

ON INJECTIVITY OF COMBINATORIAL RADON TRANSFORM OF ORDER FIVE

TEWODROS AMDEBERHAN AND MELKAMU ZELEKE

ABSTRACT. In the present work, we give a proof of the injectivity of the combinatorial radon transform of order five.

The problem of determining members of a set by their sums of a fixed order was posed by Leo Moser and partially settled by Ewell, Fraenkel, Gordon, Selfridge, and Straus. Following the notation of [BL], the general problem can be stated in the following way.

For any given $(k, n) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$, with $2 \leq k \leq n$, we choose arbitrarily an n -set $X_n = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ then form the set $W_n^k(X_n) = \{\sigma_i\}$ of all sums of k distinct elements of X_n and ask:

Does there exist an n -set X'_n different from X_n giving rise to the same set of sums as does X_n ? More formally, we can describe the problem as follows:

Define a mapping W_n^k from the set $\{X_n\}$ of all n -sets to the set of all $\binom{n}{k}$ -sets by the rule:

$$W_n^k(\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}) = \{x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + \dots + x_{i_k} : 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n\}$$

and try to determine whether W_n^k is one-to-one.

Definition: W_n^k is called a combinatorial radon transform of order k .

It is known [E], [FGS], [SS] that W_n^k is injective if

$$A(n, k, s) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (k-i)^{s-1} \neq 0 \quad (1)$$

for each s in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Remarks: The following results are also known.

- (1) if $k = 2$, W_n^2 is injective for all n which are *not* a power of 2. W_n^2 is *not* injective if n is a power of 2 [SS].
- (2) if $k = 3$, W_n^3 is injective for all $n \geq 3$ and $n \neq 3, 6, 27$, and 486. W_n^k is not injective if $n = 3, 6, 27$, [BL], [EZ] or 486 [BL].

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to our advisor Professor Doron Zeilberger for his inspirations and strong support.

- (3) If $k = 4$, W_n^4 is injective for all $n \geq 4$ and $n \neq 4$ and 8. W_n^k is not injective if $n = 4$, or 8 [E], [EZ]. Here we would like to point out that while $A(12, 4, 6) = 0$, John Ewell proved W_{12}^4 is injective, thereby showing that condition (1), though necessary, is *not* sufficient.

In this paper, we settle the problem for the combinatorial radon transform of order five.

In the case $k = 5$, condition (1) reduces to a polynomial in $n, 2^s, 3^s, 5^s$, and it can be written as: W_n^5 is injective if

$$\begin{aligned} A(n, 5, s) = & n^4 - (2^{s+1} + 6)n^3 + (4 \cdot 3^s + 3 \cdot 2^{s+1} + 11)n^2 \\ & - (4 \cdot 3^s + 3 \cdot 2^{2s+1} + 2^{s+2} + 6)n + 24 \cdot 5^{s-1} \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for every $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Consider the function

$$B(n, s) = n^4 + a_3 n^3 + a_2 n^2 + a_1 n + a_0;$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_3 &= -2(2^s + 3) & a_2 &= 4 \cdot 3^s + 3 \cdot 2^{s+1} + 11 \\ a_1 &= -2(2 \cdot 3^s + 3 \cdot 4^s + 2^{s+1} + 3) & a_0 &= 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5^{s-1} \end{aligned}$$

for integers $1 \leq s \leq n$.

Let n be an integral solution of

$$B(n, s) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Note: n must have the form

$$n = 2^\alpha \cdot 3^\beta \cdot 5^\gamma \quad (4)$$

for $\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3; \beta = 0, 1; \gamma = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, s-1$.

So, throughout this investigation we assume that n has the form (4).

Dividing (3) by n we get:

$$\tilde{B}(n, s) = n^3 + a_3 n^2 + a_2 n + a_1 + \tilde{a}_0 = 0 \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{a}_0 = 2^{3-\alpha} \cdot 3^{1-\beta} \cdot 5^{s-1-\gamma}$.

