Completeness of Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

Elżbieta Bołdyriew (eboldyriew@colgate.edu)
John Haviland (havijw@umich.edu)
Phuc Lam (plam6@u.rochester.edu)
John Lentfer (jlentfer@hmc.edu)
Fernando Trejos Suárez (fernando.trejos@yale.edu)

Joint work with Steven J. Miller

The Nineteenth International Conference on Fibonacci Numbers and Their Applications
07/21/2020

Introduction

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq1}$ of positive integers is a **Positive Linear Recurrence Sequence (PLRS)** if the following properties hold:

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ of positive integers is a **Positive Linear Recurrence Sequence (PLRS)** if the following properties hold:

- (Recurrence relation) There are non-negative integers $L, c_1, \dots, c_L$ such that
$$H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n+1-L}$$
with L, c_1, c_L positive.

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ of positive integers is a **Positive Linear Recurrence Sequence (PLRS)** if the following properties hold:

- (Recurrence relation) There are non-negative integers $L, c_1, \ldots, c_L$ such that
$$H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n+1-L}$$
with L, c_1, c_L positive.
- (Initial conditions) $H_1 = 1$, and for $1 \leq n < L$,
$$H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_n H_1 + 1$$

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

- We write $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ for $H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n-L+1}$.

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

- We write $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ for $H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n-L+1}$.
- For example, for the Fibonacci numbers, we write $[1, 1]$. This definition gives initial conditions $F_1 = 1,\ F_2 = 2$.

Positive Linear Recurrence Sequences

- We write $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ for $H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n-L+1}$.
- For example, for the Fibonacci numbers, we write $[1, 1]$. This definition gives initial conditions $F_1 = 1,\ F_2 = 2$.
- Despite satisfying positive linear recurrences, the Lucas and Pell numbers are not PLRS, since their initial conditions do not meet the definition.

Introduction to Completeness

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is called **complete** if every positive integer is a sum of its terms, using each term at most once.

Introduction to Completeness

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is called **complete** if every positive integer is a sum of its terms, using each term at most once.

- The sequence with the recurrence $[1, 3]$ is *not* complete. Its terms are $\{1, 2, 5, 11, \dots\}$; you cannot get 4 or 9 as the sequence grows too quickly.

Introduction to Completeness

Definition

A sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is called **complete** if every positive integer is a sum of its terms, using each term at most once.

- The sequence with the recurrence $[1, 3]$ is *not* complete. Its terms are $\{1, 2, 5, 11, \dots\}$; you cannot get 4 or 9 as the sequence grows too quickly.
- The Fibonacci sequence $F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1}$, with initial conditions $F_1 = 1$, $F_2 = 2$, is complete (follows from Zeckendorf's Theorem).

The Doubling Sequence

The PLRS [2], which has the recurrence $H_{n+1} = 2H_n$, has terms $H_n = 2^{n-1}$ and is complete because every integer has a binary representation.

The Doubling Sequence

The PLRS [2], which has the recurrence $H_{n+1} = 2H_n$, has terms $H_n = 2^{n-1}$ and is complete because every integer has a binary representation.

Theorem (Brown)

The complete sequence with maximal terms is $H_n = 2^{n-1}$.

The Doubling Sequence

The PLRS [2], which has the recurrence $H_{n+1} = 2H_n$, has terms $H_n = 2^{n-1}$ and is complete because every integer has a binary representation.

Theorem (Brown)

The complete sequence with maximal terms is $H_n = 2^{n-1}$.

Any PLRS of the form $[1, \ldots, 1, 2]$ has the same terms as [2], i.e., $H_n = 2^{n-1}$.

Brown's Criterion

Theorem (Brown)

A nondecreasing sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is complete if and only if $H_1 = 1$ and for every $n \geq 1$,

$$H_{n+1} \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i.$$

Brown's Criterion

Theorem (Brown)

A nondecreasing sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is complete if and only if $H_1 = 1$ and for every $n \geq 1$,

$$H_{n+1} \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i.$$

Can we bound where a sequence must fail Brown's Criterion?

Brown's Criterion

Theorem (Brown)

A nondecreasing sequence $\{H_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is complete if and only if $H_1 = 1$ and for every $n \geq 1$,

$$H_{n+1} \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i.$$

Can we bound where a sequence must fail Brown's Criterion? We think so!

