

# On Perfect Bases in Finite Abelian Groups

Béla Bajnok\*

Connor Berson†

Hoang Anh Just‡

September 29, 2021

## Abstract

Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group and  $s$  be a positive integer. A subset  $A$  of  $G$  is called a *perfect  $s$ -basis* of  $G$  if each element of  $G$  can be written uniquely as the sum of at most  $s$  (not-necessarily-distinct) elements of  $A$ ; similarly, we say that  $A$  is a *perfect restricted  $s$ -basis* of  $G$  if each element of  $G$  can be written uniquely as the sum of at most  $s$  distinct elements of  $A$ . We prove that perfect  $s$ -bases exist only in the trivial cases of  $s = 1$  or  $|A| = 1$ . The situation is different with restricted addition where perfection is more frequent; here we treat the case of  $s = 2$  and prove that  $G$  has a perfect restricted 2-basis if, and only if, it is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_7$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ .

2020 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 11B13; Secondary: 05B10, 11P70, 11B75, 20K01.

Key words: Abelian group, sumset, restricted addition, basis,  $B_h$  set.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper we let  $G$  be an additively written finite abelian group. When  $G$  is cyclic and of order  $n$ , we identify it with  $\mathbb{Z}_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ; we consider  $0, 1, \dots, n-1$  interchangeably as integers and as elements of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ .

For subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $G$ , we let  $A+B$  and  $A-B$  denote the set of two-term sums and differences, respectively, with one term chosen from  $A$  and the other from  $B$ . (If, say,  $A$  consists of a single element  $a$ , we simply write  $a+B$  and  $a-B$  instead of  $A+B$  and  $A-B$ .) For a subset  $A$  of  $G$  and a nonnegative integer  $h$ ,  $hA$  denotes the  *$h$ -fold sumset* of  $A$ , that is, the collection of  $h$ -term sums with (not-necessarily-distinct) elements from  $A$ . The study of sumsets is the main theme in much of additive number theory; Nathanson's textbook [11] provides a general introduction to the field, while the monograph [1] discusses and provides the background for over 300 of its open questions.

Given a positive integer  $s$ , we say that a subset  $A$  of  $G$  is an  *$s$ -basis* for  $G$  if every element of  $G$  can be written as the sum of at most  $s$  (not-necessarily-distinct) elements of  $A$ ; that is, if  $\cup_{h=0}^s hA = G$ . The concept has enjoyed a rich history since it was first discussed by Erdős and Turán in [5] eighty years ago; see, for example, [3], [4], [7], [10], [11], and [12].

A subset  $A$  of  $G$  is called a *perfect  $s$ -basis* if every element of  $G$  can be written uniquely (apart from the order of the terms) as a sum of at most  $s$  elements of  $A$ . (In somewhat of a contrast to our usual understanding of bases, this uniqueness property is not part of the definition of  $s$ -bases where only the spanning property is required.) One can then ask for each

\*Department of Mathematics, Gettysburg College, U.S.A. Email: bbajnok@gettysburg.edu. Corresponding author.

†Asymmetrik, U.S.A. Email: cjberson@gmail.com.

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, U.S.A. E-mail: just@vt.edu.

instance when a group  $G$  possesses a perfect  $s$ -basis. Trivially, the set of nonzero elements is a perfect 1-basis in any group  $G$ , and the 1-element set consisting of a generator of  $G$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in the cyclic group of order  $s + 1$ . We prove that there are no others:

**Theorem 1** *If a subset  $A$  of a finite abelian group  $G$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis, then  $s = 1$  and  $A = G \setminus \{0\}$ , or  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{s+1}$  and  $|A| = 1$ .*

Our proof of Theorem 1 is based on the fact that if  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$ , then the  $s + 1$  subsets

$$-A, A - A, 2A - A, \dots, (s - 1)A - A, \text{ and } (s - 1)A$$

are pairwise disjoint. This will allow us to conclude that, when  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$  with  $|A| \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ , then the set

$$S = \cup_{h=0}^{s-1} (hA - A) \cup (s - 1)A$$

has size more than the order of  $G$ , which is clearly not possible.

