

On a Convolution of Eulerian Numbers: 10609

Donald E. Knuth; David Callan

The American Mathematical Monthly, Vol. 106, No. 7. (Aug. - Sep., 1999), pp. 690-691.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9890%28199908%2F09%29106%3A7%3C690%3AOACOEN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

The American Mathematical Monthly is currently published by Mathematical Association of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at [http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html.](http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html) JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/maa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On a Convolution of Eulerian Numbers

10609 *[1997, 6641. Proposed by Donald E. Knuth, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.* Let $a(l, m, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{l} {n \choose k} (l + m - k)^{n-k} (k - l)^k$. Prove that $\sum_{l=1}^{n} a(l, m, n) =$ $((m + n + 1)/2)a(n, m, n) - ((m + 1)/2)m^n$.

Solution by David Callan, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI. We compare coefficients of m^j to prove the desired identity. First we express $a(l, m, n)$ using Eulerian numbers. The classical Eulerian number $\binom{n}{k}$ is the number of permutations of $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ consisting of *k* ascending runs (with descents at $k-1$ locations). These are counted by placing *n* numbered objects into *k* numbered boxes to avoid properties P_1, \ldots, P_k , where P_i is the property that box *i* is empty or has only objects greater than those in the preceding box. A careful application of the inclusion-exclusion principle yields the formula $\binom{n}{k}$ = $\sum_{j=0}^{k}(-1)^{j}\binom{n+1}{j}(k-j)^{n}$. Note that $\binom{0}{0}=1$.

The definition of $\binom{n}{k}$ yields $\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} = n!$. We also need $\sum_{k=0}^{n} k \binom{n}{k} = \frac{1}{2}(n+1)!$. To prove this combinatorially, we alter each permutation of $[n]$ with *k* runs by placing $n + 1$ at the end of one run. This can be done in *k* ways and yields a permutation of $[n + 1]$. A permutation of $[n + 1]$ arises in this way if $n + 1$ is at the end, not if $n + 1$ is at the start, and otherwise if and only if the element preceding $n + 1$ is greater than the element following it. Thus we obtain half the permutations of $[n + 1]$.

We claim that

$$
a(l, m, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{i=0}^{l} {n \choose j} {n-j \choose i} m^{j}, \qquad (*)
$$

which we prove by comparing coefficients of m^j . By applying the binomial theorem to *(I - k + m)^{n-k}*, we extract the desired coefficient as $\sum_{k=0}^{l}(-1)^{k} {n \choose k} {n-k \choose l} (l-k)^{n-j}$. Rearranging binomial coefficients converts this to $\binom{n}{i} \sum_{k=0}^{l} (-1)^k \binom{n-j}{k} (l-k)^{n-j}$. After canceling the $\binom{n}{j}$, it remains only to rewrite the sum as $\sum_{i=0}^{l} \binom{n-j}{i}$. We use our formula for Eulerian numbers, let $k = i - h$, apply the elementary identity $\sum_{h=0}^{r} (-1)^h {n+1 \choose h} = (-1)^r {n \choose r}$ lerian numbers, let $k = i - h$, apply the eleme
and finally interchange k with $l - k$ to obtain

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{l} \binom{n-j}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^{l} \sum_{h=0}^{i} (-1)^h \binom{n-j+1}{h} (i-h)^{n-j} = \sum_{k=0}^{l} k^{n-j} \sum_{h=0}^{l-k} (-1)^h \binom{n-j+1}{h}
$$

$$
= \sum_{k=0}^{l} (-1)^{l-k} \binom{n-j}{l-k} k^{n-j} = \sum_{k=0}^{l} (-1)^k \binom{n-j}{k} (l-k)^{n-j}.
$$

Using (*), we compute coefficients of m^j in the desired identity. For $j = n + 1$, the contributions cancel. For $j = n$, the coefficient is *n*. For $j < n$, the coefficient of m^j in $\sum_{l=1}^{n} a(l, m, n)$ divided by $\binom{n}{i}$ is

$$
\sum_{l=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{l} {n-j \choose i} = \sum_{i=1}^{l} (n+1-i) \sum_{i=1}^{n} {n-j \choose i} = (n+1) \sum_{i=1}^{n} {n-j \choose i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} i {n-j \choose i}
$$

$$
= (n+1)(n-j)! - \frac{1}{2}(n-j+1)! = (n-j)! \frac{n+j+1}{2}.
$$

For $j < n$, the coefficient of m^j in $((m + n + 1)/2)a(n, m, n) - ((m + 1)/2)m^n$ is

$$
\frac{n+1}{2} \binom{n}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{n-j}{i} + \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{j-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{n-j+1}{i}
$$

=
$$
\frac{n+1}{2} \binom{n}{j} (n-j)! + \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{j-1} (n-j+1)! = \binom{n}{j} (n-j)! \frac{n+j+1}{2}.
$$

690 PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS [Monthly 106

Editorial comment. From (*) we infer that $a(l, 1, n)$ is the total number of arrangements with at most *l* ascending runs that can be formed from subsets of [n].

Solved also by R. J. Chapman (U. K.), Q. Darwish (Oman), H.-J. Seiffert (Germany), and the proposer.