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

If a PLRS $H_{n+1} = c_1 H_n + \cdots + c_L H_{n+1-L}$ incomplete, then it fails Brown's criterion before the $2L$-th term.

Families of Sequences

Analyzing Families of Sequences

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

1. $[1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, N]$, *is complete if and only if*
$$N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(k+2)(k+3)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor .$$
2. $[1, 1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, N]$, *is complete if and only if*
$$N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{F_{k+6} - (k+5)}{4} \right\rfloor ,$$

where F_k is the kth Fibonacci number.

Proof Sketch

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

1. $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, N]$, *with* k *zeros, is complete if and only if* $N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(k+2)(k+3)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

Partial Proof. We sketch that if $N_{\max} = \left\lfloor \frac{(k+2)(k+3)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$, then the sequence is complete. It is similar for $N < N_{\max}$.

Proof Sketch

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

1. $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, N]$, *with* k *zeros, is complete if and only if* $N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(k+2)(k+3)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

Partial Proof. We sketch that if $N_{\max} = \left\lfloor \frac{(k+2)(k+3)}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$, then the sequence is complete. It is similar for $N < N_{\max}$. With the recurrence relation and Brown's Criterion,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{n+1} &= H_n + N_{\max} H_{n-k-1} \\ &\leq H_n + (N_{\max} - 1) H_{n-k-1} + H_{n-k-2} + \cdots + H_1 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

By induction, $(N_{\max} - 1) H_{n-k-1} \leq H_{n-1} + \cdots + H_{n-k-1}$, so

$$\leq H_n + \cdots + H_1 + 1.$$

Example for $L = 6$

By the previous theorem, $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.

Example for $L = 6$

By the previous theorem, $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.

Question

Does there exist a complete PLRS of length $L = 6$ with $N > 11$?

Example for $L = 6$

Here are the maximal last terms for preserving completeness for several other sequences of length $L = 6$:

Example for $L = 6$

Here are the maximal last terms for preserving completeness for several other sequences of length $L = 6$:

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 1, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 12$.
- $[1, 0, 0, 1, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 1, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 10$.

Example for $L = 6$

Here are the maximal last terms for preserving completeness for several other sequences of length $L = 6$:

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 1, 0, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 12$.
- $[1, 0, 0, 1, 0, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 11$.
- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 1, N]$ is complete for $N \leq 10$.

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

Example for $L = 6$

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

Example for $L = 6$

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 42, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 11, 16, 22, 40, \dots\}$

Example for $L = 6$

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 42, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 11, 16, 22, 40, \dots\}$
- $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 12, 29, 61, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 12, 20, 32, 61, \dots\}$

Example for $L = 6$

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 42, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 11, 16, 22, 40, \dots\}$
- $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 12, 29, 61, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 12, 20, 32, 61, \dots\}$
- $[1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 4, 8, 15, 28, 63, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 8, 16, 31, 59, \dots\}$

Example for $L = 6$

Why is $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ complete, but $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ is not complete?

- $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 42, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 11, 16, 22, 40, \dots\}$
- $[1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 12, 29, 61, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 7, 12, 20, 32, 61, \dots\}$
- $[1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 12]$ has terms $\{1, 2, 4, 8, 15, 28, 63, \dots\}$ and so computing the sums $\sum_{i=1}^{n} H_i + 1$ we see $\{2, 4, 8, 16, 31, 59, \dots\}$

Sequences of Initial Ones

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

If a sequence $[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m},\underbrace{0,\dots,0}_{k},N]$ *is complete with* $m \geq 3$*, then*

$$N \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{k+1}F_i^{(m)}+\sum_{i=1}^{k+1-m}F_i^{(m)}+\cdots+\sum_{i=1}^{(k+1) \bmod m}F_i^{(m)}\right)$$

where $F_i^{(m)}$ *is the m-bonacci sequence,* $[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m}]$.