We should note that focusing on sums of at most  $s$  terms is equivalent to the case when exactly  $s$  terms are considered. A subset  $B$  of  $G$  is said to be an *additive basis of order  $s$*  if every element of  $G$  can be expressed as the sum of exactly  $s$  terms (that is, if  $sA = G$ ), and it is called a  $B_s$  set if all  $s$ -term sums are distinct (up to the order of the terms). We now prove that  $G$  has a perfect  $s$ -basis of size  $m$  if, and only if, it has a subset of size  $m + 1$  that is an additive basis of order  $s$  as well as a  $B_s$  set.

Suppose first that  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$ . Since then  $0 \notin A$ , the set  $B = A \cup \{0\}$  has size  $|A| + 1$ ; it is also easy to see that each element of  $G$  can be written uniquely as the sum of exactly  $s$  elements of  $B$ . Conversely, assume that  $B$  is an additive basis of order  $s$  as well as a  $B_s$  set. Note that this implies that each translate of  $B$  has these two properties as well; in particular, we may assume that  $0 \in B$ . This then clearly implies that  $A = B \setminus \{0\}$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$ . We can thus restate Theorem 1 as follows:

**Theorem 2** *If a subset  $B$  of a finite abelian group  $G$  is a  $B_s$  set and an additive basis of order  $s$ , then  $s = 1$  and  $B = G$ , or  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{s+1}$  and  $|B| = 2$ .*

Let us now turn to *restricted addition*, that is, when the terms in the sums must be pairwise distinct. The  $h$ -fold *restricted sumset* of  $A$ , denoted by  $h\hat{A}$ , is the collection of  $h$ -term sums with pairwise distinct elements from  $A$ . We call a subset  $A$  of  $G$  a *restricted  $s$ -basis* if every element of  $G$  can be written as the sum of at most  $s$  distinct elements of  $A$ , and  $A$  is said to be a *perfect restricted  $s$ -basis* if these sums are (apart from the order of the terms) unique for each element of the group. The instances of  $|A| = 1$  or  $s = 1$  are identical for restricted addition and unrestricted addition, and are as listed above. As a major contrast, however, there are infinitely many perfect restricted  $s$ -bases with  $|A| \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$  (see Section 4).

Our strategy for classifying perfect restricted  $s$ -bases is similar to the unrestricted case, but exhibiting sets that are pairwise disjoint seems more elusive. Here we only treat the case of  $s = 2$ , for which we prove that when  $G$  is not isomorphic to the elementary abelian 2-group, then  $G$  has a perfect restricted 2-basis in exactly three cases: when  $G$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_7$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ . Similarly to the unrestricted case, for a given perfect restricted 2-basis  $A$  we consider the set

$$T = (A - A) \cup A,$$

and prove that, unless  $G$  is isomorphic to the three groups just listed,  $T$  has size more than the order of  $G$ . Elements of order 2 in  $G$  require additional attention that we are able to handle when  $G$  is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group. However, if all nonzero elements of  $G$  have order 2, then

$$A - A = 2A = \{0\} \cup \hat{2}A,$$

and thus  $T = \cup_{h=0}^2 hA$ . Therefore,  $A$  being a perfect restricted 2-basis in  $G$  is equivalent to having  $T = G$ , resulting in no contradiction. Luckily, a problem of Ramanujan comes to the rescue.

In 1913, Ramanujan asked in [13] whether the quantity  $2^k - 7$  can be a square number for any integer  $k$  besides 3, 4, 5, 7, and 15 (see also Question 464 in [2]). The negative answer was given by Nagell in 1948 (see [8]; [9] for the English version). Suppose now that  $G$  is the elementary abelian 2-group of rank  $r$  that has a perfect restricted 2-basis of size  $m$ : we then must have

$$2^r = \binom{m}{0} + \binom{m}{1} + \binom{m}{2},$$

and therefore

$$2^{r+3} - 7 = (2m + 1)^2.$$

We thus have exactly four choices for  $r$ : 1, 2, 4, and 12. We show that perfect restricted 2-bases exist in the first three cases but not in  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{12}$ . In summary, we have the following results:

**Theorem 3** *A finite abelian group  $G$  has a perfect restricted 2-basis if, and only if, it is isomorphic to one of the following groups:  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_7$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ .*

The structure of the paper is as follows: In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1, and in Section 3 we prove Theorem 3. We then consider some further results and present some open questions in Section 4.

