Zeitschrift: L'Enseignement Mathématique
Herausgeber: Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique
Band: 40 (1994)
Heft: 1-2: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

Artikel: THE PROUHET-TARRY-ESCOTT PROBLEM REVISITED
Autor: Borwein, Peter / Ingalls, Colin
Kapitel: 4. Related Problems
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-61102

Nutzungsbedingungen
Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation
L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use
The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 24.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

PROPOSITION 8. *For symmetric solutions we have*

$$19 \mid r_7, \quad 19 \mid r_{11}, \quad 17 \cdot 19 \mid r_{13}$$

Proof. This is a result of performing the calculation mod p and observing that $C_n \equiv 0 \bmod p$. □

It is interesting to observe that an ideal solution in its third form has a large factor

$$\prod (1 - x^{p_i}) .$$

This follows from Propositions 6 and 7. Hence the degree of this polynomial grows at least like $n^2/(2 \log n)$.

4. RELATED PROBLEMS

There are several related problems. We mention two.

4.1. THE 'EASIER' WARING PROBLEM

In [21] Wright stated, and probably misnamed, the following variation of the well known Waring problem. The problem is to find the least s so that for all n there are natural numbers $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s\}$ so that

$$\pm \alpha_1^k \pm \cdots \pm \alpha_s^k = n$$

for some choice of signs. We denote the least such s by $v(k)$. Recall that the usual Waring problem requires al positive signs. For arbitrary k the best known bounds for $v(k)$ derive from the bounds for the usual Waring problem. So to date, the "easier" Waring problem is not easier than the Waring problem. However, the best bounds for small k are derived in an elementary manner from solutions to the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem.

Suppose $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \overset{k-2}{=} \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}$. We see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x + \alpha_i)^k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x + \beta_i)^k = Cx + D$$

where

$$C = k \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i^{k-1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i^{k-1} \right)$$

and

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i^k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i^k .$$

We define $\Delta(k, C)$ to be the smallest s such that every residue mod C is represented by s positive and negative k^{th} powers. We also define $\Delta(k) = \max_C \Delta(k, C)$. Wright shows how to calculate $\Delta(k, C)$ and $\Delta(k)$ in [9].

LEMMA 4. *If*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x + \alpha_i)^k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x + \beta_i)^k = Cx + D$$

then

$$v(k) \leqslant 2n + \Delta(k, C) \leqslant 2n + \Delta(k) .$$

Proof. This follows directly from the above definitions. □

PROPOSITION 9.

$$v(k) \leqslant 2M(k-2) + \Delta(k) \leqslant 2(k-1)\left(\frac{\log \frac{1}{2}(k)}{\log\left(1 + \frac{1}{k-2}\right)} + 1\right) + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(3k-1) & k \text{ odd} \\ 2k & k \text{ even} . \end{cases}$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that

$$\Delta(k) \leqslant \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(3k-1) & k \text{ odd} \\ 2k & k \text{ even} \end{cases}$$

which is established in [22], and Lemma 4, and Hua's bound for $M(k)$ in [11]. Note that we must use $M(k)$ and not $N(k)$ since we require exact solutions so that $C \neq 0$. □

The best bounds for small k are derived from the above lemma using specific solutions of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem and careful computation of $\Delta(k, C)$. In the following table we represent solutions as in the third form of the problem, and we define

$$[n_1, \ldots, n_k] := \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - x^{n_i})$$

$$g := 1 - x + x^3 + x^5 - x^4 + x^{10} + x^{27} + x^{17} - x^{26} - x^{23} + x^{22} + x^{24}$$

$$h := x + x^{25} + x^{31} + x^{84} + x^{87} + x^{134} + x^{158} + x^{182} + x^{198} - x^2 - x^{18} - x^{42} - x^{66} - x^{113} - x^{116} - x^{169} - x^{175} - x^{199}$$

k	bound for $v(k)$	solution
7	14	[1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
8	30	[3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19] $\cdot\, g$
9	29	[1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13]
10	30	h
11	28	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17]
12	37	[1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19]
13	39	[1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19]
14	53	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19]
15	69	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19]
16	92	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19]
17	72	[1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19]
18	86	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 29]
19	88	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23]
20	120	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29]

This table is from [9] and [24] as are most of the results of this section. Some of the bounds are improved by using Wright's calculation of $\Delta(k)$ and our solutions of smaller size.

4.2. A Problem of Erdős and Szekeres

We call a solution $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$, $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}$ of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem a **pure product** if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\beta_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - z^{n_i})$$

for some $n_1, \ldots, n_k$. Note that pure products are obtained from ideal solutions of degree zero by applying Lemma 2 repeatedly. These are a very restricted class of solutions of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott Problem.

Proposition 10. *If*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\beta_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - z^{n_i})$$

then $\{\alpha_i\}, \{\beta_i\}$ *is equivalent to a symmetric solution of degree* k *and size* n.

