

On the Non-existence of Lattice Tilings by Quasi-crosses[☆]

Moshe Schwartz¹

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel

Abstract

We study necessary conditions for the existence of lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by quasi-crosses. We prove non-existence results, and focus in particular on the two smallest unclassified shapes, the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross and the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross. We show that for dimensions $n \leq 250$, apart from the known constructions, there are no lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses except for ten remaining cases, and no lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-crosses except for eleven remaining cases.

Keywords: tiling, lattices, quasi-cross, group splitting
2010 MSC: 05B45, 52C22

1. Introduction

Problems involving tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by clusters of cubes have a long history, as is evident from the early work of Minkowski [10]. In this context, let

$$Q = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid 0 \leq x_i < 1, x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

denote the *unit cube*, which, we shall also say, is *centered at the origin*. A translate of the cube by a vector $\bar{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set

$$\bar{e} + Q = \{\bar{e} + \bar{x} \mid \bar{x} \in Q\},$$

[☆]This work was supported in part by ISF grant 134/10.

Email address: schwartz@ee.bgu.ac.il (Moshe Schwartz)

¹The author is on a sabbatical at the Department of Electrical Engineering, MIT, Research Laboratory of Electronics.

and a *cluster of cubes* is a union of disjoint translates of cubes

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{E} + Q = \{\bar{e} + Q \mid \bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}\},$$

for some $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

A set of disjoint translates of \mathcal{C} is called a *packing* of \mathbb{R}^n by \mathcal{C} . If the union of the translates is the entire space \mathbb{R}^n , we say it is a *tiling*. If the set of translates forming the packing (tiling) forms an additive subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^n , we shall say it is a lattice² packing (lattice tiling).

Several types of clusters have been considered in the past. The two most studied clusters are the (k, n) -*cross* and the (k, n) -*semi-cross*. The (k, n) -cross is defined by the following set of translates

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{cross}} = \{i\bar{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid i \in [-k, k], j \in [n]\}$$

where $[a, b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, $[a]$ is short for $[1, a]$, and \bar{e}_j is the j -th standard unit vector. That is, a (k, n) -cross contains a center cube, and arms of length k cubes in the positive and negative directions along each axis. In contrast, the (k, n) -semi-cross has arms only in the positive direction and is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{semi-cross}} = \{i\bar{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid i \in [0, k], j \in [n]\}$$

Packings (lattice and non-lattice) of \mathbb{R}^n by crosses and semi-crosses were studied by Stein [14], and Hickerson and Stein [6]. For an excellent survey the reader is referred to [15]. We also note that a $(1, n)$ -cross is also a Lee sphere of radius 1. Apart from radius 1 or dimension 2, the non-existence of tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by Lee spheres is a long-standing conjecture by Golomb and Welch [4] (see [11, 9, 8, 3], as well as the more recent [7] for a survey on the current status of the conjecture).

Motivated by an application to error-correcting codes for non-volatile memories, Schwartz [12] suggested a generalization of both the cross and semi-cross to a shape called the (k_+, k_-, n) -*quasi-cross* defined by the set of translations

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{quasi-cross}} = \{i\bar{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid i \in [-k_-, k_+], j \in [n]\}.$$

Namely, in a (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross the center cube has arms of length k_+ in the positive direction, and arms of length k_- in the negative direction (see Figure 1). Thus, a $(k, 0, n)$ -quasi-cross is simply a (k, n) -semi-cross, while a (k, k, n) -quasi-cross is a (k, n) -cross. To avoid the two studied cases we shall assume throughout that $1 \leq k_- < k_+$.

² This is, in fact, an *integer* lattice, but we shall omit this throughout the paper.




Figure 1: A $(3, 1, 2)$ -quasi-cross and a $(3, 1, 3)$ -quasi-cross

A few constructions were given in [12] for lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by quasi-crosses, and in particular, a full classification was provided of the dimensions in which there exist lattice tilings by $(2, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses. Recently, Yari et al. [18] gave other constructions for lattice packings and tilings by quasi-crosses, and in particular, new constructions for tilings by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses.

The motivation given in [12] is that of producing perfect 1-error-correcting codes for the unbalanced limited magnitude channel, a natural extension to the earlier work of [2]. The dual case of $(n - 1)$ -error-correcting codes gives rise to a tiling problem of cluster of cubes called a “chair”, which is described in [1].

The goal of this work is to derive new necessary conditions for the existence of tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by quasi-crosses. Though most of the results apply to general (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses, we shall focus in particular on the two smallest unclassified cases of the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross and the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross.