## 2 The proof of Theorem 1

As mentioned in the Introduction, in order to prove Theorem 1, we argue indirectly, and show that, when  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$  with  $|A| \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ , then the size of

$$S = \cup_{h=0}^{s-1} (hA - A) \cup (s-1)A$$

is more than the order of  $G$ , which is impossible.

Recall that if  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$ , then it is a  $B_h$  set for every  $0 \leq h \leq s$ , and  $G$  is the disjoint union of sets  $hA$  with  $0 \leq h \leq s$ . Therefore, for each such  $h$  we have

$$|hA| = \binom{m+h-1}{h}$$

and thus

$$|G| = \sum_{h=0}^s |hA| = \binom{m+s}{s}.$$

In order to compute the size of  $S$ , first note that if  $A$  is a perfect  $s$ -basis in  $G$ , then the  $s+1$  sets  $-A, A-A, 2A-A, \dots, (s-1)A-A$ , and  $(s-1)A$  are pairwise disjoint. Therefore,

$$|S| = \sum_{h=0}^{s-1} |hA - A| + |(s-1)A| = \sum_{h=0}^{s-1} |hA - A| + \binom{m+s-2}{s-1}.$$

For  $h = 0$  we have  $|hA - A| = |-A| = m$ . To find the size of  $hA - A$  for a given  $1 \leq h \leq s - 1$ , we first observe that  $(h - 1)A$  is a subset of  $hA - A$ , so there are exactly  $\binom{m+h-2}{h-1}$  elements of  $hA - A$  that are in  $(h - 1)A$ . We will now show that there are precisely  $m \cdot \binom{m+h-2}{h}$  elements in  $hA - A$  that are not in  $(h - 1)A$ .

Let  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ . Observe that each element  $g$  of  $(hA - A) \setminus (h - 1)A$  can be written as

$$g = \lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_m a_m - a_i,$$

where  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$  are nonnegative integers that sum to  $h$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , and  $\lambda_i = 0$ . As we now show, the expression is unique for each  $g$ . Suppose that we also have

$$g = \lambda'_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda'_m a_m - a_j$$

with some  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $\lambda'_1 + \dots + \lambda'_m = h$ , and  $\lambda'_j = 0$ . This yields

$$\lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_m a_m + a_j = \lambda'_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda'_m a_m + a_i \in (h + 1)A.$$

If  $i \neq j$ , then since  $A$  is a  $B_{h+1}$  set, we must have  $\lambda_j + 1 = \lambda'_j$  and  $\lambda_i = \lambda'_i + 1$ , contradicting  $\lambda_i = \lambda'_j = 0$ . Furthermore,  $g + a_i \in hA$ , so the coefficients  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$  are unique as well.

This means that  $(hA - A) \setminus (h - 1)A$  is the disjoint union of sets  $h(A \setminus \{a_i\}) - a_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Since a subset of a  $B_h$  set is also a  $B_h$  set, we have

$$|h(A \setminus \{a_i\}) - a_i| = |h(A \setminus \{a_i\})| = \binom{m+h-2}{h},$$

implying

$$|(hA - A) \setminus (h - 1)A| = m \cdot \binom{m+h-2}{h},$$

as claimed.

We thus find that

$$|hA - A| = m \cdot \binom{m+h-2}{h} + \binom{m+h-2}{h-1},$$

from which

$$\sum_{h=0}^{s-1} |hA - A| = m + \sum_{h=1}^{s-1} m \cdot \binom{m+h-2}{h} + \sum_{h=1}^{s-1} \binom{m+h-2}{h-1} = m \binom{m+s-2}{s-1} + \binom{m+s-2}{s-2}.$$

This then yields

$$|S| = \sum_{h=0}^{s-1} |hA - A| + |(s-1)A| = m \binom{m+s-2}{s-1} + \binom{m+s-1}{s-1};$$

rewriting this expression, we get

$$|S| = m \binom{m+s-2}{s-1} + \binom{m+s}{s} - \binom{m+s-1}{s} = \binom{m+s}{s} + \frac{(m-1)(s-1)}{s} \binom{m+s-2}{s-1}.$$

Since this quantity is larger than  $|G| = \binom{m+s}{s}$  for  $m \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ , our proof is complete.

