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ABSTRACT. In 1949, Motzkin proved that every Euclidean domain \( R \) has a minimal Euclidean function, \( \phi_R \). He showed that when \( R = \mathbb{Z} \), the minimal function is \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) = \lfloor \log_2 |x| \rfloor \). For over seventy years, \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}} \) has been the only example of an explicitly-computed minimal function in a non-trivial number field. We give the first explicitly-computed minimal function in a non-trivial number field, \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \), which computes the length of the shortest possible \((1+i)\)-ary expansion of any Gaussian integer. We also present an algorithm that uses \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \) to compute minimal \((1+i)\)-ary expansions of Gaussian integers. We solve these problems using only elementary methods.

1. Introduction

Given \( a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \), \( b \neq 0 \), we can divide \( a \) by \( b \) to get a quotient \( q \) and a remainder \( r \), which allows us to write \( a = qb + r \), with \( r < b \). If \( r > \frac{b}{2} \), we may rewrite \( a \) as \((q + 1)b + (r - b)\), so there exist some \( q', r' \in \mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, \ldots\} \) such that \( a = q'b + r' \) and \( |r'| \leq \frac{b}{2} \).

An integral domain \( R \) is a commutative ring with a multiplicative identity where \( ab = 0 \) implies either \( a = 0 \) or \( b = 0 \). A domain \( R \) is called a Euclidean domain if there is a function \( f : R \setminus 0 \to \mathbb{N}_0 \) such that for any \( a, b \in R \setminus 0 \), there exist \( q, r \in R \) such that \( a = qb + r \) and either \( r = 0 \) or \( f(r) < f(b) \). The function \( f \) is a Euclidean function for \( R \). The first paragraph shows that \( f(x) = |x| \) is a Euclidean function for \( \mathbb{Z} \), and that \( f(x) = |\log_2 |x|| \) is a strictly smaller one.

In 1949 Motzkin [5] proved that all Euclidean domains have a minimal Euclidean function, the point-wise minimum of the domain’s Euclidean functions, and that \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) = |\log_2 |x|| \). In the last seventy years, there have been no minimal functions computed for any non-trivial rings of integers of number fields. This paper’s purpose is to ameliorate the situation by computing the minimal function for the Gaussian integers, \( \mathbb{Z}[i] = \{a + bi : a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \} \subset \mathbb{Q}(i) \subset \mathbb{C} \).

H.W. Lenstra Jr. lay the foundation for Theorem 1.2 in 1974 when he proved that

\[
\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^{-1}([0, n]) = B_n = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{n} v_j (1+i)^j, v_j \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm i\} \right\}.
\]

This is a direct analogue of Motzkin’s formula, \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) = \log_2 |x| \), as Lenstra’s formula is one less than the minimal number of digits needed to write \( a + bi \) in base \((1+i)\), and \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}}(x) \) is one less than the least number of digits necessary to write \( x \) in base 2. One can read his original proof in [3], or an elementary, geometric proof in the accompanying paper [2].

Unfortunately, the representation of \( B_n \) in equation [1] makes computing \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \) tricky, even on the integers. Because \( 5 = 4 + 1 = -(1+i)^4 + 1 \), it is clear that \( 5 \in B_4 \), but \( 5 \) can also be written as

\[
(2+2i) + 2 + (1-i) - i = -i \left((1+i)^3 + (1+i)^2 + (1+i) + 1\right) \in B_3,
\]

so finding the smallest \( B_n \) an integer belongs to is not obvious. To confirm that \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(5) = 3 \), we would have to compute all the elements of \( B_2 \), and check that \( 5 \) is not one of them. With the following definition and subsequent theorem, however, computing \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \) and finding the least \( B_n \) is surprisingly easy.
Definition 1.1. For \( n \geq 0 \), we define the sequence

\[
  w_n = \begin{cases} 
  2^{k+1} + 2^k & \text{if } n = 2k \\
  2^{k+2} & \text{if } n = 2k + 1.
  \end{cases}
\]

If \( n \geq 0 \), then \( w_{n+2} = 2w_n \) and if \( k \geq 1 \), then \( w_{2k+1} - w_{2k} = w_{2k} - w_{2k-1} = 2^k \).