The paper is organized as follows: We begin in Section 2 by providing the notation and definitions used throughout the paper. We shall also cite relevant results from previous works. We continue in Section 3 with a list of the main results. We conclude in Section 4 with the application of the main results to the specific case of tilings by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses and tilings by $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-crosses.

2. Preliminaries

We shall now describe the definitions and notation used in this work. For the reader’s benefit we repeat some of the definitions given in the introduction. A

cube is defined as the set

$$Q = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid 0 \leq x_i < 1, x_i \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

A set of pair-wise disjoint translates of the cube is a *cluster of cubes*

$$C = \mathcal{E} + Q = \{\bar{e} + Q \mid \bar{e} \in \mathcal{E}\},$$

for some $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ specifying the translate vectors. Through the paper we shall use only integer translate vectors, i.e., $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

We denote $[a, b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, $[a]$ is short for $[1, a]$, and $[a, b]^* = [a, b] \setminus \{0\}$. For any two positive integers $1 \leq k_- < k_+$, the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross is the cluster of cubes defined by the translate vectors

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{quasi-cross}} = \{i\bar{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid i \in [-k_-, k_+], j \in [n]\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set of vectors, and let $\mathcal{C}_{\text{quasi-cross}}$ be a (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross cluster of cubes centered at the origin. If the translates $\bar{t} + \mathcal{C}_{\text{quasi-cross}}$, $\bar{t} \in \mathcal{T}$, are pair-wise disjoint, we say \mathcal{T} is a *packing* of \mathbb{R}^n by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses. If

$$\bigcup_{\bar{t} \in \mathcal{T}} (\bar{t} + \mathcal{C}_{\text{quasi-cross}}) = \mathbb{R}^n$$

we say \mathcal{T} is a *tiling* of \mathbb{R}^n by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses. If \mathcal{T} is an additive subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^n then we shall call \mathcal{T} a *lattice*, and will use the letter Λ instead of \mathcal{T} to denote it.

Finally, the *primorial* is defined as

$$n\# = \prod_{\substack{p \text{ prime} \\ p \leq n}} p.$$

2.1. Abelian-Group Splitting and Lattice Tiling

While we may use geometric arguments to prove necessary conditions for a shape to tile \mathbb{R}^n , stronger results may be obtained using the algebraic structure of a *lattice tiling*. An equivalence between lattice tilings and Abelian-group splitting was described in [13, 14, 6], which we describe here for completeness.

Let G be a finite Abelian group, where we shall denote the group operation as $+$. Given some $s \in G$ and a non-negative integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by ms the sum $s + s + \dots + s$, where s appears in the sum m times. The definition is extended in the natural way to negative integers m .

A splitting of G is a pair of sets, $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, called the *multiplier set*, and $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\} \subseteq G$, called the *splitter set*, such that the elements of the form ms , $m \in M$, $s \in S$, are all distinct, non-zero, and cover all the non-zero elements in G . We shall denote such a splitting as $G = (M, S)$. It follows that $|M| \cdot |S| = |G| - 1$.

Next, we define a homomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ by

$$\phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i s_i.$$

If the multiplier set is $M = [-k_-, k_+]^*$, then it may be easily verified that $\ker \phi$ is a lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses. The fact that $\ker \phi$ is a lattice is obvious. To show that the lattice is a packing by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses, assume to the contrary two such distinct quasi-crosses, one centered at $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and one centered at $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, have a non-empty intersection, i.e.,

$$\bar{x} + m_1 \bar{e}_i = \bar{y} + m_2 \bar{e}_j,$$

where $m_1, m_2 \in M$, then

$$m_1 s_i = \phi(\bar{x} + m_1 \bar{e}_i) = \phi(\bar{y} + m_2 \bar{e}_j) = m_2 s_j$$

which is possible only if $m_1 = m_2$ and $i = j$, resulting in the two quasi-crosses being the same one, a contradiction.

Finally, to show that the packing is in fact a tiling let $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be some point in the space. Obviously, $\bar{x} \in [\bar{x}] + Q$. If $\phi([\bar{x}]) = 0$ then $[\bar{x}] \in \ker \phi$ and \bar{x} is in the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross cube cluster centered at $[\bar{x}]$. Otherwise, by the properties of the splitting there exist $m \in M$ and $s_i \in S$ such that $\phi([\bar{x}]) = ms_i$. It follows that $[\bar{x}] - m \bar{e}_i \in \ker \phi$ and \bar{x} is in the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross cube cluster centered at $[\bar{x}] - m \bar{e}_i$.

Group splitting as a method for constructing error-correcting codes was also discussed, for example, in the case of shift-correcting codes [16] and integer codes [17].