### 3 The proof of Theorem 3

We start by treating the cases when  $G$  is isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group  $\mathbb{Z}_2^r$ . As explained in the Introduction, we only need to examine four cases: when  $G$  has rank 1, 2, 4, or 12. It is not hard to find perfect restricted 2-bases in the first three of these cases; for example:

- in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , the set  $\{1\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis;
- in  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ , the set  $\{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis; and
- in  $\mathbb{Z}_2^4$ , the set  $\{(0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 1, 1)\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis.

However, we can easily see that  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{12}$  has no perfect restricted 2-bases. For the sake of a contradiction, suppose that  $A$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis in  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{12}$ ; it then has size  $|A| = 90$ . If  $k$  elements of  $A$  have a first component of 1 for some  $0 \leq k \leq 90$ , then  $0 \wedge A \cup 1 \wedge A \cup 2 \wedge A$  has  $k + k(90 - k)$  elements with a first component of 1. Since there is no  $k$  for which  $k + k(90 - k)$  equals  $|G|/2 = 2^{11}$ , this is a contradiction.

We now turn to the cases when  $G$  is not isomorphic to elementary abelian 2-groups: we need to prove that  $G$  has a perfect restricted 2-basis if, and only if, it is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_7$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ .

We let  $L$  denote the subset consisting of the identity element of  $G$  as well as all involutions in  $G$ ; that is,

$$L = \{g \in G \mid 2g = 0\}.$$

Note that  $L$  is a subgroup of  $G$ ; in fact,  $L$  is isomorphic to the elementary abelian 2-group whose rank equals the number of even-order terms in the invariant decomposition of  $G$ .

Let  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$  be an  $m$ -subset of  $G$ , and suppose that  $A$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis in  $G$ . The main idea of the proof is to estimate the size of  $(A - A) \cup A$ , namely, to prove that

$$|(A - A) \cup A| \geq m^2 - 2m + 2 - |L|.$$

Since, as we show, this bound is more than  $|G|$  when  $m \geq 6$ , we get a contradiction; the cases of  $m \leq 5$  will be examined individually.

For an element  $g \in G$ , let  $R(g)$  denote the number of ordered pairs  $(a_i, a_j) \in A^2$  for which  $g = a_i - a_j$ ; we say that  $R(g)$  is the *representation number* of  $g$ . Below we prove that  $R(g) \in \{0, 1, 2, m\}$  for each  $g \in G$  and, in fact, count the number of elements for each possible representation number.

Clearly, elements not in  $A - A$  have representation number 0, and  $R(0) = m$ .

Suppose now that  $g \in A - A$ ,  $g \neq 0$ ; we will prove that  $R(g) = 1$  or  $R(g) = 2$ . Let's assume indirectly that  $R(g) \geq 3$ , and let

$$g = a_1 - a_2 = a_3 - a_4 = a_5 - a_6$$

for some  $a_1, \dots, a_6 \in A$  such that  $a_1, a_3, a_5$  are pairwise distinct and  $a_2, a_4, a_6$  are pairwise distinct. (Note that if  $a_1 = a_3$ , for example, then  $a_2 = a_4$  and thus those two representations of  $g$  are identical.) Our equations imply that  $a_1 + a_4 = a_2 + a_3$ ,  $a_1 + a_6 = a_2 + a_5$ , and  $a_3 + a_6 = a_4 + a_5$ . Since  $A$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis, we must have  $a_1 = a_4$  or  $a_2 = a_3$ ;  $a_1 = a_6$  or  $a_2 = a_5$ ; and  $a_3 = a_6$  or  $a_4 = a_5$ . In particular, note that if  $a_1 = a_4$ , then we cannot have  $a_1 = a_6$  or  $a_4 = a_5$ , since that would imply that  $a_4 = a_6$  or  $a_1 = a_5$ , respectively, which we can't have. Therefore, there are only two possibilities:  $a_1 = a_4$ ,  $a_2 = a_5$ , and  $a_3 = a_6$ ; or  $a_2 = a_3$ ,  $a_1 = a_6$ , and  $a_4 = a_5$ . In the first case, we have

