

Amitabha Tripathi

The postage stamp problem and arithmetic in base  $r$

*Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, Vol. 58 (2008), No. 4, 1097–1100

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/140442>

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2008

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

THE POSTAGE STAMP PROBLEM AND ARITHMETIC IN BASE  $r$ 

AMITABHA TRIPATHI, New Delhi

(Received December 12, 2006)

*Abstract.* Let  $h, k$  be fixed positive integers, and let  $A$  be any set of positive integers. Let  $hA := \{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_r : a_i \in A, r \leq h\}$  denote the set of all integers representable as a sum of no more than  $h$  elements of  $A$ , and let  $n(h, A)$  denote the largest integer  $n$  such that  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq hA$ . Let  $n(h, k) := \max_A n(h, A)$ , where the maximum is taken over all sets  $A$  with  $k$  elements. We determine  $n(h, A)$  when the elements of  $A$  are in geometric progression. In particular, this results in the evaluation of  $n(h, 2)$  and yields surprisingly sharp lower bounds for  $n(h, k)$ , particularly for  $k = 3$ .

*Keywords:*  $h$ -basis, extremal  $h$ -basis, geometric progression

*MSC 2010:* 11B13

The *Postage Stamp Problem* derives its name from the situation when we require the largest integer  $n = n(h, k)$  such that all stamp values from 1 to  $n$  may be made up from a collection of  $k$  integer-valued stamp denominations with the restriction that there are no more than  $h$  stamps, repetitions being allowed. The problem of determining  $n(h, k)$  is apparently due to Rohrbach [3], and has been studied often ever since. A large and extensive bibliography can be found in a paper of Alter and Barnett [1].

Let  $h, k$  be fixed positive integers, and let  $A$  be any set of positive integers. Let  $hA := \{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_r : a_i \in A, r \leq h\}$  denote the set of all integers representable as a sum of no more than  $h$  elements of  $A$ , and let  $n(h, A)$  denote the largest integer  $n$  such that  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq hA$ . Observe that in order for this to happen, it is necessary that  $a_1 = 1$ . Thus,  $n(h, k) := \max_A n(h, A)$ , where the maximum is taken over all sets  $A$  with  $k$  elements. Any set  $A$  with  $k$  elements for which  $n(h, A) = n(h, k)$  is called an *extremal  $h$ -basis* for  $\{1, 2, \dots, n(h, k)\}$ , and it is natural to ask for all such extremal  $h$ -bases for a given  $k$ .

It is easy to see that  $n(1, k) = k$  with unique extremal basis  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and that  $n(h, 1) = h$  with unique extremal basis  $\{1\}$ . The result  $n(h, 2) = \lfloor \frac{1}{4}(h^2 + 6h + 1) \rfloor$  with unique extremal basis  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+3)\}$  for odd  $h$  and  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+2)\}$  and  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+4)\}$  for even  $h$  has been rediscovered several times, for instance by Stöhr in [5, 6] and by Stanton, Bate and Mullin in [4]. No other closed-form formula is known for any other pair  $(h, k)$  where one of  $h, k$  is fixed.

The purpose of this note is to determine  $n(h, A)$  when the elements of  $A$  are in geometric progression. In particular, this easily gives the value of  $n(h, 2)$ . The study of this case naturally leads to the representation of positive integers in a fixed basis  $r > 1$ . Suppose  $h, k, r$  are fixed positive integers, and let  $A = \{1, r, r^2, \dots, r^{k-1}\}$  be a  $k$ -term geometric progression. Since each positive integer  $n$  can be *uniquely* expressed in the form

$$n = d_0 + d_1 r + d_2 r^2 \dots + d_{k-1} r^{k-1},$$

where  $0 \leq d_i \leq r - 1$  for each  $i, 0 \leq i \leq k - 1$ , it follows that

$$(1) \quad n \in hA \text{ if and only if } d_0 + d_1 + \dots + d_{k-1} \leq h.$$

The determination of  $n(h, A)$  in this case, and subsequently of  $n(h, 2)$ , is an easy consequence of (1).

**Theorem.** *Let  $h, k, r$  be positive integers. Then*

$$n(h, \{1, r, r^2, \dots, r^{k-1}\}) = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } h \leq r - 2; \\ r^i(t + 1) + (r^i - 2) & \text{if } h = i(r - 1) + t, 1 \leq i \leq k - 2, \\ & 0 \leq t \leq r - 2; \\ r^{k-1}(t + 1) + (r^{k-1} - 2) & \text{if } h = (k - 1)(r - 1) + t, t \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** We write  $A = \{1, r, r^2, \dots, r^{k-1}\}$ . The case  $h \leq r - 2$  is easily dealt with. Henceforth, we assume  $h \geq r - 1$  and write  $h = i(r - 1) + t$  with  $i \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq t \leq r - 2$ .

We first show that  $N = r^i(t + 1) + (r^i - 1) = r^i(t + 2) - 1 \notin hA$ . Observe that  $N < r^{i+1}$ , and in base  $r$  it equals  $d_i d_{i-1} \dots d_0$ , where  $d_i = t + 1$  and  $d_j = r - 1$  for  $0 \leq j \leq i - 1$ , since  $N - r^i(t + 1) = r^i - 1 = (r - 1)(r^{i-1} + r^{i-2} + \dots + r + 1)$ . By (1),  $N \notin hA$  since  $d_0 + d_1 + \dots + d_{k-1} = i(r - 1) + (t + 1) = h + 1$ .