Observations:

- (1) α cannot be 3: if $\alpha = 3$, then $\tilde{B}(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ since $2 \nmid \tilde{a}_0$, but 2 divides the rest of the terms.
- (2) α cannot be 2: if $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$ then similarly $\tilde{B}(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ (in fact $\tilde{B}(n, s) \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$).
If $\alpha = 2, \beta = 0$, then likewise $\tilde{B}(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{16}$.
- (3) $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1$ is not possible: $\tilde{B}(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$.

Hence we gather that n takes one of the forms:

$$n = 2 \cdot 5^\gamma \text{ or } n = 3 \cdot 5^\gamma \text{ or } n = 5^\gamma. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, if $n > 2(2^s + 3)$, then

$$n^4 + a_3 n^3 = n^3(n - 2(2^s + 3)) > 0,$$

and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 n^2 + a_1 n &= n \{ (4 \cdot 3^s + 6 \cdot 2^s + 11)n - (4 \cdot 3^s + 6 \cdot 4^s + 2^{s+2} + 6) \} \\ &> n \{ (4 \cdot 3^s + 6 \cdot 2^s + 11)2^{s+1} - (4 \cdot 3^s + 6 \cdot 4^s + 2^{s+2} + 6) \} \\ &> n \{ (4 \cdot 3^s \cdot 2^{s+1} + 6 \cdot 4^s \cdot 2 + 5 \cdot 2^{s+1} + 6 \cdot 2^{s+1}) \\ &\quad - (4 \cdot 3^s + 6 \cdot 4^s + 2 \cdot 2^{s+2} + 6) \} \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $B(n, s) > 0$ if $n > 2(2^s + 3)$.

Note however that if $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2}s + 1$, then $n > 2(2^s + 3)$. This implies for such γ , the equation $B(n, s) = 0$ has no integral solution n . Therefore, in the sequel it suffices to assume that $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}s + 1$.

Notation: Let $\text{ord}_p x$ denote the exponent of a prime p in the prime factorization of x .

Lemma.: If $5^m \leq s < 5^{m+1}$ for any fixed $m \geq 0$, then $\mu := \text{ord}_5 \tilde{a}_1(s) \leq m + 2$.

Proof. Using the binomial theorem

$$(5 - x)^s = (-1)^s x^s + (-1)^{s-1} 5 \cdot s \cdot x^{s-1} + \dots \quad (7)$$

Let $\tilde{a}_1 := 2 \cdot 3^s + 3 \cdot 4^s + 2 \cdot 2^s + 3$. Then $\tilde{a}_1 = 3(4^s + 1) + 2(3^s + 2^s)$, and in light of (7) we can rewrite $\tilde{a}_1$ as

$$\tilde{a}_1 = (3 \cdot 5 \cdot s + 2 \cdot 5 \cdot s \cdot 2^{s-1}) + \dots,$$

for s odd.

Writing s in the form

$$s = k_m 5^m + k_{m-1} 5^{m-1} + \dots + k_1 5 + k_0; \quad 0 \leq k_i \leq 4, \text{ for all } i,$$

define $j := \min\{i | k_i \neq 0\}$. Then $s = k_m 5^s + \dots + k_j 5^j$. Note that $k_m \geq 1, k_j \geq 1$.

Therefore, for s odd,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{a}_1 &= 5(3 \cdot k_m \cdot 5^m + 2 \cdot k_m \cdot 5^m \cdot 2^{s-1}) + \dots + 5(3 \cdot k_j \cdot 5^j + 2 \cdot k_j \cdot 5^j \cdot 2^{s-1}) + \dots \\ &= 5^{m+1}(3 + 2^s)k_m + \dots + 5^{j+1}(3 + 2^s)k_j + \dots\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\text{ord}_5 \tilde{a}_1(s) \leq j + 2 \leq m + 2.$$

For s even,

$$x^s + (5 - x)^s = 2x^s - 5sx^{s-1} + 5^2 \binom{s}{1} x^{s-2} - \dots$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{a}_1 = 2(3 + 2^{s+1}) - 5s(3 + 2^s) + 5^2 \binom{s}{1} (3 + 2^s) - \dots$$

Writing s in the form:

$$s = k_m 5^s + \dots + k_j 5^j, \quad j \text{ as in above},$$

we see that

$$\tilde{a}_1 = 2(3 + 2^{s+1}) - k_m 5^{m+1}(3 + 2^s) - \dots - k_j 5^{j+1}(3 + 2^s) + \dots$$

