D(\mathcal{A})) = d > 1$, then $d \mid a_k$. Therefore, any sum of elements taken from \mathcal{A} is a multiple of d , which contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis. \square

PROOF OF SUFFICIENCY. We write $g_n = \gcd(a_2 - a_1, a_3 - a_2, \dots, a_{n+1} - a_n)$. Since $g_1 \geq g_2 \geq \dots$, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} g_n = D(\mathcal{A})$. Then there exists a positive integer n_0 such that $|g_n - D(\mathcal{A})| < 1$ for $n \geq n_0$. Since the g_n and $D(\mathcal{A})$ are integers, $g_n = D(\mathcal{A})$ for $n \geq n_0$. This means that $\gcd(a_2 - a_1, a_3 - a_2, \dots, a_{n_0+1} - a_{n_0}) = D(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, $\gcd(a_i, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$ for some $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

If $1 \leq i \leq n_0 + 1$, then $D(\mathcal{A}) \mid a_{i+1} - a_i$. Also, $D(\mathcal{A}) \mid a_{n_0+1} - a_1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(a_i, D(\mathcal{A})) &= \gcd(a_i, D(\mathcal{A}), a_{n_0+1} - a_1) \\ &= \gcd(a_i, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_{i+1} - a_i, \dots, a_{n_0+1} - a_{n_0}, a_{n_0+1} - a_1) \\ &= \gcd(a_i, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{n_0+1}, a_{n_0+1} - a_1) \\ &= \gcd(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n_0+1}). \end{aligned}$$

If $i > n_0 + 1$, then $D(\mathcal{A}) = \gcd(D(\mathcal{A}), a_{n_0+2} - a_{n_0+1}, \dots, a_i - a_{i-1})$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(a_i, D(\mathcal{A})) &= \gcd(a_i, D(\mathcal{A}), a_{n_0+2} - a_{n_0+1}, \dots, a_i - a_{i-1}, a_i - a_1) \\ &= \gcd(a_i, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_i - a_{i-1}, a_i - a_1) \\ &= \gcd(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in both cases, there exists a positive integer t such that

$$\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) = 1$$

and there are integer constants c_i with $\sum_{i=1}^t c_i a_i = 1$. Let $A = a_1 \cdots a_t$ and $b_i = c_i + k_i A$, where k_i is the smallest nonnegative integer with $b_i > 0$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^t b_i a_i = kA + 1$ for some nonnegative integer k . Let $N = \sum_{i=1}^t b_i a_i + kA$, then

$$N + 1 = \sum_{i=1}^t b_i a_i + kA + 1 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^t b_i a_i.$$

Thus, there exists a positive integer h_1 such that

$$\{N, N + 1\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{h_1} i\mathcal{A}.$$

Hence, for every positive integer l ,

$$\{lN, lN + 1, \dots, lN + l\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{lh_1} i\mathcal{A}.$$

Moreover, when $l \geq N$,

$$\{lN, lN + 1, \dots, lN + l\} \cap \{(l + 1)N, (l + 1)N + 1, \dots, (l + 1)N + l + 1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore, for every positive integer $s \geq N$,

$$\{N^2, N^2 + 1, \dots, sN + s\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{sh_1} i\mathcal{A}.$$

Since the difference of consecutive integers of \mathcal{A} is bounded, we may assume that

$$\max\{a_{k+1} - a_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\} \leq M.$$

Then there exists a positive integer $q \geq N$ such that $N^2 + M \leq qN + q$. For every integer $n \geq N^2 + a_1$, there must exist an integer k such that $a_k \leq n - N^2 < a_{k+1}$. Thus,

$$N^2 \leq n - a_k = n - a_{k+1} + a_{k+1} - a_k < N^2 + M.$$

Hence,

$$n - a_k \in \{N^2, N^2 + 1, \dots, qN + q\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{qh_1} i\mathcal{A},$$

that is, $n = n - a_k + a_k \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{qh_1+1} i\mathcal{A}$. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

3. Proof of Corollary 1.4

In 2011, Yang and Chen [7, Lemma 3] showed that if $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ is an asymptotic basis, then $(a_k, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$ for all positive integers k . By this result, it follows that $\gcd(a_k, D(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F})) = 1$ for all positive integers k . Since $D(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}) = D(\mathcal{A})$, we see that $\gcd(a_k, D(\mathcal{A})) = 1$ for all positive integers k . Thus, by Theorem 1.3, \mathcal{A} is an asymptotic basis.

References

- [1] S. Chen and W. Z. Gu, ‘Exact order of subsets of asymptotic bases’, *J. Number Theory* **41** (1992), 15–21.
- [2] P. Erdős and R. L. Graham, ‘On bases with an exact order’, *Acta Arith.* **37** (1980), 201–207.
- [3] X. D. Jia, ‘Exact order of subsets of asymptotic bases in additive number theory’, *J. Number Theory* **28** (1988), 205–218.
- [4] J. C. M. Nash and M. B. Nathanson, ‘Cofinite subsets of asymptotic bases for the positive integers’, *J. Number Theory* **20** (1985), 363–372.
- [5] M. B. Nathanson, ‘The exact order of subsets of additive bases’, in: *Number Theory (New York, 1982)*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1052 (Springer, Berlin, 1984), 273–277.
- [6] A. Plagne, ‘Removing one element from an exact additive basis’, *J. Number Theory* **87** (2001), 306–314.
- [7] Q. H. Yang and F. J. Chen, ‘On bases with a T -order’, *Integers* **11** (2011), A5.

WENHUI WANG, School of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241003, China
e-mail: wangwenhui96@163.com

MIN TANG, School of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241003, China
e-mail: tmzzz2000@163.com