

Asymptotic hollowness of lattice simplices

Abstract An $(n - 1)$ -tuple $\mathbf{a} := (a(1), \dots, a(n - 1))$ consisting of positive integers is said to be *asymptotically hollow* if there exist infinitely many positive integers N such that the convex hull in $\mathbf{R}^n = \mathbf{R}^{n \times 1}$, $K_{\alpha(N)}$, of $\{0, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, \alpha(N)^T\}$ is hollow (no lattice points in its interior), where e_i run over all but the last standard basis element of \mathbf{R}^n , and $\alpha(N) = (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n - 1), N)$. Such a tuple is *trivial* if $\min \{a(i)\} = 1$.

Nontrivial asymptotically hollow tuples are characterized in terms of modular inequalities, and turn out to be rare. We show that for a tuple \mathbf{a} , there exists an effectively computable constant C (depending on \mathbf{a}) such that if for some $N > C$, $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is (not) hollow, then for all $M > C$, $K_{\alpha(M)}$ is (not) hollow (respectively); in particular, if \mathbf{a} is asymptotically hollow, the set of N such that $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is hollow is cofinite in the positive integers.

When $n = 4$, the nontrivial asymptotically hollow triples are completely determined; there are eleven of them, together with a one-parameter family.

David Handelman*

0 Introduction, definitions, and elementary results

A *lattice polytope* is a subset of Euclidean space (\mathbf{R}^n) that is the convex hull of a finite set of points from \mathbf{Z}^d , written $K = \text{cvx } S$ where S is a finite subset of \mathbf{Z}^d . We normally also assume that K has interior (that is, contains an open n -ball), which is equivalent to the group generated by $S - S$ being of full rank (n). A lattice polytope K is *empty* if $K \cap \mathbf{Z}^d = \partial_e K$, that is, the only lattice points in K are its extreme points (this is poor terminology, as confusion with an empty set could arise). Finally, a lattice polytope is *hollow* if it has interior, but no interior lattice points. We are interested in lattice simplices, that is, lattice polytopes that are also simplices.

Empty and hollow lattice simplices have been heavily studied, especially with respect to classification (up to affine equivalence), e.g., [R, W, MMM, IS] and their natural connection to toric varieties, e.g., [B, ALPPT], and their connections to other areas, e.g., [B2, H, PR]. This paper is along different lines. A very special class of families of (mostly) hollow simplices is introduced, and examples provided, with a complete determination in dimension four (in this context, dimension three is not of interest).

I wanted to find families of hollow polytopes, requiring only relatively easy computations. This led naturally to the notion of (nontrivial) asymptotic hollowness. It turns out that these are rare (none in dimension 3, some in dimension four; higher dimensions, mostly unknown)

Section 1 contains some introductory results. Section 2 contains the main result, giving necessary and sufficient conditions to be an asymptotically hollow sequence in terms of modular relations. The short section 3 contains elementary results on facets and width. Section four shows that for every $n > 3$, there exists an asymptotically hollow $(n - 1)$ -tuple whose least entry is $2^{n-3}(2^{n-2} - 1)$; whether this is sharp is unknown.

Section 5 is a technical section, in preparation for the $n = 4$ classification result, although it does apply much more generally. And section 6 contains the classification result for $n = 4$. The appendix contains a result that is used in the determination of asymptotically hollow triples, and might be of interest on its own.

1 Elementary results on lattice simplices

If A is a set, list, or tuple of integers, then we define the *content* of A , $\text{cont } A$, to be the greatest common divisor of the integers in A ; if A is empty, then $\text{cont } A = 0$. The superscript T , applied to matrices, columns, or rows, means *transpose*.

Let $d, a(i), i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ be integers, and let $\alpha = (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n - 1), d) \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times n}$, and assume $d \neq 0$. Form K_α , the convex hull of $\{0, \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \alpha^T\}$, where e_i are the standard basis elements in $\mathbf{R}^n = \mathbf{R}^{n \times 1}$ (columns; the superscripted T indicates transpose). This is a lattice polytope of volume d times that of the

* Mathematics Dept, University of Ottawa, Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada; e-mail: dehsg@uottawa.ca
AMS(MOS) classification: 11H06, 15A36, 52B20; key words and phrases: lattice simplex, empty polytope, hollow polytope, asymptotically hollow, facet, width (of a lattice polytope), proscriptive interval

standard simplex. If $\text{cont } \alpha$ is not 1, then the edge running from 0 to α^T contains a lattice point. So we normally assume $\text{cont } \alpha = 1$, that is, $\gcd\{a(1), \dots, a(n-1); d\} = 1$. Now questions arise, which K_α are empty, and how do we classify them (up to affine equivalence)?

We form the matrix M_α whose first $n-1$ columns are the e_i , and the remaining column is α^T . Elementary row operations on M_α implement $\text{GL}(d, \mathbf{Z})$ equivalences between K_α and the convex hull of the columns of EM_α , where E is the corresponding elementary matrix. By adding or subtracting suitable multiples of the last row, we can also assume that $0 \leq a(i) < d$, and in fact, many of the equivalences are really implemented over the finite ring $\mathbf{Z}_d = \mathbf{Z}/d\mathbf{Z}$. Moreover, the presence of a zero as one of the $a(i)$ allows immediate reduction to the smaller size matrix obtained by deleting the i th row and column. So we may as well assume $0 < a(i) < d$ (note that $d = 1$ yields the standard n -simplex, regardless of the $a(i)$).

For emptiness, we wish to determine when there does not exist a tuple $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ such that $0 \leq \lambda_i < 1$ for all i , $\sum \lambda_i \leq 1$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i e_i + \lambda_n \alpha \in \mathbf{Z}^d$. This amounts to solving an inequality—or more accurately, showing nonexistence of a solution: does there exist an integer k with $1 \leq k < d$, such that

$$(1) \quad \sum_{\{i \mid d \text{ does not divide } a(i)k\}} \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{d}\right\}\right) + \frac{k}{d} \leq 1?$$

Here are a couple of elementary classes of examples. We normally assume that (i) $1 \leq a(i) < d$ for all i , and (ii) $\text{cont } \alpha = 1$

LEMMA 1.1 Sufficient for K_α to be empty is either of the following conditions.

- (i) there exists i such that $a(i) = 1$ and $\text{cont } (\alpha \setminus \{a(i)\}) = 1$;
- (ii) $\text{cont } (V, d) = 1$ where $U = \cup T$ with T varying over those subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that d divides $\sum_{t \in T} a(t)$, and $V = \{a(i) \mid i \in U\}$.

Remark. These two conditions are very closely related to each other, despite appearances. We will see this when we consider affine equivalences between various K_α . The second condition is very similar to the width one property, that will be mentioned later.

Proof. Suppose there exists a positive integer $k < d$ such that $\sum \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{d}\right\}\right) + \frac{k}{d} \leq 1$.

(i) If $a(j) = 1$, then $\{a(j)k/d\} = k/d$, so $\left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(j)}{d}\right\}\right) + k/d = 1$. Thus d divides $ka(i)$ for all $i \neq j$. Hence d divides $k \cdot \gcd\{a(i)\}_{i \neq j}$; by hypothesis, the second factor is relatively prime to d , so d divides k , contradicting $k < d$.

(ii) If T is a set as indicated, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\{ \sum_T a(t)k/d \right\} \equiv \sum_T \{a(t)k/d\} \pmod{\mathbf{Z}} \\ &\equiv \sum_T (1 - \{a(t)k/d\}) \pmod{\mathbf{Z}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sum_T (1 - \{a(t)k/d\})$ is an integer. Since it is strictly less than $\sum \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{d}\right\}\right) + \frac{k}{d}$, which in turn is less than or equal 1, the sum must be zero; this is impossible, unless it is over an empty set. In particular, this forces d to divide $ka(i)$ for all i in such a T , and thus for all $i \in U$. Now the same gcd argument applies.

•

The second criterion is easily refined to the following, by essentially the same proof.

LEMMA 1.2 Suppose that (with the notation of the previous lemma), U is nonempty, and $z = \sum \lambda_i e_i + \lambda_n \alpha$ is a lattice point in $K_\alpha \setminus \partial_e K_\alpha$, expressed as convex linear sum of the extreme points other than zero). Then $\lambda_n = k/d$ where k is divisible by $d/\text{cont } \{U, d\}$.

Projections onto lower dimensional versions also yield another source of empty polytopes.

LEMMA 1.3 Suppose that $K_\alpha \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is empty, where $\alpha = (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-1); d)$. If $\alpha' = (b(1), b(2), \dots, b(m), a(1), \dots, a(n-1); d)$ and $b = (b(j))$ is any m -tuple, then $K_{\alpha'} \subset \mathbf{R}^{m+n}$ is empty.

If b consists only of zeros, we have essentially a direct sum (in the category of simplices). This suggests a classification of minimal empty simplices, those such that deleting any term causes the resulting lower dimensional simplex to be nonempty.

2 Asymptotic hollowness

Given $\alpha(N) := (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-1); N) \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times n}$ (with N permitted to vary over the positive integers), we wish to determine conditions guaranteeing or consequences of $K_{\alpha(N)}$ being hollow for all sufficiently large N , together with upper bounds on the N such that it is not hollow. (Recall that $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is the convex hull—in $\mathbf{R}^{1 \times n}$ —of $\{0, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n-1}, \alpha(N)^T\}$.) We say $\mathbf{a} = (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-1)) \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times (n-1)}$ is *asymptotically hollow* if there exist infinitely many positive integers N such that $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is hollow. A simple argument shows that if there exists i such that $a(i) = 1$, then $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is hollow; so we say an asymptotically hollow tuple \mathbf{a} is *nontrivial* if $a(i) \neq 1$ for all i .

It turns out that this notion is not interesting if $n = 3$; that is, a pair of positive integers is asymptotically hollow only if one of its entries is 1. This follows from the description empty three-dimensional lattice simplices ([R, W]), but we can give a direct and elementary argument.

LEMMA 2.0 Let (a, x) be an ordered pair of positive integers, with $2 \leq a \leq x$. Let N be an integer such that $(N - x)(a - 1) \geq x^2$ (that is, $N > x + x^2/(a - 1)$). On defining $\alpha = (a, x, N)$, we have that $\text{cvx}\{0, e_1, e_2, \alpha^T\}$ has an interior lattice point.

Proof. We will find $\lambda_i > 0$ such that $\lambda_1 e_1 + \lambda_2 e_2 + \lambda_3 \alpha^T$ is a lattice point and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \leq 1$. Write $N = mx + r$ where $1 \leq r \leq x$ (note: not $0 \leq r \leq x - 1$), and set $\lambda_3 = m/N$. As $a \leq x$ and $mx < N$, we have $ma < N$. Then we set $\lambda_1 = 1 - ma/N > 0$, and $\lambda_2 = 1 - mx/N = r/N > 0$. It is clear that $\lambda_1 e_1 + \lambda_2 e_2 + \lambda_3 \alpha^T$ is the lattice point $(1, 1, m)^T$. Now $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1 - ma/N + r/N + m/N \leq 1 + (-ma + x + m)/N$, so this will be at most one if $m(a - 1) \geq x$. But $m = (N - r)/x \geq (N - x)/x$, and our assumption was that $((N - x)/x)(a - 1) \geq x$. •

In the case that $n = 4$ (that is, triples), nontrivial asymptotically hollow triples exist, and are completely described in section 5.

We introduce the following notation (this is open to suggestions for improvement). Let x and y be integers with $x > 1$. Define

$${}_x \setminus y = \begin{cases} r & \text{if } 1 \leq r \leq x - 1, \text{ and } r \text{ is the remainder of } y \text{ modulo } x \\ x & \text{if } x \text{ divides } y. \end{cases}$$

This is the usual remainder function, except that instead of having zero as a value, it has x as a value. Obviously, ${}_x \setminus y \equiv y \pmod{x}$. To avoid excessive parenthesization, we often write ${}_x \setminus (ty)$ simply as ${}_x \setminus ty$.

THEOREM 2.1 (a) If $N \geq \max_{i \neq j} \{(a(i) - 1)a(j)\}$, then sufficient for $K_{\alpha(N)}$ to be hollow is that for all i, t ,

$$\sum_{\substack{j \\ j \neq i}} {}_{a(i)} \setminus ta(j) \leq t + (n - 3)a(i).$$

(b) If additionally $N > (\sum a(i) - 1) \cdot \max_i \{a(i) - 1\}$, then this condition is also necessary.

Proof. Let b be a lattice point in $K_{\alpha(N)}$ other than an extreme point. Then there exists a positive integer $k < N$ such that

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} b &= \sum_{\{i \mid N \text{ does not divide } ka(i)\}} \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{N}\right\}\right) e_i + \frac{k}{N} \alpha(N)^T \\ 1 &\geq \sum_{\{i \mid N \text{ does not divide } ka(i)\}} \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{N}\right\}\right) + \frac{k}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite the inequality as

$$(2') \quad \sum_{\{i \mid N \text{ does not divide } ka(i)\}} \left\{\frac{ka(i)}{N}\right\} - \frac{k}{N} \geq |\{i \mid N \text{ does not divide } ka(i)\}| - 1.$$

Since $K_{\alpha(N)^T}$ is a simplex, the decomposition will be unique (given by the barycentric coordinates from the extreme points, $\{0; e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}; \alpha(N)^T\}$). Then b will be in the interior if and only if there does not exist i such that N divides $ka(i)$ and the inequality in the second line is strict. So let us assume that b is in the interior. In that case, $\{i \mid N \text{ does not divide } ka(i)\}$ is just the entire set of is . So assuming b is an interior point, the inequality becomes,

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left\{ \frac{ka(i)}{N} \right\} - \frac{k}{N} \geq n - 2.$$

And of course, (2) holding for some k is both necessary and sufficient for $K_{\alpha(N)}$ to have an interior lattice point.

Now consider the finite set of nonzero rational numbers,

$$U = \left\{ \frac{t}{a(i)} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; \text{ and } 1 \leq t \leq a(i) - 1 \right\}$$

Then $U^c = (0, 1) \setminus U$ is a finite union of open intervals, whose endpoints are of the form $t/a(i)$. It can happen that $t_1/a(i_1) = t_2/a(i_2)$ with $i_1 \neq i_2$, but this is not a problem (and will not occur if the $a(i)$ are pairwise relatively prime).

Now let b be an interior point, with corresponding k . Since N does not divide $ka(i)$ for any i , it follows that k/N does not belong to U . Hence there exists a unique open interval $I = (t_1/a(i_1), t_2/a(i_2))$ that is a component of U^c and contains k/N . From the definitions of U , it follows that I contains no elements of the form $t/a(i)$. Thus for each i , the function $x \mapsto \lfloor xa(i) \rfloor$ is constant on I (x is a real variable, the continuous version of k/N). Thus the function $I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$x \mapsto \sum \{xa(i)\} - x$$

can be rewritten in the form

$$F : x \mapsto \sum xa(i) - x - C$$

where C is the constant $\sum \lfloor xa(i) \rfloor$. The derivative is thus $\sum a(i) - 1$ —which is a positive integer. In particular, F is strictly increasing on I . Hence if $k' > k$ is another integer with $k'/N \in I$, then $F(k'/N) > F(k/N)$. But from (2), this implies that $F(k'/N) > F(k/N) > n - 2$, and thus k'/N yields another interior point.

