ON THE MINIMAL PERIOD OF INTEGER TILINGS

IZABELLA ŁABA AND DMITRII ZAKHAROV

ABSTRACT. If a finite set A tiles the integers by translations, it also admits a tiling whose period M has the same prime factors as $|A|$. We prove that the minimal period of such a tiling is bounded by $\exp(c(\log D)^2/\log\log D)$, where D is the diameter of A. In the converse direction, given $\epsilon > 0$, we construct tilings whose minimal period has the same prime factors as $|A|$ and is bounded from below by $D^{3/2-\epsilon}$. We also discuss the relationship between minimal tiling period estimates and the Coven-Meyerowitz conjecture.
  MSC subject codes: 05B45, 52C22.

1. INTRODUCTION

A finite set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ tiles the integers by translations if there exists a covering of $\mathbb{Z}$ by pairwise disjoint translates of A. More formally, there exists a translation set $T \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that every integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ has a unique representation $n = a + t$ with $a \in A$ and $t \in T$.

Newman [12] proved that any tiling of $\mathbb{Z}$ by a finite set A must be periodic, so that $T = B \oplus M\mathbb{Z}$ for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \subset \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$. His pigeonholing argument shows that the least period of the tiling must satisfy $M \leq 2^D$, where

$$D := \mathrm{diam}(A) = \max(A) - \min(A)$$

is the diameter of A. This bound was subsequently improved by Kolountzakis [6], Ruzsa [22, Appendix], and Biró [1]. The best estimate to date is due to Biró, who proved the following: for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a number $D(\epsilon)$ such that if $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$ is a tiling and $D = \mathrm{diam}(A) \geq D(\epsilon)$, then the least period of T is at most $\exp(D^{1/3+\epsilon})$.

In the other direction, Kolountzakis [6] constructed tilings with the least period M bounded from below by cD^2 for some absolute constant c. Steinberger [18] gave an improved construction with

$$M \geq \exp((\log D)^2/4\log\log D);$$

in particular, there exist tilings whose least period is superpolynomial in D.

In the sequel, we will always assume that $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is finite and nonempty, and we will always use D to denote the diameter of A.

Definition 1. *Assume that A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$ by translation. We define the* minimal tiling period of *A to be the smallest number $\mathcal{P}(A)$ such that there exists a $\mathcal{P}(A)$-periodic set $T \subset \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$.*

If $A \oplus T$ is a tiling and M is the least period of T, we clearly have $\mathcal{P}(A) \leq M$. The inequality may be strict, since there may exist a different tiling of $\mathbb{Z}$ whose least period is smaller. For example, we have the following reduction, due to Coven and Meyerowitz [3] and based on the dilation theorem of Tijdeman [21].

Date: July 3, 2024.

Lemma 1. [3, Lemma 2.3] *Assume that A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$ with period M, and suppose that $M = mM'$, where M' has the same prime factors as $|A|$ and m is relatively prime to $|A|$. Then A also tiles $\mathbb{Z}$ with period M'.*

The tilings constructed in [6] and [18] have long periods M, but in both cases we have $M = m|A|$ with m relatively prime to A. It follows that A also admits the tiling $A \oplus |A|\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}$, so that the minimal tiling period for A is $\mathcal{P}(A) = |A| \leq D + 1$.

Our first result is an upper bound on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ in terms of D.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$ is a tiling, and that the least period M of T has the same prime factors as $|A|$. (By Lemma 1, if A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$, then such a tiling always exists.) Then*
$$\mathcal{P}(A) \leq M \leq \exp(c(\log D)^2/\log\log D)$$
for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

One might ask whether the condition on the prime factors of M prevents the tiling from having long periods altogether. We provide a partial answer in Theorem 2. Our lower bound on the tiling period is worse than that in [6] and especially in [18], but, unlike in [6] and [18], M does not have any new prime factors that are not already present in $|A|$. For a discussion of the formal similarity between our upper bound in Theorem 1 and Steinberger's lower bound in [18], see the remark at the end of Section 2.

Theorem 2. *For any $0 < \beta < 3/2$, there exists a tiling $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$ with least period M such that $M \geq D^\beta$ and M has the same prime factors as $|A|$.*

We do not have examples of sets that tile *only* with long periods. The set A constructed in the proof of Theorem 2 also tiles with period $|A|$, as do those in [6] and [18]. Intuitively, a "simple" tile A allows significant freedom in the choice of the tiling complement, ranging from simple to more complicated. (For an analogue of this in metric geometry, one may think of cube tilings in high-dimensional spaces.)

