

# PROJECTIVE NORMALITY AND EHRHART UNIMODALITY FOR WEIGHTED PROJECTIVE SPACE SIMPLICES

BENJAMIN BRAUN, ROBERT DAVIS, DEREK HANELY, MORGAN LANE, AND LIAM SOLUS

**ABSTRACT.** Within the intersection of Ehrhart theory, commutative algebra, and algebraic geometry lie lattice polytopes. Ehrhart theory is concerned with lattice point enumeration in dilates of polytopes; lattice polytopes provide a sandbox in which to test many conjectures in commutative algebra; and many properties of projectively normal toric varieties in algebraic geometry are encoded through corresponding lattice polytopes. In this article we focus on reflexive simplices and work to identify when these have the integer decomposition property (IDP), or equivalently, when certain weighted projective spaces are projectively normal. We characterize the reflexive, IDP simplices whose associated weighted projective spaces have one projective coordinate with weight fixed to unity and for which the remaining coordinates can assume one of three distinct weights. We show that several subfamilies of such reflexive simplices have unimodal  $h^*$ -polynomials, thereby making progress towards conjectures and questions of Stanley, Hibi-Ohsugi, and others regarding the unimodality of their  $h^*$ -polynomials. We also provide computational results and introduce the notion of reflexive stabilizations to explore the (non-)ubiquity of reflexive simplices that are simultaneously IDP and  $h^*$ -unimodal.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A subset  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a  $d$ -dimensional (convex) lattice polytope if it is the convex hull of finitely many points  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  that span a  $d$ -dimensional affine subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Many interesting geometric and algebraic properties of  $P$  are revealed by considering the cone over  $P$ , defined as the non-negative span of the vectors formed by appending a 1 to each vertex of  $P$ , i.e.

$$\text{cone}(P) := \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} \{(1, \mathbf{v}^{(i)}) : i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Two properties of  $P$  of particular importance are encoded in the arithmetical structure of the cone over  $P$ . First, a lattice polytope  $P$  is said to have the *integer decomposition property* (or to be IDP) if for every positive integer  $m$  and each  $(m, \mathbf{w}) \in \text{cone}(P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ , there exist  $m$  points  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$  for which  $(k, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_i (1, \mathbf{x}_i)$ . Second, letting  $K^\circ$  denote the topological interior of a space  $K$ ,  $P$  is said to be *reflexive* if there exists an integer vector  $\mathbf{c} \in P^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  such that

$$(1, \mathbf{c}) + (\text{cone}(P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}) = \text{cone}(P)^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}.$$

Equivalently,  $P$  is reflexive if, possibly after translation by an integer vector, the origin is contained in  $P^\circ$  and the geometric dual (or polar body) of  $P$  is also a lattice polytope. There are many interesting questions about polytopes that are IDP and/or reflexive. For example, it is typically difficult to identify when a given polytope is IDP and unknown how to efficiently determine the number of reflexive polytopes of a fixed dimension (up to unimodular equivalence). Our interest in this paper is polytopes that are simultaneously IDP and reflexive. Our motivation comes from conjectures in Ehrhart theory and combinatorial commutative algebra.

---

*Date:* 31 March 2021.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 52B20, 05A15, 11A05.

BB was partially supported by National Science Foundation award DMS-1953785. RD was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1922998. LS was partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation as well as Starting Grant (Etableringsbidrag) No. 2019-05195 from The Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet).

Specifically, many open problems in combinatorics ask whether or not a given combinatorial generating polynomial  $p = p_0 + p_1x + \cdots + p_dx^d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[x]$  is *unimodal*; i.e., if there exists  $t \in [d] \cup \{0\} := \{1, \dots, d\} \cup \{0\}$  such that  $p_0 \leq \cdots \leq p_t \geq \cdots \geq p_d$ . One approach to such questions is to interpret the polynomial  $p$  as the  $h$ -polynomial associated to a graded ring, and then use the properties of this ring to derive the desired inequalities. Perhaps one of the longest standing questions of this nature is the following, which appeared first in the survey [8]:

**Conjecture 1.1.** [8] *The  $h$ -polynomial of a standard graded Gorenstein domain is unimodal.*

In recent decades, much of the work aimed at resolving this conjecture has centered around examples in which the integral domain of interest is the coordinate ring of a projectively normal toric variety, since in this case, the  $h$ -polynomial admits a combinatorial interpretation in terms of Ehrhart theory for lattice polytopes. Hence, one can attempt to either prove or disprove this conjecture in the special case of semigroup algebras arising from lattice polytopes. The  $h$ -polynomials of standard Gorenstein domains associated to lattice polytopes are precisely the Ehrhart  $h^*$ -polynomials for IDP reflexive polytopes [9], where  $h^*$ -polynomials are defined in Section 4.

While much work has been devoted to studying Conjecture 1.1 in the context of  $h^*$ -polynomials of IDP reflexive polytopes, the conjecture remains open even in many natural special cases. One challenge in addressing Conjecture 1.1 for arbitrary  $P$  is that combinatorial aspects of the  $h^*$ -polynomial are influenced by the topology of triangulations of  $P$  [3, 16, 20]. However, when  $P$  is a simplex, the coefficients of the  $h^*$ -polynomial admit a combinatorial interpretation strictly in terms of lattice point enumeration. This supports the idea that lattice simplices form a simple, combinatorial testing ground for Conjecture 1.1. Moreover, there is an algorithmic classification of reflexive simplices [10]. This makes the family of reflexive simplices a natural starting point for testing Conjecture 1.1. Despite this observation, the status of Conjecture 1.1 is still undecided for many reflexive simplices. This is, in part, due to the fact that those reflexive simplices which are IDP are not well-understood, and in part due to a general inability to test the IDP and  $h^*$ -unimodality conditions for general polytopes living in high dimensions.

Recently, three of the authors [5] gave a characterization of the reflexive IDP simplices associated to a family of weighted projective spaces, and a formula for their  $h^*$ -polynomials, both based in elementary number theory. This machinery yields an efficient method for checking the IDP and unimodality conditions for a relatively broad family of reflexive simplices. In this paper, we explore how a necessary condition for IDP that relaxes the IDP characterization of [5] yields a natural parameterization of an infinite class of reflexive simplices associated to weighted projective spaces. This parametrization allows us to check the IDP condition for reflexive simplices having high dimension and large volume, and to investigate  $h^*$ -unimodality for the resulting IDP reflexives.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review properties of the weighted projective spaces simplices  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ , for  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^n$ , which correspond to weighted projective spaces in which one projective coordinate has weight 1 and the others are given by the entries in  $\mathbf{q}$ . In Section 3, we investigate when a reflexive  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is IDP. We prove Theorem 3.6, which gives a bound on the possible entries of an IDP reflexive  $\mathbf{q}$  with fixed multiplicities on the distinct entries. We also prove Theorem 3.9, a classification of all IDP reflexive  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  where  $\mathbf{q}$  has three distinct entries. In Section 4, we consider the question of  $h^*$ -unimodality for  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ . We provide experimental data that suggests that  $h^*$ -unimodality is rare among the  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ . We also prove Theorem 4.7, establishing that some of the  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  with three distinct entries in  $\mathbf{q}$  are  $h^*$ -unimodal. In Theorem 4.9, we provide an example of a  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  that is simultaneously “almost IDP” and “almost unimodal”. In Section 5, we introduce the concept of  $m$ -th reflexive stabilizations for a simplex  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ . We prove that for large  $m$ , these reflexive stabilizations produce non-IDP simplices that have non-unimodal  $h^*$ -vectors. As most of the proofs for these results are quite technical, we omit the majority of them to the Appendix.

2. THE WEIGHTED PROJECTIVE SPACE SIMPLEX  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ 

Consider an integer partition  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^n$  with the convention  $q_1 \leq \dots \leq q_n$ . The lattice simplex associated with  $\mathbf{q}$  is

$$\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})} := \text{conv} \left\{ \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n, - \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \mathbf{e}_i \right\}$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_i$  denotes the  $i^{\text{th}}$  standard basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Set  $N(\mathbf{q}) := 1 + \sum_i q_i$ . One can show, as for instance in [15, Proposition 4.4], that  $N(\mathbf{q})$  is the normalized volume of  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  denote the set of all lattice simplices of the form  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ .

The simplices in  $\mathcal{Q}$  correspond to a subset of the simplices defining weighted projective spaces [10] for which the vector  $(1, \mathbf{q})$  gives the weights of the projective coordinates of the associated weighted projective space. The family of simplices  $\mathcal{Q}$  are the focus of active study [1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 17], in particular in regards to Conjecture 1.1 and the associated IDP and unimodality conditions. This is because  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a relatively general family of simplices (one for each weakly increasing vector  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^n$ ) with diverse lattice point combinatorics, and because they simultaneously admit tractable characterizations of the reflexive and IDP conditions. This makes  $\mathcal{Q}$  a natural testing ground for exploring the intricacies of the relationship between the IDP and unimodality properties while maintaining some combinatorial control over the examples at hand.

The family  $\mathcal{Q}$  admits a natural parametrization (or stratification), based on the distinct entries in the vector  $\mathbf{q}$ , that allows us to test for the reflexive and IDP conditions even when  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is high-dimensional and/or has large volume. Given a vector of distinct positive integers  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ , write

$$(r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \dots, r_d^{x_d}) := \underbrace{(r_1, r_1, \dots, r_1)}_{x_1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{(r_2, r_2, \dots, r_2)}_{x_2 \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{(r_d, r_d, \dots, r_d)}_{x_d \text{ times}}.$$

If  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_n) = (r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2}, \dots, r_d^{x_d})$ , we say that both  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  are *supported* by the vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$ , which has distinct entries, with *multiplicity*  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ . We write  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$  in this case and say that  $\mathbf{q}$  is *d-supported*.

We are particularly interested in the case when the simplex  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive, and we say that  $\mathbf{q}$  is reflexive whenever  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive. The following theorem and setup provide us with a number-theoretic basis for studying reflexive simplices in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** [10] *The simplex  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})} \in \mathcal{Q}$  is reflexive if and only if*

$$(1) \quad q_i \text{ divides } 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n q_j \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq n .$$

*Equivalently, if  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$ , then  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive if and only if  $\text{lcm}(r_1, \dots, r_d)$  divides  $1 + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i r_i$ .*

**Setup 2.2.** Let  $\mathbf{q}$  be reflexive and supported by the vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$  with multiplicity  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$ . Let  $\ell = \ell(\mathbf{q})$  be the integer defined by

$$(2) \quad 1 + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i r_i = \ell \cdot \text{lcm}(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_d) .$$

Finally, we define  $\mathbf{s} := (s_1, \dots, s_d)$  where

$$(3) \quad s_i := \frac{\text{lcm}(r_1, \dots, r_d)}{r_i}$$

for each  $1 \leq i \leq d$ .

This setup provides useful restrictions on  $\mathbf{q}$ , such as the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3** (Braun, Liu, [7]). *In Setup 2.2, we have that  $\gcd(r_1, \dots, r_d) = 1$  and thus*

$$(4) \quad \text{lcm}(s_1, \dots, s_d) = \text{lcm}(r_1, \dots, r_d).$$

**Remark 2.4.** The Hermite normal form for the simplex  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} - e_1$  is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & N(\mathbf{q}) - q_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & N(\mathbf{q}) - q_3 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & N(\mathbf{q}) - q_d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & N(\mathbf{q}) \end{bmatrix},$$

that is,  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  is unimodularly equivalent to the convex hull of the columns of this matrix. This is an example of a simplex with what Hibi, Higashitani, and Li [13] call a one-column Hermite normal form. Their paper provides a partial study of Ehrhart-theoretic properties of such polytopes.

### 3. THE INTEGER DECOMPOSITION PROPERTY

**3.1. Restrictions on IDP reflexive  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ .** For each  $\mathbf{r}$ -vector, it is known [5] that there are infinitely many reflexive  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ 's supported on  $\mathbf{r}$ . Given a pair  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  and  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$ , both reflexive and IDP, Braun and Davis [4] proved that a new reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{y})}$  can be constructed as shown in the following theorem. Suppose that  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  are reflexive and the vertices of  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  are labeled as  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_m$ . For every  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , define the *affine free sum*

$$\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} *_i \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})} := \text{conv} \{ (\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} \times 0^m) \cup (0^n \times \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})} - v_i) \} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}.$$

The notion of an affine free sum can be generalized significantly [2], but in this article it will not be necessary.

**Theorem 3.1** (Braun, Davis [4]). *The simplex  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive and arises as a free sum  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})} *_0 \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{w})}$  if and only if  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  and  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{w})}$  are reflexive and  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{p}, (1 + \sum_i p_i) \mathbf{w})$ . If  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  is IDP reflexive and  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  is IDP, then  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} *_0 \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  is IDP. Further, if  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  and  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  are reflexive, IDP, and  $h^*$ -unimodal (defined in Section 4), then so is  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} *_0 \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$ .*

Thus, there are infinitely many reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ 's that arise as a result of the affine free sum operation, and these all satisfy Conjecture 1.1. However, the support vector for  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})} *_0 \Delta_{(1, \mathbf{p})}$  is distinct from that of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , so this operation does not respect the stratification of  $\mathcal{Q}$  given by support vectors. In fact, for many  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors, it is impossible to generate infinitely many reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ 's supported on  $\mathbf{r}$ , as the following theorem shows.

**Theorem 3.2** (Braun, Davis, Solus [5]). *Given a support vector  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$ , if there exists some  $j < d$  such that  $r_j \nmid r_d$ , then only finitely many reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ 's are supported on  $\mathbf{r}$ .*

Computational experiments suggest that  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  satisfying the criteria in Theorem 3.2 are rare. Specifically, consider all  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors that are partitions of  $M \leq 75$  with distinct entries, such that there exist some  $r_j$  such that  $r_j \nmid r_d$ . Table 1 shows that only 509 IDP reflexives are supported on  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of this type. While this suggests that IDP reflexive  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ 's are rare, it is important to keep in mind that this represents a relatively small sample set of simplices. For example,

$$\mathbf{q} = (210, 211, 211, 211, 211, \underbrace{1055, 1055, \dots, 1055}_{41 \text{ times}})$$

is not among this sample, but it is both IDP and reflexive with  $210 \nmid 1055$ .

Fortunately, the following theorem provides a number-theoretic characterization of the IDP property for reflexive  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ .

# of $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors with some $r_j \nmid r_d$	# of IDP reflexives supported by these
501350	509

TABLE 1. Experimental results.

**Theorem 3.3** (Braun, Davis, Solus [5]). *The reflexive simplex  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is IDP if and only if for every  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , for all  $b = 1, \dots, q_j - 1$  satisfying*

$$(5) \quad b \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i}{q_j} \right) - \sum_{i \neq j} \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor \geq 2$$

*there exists a positive integer  $c < b$  satisfying the following equations, where the first is considered for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  with  $i \neq j$ :*

$$(6) \quad \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{(b-c)q_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor, \text{ and}$$

$$(7) \quad c \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i}{q_j} \right) - \sum_{i \neq j} \left\lfloor \frac{cq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor = 1.$$

The next corollary of Theorem 3.3 provides a necessary condition for a reflexive  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  to be IDP. This condition is an essential tool in our study of IDP reflexive elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**Corollary 3.4** (Braun, Davis, Solus [5]). *If  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive and IDP, then for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,*

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^n (q_i \bmod q_j) = q_j$$

*or equivalently*

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (r_i \bmod r_j) = r_j.$$

**Definition 3.5.** Any  $\mathbf{q}$  satisfying one (hence both) of these equations for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$  is said to satisfy *the necessary condition for IDP*.