Theorem on Adding Ones

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

- *For* $L \geq 6$*, consider the sequence* $\{H_n\}$ *given by* $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, M]$*. Then, if* M *is maximal such that* $\{H_n\}$ *is complete, and* N *is maximal such that* $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, N]$ *is complete, we have* $M \geq N$*.*
- *For a fixed length* L*, the sequence* $[1, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k}, \underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{m}, N]$ *with* m *ones has a lower bound on* N *than the sequence* $[1, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1}, \underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{m+1}, N]$*.*

  In particular, if $m < \frac{L}{2}$*, the bound is precisely*

$$N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(L-m)(L+m+1)}{4} + \frac{1}{48}m(m+1)(m+2)(m+3) + \frac{1-2m}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Modifying Sequences

Modifying Coefficients of a PLRS

When studying a PLRS, what modifications to the recurrence coefficients preserve completeness or incompleteness?

Modifying Coefficients of a PLRS

When studying a PLRS, what modifications to the recurrence coefficients preserve completeness or incompleteness?

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

- *If a sequence* $[c_1, \dots, c_{L-1}, c_L]$ *is complete, then so is* $[c_1, \dots, c_{L-1}, d_L]$ *for any* $d_L \leq c_L$.
  Remark. This is not true for c_i *in any position.*
- *If a sequence* $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, c_L]$ *is complete and* $c_L = 2^{k+1} - 1$, $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, c_L + j]$ *is incomplete for any positive integer* j.

Modifying Lengths of a PLRS

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

- *If a sequence* $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ *is incomplete, then so is* $[c_1, \dots, c_{L-1} + c_L]$.
- *If a sequence* $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ *is incomplete, then so is* $[c_1, \dots, c_L, c_{L+1}]$ *for any* $c_{L+1} > 0$.

Modifying Lengths of a PLRS

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

- *If a sequence* $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ *is incomplete, then so is* $[c_1, \dots, c_{L-1} + c_L]$.
- *If a sequence* $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$ *is incomplete, then so is* $[c_1, \dots, c_L, c_{L+1}]$ *for any* $c_{L+1} > 0$.

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

If a sequence $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, c_L]$ *is complete, then so is* $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m+j}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k}, c_L]$ *for any positive integer* j.

Principal Roots

Principal Roots

Theorem (Binet's Formula)

If $r_1, \dots, r_k$ are the distinct roots of the characteristic polynomial of a PLRS $\{H_n\}$, then there exist polynomials $q_1, \dots, q_k$ such that $H_n = q_1(n)r_1^n + \cdots + q_k(n)r_k^n$.

Principal Roots

Theorem (Binet's Formula)

If $r_1, \ldots, r_k$ are the distinct roots of the characteristic polynomial of a PLRS $\{H_n\}$, then there exist polynomials $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ such that $H_n = q_1(n)r_1^n + \cdots + q_k(n)r_k^n$.

For PLRS, the characteristic polynomial has a unique positive root r_1 which is the largest in absolute value, called the *principal root.*

Principal Roots

Theorem (Binet's Formula)

If $r_1, \ldots, r_k$ are the distinct roots of the characteristic polynomial of a PLRS $\{H_n\}$, then there exist polynomials $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ such that $H_n = q_1(n)r_1^n + \cdots + q_k(n)r_k^n$.

For PLRS, the characteristic polynomial has a unique positive root r_1 which is the largest in absolute value, called the *principal root.*

Theorem (SMALL 2020)

If H_n is a complete PLRS and r_1 is its principal root, then $r_1 \leq 2$.

Bounding Principal Roots

- If a sequence is complete, $r_1 \leq 2$.

Bounding Principal Roots

- If a sequence is complete, $r_1 \leq 2$.
- There exists a second bound $1 < B_L < 2$ on the principal roots, so that if a sequence is incomplete, the its principal root r_1 satisfies $r_1 \geq B_L$. This bound is dependent on the length of the generating sequence $[c_1, \dots, c_L]$. We conjecture the following:

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \dots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

Bounding Principal Roots

- If a sequence is complete, $r_1 \leq 2$.
- There exists a second bound $1 < B_L < 2$ on the principal roots, so that if a sequence is incomplete, the its principal root r_1 satisfies $r_1 \geq B_L$. This bound is dependent on the length of the generating sequence $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$. We conjecture the following:

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

- If this holds, then for large L, we would have $B_L \approx (L/2)^{2/L}$. In particular, $\lim_{L\to\infty} B_L = 1$.

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

Suppose $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is an incomplete sequence.