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that \( a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \), that \( m \) is the smallest integer such that \( \frac{\max(|a|,|b|)}{2^j} \leq w_m - 2 \), and that \( j \) is the largest integer such that \( 2^j \) divides both \( a \) and \( b \). Then

\[
  \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi) = \begin{cases} 
  m + 2j & \text{if } \frac{|a|+|b|}{2^j} \leq w_{m+1} - 3 \\
  m + 2j + 1 & \text{if } \frac{|a|+|b|}{2^j} > w_{m+1} - 3.
  \end{cases}
\]

We introduce directions to compute \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi) \) that run particularly quickly on computers, as the implementation takes advantage of processors' underlying binary nature. We also present an algorithm using \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \) to find minimal \((1+i)\) -ary expansions of any Gaussian integer. Lastly, we provide step-by-step examples computing \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(90 + 44i) \) in Section 3 and a minimal \((1+i)\) -ary expansion of \( 90 + 44i \) in Section 4.

2. Euclidean functions and the Gaussian integers, \( \mathbb{Z}[i] \)

The sets \( B_n \), defined in the introduction, have several nice properties. They are closed under both complex conjugation and multiplication by elements of \( B_0 = \{0, \pm 1, \pm i\} \). If \( a + bi \in B_n \), then \((1+i)^j(a + bi) \in B_{n+j} \). Similarly, if \( 2^j \) divides both \( a \) and \( b \) for some \( a + bi \in B_n \), then \( \frac{a}{b} + \frac{b}{a}i \in B_{n-2j} \). Our definition of \( B_n \) does not, however, allow us to easily determine whether a given element \( a + bi \) is a member of \( B_n \).

We use the sequence \( w_n \), also defined in the introduction, to define the following ‘octagonal snowflakes,’ which we will use to delinate the shape of the \( B_n \)'s. We use \( a|b \) to denote ‘\( a \) divides \( b \),’ we use \( a \parallel c \) when \( a|c \) and \( a^{k+1} \mid c \), and we use \( (a,b) \) as shorthand for ‘the greatest common divisor of \( a \) and \( b \).’ If \( x \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \), we denote the real and imaginary parts by \( \text{Re}(x) \) and \( \text{Im}(x) \), so that \( x = \text{Re}(x) + \text{Im}(x)i \).

Definition 2.1. For \( n \geq 0 \), we define

\[
  S_n := \{x + yi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] : 0 \not\mid 2 \mid \gcd(x,y); |x|, |y| \leq w_n - 2; |x| + |y| \leq w_{n+1} - 3\}.
\]

Our sets are lacy and symmetrical (see Figure 1) along the four lines \( \text{Re}(x) = 0 \), \( \text{Im}(x) = 0 \), \( \text{Re}(x) = \text{Im}(x) \), and \( \text{Re}(x) = -\text{Im}(x) \) because the \( S_0 \) are closed under complex conjugation and multiplication by units, like the sets \( B_n \). They are nested, so that \( S_0 \subset S_1 \subset S_2 \). The following theorem demonstrates the relationship between the sets \( S_n \) and \( B_n \).

Theorem 2.2. The set \( B_n \setminus 0 \) is a disjoint union of multiples of the sets \( S_{n-2j} \), where

\[
  B_n \setminus 0 = \coprod_{j=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} 2^j S_{n-2j}.
\]

Proof. We prove this by induction on \( n \). We first show that this holds when \( n \) is even, and then we prove it for odd \( n \).

Our base cases are \( B_0 \setminus 0 = \{\pm 1, \pm i\} \) and \( B_1 \setminus 0 = \{\pm 1, \pm i, \pm 1 \pm i, \pm 2 \pm i, \pm 1 \pm 2i\} \). Definition 2.1 shows that \( B_0 = S_0 \) and \( B_1 = S_1 \).

Case \( n = 2k \): We prove \( B_{2k} = S_{2k} \) by showing containment in both directions. First suppose that \( k \geq 1 \) and that the theorem holds for all \( j, 0 \leq j < n = 2k \). If \( a + bi \in B_{2k} \setminus B_{2k-1} \), then there exists a unit \( u \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \).
such that \((a + bi) - 2^k \in B_{2k-1}\), so we may assume without loss of generality that \((a - 2^k) + bi \in B_{2k-1}\). Our induction hypothesis implies that there exists some \(j, 0 \leq j < k\), such that \(2^j \parallel (a - 2^k, b)\).