Note that if  $\mathbf{q}$  satisfies the necessary condition for IDP, then  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive.

**3.2. Stratifying by multiplicity instead of support.** The necessary condition for IDP allows us to produce the following new refinement of Theorem 3.2. It has the added benefit of giving a geometric interpretation of IDP reflexive simplices as lattice points contained in a  $d$ -dimensional box with boundary determined by the coordinates of the support vector  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^n$ , where  $\mathbf{q}$  has at least two distinct entries and  $r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_d$ . If  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive and IDP, then*

$$x_i \leq r_{i+1}/r_i$$

*for all  $i \leq d-1$ . Further, if there exists some  $j < d$  such that  $r_j \nmid r_d$ , then*

$$x_d \leq r_j / (r_d \bmod r_j).$$

*Thus, if there exists some  $j < d$  such that  $r_j \nmid r_d$ , then there are at most finitely many IDP reflexives supported on  $\mathbf{r}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $j < d$ , and assume that  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is reflexive and IDP. Then by Corollary 3.4, we have

$$x_j r_j \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i (r_i \bmod r_{j+1}) = r_{j+1},$$

from which the first inequality follows. Similarly, if  $r_j \nmid r_d$ , then

$$x_d (r_d \bmod r_j) \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i (r_i \bmod r_j) = r_j,$$

from which the second inequality follows.  $\square$

Theorem 3.6 indicates that there are important relationships between the multiplicity vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $\mathbf{q}$  and the support vector  $\mathbf{r}$ . By shifting our primary focus to the multiplicity vector, we are able to give a complete classification of all reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ 's that are supported on up to 3 distinct entries. If  $\mathbf{x}$  has one entry, it is straightforward to prove the following.

**Proposition 3.7.** *For  $\mathbf{q} = (r_1^{x_1})$ , if  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is IDP reflexive, then  $\mathbf{q} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ .*

If  $\mathbf{x}$  has two entries, meaning that  $\mathbf{r}$  has two distinct entries, the following theorem applies.

**Theorem 3.8** (Braun, Davis, Solus [5]). *For the vector  $\mathbf{q} = (r_1^{x_1}, r_2^{x_2})$ ,  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is IDP reflexive if and only if it satisfies the necessary condition. The following is a classification of all such vectors, for  $x_1, x_2 \geq 1$ :*

- (1)  $q = (1^{x_1}, (1 + x_1)^{x_2})$
- (2)  $q = ((1 + x_2)^{x_1}, (1 + (1 + x_2)x_1)^{x_2})$

Note that in the first case  $r_1 \mid r_2$  while in the second case  $r_1 \nmid r_2$ . We next extend these known results using Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.4 to the 3-supported case.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Consider a 3-supported vector  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$  such that  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  satisfies the necessity condition for IDP given in Corollary 3.4. If  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  is the multiplicity vector, then  $\mathbf{r}$  is of one of the following forms.*

- (i)  $\mathbf{r} = (1, 1 + x_1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2))$ .
- (ii)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + x_2, 1 + x_1(1 + x_2), (1 + x_1(1 + x_2))(1 + x_2))$ .
- (iii)  $\mathbf{r} = ((1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), 1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), (1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3))(1 + x_2))$ .
- (iv)  $\mathbf{r} = (1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_3), (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2(1 + x_3)))$ .
- (v)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .
- (vi)  $\mathbf{r} = ((1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2), (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .
- (vii)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + x_3, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)), (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .
- (viii) *There exists some  $k, s \geq 1$ , where*

$$\mathbf{r} = (1 + kx_2, (skx_2 + s + k)(1 + x_1(1 + kx_2)), (1 + x_1(1 + kx_2))(1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k)))$$

and

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, skx_2 + s - k + 1).$$

Further, the first seven  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors produce IDP  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ 's, while (8) does not.

As the necessary condition for IDP (see Definition 3.5) implies reflexivity, one immediate consequence of Proposition 3.7 together with Theorems 3.8 and 3.9 is a complete classification of all IDP reflexive simplicies corresponding to weighted projective spaces with one projective coordinate having weight unity and the others limited to three options. Note that the first seven  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors in Theorem 3.9 each correspond to a unique divisibility criteria for  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ , as follows:

- (i)  $r_1 \mid r_2, r_1 \mid r_3, r_2 \mid r_3$

- (ii)  $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \mid r_3, r_2 \mid r_3$
- (iii)  $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \nmid r_3, r_2 \mid r_3$
- (iv)  $r_1 \mid r_2, r_1 \mid r_3, r_2 \nmid r_3$
- (v)  $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \mid r_3, r_2 \nmid r_3$
- (vi)  $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \nmid r_3, r_2 \nmid r_3$
- (vii)  $r_1 \mid r_2, r_1 \nmid r_3, r_2 \nmid r_3$
- (viii)  $r_1 \nmid r_2, r_1 \mid r_3, r_2 \nmid r_3$

We see that (v) and (viii) share the same divisibility pattern, yet of these two families only (v) contains IDP simplices. Note that for each positive integer vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of length at most three, and for each divisibility condition on the support vector  $\mathbf{r}$ , there is at most one support vector  $\mathbf{r}$  such that  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$  is reflexive IDP. It would be of interest to determine if this is true for  $\mathbf{x}$  of arbitrary length.

#### 4. EHRHART UNIMODALITY

**4.1. Properties of  $h^*$ -polynomials for  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ .** The *Ehrhart function* of  $P$  is the lattice point enumerator  $i(P; t) := |tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^n|$ , where  $tP := \{tp : p \in P\}$  denotes the  $t^{\text{th}}$  dilate of the polytope  $P$ . It is well-known [11] that  $i(P; t)$  is a polynomial in  $t$  of degree  $d \leq \dim(P)$ . The *Ehrhart series* of  $P$  is the rational function

$$\text{Ehr}_P(z) := \sum_{t \geq 0} i(P; t) z^t = \frac{h_0^* + h_1^* z + \cdots + h_d^* z^d}{(1 - z)^{\dim(P)+1}},$$

where the coefficients  $h_0^*, h_1^*, \dots, h_d^*$  are all nonnegative integers [18]. The polynomial  $h^*(P; z) := h_0^* + h_1^* z + \cdots + h_d^* z^d$  is called the (*Ehrhart*)  $h^*$ -*polynomial* of  $P$ , and it is the  $h$ -polynomial of interest in Conjecture 1.1 when  $\text{Ehr}_P(z)$  is the Hilbert series of the coordinate ring  $A_P$  of the toric variety associated to the lattice polytope  $P$ . It is well-known that  $A_P$  is standard if and only if  $P$  is IDP. A result of Stanley [19] states that  $A_P$  is Gorenstein if and only if  $h^*(P; z)$  is symmetric with respect to its degree  $s$ ; i.e.,  $h_i^* = h_{s-i}^*$  for all  $i$ . Hibi [12] proved the special case that  $P$  is reflexive if and only if  $h_i^* = h_{\dim(P)-i}^*$  for all  $i$ . Further, Bruns and Römer [9] proved that if  $A_P$  is Gorenstein, then  $h^*(P; z)$  is the  $h^*$ -polynomial of a reflexive polytope. The Bruns and Römer result implies that the family of lattice polytopes of interest in Conjecture 1.1 are the  $d$ -dimensional IDP lattice polytopes with symmetric  $h^*$ -polynomials of degree  $d$ . Unlike the situation for general lattice polytopes, for  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  there is an explicit formula for  $h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z)$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (Braun, Davis, Solus [5]). *The  $h^*$ -polynomial of  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is*

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z) = \sum_{b=0}^{q_1 + \cdots + q_n} z^{w(\mathbf{q}, b)}$$

where

$$(8) \quad w(\mathbf{q}, b) := b - \sum_{i=1}^n \left\lfloor \frac{q_i b}{1 + q_1 + \cdots + q_n} \right\rfloor.$$

**Example 4.2.** Let  $\mathbf{q} = (2, 2, 3)$ . Then  $w(\mathbf{q}, b) := b - 2 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{4} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{3b}{8} \right\rfloor$ , and thus

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z) = 1 + 2z + 4z^2 + z^3.$$

Prior to discussing the case of reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ , it is worth asking whether or not  $h^*$ -unimodality is expected for an arbitrary  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ . Based on experiments conducted via SageMath [21], there appears to be a trend in the overall frequency of  $h^*$ -unimodality of  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  as the normalized volume  $N(\mathbf{q})$  grows. Specifically, let  $V(M) := \{\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})} : N(\mathbf{q}) = M\}$  and define  $\text{un}(M)$  to be the




FIGURE 1. Approximate values of  $\text{un}(M)$  for  $M \leq 120$ , based on randomly sampled partitions.

fraction of the simplices in  $V(M)$  having a unimodal  $h^*$ -vector. The values of  $\text{un}(M)$  for  $M \leq 75$  have been computed exactly, involving 61,537,394 simplices. A plot of approximate values of  $\text{un}(M)$  using random samples is given in Figure 1.

The limiting behavior of  $\text{un}(M)$  is not known; various random sampling of  $\mathbf{q}$  with fixed values of  $N(\mathbf{q})$  suggests that  $\text{un}(M)$  continues to decrease as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , but the rate of decrease also appears to be approaching zero. This leads us to the following question.

**Question 4.3.** *Is  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{un}(M) = 0$ ? If not, does the limit exist? If not, what are the values of  $\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{un}(M)$  and  $\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{un}(M)$ ?*

Based on this empirical data, it seems reasonable to suspect that those  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  having unimodal  $h^*$ -polynomials are uncommon, and thus Conjecture 1.1 is suggesting that reflexive IDP  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ 's are unusual in this regard. Returning our focus to the case where  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is IDP reflexive, we will later need to know that the  $h^*$ -polynomial of  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  often admits a geometric series as a factor, as the following definition and theorem demonstrate.

**Definition 4.4.** Suppose  $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}, \ell$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  are as given in Setup 2.2. We define

$$g_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{x}}(z) := \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < \text{lcm}(r_1, \dots, r_d)} z^{u(\alpha)}$$

where

$$u(\alpha) = u_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{x}}(\alpha) := \alpha \ell - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha}{s_i} \right\rfloor.$$

**Theorem 4.5** (Braun, Liu [7]). *Assuming Setup 2.2, we have that*

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z) = \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\ell-1} z^t \right) \cdot g_{\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbf{x}}(z).$$

**Example 4.6.** For  $\mathbf{q} = (1^7, 3^4, 5^5)$ , we have

$$(z^2 + z + 1)(x^{14} + x^{11} + 2x^{10} + 2x^8 + 3x^7 + 2x^6 + 2x^4 + x^3 + 1).$$

Note that in this case,  $\ell = 3$  and a factor of  $z^2 + z + 1$  appears in the  $h^*$ -polynomial.



4.2.  $h^*$ -**unimodality and  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$** . It has been previously shown [5] that all 1-supported and 2-supported IDP reflexive  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  are  $h^*$ -unimodal. We consider here several of the 3-supported classes given in Theorem 3.9.

**Theorem 4.7.** *For  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  a positive integer vector, if  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$  where  $\mathbf{r}$  is one of the following forms, then  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  is  $h^*$ -unimodal.*

- (i)  $\mathbf{r} = (1, 1 + x_1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2))$ .
- (ii)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + x_2, 1 + x_1(1 + x_2), (1 + x_1(1 + x_2))(1 + x_2))$ .
- (iv)  $\mathbf{r} = (1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_3), (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2(1 + x_3)))$ .

*Proof.* As shown in the proof of Theorem 3.9, these cases all arise as affine free sums. Thus, by Theorem 3.1, they are  $h^*$ -unimodal.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** Based on experimental evidence using SageMath [21], we conjecture that the remaining four cases, listed here, are also  $h^*$ -unimodal.

- (iii)  $\mathbf{r} = ((1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), 1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), (1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3))(1 + x_2))$ .
- (v)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .
- (vi)  $\mathbf{r} = ((1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2), (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .
- (vii)  $\mathbf{r} = (1 + x_3, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)), (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .

However, these do not arise as affine free sums. While a direct proof of  $h^*$ -unimodality for these cases might be possible, it is not clear how to carry this out other than by ad hoc arguments given case-by-case, similar to the proof of Theorem 3.9.

It is interesting that among the  $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$  simplices, some can be found that are “on the boundary” of both  $h^*$ -unimodality and the IDP condition. One example is the following. Recall that for a lattice polytope  $P$ , the *Hilbert basis* of cone( $P$ ) is the minimal generating set of cone( $P$ )  $\cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . Thus,  $P$  is IDP if and only if the Hilbert basis of cone( $P$ ) consists of the elements at height 1 in cone( $P$ ), i.e.  $(1, P) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** *For  $n \geq 1$ , define  $\mathbf{r}(n) = (1, 3n, 10n, 15n)$  and  $\mathbf{x}(n) = (2n - 1, 1, 1, 1)$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{q}(n) := (\mathbf{r}(n), \mathbf{x}(n)) = \text{rs}((3n, 10n, 15n))$ . For  $n \geq 2$  with  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}(n), \mathbf{x}(n))$ , we have*

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z) = (1 + z^2 + z^4 + z^6 + \cdots + z^{2n-2}) \cdot (1 + 7z + 14z^2 + 7z^3 + z^4),$$

*which can be verified to be non-unimodal. For  $n \geq 1$  with  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}(n), \mathbf{x}(n))$ , let  $V(n) = \{(1, \mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{v} \text{ a vertex of } \Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}\}$ . The Hilbert basis for cone( $\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}$ ) consists of  $V(n)$  and the columns of the following matrix (where the height coordinate is the first entry):*

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -4 & -7 & -10 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -5 & -6 & -10 & -15 \end{bmatrix}$$

*Thus, there are exactly two elements in the Hilbert basis of height greater than 1, both of which are at height 2.*

As another example, for  $n \geq 2$ , let

$$\mathbf{q} = ((n, (2n - 1)(n + 1), 2n(n + 1)), (1, 1, 2(n - 1))).$$

For  $n \leq 20$ , it has been verified that

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}; z) = (1, (n+1)^2, (2n+1)(n+1)+1, (2n+1)(n+1), (2n+1)(n+1)+1, \dots, \\ (2n+1)(n+1)+1, (2n+1)(n+1), (2n+1)(n+1)+1, (n+1)^2, 1)$$

and that the Hilbert basis of cone  $(\Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})})$  consists of the points  $(1, \Delta_{(1,\mathbf{q})}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{2n+1}$  together with following the lattice point at height two (as given by the first coordinate):

$$(2, -1, -2n-1, -2(n-1), -2(n-1), -2(n-1), \dots, -2(n-1))^T.$$

Thus, this family of simplices is another example of polytopes on the boundary of both IDP and  $h^*$ -unimodality; this family is more arithmetically complicated than the one given in Theorem 4.9.