A Variation on Additive Bases

10610 [1997, 664]. Proposed by Richard Hall, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, *England.* Given a positive integer m , let $C(m)$ be the greatest positive integer k such that, for some set *S* of *rn* integers, every integer from *1* to k belongs to *S* or is a sum of two not necessarily distinct elements of *S*. For example, $C(3) = 8$ with $S = \{1, 3, 4\}$.

(a) Show that, for all $\epsilon > 0$, $1/4 < C(m)/m^2 < 1/2 + \epsilon$ for all sufficiently large *m*. *(b)**Improve the asymptotic bounds in part *(a).*

Solution to (a) by the National Security Agency Problems Group, Fort Meade, MD. Let *[n]l* denote the first *n* positive multiples of *l*. When *m* is even, with $m = 2t$, let $S =$ $[t-1]$ \cup $[t+1]$ *t*. Since *S* has size *m* and represents all positive integers up to $(t+1)t + t$, we have $C(m) \ge t^2 + 2t$. Thus $C(m)/m^2 \ge (t^2 + 2t)/(2t)^2 > 1/4$.

When *m* is odd, with $m = 2t + 1$, let $S = [t]1 + t + 1$. Since *S* has size *m* and represents all positive integers up to $(t + 1)^2 + t + 1$, we have $C(m) \ge (t + 1)(t + 2)$. Thus $c(m)/m^2 \ge (t+1)(t+2)/(2t+1)^2 > 1/4.$

A set of size *m* represents at most $2m + {m \choose 2}$ integers. Hence $C(m)/m^2 \leq 1/2+3/(2m) <$ $1/2 + \epsilon$ for $m > 3/(2\epsilon)$.

Solution to (b) by the GCHQ Problems Group, Cheltenharn, UK. We show that *9/32* < $C(m)/m^2 < 4/9 + \epsilon$ for all sufficiently large *m*.

For the lower bound, we construct a set that represents many integers by spreading the summands apart more quickly than in (a). Write *m* as $16i + j$, where $-7 \leq j \leq 8$, and let $A = [1, 3i]$, $B = [2, 7i + j]3i$, $C = (7i + j)3i + [1, 3i](3i + 1)$, and $D =$ $(7i + j)6i + 6i + [0, 3i]$, where $[x, y] = \{n \in \mathbb{Z}: x \le n \le y\}$. Let $S = A \cup B \cup C \cup D$.

From *A* and $A + A$ we get [1, 6*i*], from $A + B$ we get [6*i* + 1, $(7i + j)3i + 3i$], and from *C* and $A + C$ we get $[(7i + j)3i + 3i + 1, 30i^2 + 3i(j + 2)].$

For $r \in [1, 4i + j]$ and $s \in [1, 3i]$, we have $(3i + r - s + 1)3i \in B$ and $(7i + j)3i +$ $s(3i+1) \in C$, and the sum of these integers is $(10i+r+j+1)3i+s$. Thus $B+C$ contains $[(10i+2+j)3i+1, (14i+2j+1)3i+3i]$, which equals $[30i^2+3i(j+2)+1, (7i+j)6i+6i]$. Furthermore, $D \cup (A + D) \cup (B + D) = [(7i + j)6i + 6i, (7i + j)9i + 9i]$, and $C + D =$ $[(7i + j)9i + 9i + 1, (7i + j)9i + 3i(3i + 1) + 9i] = [(7i + j)9i + 9i + 1, 72i^2 + i(12+9j)].$ Since $|A \cup B \cup C \cup D| = m$, for large enough *i* we have

$$
\frac{C(m)}{m^2} \ge \frac{72i^2 + i(12+9j)}{256i^2 + 32ij + j^2} = \frac{9}{32} \frac{8i^2 + i(j+4/3)}{8i^2 + ij + j^2/32} > \frac{9}{32}.
$$

To prove that $C(m)/m^2 < 4/9 + \epsilon$, we show that some of the $m + {m \choose 2}$ pairs must be "wasted". This happens in two ways. First, the sum may be too big, as happens for any pair of numbers that both exceed $C(m)/2$. Second, note that $r - s = t - u$ if and only if $r + u = t + s$. Thus we obtain a wasted pair for each instance of identical differences.

Consider a set *S* that represents everything from 1 to μm^2 , for some $\mu > 1/4$. We may assume that $S \subseteq [1, \mu m^2]$. Let $am = |S \cap [1, \mu m^2/2]|$. All pairs from the $(1 - a)m$ numbers above $\mu m^2/2$ are wasted. The smaller pairs have differences between 1 and $\mu m^2/2 - 1$, yielding wastage when $am + {am \choose 2} > \mu m^2/2 - 1$.

Let $a > b$ mean that $a > b - \epsilon$ for large enough m. Letting wm^2 be the number of wasted pairs, we have $w \ge \max(0, (a^2 - \mu)/2) + (1 - a)^2/2$. Letting $f(a)$ denote this lower bound, we have $f'(a) = -(1 - a)$ for $a^2 < \mu$ and $f'(a) = 2a - 1$ for $a^2 > \mu$. The first quantity is negative and the second positive, since $\mu > 1/4$. Thus *w* is minimized at