The largest k' such that $k'/N \in I$ is given by $k' = \lfloor Nt_2/a(i_2) \rfloor$ (obviously $k' < Nt_2/a(i_2)$). Hence given a solution (an interior lattice point) parameterized by k , we obtain a solution arising from $k' = \lfloor Nt_2/a(i_2) \rfloor$. In particular, to decide whether $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is hollow, we only have to investigate the choices for k of the form $\lfloor Nt/a(i) \rfloor$ as i varies over $1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and $1 \leq t < a(i) - 1$. The number of such choices is $\sum a(i) - 1$ (under some conditions, we can halve this; see Lemma 2.3). The number of trials is independent of N , except when the latter is relatively small. We now investigate what conditions this imposes. Relabel k' as k .

Let $0 < \rho_{i_2, t} \equiv \rho < a(i_2)$ be the remainder of Nt_2 modulo $a(i_2)$, i.e., $k/N = (t_2 - \rho/N)/a(i_2)$ (we are assuming $N > \max a(i)$, as usual).

We have $ka(i_2) = Nt_2 - \rho$, so $\{ka(i_2)/N\} = 1 - \rho/N$. For $j \neq i_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ka(j)}{N} &= \frac{(Nt - \rho)a(j)}{a(i_2)N} \\ &= \frac{ta(j)}{a(i_2)} - \frac{\rho a(j)}{Na(i_2)} \\ &= \frac{a(i_2) \setminus ta(j)}{a(i_2)} + \left\lfloor \frac{ta(j) - 1}{a(i_2)} \right\rfloor - \frac{\rho a(j)}{Na(i_2)}, \quad \text{and thus} \\ \left\{ \frac{ka(j)}{N} \right\} &= \left\{ \frac{a(i_2) \setminus ta(j) - a(j)\rho/N}{a(i_2)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we make assumption (m):

$$(m) \quad N \geq \frac{\rho_{i,t}a(j)}{a(i)\setminus ta(j)} \quad \text{for all } i \text{ and } t < a(i).$$

(This occurs if $N > a(i)a(j)$ for all $i \neq j$; we will slightly refine this later.) Under this assumption,

$$\left\{ \frac{ka(j)}{N} \right\} = \frac{a(i)\setminus ta(j) - a(j)\rho/N}{a(i)}.$$

Plugging everything into the left side of (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \left\{ \frac{ka(i)}{N} \right\} - \frac{k}{N} &= 1 + \frac{1}{a(i_2)} \left(\sum_{j \neq i_2} a(i)\setminus ta(j) - t - \frac{\rho}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a(j) - 1 \right) \right); \text{ this exceeds } n-2 \text{ iff} \\ \sum_{j \neq i_2} a(i)\setminus ta(j) - t &> \frac{\rho}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a(j) - 1 \right) + (n-3)a(i_2). \end{aligned}$$

Relabelling the terms, this means that in the presence of (m), necessary and sufficient for $K_{\alpha(N)}$ to be hollow is that for all i, t ,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} a(i)\setminus ta(j) - t - \frac{\rho_{i,t}}{N} \left(\sum_1^n a(j) - 1 \right) \leq (n-3)a(i).$$

In particular,

$$(3) \quad \sum_{a(i)\setminus ta(j) - t \leq (n-3)a(i)}$$

is sufficient (in the presence of (m)) for $K_{\alpha(N)}$ to be hollow.

If we make assumption (M),

$$(M) \quad \frac{\rho_{i,t}}{N} \left(\sum_1^n a(j) - 1 \right) < 1,$$

then (3) is also necessary. Sufficient for (M) to hold is

$$N > \left(\sum a(j) - 1 \right) \rho_{i,t},$$

or a little less generally (but subscript-independent), $N > (\sum a(i) - 1) \cdot \max_i \{a(i) - 1\}$. Similarly, $N \geq \max_{i \neq j} \{(a(i) - 1)a(j)\}$ is sufficient for (m) to hold. \bullet

For example, it is easy to verify from these criteria that $\alpha(N) := (3, 5, 7; N)$ is hollow for $N \geq 30$. Verification by hand reveals all other choices of N also yield hollow polytopes. Examination of the faces reveals that provided $\gcd(N, 7) = 1$, all the facets are themselves empty, and thus we obtain that if 7 does not divide N , then $K_{\alpha(N)}$ is empty (when 7 divides N , two of the facets are not empty). Here $n = 4$ is small enough that emptiness of the facets is easy to check. In general, checking that the facets are themselves empty (or at least relatively hollow), involves reduction of the N to much smaller numbers—specifically $\gcd\{a(i), N\}$ for each i , and $\gcd\{\sum a(j) - 1, N\}$ —so computations are going to be much less cumbersome.

In particular, a sufficient condition for emptiness is that $K_{\alpha(N)}$ be hollow, and for all i , $\gcd\{a(i), N\} = 1 = \gcd\{\sum a(j) - 1, N\}$.

COROLLARY 2.2 Let $\alpha(N) = (a(1), \dots, a(n-1); N)$ where $0 < a(i)$, and suppose there exists an integer $M > (\sum a(i) - 1) \cdot \max_i \{a(i) - 1\}$ such that $K_{\alpha(M)}$ is hollow (not hollow, respectively). Then $K_{\alpha(M)}$ is hollow (not hollow, respectively) for all $N > (\sum a(i) - 1) \cdot \max_i \{a(i) - 1\}$.

We can improve the result of Theorem 2.1, in that we can restrict to $1 \leq t \leq a(i)/2$ rather than all $1 \leq t \leq a(i)$.

LEMMA 2.3 Assume that condition (m) applies to $\alpha \equiv \alpha(N)$. Suppose that for $k = \lfloor Nt/a(i) \rfloor$ with $a(i)/2 < t < a(i)$, the corresponding point,

$$v := \sum_{\{j \mid a(i) \text{ does not divide } Na(j)\}} \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(j)}{N}\right\}\right) e_j + \frac{k}{N} \alpha^T \in K_\alpha.$$

Then the same is true with k replaced by $k_0 = \lfloor Nt_0/a(i) \rfloor$, where $t_0 = 2t - a(i)$. If the former is in the interior, then so is lattice point arising from k_0 .

Proof. Since K_α is a simplex, the displayed condition is simply,

$$\sum_{\{j \mid a(i) \text{ does not divide } Na(j)\}} \left(1 - \left\{\frac{ka(j)}{N}\right\}\right) + \frac{k}{N} \leq 1.$$

In the presence of (m), this boils down to

$$\sum_{j \neq i}^{a(i) \setminus ta(j)} ta(j) - t - \frac{\rho}{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a(j) - 1 \right) \geq (n-3)a(i),$$

where $\rho = \rho_{i,t}$. Define $\alpha_2 = a(i) \setminus t_0 a(j)$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_{i,t_0}$. Since the right hand side differs from $(n-2)a(i)$ by less than $a(i)/2$, and there are only $n-2$ positive terms on the left each of which has maximum value at most $a(i)$, it follows that each $\alpha(j) > a(i)/2$, and thus $\alpha_2(j) = 2\alpha(j) - a(i)$. Also ρ_2 is either 2ρ (when $\rho < a(i)/2$) or $2\rho - a(i)$; write ε to be 1 if $\rho/a(i) > 1/2$, else zero. Then $\rho_2 = 2\rho - \varepsilon$. The corresponding expression on the left for k_0 is

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{a(i) \setminus ta(j)} ta(j) - (n-2)a(i) - (2t - a(i)) - \frac{2\rho - \varepsilon}{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a(j) - 1 \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\sum_{a(i) \setminus ta(j)} ta(j) - t - \frac{\rho}{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a(j) - 1 \right) \right) - (n-3)a(i) + \frac{\varepsilon a(i)}{N} \\ &\geq (2n - 6 - (n-3))a(i) \\ &= (n-3)a(i). \end{aligned}$$

So the lattice point associated to k_0 belongs to K_α . If v belongs to the interior, then all the coefficients in the barycentric decomposition are nonzero, and their sum is not one. It is easy to check that this will also apply to the new lattice point. •

PROPOSITION 2.4 Suppose that K_α admits a non-extreme (interior) lattice point, and that condition (m) holds. Then there exist positive integers i and s with $s < a(i)/2$ such that $k = \lfloor Ns/a(i) \rfloor$ yields a lattice point (in the interior of) K_α .

Remark. Sufficient for condition (m) to hold is that $N > \max_{i \neq j} a(j)(a(i) - 1)$.

Proof. The function $f : x \mapsto 2x - 1$ has a fixed point at $x = 1$ and for $0 < x < 1$, the sequence of iterates $(f^n(x))$ converges to zero. Hence given $x = t/a(i) > 1/2$, there exists a smallest integer u such that $f^u(x) < 1/2$. Now the lemma above applies. •

Can we do better, that is, can we drastically weaken the condition (m) hypothesis to obtain a result on minimal t ? The proof of Lemma 2.4 uses what appear to be flabby estimates. To this end, define $S_+ = \{j \mid \alpha(j) > \rho a(j)/N\}$, and S_- its complement in $\{i\}^c$. If any of $|S_-| \leq (n-2)/2$, or $\{Nt/a(i)\} \leq 1/2$, or $|S_-| = |S_{2,-}|$ (the latter is the corresponding set for t_0), then the first round of iteration succeeds, that

is, the lemma applies—once. Unfortunately, none of these conditions are likely to be preserved in the next iteration, so we cannot continue the argument. (A notable exception occurs if $t/a(i) < 3/4$, because only one iteration is required.) A preferable condition would be something like $N > 2 \max a(j)$.

The upshot is that at least if (m) applies, then we only have test to the cases with $t < a(i)/2$. So at most $\sum \lfloor a(i)/2 \rfloor$ congruence inequalities have to be checked to decide hollowness.

COROLLARY 2.5 If $N \geq \max_{i \neq j} \{(a(i) - 1)a(j)\}$, then sufficient for $K_{\alpha(N)}$ to be hollow is that for all i, t with $t < a(i)/2$,

$$\sum_{\substack{a(i) \setminus \\ j \neq i}} ta(j) \leq t + (n - 3)a(i).$$

In particular, the displayed condition is necessary and sufficient for $\mathbf{a} = (a(1), \dots, a(n - 1))$ to be asymptotically hollow. •

The following is elementary, but very useful in reducing the number of times we have to decide whether the inequality in Corollary 2.5 holds.

LEMMA 2.6 Let $\mathbf{a} = (a(1), \dots, a(n - 1)) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-1}$ with all $a(i) \geq 2$. Suppose there exists j and $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\} \setminus \{j\}$ such that $\sum_{s \in S} a(s) \equiv r \pmod{a(j)}$. Either of the following conditions is sufficient to guarantee that for all $t \in \mathbf{N}$, $\sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t \leq t + (n - 3)a(j)$.

- (a) $r = 1$.
- (b) $r = 0$ and there exists $s \in S$ such that $a(s)$ is not divisible by $a(j)$.

Proof. Define $s_t = \sum_{S} a(i)t \equiv t \pmod{a(j)}$; then $s_t \equiv tr \pmod{a(j)}$. It is sufficient to verify the condition for $t < a(j)/2$, by Corollary 2.5.

(a) We have $s_t = \sum_{S} a(i)t \equiv t \pmod{a(j)}$, so we can write $s_t - t = ka(j)$ for some integer k . Since $s_t \leq |S|a(j)$, it follows that $k \leq |S| - 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t - t &\leq (s_t - t) + \sum_{S^c \setminus \{j\}} a(i)t \\ &\leq (|S| - 1)a(j) + |S^c \setminus \{j\}|a(j) \\ &= ((n - 1) - 2)a(j). \end{aligned}$$

(b) We can write $s_t = ka(j)$, where $k \leq |S|$. However, not all $a(s)$ are divisible by $a(j)$, hence for fixed t not all $a(s)t = a(j)$; hence $k < |S|$. Now the same argument applies, and we deduce (in this case) that $\sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t \leq (n - 3)a(j)$ (with no t term on the right). •

This generalizes; we have a result for specific t . The proof is essentially the same.

LEMMA 2.7 Let $(a(i)) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-1}$. Suppose that for some j and positive integer t , there exists a subset $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\} \setminus \{j\}$, such that

$$t \sum_{i \in S} a(i) \equiv z \pmod{a(j)},$$

for some z with $1 \leq z \leq t$, or if $z = 0$ and there exists $i \in S$ such that $a(i)$ does not divide $a(j)$. Then

$$\sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t \leq t + (n - 3)a(j).$$

Proof. Since $\sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t \equiv t \sum_{i \in S} a(i)$, we have that $\sum_{i \neq j} a(i)t \leq (|S| - 1)a(j) + z$, and this is bounded above by $(|S| - 1)a(j) + t$. Now the same finishing arguments as those in Lemma 2.6(a,b) complete the proof. •

For example, suppose we have the quadruple $(3, 29, 38, 66)$ ($n = 5$), and wish to determine whether the inequalities modulo (say) 29 hold. First, reduce the three remaining numbers modulo 29, so we are dealing with 3, 9, 8. Using $S = \{3\}$, applying Lemma 2.7, we have that the inequality holds for $10 \leq t \leq 14$. From

$S = \{3, 8, 9\}$, we see that it holds for $t = 3, 6, 9$; with $S = \{8\}$, we obtain $t = 4, 8$. When $S = \{3, 9\}$, the inequality holds for $t = 5$, and when $S = \{8, 9\}$, $t = 7$ works. Since the inequality trivially holds when $t = 1$ or 2 , it holds for all t . In fact, this quadruple is asymptotically hollow, as we will see in Example 5.4.

3 Facets and width

Let $A \subset \mathbf{Z}^n$, and form the group generated by $A - A$ (the set of differences of elements of A), $H(A)$. If the torsion subgroup of $\mathbf{Z}^n/H(A)$ has order m (that is, the torsion subgroup of $\mathbf{Z}^n/H(A)$ has m elements—it will always be finite), we say A generates a subgroup of cotorsion m .

Now let K be a lattice polytope with interior, and F a facet of K . Set $A = F \cap \mathbf{Z}^d$. Then it is easy to see that the torsion-free rank of $H(A)$ is $n - 1$ (since we assumed at the outset that K has interior). Recall the notation: if $\alpha = (a(1), \dots, a(n - 1), d) \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times n}$, then K_α is the convex hull of $\{0, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, \alpha^T\}$, and this has interior if and only if d is not zero—and we normally assume that $d \geq 1$.

Define the *volume* of F to be the m such that A generates a subgroup (of \mathbf{Z}^n) of cotorsion m . If $m = 1$, then F is a *standard* (or *unimodular*) $(d - 1)$ simplex, and in general m is the normalized volume of F .