We further note that if a tile A satisfies the Coven-Meyerowitz conditions (T1) and (T2) [3], it admits a tiling with period at most $2D$. Thus any tile with $\mathcal{P}(A) > 2D$ would also have to provide a counterexample to the Coven-Meyerowitz conjecture. We discuss this connection in Section 4.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

We will need the polynomial formulation of integer tilings. Assume that $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$ and that T is M-periodic, so that $T = B \oplus M\mathbb{Z}$ for some finite set $B \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Then $A \oplus B \bmod M$ is a factorization of the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_M$. We write this as $A \oplus B = \mathbb{Z}_M$.

By translational invariance, we may assume that $A, B \subset \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and that $0 \in A \cap B$. The *mask polynomials* of A and B are
$$A(X) = \sum_{a \in A} X^a, \ B(X) = \sum_{b \in B} X^b.$$

Then $A \oplus B = \mathbb{Z}_M$ means that

(1) $$A(X)B(X) = 1 + X + \cdots + X^{M-1} \mod (X^M - 1).$$

We may rephrase this in terms of cyclotomic polynomials as follows. Recall that the s-th cyclotomic polynomial Φ_s for $s \in \mathbb{N}$ is the minimal polynomial of $e^{2\pi i/s}$. Alternatively, Φ_s may be defined inductively via the identity

$$X^N - 1 = \prod_{s|N} \Phi_s(X).$$

Then (1) is equivalent to

(2) $$|A||B| = M \text{ and } \Phi_s(X) \, | \, A(X)B(X) \text{ for all } s|M, \ s \neq 1.$$

Since Φ_s are irreducible, each $\Phi_s(X)$ with $s|M$ must divide at least one of $A(X)$ and $B(X)$.

Lemma 2. *Assume that $A \oplus T = \mathbb{Z}$ is a tiling with the least period M, and let $M = p_1^{n_1} \ldots p_d^{n_d}$ be the prime factorization of M. Then for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ there exists $s|M$ such that $\Phi_s|A$ and $p_j^{n_j}|s$.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Write $T = B \oplus M\mathbb{Z}$ for some $B \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, M-1\}$, so that $A \oplus B = \mathbb{Z}_M$. Suppose that there is a $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that

$$\text{if } s|M \text{ and } p_j^{n_j}|s, \text{ then } \Phi_s \nmid A.$$

It follows that

$$P(X) := \frac{X^M - 1}{X^{M/p_j} - 1} = \prod_{s|M, \, s \nmid \frac{M}{p_j}} \Phi_s(X)$$

divides $B(X)$. Hence

$$B(X) = P(X)B_0(X) = \left(1 + X^{M/p_j} + X^{2M/p_j} + \cdots + X^{(p_j-1)M/p_j}\right) B_0(X)$$

for some polynomial $B_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. If $B_0(X)$ had degree M/p_j or higher, then $B(X)$ would have degree M or higher, contradicting the assumption that $B \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, M-1\}$. It follows that $B_0(X)$ is the mask polynomial of a set $B_0 \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, (M/p_j) - 1\}$, and that B is (M/p_j)-periodic, contradicting the minimality of M. $\square$

Recall that the degree of the cyclotomic polynomial Φ_s is equal to $\varphi(s)$, the Euler totient function. By Lemma 2, for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ there is an s_j such that $p_j^{n_j} \mid s_j$ and $\Phi_{s_j}|A$, so that

$$D = \deg A(X) \geq \deg \Phi_{s_j} = \varphi(s_j) \geq \varphi(p_j^{n_j}) = (1 - p_j^{-1})p_j^{n_j} \geq p_j^{n_j}/2.$$

Taking the product over $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ leads to an upper bound $M \leq (2D)^d$.

On the other hand, since $|A|$ and M have the same prime factors, we have

$$D \geq |A| - 1 \geq p_1 \ldots p_d - 1 \geq d! - 1,$$

where we crudely lower-bounded the size of the j-th prime number by j. This readily implies that

(3) $$d \leq c\frac{\log D}{\log \log D}$$

for some absolute constant $c > 0$. Plugging this into the upper bound on M finishes the proof.