## 5. REFLEXIVE STABILIZATIONS

It is unlikely that a random integer partition  $\mathbf{q}$  is reflexive. Further, Theorem 3.6 tells us that for many support vectors  $\mathbf{r}$ ,  $\mathbf{r}$  only supports finitely many IDP reflexives, though it supports infinitely many reflexives. Thus, it is interesting to consider both (i) how to assign reflexive elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$  to an arbitrary integer partition and (ii) the behavior of  $h^*$ -vectors for reflexive elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$  where at least one entry has a large multiplicity. We can begin investigating both of these through a process we call *reflexive stabilization*, which allows us to assign to each integer partition  $\mathbf{q}$  a family of reflexive simplices in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^n$ . The *first reflexive stabilization* of  $\mathbf{q}$ , denoted  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})$ , is the vector  $(1, 1, \dots, 1, \mathbf{q})$  such that  $\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}))}$  is reflexive and the number of 1's prepended to  $\mathbf{q}$  is the minimum necessary for this condition to hold; if  $\mathbf{q}$  is reflexive, then no 1's are prepended. We say the number of 1's prepended to  $\mathbf{q}$  in  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})$  is the *reflexive stabilization number* of  $\mathbf{q}$ , denoted  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q})$ . Thus, we can write

$$\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}) := (1^{\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q})}, \mathbf{q}).$$

More generally, the  $m$ -th *reflexive stabilization* of  $\mathbf{q}$ , denoted  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m)$ , is defined as

$$\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m) := (1^{\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q}) + (m-1) \cdot \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q})}, \mathbf{q}).$$

Note that when prepending  $\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q})$  copies of 1 as many times as desired, the corresponding simplex will remain reflexive.

**Example 5.2.** Let  $\mathbf{q} = (2, 2, 3)$ . Then  $1 + 2 + 2 + 3 = 8$ , and thus  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3)$  is reflexive with  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q}) = 4$ . Further,  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, 3) = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((1, 2, 3), (16, 2, 1))$ .

We can restrict ourselves to considering only  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}^n$ , since if 1 is an entry of  $\mathbf{q}$ , then  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})$  is  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}', m)$  for some  $m$  with  $\mathbf{q}'$  given by the entries of  $\mathbf{q}$  that are not equal to 1. We begin by noting that for  $m$  sufficiently large, reflexive stabilizations are not  $h^*$ -unimodal.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Assume that  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}^n$ . For  $m$  sufficiently large,  $\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}$  is not  $h^*$ -unimodal. Further,  $h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))})$  contains only 1's and 2's.*

A proof is given in Section A. We next show that, as expected from Theorem 3.6, reflexive stabilizations generally eliminate the IDP property.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Assume that  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}^n$ . For  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}$  is not IDP.*

A proof is given in Section A. In order to study those partitions  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}))}$  is IDP and/or  $h^*$ -unimodal, it makes sense to begin by considering the case where  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q})$  is small, potentially keeping the value of  $\ell(\mathbf{q})$  small as well. When  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q}) = 1$  and  $\ell(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})) = 1$ , we have the following curious result.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Suppose that  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q}) = 1$  and that  $\ell(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})) = 1$ , i.e., that  $1 + \sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1$ . Then for all  $0 \leq b \leq \sum_i q_i$ , we have  $w(\mathbf{q}, b) = w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b)$  and hence*

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}))}; z) = h^*(\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}; z) + z^{n+1}.$$

It would be interesting to determine whether or not there are similar additive structures for the  $h^*$ -polynomial in other cases where  $\text{rsn}(\mathbf{q})$  and that  $\ell(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}))$  are small.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Gabriele Balletti, Takayuki Hibi, Marie Meyer, and Akiyoshi Tsuchiya. Laplacian simplices associated to digraphs. *Arkiv för matematik*, 56, 12 2018.
- [2] Matthias Beck, Pallavi Jayawant, and Tyrrell B. McAllister. Lattice-point generating functions for free sums of convex sets. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 120(6):1246–1262, 2013.
- [3] U. Betke and P. McMullen. Lattice points in lattice polytopes. *Monatsh. Math.*, 99(4):253–265, 1985.
- [4] Benjamin Braun and Robert Davis. Ehrhart series, unimodality, and integrally closed reflexive polytopes. *Ann. Comb.*, 20(4):705–717, 2016.
- [5] Benjamin Braun, Robert Davis, and Liam Solus. Detecting the integer decomposition property and ehrhart unimodality in reflexive simplices. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 100, 08 2016.
- [6] Benjamin Braun and Derek Hanely. A regular unimodular triangulation of reflexive 2-supported weighted projective space simplices. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.13720>, submitted.
- [7] Benjamin Braun and Fu Liu.  $h^*$ -polynomials with roots on the unit circle. *Experimental Mathematics*, 0(0):1–17, 2019.
- [8] Francesco Brenti. Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry: an update. In *Jerusalem combinatorics '93*, volume 178 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 71–89. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [9] Winfried Bruns and Tim Römer.  $h$ -vectors of Gorenstein polytopes. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 114(1):65–76, 2007.
- [10] Heinke Conrads. Weighted projective spaces and reflexive simplices. *Manuscripta Math.*, 107(2):215–227, 2002.
- [11] Eugène Ehrhart. Sur les polyèdres rationnels homothétiques à  $n$  dimensions. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 254:616–618, 1962.
- [12] Takayuki Hibi. Dual polytopes of rational convex polytopes. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):237–240, 1992.
- [13] Takayuki Hibi, Akihiro Higashitani, and Nan Li. Hermite normal forms and  $\delta$ -vectors. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 119(6):1158–1173, 2012.
- [14] Fu Liu and Liam Solus. On the relationship between Ehrhart unimodality and Ehrhart positivity. *Ann. Comb.*, 23(2):347–365, 2019.
- [15] Benjamin Nill. Volume and lattice points of reflexive simplices. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 37(2):301–320, 2007.
- [16] Sam Payne. Ehrhart series and lattice triangulations. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 40(3):365–376, 2008.
- [17] Liam Solus. Simplices for numeral systems. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 371, 06 2017.
- [18] Richard P. Stanley. Decompositions of rational convex polytopes. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 6:333–342, 1980. Combinatorial mathematics, optimal designs and their applications (Proc. Sympos. Combin. Math. and Optimal Design, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, Colo., 1978).
- [19] Richard P. Stanley. *Combinatorics and commutative algebra*, volume 41 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, second edition, 1996.
- [20] A. Stapledon. Inequalities and Ehrhart  $\delta$ -vectors. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(10):5615–5626, 2009.
- [21] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.2)*, 2020. <https://www.sagemath.org>.

## APPENDIX A. PROOFS

**A.1. Proof of derivation of (i)-(viii) in Theorem 3.9.** We first suppose that  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$  satisfies the necessity condition, and show that the resulting  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors must be of one of the eight types listed. Since  $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$ , reducing modulo  $r_3$  gives  $r_3 = 1 + r_1x_1 + r_2x_2$ . If we next consider the modulo  $r_2$  necessary condition, then substituting the above for  $r_3$  and simplifying gives  $r_2 = 1 + x_1r_1 + x_3((1 + r_1x_1) \bmod r_2)$ . The challenge here is that we would like to specify  $r_2$  using this formula, but it involves a remainder which could fluctuate. The key observation is to recall that if the necessary condition for IDP holds, then Theorem 3.6 implies  $x_1 \leq r_2/r_1$ . Thus, we have

$$(9) \quad 1 + x_1r_1 \leq 1 + (r_2/r_1)r_1 = 1 + r_2.$$

There are now three cases to consider.

**Case 1:** Suppose we have equality in (9). It is immediate that in this case

$$(1 + r_1x_1) \bmod r_2 = (1 + r_2) \bmod r_2 = 1,$$

and thus  $r_2 = 1 + x_1r_1 + x_3 = r_2 + 1 + x_3$ . As  $x_3 \geq 1$ , this yields a contradiction, and thus this case does not occur.

**Case 2:** Consider if  $1 + x_1r_1 = r_2$  in (9). Then

$$(1 + r_1x_1) \bmod r_2 = r_2 \bmod r_2 = 0.$$

Thus, we have  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((r_1, 1 + x_1r_1, r_3), (x_1, x_2, x_3))$ . However, we know that

$$r_3 = 1 + r_1x_1 + r_2x_2 = (1 + x_1r_1)(1 + x_2),$$

and thus  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((r_1, 1 + x_1r_1, (1 + x_1r_1)(1 + x_2)), (x_1, x_2, x_3))$ . If  $r_1 = 1$ , then the result is  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((1, 1 + x_1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2)), (x_1, x_2, x_3))$ , which corresponds to (i) in our theorem statement. If  $r_1 \geq 2$ , we consider our necessary condition modulo  $r_1$  and obtain  $r_1 = 1 + x_2 + x_3((1 + x_2) \bmod r_1)$ . Since (by this equality) we have  $1 + x_2 \leq r_1$ , it follows that there are two subcases.

**Subcase 2.1:** Suppose  $1 + x_2 = r_1$ . Then our vector is

$$(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((1 + x_2, 1 + x_1(1 + x_2), (1 + x_1(1 + x_2))(1 + x_2)), (x_1, x_2, x_3)),$$

yielding (ii) in our theorem statement.

**Subcase 2.2:** Suppose  $1 + x_2 < r_1$ . Then

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2 + x_3((1 + x_2) \bmod r_1) = 1 + x_2 + x_3(1 + x_2) = (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3).$$

Then our vector is

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = & (((1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), \\ & 1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3), \\ & (1 + x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3))(1 + x_2)), (x_1, x_2, x_3)), \end{aligned}$$

yielding (iii) in our theorem statement.

**Case 3:** If  $1 + x_1r_1 < r_2$  in (9), it is immediate that  $(1 + r_1x_1) \bmod r_2 = 1 + r_1x_1$ , and thus  $r_2 = 1 + x_1r_1 + (1 + r_1x_1)x_3 = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1r_1)$ . Combining this with

$$r_3 = 1 + r_1x_1 + r_2x_2 = 1 + r_1x_1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1r_1)x_2 = (1 + r_1x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2),$$

we obtain that

$$(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) = ((r_1, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1r_1), (1 + r_1x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), (x_1, x_2, x_3)),$$

which is a function of the multiplicities and the value  $r_1$ . If  $r_1 = 1$ , then we obtain

$$(1, (1 + x_1)(1 + x_3), (1 + x_1)(1 + x_2(1 + x_3)))$$

which corresponds to item (iv) in our theorem statement. If  $r_1 \geq 2$ , we again consider the necessary condition modulo  $r_1$ , for which we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= 1 + x_2((1 + x_3)(1 + x_1 r_1) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + r_1 x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1) \\ &= 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1). \end{aligned}$$

We now have three subcases to consider.

**Subcase 3.1:** If  $1 + x_3 < r_1$  then

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2(1 + x_3) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1).$$

This requires two subsubcases.

**Subsubcase 3.1.1:** Suppose  $(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) = r_1$ . Then  $x_3$  is arbitrary, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}) &= ((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))), \\ &\quad (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2), (x_1, x_2, x_3)), \end{aligned}$$

establishing item (v) in the theorem statement.

**Subsubcase 3.1.2:** Suppose  $(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < r_1$ . Then

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2(1 + x_3) + x_3(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) = (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2),$$

and thus it follows that for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r} &= ((1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2), \\ &\quad (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), \\ &\quad (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)), \end{aligned}$$

establishing item (vi) in the theorem statement.

**Subcase 3.2:** Suppose  $1 + x_3 = r_1$ . Then for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  we have

$$\mathbf{r} = (1 + x_3, (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)), (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)),$$

establishing item (vii) in the theorem statement.

**Subcase 3.3:** Suppose  $1 + x_3 > r_1$ . If  $r_1 \mid (1 + x_3)$ , then we have

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1) = 1 + x_3.$$

This is a contradiction, and thus it follows that  $r_1 \nmid 1 + x_3$ . If  $r_1 \mid x_2$ , then

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3,$$

which implies that  $r_1 \mid (1 + x_3)$ , again a contradiction. Thus, we must have that  $r_1 \nmid x_2$ , and since  $r_1 \nmid (1 + x_3)$  we also know  $r_1 > x_2$  since

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1) > x_2.$$

We now consider two subsubcases.

**Subsubcase 3.3.1:** Suppose  $r_1 \mid (1 + x_2(1 + x_3))$ . Then

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1).$$

Thus, there exists some  $k \geq 1$  where  $r_1 = 1 + x_2 k$ , and we are forced to have

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2 k = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1)$$

implying that  $k = (1 + x_3) \bmod 1 + x_2 k$ . Thus, for some  $s \geq 1$  we set

$$x_3 = s k x_2 + s - k + 1$$

and we have the case

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r} &= (1 + k x_2, (2 + s k x_2 + s - k)(1 + x_1(1 + k x_2)), \\ &\quad (1 + x_1(1 + k x_2))(1 + x_2(2 + s k x_2 + s - k))) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, skx_2 + s - k + 1),$$

corresponding to item (viii) in our theorem statement.

**Subsubcase 3.3.2:** Suppose  $r_1 \nmid (1 + x_2(1 + x_3))$ , so we have

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1).$$

We also have that  $1 + x_3 > r_1 > x_2$ . However,  $r_1 \nmid (1 + x_2(1 + x_3))$  implies that

$$r_1 = 1 + x_2((1 + x_3) \bmod r_1) + x_3((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \bmod r_1) \geq 1 + x_3,$$

yielding a contradiction.

This completes our analysis of possible cases based on the necessary condition. In particular, all of the types listed yield reflexive simplices.

**A.2. Proof of IDP for types (i), (ii), and (iv) and of non-IDP for type (viii) in Theorem 3.9.** We now show that type (viii)  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors yield non-IDP simplices, where we apply Theorem 3.3 and the notation therein. Let  $q_j = r_2 = (skx_2 + s + k)(1 + x_1(1 + kx_2))$ , and set  $b = skx_2 + s + k$  which is strictly less than  $r_2$  as needed for Theorem 3.3. It is tedious but straightforward to reduce the left-hand side of (5) to the form  $x_3 + (x_3 - 1)x_2(skx_2 + s + k)$ . Note that by the assumption of type (viii), we have

$$x_3 = s + 1 + k(skx_2 - 1) \geq 2$$

and thus

$$x_3 + (x_3 - 1)x_2(skx_2 + s + k) \geq 2 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k) \geq 2,$$

satisfying (5). Setting  $q_i = r_3$ , we now ask if there is a solution  $0 < c < b$  satisfying (6) and (7). Using the fact that we must have  $0 < c < b = skx_2 + s + k$ , we obtain that the left-hand side of 6 is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{(skx_2 + s + k)(1 + x_1(1 + kx_2))(1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k))}{(skx_2 + s + k)(1 + x_1(1 + kx_2))} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k))}{skx_2 + s + k} \right\rfloor \\ &= 1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k) - cx_2 - \left\lfloor \frac{c}{skx_2 + s + k} \right\rfloor \\ &= 1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k - c) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using  $0 < c < b = skx_2 + s + k$ , we find that the right-hand side of 6 is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{(skx_2 + s + k - c)(1 + x_2(skx_2 + s + k))}{(skx_2 + s + k)} \right\rfloor \\ &= x_2(skx_2 + s + k - c) + \left\lfloor 1 - \frac{c}{skx_2 + s + k} \right\rfloor \\ &= x_2(skx_2 + s + k - c) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is no  $c$  value in this range that satisfies (6), and hence we find that simplices of type (viii) are not IDP.

We next show that simplices of types (i)-(vii) are IDP. Types (i), (ii), and (iv) all follow from affine free sum decompositions as follows. For (i), observe that

$$\mathbf{r} = (1^{x_1}) *_0 (1^{x_2}) *_0 (1^{x_3}),$$

and thus Theorem 3.1 applies. For (ii), observe that

$$\mathbf{r} = ((1 + x_1)^{x_2}, (1 + x_1(1 + x_2))^{x_2}) *_0 (1^{x_3}),$$

and thus Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.1 apply to finish this case. Finally, for (iv) observe that

$$\mathbf{r} = (1^{x_3}) *_0 ((1 + x_2)^{x_3}, (1 + x_2(1 + x_3))^{x_3}),$$

and thus again Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.1 apply to finish this case.