Now we look at the facets of K_α . There are of course $n + 1$ of them. One of them is the standard $d - 1$ simplex, obtained by deleting α from the list of vertices. Deleting one of the e_i yields a facet of (normalized) volume $\gcd\{a(i), d\}$, as is easy to verify. Deleting 0 is slightly more complicated, in that we have to translate $\text{cvx}\{\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\alpha^T\}\}$ so as to hit the origin, e.g., by subtracting e_1 from everything, and it is routine that the volume of this face is $\gcd\{\sum a(i) - 1, d\}$. We thus have a list of the volumes of the facets of K_α :

$$1, \gcd(a(1), d), \gcd(a(2), d), \dots, \gcd(a(n - 1), d); \gcd\left(\sum a(i) - 1, d\right),$$

the last term corresponding to the facet obtained by deleting 0 .

LEMMA 3.1 Let $K = K_\alpha$.

- (i) The number of facets of K that are standard simplices is 1 plus the number of $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ in the augmented row $b = (b(j))$ (with $b(j) = a(j)$ if $j \leq n - 1$, and $b(n) = \sum a(i) - 1$) such that $\gcd\{b(i), d\} = 1$; this is an affine integral invariant of K .
- (ii) All of the facets are standard simplices if and only if $\gcd(\sum a(i) - 1, d) = 1$ and $\gcd(a(i), 1) = 1$ for all $i \leq n - 1$.

When d is prime and all of the $a(i)$ are not divisible by d , then there are either $n - 1$ or n facets that are standard simplices, depending on whether $\sum a(i) - 1$ is divisible by d . Both situations can occur, and constructions are quite easy, even if we also require emptiness.

If K_α is hollow, then necessary and sufficient that it be empty is that every facet is hollow (relative to the corresponding sublattice); in particular, this occurs if all the facets are standard.

Width Let K be a lattice polytope, and let $\phi \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times n}$ (equivalently, ϕ is a homomorphism $\mathbf{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$). Define the *width relative to ϕ of K* , $\text{wid}_K(\phi)$ to be $\max \phi|K - \min \phi|K$. Since linear functionals take their extreme values on extreme points (which here are lattice points), this is an integer, and if we take the infimum of $\text{wid}_K(\phi)$ over all nonzero ϕ , we see that the infimum is achieved. This defines $\text{wid}(K)$. Obviously, this is an $\text{AGL}(\mathbf{Z})$ invariant, and is never zero.

For $K = K_\alpha$, width one is easy to characterize.

LEMMA 3.2 K_α has width one iff either there exists a subset $T \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$ such that $\sum_{i \in T} a(i) \equiv 0 \pmod{d}$ or $\sum_T a(i) \equiv 1 \pmod{d}$.

Proof. We can obviously assume $d > 1$. First suppose that K_α has width one. Since $0 \in K_\alpha$, the integer 0 is a value of any $\phi \in \mathbf{Z}^{1 \times n}$. If ϕ achieves the minimal width, then either all of its other values are either 1 , or all of its other values are either -1 . Replacing ϕ by $-\phi$ if necessary, we can assume that its values on K are all in $\{0, 1\}$, and since K contains interior and ϕ is supposed to be nonzero, 1 is a value.

Writing ϕ as a row, from the values on the first $n - 1$ of the e_i , we see that $\phi = (\epsilon(i); x)$ where $\epsilon(i) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \leq n - 1$. Set $T = \{i \mid \epsilon(i) = 1\}$. Then $\phi \cdot \alpha = \sum_T a(i) + xd$. If this is zero, then we are done; otherwise, it equals 1 , and again we are done.

Conversely, assume such a subset T exists. Write $\sum_T a(i) = \epsilon + md$ where $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, and define $\phi = (\epsilon(1), \epsilon(2), \dots, \epsilon(n - 1), -m)$ where $\epsilon(i) = 1$ if $i \in T$ and 0 otherwise. •

This extends, somewhat.

LEMMA 3.3 Let $K = K_\alpha$, and let U be the set of integers that appear in any of the augmented forms resulting $(a(i))$ and its iterates under the actions described in section 2. Rewrite the elements of U modulo d so that $-d/2 < u \leq d/2$ for all $u \in U$, and suppose that 0 never appears (that is, no edges contain lattice points other than the extreme points). Set $s = \min\{\{u \mid u \in U; u > 0\} \cup \{1 + |u| \mid u \in U; u < 0\}\}$. Then $\text{wid}(K) \leq s$.

Proof. Pick the corresponding u to achieve s . There exists an equivalent simplex $K' = K_{\alpha'}$ such that $u + md$ is the i th entry of α' for some $i \leq d - 1$. Then set ϕ to be the row with a 1 in the i th entry, $-m$ in the d th entry, and zeros elsewhere. Then the values of ϕ on the extreme points are 0, 1, and u . If $u < 0$, then $\text{wid}_{K'}(\phi)$ is $1 - u = 1 + |u| = s$, whereas if $u > 0$, then $\text{wid}_{K'}(\phi) = u = s$. Thus $\text{wid}(K') \leq s$. The result follows from the observation that the width is an affine invariant. \bullet

Unfortunately, the inequality can be strict. Take $\alpha = (2, 3, 3, 3, 4; 12)$. Then because there are no equivalences arising from inverting modulo d , there is only one augmented row to check, $(-2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 4)$. It contains no ones, so the s in this case is 2. However, $2 + 3 + 3 + 4 = 12$, so by Lemma 3.2, the width is one. This can be fixed by restricting to projections onto lower dimensional spaces, e.g., $(2, 3, 3, 4; 12)$ obtained by deleting one of the terms is still empty, only this time 1 appears in the augmented row $(1, 2, 3, 3, 4)$ (and there is only one other augmented row, $(1, -2, -3, -3, -4)$). So we could take the infimum of the s obtained by deleting some of the terms.

4 Higher dimensional asymptotically hollow tuples with large minimum entry

As usual, we order the $n - 1$ -tuple $\mathbf{a} = (a(i))$, $a(1) \leq a(2) \leq a(3) \leq \dots \leq a(n - 1)$. What is the largest $a(1)$ (that is, the largest integer that can appear as the smallest integer in the sequence) that can occur in an asymptotically hollow-sequence? For example, we will see later that if $n = 4$, then the largest $a(1)$ is 6. Here we will show that for general n , the largest minimal entry of an asymptotically hollow tuple (with $n - 1$ entries) is *at least* $2^{n-3}(2^{n-2} - 1)$. The corresponding list includes all even perfect numbers (which occur precisely when $n - 2$ is a Mersenne prime, that is, when $2^{n-2} - 1$ is prime).

For $n \geq 4$, define

$$\mathbf{a}_n = (2^{2n-5} - 2^{n-3}, 2^{2n-5} + 2^{n-3}, 2^{2n-4} - 1, 2(2^{2n-4} - 1), \dots, 2^{n-4}(2^{2n-4} - 1)) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-1};$$

the fourth and subsequent terms (if $n \geq 5$) are double their immediate predecessor. For $n = 4$, the corresponding triple is $(6, 10, 15)$; if $n = 5$, then the quadruple is $(28, 36, 63, 126)$, and the next one is $(120, 136, 255, 510, 1020)$. I don't know whether these are optimal, for any $n \geq 5$. There are an enormous number of similar constructions, but this particular one seems to maximize the least element.

PROPOSITION 4.1 \mathbf{a}_n is asymptotically hollow.

Proof. We use the criteria in Lemma 2.6. It is simple to verify that $a(1) + a(2) = a(3) + 1$, and $\sum_{i < j} a(i) = a(j) + 1$ for $j \geq 3$. Moreover, we also have $\sum_{i \neq 1} a(i) = (2^{2n-4} - 1)(2^{n-3} - 1) + 2^{2n-5} + 2^{n-3}$. This simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{3n-7} - 2^{2n-4} - 2^{n-3} + 1 + 2^{2n-5} + 2^{n-3} &= 1 + 2^{3n-7} - 2^{2n-5} \\ &= 1 + (2^{2n-5} - 2^{n-3})2^{n-2} \\ &\equiv 1 \pmod{a(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq 2} a(i) &= \sum_{i \neq 1} a(i) + a(1) - a(2) \\ &= 1 + (2^{2n-5} - 2^{n-3})2^{n-2} + 2 \cdot 2^{2n-5} \\ &= 1 + (2^{2n-5} + 2^{n-3})2^{n-2} \\ &\equiv 1 \pmod{a(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

When $n = 4$, there is only one asymptotically hollow triple whose least entry is 6, specifically $(6, 10, 15)$ (this will be shown in section 5). So the following is plausible.

CONJECTURE 4.2 Suppose that $\mathbf{a} = (a(i)) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n-1}$ is asymptotically hollow.

- (i) Then $\min_i a(i) \leq 2^{n-3}(2^{n-2} - 1)$.
- (ii) If $\min_i a(i) = 2^{n-3}(2^{n-2} - 1)$, then $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_n$.

The first test of this conjecture occurs when $n = 5$; for (i), we would have to show that $a(1) \leq 28$. And the natural conjecture concerning the largest $a(i)$: $a(n-1)$ should be at most the largest coefficient of \mathbf{a}_n .

5 Proscriptive intervals

One approach to the problem of characterization of asymptotically hollow sequences yields intervals of real numbers in which the last coordinate cannot appear. Specifically, let $(a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2))$ be monotone increasing. We wish to determine (among other things) which integers $y \geq a(n-2)$ (or whether such a y exists) such that $\mathbf{a} := (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2), y)$ is asymptotically hollow. We obtain fairly good constraints on y . As a preliminary example, suppose that $y \geq a(n-2)t$ for some positive integer t . Then for all $i \leq n-2$, we have $a(i)t \leq a(n-2)t \leq y$, and thus $y \setminus a(i)t = a(i)t$. Hence $(n-3)y + t \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} a(i)t$. Set $s = \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} a(i) - 1$.

Therefore, $y \geq a(n-2)t$ implies $y \geq ts/(n-3)$. That is, y does not belong to the half-open real intervals $[a(n-2)t, st/(n-3))$ for all positive integers t . Hence

$$y \notin \bigcup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} \left[a(n-2)t, \frac{st}{n-3} \right) = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} t \left[a(n-2), \frac{s}{n-3} \right).$$

It can happen that $a(n-2) \geq s/(n-3)$, in which case all of these multiple intervals are empty, and no constraint on y results. On the other hand, if $a(n-2) < s/(n-3)$, then the union contains an infinite ray, that is, there exists $b \in \mathbf{R}$, such that $[b, \infty)$ is contained in the union. It is easy to estimate b , for example, determine the smallest integer t_0 such that the right endpoint of $st_0/(n-3) \geq a(n-2)(t_0 + 1)$, and then we can set $b = a(n-2)t_0$ (smaller choices for b can sometimes arise, especially since we only care about integer values for y). This yields a first class of constraints. There are more of this type.

To explain this, order the set $\mathcal{S} := \{a(i)/m \mid i \leq n-2; m \in \mathbf{N}\}$ in the usual way (as a set of real numbers; generally, ties occur, that is, $a(i)/m = a(i')/m'$ can arise with differing i, i'). For each $a(i)/m$, define $g(i, j, m) = \#\{k \in \mathbf{N} \mid a(i)/m < a(j)/k\}$. If $i = j$, then $g(i, i, m) = m - 1$, and obviously $g(i, i, 1) = 0$. In general, $g(i, j, m)$ is simply the largest integer k such that $k < ma(j)/a(i)$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} g(i, j, m) &= \left\lfloor \frac{ma(j) - 1}{a(i)} \right\rfloor \\ &= \frac{ma(j) - a(i) \setminus ma(j)}{a(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $f(i, m) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} g(i, j, m)$. Now let $c \equiv c(i, m) \in \mathcal{S}$ be the smallest such that $c > a(i)/m$ (if no such c exists, then $m = 1$ and $a(i) = a(n-2)$, and the resulting proscriptive intervals will be the ones obtained above from $y \geq a(n-1)t$, that is, nothing new happens; so we may assume c exists).

Suppose that $a(i)t/m \leq y < ct$ for some $t \in \mathbf{N}$. Then $a(i)t/m \leq y < a(i)t/(m-1)$ (true even if $m = 1$), so that $(m-1)ty < a(i)t \leq mty$. Thus $y \setminus a(i)t = a(i)t - (m-1)y$, and this is $a(i)t - g(i, i, m)y$. Now let $j \neq i$. If $a(j) \leq a(i)/m$, then $a(j)t \leq y$, and $y \setminus ta(j) = ta(j)$, and of course, this is $ta(j) - g(i, j, m)y$. On the other hand, if $a(j) > a(i)/m$, then $a(j) \geq c$, and thus $g(i, j, m) \geq 1$.

We have that $a(j)/g(i, j, m) \geq a(i)/m$ (by definition), with equality only if $a(j)/g(i, j, m) = a(i)/m$, and thus $y \setminus a(j)t = a(j)t - g(i, j, m)y$ in this case as well. Finally, if $a(j)/g(i, j, m) > a(i)/m$, then $a(j)/g(i, j, m) \geq c$, and thus $a(j)t/g(i, j, m) \geq ct > y$. This yields $a(j)t > g(i, j, m)y$.

On the other hand, $a(j) < (g(i, j, m) + 1)a(i)/m$, so that $a(j)t < (g(i, j, m) + 1)a(i)t/m \leq (g(i, j, m) + 1)y$. Hence $y \setminus ta(j) = ta(j) - g(i, j, m)y$ in all cases. Thus for all i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} y \setminus ta(j) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} ta(j) - y \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} g(i, j, m) \\ &= (s+1)t - f(i, m)y \end{aligned}$$

From $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y \setminus ta(j) \leq (n-3)y + t$, we deduce

$$y \geq \frac{st}{n-3+f(i,m)}.$$

Set $H(i, m) = n-3+f(i, m)$. We obtain the corresponding *proscriptive intervals*,¹(sometimes, *proscribed intervals*)

$$y \notin \left[\frac{ta(i)}{m}, \frac{st}{H(i, m)} \wedge c(i, m)t \right).$$

The infimum, \wedge , arises from the original condition that $y < ct$, but we can dispense with the $c(i, m)$ term, as follows. If $c't > y \geq c(i, m)t$ (where c' is the next strictly larger term than c (ignore ties) in \mathcal{S}), then we similarly derive, $y \notin [ct, st/H(i_0, m_0) \wedge c't)$, where $c = a(i_0)/m_0$. Then from the definitions, $H(i, m) < H(i_0, m_0)$, and we continue by induction on the elements of \mathcal{S} increasing to $a(n-1)$, to eliminate the wedge term. In particular, the corresponding proscriptive interval is $\left[\frac{ta(i)}{m}, \frac{st}{H(i, m)} \right)$, and we have

$$y \notin \bigcup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} \left[\frac{ta(i)}{m}, \frac{st}{H(i, m)} \right).$$

The proscriptive intervals are determined by t , $a(i)$, m , and s , and we allow m and t to vary over all positive integers.

We do not require $y \geq a(n-2)$ in this construction, and this will be useful in problems of the type discussed in Example 5.4.