\[
|a - 2^k|, |b| \leq w_{2k-1} - 2^{j+1} \text{ and } |a - 2^k| + |b| \leq w_{2k} - 3 \cdot 2^j.
\]

This means that

\[
|a|, |b| \leq w_{2k-1} + 2^k - 2^{j+1} \text{ and } |a| + |b| \leq w_{2k} + 2^k - 3 \cdot 2^j,
\]

and thus

\[
|a|, |b| \leq w_{2k} - 2^{j+1} \text{ and } |a| + |b| \leq w_{2k+1} - 3 \cdot 2^j.
\]

As \(2^j \parallel (a, b)\), \(a + bi \in 2^j S_{2k-j}\) and \(B_{2k} \setminus 0 \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{[k]} 2^j S_{2(k-j)}\).

Now we prove containment in the other direction. Suppose that \(0 \leq j \leq k\) and that \(a + bi \in 2^j S_{n-2j}\). If \(j > 0\), then \(\frac{a}{2^j} + \frac{bi}{2^j} \in S_{2(k-j)}\), which is contained in \(B_{2(k-j)} \setminus 0\) by our induction hypothesis, and thus \(a + bi \in B_{2k} \setminus 0\).

If \(j = 0\), then \(a + bi \in S_{2k}\). Due to the symmetries of \(S_{2k}\), we can assume without loss of generality that \(a \geq b \geq 0\). Our induction hypothesis implies that \(S_{2k-1} \subset B_{2k-1} \setminus 0\) and as \(B_{2k-1} \subset B_{2k}\), we need only concern ourselves with \(a + bi \in S_{2k} \setminus S_{2k-1}\). If \(a + bi \in S_{2k} \setminus S_{2k-1}\), then either \(a > w_{2k-1} - 2 = 2^{k+1} - 2\) or \(a + b > w_{2k} - 3 = 2^{k+1} + 2^k - 3\).

In both of these situations, \(a \geq 2^k\), so

\[
|a - 2^k| \leq w_{2k} - 2^k - 2 = w_{2k-1} - 2.
\]

As \(a + b \leq w_{2k+1} - 3\) and \(0 \leq b \leq a\), \(2b \leq w_{2k+1} - 4\), and thus \(b \leq w_{2k-1} - 2\). Lastly, note

\[
|a - 2^k| + |b| = a + b - 2^k \leq w_{2k+1} - 3 - 2^k = w_{2k} - 3.
\]
The pair $a$ and $b$ are not both even, so $2 \nmid (a - 2^k, b)$ and thus $(a - 2^k) + bi \in S_{2k-1} \subset B_{2k-1}$. Therefore, $a + bi \in (B_{2k-1} + 2^k) \subset B_{2k}$, and $\bigcup_{j=0}^{2j} S_{2(k-j)}$ is contained in $B_{2k}$. We have shown containment in both directions, so the two sets are, indeed, equal.

We assumed that $k \geq 1$ and that the theorem held for all $j$, $0 \leq j < 2k$. After the first part of the proof, we can now say under the same assumptions, that the claim holds for all $j$, $0 \leq j \leq 2k$.

**Case $n = 2k+1$:** We will again prove this by containment in both directions. We just showed that $B_{2k} \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{2j} S_{2(k-j)} \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{2j} \bigcup_{k=1}^{2} S_{2(k-j)+1}$. Let $a + bi \in B_{2k+1} \setminus B_{2k}$. We may again assume without loss of generality that $(a + bi) - 2^k (1 + i) \in B_{2k}$ and that there exists some $j$, $0 \leq j \leq k$, such that $(a - 2^k) + (b - 2^k)i \in 2^j S_{2(k-j)}$.

Note that if $j = k$, then $|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| \leq 2^k$, so one of the summands must be zero. This implies that, even when $j = k$, $2^j \parallel (a, b)$. We know that $|a - 2^k|, |b - 2^k| \leq w_{2k} - 2^{j+1}$ and $|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| \leq w_{2k+1} - 3 \cdot 2^j$. As $w_{2k} + 2^k = w_{2k+1}$ and $w_{2k+1} + 2^{k+1} = w_{2k+2}$, we see that $2^j \parallel (a, b); |a|, |b| \leq w_{2k+1} - 2^{j+1};$ and $|a| + |b| \leq w_{2k+2} - 3 \cdot 2^j$,

We infer that $B_{2k+1} \setminus B_{2k}$, and thus all of $B_{2k+1}$, is contained inside $\bigcup_{j=0}^{k} 2^j S_{2(k-j)+1}$.