Remark: Our upper bound in Theorem 1, and Steinberger's lower bound in [18], have the same form because they are both based on the same estimate for prime numbers. Specifically, our proof above uses that if $p_1, \ldots, p_d$ are primes such that $p_1 \ldots p_d \leq D$, then d obeys the bound (3). We then combine this with $M \geq (2D)^d$ to get our conclusion. Steinberger optimizes the estimate (3) and constructs the set A so that $|A| = p_1 \ldots p_d$ and $|A| \leq D$, but then the period of the tiling he constructs is divisible by additional d primes $q_1, \ldots, q_d$ of size about D; thus $M \geq D^d$ in his construction. This leads to a lower bound of the same general form as our upper bound in Theorem 1, but we were not able to replicate his construction without introducing the additional large primes not appearing in $|A|$.

3. Proof of Theorem 2

Let p_1, p_2, p_3 be large primes such that $p_1 < p_2 < p_3 < 2p_1$. Let $M = (p_1 p_2 p_3)^n$ for some large n to be determined later. Define

$$A(X) = \prod_{i=1}^{3} \left(1 + X^{M/p_i^n} + X^{2M/p_i^n} + \cdots + X^{(p_i-1)M/p_i^n}\right),$$

and $B_0(X) = \prod_{i=1}^{3} B_i(X)$, where

$$B_i(X) = 1 + X^{M/p_i^{n-1}} + X^{2M/p_i^{n-1}} + \cdots + X^{(p_i^{n-1}-1)M/p_i^{n-1}}.$$

Then $A \oplus B_0 = \mathbb{Z}_M$ and M has the same prime factors as $|A|$, but this tiling does not meet the conditions of Theorem 2 because B_0 is obviously M/p_i-periodic for each i. In the Chinese Remainder Theorem geometric representation, we may interpret A as a discrete rectangular box, and $A \oplus B_0$ is a lattice tiling by translates of that box. To construct a non-periodic set tiling complement B, we perform a "column shift" in each direction. Let

$$a = (p_3^{n-1} - 1)M/p_3^{n-1}, \quad b = (p_2^{n-1} - 1)M/p_2^{n-1} + (p_1^{n-1} - 1)M/p_1^{n-1}$$

and define

$$B(X) := B(X) + (X^{M/p_1^n} - 1)B_1(X) + (X^{a+M/p_2^n} - X^a)B_2(X) + (X^{b+M/p_3^n} - X^b)B_3(X).$$

We still have $A \oplus B = \mathbb{Z}_M$, but now B has no periods smaller than M. Constructions of this type go back to the work of Szabó [20].

Given $0 < \beta < 3/2$, we need to verify that $M \geq D^\beta$ for an appropriate choice of the parameters of the construction. We have

$$\mathrm{diam}(A) = \frac{(p_1 - 1)M}{p_1^n} + \frac{(p_2 - 1)M}{p_2^n} + \frac{(p_3 - 1)M}{p_3^n} \leq \frac{3M}{p_1^{n-1}}.$$

Choose a small $\epsilon > 0$ to be fixed later, and let

$$\alpha = \frac{(3 - \epsilon)n}{2n + 1}.$$

Note that $0 < \alpha < 3/2$. Then

$$M = p_1^n p_2^n p_3^n = p_1^{\epsilon n} p_1^\alpha p_1^{n-\alpha-n\epsilon} p_2^n p_3^n$$

$$\geq p_1^{\epsilon n} 2^{-(n-\alpha-n\epsilon)} p_1^\alpha p_2^{(3n-\alpha-n\epsilon)/2} p_3^{(3n-\alpha-n\epsilon)/2}$$

$$= p_1^{\epsilon n} 2^{-(n-\alpha-n\epsilon)} 3^{-\alpha} (3 p_1 p_2^n p_3^n)^\alpha,$$

since we chose α so that $n\alpha = (3n - \alpha - n\epsilon)/2$.

Given β with $0 < \beta < 3/2$, we may choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and n large enough so that $\beta < \alpha < 3/2$. We fix these choices. Next,

$$\frac{p_1^{\epsilon n}}{2^{n-\alpha-n\epsilon}3^\alpha} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^\alpha \frac{p_1^{\epsilon n}}{2^{n-n\epsilon}} \geq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{p_1^\epsilon}{2}\right)^n.$$

If we choose p_1 large enough so that $(\frac{p_1^\epsilon}{2})^n > (\frac{3}{2})^{3/2}$, we may conclude that

$$M \geq (3p_1 p_2^n p_3^n)^\beta \geq (\mathrm{diam}(A))^\beta$$

as claimed.