There are only finitely many choices of (i, m) for which the interval $[a(i)/m, s/H(i, m))$ is nonempty. To see this, expand

$$\begin{aligned} H(i, m) &= n-3+m-1 + \sum_{j \neq i} g(i, j, m) \\ &= n-3+m-1 + \frac{m}{a(i)} \sum_{j \neq i} a(j) - \frac{1}{a(i)} \sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j) \\ &= n+m-4 + \frac{m}{a(i)}(s-a(i)+1) - \frac{1}{a(i)} \sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j) \\ &= n-4 + \frac{m(s+1)}{a(i)} - \frac{1}{a(i)} \sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j). \end{aligned}$$

The interval $[a(i)/m, s/H(i, m))$ (and thus all of its positive integer multiples) is empty if and only if $a(i)H(i, m)/m \geq s$. Applying the preceding expression for $H(i, m)$, the interval is trivial if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} s+1 + \frac{(n-4)a(i)}{m} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j) &\geq s, \quad \text{that is} \\ \sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j) &\leq m + (n-4)a(i) \end{aligned}$$

These are stronger than the necessary conditions (for \mathbf{a} to be asymptotically hollow), that $\sum_{j \neq i} y \setminus ma(j) \leq m + (n-3)a(i)$, and lends itself immediately to the following.

COROLLARY 5.1 If all proscriptive intervals of $\mathbf{b} := (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2))$ are empty, then \mathbf{b} is asymptotically hollow.

Proof. Simply note that then $n-2$ -tuple corresponds to n replaced by $n-1$, and $(n-1)-3 = n-4$.

¹ *Proscribe* is the opposite of *prescribe*.

COROLLARY 5.2 If there exist infinitely many y such that $(a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2), y)$ is asymptotically hollow, then $(a(1), \dots, a(n-2))$ is asymptotically hollow.

Proof. If at least one of the proscriptive intervals is nontrivial, then its union over all positive integer multiples contains an infinite ray, and thus there is an upper bound on the possible y such that $(a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2), y)$ is asymptotically hollow. \bullet

More can be deduced from the methods here. Fix i, j and let $k = g(i, j, m)$. Then $k+1 \geq ma(j)/a(i) > k$ by definition, and thus $(k+1)a(i) \geq ma(j) > ka(i)$. Thus $_{a(i)\setminus}ma(j) = ma(j) - g(i, j, m)a(i)$. Allowing j to vary, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(j) &= m \sum_{i \neq j} a(j) - \sum_{i \neq j} g(i, j, m)a(i) \\ &= m(s+1 - a(i)) - (f(i, m) - (m-1))a(i) \\ &= ms - f(i, m) + 1)a(i); \quad \text{thus} \\ {}_{a(i)\setminus}my &\leq (n-3)a(i) + m - \sum_{j \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(j) \\ &= (n-2 + f(i, m))a(i) - ms = (1 + H(i, m))a(i) - ms. \end{aligned}$$

This imposes constraints on $_{a(i)\setminus}y$, which are sometimes useful (more frequently with $i = n-2$). The condition for triviality of the corresponding interval, $[a(i)/m, s/H(i, m))$ is that $ms \leq H(i, m)a(i)$, which is slightly stronger than the inequality here.

We also have a quantitative proof of the preceding, which relates proscriptive intervals to solutions to inequalities.

PROPOSITION 5.3 Suppose that $\mathbf{a}' := (a(1), a(2), \dots, a(n-2)) \in \mathbf{N}^{n-2}$ is not asymptotically hollow.

(a) There exist positive integers i and m with $i \leq n-2$ and $m < a(i)/2$ such that

$$(1) \quad \sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}a(l)m > (n-4)a(i) + m,$$

and the corresponding proscriptive interval $[a(i)/m, s/H(i, m))$ (where $s = \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} a(j) - 1$) is nonempty.

(b) Suppose that i, m are positive integers such that (1) holds. If $\mathbf{a} := (a(1), \dots, a(n-2), y) \in \mathbf{N}^{n-1}$ is asymptotically hollow for some positive integer y , then

$$y < \frac{a(i)(1 + s - m)}{2m}.$$

Proof. The first part of (a) is a consequence of the general criterion for asymptotic hollowness, applied with $n-1$ replacing $n-2$. Consequent nonemptiness of the interval was shown earlier. (b) Set $I = [a(i)/m, s/H(i, m))$, so that $y \notin \cup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} tI$. There exists $t_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for all $t \geq t_0$, we have $st/H(i, m) \geq a(i)/m$, estimated as follows. The inequality can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} t_0 \left(\frac{ms}{H(i, m)} - a(i) \right) &\geq a(i); \quad \text{so} \\ t_0 &\geq \frac{a(i)H(i, m)}{ms - a(i)H(i, m)} \\ &= \frac{a(i)(n+m-4) + m \sum_{l \neq i} a(l) - \sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l)}{ms - \left(a(i)(n+m-4) + m \sum_{l \neq i} a(l) - \sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l) \right)} \\ &= \frac{a(i)(n-4) + m + ms - \sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l)}{m - a(i)(n-4) + \sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{a(i)(n-4)}{m} + s + 1 - \frac{\sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l)}{m}}{1 - \frac{a(i)(n-4)}{m} + \frac{\sum_{l \neq i} {}_{a(i)\setminus}ma(l)}{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

If t_0 is set to the ceiling of the last expression, than any larger t will also satisfy the inequality, and thus the ray $[a(i)t_0/m, \infty)$ is contained in $\cup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} tI$. In particular, $y \leq a(i)t_0/m$. The denominator is at least as large as 2 (by (1)), and the numerator is bounded above by $s + 1 - m$. So we can take $t_0 = \lceil (s + 1 - m)/2 \rceil$, e.g., $t_0 \leq (s - m)/2 + 1$. Thus $a(i)t_0/m \leq (1 + (s - m))a(i)/2m$. •

If there are numerous pairs (i, m) such that (1) holds, then the the upper bound can be made much smaller (often), since there will be overlapping of multiples of different intervals.

On rereading this article for the $(n - 1)$ st time, I decided that the definition of $H(i, m)$ hides its essential simplicity. We provide an example to show how to use it effectively.

EXAMPLE 5.4 Suppose α is a nontrivial asymptotically hollow quadruple that has entries 29, 38, 66. Then α is one of $(2, 29, 38, 66)$, $(3, 29, 38, 66)$, or $(11, 29, 38, 66)$.

Proof. We consider the quadruple $(29, 38, 66, y)$, where we do not require $y \geq 66$. Here $s = 132$. We obtain various proscriptive intervals, out of the saturated sequence of fractions

$$\frac{66}{1} > \frac{38}{1} > \frac{66}{2} > \frac{29}{1} > \frac{66}{3} > \frac{38}{2} > \frac{66}{4} > \frac{29}{2} > \frac{66}{5} > \frac{38}{3} > \dots$$

This initial sequence yields the respective proscriptive intervals (we will need more later),

$$\begin{aligned} t \left[66, \frac{132}{2} \right) &= \emptyset; & t \left[38, \frac{132}{3} \right) &= t[38, 44); & t \left[33, \frac{132}{4} \right) &= \emptyset; & t \left[29, \frac{132}{5} \right) &= \emptyset; \\ t \left[22, \frac{132}{6} \right) &= \emptyset; & t \left[19, \frac{132}{7} \right) &= t \left[19, 19\frac{5}{7} \right); & t \left[15\frac{1}{2}, \frac{132}{8} \right) &= \emptyset; & \text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

The denominators, $H(i, m)$, just increase by one.

Now consider what happens modulo 38: we have $_{38}\backslash 29t + _{38}\backslash 28t + _{38}\backslash ty \leq t + 77$ (as $66 \equiv 28 \pmod{38}$) for all t , but just from $t = 1$, we have $_{39}\backslash y \leq 79 - 67 = 11$. In particular, $y = 38k + j$ where $k \geq 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq 11$ are integers. From the proscriptive intervals $[38, 44) \cup [76, 88) \cup [114, 132) \cup \dots$, we see that the only choices for y are $\{2, \dots, 11\} \cup \{45, \dots, 49\}$.

Now consider the situation modulo 29; we have $_{29}\backslash 9t + _{29}\backslash 8t + _{29}\backslash ty \leq t + 58$. With $t = 3$, we have $27 + 24 + _{29}\backslash 3y \leq 61$, and so $_{29}\backslash 3y \leq 10$. The only possible values (of the previous paragraph) satisfying this are $y \in \{2, 3, 10, 11, 49\}$. We can eliminate 10 and 49 simultaneously.

The saturated sequence of fractions around 10 is

$$\frac{29}{2} > \frac{66}{5} > \frac{38}{3} > \frac{66}{6} > \frac{29}{3} > \frac{38}{4} > \dots$$

To find $H(1, 3)$ (here $a(1) = 29$), we simply add the denominators for each of the terms in 29 (3), 38 (3), 66 (6), and add one (because $n = 5$), so that $H(1, 3) = 13$ (the occurrence of $66/5$ between $38/3$ and $29/2$, but before $66/6$, is irrelevant for this). Thus we obtain the proscriptive intervals

$$t \left[\frac{29}{3}, \frac{132}{13} \right) = t \left[9\frac{2}{3}, 10\frac{2}{13} \right).$$

At $t = 1$, we obtain that 10 belongs to the interval, so that $y \neq 10$, and at $t = 5$, 49 belongs, eliminating it. We are thus reduced to $y \in \{2, 3, 11\}$.

[As an aside, we also see directly, that if $t = 5$, then modulo 49 (for the quadruple $(29, 38, 49, 66)$) we have $_{49}\backslash 29 \cdot 5 + _{49}\backslash 38 \cdot 5 + _{49}\backslash 66 \cdot 5 > 5 + 98$, either by direct computation or from Lemma 5.3.]

Now we show that with each of $y = 2, 3$, or 11, the resulting quadruples are asymptotically hollow. We notice that $38 + 29 \equiv 1 \pmod{66}$, so we need only consider the inequalities modulo $y, 29$, or 39.

• $(2, 29, 38, 66)$ is asymptotically hollow. Modulo 2 is trivial. We can deal with both 29 and 38 because of the following easy result.

LEMMA 5.5 Let $(2, b, c, d)$ be a quadruple of integers exceeding 1, not necessarily in ascending order. Suppose that $c \equiv b + 1 \pmod{d}$. Let t be a positive integer less than $d/2$. Then $_{d}\backslash 2t + _{d}\backslash bt + _{d}\backslash ct \leq t + 2d$.

Proof. Assume that $d \setminus 2t + d \setminus bt + d \setminus ct > t + 2d$. Set $x = d \setminus bt$. Then $d \setminus ct = d \setminus (b+1)t \equiv x + t \pmod{d}$. Also $2t \leq d$, so $d \setminus 2t = 2t$.

If $x + t \leq d$, then $d \setminus ct = x + t$. Then we have

$$d \setminus 2t + d \setminus bt + d \setminus ct = 2t + 2x + t.$$

Plugging these into the inequality, we obtain

$$2(x + t) > 2d,$$

contradicting $x + t \leq d$.

Now suppose that $x + t > d$; as $x \leq d$ and $t < d$, it follows that $x + t < 2d$, so that $d \setminus ct = x + t - d$. This yields $2t + 2x + t - d > t + 2d$, so $2x > 3d - 2t$. As $2x \leq 2d$, we have $d < d \setminus 2t$, a contradiction. •

This applies directly to $y = 2$ and both $d = 29$ and 38 , since modulo 29 , the remainders are $2, 9, 8$, and modulo 38 , the remainders are $2, 29, 28$. This shows that $(2, 29, 38, 66)$ is asymptotically hollow. •

• $(3, 29, 38, 66)$ is asymptotically hollow. First we consider the case that $d = 29$, that is the inequalities are verified modulo 29 . We reduce modulo 29 to $(3, 8, 9)$ —we wish to verify that for all $1 \leq t \leq 14$, we have $29 \setminus 3t + 29 \setminus 8t + 29 \setminus 9t \leq t + 58$. This was proved just after Lemma 2.7, but we want to illustrate the use of proscriptive intervals. Assume that for some t , $29 \setminus 3t + 29 \setminus 8t + 29 \setminus 9t > t + 58$.

Denote $29 \setminus 8t$ by x , so that $29 \setminus 9t \equiv x + t \pmod{29}$. Since 29 is prime and $t \leq 14 < 29$, we must have $x \leq 28$. We note that $3 + 8 + 2 \cdot 9 = 29$, and so 29 divides $3t + x + 2x + 2t = 3x + 5t$. First suppose that $t \leq 9$, so that $29 \setminus 3t = 3t$. If $x + t > 29$, then (as $x \leq 28$), $29 \setminus 9t \leq t - 1$. Then we obtain $3t + x + t - 1 > 58 + t$, so $x + 3t > 59$; as $t \leq 9$, it follows that $x > 32$ a contradiction. Hence $x + t \leq 29$, and thus $29 \setminus 9t = x + t \leq 28$. This yields $3t + x + x + t > t + 58$, so $2x + 3t > 58$. This entails $3x + 9t/2 > 87$, and thus $3x + 5t > 87$; the left side being divisible by 29 forces $3x + 5t = 29 \cdot k$ where $k \geq 4$ is an integer. On the other hand, $3x + 5t \leq 84 + 45 = 129 < 145$. Hence $3x + 5t = 116$. Thus $5t \geq 116 - 84 = 32$, so $7 \leq t \leq 9$. Also, $3x + 5t = 116$ entails $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, and thus $t = 7$, forcing $x = 27$, which contradicts $x + t \leq 29$.

Now suppose that $10 \leq t \leq 14$; then $29 \setminus 3t = 3t - 29$. If $x + t > 29$, as before it follows that $29 \setminus 9t \leq t - 1$, and so $3t - 29 + x + t - 1 > 58 + t$, that is, $x + 3t > 88$. Since $3t \leq 42$, we obtain an immediate contradiction. Thus $x + t \leq 29$, and so $3t - 29 + x + x + t > 58 + t$, that is, $2x + 3t > 87$. As before, $3x + 9t/2 \geq 132$, so that $3x + 5t = k \cdot 29$ where $k \geq 5$ is an integer. As $3x + 5t \leq 84 + 70 = 154$, we have that $3x + 5t = 145$. Since $2x + 3t \leq 87$, we have $x + 2t \geq 58$, contradicting $x + 2t \leq 28 + 28$.

Now we consider $(3, 29, 38, 66)$ modulo 38 . This reduces to $(3, 28, 29)$. Assume $38 \setminus 3t + 38 \setminus 28t + 38 \setminus 29t > t + 76$ for some positive integer $t \leq 18$, and set $x = 38 \setminus 28t$. Since $2 \cdot 29 + 2 \cdot 28 = 114$, we have 38 divides $4x + 2t$.

First, consider the case $t \leq 12$. Then $38 \setminus 3t = 3t$. If $x + t > 38$, then $38 \setminus 29t \leq t$, and so $3t + x + t > t + 76$, that is, $x + 3t > 76$, yielding a contradiction, as $3t \leq 36$. Hence $x + t \leq 38$, and thus $38 \setminus 29t = x + t$.