$$3g = (a_1 - a_2) + (a_3 - a_4) + (a_5 - a_6) = (a_1 - a_2) + (a_3 - a_1) + (a_2 - a_3) = 0,$$

and in the second case

$$3g = (a_1 - a_2) + (a_3 - a_4) + (a_5 - a_6) = (a_1 - a_2) + (a_2 - a_4) + (a_4 - a_1) = 0,$$

and, since  $g \neq 0$ , this implies that the order of  $G$  must be divisible by 3. However,

$$|G| = \binom{m}{0} + \binom{m}{1} + \binom{m}{2} = \frac{m^2 + m + 2}{2},$$

which is not divisible by 3 for any  $m$ . We arrived at a contradiction, and thus every nonzero element of  $A - A$  has representation number equal to either 1 or 2.

We now identify the elements of  $A - A$  that have representation number 2. We call two elements  $a_i, a_j \in A$  *twins* if  $2a_i = 2a_j$  or, equivalently, if  $a_i - a_j \in L \setminus \{0\}$ . More specifically, we say that  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  are  $g$ -twins for some  $g \in L \setminus \{0\}$  when  $a_i = a_j + g$  (in which case we also have  $a_j = a_i + g$ ). Clearly, if  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  are twins, then  $R(a_i - a_j) = 2$  since  $a_i - a_j = a_j - a_i$ . Now we show that there cannot be more than one  $g$ -twin pair for any  $g \in L \setminus \{0\}$ ; in other words, if  $a_i$  and  $a_j$  are  $g$ -twins and  $a'_i$  and  $a'_j$  are  $g$ -twins, then  $\{a_i, a_j\} = \{a'_i, a'_j\}$ . Indeed if  $a_i - a_j = a'_i - a'_j = g$ , then adding the equations results in  $a_i + a'_i = a_j + a'_j$  which, since  $A$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis, can only happen if  $a_i = a'_i$  (but then  $a_j = a'_j$ ), or  $a_j = a'_j$  (but then  $a_i = a'_i$ ), or  $a_i = a'_j$  and  $a_j = a'_i$ . In any case,  $\{a_i, a_j\} = \{a'_i, a'_j\}$ , as claimed, and this implies that there are at most  $|L| - 1$  pairs of twins in  $A$ .

Next, we examine the *awesum* elements of  $A$ , that is, elements  $a_i$  for which  $2a_i \in 2\hat{A}$ . If  $a_i \in A$  is awesum, then there exists an unordered pair of distinct elements  $a_{i'}, a_{i''} \in A$  with  $2a_i = a_{i'} + a_{i''}$ ; we call  $a_{i'}$  and  $a_{i''}$  the *summands* of  $a_i$ . Note that the summands of an element  $a_i$  cannot equal  $a_i$  since that would imply that the two summands are equal. Now if  $a_i$  is an awesum element of  $A$  with summands  $a_{i'}$  and  $a_{i''}$ , then  $R(a_i - a'_i) = R(a_i - a''_i) = 2$  since  $a_i - a'_i = a''_i - a_i$  and  $a_i - a''_i = a'_i - a_i$ .