2.2. Previous Results

Several results from previous works are relevant to this one. Some apply directly to quasi-crosses, while others will be used as a basis for our new results, appearing in the next section. The first theorem we cite is the only one which uses geometric arguments to derive a necessary condition on lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by quasi-crosses.

Theorem 1. [12, Theorem 9] For any $n \geq 2$, if

$$\frac{2k_+(k_- + 1) - k_-^2}{k_+ + k_-} > n,$$

then there is no lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses.

When looking for a lattice tiling using the group splitting equivalence, the question is which finite Abelian group to split, where it was demonstrated in [12] that splitting different Abelian groups of the same size may result in different lattice tilings. However, since we are only interested in finding necessary conditions for the existence of lattice tilings, the following theorem from [12] (which is a generalization of a theorem from [15]) shows that we may focus only on cyclic groups.

Theorem 2. [12, Theorem 15] Let G be a finite Abelian group, and let $M = [-k_-, k_+]^*$ be the multiplier set corresponding to the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross. If there is a splitting $G = (M, S)$, then there is a splitting of the cyclic group of the same size $\mathbb{Z}_{|G|} = (M, S')$.

Using Theorem 2 we can say that the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross lattice tiles \mathbb{R}^n if and only if $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$, where $q = n(k_+ + k_-) + 1$ and $M = [-k_-, k_+]^*$. Furthermore, the expressions ms , for $m \in M$ and $s \in S$, simply denote integer multiplication in the ring \mathbb{Z}_q . To avoid confusion, we shall denote the multiplicative semi-group of the ring \mathbb{Z}_q as R_q .

Another result which shall be useful for the classification of lattice tilings by $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-crosses is the following.

Theorem 3. [12, Theorem 16] Let $k \geq 2$ be some positive integer, and let $M = [-(k-1), k]^*$. If $G = (M, S)$ is a splitting of an Abelian group G , $|G| > 1$, then $\gcd(k, |G|) \neq 1$.

A notion we shall find useful is that of a *character*, as defined by Stein [13]: A character is a homomorphism $\chi : G \rightarrow R$ from a semi-group G into a (multiplicative) semi-group H . The following theorem, with a one-line proof that we bring for completeness, is due to Stein³.

³The version due to Stein is somewhat more general, but we shall not require the full generality of the original claim.

Theorem 4. [13, Theorem 4.1] Let us consider a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$ and let $\chi : R_q \rightarrow R$ be a character from R_q into a ring R . Then

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) \right) = \sum_{a \in R_q} \chi(a).$$

Proof.

$$\sum_{a \in R_q} \chi(a) = \sum_{\substack{m \in M \\ s \in S}} \chi(ms) = \sum_{\substack{m \in M \\ s \in S}} \chi(m)\chi(s) = \left(\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) \right).$$

□

Several characters will be of interest in the following section, the first is the Legendre symbol: for an odd prime p we define the character $\left(\frac{\cdot}{p}\right) : R_p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as

$$\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & a \equiv x^2 \pmod{p} \text{ for some } x \in R_p, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = 1$ we call a a *quadratic residue modulo p* (QR), and otherwise we call a a *quadratic non-residue modulo p* (QNR). Using the Legendre symbol and Theorem 4 Stein proved the following theorem.

Theorem 5. [13, Corollary 4.3] If $\mathbb{Z}_p = (M, S)$ is a splitting, p an odd prime, then in at least one of M or S the number of quadratic residues equals the number of quadratic non-residues.

We recall some well-known facts about the Legendre symbol, which we shall use later. For a proof, see for example [5].

Lemma 6. Let p be an odd prime, and let ℓ denote some integer. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) &= 1 && \text{iff } p = 4\ell + 1, \\ \left(\frac{2}{p}\right) &= 1 && \text{iff } p = 8\ell \pm 1, \\ \left(\frac{3}{p}\right) &= 1 && \text{iff } p = 12\ell \pm 1, \\ \left(\frac{5}{p}\right) &= 1 && \text{iff } p = 10\ell \pm 1. \end{aligned}$$

3. Main Results

In this section we list our new results, where we group them according to the method employed to derive the necessary condition for lattice tiling \mathbb{R}^n by (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-crosses.

3.1. The Legendre Symbol and Higher-Order Characters

We begin our treatment by examining results obtained by using the Legendre symbol and higher-order characters.