Types (iii), (v), (vi), and (vii) do not follow from affine free sum decompositions, and thus we must use Theorem 3.3 directly. Throughout the remainder of this proof, we use the notation

$$h(b) := b \left( \frac{1 + \sum_{i \neq j} q_i}{q_j} \right) - \sum_{i \neq j} \left\lfloor \frac{bq_i}{q_j} \right\rfloor$$

to denote the left-hand side of (5).

**A.3. Proof of IDP for type (iii) in Theorem 3.9.** We next verify IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (iii) using Theorem 3.3. We must consider three cases corresponding to three possible values of  $q_j$ .

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{(1 + x_3)} \right\rfloor,$$

and using this formula one can check that

$$h(k(1 + x_3)) = k.$$

Combining these two observations, it follows that  $h(b) = 1$  only when  $b = 1$  and  $b = (1 + x_3)$ , thus identifying the  $b$ -values we are required to check in (5). To verify that (6) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1$ , then we may select  $c = 1$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $x_1(b - 1)$ . If  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1)$ , then we set  $c = (1 + x_3)$ , from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $b(1 + x_2)x_1 - x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) - 1 + \lfloor b/(1 + x_3) \rfloor$ . This completes our first case.

**Case:**  $q_j = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1$ . It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor,$$

where the values of  $b$  range from 1 to  $x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . To verify that (6) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If  $q_i = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , then we write  $b = \alpha x_1 + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha x_1 + \beta)(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= \alpha + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) - \alpha}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= \alpha + \begin{cases} 0, & \beta > 0 \\ -1, & \beta = 0 \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case that  $\beta > 0$ , we have that  $h(b) = b - x_1\alpha = \beta$ . Hence, the viable candidates for  $c$ -values from 1 to  $x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  that satisfy equation (7) are precisely those  $c$  such that  $c \equiv 1 \pmod{x_1}$ . Therefore, the  $b$ -values we are required to check in (5) are all  $b = \alpha x_1 + \beta$ , where  $2 \leq \beta \leq x_1 - 1$ . In this case, we may choose  $c = \alpha x_1 + 1$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to 0, giving the desired result. On the other hand, if  $\beta = 0$ , then we have that  $h(b) = h(\alpha x_1) = \alpha x_1 - x_1(\alpha - 1) = x_1$ . If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = 1$ . Thus, we need only consider when  $x_1 > 1$ . In order to satisfy (5), it must be that  $\alpha > 0$ . Given that  $x_1 > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) when  $c = 1$  are equal to  $\alpha - 1$ . Finally, if  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1)$ , then we can set  $c = 1$  and the result is immediate. This completes our second case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_2)(x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1)$ . We first identify those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor - ((1 + x_2) - 1) \left\lfloor \frac{b}{(1 + x_2)} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = m(1 + x_2) + t$  where  $0 \leq m \leq x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and  $0 \leq t \leq (1 + x_2)$ , it follows that

$$h(b) = h(m(1 + x_2) + t) = m + t - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{m(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

We can now further divide into cases: either we have  $m = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  or we have  $m = kx_1 + w$  where  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and  $0 \leq w < x_1$ , which yields

$$h(b) = h((kx_1 + w)(1 + x_2) + t) = w + t - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - k}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

For  $m \neq x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , observe that since  $0 \leq w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) \leq x_1 - 1$  and  $0 \leq t(1 + x_3) < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , with  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , we have that  $0 \leq w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) < x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . Thus,  $\left\lfloor \frac{w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - k}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ .

**Subcase 1 of 3:** Suppose  $m = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . Since  $0 \leq t(1 + x_3) < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , we have

$$h((1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)x_1(1 + x_2) + t) = t - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{t(1 + x_3) - (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = t + x_1.$$

If this is equal to 1, then it must be that  $t = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h((1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)(1 + x_2)) = 1$ .

**Subcase 2 of 3:** Suppose now that  $m \neq x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - k}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Then since  $w, t \geq 0$  and  $x_1 \geq 1$ , we have  $h(b) = w + t + x_1 = 1$  which forces  $w = t = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . In this case,  $h(k(1 + x_2)) = 1$  any time that  $k > 0$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h(k(1 + x_2)) = 1$  when  $0 < k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ .

**Subcase 3 of 3:** Suppose again that  $m \neq x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - k}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Then  $0 \leq k \leq w(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3)$ , which implies that either (A)  $0 < w < x_1$  with  $0 \leq t < (1 + x_2)$  or (B)  $w = 0$  with  $k \leq t(1 + x_3)$ . If (A) holds, then  $h(b) = w + t = 1$  forces  $w = 1$  and  $t = 0$  since  $w > 0$ , which means that  $h(b) = 1$  when  $b = (kx_1 + 1)(1 + x_2)$  for  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . If (B) holds, then our same equation forces  $w = 0$  and  $t = 1$  when  $k \leq (1 + x_3)$ , which means that  $h(b) = 1$  when  $b = kx_1(1 + x_2) + 1$  for  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and  $k \leq (1 + x_3)$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$  and  $0 < k \leq (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  we have  $b = k(1 + x_2)$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , we have  $b = (kx_1 + 1)(1 + x_2)$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq k < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$  and  $k \leq (1 + x_3)$ , we have  $b = kx_1(1 + x_2) + 1$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1 + x_2)(x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1)$ . If  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1)$ , then (6) is trivially satisfied. If  $q_i = x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1$ , we write  $b = m(1 + x_2) + t$  where  $0 \leq m < x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1$  and  $0 \leq t < (1 + x_2)$ . Substituting this form of  $b$  into (6) yields the equation

$$- \left\lfloor \frac{c}{(1 + x_2)} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{t - c}{(1 + x_2)} \right\rfloor.$$



If  $b > (1 + x_2)$ , we set  $c = (1 + x_2)$  and the equation is satisfied. If  $2 < b < (1 + x_2)$ , then we set  $c = 1$  and the equation is satisfied.

If  $q_i = (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , the analysis becomes more complicated. We write  $b = m(1 + x_2) + t$  where  $0 \leq m < d$  and  $0 \leq t < (1 + x_2)$ . Our argument will proceed by considering  $x_1 = 1$  and  $x_1 > 1$  separately.

Suppose  $x_1 = 1$ . Then the left-hand-side of (6) is reduced to

$$\left\lfloor \frac{t(1 + x_3) - m}{(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor$$

and the right-hand-side to

$$\left\lfloor \frac{t(1 + x_3) - m - c(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

Since  $m < (1 + x_3)$ , if  $t(1 + x_3) - m < 0$  this forces  $t = 0$  and  $0 < m$ , thus  $b$  is a multiple of  $(1 + x_2)$ , and we found earlier that  $h(m(1 + x_2)) = 1$ . Thus, we need proceed no further. If  $t(1 + x_3) - m \geq 0$ , then since  $m < (1 + x_3)$  we must have  $t \geq 1$ , and we also have  $t(1 + x_3) - m < (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ .

Thus,  $\left\lfloor \frac{t(1+x_3)-m}{(1+x_2)(1+x_3)+1} \right\rfloor = 0$ , from which it follows that (6) reduces to

$$- \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{t(1 + x_3) - m - c(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

If  $m = 0$ , set  $c = 1$  and this equation is solved. If  $m \geq 1$ , set  $c = m(1 + x_2) + 1$  which is less than  $b$  in this case, and this equation is again satisfied. This completes our proof for  $x_1 = 1$ .

We next consider when  $x_1 \geq 2$ , maintaining our previous notation of  $b = m(1 + x_2) + t$ . Write  $m = fx_1 + g$  where  $0 \leq f \leq \lfloor (1 + x_3)/x_1 \rfloor$  and  $0 \leq g < x_1$  except in the case where  $f = \lfloor (1 + x_3)/x_1 \rfloor$  in which case  $g$  is bounded above by  $(1 + x_3) - (1 + x_3)\lfloor (1 + x_3)/x_1 \rfloor$ . This leads to the left-hand-side of (6) having the form

$$f + \left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor$$

while the right-hand-side has the form

$$f + \left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f - c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

We thus need to solve the equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f - c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \end{aligned}$$

subject to the constraints  $0 \leq g < x_1$  (with the exception mentioned above),  $0 \leq t \leq (1 + x_2)$ , and  $0 \leq f \leq \lfloor (1 + x_3)/x_1 \rfloor$ . Note that the first two inequalities imply that  $0 \leq g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) < x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , and also  $f \leq \lfloor (1 + x_3)/x_1 \rfloor \leq (1 + x_2)(1 + x_3)$ , hence

$$\left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) \geq f \\ -1 & \text{if } g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) < f \end{cases}$$

**Subcase 1 of 2:** Suppose  $g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f \geq 0$ . Then (6) reduces to

$$- \left\lfloor \frac{c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{g(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + t(1 + x_3) - f - c(1 + x_3)}{x_1(1 + x_2)(1 + x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

Note that  $f \leq \lfloor (1+x_3)/x_1 \rfloor < (1+x_3)$ , and thus we can set  $c = fx_1(1+x_2) + 1$  which is less than  $b$ . The left-hand-side of our above equation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left\lfloor \frac{(fx_1(1+x_2) + 1)(1+x_3)}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= - \left\lfloor \frac{fx_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + (1+x_3)}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= - \left\lfloor \frac{fx_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + f + (1+x_3) - f}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= -f. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the right-hand-side of our equation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & -f + \left\lfloor \frac{f - (1+x_3) + g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - f}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= -f + \left\lfloor \frac{-(1+x_3) + g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3)}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $h(b)$  is assumed to be at least 2, we have that one or both of  $g$  and  $t$  are non-zero. Combining this observation with  $g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - f \geq 0$  it follows that  $g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) > 0$ . Note that  $(1+x_3) \mid (g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3))$ , and thus  $x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1 > g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - (1+x_3) \geq 0$ , which forces the right-hand-side of our equation to equal  $-f$ , satisfying (6).

**Subcase 2 of 2:** Suppose  $g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - f < 0$ . Note that since  $g, (1+x_2)(1+x_3), t, (1+x_3) \geq 0$ , it follows that  $f \geq 1$  and thus  $b = (fx_1 + g)(1+x_2) + t \geq (1+x_2)$ . Set  $c = (1+x_2)$ , which is less than  $b$ . With these conditions, the left-hand-side of (6) is easily seen to equal  $-1$ . The right-hand-side of (6) is given by

$$\left\lfloor \frac{g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - f - (1+x_2)(1+x_3)}{x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

Since  $g(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + t(1+x_3) - f < 0$  and  $-(1+x_2)(1+x_3) < 0$ , the numerator above is strictly negative. Also, since  $g, (1+x_2)(1+x_3), t, (1+x_3) \geq 0$ , the numerator is minimized by  $-f - (1+x_2)(1+x_3) > -(1+x_3) - (1+x_2)(1+x_3) \geq -2(1+x_2)(1+x_3)$ . But, since we assumed that  $x_1 \geq 2$ , it follows that  $x_1(1+x_2)(1+x_3) + 1 > 2(1+x_2)(1+x_3)$  and thus the floor function above is equal to  $-1$ , satisfying equality for (6). This completes the proof establishing IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (iii).

**A.4. Proof of IDP for type (v) in Theorem 3.9.** We next verify IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (v) using Theorem 3.3. Again, we must consider three cases corresponding to three possible values of  $q_j$ .

**Case:**  $q_j = 1 + (1+x_3)x_2$ . It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1+x_3)}{1 + (1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor,$$

where  $1 \leq b \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ . To verify that (6) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If  $q_i = 1 + (1+x_3)x_2$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1+x_3)(1+x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2))$ , then we write  $b = \alpha x_2 + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1+x_3$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Consequently, observe that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{b(1+x_3)}{1 + (1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha x_2 + \beta)(1+x_3)}{1 + (1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = \alpha + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1+x_3) - \alpha}{1 + (1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = \alpha + \begin{cases} 0, & \beta > 0 \\ -1, & \beta = 0 \end{cases}.$$

In the case that  $\beta > 0$ , this formula implies that  $h(b) = b - x_2\alpha = \beta$ . Hence, the viable candidates for  $c$ -values that satisfy (7) are precisely those  $c$  such that  $c \equiv 1 \pmod{x_2}$ . Therefore, the  $b$ -values we are required to check in (5) are all  $b = \alpha x_2 + \beta$ , where  $2 \leq \beta \leq x_2 - 1$ . In this case, we may

choose  $c = \alpha x_2 + 1$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\beta - 1)(1 + x_3)x_1$ . On the other hand, if  $\beta = 0$ , then we have that  $h(b) = h(\alpha x_2) = \alpha x_2 - x_2(\alpha - 1) = x_2$ . If  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = 1$ . Thus, we need only consider when  $x_2 > 1$ . Given that  $x_2 > 1$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 + x_3$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) when  $c = 1$  are equal to  $(\alpha x_2 - 1)(1 + x_3)x_1 + \alpha - 1$ . If  $q_i = (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , then we may again set  $c = 1$ , from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b - 1)(1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)$ . This completes our first case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ . We first identify those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

We can now further divide into cases: either we have  $\alpha = x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  or we have  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$ , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h((\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1 + x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \delta + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , observe that since  $0 \leq \delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq (x_1 - 1)(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $0 \leq \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  with  $0 \leq \gamma(1 + x_3) < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we have that  $0 \leq \delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Thus,  $\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ .

**Subcase 1 of 3:** Suppose  $\alpha = x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Since  $0 \leq \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h((1 + x_3)x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta) &= \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor \\ &= \beta + x_1. \end{aligned}$$

If this is equal to 1, then it must be that  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h((1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = 1$ .

**Subcase 2 of 3:** Suppose now that  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Then, writing  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$ , we have  $h(b) = \delta + \beta + x_1$ . Since  $\delta, \beta \geq 0$  and  $x_1 \geq 1$ , for this to equal 1, we must have  $\delta = \beta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . In this case,  $h(\gamma(1 + x_3)) = 1$  whenever  $\gamma > 0$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h(\gamma(1 + x_3)) = 1$  when  $0 < \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ .

**Subcase 3 of 3:** Suppose now that  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Then, it follows that  $0 \leq \gamma(1 + x_3) \leq \delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , which given the bounds on  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\beta$ , implies that either (A)  $0 < \delta < x_1$  or (B)  $\delta = 0$  with  $\gamma(1 + x_3) \leq \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . If (A) holds, then  $h(b) = \delta + \beta = 1$  forces  $\delta = 1$  and  $\beta = 0$  since  $\delta > 0$ . Therefore,

$h(b) = 1$  when  $b = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1 + x_3)$  for  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . If (B) holds, then our same equation forces  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta = 1$  when  $\gamma(1 + x_3) \leq 1 + 1(1 + x_3)x_2$ , which further implies  $0 \leq \gamma \leq x_2$ . This means  $h(b) = 1$  when  $b = \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + 1$  for  $0 \leq \gamma \leq x_2$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$  and  $0 < \gamma \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = \gamma(1 + x_3)$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1 + x_3)$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $\gamma < x_2$ , we have  $b = \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + 1$ .