To prove the other direction, let $0 \leq j \leq k$ and let $a + bi \in 2^j S_{2(k-j)+1}$. We can again assume without loss of generality that $a \geq b \geq 0$. When $j \geq 1$, we can apply our induction hypothesis to see that $\frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2^j}i \in S_{2(k-j)+1} \subset B_{2(k-j)+1}$, and thus $a + bi \in B_{2k+1}$.

When $j = 0$, we restrict ourselves once more to $a + bi \in S_{2k+1} \setminus S_{2k}$, as $S_{2k} \subset B_{2k} \subset B_{2k+1}$. If $a + bi \in S_{2k+1} \setminus S_{2k}$, then either $a > w_{2k} - 2$ or $a + b > w_{2k+1} - 3$. We see that $a \geq 2^{k+1} - 1$ in both situations, so $2^k - 1 \leq a - 2^k \leq w_{2k} - 2$ and $-2^k \leq b - 2^k \leq w_{2k} - 2$. If $b \geq 2^k$, then

$$|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| = a + b - 2^{k+1} \leq w_{2k+2} - 2^{k+1} - 3 = w_{2k+1} - 3.$$ If $0 < b < 2^k$, then

$$|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| \leq a - 2^k + 2^k - b \leq a - 1 \leq w_{2k+1} - 3.$$ Lastly, if $b = 0$, then $a$ is odd, so

$$|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| = a \leq w_{2k+1} - 3.$$

In summary, if $j = 0$ and $a + bi \in S_{2k+1} \setminus S_{2k}$, then $(a - 2^k) + (b - 2^k)i \in S_{2k} \subset B_{2k}$, so $a + bi = 2^k (1 + i) + (a - 2^k) + (b - 2^k)i \in B_{2k+1}$.

We conclude that $\bigcup_{j=0}^{k} 2^j S_{2(k-j)+1} \subset B_{2k+1} \setminus 0$, and the two sets are equal. 

**Example 2.3.** We see in Figure 2 that the set $B_2 \setminus 0$ is the union of $S_2$ (in light gray) and $2S_0$ (in black). Similarly, the set $B_3 \setminus 0$ is the union of $S_3$ (in light gray) and $2S_1$ (in black).

2.1. **An Alternate Formulation of our Main Result.** We can use another set of octagons that are even lacier than our sequence $S_n$.

**Definition 2.4.** For $n \geq 0$, we define

$$D_n := \{x + yi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] : 2 \parallel (x + y); |x|, |y| \leq w_n - 2; |x| + |y| \leq w_{n+1} - 3 \}.$$
Figure 2. Examples of the sets $B_n \setminus 0$

Figure 3. Examples of $D_n$

The set $D_n$ is the subset of elements of $S_n$ that are not divisible by $1 + i$. Like the $S_n$ and $B_n$, the sets $D_n$ are nested, and they are closed under both complex conjugation and multiplication by units.

Lemma 2.5. For $n \geq 1$, $S_n = D_n \cup (1+i)D_{n-1}$.

Proof. As $(1+i)|(x+yi)$ if and only if $2|(x+y)$, it is clear that \{ $x+yi \in S_n : (1+i) \nmid (x+yi)$ \} = $D_n$. To complete the proof, we must show that \{ $x+yi \in S_n : (1+i)|(x+yi)$ \} = $(1+i)D_{n-1}$. We do so by showing containment in both directions.

Suppose $a + bi \in D_{n-1}$, noting that $(1+i) \nmid (a+bi)$. We can assume without loss of generality that $w_{n-1}-2 \geq a > b \geq 0$. Note that $(1+i)(a+bi) = (a-b) + (a+b)i$, so that $0 < a-b \leq a+b \leq w_n - 3 < w_n - 2$ and

$$0 \leq (a-b) + (a+b) = 2a \leq 2(w_{n-1}-2) = w_{n+1} - 4 < w_{n+1} - 3.$$  
As $2 \nmid (a+b)$, we see $2 \nmid \gcd(a-b,a+b)$, and therefore infer that $(a+bi)(1+i) \in S_n$. 


Therefore, to compute $\varphi$ under complex conjugation and multiplication by units.