It remains to show that every positive integer less than or equal to  $r^i(t + 1) + (r^i - 2) = r^i(t + 2) - 2$  is an element of  $hA$ . We employ the notation  $(a_k, a_{k-1}, \dots,$

$a_1, a_0)_r$  to denote the number  $a_k r^k + a_{k-1} r^{k-1} + \dots + a_1 r + a_0$ . Since the base  $r$  representation of  $N$  is  $(t+1, r-1, r-1, \dots, r-1)_r$  ( $i$  occurrences of  $r-1$ ), each positive integer less than  $N$  must be in  $hA$  by (1) since *at least* one digit in base  $r$  representation of such an integer must be less than the corresponding one for  $N$  and none can be greater. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Corollary 1 is a special case of the theorem, which we single out in order to prove the result stated in Corollary 2, due to Stöhr in [5]. Our proof of the result in Corollary 2 is therefore a consequence of a more general result, whereas Stöhr proved his result directly.

**Corollary 1.** For  $h \geq 1$ ,

$$n(h, \{1, r\}) = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } h \leq r - 2; \\ r(h - r + 3) - 2 & \text{if } h \geq r - 1. \end{cases}$$

**Corollary 2** (Stöhr, [5]). For  $h \geq 1$ ,

$$n(h, 2) = \left\lfloor \frac{h^2 + 6h + 1}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

Moreover, the only extremal basis is  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+3)\}$  if  $h$  is odd, and  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+2)\}$  and  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}(h+4)\}$  if  $h$  is even.

**Proof.** From Corollary 1,

$$n(h, 2) = \max_{2 \leq r \leq h+2} r(h - r + 3) - 2 = \left\lfloor \frac{(h+3)^2}{4} \right\rfloor - 2 = \left\lfloor \frac{h^2 + 6h + 1}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

Since the maximum product of two positive real numbers  $x$  and  $y$  with a fixed sum  $x + y = c$  is attained at  $x = y$ , the maximum in the displayed equation above is achieved at  $r = \frac{1}{2}(h+3)$ . Thus, there is only one extremal basis if  $h$  is odd and two such bases if  $h$  is even.  $\square$

We close this paper with a remark on the lower bound on  $n(h, k)$  provided by the theorem when  $k \geq 3$ . By the theorem, substituting  $t = (k-1)(r-1) - h$ , we get

$$(2) \quad n(h, k) \geq \max_r r^{k-1}(h - (k-1)(r-1) + 2) - 2.$$

If we now maximize  $f(r) := r^{k-1}(h - (k-1)(r-1) + 2)$  in the interval  $[2, \infty)$ , a simple computation shows that it attains its maximum at  $r = (h+k+1)/k$ . Further

computation shows that  $f(h, k)$  at  $r = (h + k + 1)/k$  equals  $(h + k + 1)^k/k^k$ . Note that this is the best possible when  $k = 2$ , as seen in Corollary 2, but gives a lower bound in the general case

$$(3) \quad n(h, k) \geq \left( \frac{h + k + 1}{k} \right)^k,$$

which is surprisingly close to the best known lower bounds for  $n(h, k)$  for  $k \geq 3$ , obtained by Hofmeister [2]. For instance, for  $k = 3$ , (3) gives the lower bound

$$n(h, 3) \geq \frac{1}{27}(h + 4)^3 = \frac{1}{27}h^3 + \frac{4}{9}h^2 + \frac{16}{9}h + \frac{64}{27}$$

against the lower bound

$$n(h, 3) \geq \frac{4}{81}h^3 + \frac{2}{3}h^2 + \frac{66}{27}h$$

obtained in [2].

**Acknowledgement.** The author wishes to thank the referee for a very careful and thorough reading of the paper, and for numerous suggestions made.

#### *References*

- [1] *R. Alter and J. A. Barnett*: A postage stamp problem. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 87 (1980), 206–210.
- [2] *G. Hofmeister*: Asymptotische Abschätzungen für dreielementige Extremalbasen in natürlichen Zahlen. *J. reine angew. Math.* 232 (1968), 77–101.
- [3] *H. Rohrbach*: Ein Beitrag zur additiven Zahlentheorie. *Math. Z.* 42 (1937), 1–30.
- [4] *R. G. Stanton, J. A. Bate and R. C. Mullin*: Some tables for the postage stamp problem. *Congr. Numer., Proceedings of the Fourth Manitoba Conference on Numerical Mathematics, Winnipeg 12* (1974), 351–356.
- [5] *A. Stöhr*: Gelöste and ungelöste Fragen über Basen der natürlichen Zahlenreihe, I. *J. reine Angew. Math.* 194 (1955), 40–65.
- [6] *A. Stöhr*: Gelöste and ungelöste Fragen über Basen der natürlichen Zahlenreihe, II. *J. reine Angew. Math.* 194 (1955), 111–140.

*Author's address*: Amitabha Tripathi, Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology, Hauz Khas, New Delhi-110 016, India, e-mail: atripath@maths.iitd.ac.in.