Then $3t + x + x + t > t + 76$, that is, $2x + 3t > 76$, so $4x + 6t > 152$; also, $4x + 6t \leq 4 \cdot 38 + 6 \cdot 18 < 7 \cdot 38$. Write $4x + 6t = 38 \cdot k$ for some k . Then $7 \cdot 38 > 4t + 38k > 152$; the right side yields $k \geq 3$. If $k = 3$, then $4t > 38$, forcing $10 \leq t \leq 12$. Since $2x + t = 57$, t is odd, yielding $t = 11$. But then $x = 23$. However, $x \equiv 28 \cdot 11 \equiv -10 \cdot 11 \pmod{38}$, and this is just 3 , a contradiction.

If $k = 4$, then $x = 38 - t/2$, contradicting $x + t \leq 38$. If $k \geq 5$, then $x \geq 95/2 - t/2 \geq 83/2 > 38$, contradiction.

So we are left with the case that $13 \leq t \leq 18$, and then $38 \setminus 3t = 3t - 38$. If $x + t > 38$, then as before, $38 \setminus 29t \leq t$ and so $3t - 38 + x + t > t + 76$, that is, $x + 3t > 114$, whence $x > 60$ a contradiction. Thus $x + t \leq 38$.

This yields $3t - 38 + 2x + t > t + 76$, so $2x + 3t > 114$. But $2x + 2t \leq 76$ and $t \leq 18$, a contradiction. •

• $(11, 29, 38, 66)$ is asymptotically hollow. We have $29 + 38 \equiv 1 \pmod{11}$ and $11 + 66 \equiv 1 \pmod{38}$; by Lemma 2.6, we need only deal with one situation, that is, modulo 29 .

As usual, assume that $29 \setminus 11t + 29 \setminus 8t + 29 \setminus 9t > t + 58$ for some positive integer $t \leq 14$, and set $x = 29 \setminus 8t$. We observe that $29 \setminus 9t \equiv x + t \pmod{29}$ and $29 \setminus 11t \equiv x + 3t \pmod{29}$. In addition, $11 + 38 + 66 = 115 \equiv -1 \pmod{29}$, and so $x + 3t + x + x + t \equiv -t \pmod{29}$; alternatively, $3x + 5t$ is divisible by 29 . Now $3x + 5t <$

$3 \cdot 29 + 70 = 147$ (and less than 145 if $t \neq 14$. Hence, on writing $3x + 5t = 29k$, we must have $k \leq 6$, and if $t \neq 14$, then $k \leq 5$.

If $x+t > 29$, then ${}_{29}\backslash 9t \leq t-1$, and we deduce (over-estimating ${}_{29}\backslash 11t$ by 28), that $28+x+t-1 > t+57$, that is, $x > 30$ a contradiction. Hence $x+t \leq 29$, so ${}_{29}\backslash 9t = x+t$, and this is at most 28 (since 29 is prime and $t \leq 14$). If now $x+3t > 29$, then ${}_{29}\backslash 11t \leq 2t-1$. This yields $2t-1+x+x+t > t+58$, so $2(x+t) > 59$, a contradiction. Therefore, $x+3t \leq 29$, so ${}_{29}\backslash 11t = x+3t$, and again by primeness of 29, $x+3t \leq 28$.

We obtain $x+3t+x+x+t > t+58$, or $3x+3t > 58$. As $x+3t \leq 28$, $3x+9t \leq 84$; hence $3x+5t < 84$, and therefore $k \leq 2$, that is, $3x+5t \leq 58$, which obviously contradicts $3x+3t > 58$. •

5 Classification when $n = 4$

In this section, we will analyze the possibilities for $n = 4$. It turns out that there is one infinite family of (nontrivial) asymptotically hollow triples, and a small number of others. We relabel the triples, (a, x, y) with $a \leq x \leq y$ (instead of $(a(1), a(2), a(3))$) for convenience. Then the conditions of Corollary 2.5 translate to the following three inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} a \backslash xt + a \backslash yt &\leq t + a && \text{for all positive integers } t < a/2 \\ x \backslash at + x \backslash yt &\leq t + x && \text{for all positive integers } t < x/2 \\ y \backslash at + y \backslash xt &\leq t + y && \text{for all positive integers } t < y/2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that (a, x, y) is asymptotically hollow, and $a \geq 2$. Define $k = \lfloor x/a \rfloor$; then $x = ka + \delta$, where $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq a-1$. Then $x > x/2 > \dots > x/k \geq a > x/(k+1)$. We recall the construction of proscriptive intervals from the previous section.

If $y \geq xt$ for some positive integer t (necessarily with $t < y/2$), then ${}_y \backslash xt = xt$, and as $a \leq x$, we also deduce ${}_y \backslash at = at$. The third inequality yields $at + xt \leq y + t$, or in other words, $y \geq (x+a-1)t$. So $y \geq xt$ entails that $y \geq (x+a-1)t$. Hence $y \notin S_1 := \cup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} [xt, (x+a-1)t)$ (the first and easiest to deal with union of proscriptive intervals). We similarly deal with the possibility that $xt/r \leq y < xt/(r-1)$ for some $r \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$ (if $k \geq 2$). It follows that $xt - (r-1)y > 0$, but $xt - ry < 0$. Hence ${}_y \backslash xt = xt - (r-1)y$. Also, as $a \leq x/k$, $at \leq xt/k \leq y$, we have ${}_y \backslash at = at$. Applying the third inequality as before, we obtain $y \geq (x+a-1)t/r$. Since $(x+a-1)/r \leq xt/(r-1)$ (as $ka \leq x$), we have that $y \notin S_r := \cup_{t \in \mathbf{N}} [xt/r, (x+a-1)t/r)$. From $y \notin S_1$ and with $t = 1$, we observe (trivially) that $y \geq x + a - 1$.

Now we can give a complete description of asymptotically hollow triples ($n = 4$).

THEOREM 5.1 The nontrivial asymptotically hollow triples are precisely

- (i) $(2, x, x+1)$ for every $x \geq 2$
- (ii) $(2, 3, 5), (2, 3, 8), (2, 5, 9)$
- (iii) $(3, 4, 6), (3, 5, 7), (3, 5, 8), (3, 8, 10)$
- (iv) $(4, 6, 9), (4, 7, 10)$
- (v) $(5, 8, 12)$
- (vi) $(6, 10, 15)$.

(Observe that $(2, 3, 4)$ and $(2, 5, 6)$ are asymptotically hollow; they appear in (i).) It is an easy consequence that all the hollow lattice polytopes that arise from these asymptotically hollow triples have width at most two (these are of course four-simplices; finitely many empty four-simplices with width exceeding two exist [IS], but none of them appear here). The first and easy step is to verify that all the listed triples are asymptotically hollow. For most of the computations, we can apply Lemma 2.6, which specializes to the following when $n = 4$.

LEMMA 5.2 Suppose a, b, c are integers all of which are at least two, and any of the following conditions hold.

- (a) either $a \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$ or $b \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$;
- (b) $a + b \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$;
- (c) $a + b \equiv 0 \pmod{c}$ and at least one of a or b does not divide c .

Then for all integers t with $1 \leq t < c/2$, we have

$$c \backslash ta + c \backslash tb \leq t + c.$$

For example, to verify that $(2, x, x + 1)$ is asymptotically hollow for any integer $x \geq 2$, we observe that at least one of x or $x + 1$ is odd, so the condition holds for $c = 2$; next $x + 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{x}$, and $2 + x \equiv 1 \pmod{x + 1}$, so the conditions hold for $c = x$ and $c = x + 1$. Each of those whose smallest entry is at least 4 are immediately verified to be asymptotically hollow, by three applications of Lemma 5.2. For some of these triples, for example, $(2, 3, 8)$, we have to check some of the conditions by hand, but this is routine. Or we could just use Lemma 2.7.

Now we begin the proof that that the listed triples are the only nontrivial asymptotically hollow ones. We write the candidate as (a, x, y) , and set $k = \lfloor x/a \rfloor$; then $x = ka + \delta$, where $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq a - 1$. Also define $\rho = y - x$.

The proof is divided into five parts (which further subdivide), roughly speaking, as follows (more detail is included in the precise statements).

- (A) No asymptotically hollow triples exist with $k \geq a \geq 3$.
- (B) No asymptotically hollow triples exist with $3 \leq k < a$.
- (C) The only asymptotically hollow triple with $k = 2$ and $a > 2$ is $(3, 8, 10)$.
- (D) The only asymptotically hollow triples with $k \geq 2$ and $a = 2$ are $(2, 5, 9)$ and $(2, x, x + 1)$ with $x \geq 4$.
- (E) $k = 1$.

We severely restrict the possibilities for y (and consequently for a and x) via proscriptive intervals. For $r \leq k$, let S_r be the union of the proscriptive intervals

$$S_r := \bigcup_{t=r, r+1, r+2, \dots} \left[\frac{xt}{r}, \frac{(x+a-1)t}{r} \right).$$

In S_r , consider the condition that the right endpoint for some $t = t_0$, $(x+a-1)t/r$ is at least as large as the left endpoint for the prescriptive interval arising from $t_0 + 1$ ($x(t+1)/r$), that is, $(x+a-1)t/r \geq x(t+1)/r$; this is simply that $t_0 \geq x/(a-1)$ and this is independently of r . Set $t_0 = \lceil x/(a-1) \rceil$. We deduce that S_r contains the infinite ray, $[xt_0/r, \infty)$. The largest of these rays arises when $r = k$, and this forces $y < xt_0/k$.

As a rough (for now) estimate, $t_0 = \lceil x/(a-1) \rceil = k + \lceil (\delta + k)/(a-1) \rceil$; hence $y \leq x(1 + \lceil (\delta + k)/(a-1) \rceil / k)$. We see that $\lceil (\delta + k)/(a-1) \rceil / k < 2/k + 1/(a-1)$. In particular if $2/k + 1/(a-1) \leq 1$, then $y \leq 2x$; since $2x$ belongs to a proscriptive interval, in this case $y \leq 2x - 1$.

For example, if $k \geq 3$ and $a \geq 4$, or if $k \geq 4$ and $a \geq 3$, then $y \leq 2x$. When $k = 2$, we don't use this estimate, but go back to $\lceil (\delta + 2)/(a-1) \rceil \in \{1, 2\}$, so obtain $y \leq 3x/2$ when $a \geq 3$, and since $3x/2$ is the initial endpoint of a proscriptive interval, we have $y < 3x/2$; similarly if $k = 3$, $\lceil (\delta + 3)/(a-1) \rceil \in \{1, 2\}$ when $a \geq 3$, so that $y - x \leq 2x/3$. If $k = 4$, we similarly obtain that if $a \geq 3$, then $\rho \leq 3x/4$.

For larger k (but still with $a \geq 3$), we require in what follows the simple inequality $(y-x)/x \leq 1 - 1/k$. But this is a consequence of $2/k + 1/(a-1) \leq 1 - 1/k$, that is, $3/k + 1/(a-1) \leq 1$; this obviously holds if $k \geq 6$. When $k = 5$ and $a = 4$, $\lceil (k + \delta)/(a-1) \rceil / k = \lceil (5 + \delta)/3 \rceil / 5 \leq 3/5 < 4/5$; when $k = 5$ and $a = 3$, we obtain $\lceil (4 + \delta)/2 \rceil / 4 \leq 3/4$. We conclude that provided $a \geq 3$ (and our running assumption that $k \geq 2$), $(y-x)/x \leq 1 - 1/k$. We will further restrict the possible values of $(y-x)/x$ as we go along, by considering other S_r (when $k \geq 2$). We summarize these remarks.

- LEMMA 5.3 (a) $y \leq x(1 + 2/k + 1/(a-1))$.
 (b) If $k \geq 2$ and $a \geq 3$, then $y < (2 - 1/k)x$.
 (c) $y < \lceil x/(a-1) \rceil \cdot x/k$.

- (A) LEMMA 5.4 No asymptotically hollow triples exist with $k \geq a \geq 3$.

We require a preliminary lemma.

LEMMA 5.5 If $a|x$, then $a = 2$, and in this case, the only asymptotically hollow triples are of the form $(2, 2m, 2m + 1)$ ($m = 1, 2, \dots$).

Proof. Here the triple is $(a, ka, y := ak + \rho)$; $\delta = 0$, $t_0 = \lceil ak/(a-1) \rceil = k + \lceil k/(a-1) \rceil$, and $y < \lceil x(1 + 2/k + 1/(a-1)) \rceil$; the left endpoint is $x + 2a + ka/(a-1)$. Also $y \notin [at, (x+a-1)t/(k+1)]$. Moreover, modulo a , we deduce $a + \rho \leq a + 1$, so $\rho = 1$. First, suppose $k = 1$, so that $t_0 = 2$, and $y \notin [2x, \infty)$, that is, $\rho < x$. Then applying the criteria modulo x , we have $a + \rho \leq x + 1 = a + 2$, so that $\rho \leq 2$. The resulting triples are thus $(a, a, a + 1)$ or $(a, a, a + 2)$. In both cases, modulo $a + 1$, we have

$a + a \leq a + 2$ or $a + 3$, respectively. The former yields $a = 2$, the latter $a = 3$. With $a = 2$, we have the triple $\boxed{(2, 2, 3)}$, which despite the repetition, is asymptotically hollow; the other triple is $(2, 2, 4)$ which is obviously not asymptotically hollow. The remaining case is $(3, 3, 5)$, which violates $\rho \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$.

Now let $k \geq 3$. We have $y \notin [xt/k, (x+a-1)t/k] = [at, at+(a-1)t/k]$. If $a \geq 4$, then $1/2k+1/(a-1) \leq 1$, and so $\rho < x$; thus $\rho = la + 1$ with $l < k$. Set $t = l + k$; then $y \notin [a(l+k), a(l+k) + (a-1)(l+k)/k]$. Since $(a-1)(l+k)/k > 1$, we are done. If $k \geq 3$ and $a = 3$, then $x = 3k$, and $t_0 = \lceil x/2 \rceil \leq (x+1)/2$, so $y \notin [3(3k+2)/2, \infty)$, so $\rho < (3k+2)/2$; this is less than $x = 3k$. Write $\rho = 3l + 1$; necessarily, $l < k$. Set $t = l + k$ as before; we obtain $y \notin [3(l+k), 3(l+k) + 2(l+k)/k]$, and since $2(l+k)/k > 1$, we are done.

When $a = 2$, we have $(2, 2k, 2k + \rho)$, and now $y \notin [2t, 2t + t/k]$; here $t_0 = x$, so $y \notin [x^2/k, \infty) = [4k, \infty) = [2x, \infty)$. Thus $\rho < x$, and we can again set $t = l + k$ where $\rho = 2l + 1$ (with $l < k$). If $l \neq 0$, we obtain $y \notin [2l, 2l + (l+k)/k]$, and once again $(l+k)/k > 1$, ruling out all possible ρ . The only remaining cases are of the form $\{(2, 2k, 2k + 1)\}$, which are asymptotically hollow. Finally, let $k = 2$. The triple is then $(a, 2a, 2a + \rho)$.