But $5 \nmid (3 + 2^s)$, while $5 \mid (3 + 2^{s+1})$ as s is even. Thus $\tilde{a}_1 = 2^{s+1} - (3 + 2^s) \cdot 5(s - 2) + \dots$ is at most divisible by 5^{m+2} since $5^m \leq s < 5^{m+1}$. Hence if s is even and $5^m \leq s < 5^{m+1}$, then $\text{Ord}_5 \tilde{a}_1(s) \leq m + 2$. ■

Now,

- (1) Suppose that $\gamma \geq m + 1$. Then $m + 1 \leq \gamma < \frac{1}{2}(s + 1)$.
 - (i) if $s - 1 - \gamma \geq m + 1$, then $\tilde{B}(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{5^{m+1}}$ since $5^{m+1} \nmid a_1$ by the lemma above.
 - (ii) if $s - 1 - \gamma < \mu$, then $B(n, s) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{5^\mu}$ as $5^\mu \nmid \tilde{a}_0$.
 - (iii) if $s - 1 - \gamma = \mu$, then $\gamma = s - 1 - \mu \geq s - 1 - m$ by the lemma above. But then $s - 1 - m < \frac{1}{2}s + 1$.

Therefore,

$$5^{m-2} \leq s < 2m + 4.$$

Hence $m \leq 3$.

- (2) Suppose that $m - 2 \leq \gamma \leq m$.

If $m \geq 4$, then $a_0(s) = 24 \cdot 5^{s-1} > -a_1 n - a_3 n^3$ for n in one of the above forms. We then conclude that $B(n, s) > 0$, that is, equation (3) has no integral solution unless $m \leq 3$.

Conclusion: In all cases, $m \leq 3$. This shows that it remains to verify whether n in the form (4) is a solution of equation (3) for $0 \leq \gamma < \frac{1}{2}s + 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}5^2 + 1 \leq 14$. (Recall that for $m \leq 3$, we also have $1 \leq s \leq 24$.) That is, we simply test if

$$B(n, s) = 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq \gamma \leq 14, 1 \leq s \leq 24. \quad (8)$$

We carried out this test using **Maple**^{*}, and found that (8) is true only if $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, or 10 .

Thus we have proved the following theorem:

Theorem. *Let n and s be positive integers such that $s \leq n$. Then*

$$B(n, s) = 0$$

only if $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, or 10 .

Corollary. *The combinatorial radon transform of order five is injective for all $n \geq 5$ and $n \neq 5$, and 10 .*

Note: W_5^5 is clearly noninjective and W_{10}^5 is not injective since

$$X := \{0^1, 5^6, 10^3\} \neq Y := \{2^3, 7^6, 12^1\}$$

but

$$W_{10}^5(X) = W_{10}^5(Y)$$

[EZ].

^{*}A short Maple program that carries out the test is available in the WWW under [http://www.math.temple.edu/~\[melkamu,tewodros\]](http://www.math.temple.edu/~[melkamu,tewodros]).

References:

- [BL] Jan Boman and Svante Linusson, *Examples of non-uniqueness for the combinatorial radon transform modulo the symmetric group*, Mat. Scan., to appear.
- [E] John A. Ewell, *On the determination of sets by sets of sums of fixed order*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics 20 (1968), 596–611.
- [EZ] Shalosh B. Ekhad and Melkamu Zeleke, *Finding examples of noninjectivity for combinatorial radon transform*, Preprint.
- [G] Richard K. Guy, *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, 1981; second edition, 1994.
- [FGS] A. S. Fraenkel, B. Gordon and E.G. Straus, *On the determination of sums of a certain order*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics 12 (1962), 187–196.
- [SS] J. L. Selfridge and E. G. Straus, *On the determination of numbers by their sums of a fixed order*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics 8 (1958), 847–856.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19122

E-mail address: [tewodros,melkamu]@math.temple.edu,

World Wide Web: [http://www.math.temple.edu/~\[tewodros,melkamu\]](http://www.math.temple.edu/~[tewodros,melkamu])