Next, we establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ . If  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ , then (6) is trivially satisfied. Now suppose  $q_i = (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Note that  $b \neq 1 + x_3$  since  $h(1 + x_3) = 1$ . If  $b > 1 + x_3$ , we set  $c = 1 + x_3$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $bx_2 - (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor$ . Otherwise, if  $b < 1 + x_3$ , we may choose  $c = 1$  from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b - 1)x_2$  since  $1 \leq b < 1 + x_3$  implies  $0 \leq b - 1 < 1 + x_3$ . Finally, if  $q_i = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we write  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Moreover, we write  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . We consider the following possible cases:

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\beta > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then, choosing  $c = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1 + x_3) < (\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ , it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\beta = 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since  $h((\gamma x_1 + 1)(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Therefore,  $2 \leq \delta < x_1$ , so we may consider  $c = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1 + x_3) < (\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1 + x_3) = b$ . Since  $2 \leq \delta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\beta > 0$  and  $\delta = 0$ . If  $0 \leq \gamma \leq x_2$ , then  $\beta \neq 1$  since  $h(\gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + 1) = 1$ . Thus, it must be that  $\beta > 1$ , thereby allowing us to consider  $c = \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + 1 < \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify both sides of (6) will again be equal to 0. Otherwise, if  $x_2 < \gamma \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , consider  $c = x_2 x_1(1 + x_3) + 1 < \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ . Then, the left-hand side of (6) simplifies to

$$\gamma - x_2 + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3)}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor,$$

and the right-hand side of (6) simplifies to

$$\gamma - x_2 + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma(1 + x_3) - 1}{(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))} \right\rfloor.$$

Indeed, these two quantities are equivalent because  $\beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \neq \gamma(1 + x_3)$ . To see this, assume otherwise. Then, it would follow that  $\beta = (\gamma - \beta x_2)(1 + x_3)$ . However, this is a contradiction as we assumed  $0 < \beta < 1 + x_3$ . Therefore, we have that (6) is satisfied.

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\beta = \delta = 0$ . In this case,  $b = \gamma x_1(1 + x_3)$ . Moreover, note that  $\gamma > 0$  since otherwise,  $b = 0$  contradicting our bounds on  $b$ . If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = h(\gamma(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Hence, we need only consider when  $x_1 > 1$ . Since  $\gamma > 0$  and  $x_1 > 1$ , we may consider  $c = 1 + x_3 < \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) = b$ , from which it is straightforward to find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\gamma - 1$ .

As these cases cover all possible values for  $\beta$  and  $\delta$ , this completes our second case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Thus, we consider  $1 \leq b \leq (1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - 1$ . Again, we will start by identifying those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Now, writing  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , it follows that

$$h(b) = \eta + \delta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Since  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , observe that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Given the bounds on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$ , note that  $-(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq \eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon < 1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1$ . Consequently, it follows that

$$|\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon| < 1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1,$$

and this implies that  $\left\lfloor \frac{\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ . To resolve this floor function, we consider the following subcases which analyze the sign of the numerator of its argument. Let  $n$  denote that numerator, i.e.,  $n = \eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon$ .

**Subcase 1 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\gamma x_2 + \delta \geq \varepsilon$ . Then, we have that  $n \geq 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to

$$h(b) = \delta - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = x_2$ . Thus, if  $x_2 = 1$ , we have that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$  whenever  $\gamma \geq \varepsilon$  with  $\gamma > 0$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = \delta$ , which forces  $\delta = 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = 1$  whenever  $\gamma x_2 + \delta \geq \varepsilon$ .

**Subcase 2 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\gamma x_2 + \delta < \varepsilon$ . Then, we have that  $n < 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to

$$h(b) = \delta + x_1 - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = \delta + x_1$ , which forces  $\delta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$  since  $x_1 \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1$  whenever  $\gamma x_2 < \varepsilon$ .

**Subcase 3 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta \geq 1$ . Then, we have that  $n \geq 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to

$$h(b) = \eta + \delta - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = \eta + x_2 \geq 1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = \eta + \delta$ , which forces  $\delta = 0$  and  $\eta = 1$  since we assume  $\eta \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\eta = \delta = 0$ , and  $0 \leq \gamma x_2 < \varepsilon \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2$ .
- If  $x_2 = 1$ ,  $\eta = \delta = 0$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$  with  $\gamma > 0$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma$ .
- If  $x_1, x_2 \geq 1$ ,  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\delta = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma x_2 + 1 \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1$ .
- If  $x_1, x_2 \geq 1$ ,  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\delta = 0$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1 + (1 + (1 + x + 3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . If  $q_i = (1 + (1 + (1 + x + 3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we write  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1$ . Furthermore, we write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and we write  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . We consider the following possible cases:

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . We consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . Since  $0 < \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$ , it follows that  $0 < (\eta - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta < x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Therefore, it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . If  $\gamma x_2 + 1 \geq \varepsilon$ , note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$ . Thus, we have that  $\delta > 1$ , and we consider  $c = \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1 < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . Given that  $1 < \delta < x_2$  implies  $\gamma x_2 + \delta > \gamma x_2 + 1 \geq \varepsilon$ , it is straightforward to verify that our choice of  $c$  gives that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. Otherwise, if  $\gamma x_2 + 1 < \varepsilon$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 1$ ), we consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq \delta + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify both sides of (6) are equal to

$$\varepsilon - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\gamma x_2 + \delta - \varepsilon}{1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1} \right\rfloor.$$

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\delta = 0$ . Note that  $\eta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1$ . Thus, we have that  $\eta > 1$ , and we consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ . Since  $1 < \eta < x_1$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta = \delta = 0$ . Further suppose  $\gamma x_2 < \varepsilon$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ). If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1$ , so we may assume  $x_1 > 1$ . Consider  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2 < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ . Since  $x_1 > 1$  and  $\gamma x_2 < \varepsilon$ , it follows that  $-x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq \gamma x_2 - \varepsilon - (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < 0$ . Given this, it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - 1$ . Now, suppose  $\gamma x_2 > \varepsilon$ . Note that  $\gamma \neq 0$  since otherwise,  $\varepsilon < 0$  contradicting our initial bounds on  $\varepsilon$ . Thus, we have that  $\gamma > 0$ . Moreover, if  $x_2 = 1$ , it follows that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$ , so we may assume  $x_2 > 1$ . Taking  $c = 1$ , the inequality  $\gamma x_2 > \varepsilon$  readily implies that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon$ . Finally, suppose  $\gamma x_2 = \varepsilon$ . Note that neither  $\gamma$  nor  $\varepsilon$  can be equal to 0 since otherwise, we would have  $\eta = \delta = \gamma = \varepsilon = 0$ , implying  $b = 0$ . This, of course, contradicts the bounds on  $b$ . Moreover, we may again assume  $x_2 > 1$  (and thus,  $\varepsilon > 1$ ) since otherwise,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$ . Since  $\gamma x_2 = \varepsilon$ , observe that  $b = \varepsilon(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ .

As such, we may consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  which is strictly less than  $b$  since  $\varepsilon > 1$ . This choice of  $c$  readily gives that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - 1$ .

Finally, if  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ , we begin again by writing  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1$ . Furthermore, we write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and we write  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . We consider the following possible cases:

**Subcase 1 of 3:** Suppose  $\delta > 1$ . Combined with our bounds on  $\gamma$ , this implies that  $0 \leq (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Taking  $c = 1$ , it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\alpha(1 + x_3) + \gamma$ .

**Subcase 2 of 3:** Suppose  $\delta = 1$ . If  $\gamma x_2 + 1 \geq \varepsilon$ , note that  $\eta \neq 0$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$ . Thus,  $\eta \geq 1$ , and we may consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1 = b$ . Since  $\gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , it is straightforward to show both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\eta - 1)(1 + x_3) + \gamma$ . On the other hand, if  $\gamma x_2 + 1 < \varepsilon$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 1$ ), we may consider  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2 < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1 = b$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\varepsilon x_1 + \eta - 1)(1 + x_3) + \gamma$ .

**Subcase 3 of 3:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$ . Note that  $\eta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = 1$ . This lends itself to two possibilities: (A)  $\eta = 0$  or (B)  $\eta > 1$ . If (A) holds, we first suppose  $\gamma x_2 < \varepsilon$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ). If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = 1$ , so we may assume  $x_1 > 1$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $x_1 > 1$ , we may consider  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2 < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ . For this choice of  $c$ , it readily follows that both sides of (6) are equal to

$$(\varepsilon x_1 - 1)(1 + x_3) + \left\lfloor \frac{\gamma x_2}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Now, suppose  $\gamma x_2 > \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  by construction, this inequality implies  $\gamma \neq 0$ . Moreover, note that if  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = 1$ . Thus, we may assume  $x_2 > 1$ , and we simply consider  $c = 1$ . Given that  $0 < \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$  and  $x_2 > 1$ , it follows that  $0 < \gamma + (1 + x_3) < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Therefore, with  $c = 1$ , we find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon x_1(1 + x_3) + \gamma - 1$ . Finally, suppose  $\gamma x_2 = \varepsilon$ . Since  $b \neq 0$ , this equality implies that both  $\gamma$  and  $\varepsilon$  cannot be 0. Moreover, we may again assume  $x_2 > 1$  since  $x_2 = 1$  would imply  $h(b) = 1$ . Since  $\gamma x_2 = \varepsilon$ , it follows that  $b = \varepsilon(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ , and we also get that  $\varepsilon > 1$  since we assume  $x_2 > 1$ . Combining, we may consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon(1 + x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = b$ . As before, the inequality  $0 < \gamma + (1 + x_3) < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  still holds in this case, from which it is straightforward to verify both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\varepsilon - 1)x_1(1 + x_3) + \gamma - 1$ .

On the other hand, if (B) holds, we have that  $\eta > 1$ . Therefore, we consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) simplify to  $(\eta - 1)(1 + x_3)$ . In any case, we find that both sides of (6) are equivalent for each possible  $q_i$ , thereby completing our third and final case. Thus, we have established IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (v).

**A.5. Proof of IDP for type (vi) in Theorem 3.9.** We next verify IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (vi) using Theorem 3.3. Again, we must consider three cases corresponding to three possible values of  $q_j$ .

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . We first identify those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor,$$

where  $1 \leq b \leq (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) - 1$ . Writing  $b = \alpha(1+x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1+x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1+(1+x_3)x_2$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1+x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1+x_3) + \beta}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

We can now further divide into cases: either we have  $\alpha = (1+x_3)x_2$  or we have  $\alpha = \gamma x_2 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$ , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h((\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \delta + \beta - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha \neq (1+x_3)x_2$ , let  $n = \delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma$ . Observe that since  $0 \leq \delta(1+x_3) + \beta < 1+(1+x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ , it follows that  $|n| < 1+(1+x_3)x_2$ . Thus,  $\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ .

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\alpha = (1+x_3)x_2$ . Since  $0 \leq \beta < 1+x_3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h((1+x_3)^2 x_2 + \beta) &= (1+x_3)x_2 + \beta - (1+x_3)x_2 - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta - (1+x_3)}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor \\ &= \beta + x_2. \end{aligned}$$

If this is equal to 1, then it must be that  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_2 = 1$ . Thus, if  $x_2 = 1$ , we have that  $h((1+x_3)^2) = 1$ .

For the next three subcases, we assume  $\alpha \neq (1+x_3)x_2$ , so we may write  $\alpha = \gamma x_2 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ .

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta \geq \gamma$ . Then, we have that  $n \geq 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta$ , which forces  $\beta = 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h(\gamma x_2(1+x_3) + 1) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ .

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta < \gamma$ . Then, we have that  $n < 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta + x_2$ , which forces  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_2 = 1$  since  $x_2 \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h(\gamma(1+x_3)) = 1$  for  $0 < \gamma < 1+x_3$ .

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta \geq 1$ . Then, since  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ , we have that  $n \geq 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3) + \beta - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \delta + \beta$ , which forces  $\beta = 0$  and  $\delta = 1$  since we assume  $\delta \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h((\gamma x_2 + 1)(1+x_3)) = 1$  for  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_2 = 1$  and  $0 < \gamma \leq 1+x_3$ , we have  $b = \gamma(1+x_3)$ .
- If  $x_2 \geq 1$ ,  $\delta = 0$ ,  $\beta = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ , we have  $b = \gamma x_2(1+x_3) + 1$ .
- If  $x_2 \geq 1$ ,  $\delta = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$ , and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ , we have  $b = (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1+x_3)$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . If  $q_i = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1+(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we write  $b = \alpha(1+x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1+x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1+(1+x_3)x_2$ . Note that  $b \neq 1+x_3$  since  $h(1+x_3) = 1$ . If  $b > 1+x_3$ , we



set  $c = 1 + x_3$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $((\alpha - 1)(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1 + \alpha - 1$ . Otherwise, if  $b < 1 + x_3$ , note that  $\alpha = 0$  and hence  $b = \beta$ . To satisfy (5), we need only consider  $1 < \beta < 1 + x_3$ . Thus, we may choose  $c = 1$  from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\beta - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1$  since  $1 < b < 1 + x_3$  implies  $1 \leq \beta - 1 < 1 + x_3$ . Finally, if  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ , we again write  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Moreover, in the case that  $\alpha \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we write  $\alpha = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < (1 + x_3)$ . We consider the following possible cases:

**Subcase 1 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha = (1 + x_3)x_2$ . If  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $\beta \neq 0$  since  $h((1 + x_3)^2) = 1$ . Thus, we may consider  $c = (1 + x_3)^2 < (1 + x_3)^2 + \beta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\beta x_1(1 + x_3)$ . Otherwise, if  $x_2 > 1$ , we consider  $c = 1 + x_3 < (1 + x_3)^2 x_2 + \beta = b$ . Since  $x_2 > 1$  implies  $-x_2(1 + x_3) < \beta - 2(1 + x_3) < 0$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b - (1 + x_3))x_1(1 + x_3) + x_3$ .

**Subcase 2 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$  with  $\delta > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ . Then, choosing  $c = (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3) < (\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ , it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $((\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) + \beta)x_1(1 + x_3)$ .

**Subcase 3 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$  with  $\delta > 0$  and  $\beta = 0$ . Note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since  $h((\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Therefore,  $2 \leq \delta < x_2$ , so we may consider  $c = (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3) < (\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3) = b$ . Given this choice, we find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\delta - 1)(1 + x_3)x_1(1 + x_3)$ .

**Subcase 4 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$  with  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ . If  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ , then  $\beta \neq 1$  since  $h(\gamma x_2(1 + x_3) + 1) = 1$ . Thus, it must be that  $\beta > 1$ , thereby allowing us to consider  $c = \gamma x_2(1 + x_3) + 1 < \gamma x_2(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\beta - 1)x_1(1 + x_3)$ . Otherwise, if  $1 < \gamma < 1 + x_3$ , consider  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2 < \gamma x_2(1 + x_3) + \beta = b$ . Then, both sides of (6) are equal to

$$((\gamma - 1)x_2(1 + x_3) + \beta - 1)x_1(1 + x_3) + \gamma - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

**Subcase 5 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$  with  $\delta = \beta = 0$ . In this case,  $b = \gamma x_2(1 + x_3)$ . Moreover, note that  $\gamma > 0$  since otherwise,  $b = 0$  contradicting our bounds on  $b$ . If  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = h(\gamma(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Hence, we need only consider when  $x_2 > 1$ . Since  $\gamma > 0$  and  $x_2 > 1$ , we may take  $c = 1 + x_3 < \gamma x_2(1 + x_3) = b$ , from which it is straightforward to find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\gamma x_2 - 1)(1 + x_3)^2 x_1 + \gamma - 1$ .