We know (more generally, independently of the value of k) that $\rho \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Modulo $y = 2a + \rho$, we have $a + 2a \leq 2a + \rho + 1$, so $\rho \geq a + 1$. If $\rho > a + 1$, then $\rho \geq 2a + 1$, and so modulo y with $t = 2$, we obtain $2a + 4a \leq 2a + \rho + 2$, so that $\rho \geq 4a - 2$. Thus if $a > 2$, we have $\rho \geq 4a + 1$, so we can now take $t = 3$, and obtain $3a + 6a \leq 2a + \rho + 3$, that is, $\rho \geq 7a - 3$. But then $y \geq 9a - 3 > 6a = 3x$. However, $y \leq 3x$ following from the original inequality. We are thus reduce to the case that $a = 2 = k$. The triple is thus $(2, 4, 4 + \rho)$.

Of course, ρ is odd. When $\rho = 1$, we obtain the triple $\boxed{(2, 4, 5)}$. If $\rho \neq 1$, then $\rho \geq 3$, so that the triple is in the form $(2, 4, 5 + 2s)$ where $s \geq 1$. Here $t_0 = 4$, so $y \notin [8, \infty)$, leaving 7 as the only possible value for y . But $(2, 4, 7)$ is not asymptotically hollow (modulo 7 and with $t = 3$, we have $6 + 5 > 7 + 3$). •

Proof. (of (A) Lemma 5.4) We can assume a does not divide x ; since $x \geq a^2$, we thus have $a \geq x^2 + 1$. With $a = r$, we have $x \setminus ty \leq x - t(r-1)$ for all $t \leq x/2$. Hence Theorem A.1 (in the Appendix) applies, so that $y \equiv 1, x - a, x - a + 1 \pmod{x}$. We go through the various possibilities.

$y \equiv 1 \pmod{x}$. Then $y = sx + 1$ for some integer $s \geq 1$, but since $a > 2$, each of these lies in the proscribed interval $[sx, s(x+a-1))$.

$y \equiv x - a, x - (a-1) \pmod{x}$. Then $y = sx - a$ or $y = sx - a + 1$ with $s \geq 2$. But $2/k + 1/(a-1) \leq 1$ if $a \geq 4$ or $k \geq 4$, in which case $y < 2x$ ($y = 2x$ is always a proscribed value), or $a = 3$ and $k = 3$, and then $y < 13x/6$. In the latter case, we have proscribed interval $[2x, 2x + 2a - 3]$, $x = 9 + \delta \leq 11$, so $2a - 3 = 3 > x/4 > x/6$. Hence in this case as well, we have $y < 2x$. Thus $y = 2x - a$ or $2x - a + 1$.

Now we consider the proscribed interval, $[(2-1/k)x, (2-1/k)(x+a-1))$ (obtained by setting $t = 2k - 1$ in $[xt/k, (x+a-1)t/k]$). We claim that

$$\left(2 - \frac{1}{k}\right)x \leq 2x - a, \quad 2x - a + 1 < \left(2 - \frac{1}{k}\right)(x + a - 1),$$

that is, either choice for y is in a proscribed interval, hence the triple is not asymptotically hollow. The left inequality, $2x - a \geq (2 - 1/k)x$ is equivalent to $x/k \geq a$, which of course is true (since $k = \lfloor x/a \rfloor$). The right (strict) inequality, $(2 - 1/k)(x + a - 1) > 2x - a + 1$ is equivalent to $x/k < (3 - 1/k)(a - 1)$. Writing $x = ka + \delta \leq (k+1)a - 1$, the left side is at most $a(1 + 1/k) - 1/k = (1 + 1/k)(a - 1) + 1$, so the difference (right side minus left side) is at least $2(a - 1) - 1 > 0$. •

(B) LEMMA 5.6 No asymptotically hollow triples exist with $a > k \geq 3$.

Here we show that various proscribed intervals overlap, so their union contains a large interval. The following results are routine, but require a little care.

LEMMA 5.7 Suppose that $1 \leq s \leq k - 2$ and $a > k$. Then

$$\left(2 - \frac{s}{k-1}\right)(x + a - 1) > \left(2 - \frac{s}{k}\right)x.$$

Proof. The inequality is equivalent to

$$\left(2 - \frac{s}{k-1}\right)(a-1) > \frac{sx}{k(k-1)}; \quad \text{as } x \leq (k+1)a - 1, \text{ sufficient is}$$

$$(2k^2 - 2(1+s)k - s)(a-1) > sk$$

The coefficient of s in the left side minus that of the right side is $-(2k+1)(a-1)-k < 0$; hence the difference is decreasing in s . It thus suffices to verify the inequality when $s = k - 2$. At $s = k - 2$, the left side becomes $(k+2)(a-1)$, and the right side is $k^2 - 2k$. Hence sufficient is

$$a > 1 + \frac{k^2 - 2k}{k+2} = k - 3 + \frac{8}{k+2}.$$

Since $a > k$, sufficient is that $8/(k+2) \leq 3$, for which $k \geq 1$ is enough. •

LEMMA 5.8 Suppose that $2 \leq s$ and any one of the following pairs of conditions hold:

- (a) $k \geq 6$ and $a \geq 3$;
- (b) $k = 5$ and $a \geq 4$;
- (c) $k = 4$ and $a \geq 5$.

Then

$$\left(2 - \frac{s}{k}\right)(x + a - 1) > \left(2 - \frac{s-1}{k-1}\right)x.$$

Proof. This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(2 - \frac{s}{k}\right)(a-1) &> \left(\frac{s}{k} - \frac{s-1}{k-1}\right)x; \quad \times k(k-1); \text{ as } x \leq (k+1)a-1, \text{ sufficient is,} \\ (k^2 - 2k - s)(a-1) &> (k+\delta)(k-s). \end{aligned}$$

The right side is bounded above by $(k+a-1)(k-s)$, so sufficient is

$$(k^2 - 3k)(a-1) > k^2 - sk.$$

The right side is decreasing in s (and the left side has no s term), so it is sufficient to verify the last inequality in the case that $s = 1$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} a-1 &> \frac{k^2 - k}{k^2 - 3k} = 1 + \frac{2k}{k^2 - 3k}; \quad \text{equivalently,} \\ a &> 2 + \frac{2k}{k^2 - 3k} = 2 + \frac{2}{k-3} \end{aligned}$$

If $k = 4$, $a \geq 5$ is sufficient; if $k = 5$, then $a \geq 4$ suffices, and if $k \geq 6$, then $a \geq 3$ is sufficient. •

Suppose that $k \geq 4$. Label some of the proscriptive intervals, $I_i = [(2 - i/k)x, (2 - i/k)(x + a - 1)]$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $J_i = [(2 - i/(k-1))x, (2 - i/(k-1))(x + a - 1)]$ for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. The preceding two lemmas (when they apply) yield $I_{i+1} \cap J_i \neq \emptyset$ and $J_s \cap I_s \neq \emptyset$. It follows easily that the union,

$$I_{k-1} \cup J_{k-2} \cup I_{k-2} \cup \cdots \cup I_2 \cup J_1 \cup I_1, \quad \text{is the interval } \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)x, \left(2 - \frac{1}{k}\right)(x + a - 1) \right].$$

(To see this, read the union from the right to left, that is, starting with I_1 .) Combined with Lemma 5.3(b), and the fact that the very first proscribed interval is $[x, x + a - 1)$, we obtain the following.

LEMMA 5.9 If $a > k \geq 3$, then $x + a - 1 \leq y < \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)x$.

LEMMA 5.10 Suppose that $a \geq 3$. If $k \geq 3$, or if $k = 2$ and $a \geq 4$, then $y \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)(x + a - 1)$.

Proof. We have the first proscriptive interval, $[x, x + a - 1)$, so $y \geq x + a - 1$. From the proscriptive interval $\left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)x, \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)(x + a - 1)\right)$, it suffices to show that $\rho \notin [x + a - 1, \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)x]$. If ρ does belong to this last interval, then $y = x + \rho$ with $a - 1 \leq \rho \leq x/k$. Then $k(a - 1) \leq k\rho \leq x$. Hence $x \setminus ky = x \setminus k\rho = k\rho$; since $x \setminus ka = ka$, we have, with $t = k$ (which is obviously bounded above by $x/2$), applied to (a, x, y) , we have $ka + k\rho \leq k + x = k + ka + \delta$. Hence $k\rho \leq k + \delta$, that is, $\rho \leq \delta/k + 1$.

As $\delta \leq a - 1 \leq \rho$, we have $a - 1 \leq (a - 1)/k + 1$, that is, $k \leq (a - 1)/(a - 2) = 1 + 1/(a - 2)$. The right side is at most 2, so if $k \geq 3$, we are done; if $a \geq 4$, then the right side is strictly less than 2, so we obtain a contradiction if $k = 2$. •

LEMMA 5.11 (a)(trivial) $y \notin [2x - a + 2, 2x - 1]$.

(b) If $k \geq 2$ and $a \geq 3$, then $y \notin [(2 - 1/k)x, 2x + 2a - 3]$.

Proof. (a) Write $\rho = x - u$ where $1 \leq u$. With $t = 1$ and modulo x , we have $a + x - u \leq 1 + x$, and thus $u \geq a - 1$, so $y = 2x - u \leq 2x - a + 1$.

(b) By (a) and the two proscriptive intervals, $[x(2 - 1/k), (x + a - 1)(2 - 1/k)]$ and $[2x, 2x + 2a - 2]$, it suffices to show

$$(2 - 1/k)x \leq 2x - a + 2 < (2 - 1/k)(x + a - 1).$$

The left inequality is equivalent to $x/k \geq a - 2$, which is trivial since $x \geq ka$. The right inequality boils down (after simplifying and multiplying by k) to $x < (3k - 1)(a - 1) - k$. Since $x \leq (k + 1)a - 1 = (k + 1)(a - 1) + k$, it suffices to show $(2k - 2)(a - 1) > 2k$. As $k > 1$, sufficient is thus $a - 1 > k/(k - 1)$, so $a \geq 3$ is enough. •

Proof. (of (B) Lemma 5.6) Since $2/k + 1/(a - 1) \leq 1$, so $y \leq 2x$. By Lemmas 5.9–5.11, there are no choices for y . •

(C) LEMMA 5.12 The only asymptotically hollow triple with $k = 2$ and $a \geq 3$ is $(3, 8, 10)$.

Proof. First, for $k = 2$ and $a \geq 4$; we show no triples exist. Candidate triples are of the form $(a, 2a + \delta, 2a + \rho + \delta)$. Then $x/(a - 1) = 2 + (\delta + 2)/(a - 1)$, and thus $\lceil x/(a - 1) \rceil \in \{3, 4\}$. Hence $y \leq 4(2a + \delta)/2 = 2x$, and since $2x$ belongs to a proscriptive interval, $y \leq 2x - 1$.

By Lemmas 5.10 and 5.11, with $k = 2$, we have $3(x + a - 1)/2 \leq y < 3x/2$, a contradiction.

This leaves the possibility that $k = 2$ and $a = 3$; we must show that $(3, 8, 10)$ is the only one. The triple is $(3, 7 + \epsilon, 7 + \epsilon + \rho)$ ($\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$). Here $\lceil x/2 \rceil = 4$, so $y \leq 2x$, and thus, $y \leq 2x - 1$. By Lemma 5.11(b), $y < 3x/2$, so $\rho < x/2$; since $a > 2$, $\rho \geq 2$ (from the first proscribed interval $[x, x + 1]$). So $2 \leq \rho < x/2$; since x is 7 or 8, we can only have $\rho \in \{2, 3\}$.

With $\epsilon = 0$, $x = 7$, and we are left with $y \in \{9, 10\}$. The triples are thus $(3, 7, 9)$ and $(3, 7, 10)$. Modulo 7 and with $t = 2$, we see neither is asymptotically hollow.

With $\epsilon = 1$, we have $x = 8$ and the corresponding triples are $\boxed{(3, 8, 10)}$ and $(3, 8, 11)$. The first is asymptotically hollow, while the other is not (modulo 8, set $t = 2$). •

(D) LEMMA 5.13 The only asymptotically hollow triples with $k \geq 2$ and $a = 2$ are $(2, x, x + 1)$ ($x \geq 4$) and $(2, 5, 9)$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, we can assume that x is odd, so $x = 2k + 1$. Here $x \geq a^2 = 4$, so by Theorem A.1, $y \equiv \pm 1, -2 \pmod{x}$.

First, consider the case that $k \geq 3$; we show no triples exist other than $(2, x, x + 1)$. Here $x \geq 7$. We also have $y < \lceil x/(a - 1) \rceil \cdot x/k = 4k + 4 + 1/k$ by Lemma 5.3(c), so $y \leq 4k + 4 = 2x + 2$. Hence y can only be one of $x + 1, 2x - 2, 2x - 1$, or $2x + 1$. The first yields $\boxed{(2, x, x + 1)}$. We eliminate $2x + 1 \in [2x, 2x + 2]$, a proscriptive interval. The proscriptive interval $[(2 - 1/k)x, (2 - 1/k)(x + 1)]$ contains both $2x - 2$ and $2x - 1$: $(2 - 1/k)x = 2x - 2 - 1/k \leq 2x - 2$, and $(2 - 1/k)(x + 1) = 2x + 2 - 2 - 2/k > 2x - 1$.

$k = a = 2$. We must have $x = 5$, so the triples are of the form $(2, 5, 5 + \rho)$. The proscribed intervals are $[5, 6)$, $[15/2, 9)$, $[10, 12)$, $[25/2, 15)$, and the union of the remaining ones includes $[15, \infty)$. This leaves possible values for y , 6, 7, 9, 12. With $y = 6$, we obtain $\boxed{(2, 5, 6)}$. We also have that $y \equiv \pm 1, -2 \pmod{5}$, eliminating 7 and 12. The only remaining one is $y = 9$, yielding $\boxed{(2, 5, 9)}$. •

(E) LEMMA 5.14 With $k = 1$, the only asymptotically hollow triples are $(2, 2, 3)$, $(2, 3, 4)$, $(2, 3, 5)$, $(2, 3, 8)$, $(3, 4, 6)$, $(3, 5, 7)$, $(3, 5, 8)$, $(4, 6, 9)$, $(4, 7, 10)$, $(5, 8, 12)$ and $(6, 10, 15)$.

Proof. Here $x = a + \delta$.

(i) First, we consider the case wherein $a \geq 3$, and $\delta = a - 1$. The triple is then $(a, 2a - 1, 2a - 1 + \rho)$.