4. The minimal tiling period and the Coven-Meyerowitz conjecture

Coven and Meyerowitz [3] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let S_A be the set of prime powers p^α such that $\Phi_{p^\alpha}(X)$ divides $A(X)$. Consider the following conditions.*

(T1) $A(1) = \prod_{s \in S_A} \Phi_s(1)$,

(T2) if $s_1, \ldots, s_k \in S_A$ are powers of different primes, then $\Phi_{s_1 \ldots s_k}(X)$ divides $A(X)$.

Then:

  (i) *if A satisfies (T1), (T2), then A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$;*
  (ii) *if A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$ then (T1) holds;*
  (iii) *if A tiles $\mathbb{Z}$ and $|A|$ has at most two distinct prime factors, then (T2) holds.*

The conjecture that (T2) holds for all finite integer tiles has become known as the *Coven-Meyerowitz conjecture*. It remains open in general; see [7, 8, 9] for recent progress.

The proof of Theorem 3 (i) in [3] is by explicit construction. Throughout the rest of this section, we fix

$$M := \mathrm{lcm}(S_A) = p_1^{n_1} \ldots p_k^{n_k}.$$

Assuming that A satisfies (T1) and (T2), Coven and Meyerowitz construct an explicit tiling of the integers by A with period M. On the other hand, we always have

$$D = \mathrm{diam}(A) \geq M/2.$$

Indeed, we may assume that $\min(A) = 0$. Since $\Phi_M | A$ by (T2), we have $A(e^{2\pi i/M}) = 0$. This would not be possible with $D < M/2$, since then we would have $\mathrm{Im}(e^{2\pi i a/M}) \geq 0$ for all $a \in A$, with a strict inequality at least once. This implies that if A tiles the integers and satisfies (T2), then it also admits a tiling (possibly a different one) with period $M \leq 2D$.

Coven and Meyerowitz also make the stronger claim without proof (page 167, remarks after Lemma 2.1) that for any set A of nonnegative integers we have $M \leq pD/(p-1)$, or equivalently,

$$(4) \qquad \qquad \mathrm{diam}(A) \geq \frac{p-1}{p} M$$

where p is the smallest prime factor of $|A|$. This would imply that if A tiles the integers and satisfies (T2), then it also tiles with period at most $pD/(p-1)$. However, we could not reproduce their proof and do not believe their claim to be true in general.

The details are as follows. For general sets of integers (that do not necessarily tile the integers or satisfy (T2)), an easy counterexample is provided by the set A with the mask polynomial

$$A(X) = \Phi_{p^2}(X)\Phi_{q^2}(X) = (1 + X^p + \cdots + X^{(p-1)p})(1 + X^q + \cdots + X^{(q-1)q}),$$

where p, q are large primes such that $p < q < 2p$. Then $M = \mathrm{lcm}(S_A) = p^2q^2$, but $D = (p-1)p + (q-1)q$ which is much smaller than $\frac{p-1}{p}M$.

The more interesting question is whether (4) holds if we assume that A satisfies (T1) and (T2). This is in fact true if $|A|$ has at most two distinct prime factors. Indeed, in that case M also has at most two distinct prime factors, say p and q. As above, (T2) implies that $\Phi_M|A$. By the 2-prime case of the structure theorem for vanishing sums of roots of unity [4] (see also [10, Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.4]), we have

$$A(X) = P(X)\left(1 + X^{M/p} + \cdots + X^{(p-1)M/p}\right) + Q(X)\left(1 + X^{M/q} + \cdots + X^{(q-1)M/q}\right)$$

mod $(X^M - 1)$, for some polynomials $P(X)$ and $Q(X)$ with nonnegative integer coefficients. In other words, A mod M is a union of "fibers" – cosets of subgroups of $\mathbb{Z}_M$ of order p and q. Since the diameter of each such coset is either $(p-1)M/p$ or $(q-1)M/q$, the inequality (4) follows. If $|A|$ is a prime power, the same proof applies with the terms involving q removed.