This completes our first case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ . We first identify those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

We can now further divide into cases: either we have  $\alpha = x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  or we have  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \gamma < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$ . If  $\alpha = x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ ,

then since  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= \beta - x_1 \left[ \frac{\beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right] \\ &= \beta + x_1. \end{aligned}$$

If this is equal to 1, then it must be that  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h((1 + x_3)^2(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = 1$ . Otherwise, if  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we write  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \gamma < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$ . Thus,  $h(b)$  simplifies as follows

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h((\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1 + x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \delta + \beta - x_1 \left[ \frac{(\delta(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , observe that since  $0 \leq \delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq (x_1 - 1)(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $0 \leq \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  with  $0 \leq \gamma < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we have that  $0 \leq (\delta(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Let  $n = (\delta(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma$ . The inequalities above readily imply  $|n| < 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Thus,

$$\left[ \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right]$$

is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ . We further write  $\gamma = \varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1 + x_3$ . Then,  $h(b)$  becomes

$$h(b) = \delta + \beta - x_1 \left[ \frac{(\delta(1 + x_3) + \beta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - (\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \eta)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right].$$

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta > \varepsilon$ . Then, we have that  $n > 0$ , implying

$$\left[ \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right] = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta$ , which forces  $\beta = 1$ . Note that  $\beta = 1$  implies  $\varepsilon = 0$  as  $\beta > \varepsilon$ . Thus, we have  $h(b) = h(\eta x_1(1 + x_3) + 1) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1 + x_3)x_2$ .

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta < \varepsilon$ . Note that  $\varepsilon > 0$  since  $\beta < \varepsilon$ . Then, we have that  $n < 0$ , implying

$$\left[ \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right] = -1.$$

Consequently, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta + x_1$ , which forces  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$  since  $x_1 \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \eta)(1 + x_3)) = 1$  whenever  $0 < \varepsilon < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1 + x_3)x_2$ .

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta = \varepsilon$ . If  $\eta > 0$ , then we have that  $n < 0$ , implying

$$\left[ \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right] = -1.$$

In this case,  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta + x_1$ , which again forces  $\beta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . Since  $\beta = \varepsilon$ , it follows that  $\varepsilon = 0$ , and so we have that  $h(b) = h(\eta(1 + x_3)) = 1$  whenever  $0 < \eta \leq (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Otherwise, if  $\eta = 0$ , then we have that  $n = 0$ , implying

$$\left[ \frac{\delta(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right] = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \beta$ , which forces  $\beta = 1$  (and thus,  $\varepsilon = 1$ ), i.e.,  $h(b) = h((1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1(1 + x_3) + 1) = 1$ .

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\delta \geq 1$ . Then, we have that  $n \geq 0$ , implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \beta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) - \gamma}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to  $h(b) = \delta + \beta$ , which forces  $\delta = 1$  and  $\beta = 0$  since  $\delta \geq 1$ . That is, we have  $h(b) = h(((\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)x_1 + 1)(1+x_3)) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1+x_3$  and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$ , and  $\alpha = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we have  $b = (1+x_3)^2(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ .
- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\beta = \delta = 0$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon < 1+x_3$ , and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = (\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)(1+x_3)$ .
- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\beta = \delta = \varepsilon = 0$ , and  $0 < \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = \eta(1+x_3)$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$ ,  $\delta = \varepsilon = 0$ ,  $\beta = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = \eta x_1(1+x_3) + 1$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$ ,  $\delta = \eta = 0$ , and  $\beta = \varepsilon = 1$ , we have  $b = (1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1(1+x_3) + 1$ .
- If  $x_1 \geq 1$ ,  $\delta = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1+x_3$ , and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ , we have  $b = ((\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)x_1 + 1)(1+x_3)$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1+x_3)(1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2))$ . If  $q_i = (1+x_3)(1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2))$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1+(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , note that  $b \neq 1+x_3$  since  $h(1+x_3) = 1$ . If  $b > 1+x_3$ , we set  $c = 1+x_3$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $bx_2 - (1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1+x_3} \right\rfloor$ . Otherwise, if  $b < 1+x_3$ , we may choose  $c = 1$  from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b-1)x_2$  since  $1 < b < 1+x_3$  implies  $1 \leq b-1 < 1+x_3$ . Finally, if  $q_i = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we again write  $b = \alpha(1+x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1+x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . Moreover, in the case that  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we write  $\alpha = \gamma x_1 + \delta$  with  $\gamma = (\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_1$ ,  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)$ , and  $0 \leq \eta \leq (1+x_3)x_2$ . We consider the following possible cases:

**Subcase 1 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha = x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . If  $x_1 = 1$ , note that  $\beta \neq 0$  since  $h((1+x_3)^2(1+(1+x_3)x_2)) = 1$ . Thus, we may consider  $c = (1+x_3)^2(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (1+x_3)^2(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \beta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. Otherwise, if  $x_1 > 1$ , we consider  $c = 1$ . Since  $x_1 > 1$  implies  $-x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (\beta - x_3 - 2)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < 0$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) - 1$ .

**Subcase 2 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  with  $\delta > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ . Then, choosing  $c = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1+x_3) < (\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1+x_3) + \beta = b$ , it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to 0 since  $0 \leq \delta - 1 < x_1 - 1$  and  $0 < \beta < 1+x_3$  together imply  $0 < (\delta - 1)(1+x_3) + \beta < x_1(1+x_3)$ .

**Subcase 3 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  with  $\delta > 0$  and  $\beta = 0$ . Note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since  $h((\gamma x_1 + 1)(1+x_3)) = 1$ . Therefore,  $2 \leq \delta < x_2$ , so we may consider  $c = (\gamma x_1 + 1)(1+x_3) < (\gamma x_1 + \delta)(1+x_3) = b$ . Given this choice, we find that both sides of (6) are equal to 0 since  $0 < \delta < x_1$ .

**Subcase 4 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  with  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ . If  $\beta > \varepsilon$ , then  $\beta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $\beta = 1$  would force  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $h(\eta x_1(1+x_3) + 1) = 1$ . Thus, it must be that  $\beta > 1$ , thereby allowing us to consider  $c = \eta x_1(1+x_3) < (\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)x_1(1+x_3) + \beta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$  and since  $\beta - 1 \geq \varepsilon$  with  $\beta > 1$ , it is straightforward to verify both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . Now, if  $\beta < \varepsilon$ , we have that  $\varepsilon > 1$  since we assumed  $\beta > 0$ . Therefore, we consider  $c = (1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1(1+x_3) + 1 < (\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)x_1(1+x_3) + \beta = b$ . Then, both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\varepsilon - 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta - 1$ . Lastly, if  $\beta = \varepsilon$ , we consider two possibilities. If  $\eta > 0$ , we may again choose  $c = (1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1(1+x_3) + 1 < (\varepsilon(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta)x_1(1+x_3) + \beta = b$  and find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\varepsilon - 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \eta - 1$ . Otherwise, if  $\eta = 0$ , note that  $\varepsilon = \beta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h((1+(1+x_3)x_2)x_1(1+x_3) + 1) = 1$ . Therefore, the

same value of  $c$ , namely  $c = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1(1 + x_3) + 1$ , will again be strictly less than  $b$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(\varepsilon - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \eta - 1$ .

**Subcase 5 of 5:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  with  $\delta = 0$  and  $\beta = 0$ . In this case,  $b = \gamma x_1(1 + x_3)$ . Moreover, note that  $\gamma > 0$  since otherwise,  $b = 0$  contradicting our bounds on  $b$ . If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $h(b) = h(\gamma(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Hence, we need only consider when  $x_1 > 1$ . Since  $\gamma > 0$  and  $x_2 > 1$ , we may take  $c = 1 + x_3 < \gamma x_1(1 + x_3) = b$ , from which it is straightforward to find that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\gamma - 1$ .

This completes our second case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Thus, we consider  $1 \leq b \leq (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - 1$ . Again, we will start by identifying those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{(\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta)(1 + x_3)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

There are two different possibilities for both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ : either  $\alpha = x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  or  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$  where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , and either  $\beta = (1 + x_3)x_2$  or  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$ . We consider the following subcases.

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\alpha = x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $\beta = (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (1 + x_3)x_2 \\ &\quad - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{x_1(1 + x_3)^2(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)^2 + (1 + x_3)^2 x_2}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{(1 + x_3)^2 x_2}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor \\ &= x_1 + x_2 \\ &> 1. \end{aligned}$$

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\alpha = x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  and  $\beta \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Writing  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta \\ &\quad - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{(x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)^2 + \beta)(1 + x_3)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{(\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor \\ &= \delta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3) - (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor \\ &= \delta + x_1 - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise, we have that  $h(b) = \delta + x_1$ . For this to be equal to 1, it must be the case that  $\delta = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$  since  $x_1 \geq 1$ . Moreover, note that  $\beta = 0$  here since  $\delta = 0$  implies  $\gamma = 0$  (otherwise, we are in the previous case that  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ ). Therefore, when  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h((1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)^2) = 1$ .

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  and  $\beta = (1+x_3)x_2$ . Writing  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= \varepsilon x_1 + \eta + (1+x_3)x_2 - x_1 \left[ \frac{((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3)}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] \\ &\quad - x_2 \left[ \frac{(1+x_3)^2 x_2}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right] \\ &= \eta - x_1 \left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] + x_2. \end{aligned}$$

Given that  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , observe that

$$|(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon| < 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2).$$

Therefore,  $\left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right]$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ . If

$$\left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] = -1,$$

then  $h(b) = \eta + x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise, if

$$\left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] = 0,$$

then either (A)  $0 < \eta < x_1$  or (B)  $\eta = 0$  with  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (1+x_3)^2 x_2$ . If (A) holds, then  $h(b) = \eta + x_2 > 1$  since  $\eta > 0$ . If (B) holds, then our same equation forces  $\eta = 0$  and  $x_2 = 1$  when  $\varepsilon \leq (1+x_3)^2$ , which means that  $h(\varepsilon x_1(2+x_3) + (1+x_3)) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (1+x_3)^2$ .

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  and  $\beta \neq (1+x_3)x_2$ . Writing  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$  where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$  and  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$  where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= \varepsilon x_1 + \eta + \gamma x_2 + \delta - x_1 \left[ \frac{((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3)}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] \\ &\quad - x_2 \left[ \frac{(\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3)}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right] \\ &= \eta + \delta - x_1 \left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] - x_2 \left[ \frac{\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{1+(1+x_3)x_2} \right] \\ &= \eta + \delta - x_1 \left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] - x_2 \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given the bounds on  $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\varepsilon$ , observe that

$$|(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon| < 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2).$$

Therefore,

$$\left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right]$$

is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ .

(i) Suppose  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ . If

$$\left[ \frac{(\eta(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right] = -1,$$

then  $h(b) = \eta + x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise, if

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0,$$

then either (A)  $0 < \eta < x_1$  or (B)  $\eta = 0$  with  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma x_2(1 + x_3)$ . If (A) holds, then  $h(b) = \eta + x_2 > 1$  since  $\eta > 0$  and  $x_2 \geq 1$ . If (B) holds, then our same equation forces  $\eta = 0$  and  $x_2 = 1$  when  $\varepsilon \leq \gamma(1 + x_3)$ , which means that  $h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma(1 + x_3)$ .

(ii) Suppose otherwise, i.e.,  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$  does not hold. If

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = -1,$$

note that  $\eta = 0$ . Then,  $h(b) = \delta + x_1$ . For this to equal 1, it must be the case that  $\delta = 0$  (and hence  $\gamma = 0$  since otherwise, we would be in the previous case) and  $x_1 = 1$ . Since  $\gamma = \delta = 0$ , we have that  $\beta = 0$ . Therefore, given that  $\eta = 0$  as well, it must be that  $\varepsilon > 0$  since otherwise,  $b = 0$  contradicting our bounds on  $b$ . In this case, we have that  $h(\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = 1$  whenever  $0 < \varepsilon < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Otherwise, if

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0,$$

then either (A)  $0 < \eta < x_1$  or (B)  $\eta = 0$  with  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3)$ . If (A) holds, then  $h(b) = \eta + \delta$ , which setting equal to 1 forces  $\eta = 1$  and  $\delta = 0$  since  $\eta > 0$ . Note that  $\delta = 0$  forces  $\gamma = 0$  since otherwise, we would be in the previous case. Therefore, we have that  $h(\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . On the other hand, if (B) holds, then our same equation forces  $\eta = 0$  and  $\delta = 1$  when  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3)$ , which means that  $h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3)$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0$ , and  $0 < \varepsilon \leq (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ .
- If  $x_2 = 1$ ,  $\delta = \eta = 0$ ,  $0 < \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma(1 + x_3)$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma$ .
- If  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\eta = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , we have  $b = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ .
- If  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\delta = 1$ ,  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1 + x_3)$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . If  $q_i = (1 + (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2))$ , we write  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Note that  $b \neq 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  since  $h(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) = 1$ . If  $b > 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we set  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to

$$(\alpha - 1)(1 + x_3) + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Otherwise, if  $b < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , note that  $\alpha = 0$  and  $b = \beta$ . Therefore, to ensure we satisfy (5), we consider  $2 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Moreover, note that  $\beta \not\equiv 1 \pmod{x_2}$  since otherwise  $h(b) = h(\beta) = 1$ . Now, suppose  $\beta = (1 + x_3)x_2$ . If  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $h(\beta) = h(1 + x_3) = 1$ , so we may assume  $x_2 > 1$ . Setting  $c = 1$  and since  $x_2 > 1$ , it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $x_3$ . Otherwise, if  $\beta \neq (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$ . Note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since  $h(\gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$  for  $0 \leq \gamma < 1 + x_3$ . Suppose  $\delta > 1$ . Then, choosing  $c = \gamma x_2 + 1 < \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ , it is straightforward to show that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. On the other hand suppose  $\delta = 0$ , so  $\beta = \gamma x_2$ , where  $\gamma > 0$ . If  $x_2 = 1$ , then  $h(\beta) = 1$ , so we may

assume  $x_2 > 1$ . Taking  $c = 1$  and observing that  $x_2 > 1$  implies  $-x_2(1+x_3) < -(1+x_3) - \gamma$ , it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\gamma - 1$ .

Finally, if  $q_i = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , the analysis becomes a bit more complicated. We start by again writing  $b = \alpha(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1+(1+x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . Suppose  $\alpha = x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $\beta \neq 0$  since otherwise  $h(b) = 1$ . Thus, we may consider  $c = (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)^2 < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)^2 + \beta = b$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. If  $x_1 > 1$ , observe that

$$-x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < -(1+x_3)(2+(1+x_3)x_2) \leq (\beta-1)(1+x_3) - (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < 0.$$

Choosing  $c = 1$ , the previous inequality readily gives that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) - 1$ .

Now, suppose  $\alpha \neq x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . Then, we may write  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , and so  $b = (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \beta$ . Suppose  $\beta = (1+x_3)x_2$ . If  $\eta \geq 1$ , then we may consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2 = b$  from which it is straightforward to show that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. Otherwise, if  $\eta = 0$ , note that we may assume  $x_2 > 1$  since  $x_2 = 1$  gives that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2+x_3) + (1+x_3)) = 1$ .