Figure 4 shows that Example 2.6.

Example 2.6. Figure 4 shows that $S_3$ is the union of $D_3$ (in light grey) and $(1 + i)D_2$ (in black).

Lemma 2.3 allows us to restate Theorem 2.2 in terms of the $D_n$, rather than the $S_n$.

Theorem 2.7. The set $B_n \setminus 0$ is a disjoint union of multiples of sets $D_n$, where

$$B_n = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 + i)^j D_{n-j}.$$ 

Proof. Theorem 2.2 states that $B_n \setminus 0 = \bigcup_{j=0}^{n/2} 2^j S_{n-2j}$. If $n = 2j$, then $2^j S_0 = (1 + i)^{2j} D_0$. As $2^j S_{n-2j} = (1 + i)^{2j} D_{n-2j} \cup (1 + i)^{2j+1} D_{n-(2j+1)}$ when $n - 2j \geq 0$, the rest follows.

Example 2.8. In Figure 5, $B_3$ is the union of $D_3$ (in lightest grey), $(1 + i)D_2$ (in medium grey), $(1 + i)^2 D_1$ (in hatched grey), and $(1 + i)^3 D_0$ (in black).

3. Computing the minimal Euclidean function on the Gaussian integers

Lenstra’s Theorem tells us that

$$\varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^{-1}(n) = \varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^{-1}([0, n]) \setminus \varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}^{-1}([0, n-1]) = B_n \setminus B_{n-1}.$$ 

Therefore, to compute $\varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi)$ for $a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus 0$, we need to find the least value of $n$ such that $a + bi \in B_n$. We do this using Theorem 2.2. Note $\varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(\pm a \pm bi) = \varphi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(\pm b \pm ai)$ as the sets $B_n$ are closed under complex conjugation and multiplication by units.

We can now prove Theorem 2.2.
Figure 5. \(B_3 = D_3 \cup (1+i)D_2 \cup 2D_1 \cup 2(1+i)D_0\)

Proof. If \(\frac{|a|+|b|}{2^j} \leq w_{m+1} - 3\), then \(a + bi \in 2^j(S_m \setminus S_{m-1})\) and \(a + bi \in B_{m+2j} \setminus B_{m+2j-1}\) by Theorem 2.2. Suppose that \(\frac{|a|+|b|}{2^j} > w_{m+1} - 3\) and \(a + bi \notin 2^jS_m\). Our assumption \(a \geq b \geq 0\) tells us that \(\frac{|a|+|b|}{2^j} \leq 2(w_m - 2) \leq w_{m+2} - 4\), so \(a + bi \in 2^j(S_{m+1} \setminus S_m)\). We deduce that \(a + bi \in B_{m+2j+1} \setminus B_{m+2j}\) by Theorem 2.2. \(\square\)

Theorem 1.2 gives us a clear algorithm to compute \(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi)\) for any \(a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus 0\), as \(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi) = \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(\max(|a|,|b|) + \min(|a|,|b|)i)\). It runs rapidly on computers, as they all run on binary arithmetic. We can use the bitwise operations \& and \(\gg\) to quickly find the greatest power of 2 that divides any non-zero integer \(x\). We outline the algorithm below.

1. Given \(\alpha + \beta i\), let \(a = \max(|\alpha|,|\beta|), b = \min(|\alpha|,|\beta|)\).

2. Let \(j\) be the integer satisfying \(2^j \parallel (a,b)\).

3. Let \(p = |\log_2(\frac{a}{b} + 2)|\).
   When \(p = 1\):
   - If \(b = 0\), then \(m = 0\).
   - If \(b = 2^j\), then \(M = 1\).
   When \(p \geq 2\):
   - If \((\frac{a}{b} + 2) = 2^p\), let \(m = 2p - 3\).
   - If \(2^p < (\frac{a}{b} + 2) \leq 2^p + 2^{p-1}\), then let \(m = 2p - 2\).
   - If \(2^p + 2^{p-1} < (\frac{a}{b} + 2) < 2^{p+1}\), then let \(m = 2p - 1\).