Proof. Note that symmetry in the third form of the problem requires

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\alpha_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} z^{\beta_i} = (-1)^k f(1/z) .$$

The appropriate equivalent solution can be shown to satisfy this condition. □

For $f(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{k}(1 - z^{n_i}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i z^i$, where $n = \deg f$, we define the norms

$$\| f \|_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n} | \alpha_i |$$

$$\| f \|_2 = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(e^{i\theta})^2 d\theta \right)^{1/2}$$

$$\| f \|_\infty = \sup_{|z|=1} | f(z) | .$$

We observe that $\| f \|_1$ is twice the size of the solution $\{\alpha_i\}$, $\{\beta_i\}$ of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem.

LEMMA 5.

$$\frac{\| f \|_1}{\sqrt{\deg f + 1}} \leqslant \| f \|_2 \leqslant \| f \|_\infty \leqslant \| f \|_1 \leqslant \| f \|_2^2 .$$

Proof. This is all easily established. It all follows from well known inequalities and the fact that the coefficients of f are integers. □

In 1958 [8] Erdős and Szekeres formulated the problem of finding

$$A(k) = \min_{n_1, \ldots, n_k} \left\| \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 - z^{n_i}) \right\|_\infty$$

They have conjectured that $A(k) \geqslant k^C$ for any C. There has been very little progress in this pretty old problem. Though an interesting and possibly related problem is solved in [2]. See Section 6.

We can use pure product solutions of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem to find upper bounds for $A(k)$. These are not good general bounds, but we do find good upper bounds for small values of k using specific solutions. The following table was derived using various greedy algorithms to find the $\{n_i\}$.

k	$\|f\|_1$	$\{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$
1	2	$\{1\}$
2	4	$\{1, 2\}$
3	6	$\{1, 2, 3\}$
4	8	$\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$
5	10	$\{1, 2, 3, 5, 7\}$
6	12	$\{1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$
7	16	$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11\}$
8	16	$\{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13\}$
9	20	$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13\}$
10	24	$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17\}$
11	28	$\{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19\}$
12	36	$\{1, \ldots, 9, 11, 13, 17\}$
13	48	$\{1, \ldots, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19\}$
14	56	$\{1, \ldots, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17\}$
15	60	$\{1, \ldots, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19\}$
16	60	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23\}$
17	68	$\{1, \ldots, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 29\}$
18	84	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23\}$
19	100	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29\}$
20	116	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 31\}$
21	130	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31\}$
22	140	$\{1, \ldots, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 37\}$
23	156	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 37\}$
24	204	$\{1, \ldots, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37\}$
25	188	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 41\}$
26	228	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41\}$
27	276	$\{1, \ldots, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41\}$
28	336	$\{1, \ldots, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41\}$
29	392	$\{1, 1, 2, 2, \ldots, 27\}$
30	432	$\{1, 1, 1, 2, \ldots, 28\}$

k	$\|f\|_1$	$\{n_1, \ldots, n_k\}$
40	1900	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 17, 19, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 37, 43, 47, 49, 49\}$
41	1348	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 17, 19, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 49, 53\}$
42	1936	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 17, 19, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 47, 52, 53\}$
43	2396	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 17, 19, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 46, 52, 53, 60\}$
44	2492	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 46, 52, 53, 60\}$
45	2684	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 44, 46, 52, 53, 60\}$
46	2336	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 52, 53, 60\}$
47	3196	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 52, 53, 60\}$
48	4080	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 60\}$
49	4086	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 60\}$
50	5088	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 60\}$
51	5480	$\{1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60\}$
52	5296	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24, 52, \ldots, 56, \ldots, 58, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 92, 95, 100\}$
53	6000	$\{1, \ldots, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, \ldots, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 95, 100, 142\}$
54	7352	$\{1, 1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, \ldots, 53, 55, 56, 60\}$
55	5044	$\{1, 1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, \ldots, 56, 60\}$
56	7536	$\{1, 1, \ldots, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, \ldots, 80, 82, \ldots, 92, 95, 100\}$
57	7156	$\{1, 1, \ldots, 11, 13, 16, 17, 24, 52, \ldots, 56, 58, \ldots, 80, 82, \ldots, 92, 95, 100\}$
58	6268	$\{1, 1, 2, 2, \ldots, 29, 31, \ldots, 38, 41, \ldots, 44, 46, \ldots, 60\}$
59	7572	$\{1, 1, \ldots, 11, 13, \ldots, 17, 24, 52, \ldots, 52, 58, \ldots, 80, 82, \ldots, 92, 95, 100\}$
60	10848	$\{1, 1, \ldots, 11, 13, \ldots, 17, 24, 52, \ldots, 56, 58, \ldots, 80, 82, \ldots, 92, 95, 100, 100\}$
80	1629900	$\{1, \ldots, 73, 90, \ldots, 95, 97\}$
100	41947220	$\{1, \ldots, 89, 107, \ldots, 117\}$

For $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$, and 8 these products are ideal solutions and therefore also optimal. These may well be the only k for which pure products give ideal solutions. We computed extensively on degree 6 ($k = 7$) and could not find a degree 6 product with $\|f\|_1 = 14$. Since $\|f\|_1$ is always an even integer we therefore conjecture that the minimum attainable is 16 (as above). For larger k there is no reason to believe that we have found minimal examples. This table also provides some good bounds for $N(k)$. For example $N(29) \leqslant 216$ which is much better than the bound of 419 that derives from the discussion following Proposition 3. There are many partial results on the Erdős-Szekeres problem

to be found in [8], [1], [6], [14], [3], [20], [2], [16] and [13]. We give one such new result here.