We consider two possible cases, namely when  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1+x_3$  and when  $1+x_3 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . If  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1+x_3$ , we consider  $c = \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + x_2 x_3 + 1$  which is strictly less than  $b = \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2$  as  $x_2 > 1$ . With this choice of  $c$  and since  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1+x_3$ , it is straightforward to show that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. On the other hand, if  $1+x_3 \leq \varepsilon < (1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ , we may consider  $c = 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + (1+x_3)x_2 = b$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to

$$\varepsilon - (1+x_3) + \left\lfloor \frac{(1+x_3)^2 x_2 - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor.$$

Now, suppose  $\beta \neq (1+x_3)x_2$ . Then, we may write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma < 1+x_3$ , and so  $b$  can be written as  $b = (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta$ . We consider the following possible subcases.

**Subcase 1 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . We consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . Since  $0 < \eta < x_1$  and  $0 < \gamma x_2 + \delta < (1+x_3)x_2$ , it follows that  $0 < (\eta - 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta < x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2)$ . Therefore, it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 2 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . If  $\varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1+x_3)$ , note that  $\delta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$ . Thus, we have that  $\delta > 1$ , and we consider  $c = \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1 < \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . Given that  $\varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 + 1)(1+x_3)$  and  $1 < \delta < x_2$ , it is straightforward to verify that our choice of  $c$  gives that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. Otherwise, if  $(\gamma x_2 + 1)(1+x_3) < \varepsilon$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 1+x_3$ ), we consider  $c = 1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon x_1(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta = b$ . With this choice of  $c$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to

$$\varepsilon - (1+x_3) + \left\lfloor \frac{(\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1+x_3) - \varepsilon}{1+x_1(1+x_3)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor.$$

**Subcase 3 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta > 0$  and  $\delta = 0$ . If  $\gamma > 0$ , we may consider  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$  from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. On the other hand, if  $\gamma = 0$ , note that  $\eta \neq 1$  since otherwise,  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2)) = 1$ . Therefore, we may again choose  $c = (\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) < (\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1+(1+x_3)x_2) = b$ . Since  $1 < \eta < x_1$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0.

**Subcase 4 of 4:** Suppose  $\eta = \delta = 0$ . Further suppose  $\gamma x_2(1 + x_3) < \varepsilon$ . If  $\gamma > 0$ , then it follows that  $\gamma x_2 \geq 1$ . Therefore, our assumed inequality implies  $\varepsilon > 1 + x_3$ , so we may consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ . Since  $\gamma x_2(1 + x_3) < \varepsilon$ , our choice of  $c$  readily gives that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - x_3 - 2$ . Otherwise, if  $\gamma = 0$  (and hence,  $\varepsilon > 0$  since we assumed  $\gamma x_2(1 + x_3) < \varepsilon$ ), we may assume  $x_1 > 1$  since otherwise, we would have that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = 1$ . Thus, since  $x_1 > 1$ , we may take  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2 < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) = b$ . Observe that the bounds on  $\varepsilon$  and  $x_1 > 1$  imply  $-x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) \leq -2(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < -(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) - \varepsilon < 0$ . Consequently, it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - 1$ . Now, suppose  $\gamma x_2(1 + x_3) > \varepsilon$ . Note that  $\gamma \neq 0$  since otherwise,  $\varepsilon < 0$  contradicting our initial bounds on  $\varepsilon$ . Thus, we have that  $\gamma > 0$ . Moreover, if  $x_2 = 1$ , it follows that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$ , so we may assume  $x_2 > 1$ . Given the addition restriction that  $\varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 - 1)(1 + x_3)$ , we may choose  $c = 1$  from which the inequality  $\varepsilon \leq (\gamma x_2 - 1)(1 + x_3)$  readily implies both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon$ . However, for  $(\gamma x_2 - 1)(1 + x_3) < \varepsilon < \gamma x_2(1 + x_3)$ , we consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . Note that  $x_2 > 1$  and  $\gamma > 0$  together with our restriction on  $\varepsilon$  imply that  $\varepsilon > 1 + x_3$ . Therefore, we satisfy  $c < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ , and a straightforward computation gives that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - (1 + x_3)$ . Finally, suppose  $\varepsilon = \gamma x_2(1 + x_3)$ . Given this equality, note that neither  $\gamma$  nor  $\varepsilon$  can be equal to 0 since otherwise, we would have  $\eta = \delta = \gamma = \varepsilon = 0$ , implying  $b = 0$ . This, of course, contradicts the bounds on  $b$ . Moreover, we may again assume  $x_2 > 1$  (and thus,  $\varepsilon > 1 + x_3$ ) since otherwise,  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 1 + x_3$ , we may consider  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) < \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 = b$ . This choice of  $c$  readily gives that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\varepsilon - (1 + x_3)$ .

In any case, we find that both sides of (6) are equivalent for each possible  $q_i$ , thereby completing our third and final case. Thus, we have established IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (vi).

**A.6. Proof of IDP for type (vii) in Theorem 3.9.** Here, we verify IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (vii) using Theorem 3.3. Again, we must consider three cases corresponding to three possible values of  $q_j$ .

**Case:**  $q_j = 1 + x_3$ . Since  $1 \leq b \leq x_3$  in this case, it is straightforward to verify that  $h(b) = b$ . Hence, the  $b$ -values we are required to check in (5) are  $2 \leq b \leq x_3$ . To verify that (6) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If  $q_i = 1 + x_3$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3))$ , then we may select  $c = 1$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b - 1)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3))$ . If  $q_i = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , then we may again set  $c = 1$ , from which it is straightforward to compute that both sides of (6) are equal to  $(b - 1)(x_1 + x_2 + x_1x_2(1 + x_3))$ . This completes our first case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3))$ . It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)} \right\rfloor - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{b}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor,$$

where the values of  $b$  range from 1 to  $(1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) - 1$ . To verify that (6) always has the desired solution, we consider three cases. If  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + x_1(1 + x_3))$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = 1 + x_3$ , then we write  $b = \alpha(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_3$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) + \beta - \alpha x_1 - \alpha x_1 x_3 - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$



If  $\beta > 0$ , we may select  $c = 1$ , from which it follows that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\alpha$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then our formula for  $h(b)$  reduces to

$$h(b) = h(\alpha(1 + x_1(1 + x_3))) = \alpha$$

since  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_3$ . Thus, to satisfy (5), it must be that  $\alpha > 1$ , implying  $b = \alpha(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) > 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)$ . In this case, taking  $c = 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)$ , it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\alpha - 1$ , and (7) is satisfied as  $h(1 + x_1(1 + x_3)) = 1$ . Finally, if  $q_i = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , then we write  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + x_1(1 + x_3)$  for  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Consequently, since  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + x_3$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)} \right\rfloor - \alpha x_3 - x_3 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta}{1 + x_3} \right\rfloor \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3) + \beta}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\beta > 0$ , we may select  $c = 1$ , from which it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to  $\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\beta - 1)x_2$  (since  $0 \leq \beta - 1 < x_3$ ). On the other hand, if  $\beta = 0$ , then our formula for  $h(b)$  reduces to

$$h(b) = h(\alpha(1 + x_3)) = \alpha - \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3)}{1 + x_1(1 + x_3)} \right\rfloor.$$

In order to satisfy (5), it must be that  $\alpha > 1$ , which implies  $b = \alpha(1 + x_3) > 1 + x_3$ . Thus, in this case, we consider  $c = 1 + x_3$ . Clearly,  $h(1 + x_3) = 1$ , giving (7), and moreover, it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) when  $c = 1 + x_3$  are equal to  $(\alpha - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . This completes our second case.

**Case:**  $q_j = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . We first identify those values of  $b$  that satisfy (5) and (7). It is straightforward to verify that

$$h(b) = b - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{b(1 + x_3)}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor.$$

Writing  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta \leq (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq (1 + x_3)x_1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= h(\alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta) \\ &= \alpha + \beta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta(1 + x_3)}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Now, writing  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , it follows that

$$h(b) = \alpha + \delta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha(1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3)}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor.$$

Since  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , observe that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor = \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We further write  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + x_3$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} h(b) &= \eta + \delta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\gamma x_2 + \delta)(1 + x_3)}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor \\ &= \eta + \delta - x_1 \left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor - x_2 \left\lfloor \frac{\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Given the bounds on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$ , note that  $-(1+x_3) \leq \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1+x_3)x_2$  and  $-(1+x_3) \leq \eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma \leq (1+x_3)x_1$ . Consequently, it follows that

$$|(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma| < (1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2),$$

and this implies that  $\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ . To resolve this floor function, we consider the following subcases which analyze the sign of the numerator of its argument.

**Subcase 1 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\varepsilon > \gamma$ . Then, since  $\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1+x_3)x_2$ , the numerator above will be negative, implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Therefore, our equation for  $h(b)$  simplifies to

$$h(b) = \delta + x_1 - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . If  $\delta = \gamma = 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)) = x_1$ . Thus, if  $x_1 = 1$ , we have that  $h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)) = 1$  whenever  $\varepsilon > 0$ . If  $\delta > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = \delta + x_1 > 1$ .

**Subcase 2 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\varepsilon < \gamma$ . Then,  $\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma > 0$ , and consequently, the numerator of our floor function argument will be positive. Hence,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0,$$

simplifying our formula for  $h(b)$  to

$$h(b) = \delta - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = x_2$ . Thus, if  $x_2 = 1$ , we have that  $h(b) = h(\varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma) = 1$  whenever  $\varepsilon < \gamma$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = \delta$ , which forces  $\delta = 1$ , i.e.,  $h(\varepsilon x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$  whenever  $\varepsilon < \gamma$ .

**Subcase 3 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$  and  $\varepsilon = \gamma$ . Then,  $\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma = 0$ , so the numerator of our floor function argument reduces to  $\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma$ . If  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma < 0$  which implies

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = -1.$$

Hence, for  $\varepsilon = \gamma > 0$ ,  $h(b) = h(\gamma x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = x_1 + x_2 > 1$ . If  $\delta = \gamma = 0$ , then  $\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma = 0$  which implies

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

Hence,  $h(b) = h(0) = 0$ . If  $\delta > 0$ , then  $\delta(1+x_3) - \gamma > 0$  since  $0 \leq \gamma \leq (1+x_3)$ . Therefore,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1+x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \delta(1+x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1+x_3)x_1)(1 + (1+x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0.$$

As such, we have that  $h(b) = h(\gamma x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = \delta$ , which forces  $\delta = 1$ , i.e.,  $h(b) = h(\gamma x_1(1 + (1+x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$  for  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ .

**Subcase 4 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta = 1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1 + x_3$ . Then, it follows that  $\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma > 0$ . Consequently, since  $\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have that the numerator of our floor function argument is positive, implying

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0$$

for any  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$  and  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$ . As a result, if  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1 + x_2 > 1$ . If  $\delta = \gamma = 0$ , then  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = \eta = 1$  whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1 + x_3$ . If  $\delta > 0$ , then  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = 1 + \delta > 1$ .

**Subcase 5 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta = 1$  and  $\varepsilon = 1 + x_3$ . Then, the numerator of our floor function argument reduces to  $\gamma(1 + x_3)x_2 + \delta(1 + x_3)$ , which is certainly nonnegative. Therefore, it follows that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0,$$

which simplifies our formula for  $h(b)$  to

$$h(b) = h((1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = 1 + \delta - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, if  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , it follows that  $h(b) = h((1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = 1 + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = h((1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = 1 + \delta$ . So, for this to be equal to 1, it must be that  $\delta = \gamma = 0$ , i.e.,  $h((1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)) = 1$ .

**Subcase 6 of 6:** Suppose  $\eta > 1$ . Then, it follows that  $\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma > 0$ , and consequently, since  $\delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we have that the numerator of our floor function argument is positive. Therefore, we have that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor = 0,$$

which simplifies our formula for  $h(b)$  to

$$h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = \eta + \delta - x_2 \cdot \begin{cases} -1, & \delta = 0, \gamma > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, if  $\delta = 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , it follows that  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2) = \eta + x_2 > 1$ . Otherwise,  $h(b) = h((\varepsilon x_1 + \eta)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + \delta) = \eta + \delta > 1$ .

We summarize the values of  $b$  for which  $h(b) = 1$  that were just derived:

- If  $x_1 = 1$ ,  $\eta = \delta = \gamma = 0$ , and  $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1 + x_3$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ .
- If  $x_2 = 1$ ,  $\eta = \delta = 0$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon < \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(2 + x_3) + \gamma x_2$ .
- If  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\delta = 1$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , we have  $b = \varepsilon x_1(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \gamma x_2 + 1$ .
- If  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\delta = \gamma = 0$ , and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + x_3$ , we have  $b = (1 + \varepsilon x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ .

Our next goal is to establish that (6) is always satisfied; recall that we are in the case where  $q_j = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ . If  $q_i = (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$ , the result is trivial. If  $q_i = (1 + x_3)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)$ , we write  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_1$ . If  $b > 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  (and thus,  $\alpha \geq 1$ ), we can take  $c = 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  as this makes both sides of (6) equal to  $(\alpha - 1)(1 + x_3) + \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(1 + x_3)}{1 + (1 + x_3)x_2} \right\rfloor$ . If  $2 \leq b < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , note that  $\alpha$  must be 0 and hence  $b = \beta$ . We write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ . In the case that  $\delta > 1$ , we set  $c = \gamma x_2 + 1$  as this makes both sides of (6) equal to 0. Moreover, note that we need not consider the case where  $\delta = 1$  since  $h(\gamma x_2 + 1) = 1$ . Therefore, it only remains to find a  $c$ -value when  $\delta = 0$ . If  $\delta = 0$ , then  $b = \beta = \gamma x_2$ . Observe that  $\gamma > 0$  since  $\gamma = 0$  would imply  $h(b) = 0 \not\equiv 2$ . In this case, we set  $c = (\gamma - 1)x_2 + 1$ . Since  $1 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$  implies that

$1 \leq 2 + x_3 - \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , it is straightforward to check that both sides of (6) will again be equal to 0.

Finally, if  $q_i = 1 + x_3$ , the analysis becomes slightly more complicated. As in the previous case, we begin by writing  $b = \alpha(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \beta$ , where  $0 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_1$ . Furthermore, we write  $\beta = \gamma x_2 + \delta$ , where  $0 \leq \delta < x_2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + x_3$ , and we write  $\alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , where  $0 \leq \eta < x_1$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1 + x_3$ . If  $b > 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , we consider  $c = 1$ . Substituting  $c = 1$  and the alternate form for  $b$  into the left-hand side of (6), yields

$$\varepsilon + \underbrace{\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor}_{=: F_1}.$$

On the other hand, substituting into the right-hand side of (6) yields

$$\varepsilon + \underbrace{\left\lfloor \frac{(\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma}{(1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)} \right\rfloor}_{=: F_2}.$$

We must show that  $F_1 = F_2$ . To this end, let  $n_1 = (\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma$  and  $n_2 = (\eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma$ , that is,  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are the numerators of the arguments in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , respectively. Given the bounds on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$ , note that  $-(1 + x_3) \leq \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ ,  $-2(1 + x_3) \leq (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , and  $-(1 + x_3) \leq \eta(1 + x_3) - \varepsilon + \gamma \leq (1 + x_3)x_1$ . Consequently, it follows that  $|n_k| < (1 + (1 + x_3)x_1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2)$  for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , and this implies that  $F_k$  is equal to either 0 or  $-1$ . Therefore, to achieve our goal, we must verify that either  $n_1, n_2 < 0$  or  $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$ . Now, observe that  $b > 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$  implies that either (A)  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta > 0$ , or (B)  $\alpha > 1$ . For each of these scenarios, we consider subcases. First assume (A) holds, i.e.,  $\alpha = 1$  and  $\beta > 0$ .