We are now ready to calculate  $|A - A|$  as the number of ordered pairs  $(a_i, a_j)$  that yield distinct elements of  $A - A$ . Since  $R(0) = m$  and  $R(g) \in \{1, 2\}$  for each nonzero element of  $A - A$ , we have

$$|A - A| = m^2 - (m - 1) - \alpha,$$

where  $\alpha$  is the number of elements of  $A - A$  whose representation number equals 2. Suppose that  $g \in A - A$  has  $R(g) = 2$  and that  $g = a_1 - a_2 = a_3 - a_4$  for some  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in G$  with  $a_1 \neq a_3$  and  $a_2 \neq a_4$ . This implies that  $a_1 + a_4 = a_2 + a_3$ , so we have three possibilities: (i)  $a_1 = a_4$  and  $a_2 = a_3$ , in which case  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are twins; (ii)  $a_1 = a_4$  and  $a_2 \neq a_3$ , in which case  $a_1$  is awesum and  $a_2$  is one of its summands; or (iii)  $a_1 \neq a_4$  and  $a_2 = a_3$ , in which case  $a_2$  is awesum and  $a_1$  is one of its summands. Thus  $\alpha$  equals the number of twin pairs in  $A$  (denoted by  $\beta$ ) plus two times the number of awesum elements of  $A$  (denoted by  $\gamma$ ):

$$|A - A| = m^2 - (m - 1) - \beta - 2\gamma.$$

Finally, we count the number of elements in  $(A - A) \cup A$  by subtracting  $|(A - A) \cap A|$  from  $|A - A| + |A|$ . Suppose that  $a = a' - a''$  for some  $a, a', a'' \in A$  or, equivalently, that  $a + a'' = a'$ . Since  $A$  and  $2\hat{A}$  are disjoint, this implies that  $a = a''$  and so  $2a \in A$ . But then  $2a \notin 2\hat{A}$ , so  $a$  is not awesum, and thus we have at most  $m - \gamma$  elements of  $A$  that are in  $A - A$ . Putting it all together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(A - A) \cup A| &= |A - A| + |A| - |(A - A) \cap A| \\ &\geq m^2 - (m - 1) - \beta - 2\gamma + m - (m - \gamma) \\ &= m^2 - m + 1 - \beta - \gamma; \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\beta \leq |L| - 1$  and  $\gamma \leq m$ , we arrive at

$$|(A - A) \cup A| \geq m^2 - 2m + 2 - |L|,$$

as claimed.

Now since  $(A - A) \cup A$  is a subset of  $G$ , this implies that the order  $n$  of  $G$  satisfies

$$n = \frac{m^2 + m + 2}{2} \geq m^2 - 2m + 2 - |L|.$$

Recall that  $L$  is a subgroup of  $G$  and its order is a power of 2. As here we treat the case when  $G$  is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, we must have  $|L| \leq n/2$ , which then implies that  $m \leq 10$ . As we mentioned above,  $n$  is not divisible by 3 for any value of  $m$ , and we also find that it is never divisible by 5 either, hence  $|L| \neq n/3, n/5$ , or  $n/6$ . Furthermore, the values of  $n = (m^2 + m + 2)/2$  are not powers of 2 for any  $6 \leq m \leq 10$ . Therefore, we have  $|L| \leq n/7$ , from which we get  $m \leq 5$ .

The cases of  $m \leq 5$  are easy to handle: since  $G$  is not isomorphic to an elementary abelian 2-group, we only need to consider  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$  for  $m = 2$ ;  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_7$  for  $m = 3$ ;  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{11}$  for  $m = 4$ ; and  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{16}, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8, \mathbb{Z}_4^2$ , or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  for  $m = 5$ . One can easily verify that:

- in  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , the set  $\{1, 2\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis;
- in  $G = \mathbb{Z}_7$ , the set  $\{1, 2, 4\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis; and
- in  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ , the set  $\{(0, 0, 2), (0, 0, 3), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1)\}$  is a perfect restricted 2-basis.

(In Section 4 we will see how each of these three constructions generalizes for arbitrary  $s$ .) However, we find – using the computer program [6] – that  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}, \mathbb{Z}_{16}, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_4^2$  have no perfect restricted 2-bases. This completes our proof of Theorem 3.

## 4 Further results and open questions

In this section we generalize the perfect restricted 2-bases we exhibited above for arbitrary values of  $s$  and present some open questions.