4. If \(\frac{a+b}{2^j} + 3 \leq w_{m+1}\), then \(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(\alpha + \beta i) = m + 2j\). Otherwise, \(\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(\alpha + \beta i) = m + 2j + 1\).
Example 3.1. Let \( a + bi = 90 + 44i \). Note that \( a + bi = 2(45 + 22i) \), so \( J = 1 \). Then \( \frac{A}{2} = 45 \) and \( 32 < 45 + 2 < 48 \), so \( P = 5 \) and \( M = 8 \). Next, we see that \( 45 + 22 + 3 = 70 > 64 = w_9 \), so \( \phi(90 + 44i) = 8 + 2 + 1 = 11 \).

4. Finding minimal \((1 + i)\)-ary expansions

Section \[ \] gives an algorithm to find the length of a minimal \((1 + i)\)-ary expansion of \( a + bi \), \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi) \). We now use \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} \) to then find one of those minimal expansions. The naive way to find a minimal expansion \( \sum_{j=0}^{n} u_j(1 + i)^j \), \( u_j \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm i\} \) of \( a + bi \) would be to compute the four values \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi - w(1 + i)^n) \) for \( w \in \{ \pm 1, \pm i\} \). For at least one of the \( w \in \{ \pm 1, \pm i\} \), \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi - w(1 + i)^n) < n \). We set \( u_n = w \) for one of the obliging values of \( w \), and then repeat with the difference \( a + bi - w(1 + i)^n \). With a little forethought, however, we don’t have to compute all four differences. Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 below show that if we check the signs of \( a \) and \( b \) and compare their magnitudes, a coefficient \( u_n \) presents itself. After Lemma 4.2, we present an example applying this technique.

Lemma 4.1. If \( a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus 0 \) and \( \phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(a + bi) = 2k \), then there exists a \((1 + i)\)-ary expansion of \( a + bi \) of length \( 2k + 1 \) where

\[
\nu_{2k}(1 + i)^{2k} = \begin{cases} 2^k & \text{if } 0 \leq |b| \leq a \\ -2^k & \text{if } 0 \leq |b| \leq -a \\ -2^k i & \text{if } 0 \leq |a| \leq -b \\ 2^k i & \text{if } 0 \leq |a| \leq b \end{cases}
\]

Proof. Let us suppose that \( a \geq |b| \geq 0 \) and that \( 2^j \parallel (a, b) \), with \( 0 \leq j \leq k \), so that \( a + bi \in 2^j S_{2(k-j)} \).

If \( k = j \), then \( \frac{a}{2^j} + \frac{b}{2^j} i \in S_0 \), and \( a + bi = 2^k \), so \( (a - 2^k) + bi = 0 \) and \( \nu_{2k}(1 + i)^{2k} = 2^k \).

Now suppose that \( 0 \leq j < k \). As \( \frac{2^j |b|}{2^j} \leq \frac{|a| + |b|}{2^j} \leq \nu_{2(k-j)+1} - 3 \), we see that \( \frac{|b|}{2^j} \leq \nu_{2(k-j)-1} - 2 \). The element \( a + bi \notin 2^j S_{2(k-j)-1} \), so either

\[
\frac{|a|}{2^j} > \nu_{2(k-j)-1} - 2 \geq \nu_{2(k-j)-1} = 2^{k-j} + 2^{k-j-1} > 2^{k-j},
\]

or \( \frac{|a| + |b|}{2^j} > \nu_{2(k-j)} - 3 \). In the second scenario,

\[
\frac{|a|}{2^j} > \nu_{2(k-j)} - 3 - \frac{|b|}{2^j} \geq \nu_{2(k-j)} - 3 + 2 - \nu_{2(k-j)-1},
\]

so

\[
\frac{|a|}{2^j} \geq \nu_{2(k-j)} - \nu_{2(k-j)-1} = 2^{k-j}.
\]

In both situations, \( a \geq 2^k \), so \( 0 < \frac{a - 2^k}{2^j} \leq \nu_{2(k-j)-1} - 2 \) and \( 0 < \frac{a + |b| - 2^k}{2^j} \leq \nu_{2(k-j)} - 3 \). The assumption \( j < k \) means that \( 2^j \parallel (a - 2^k, b) \), so \( (a - 2^k) + bi \in 2^j S_{2(k-j)-1} \subset B_{2k-1} \), and we can write \( a + bi \) as \( 2^k + \) plus some element of \( B_{2k-1} \).