Case 1: $\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \geq 2 + \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil$

We combine the following two invariant arguments:

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

Suppose $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is an incomplete sequence.

Case 1: $\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \geq 2 + \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil$

We combine the following two invariant arguments:

- The principal root of $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is strictly greater than that of $[c_1, \ldots, c_k - 1, \ldots, c_L + 1]$, for any k.

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil + 1]$.

Suppose $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is an incomplete sequence.

Case 1: $\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \geq 2 + \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil$

We combine the following two invariant arguments:

- The principal root of $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is strictly greater than that of $[c_1, \ldots, c_k - 1, \ldots, c_L + 1]$, for any k.
- The principal root of $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, S]$ is strictly greater than that of $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, S - 1]$.

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Conjecture (SMALL 2020)

For any given L, the incomplete sequence of length L with the lowest principal root is $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \rceil + 1]$.

Suppose $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is an incomplete sequence.

Case 1: $\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \geq 2 + \lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \rceil$

We combine the following two invariant arguments:

- The principal root of $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ is strictly greater than that of $[c_1, \ldots, c_k - 1, \ldots, c_L + 1]$, for any k.
- The principal root of $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, S]$ is strictly greater than that of $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, S - 1]$.

Combining these two, any sequence with large sum can be "reduced" to $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \rceil + 1]$.

Root-Bounding Proof Sketch

Case 2: $\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \leq 1 + \left\lceil \frac{L(L+1)}{4} \right\rceil$

It can be shown any "counterexample" would fulfill:

- $\forall 1 \leq k \leq L+1$,

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k} c_i \leq \left\lceil \frac{k(k+1)}{4} \right\rceil .$$

- $\sum_{i=2}^{L} c_i \left(\lambda_{L+1}^{L+1-i} - \lambda_L^{L-i}\right) < \frac{L+2}{2}$, where λ_L is the root of $[1, 0, \ldots, 0, \lceil L(L+1)/4 \rceil + 1$.

This forces the coefficients of $[c_1, \ldots, c_L]$ to be small enough to force a contradiction; for example, an analytical argument shows the first 32.5% or so must be 0.

Future Directions

Future Directions

- Extend analysis of the bound of N in $[\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{m}, 0, \ldots, 0, N]$, which involves the m-bonacci numbers, defined by $[\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{m}]$.

Future Directions

- Extend analysis of the bound of N in $[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m},0,\dots,0,N]$, which involves the m-bonacci numbers, defined by $[\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m}]$.
- Find the bound N for arbitrary coefficients $c_2,\dots,c_{L-1}$ in $[1,c_2,\dots,c_{L-1},N]$.

Future Directions

- Extend analysis of the bound of N in $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m}, 0, \dots, 0, N]$, which involves the m-bonacci numbers, defined by $[\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m}]$.
- Find the bound N for arbitrary coefficients $c_2, \dots, c_{L-1}$ in $[1, c_2, \dots, c_{L-1}, N]$.
- Prove the conjectures made in this presentation.

Bibliography

- Thomas C. Martinez, Steven J. Miller, Clay Mizgerd, and Chenyang Sun. Generalizing Zeckendorf's Theorem to Homogeneous Linear Recurrences, 2020
- Olivia Beckwith, Amanda Bower, Louis Gaudet, Rachel Insoft, Shiyu Li, Steven J. Miller, and Philip Tosteson. The Average Gap Distribution for Generalized Zeckendorf Decompositions, Dec 2012.
- J. L. Brown. Note on complete sequences of integers. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 68(6):557, 1961.

Acknowledgements

- Thank you. Any questions?
- This research was conducted as part of the 2020 SMALL REU program at Williams College. This work was supported by NSF Grant DMS1947438, Williams, Yale, and Rochester.

Legal Decompositions vs. Completeness

- Previous work on PLRS relates to *legal decompositions*, which are another way to write integers as sums of sequence terms.
- Given any PLRS, there is a legal decomposition of every positive integer. Does this mean that all PLRS are complete?
- No. For legal decompositions, sequence terms can be used more than once. This is not allowed for completeness decompositions.

Example

The PLRS $[1, 3]$ has terms $1, 2, 5, 11, \ldots$. The unique *legal* decomposition for 9 is $5 + 2(2)$, where the term 2 is used twice. However, no *complete* decomposition for 9 exists.