Suppose that a finite abelian group  $G$  has a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $m$ . When  $m \leq s$ , then for the order of  $G$  we have

$$|G| = \sum_{h=0}^s \binom{m}{h} = 2^m.$$

Let  $G$  be an abelian group of order  $2^m$ ; we then may assume that there exist positive integers  $k_1, \dots, k_r$  for which

$$G = \mathbb{Z}_{2^{k_1}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2^{k_2}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{2^{k_r}}$$

with  $k_1 + \cdots + k_r = m$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , consider the  $k_i$  elements of  $G$  whose components are all 0, except for their  $i$ -th components, which are equal to  $1, 2, \dots, 2^{k_i-1}$ , respectively. Then it is easy to see that  $m$ -subset of  $G$  consisting of these elements is a perfect restricted  $m$ -basis (and thus a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis for any  $s \geq m$ ) in  $G$ . Therefore, the case of  $m \leq s$  is settled:

**Proposition 4** *Suppose that  $m$  and  $s$  are positive integers with  $m \leq s$ . Then  $G$  has a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $m$  if, and only if,  $G$  has order  $2^m$ .*

Next, we consider  $m = s + 1$ , in which case

$$|G| = \sum_{h=0}^s \binom{m}{h} = 2^{s+1} - 1.$$

As it is easy to see that the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2^s\}$  is a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis in the cyclic group of order  $2^{s+1} - 1$ , we have:

**Proposition 5** *For every positive integer  $s$ , the cyclic group of order  $2^{s+1} - 1$  has a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $s + 1$ .*

The question then becomes:

**Question 6** *Are there any noncyclic groups that have a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $s + 1$ ?*

As we have not found any perfect restricted  $s$ -bases of size more than  $s + 1$  until reaching size  $2s + 1$ , we ask:

**Question 7** *Are there any groups that have a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $m$  with  $s + 2 \leq m \leq 2s$ ?*

This brings us to the case of  $m = 2s + 1$ , for which we have

$$\sum_{h=0}^s \binom{m}{h} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{h=0}^{2s+1} \binom{2s+1}{h} = 2^{2s}.$$

We found two different groups with perfect restricted  $s$ -bases of size  $2s + 1$ . One of them is the elementary abelian 2-group of rank  $2s$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, 2s$ , let  $\mathbf{e}_i$  denote the  $i$ -th unit vector of  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{2s}$ , that is, the element with a 1 in the  $i$ -th component and 0 everywhere else, and let  $\mathbf{e}$  be their sum. Then the  $2s$  unit vectors generate each element of the group with at most  $s$  nonzero components, and the unit vectors added to  $\mathbf{e}$  generate the rest; each element is generated only once. We thus have:

**Proposition 8** *For every positive integer  $s$ , the elementary abelian 2-group of rank  $2s$  has a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $2s + 1$ .*

The other group of order  $2^{2s}$  with a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis that we found is  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{2s-2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ . Similarly as above, for  $i = 1, \dots, 2s - 2$  we let  $\mathbf{e}_i$  denote the element of  $G$  with a 1 in the  $i$ -th component and 0 everywhere else, and we let  $\mathbf{e}$  be their sum. Furthermore, we set  $\mathbf{f}$  equal to the vector with 0s in its first  $2s - 2$  components and 1 in its last. We now verify that the set

$$A = \{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{f} \mid i = 1, \dots, 2s - 2\} \cup \{2\mathbf{f}, 3\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f}\}$$

is a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis in  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^{2s-2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ . Since  $|A| = 2s + 1$  and  $|G| = 2^{2s}$ , it suffices to prove that all elements of  $G$  can be written as the sum of at most  $s$  distinct terms from  $A$ .

For an integer  $0 \leq k \leq 2s - 2$ , we let  $S_k$  denote the collection of group elements that have exactly  $k$  of their first  $2s - 2$  components equal to 1, and we write

$$B = \{\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{f} \mid i = 1, \dots, 2s - 2\}$$

for short. Now let  $g \in S_k$  be an arbitrary element. Observe that

$$S_k = (k \wedge B) \cup (k \wedge B + 2\mathbf{f}) \cup (k \wedge B + 3\mathbf{f}) \cup (k \wedge B + 2\mathbf{f} + 3\mathbf{f}),$$



and thus if  $k \leq s - 2$ , then  $g \in \cup_{h=0}^s h \hat{A}$ . Replacing  $k \hat{B}$  above by  $(2s - 2 - k) \hat{B} + (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f})$  allows us to conclude that  $g \in \cup_{h=0}^s h \hat{A}$  whenever  $2s - 2 - k$  is at most  $s - 3$ , that is, when  $k \geq s + 1$ .