We have $y \leq (2 + 1/(a - 1))x < 5x/2$, so $\rho < 3x/2$. If $\rho \leq x$, then modulo x , we obtain $a + \rho \leq x + 1 = 2a$, so $\rho \leq a$. We can rule out $\rho = 1$ (since $x + 1$ is in a proscriptive interval), so $\rho > 1$ and thus $\rho - 1 > 0$, and

in particular, $a \setminus 2a - 1 + \rho = a \setminus \rho - 1 = \rho - 1$. We thus obtain $a - 1 + \rho - 1 \leq 1 + a$, and so $\rho \leq 3$. This leads to only two possibilities $\rho = 2$ or $\rho = 3$, and the resulting triples are $(a, 2a - 1, 2a + 1)$ and $(a, 2a - 1, 2a + 2)$. Modulo y with $t = 1$, we obtain respectively $a + 2a - 1 \leq 1 + 2a + 1$ and $a + 2a - 1 \leq 2a + 3$, that is, $a \leq 3$ and $a \leq 4$ respectively.

We are thus reduced to the following triples.

$$\rho = 2: \boxed{(3, 5, 7)}, (4, 7, 9).$$

$$\rho = 3: \boxed{(3, 5, 8)}, \boxed{(4, 7, 10)}.$$

We eliminate $(4, 7, 9)$ (modulo 9 and $t = 1$).

(ii) Now suppose that $a \geq 3$, and $\delta \leq a - 2$.

Then $(a + \delta)/(a - 1) \leq 2$, so $y < 2x$. Thus $x + a - 1 \leq y \leq 2x - a + 1$, and the candidate triples are of the form $(a, a + \delta, a + \delta + \rho)$, with $a - 1 \leq \rho \leq x - a + 1 = \delta + 1$. As $\delta \leq a - 2$, we must have $\delta = a - 2$ and $\rho = a - 1$. Hence the triples are of the form $(a, 2a - 2, 3a - 3)$. When $a = 3$, we obtain the known asymptotically hollow triple $\boxed{(3, 4, 6)}$. If $a \geq 4$, then modulo a and with $t = 1$, we have $a - 2 + a - 3 \leq 1 + a$, and thus $a \leq 6$. The resulting three triples (arising from $a = 4, 5, 6$) are all asymptotically hollow,

$$\boxed{(4, 6, 9)}, \boxed{(5, 8, 12)}, \boxed{(6, 10, 15)}.$$

(iii) Finally, suppose $k = 1$ and $a = 2$. We have $x \in \{2, 3\}$.

With $(2, 2, 2 + \rho)$, $\rho = 1$ yields $\boxed{(2, 2, 3)}$. ρ must be odd (as asymptotically hollow triples have content one), and we see that $(2, 2, 2u + 1)$ (with $u > 1$) is not asymptotically hollow: modulo $y = 2u + 1$ and $t = u$, we have $4u \leq 1 + (2u + 1)$, forcing $u \leq 1$, a contradiction.

For $x = 3$ and corresponding triple $(2, 3, 3 + \rho)$, by Lemma 5.3(c), $y < 9$. Also each of $x, 2x, 2x + 1$ is in the union of the proscribed intervals $\mathbf{Z} \cap ([x, x + 1) \cup [2x, 2x + 2a - 2)) = \{3, 6, 7\}$, leaving possible values for y , $\{4, 5, 7, 8\}$. These yield the only candidates

$$\boxed{(2, 3, 4)}, \boxed{(2, 3, 5)}, (2, 3, 7), \boxed{(2, 3, 8)}.$$

The triple $(2, 3, 7)$ is eliminated by taking $t = 2$, modulo 7. •

Appendix

Here we prove a result used in the proof of the $n = 4$ classification theorem (5.1). Let x, r be integers exceeding 1 with $x \geq 2r$. Define

$$S(x, r) := \{z \in \{1, 2, \dots, x\} \mid x \setminus zt \leq x - (r - 1)t \text{ for all } t \leq x/r\}$$

$$S_0(x, r) := \{z \in \{1, 2, \dots, x\} \mid x \setminus zt \leq x - (r - 1)t \text{ for all } t \leq x/r \text{ such that } x \setminus tz \neq x\}$$

We observe that $S(x, r) \subseteq S_0(x, r)$, and $z \notin S_0(x, r)$ if and only if there exists an integer $t \leq x/r$ such that $x > x \setminus tz > x - (r - 1)t$.

THEOREM A.1 Let x and r be integers exceeding 1, with $x \geq r^2$. Then

$$S(x, r) = \begin{cases} \{1, x - r, x - (r - 1)\} & \text{if } r \text{ does not divide } x \\ \{1, x - (r - 1)\} & \text{if } r|x \text{ and, if } r = 2, x \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \\ \{1, \frac{x}{2} - 1, x - 1\} & \text{if } r = 2 \text{ and } x \equiv 0 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

Remark. The necessary and sufficient condition for this result to be true is likely $x \geq r \lceil r/2 \rceil$ (and this is clearly necessary) rather than $x \geq r^2$.

The proof of Theorem A.1 is rather tedious. In all cases, we proceed by eliminating candidate z s from $S = S(x, r)$. There are two general techniques, based on one idea.

LEMMA A.2 (a) If $\gcd\{z, x\} \geq r$, then $z \notin S(x, r)$.

(b) If $r|x$, then the conclusion of Theorem A.1 holds.

Proof. (a) Suppose $a \geq r$ divides both z and x . Then $x/a \leq x/r$ and $z \cdot x/a \equiv 0 \pmod{x}$, and thus ${}_x \setminus (z \cdot x/a) = x$, so $z \notin S(x, r)$.

(b) (i) $r|z$. Follows from (a).

(ii) $r \nmid z$ and $z \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{x}$. Say $z \equiv \delta \pmod{r}$ where $2 \leq \delta \leq r-1$. Set $t = x/r$. Write $z = ur + \delta$. Then $zx/r = (ur + \delta)x/r = ux + \delta x/r \equiv \delta x/r \pmod{x}$. As $\delta > 1$, and with $t = x/r$, we have ${}_x \setminus zt = \delta x/r > x/r = x - (r-1)t$, so that $z \notin S(x, r)$.

(iii) $r \nmid z$ and $z \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{x}$.

So assume $\delta = 1$, and for now, $r > 2$. We try to find a positive integer $w < x/r$, so that $t := x/r - w$ will eliminate z from S .

$x/r < z < x - (r-1)$. There is a smallest positive integer w such that $(w-1)z \leq x/r$ and $wz > x/r$ (if $z > x/r$, $w = 1$). Then $z(x/r - w) \equiv x/r - wz \pmod{x}$, and thus ${}_x \setminus yt = x + x/r - wz$. This will exceed $x - (r-1)t = x - (r-1)(x/r - w)$ if and only if $wz - x/r < (r-1)(x/r - w)$; the latter is equivalent to

$$(1) \quad x > w(z + r - 1)$$

If $z > x/r$, then $w = 1$, so that (1) equivalent to $x > z + r - 1$; thus if $x/r < z < x - (r-1)$, then $z \notin S$. $1 < z < x/r$. We have $r < z + r - 1 < x/r + r - 1 < 2x/r$; since $z + r - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r}$, we have that $z + r - 1 = (u+1)r$ with $u \geq 1$. If $w(y + r - 1) \geq x$, then $x/r \leq w(u+1) < w(z/r) + 2 \leq z/r + x/r^2 + 2 < 2x/r^2 + 2$, that is, $x < 2x/r + 2r$. This is impossible, unless $r = 2$, which requires a special case.

Remaining cases with $r > 2$. If $z > x - (r-1)$ and $z \equiv 1 \pmod{r}$, then as $x \equiv 0 \pmod{r}$, z cannot lie in $\{x - r + 2, \dots, x\}$, and so this case is done. If $z = x/r$, then set $t = r$; as $r \leq x/r$ and ${}_x \setminus x = x$, we thus have $x/r \notin S$. Now the cases $r = 2$, z is odd and less than $x/2$.

The case that $r = 2$, z is odd, and $1 < z < x/2$. We apply the method outlined in the introduction to this appendix; the candidate for t is $\lfloor ((z-1)/2)x/rz \rfloor = \lfloor x(1-1/z)/2 \rfloor$, and we wish to verify that $z-1 < (r-1)t$. Since both sides are integers, this is equivalent to $z \leq (r-1)t$. As $t > x(1-1/z)/2 - 1$, it is sufficient to show $z \leq (r-1)(x(1-1/z)/2 - 1)$. This translates to a quadratic inequality in z ,

$$z \left(z - \left(\frac{x}{2} - 1 \right) \right) + \frac{x}{2} \leq 0.$$

The set of real values of z for which this holds is a closed interval. At $z = 2$, the value of the quadratic is $-2(\frac{x}{2} - 3) + \frac{x}{2} = -\frac{x}{2} + 6$; this is less than or equal zero when $x \geq 12$. At $z = x/2 - 3$, we obtain $(x/2 - 3)2 + x/2$, which is not positive when $x \geq 12$. Thus $[2, x/2 - 3] \cap S(x, 2) = \emptyset$. At this point, we notice that if 4 divides x , then $x/2 - 2$ is even, so the largest value we have to consider for z is $x/2 - 3$, and this completes the proof of the result in the case that $r = 2$ and $4|x$.

Now suppose that $x \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, so we want to conclude that $z = x/2 - 2 \in S(x, 2)$ (this will complete the proof for this case, since $x/2 - 1$ is even). Set $t = x/2 - 2$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} zt &= \left(\frac{x-4}{2} \right)^2 = \frac{x^2 - 8x + 16}{4} \\ &= x \frac{x-6}{4} + 4 - \frac{x}{2} \\ &\equiv \frac{x}{2} + 4 \pmod{x} \quad \text{since } x \equiv 2 \pmod{4}; \text{ so} \\ {}_x \setminus zt &= \frac{x}{2} + 4 \quad \text{if } x \geq 8. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $x - t = x - (x/2 - 2) = x/2 + 2 < x/2 + 4$, so $x/2 - 2 \notin S(x, 2)$. •

From now on, we deal with the case that r does not divide x . We have an easy lemma of occasional use.

LEMMA A.3 With $t = \lfloor x/z \rfloor$, sufficient for ${}_x \setminus tz > x - (r-1)t$ is that $\lfloor x/z \rfloor (r-1)$ exceed the remainder of x modulo z .

Proof. Write $x = kz + \eta$ where $0 \leq \eta < z$; we can exclude the case that $\eta = 0$ by Lemma A.2(a); and $x > z$, so $k \geq 1$. Then $x - (r-1)t = (kz + \eta) - (r-1)k = k(z - r + 1) + \eta$. On the other hand, $tz = kz < x$, so ${}_x \setminus tz = tz$. Then the inequality holds if (and only if) $kz > k(z - r + 1) + \eta$, that is, $k(r-1) > \eta$.

LEMMA A.4 Suppose that r does not divide x .

(a) $S_0(x, r) \cap [2, r] = \emptyset$.

(b) $S_0(x, r) \cap [2, 3r/2] = \emptyset$.

Proof. (a) Write $x = vr + \delta$ where $1 \leq \delta < r$. Set $t = v = \lfloor x/r \rfloor$. Then $tz \leq tr < x < (r+1)t$. In particular, $_{x \setminus} tz = tz$. On the other hand, $x - (r-1)t = v + \delta$. As $x > r^2$, we have $v \geq r$. Finally, $tz \geq 2v \geq v + r > v + \delta = x - (r-1)t$.

In view of (a), if $r = 2$, it is sufficient to show that $3 \notin S(x, 2)$; then $t = \lfloor x/3 \rfloor$ will work, as is easy to see from Lemma A.3 above. If $r = 3$, we need only show $4 \notin S(x, 3)$, and here again, $t = \lfloor x/4 \rfloor$ will do. If $r = 4$, only $5, 6 \notin S(x, 4)$ is required; but $x \geq 17$ entails $\lfloor x/6 \rfloor \geq 2$, and with respect to Lemma above, $\eta < 6$ and $r = 4$.

So we can assume $r \geq 5$. On the interval $r \leq z \leq 3r/2$, the corresponding ε varies from 0 to at most $\lfloor r/2 \rfloor$, and the ratio ε/z is bounded above by $1/3$. This yields (in (2)), $t \geq \lfloor 2x/3r \rfloor > 2x/3r - 1$. As $x/r > r$, we obtain $2x/3r - 1 > 2r/3 - 1$. Hence $(r-1)t > (2r/3 - 1)(r-1)$. As $z \leq 3r/2$, it suffices to verify $3r/2 \leq (2r/3 - 1)(r-1)$. The quadratic $2r^2/3 - r(3/2 + 2/3 + 1) + 1$ is positive for $r \geq 5$. •

Now we have a reflection principle, but only for $S_0(x, r)$.

LEMMA A.5 Suppose that $z \leq x - r$ and $z \notin S(x, r)$. Then $x - (r-1) - z \notin S_0(x, r)$. In addition, if $(x, z) = 1$, then $z \notin S(x, r)$ entails $z \notin S_0(x, r)$.

Proof. There exist nonnegative integers t and b with $t \leq x/r$ such that $x > tz - bx > x - t(r-1)$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} t(x - z - (r-1)) &= tx - tz - t(r-1) \\ &> tx - (b+1)x - t(r-1) \quad \text{so} \\ t(x - z - (r-1)) - (t - b - 2)x &> x - t(r-1); \quad \text{moreover,} \\ t(x - z - (r-1)) &= tx - tz - t(r-1) \\ &< tx - bx - x + t(r-1) - t(r-1), \quad \text{and thus,} \\ t(x - z - (r-1)) - (t - b - 2) &< x. \end{aligned}$$

If $x = tz - bx$, that is, $tz = (b+1)x$, since $(z, x = 1)$, we have z divides $b+1$. But $t \leq x/r$ entails $z \geq (b+1)x/r > (b+1)$, a contradiction. •

The following easy special cases will reduce the number of cases to be dealt with later.

LEMMA A.6 (a) If $x \geq 7$, then $[(x+3)/2 - r, (x - (r-1))/2] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$.

(d) If $x - r + 2 \leq z \leq x$, then $z \notin S(x, r)$.

(e) ($r = 2$). Let x be an odd integer exceeding 20, and let $p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. Then $(x-p)/2 \notin S(x, 2)$.

(f) Suppose $x \geq r^2$ and $1 \leq z \leq r$ is an integer of the form $z = kr + l$ where k and l are nonnegative integers such that $z = kr + l$. If $k + 2 \leq l \leq r$, then $z \notin S(x, r)$.

(g) Suppose that $x \geq 10$. Let $z = r + \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \in \{1, 2\}$. Then $z \notin S(x, r)$.

Proof. (a) Set $t = 2$ and let $z = (x-a)/2$. Then $_{x \setminus} tz = x - a$ where $a \in [r-1, 2r-3]$, whereas $x - (r-1)t = x - 2(r-1)$. Then $a < 2(r-1)$ is sufficient for $z \notin S_0(x, r)$.

(d) Set $t = 1$.

(e) Set $k = \lceil x/p \rceil$, and let $s = kp - x$; obviously, $0 \leq s \leq p-1$. Then $k(x-p)/2 = (k-1)x/2 - s/2$.

If k is odd, set $t = k$. Then $_{x \setminus} t(x-p)/2 = x - s/2$. Then $s/2 < t = (x+s)/p$ provided $s(p/2 - 1) < x$. This is implied by $(p-1)(p/2 - 1) < x$. The biggest value attainable for the left side is 15, so $x \geq 17$ is sufficient. Obviously $t \leq x/p + 1$, and this is bounded above by $x/2$ (as ≥ 3 and $x > 19$).