**Subcase 1 of 2:** Suppose  $x_1 = 1$ . Then, since  $0 \leq \eta < x_1 = 1$ , it follows that  $\eta = 0$ . Consequently, as  $1 = \alpha = \varepsilon x_1 + \eta$ , we have that  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Thus,  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= (\gamma - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma, \text{ and} \\ n_2 &= (\gamma - 1)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma \end{aligned}$$

If  $\gamma = 0$ , then the numerators  $n_1, n_2 < 0$  and hence  $F_1 = F_2 = -1$ . If  $\gamma = 1$ , note that  $\delta \neq 1$  (since  $\eta = 0, \varepsilon = \gamma$ , and  $\delta = 1$  imply  $h(b) = 1$ ). So, if  $\delta = 0$ , then  $n_1, n_2 < 0$  and hence  $F_1 = F_2 = -1$ . Otherwise, if  $\delta > 1$ , then  $n_1, n_2 > 0$  and thus  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ . If  $\gamma > 1$ , then  $n_1, n_2 > 0$ , implying  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ .

**Subcase 2 of 2:** Suppose  $x_1 > 1$ . Then, given that  $\alpha = 1$ , it must be the case that  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $\eta = 1$ . Therefore, it immediately follows that  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$  since  $n_1, n_2 > 0$ .

Thus, we can conclude that  $F_1 = F_2$  in situation (A). Now, we must consider situation (B), i.e., when  $\alpha > 1$ . We again consider subcases.

**Subcase 1 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta = 0$ . Then, it follows that  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and our numerators reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= (\gamma - \varepsilon)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma, \text{ and} \\ n_2 &= (\gamma - \varepsilon)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\gamma > \varepsilon$ , then the numerators of both arguments will be positive, implying  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ . If  $\gamma = \varepsilon$ , note that  $\delta \neq 1$  (since  $\eta = 0, \varepsilon = \gamma$ , and  $\delta = 1$  imply  $h(b) = 1$ ). So, if  $\delta = 0$ , we have that  $n_1, n_2 < 0$ , and hence  $F_1 = F_2 = -1$ . Otherwise, if  $\delta > 1$ , it follows that  $n_1, n_2 \geq 0$  which implies  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ . Finally, if  $\gamma < \varepsilon$ , it follows that  $F_1 = F_2 = -1$  since  $n_1, n_2 < 0$ .

**Subcase 2 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta = 1$ . Again, since  $\alpha > 1$ , this implies  $\varepsilon > 0$ . As a result, we have the following reduction of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= (1 + x_3 - \varepsilon + \varepsilon)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + \delta(1 + x_3) - \gamma, \text{ and} \\ n_2 &= (1 + x_3 - \varepsilon + \gamma)(1 + (1 + x_3)x_2) + (\delta - 1)(1 + x_3) - \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\varepsilon < 1 + x_3$  then we have  $n_1, n_2 > 0$ , and thus  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ . Otherwise,  $\varepsilon = 1 + x_3$ . Note that since  $\eta = 1$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$  cannot both be 0 as this would imply  $h(b) = 1$ . Therefore, if  $\gamma = 0$ , it must be that  $\delta > 0$  which implies  $n_1, n_2 > 0$  and  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ . Otherwise, if  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $n_1, n_2 > 0$ , and thus  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ .

**Subcase 3 of 3:** Suppose  $\eta > 1$ . Then, it immediately follows that  $n_1, n_2 > 0$ , and we have that  $F_1 = F_2 = 0$ .

Thus, we find that  $F_1 = F_2$ . Therefore, we have that (6) is satisfied with  $c = 1$  for  $b > 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . It remains to consider  $2 \leq b < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . If  $2 \leq b < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ , note that  $\alpha$  must be 0 and hence  $b = \beta$ . Therefore, to ensure we satisfy (5), we consider  $2 \leq \beta < 1 + (1 + x_3)x_2$ . Since  $\beta > 1$  in this case, we may take  $c = 1$  from which it is straightforward to verify that both sides of (6) are equal to 0. This completes our third and final case, thereby establishing IDP for  $\mathbf{r}$ -vectors of type (vii).

**A.7. Proof of Theorem 4.9.** We first prove that the  $h^*$ -polynomial is correct. Fix  $n \geq 2$  and set  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}(n), \mathbf{x}(n))$ . Since  $\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) = 30n$ , it follows from Theorem 4.1 that for  $0 \leq b < 30n$

$$\begin{aligned} w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b) &:= b - (2n - 1) \left\lfloor \frac{b}{30n} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{3n \cdot b}{30n} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{10n \cdot b}{30n} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{15n \cdot b}{30n} \right\rfloor \\ &= b - \left\lfloor \frac{b}{10} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{b}{3} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{b}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $b = 30\alpha + \beta$ , with  $0 \leq \alpha < n$  and  $0 \leq \beta < 30$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b) &:= 30\alpha + \beta - \left\lfloor \frac{30\alpha + \beta}{10} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{30\alpha + \beta}{3} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{30\alpha + \beta}{2} \right\rfloor \\ &= 2\alpha + \beta - \left\lfloor \frac{\beta}{10} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{\beta}{3} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{\beta}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{0 \leq b < 30n} z^{w(b)} = \left( \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < n} z^{2\alpha} \right) \left( \sum_{0 \leq \beta < 30} z^{\beta - \lfloor \frac{\beta}{10} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{\beta}{3} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{\beta}{2} \rfloor} \right)$$

which evaluates to

$$(1 + z^2 + z^4 + z^6 + \cdots + z^{2n-2}) \cdot (1 + 7z + 14z^2 + 7z^3 + z^4).$$

We next prove our claim regarding the Hilbert basis for  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ . For each  $0 \leq b < 30n$ , there exist unique values  $0 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma < 30n$  such that the following linear combination of ray generators for  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  produces an element in the fundamental parallelepiped for the cone over  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$ :

$$\mathbf{p}(b) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 & -3n \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & -10n \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & -15n \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b/30n \\ b/30n \\ \vdots \\ \alpha/30n \\ \beta/30n \\ \gamma/30n \\ b/30n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2(n+1)}$$

From the final four entries of the resulting vector, we observe that each of the following values must be an integer:

$$\frac{\alpha - 3bn}{30n}, \frac{\beta - 10bn}{30n}, \frac{\gamma - 15bn}{30n}, \frac{2nb + \alpha + \beta + \gamma}{30n}$$

To determine  $\alpha$ , we write  $b = 10p_{10} + r_{10}$  where  $0 \leq r_{10} < 10$  and evaluate in the first expression, yielding

$$\frac{\alpha - 30p_{10}n - 3r_{10}n}{30n} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

from which it follows that  $\alpha = 3nr_{10} = 3n(b \bmod 10)$  and

$$\frac{\alpha - 30p_{10}n - 3r_{10}n}{30n} = p_{10} = \lfloor b/10 \rfloor.$$

Similarly, it can be shown (by expressing  $b = 3p_3 + r_3$ ) that  $\beta = 10n(b \bmod 3)$  with

$$\frac{\beta - 10bn}{30n} = p_3 = \lfloor b/3 \rfloor.$$

Similarly,  $\gamma = 15n(b \bmod 2)$  and

$$\frac{\gamma - 15bn}{30n} = \lfloor b/2 \rfloor.$$

Thus, we have that

$$\mathbf{p}(b) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -\lfloor b/10 \rfloor \\ -\lfloor b/3 \rfloor \\ -\lfloor b/2 \rfloor \\ (2b + 3(b \bmod 10) + 10(b \bmod 3) + 15(b \bmod 2))/30n \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now show that we can reduce  $\mathbf{p}(b)$  for  $30 < b < 30n$  to a case where  $0 \leq b \leq 30$ . If  $30 < b$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}(b) - \mathbf{p}(30) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -\lfloor b/10 \rfloor + 3 \\ -\lfloor b/3 \rfloor + 10 \\ -\lfloor b/2 \rfloor + 15 \\ (2b + 3(b \bmod 10) + 10(b \bmod 3) + 15(b \bmod 2))/30n - 2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -\lfloor (b-30)/10 \rfloor \\ -\lfloor (b-30)/3 \rfloor \\ -\lfloor (b-30)/2 \rfloor \\ (2b + 3((b-30) \bmod 10) + 10((b-30) \bmod 3) + 15((b-30) \bmod 2))/30n \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{p}(b-30). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, every lattice point in  $\Delta_{(1, \mathbf{q})}$  is a sum of elements from  $\{\mathbf{p}(b) : 0 \leq b \leq 30\}$ . It is straightforward but tedious to check (either by hand or via computer algebra system) that the minimal additive generators of this set are precisely the columns of the matrix in the theorem statement. Thus, our proof is complete.

**A.8. Proof of Theorem 5.3.** For  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$ , set  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m) = (\mathbf{r}(m), \mathbf{x}(m))$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{r}$  is indexed from 1 to  $d$  and that  $\mathbf{r}(m)$  is indexed from 0 to  $d$ , i.e., that  $r(m)_0 = 1$ . Define  $\ell(m)$  by

$$1 + \sum_{i=0}^d r(m)_i x(m)_i = 1 + x(m)_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d r_i x_i = \ell(m) \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) = \ell(m) \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r}).$$

Using the fact that  $r(m)_0 = 1$  implies  $s(m)_0 = \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r})$ , Definition 4.4 gives

$$g_{\mathbf{r}(m)}^{\mathbf{x}(m)}(z) = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r})} z^{\alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor}.$$

Note that in the exponent  $\alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor$ , the only term that varies with  $m$  is  $\ell(m)$ . Note

also that for all  $\alpha$  we have  $\left( \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \right) \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor$ .

Assume that  $m$  is large enough so that

$$\ell(m) - 1 > \left( \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \right) \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor \text{ for all } \alpha.$$

By Theorem 4.5, we have that

$$h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}; z) = \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\ell(m)-1} z^t \right) \cdot g_{\mathbf{r}(m)}^{\mathbf{x}(m)}(z) = \sum_{0 \leq \alpha < \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r})} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\ell(m)-1} z^{t + \alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor} \right).$$

Our strategy is to show that for each value of  $t$ , the polynomial

$$p_\alpha(z) := \sum_{t=0}^{\ell(m)-1} z^{t + \alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor}$$

has common terms with only  $p_{\alpha-1}(z)$  and  $p_{\alpha+1}(z)$ . Thus, the coefficients in  $h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}; z)$  are either 1 or 2.

Observe that the largest term in  $p_{\alpha-1}(z)$  has degree  $\alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor (\alpha - 1) / s_i \rfloor - 1$ , while the smallest term in  $p_{\alpha+1}(z)$  has degree  $(\alpha + 1) \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor (\alpha + 1) / s_i \rfloor$ . Because of our assumption regarding  $m$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha + 1) \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor (\alpha + 1) / s_i \rfloor &\geq (\alpha + 1) \ell(m) - (\ell(m) - 1) \\ &= \alpha \ell(m) + 1 > \alpha \ell(m) \\ &> \alpha \ell(m) - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor (\alpha - 1) / s_i \rfloor - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the lowest degree term in  $p_{\alpha+1}(z)$  is strictly greater than the highest degree term in  $p_{\alpha-1}(z)$ . Further, the coefficient of  $z^{\alpha \ell(m)}$  in  $h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}; z)$  is equal to 1, which is contributed by  $p_\alpha(z)$ . Thus, all coefficients in  $h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}; z)$  are equal to either 1 or 2.

To see that  $h^*(\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}; z)$  is not unimodal, observe that if  $\alpha'$  is the least value of  $\alpha$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i \lfloor \alpha / s_i \rfloor > 0$ , then the coefficient of  $z^{\alpha' \ell(m) - 1}$  is equal to 2, while the coefficient of  $z^{\alpha' \ell(m)}$  is equal to 1.

**A.9. Proof of Theorem 5.4.** For  $\mathbf{q} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x})$ , we again set  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m) = (\mathbf{r}(m), \mathbf{x}(m))$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{r}$  is indexed from 1 to  $d$  and that  $\mathbf{r}(m)$  is indexed from 0 to  $d$ , i.e., that  $r(m)_0 = 1$ . We use Corollary 3.4 in the case where  $j = 1$ . Observe that for all  $m \geq 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sum_{i=0}^d x_i(r(m)_i \bmod r(m)_1) &= 1 + x(m)_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i(r_i \bmod r_1) \\ &> 1 + \text{lcm}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i(r_i \bmod r_1) > r_1, \end{aligned}$$

since  $x(m)_0$  grows arbitrarily large as  $m$  goes to infinity. Thus,  $\Delta_{(1, \text{rs}(\mathbf{q}, m))}$  is not IDP.

**A.10. Proof of Theorem 5.5.** Let  $\mathbf{q}$  be reflexive and supported by the vector  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$  with multiplicity  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$ . Using Setup 2.2, we have that  $r_i = \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q})/s_i$ . By Theorem 4.1, it follows that

$$w(\mathbf{q}, b) := b - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{r_i b}{\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1} \right\rfloor = b - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) b}{s_i(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)} \right\rfloor$$

with  $0 \leq b \leq \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 2$ . Rewriting  $\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) b$  as  $(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)b + b$  implies that

$$w(\mathbf{q}, b) := b - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{b}{s_i} + \frac{b}{s_i(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)} \right\rfloor.$$

Additionally, it follows from Theorem 4.1 that

$$w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b) := b - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{r_i b}{\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q})} \right\rfloor = b - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \left\lfloor \frac{b}{s_i} \right\rfloor$$

with  $0 \leq b \leq \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1$ . For all  $0 \leq b \leq \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 2$ , we have

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{s_i} \cdot \frac{b}{\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1} < \frac{1}{s_i} \quad \text{implies} \quad \frac{b}{s_i} \leq \frac{b}{s_i} + \frac{b}{s_i(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)} < \frac{b+1}{s_i}.$$

If we let  $b = ks_i + a$  with some integer  $k$  and  $0 \leq a < s_i$ , then  $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{s_i} \right\rfloor = k$ . Since

$$\frac{b}{s_i(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)} < \frac{1}{s_i}, \quad \text{then} \quad \left\lfloor \frac{b}{s_i} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{b}{s_i} + \frac{b}{s_i(\text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1)} \right\rfloor.$$

This implies that  $w(\mathbf{q}, b) = w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b)$  for all  $0 \leq b \leq \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 2$ . When considering  $\text{rs}(\mathbf{q})$ , for  $b = \text{lcm}(\mathbf{q}) - 1$  we have  $w(\text{rs}(\mathbf{q}), b) = n + 1$ , and our proof is complete.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0027  
*Email address:* [benjamin.braun@uky.edu](mailto:benjamin.braun@uky.edu)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, NY 13346  
*Email address:* [rdavis@colgate.edu](mailto:rdavis@colgate.edu)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0027  
*Email address:* [derek.hanely@uky.edu](mailto:derek.hanely@uky.edu)

MARTHA LAYNE COLLINS HIGH SCHOOL, 801 DISCOVERY BOULEVARD, SHELBYVILLE, KY 40065  
*Email address:* [morgan.lane@shelby.kyschools.us](mailto:morgan.lane@shelby.kyschools.us)

MATEMATIK, KTH, SE-100, 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
*Email address:* [solus@kth.se](mailto:solus@kth.se)