If \( 0 \leq |b| \leq -a \), then \(-a + bi\) is in the analyzed situation, so \(-a + bi + 2^k \in B_{2k-1} \), and thus \( (a + bi) \in -2^k + B_{2k-1} \). The other two claims follow from analogous reasoning. \( \square \)
Lemma 4.2. If $a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus \{0\}$ and $\phi(a + bi) = 2k + 1$, then there exists a $(1 + i)$-ary expansion of $a + bi$ of length $2k + 2$, where

$$u_{2k+1}(1+i)^{2k+1} = \begin{cases} 2^k(1+i) & \text{if } a, b \geq 0 \\ -2^k(1+i) & \text{if } a, b \leq 0 \\ 2^k(1-i) & \text{if } a \geq 0, b \leq 0 \\ -2^k(1-i) & \text{if } a \leq 0, b \geq 0 \end{cases}.$$  

Proof. Suppose that $a, b \geq 0$ and that $2^j \parallel (a, b)$, with $0 \leq j \leq k$, so that $a + bi$ is in the first quadrant of $2^jS_{2(k-j)+1}$. If $j = k$, then $\frac{a}{2^j} + \frac{b}{2j}i \in S_1 \setminus S_0$, and $a + bi \in 2^k\{1+i, 2+i, 1+2i\}$, revealing that $(a - 2^k) + b(2^k) \in \{0, 2^k, 2^k\} \subset B_{2k}$.

If $0 \leq j < k$, then $0 \leq \frac{a}{2^j}, \frac{b}{2j} \leq w_{2(k-j)+1} - 2$, and

$$\left|\frac{a - 2^k}{2^j}\right|, \left|\frac{b - 2^k}{2j}\right| \leq \max\{2^{k-j}, w_{2(k-j)+1} - 2 - 2^{k-j}\} \leq w_{2(k-j)} - 2.$$

If $a, b \geq 2^k$, then

$$\left|\frac{a - 2^k}{2^j}\right| + \left|\frac{b - 2^k}{2j}\right| = \frac{a + b - 2^{k+1}}{2^j} \leq w_{2(k-j)+2} - 3 - 2^{(k-j)+1} = w_{2(k-j)+1} - 3.$$

As $a + bi \notin 2^jS_{2(k-j)}$, we cannot have both $a, b \leq 2^k$. Suppose exactly one of the coordinates is $> 2^k$, so that $|a - 2^k| + |b - 2^k| = \max(a, b) - \min(a, b)$. If $\min(a, b) = 0$, then $2 \nmid \frac{\max(a, b)}{2^j}, \text{ so } \frac{\max(a, b) - \min(a, b)}{2^j} \leq w_{2(k-j)+1} - 3.$

We conclude that $(a - 2^k) + b(2^k) \in 2^jS_{2(k-j)} \subset B_{2k}$.

As in Lemma 4.1, the other cases come from looking at associates of $a + bi$.

\[\square\]

Example 4.3. We return to Example 3.1. We saw that $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(90 + 44i) = 11$, so Lemma 4.2 tells us that $u_{11}(1+i)^{11} = 32(1+i)$. Then:

- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(58 + 12i) = 9$, so $u_9(1+i)^9 = 16(1+i)$
- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(42 - 4i) = 8$, so $u_8(1+i)^8 = 16$
- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(26 - 4i) = 7$, so $u_7(1+i)^7 = 8(1-i)$
- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(18 + 4i) = 6$, so $u_6(1+i)^6 = 8$
- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(10 + 4i) = 5$, so $u_5(1+i)^5 = 4(1+i)$
- $\phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]}(6) = 4$, so $u_4(1+i)^4 = 4$
- $u_2(1+i)^2 = 2$.

We can then write

$$90 + 44i = -i(1+i)^{11} + (1+i)^9 + (1+i)^8 + (1+i)^7 + i(1+i)^6 - i(1+i)^5 - (1+i)^4 - i(1+i)^2,$$

where $u_{11} = u_5 = u_2 = -i, u_9 = u_8 = u_7 = 1, u_6 = i, u_4 = -1$, and $u_{10} = u_4 = u_1 = 0.$
5. Further Work

In [2], I use the geometry of the $B_n$ to give a new proof of Lenstra’s theorem in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$. Lindsey-Kay Lauderdale, Ryan Keck, and I have another paper exploring the minimal Euclidean function on the Eisenstein integers, but we do not have an explicit algorithm, as in the Gaussians. Tom Edgar and I have forthcoming research on alternate expansions of Gaussian integers.
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