Now suppose that k is even. Set $t = k + 1$, so that $tp = x + p + s$. Then $t(x-p)/2 = tx/2 - tp/2 = (t-1)x/2 - s/2 - p/2$. Since $k = t-1$ is even, $_{x \setminus} t(x-p)/2 = x - (p+s)/2$. Also $t \leq x/2$ is implied by $x/p + 2 - 1/p < x/2$, that is, $(p-2)x > 4p - 2$, and this is true for $x \geq 11$. So it remains to determine when $(p+s)/2 < t$. This boils down to $x > p(p+s-2)/2 - s$.

Worst case occurs when $p = 7$ and $s = 6$, so that $x > 6(13)/2 - 6 = 33$ is sufficient. This leaves the values $x = 33, 31, 29, \dots, 21$. When $p = 7$, $k = \lceil x/p \rceil$, and this is odd for $x = 33, 31, 29$. For $x = 27$, we have $k = 4$, $s = 1$, and $t = 5$; $p(p+s-2)/2 - s = 7 \cdot 6/21 - 2 = 19 < 27$. If $x = 25$, $s = 3$ and

$p(p+s-2)/2-s = 7 \cdot 8/2 - 2 = 24 < 25$. When $x = 23$, $s = 5$. Here $(x-p)/2 = 8$; here we take $t = 8 \leq 11$ instead. When $x = 21$, here $z = 7$, and we just take $t = 3$.

When $p = 5$, $x > 5 \cdot 7/2 - 4 < 14$ and there is no problem (nor for $p = 3$).

(f) Set $t = \lfloor x/r \rfloor$, that is, $t = (x-\delta)/r$ where $0 \leq \delta \leq r-1$. Then $tz = kx - k\delta + l(x-\delta)/r$. Modulo x , this is equivalent to $u := l(x-\delta)/r - k\delta$. Obviously $u \leq x$; we claim that $u > x - (r-1)t$ (which also entails, in this case, that $u = x \setminus tz$).

The inequality $u > x - (r-1)t$ is equivalent to

$$x > \delta \left(1 + \frac{(k+1)r}{l-1} \right).$$

But the right side is bounded above by $(r-1)(1+r) = r^2 - 1$, and the result follows.

(g) Set $t = \lfloor x/z \rfloor = (x-\phi)/z$. Then $t \leq x/r$ and $tz = x - \phi$, and thus $x \setminus tz = x - \phi$. So it suffices to show that $\phi < (r-1)t$. This is equivalent to

$$\phi < \frac{r-1}{r+\epsilon}(x-\phi);$$

this is in turn equivalent to $(r-1)x > (\epsilon+1)\phi$. Since $\phi \leq r + \epsilon - 1$, sufficient is $x > 3(r + \epsilon - 1)/(r-1)$. The right side is at most 9, and we are done. •

COROLLARY A.7 Suppose $x \geq r^2 \vee 10$. Then $\{2, 3, \dots, 2r\} \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$.

Proof. For $2 \leq z \leq r$, the result follows from Lemma A.6(f) with $k = 0$; for $r+3 \leq z \leq 2r$, it follows when $k = 1$. Finally, for $z = r+1$ or $r+2$, it follows from Lemma A.6(g). •

LEMMA A.8 Suppose $x \geq r^2 + 1$. Set $f(z) = z^2 - (r-1)\left(\frac{x}{r} - 1\right)z + (r-1)x$. If $f(z) \leq 0$, then $z \notin S_0(x, r)$.

Proof. Given the integer z in $[r+4, x-2r]$, we wish to find integers $a = t$ and b such that the following hold:

- (i) $x > az - bx > x - (r-1)a$;
- (ii) $1 \leq a \leq x/r$.

Equation (i) can be rewritten as

$$(3) \quad \frac{(b+1)x}{z} > a > \frac{(b+1)x}{z+r-1}$$

The open interval $I := ((b+1)x/(z+r-1), (b+1)x/z)$ will contain an integer if its length exceeds one; so we will require the following inequality to be satisfied by b :

$$(b+1)x(r-1) > z(z+r-1).$$

If this holds, we will choose any integer $a \in I$. To guarantee that the resulting choice satisfies (ii), we also impose the condition that $(b+1)/z \leq 1/r$ (from (3), this will imply $a \leq x/r$). So we are looking for the positive integer $b+1$ to be in the interval

$$(3') \quad \frac{z(z+r-1)}{x(r-1)} < b+1 \leq \frac{z}{r}$$

To find such b , it is sufficient that $z \geq r$ (we only require $b \geq 0$) and the interval has length at least 1. The length of the interval is $z/r - (z/x)(z+r-1)/(r-1)$, and for this to be at least 1 is equivalent to the inequality,

$$f(z) := z^2 - (r-1)\left(\frac{x}{r} - 1\right)z + (r-1)x \leq 0$$
•

Here z is allowed to vary over $(r, x]$; viewing z as a real variable, the set of z at which this quadratic is non-positive is a closed interval.

LEMMA A.9 Suppose that $x \geq (r^2 + 1) \vee (10r - 8)$, and $r > 3$. If $x \geq 5r$, then $f(2r + 1) \leq 0$; if $x \geq 10r - 8$ and $r \geq 4$, then $f(x/2 + 1 - r) \leq 0$.

Proof. Recall that $rf(z) = rz^2 - (r - 1)(x - r)z + r(r - 1)x$. Since the set of $z \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $f(z) < 0$ is a (possibly empty) open interval, it suffices to show that $rf((x + 2)/2 - r) < 0$ and $rf(2r + 1) < 0$.

To show $rf((x + 2)/2 - r) < 0$, we observe that $\frac{\partial(rf)}{\partial x} = -(r - 1)z + r(r - 1) = -(r - 1)(z - r)$, and so rf is decreasing as a function of x (keeping z fixed, but at least $r + 1$), and thus it suffices to evaluate rf at $z = (10r - 8)/2 + 1 - r = 4r - 3$.

$$\begin{aligned} rf(4r - 3)|_{x=10r-8} &= r(4r - 3)^2 - (r - 1)(9r - 8)(4r - 3) + r(r - 1)(10r - 8) \\ &= -10r^3 + 53r^2 - 66r + 24 \end{aligned}$$

This is obviously negative for $r \geq 6$, but by direct computation, we also see it is negative if $r = 4$ or 5 .

Next, $4rf(2r + 1) = -8r(r - 1)x + 4r(6r^2 + 3r + 2)$. This is negative if $x > (6r^2 + 3r + 2)/2(r - 1) = 3r + 3 + 4/(r - 1)$, and this is true if $x \geq 5r$ and $r > 2$. \bullet

Proof of theorem A.1, completed. We may assume $(x, r) = 1$. By Lemma A.6(d) and (c), we need only show $S(x, r) \cap [r + 1, x - r] = \emptyset$. By A.6(e) and Lemma A.7, it is sufficient (assuming $x \geq r^2 \vee 10$) that $S(x, r) \cap [2r + 1, x/2 + 1 - r] = \emptyset$.

The set of $z \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $f(z) \leq 0$ (with x and r fixed) is (possibly empty) closed interval. Thus by Lemmas A.11 and A.8, if $x \geq 10r - 8$ and $r \neq 2, 3$, then $S(x, r) \cap [2r + 1, x/2 + 1 - r] = \emptyset$, and we are done in this case.

Next, we observe that $x/2 + 1 - r \leq 2r$ if and only if $x \leq 6r - 2$. By Corollary A.7, the Theorem follows here.

Hence we are reduced to the following situations, with $(x, r) = 1$ and $x \geq r^2 + 1$:

- (i) $r = 2$;
- (ii) $r = 3$;
- (iii) $r \geq 4$ and $6r - 1 \leq x \leq 10r - 8$.

If $r \geq 9$, then $r^2 + 1 > 10r - 8$, so we are done.

(i) *When $r = 2$,* we have that x is odd, and by direct calculation, we can assume that $x \geq 21$. By Lemma A.6(f), it suffices to show $S(x, 2) \cap [2r + 1, (x - 9)/2] = \emptyset$; for this, it suffices to show f (or rf) is negative at the two endpoints; $f(5) = 25 - 5(x - 2) + 2x = -3x + 35$, so $x \geq 13$ is sufficient, and $4f((x - 9)/2) = -3x + 63$, which is non-positive, as $x \geq 23$.

(ii) *Now suppose that $r = 3$,* and $(x, 3) = 1$; by calculation, we may assume $x \geq 31$. Then $rf(x/2 + 1 - r) = 3f((x - 5)/2)$, and this evaluates to $(-x^2 + 22x + 15)/4$; this is negative, as $x \geq 23$. On the other hand, $f(2r + 1) = f(7) = 49 + 14 - 8x/3$, and this is non-positive if $x \geq 189/8 = 23^5/8$, that is, $x \geq 24$ (since $(x, 3) = 1$, $x \geq 25$). We are left with just the case that $x = 23$. Here $x/2 + 1 - r = 19/2$; hence we need only check that $\{7, 8, 9\} \cap S(23, 3) = \emptyset$, which is easy: for $z = 7$, set $t = 3$; for $z = 8$, set $t = 5$; and for $z = 9$, set $t = 5$.

(iii) *Subcase (a) $6r + 5 \leq x \leq 8r - 2$ for $r \geq 5$, and $6r + 6 \leq x \leq 8r - 2$ if $r = 4$.* We have $f(2r + 1) \leq 0$ if $x \geq 5r$, and a direct computation yields $f(2r + 3) \leq 0$ if $x \geq 6r + 1 + (22r + 3)/(r^2 + 2r - 3) := x_0(r)$. The values of $\lceil x_0(r) \rceil$ for $r = 4, \dots, 8$ are respectively, $(30, 35, 40, 46, 52) = \{6r + 6, 6r + 5, 6r + 5, 6r + 5, 6r + 5, 6r + 4\}$. Thus if $6r + 5 \leq x$ for $r \geq 5$ or $x \geq 30$ if $r = 4$, we have that f is nonnegative on the interval $[2r + 1, 2r + 3]$, and so $[2r + 1, 2r + 3] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$. By A.6(d), we have $[2, \dots, 3r] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$ (this requires $r \geq 4$). We will be done with this case if $3r \geq x/2 + 1 - r$, that is, $x \leq 8r - 2$, and thus with the situation that $6r + 5 \leq x \leq 8r - 2$ and $r \geq 5$ or $x = 30$ and $r = 4$.

Subcase (b) $6r - 1 \leq x \leq 6r + 4$ for $r \geq 5$ and $23 \leq x \leq 29$ for $r = 4$. We will show that $[2r + 1, 2r + 3] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$ again in this case, yielding validity of the theorem for $6r - 1 \leq x \leq 8r - 2$. This is by direct computation.

($r = 4$). For $z = 9, 10, 11$ and $x = 23, 25, 26, 27, 29$ (24 and 28 are excluded as $r|x$, and this was already done), the corresponding choices for t will work: for $z = 9$, they are $t = 2, 5, 5, 5, 3$, respectively; for $z = 10$, we take $t = 2, 4, 5, 5, 5$; and for $z = 11$, we choose $t = 2, 4, 5, 5, 5$ again.

($r = 5$). For $z = 11, 12, 13$ and $x = 29, 31, 32, 33, 34$ (30 is excluded as $r|x$), the corresponding choices for t will work: for $z = 11$, set $t = 5$ (all for each of the five values of x); $z = 12$, we take $t = 4, 5, 5, 5, 5$; and for $z = 13$, we choose $t = 2, 2, 2, 2, 8$.

($r = 6$). For $z = 13, 14, 15$ and $x = 37, 38, 39, 40$ (we are assuming $x \geq r^2$, and r does not divide x), the corresponding choices for t will work: for each of the three values of z and the four values of x , except (15, 37), we take $t = 5$; if $z = 15$ and $x = 37$, set $t = 4$.

For $r \geq 7$, $6r + 4$ falls below the threshold $x \geq r^2 + 1$ and there is nothing to do.

Subcase (c) $8r - 1 \leq x \leq 10r - 9$. Assume this. From (b) above, as $8r - 1 \geq 6r + 5$, we have that $\{2r + 1, 2r + 2, 2r + 3\} \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$, hence $\{2, \dots, 3r\} \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$. Now we show that $\{3r + 1, 3r + 2, 3r + 3\}$.

If $r = 4$, then $x = 31$, and $z = 13, 14, 15$, then $t = 2$ will work. Now $15 \geq x/2 + 1 - 4$ is implied by $x \leq 34$, and we are done.

If $r \geq 5$, we show that $f(3r + a) \leq 0$ when $a = 1$ and $a = 4$; this will entail f is nonpositive on $[3r + 1, 3r + 4]$, and thus $[3r + 1, 3r + 4] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$. This will imply $[2, \dots, 4r] \cap S_0(x, r) = \emptyset$, and sufficient for $4r \geq x/2 + 1 - r$ is $x \leq 10r - 2$, and the latter exceeds $10r - 9$, completing the proof.

An elementary computation yields that $f(3r + a) \leq 0$ iff

$$x \geq 6r + \frac{a + 9}{2} + \frac{\left(\frac{a^2}{2} + \frac{7}{2}a + 9\right)r - a(a + 9)}{2r^2 + (a - 2)r - a}.$$

For $a = 1$, the respective values of the ceiling of the right side for $r = 5, 6, 7, 8$ are 37, 43, 48, 54, each of which is less than $8r - 1$. For $a = 4$, the respective values are 39, 45, 51, 57, each of which is bounded above by $8r - 1$. Hence f is nonpositive on $[3r + 1, 3r + 4]$, and we are done. •

References

- [ALPPT] A Atanasov, C Lopez, A Perry, N Proudfoot, M Thaddeus, *Resolving toric varieties with Nash blow-ups*, Experimental Mathematics 20 (2011) 288–303.
- [B] A Borisov, *On classification of toric singularities*, J Math Sci NY 94 (1999) 1111–1113.
- [B2] ———, *Quotient singularities, integer ratios of factorials, and the Riemann Hypothesis*,
- [H] D Handelman, *Invariants for critical dimension groups and permutation-Hermite equivalence*, Münster J of Math, 11 (2018) 49–156.
- [IS] O Iglesias-Valio and F Santos, *Classification of empty lattice 4-simplices of width larger than two*,
- [MMM] S Mori, DR Morrison, and I Morrison, *On four-dimensional terminal quotient singularities*, Math Comput 51 (1988) 769–786.
- [PR] V Powers and B Reznick, *A note on mediated simplices*, J Pure and App algebra, 225 (2021)
- [R] JE Reeve, *On the volume of lattice polyhedra*, Proc London Math Soc 7 (1957) 378–395
- [W] GH White, *Lattice tetrahedra*, Can J Math (1964) 389–396.

Mathematics Department, University of Ottawa, Ottawa ON K1N 6N5, Canada; dehsg@uottawa.ca