We now construct an easy example to show that we cannot in general expect exponential growth of the norms of the partial products of $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty}(1-z^{\beta_i})$ on the unit disk. From this point on, $\|f\|$ without a subscript will denote $\|f\|_\infty$.

LEMMA 6. *Let* $1 \leqslant \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots$ *and let*

$$W_n(z) = \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} (1 - z^{\beta_j - \beta_i})$$

then

$$\| W_n(z) \| \leqslant n^{\frac{n}{2}} .$$

Proof. We can explicitly evaluate the Vandermonde determinant

$$D_n := \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} (z^{\beta_j} - z^{\beta_i}) = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & z^{\beta_1} & \cdots & z^{(n-1)\beta_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & z^{\beta_n} & \cdots & z^{(n-1)\beta_n} \end{vmatrix}$$

and by Hadamard's inequality, since each entry of the matrix has modulus at most one in the unit disk,

$$\| D_n \| \leqslant n^{n/2} .$$

Thus

$$\left\| \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} (1 - z^{\beta_j - \beta_i}) \right\| = \left\| \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} (z^{\beta_j} - z^{\beta_i}) \right\| \leqslant n^{n/2} . \qquad \square$$

Observe, as Dobrowolski did in [6], that if we take $\beta_i = i$, we deduce that

$$\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - z^i)^{n-i-1} \right\| \leqslant n^{n/2} ,$$

a result originally obtained by Atkinson in [1].

PROPOSITION 11. *Let* β_i *be the sequence formed by taking the set* $\{2^n - 2^m : n > m \geqslant 0\}$ *in increasing order. Then for all* n,

$$\| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - z^{\beta_i}) \| \leqslant (32n)^{\sqrt{n/8}} .$$

Proof. Note that $2^n - 2^m \geqslant 2^m$ if $n > m$ and that $2^{n_1} - 2^{m_1} = 2^{n_2} - 2^{m_2}$ if and only if $(n_1, m_1) = (n_2, m_2)$. So whenever $n = \frac{k(k-1)}{2}$ for some k we have

$$\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - z^{\beta_i}) \right\| = \left\| \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant k} (z^{2^{j-1}} - z^{2^{i-1}}) \right\| \leqslant k^{k/2} \leqslant \sqrt{2n}^{\sqrt{n/2}} .$$

While if $\frac{k(k-1)}{2} < n < \frac{(k+1)k}{2}$ then

$$\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - z^{\beta_i}) \right\| \leqslant \left\| \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant k} (z^{2^{j-1}} - z^{2^{i-1}}) \right\| \left\| \prod_{i=\frac{k(k-1)}{2}+1}^{n} (1 - z^{\beta_i}) \right\|$$

$$\leqslant \sqrt{2n}^{\sqrt{n/2}} 2^{n - \frac{k(k-1)}{2} - 1} \leqslant \sqrt{2n}^{\sqrt{n/2}} 2^{k-1}$$

$$\leqslant \sqrt{2n}^{\sqrt{n/2}} 2^{\sqrt{2n}} = (32n)^{\sqrt{n/8}} . \qquad \square$$

This is not as good an estimate as Odlyzko's in [16] (see also [13]) which has exponent roughly $n^{1/3}$. What distinguishes it is that it holds for all the partial products of a single infinite product (with distinct increasing exponents). Also, clearly any $\alpha > 2$ could play the role of 2 in the construction of the β_i with the exact same conclusion.

THEOREM 1. *Let* $\{\delta_i\}$ *be any sequence of integers and let* $\{\beta_i\}$ *be the sequence of differences in the following order*

$$\{\delta_1 - \delta_0, \delta_2 - \delta_0, \delta_2 - \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n - \delta_0, \ldots, \delta_n - \delta_{n-1}, \ldots\}$$

then

$$\left\| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 - z^{\beta_i}) \right\| \leqslant (32n)^{\sqrt{n/8}} .$$

5. PERFECT SOLUTIONS OF PRIME SIZE

The first unresolved case of the Prouhet-Tarry-Escott problem is the eleven case. The previous ideal solutions were all found without computer assistance; indeed the cases 1, ..., 10 were all resolved prior to 1950. It therefore seems appropriate to discuss an algorithm for searching for such solutions. We wish to perform a computer search for perfect symmetric ideal solutions