This leaves us with the cases of  $k = s - 1$  and  $k = s$ , for which we see that

$$S_{s-1} = ((s-1) \hat{B}) \cup ((s-1) \hat{B} + 2\mathbf{f}) \cup ((s-1) \hat{B} + 3\mathbf{f}) \cup ((s-1) \hat{B} + (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f}))$$

and

$$S_s = (s \hat{B}) \cup ((s-2) \hat{B} + (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f})) \cup ((s-2) \hat{B} + (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f}) + 2\mathbf{f}) \cup ((s-2) \hat{B} + (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{f}) + 3\mathbf{f}),$$

with which all cases are covered.

Therefore, we have the following result:

**Proposition 9** *For every positive integer  $s$ , the group  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{2s-2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  has a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $2s + 1$ .*

**Question 10** *Are there other groups besides those isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{2s}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}_2^{2s-2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  that are of order  $2^{2s}$  and have a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $2s + 1$ ?*

We also could not find any cases with  $m$  greater than  $2s + 1$ , so ask:

**Question 11** *Are there any groups that have a perfect restricted  $s$ -basis of size  $m$  with  $m \geq 2s + 2$ ?*

We close by mentioning that while Theorems 1 and 2 are easily seen to be equivalent, a similar statement does not appear to hold for restricted sums. In particular, we do not see a correspondence between perfect restricted  $s$ -bases, considered above, and subsets that generate every group element uniquely as the sum of *exactly*  $s$  distinct elements. This then raises the following general question:

**Question 12** *Given a positive integer  $s$ , characterize all finite abelian groups  $G$  that have a subset  $A$  for which each element of  $G$  arises as a unique sum of exactly  $s$  distinct elements of  $A$ .*

## References

- [1] B. Bajnok, Additive Combinatorics: A Menu of Research Problems. *CRC Press, Boca Raton*, 2018, xix+390 pp.
- [2] B. C. Berndt, Y-S. Choi, and S-I. Kang, The problems submitted by Ramanujan to the Journal of the Indian Mathematical Society. *Contemp. Math.* **236** (1999), 15–56.
- [3] P. Erdős and R. L. Graham, On bases with an exact order. *Acta Arith.* **37** (1980), 201–207.
- [4] P. Erdős and M. B. Nathanson, Problems and results on minimal bases in additive number theory. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1240**, Springer, Berlin (1987), 87–96.
- [5] P. Erdős and P. Turán, On a problem of Sidon in additive number theory and some related questions. *J. London Math. Soc.* **16** (1941), 212–215.
- [6] I. Ilinkin, Sumset generator. Published at <http://addcomb.gettysburg.edu>.

- [7] V. Lambert, T. H. Lê, and A. Plagne, Additive bases in groups. *Israel J. Math.* **217** (2017), no. 1, 383–411.
- [8] T. Nagell, Løsning til oppgave nr. 2, 1943, s. 29. *Nordisk Mat. Tidsskr.* **30** (1948), 62–64.
- [9] T. Nagell, The Diophantine Equation  $x^2 + 7 = 2^n$ . *Ark. Mat.* **4** (1961), 185–187.
- [10] M. B. Nathanson, Minimal bases and maximal nonbases in additive number theory. *J. Number Theory* **6** (1974), 324–333.
- [11] M. B. Nathanson, Additive number theory: Inverse problems and the geometry of sumsets. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **165**. Springer–Verlag, New York, 1996. xiv+293 pp.
- [12] M. B. Nathanson, Paul Erdős and additive bases. arXiv:1401.7598 [math.NT] (2014).
- [13] S. Ramanujan, Question 464. *Journal of the Indian Mathematical Society* **5** (1913), 120.