The above argument no longer works when $|A|$ (therefore M) has 3 or more distinct prime factors. We still have $\Phi_M|A$, but the corresponding structure theory in this case [4, 14, 15, 17] is more complicated, and there are many examples of sets A such that $\Phi_M|A$ but A does not contain any fibers (see e.g. [13] for a long list of examples). Instead of just the fact that $\Phi_M|A$, we could try to use the full strength of the assumption that A tiles and satisfies (T2); however, there are also examples of sets A that tile the integers, satisfy (T2), satisfy $\Phi_M|A$, and do not contain any fibers [2].

A deeper theorem due to Steinberger [19] states that (4) holds when $2/p_1 > 1/p_2 + \cdots + 1/p_d$, where the primes dividing M are ordered so that $p_1 < \cdots < p_d$. In particular, this is always true when $d = 3$, since there are only 2 terms on the right side and $p_1 < p_2 < p_3$. Steinberger does not believe that (4) should hold in general, and neither do we.

References

1. A. Biró, *Divisibility of integer polynomials and tilings of the integers*, Acta Arith. 118 (2) (2005), 117–127.
2. B. Bruce, I. Łaba, *Keller properties for integer tilings*, preprint, 2024.
3. E. Coven, A. Meyerowitz, *Tiling the integers with translates of one finite set*, J. Algebra 212 (1999), 161–174.
4. N.G. de Bruijn, *On the factorization of cyclic groups*, Indag. Math. 15 (1953), 370–377.
5. R. Greenfeld, T. Tao. *A counterexample to the periodic tiling conjecture*, Ann. Math., to appear.
6. M. N. Kolountzakis, *Translational tilings of the integers with long periods*, Electronic J. Comb.10(1) (2003), # R22.
7. I. Łaba, I. Londner, *Combinatorial and harmonic-analytic methods for integer tilings*, Forum of Mathematics - Pi (2022), Vol. 10:e8, 46 pp.
8. I. Łaba, I. Londner, *The Coven-Meyerowitz tiling conditions for 3 odd prime factors*, Invent. Math. 232(1) (2023), 365-470.
9. I. Łaba, I. Londner, *Splitting for integer tilings and the Coven-Meyerowitz tiling conditions*, preprint, 2022.
10. T.Y. Lam and K.H. Leung, *On vanishing sums of roots of unity*, J. Algebra 224 (2000), 91–109.
11. H. B. Mann, *On Linear Relations Between Roots of Unity*, Mathematika 12, Issue 2 (1965), 107–117.
12. D.J. Newman, *Tesselation of integers*, J. Number Theory 9 (1977), 107–111.

13. B. Poonen and M. Rubinstein: *Number of Intersection Points Made by the Diagonals of a Regular Polygon*, SIAM J. Disc. Math. 11 (1998), 135–156.
14. L. Rédei, *Über das Kreisteilungspolynom*, Acta Math. Hungar. 5 (1954), 27–28.
15. L. Rédei, *Natürliche Basen des Kreisteilungskörpers*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 23 (1959), 180–200.
16. A. Sands, *On Keller's conjecture for certain cyclic groups*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. 2 (1979), 17–21.
17. I. J. Schoenberg, *A note on the cyclotomic polynomial*, Mathematika 11 (1964), 131-136.
18. J. P. Steinberger, *Tilings of the integers can have superpolynomial periods*, Combinatorica 29(4) (2009), 503–509.
19. J. P. Steinberger, *The lowest-degree polynomial with nonnegative coefficients divisible by the n-th cyclotomic polynomial*, Electronic J. Comb. 19 (4) (2012), Article P1.
20. S. Szabó, *A type of factorization of finite abelian groups*, Discrete Math. 54 (1985), 121–124.
21. R. Tijdeman, *Decomposition of the integers as a direct sum of two subsets*, in *Number Theory (Paris 1992–1993)*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 215, 261–276, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
22. R. Tijdeman, *Periodicity and almost-periodicity*, with appendix by I. Z. Ruzsa, in: Győri, E., Katona, G.O.H., Lovász, L., Fleiner, T. (eds), More Sets, Graphs and Numbers. Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, vol 15. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg 2006. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32439-3-18

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UBC, VANCOUVER, B.C. V6T 1Z2, CANADA

ilaba@math.ubc.ca, ORCID: 0000-0002-3810-6121

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139, USA

zakhdm@mit.edu, ORCID: 0009-0007-6369-7190