Theorem 7. *The $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when $4n + 1$ is a prime, $n \equiv 3 \pmod{6}$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $\mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} = (M, S)$ is a splitting with $M = [-1, 3]^*$. Obviously, 1 is a QR. Using Lemma 6 we note that -1 and 3 are also a QRs, while 2 is a QNR, when $n \equiv 3 \pmod{6}$. Thus S should have an equal number of QRs and QNRs, but $|S| = n$ is odd, a contradiction. \square

Up to dimension 250 Theorem 7 rules out lattice tilings by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for

$$n = 3, 9, 15, 27, 39, 45, 57, 69, 87, 93, 99, 105, 135, 153, 165, 177, 183, 189, \\ 207, 213, 219, 249.$$

Equally simple, but more tedious, the same method applies for larger quasi-crosses.

Theorem 8. *The $(5, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when $6n + 1$ is a prime, $n \equiv 5, 7, 11, 13, 19 \pmod{20}$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $\mathbb{Z}_{6n+1} = (M, S)$ is a splitting with $M = [-1, 5]^*$. Denote $n = 20\ell + r$, with $r \in \{5, 7, 11, 13, 19\}$. The following table summarizes which of the elements of M is a QR using Lemma 6:

$6n + 1$	-1	1	2	3	4	5
$120\ell + 31$	QNR	QR	QR	QNR	QR	QR
$120\ell + 43$	QNR	QR	QNR	QNR	QR	QNR
$120\ell + 67$	QNR	QR	QNR	QNR	QR	QNR
$120\ell + 79$	QNR	QR	QR	QNR	QR	QR
$120\ell + 115$	QNR	QR	QNR	QNR	QR	QNR

We note that in all cases, M does not contain an equal number of QRs and QNRs. Thus, S must contain an equal number of QRs and QNRs and so $|S| = n$ must be even, a contradiction. \square

A generalization for higher power residues (generalizing the Legendre symbol) can be made, as is seen in the next theorem, which uses quartic residues⁴.

Theorem 9. *Let $4n + 1$ be a prime, with n being an odd integer. If*

$$6^n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{4n + 1}$$

then the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Since $4n + 1$ is a prime, \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} is a field, and so let g be a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} . We define the character $\chi : R_{4n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as

$$\chi(g^j) = e^{\frac{2\pi ij}{4}},$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

Assume to the contrary that there exists a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} = (M, S)$ under the conditions of the theorem. By Theorem 4 we have

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{4n} \chi(j). \quad (1)$$

We also have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{4n} \chi(j) = \sum_{j=0}^{4n-1} \chi(g^j) = \sum_{j=0}^{4n-1} \chi(g)^j = \frac{\chi(g)^{4n} - 1}{\chi(g) - 1} = 0. \quad (2)$$

It follows from (1) and (2) that

$$\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) = 0.$$

We first note that 1 and -1 are quadratic residues in \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} . If 2 or 3 are quadratic residues, then by Lemma 6 the set S must contain an equal number of quadratic residues and quadratic non-residues, but $|S| = n$ is odd. We therefore need to consider only the case where both 2 and 3 are quadratic non-residues.

We now turn to check the characters of the elements of M . It is easily seen that $\chi(1) = 1$. Since n is odd, we deduce $\chi(-1) = -1$, i.e., -1 is a quadratic

⁴Quartic residues are sometimes also called *biquadratic* residues.

residue in \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1} but is a quartic non-residue. Since both 2 and 3 are quadratic non-residues, we have $\chi(2), \chi(3) \in \{i, -i\}$.

We note that the quartic residues form a multiplicative subgroup

$$\{g^{4j} \mid 0 \leq j \leq n-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1}.$$

It is also easily seen that

$$(g^j)^n = (g^{4\lfloor j/4 \rfloor + (j \bmod 4)})^n = (g^{4n})^{\lfloor j/4 \rfloor} g^{n(j \bmod 4)} = g^{n(j \bmod 4)}.$$

Since n is odd, we get that an element $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{4n+1}$, $a \neq 0$, is a quartic residue, i.e., $\chi(a) = 1$, if and only if $a^n \equiv 1 \pmod{4n+1}$.

We are given that $6^n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{4n+1}$, and thus $1 \neq \chi(6) = \chi(2)\chi(3)$. It follows that $\chi(2) = \chi(3)$. We now have

$$\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) = \chi(-1) + \chi(1) + \chi(2) + \chi(3) = \pm 2i \neq 0.$$

Therefore, $\sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) = 0$, which is only possible if $|S| = n$ is even, a contradiction. \square

Up to dimension 250 Theorem 9 rules out lattice tilings by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for

$$n = 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 25, 27, 39, 45, 49, 57, 67, 69, 73, 79, 87, 93, 99, 105, 127, 135, \\ 153, 165, 175, 177, 183, 189, 193, 205, 207, 213, 219, 249.$$

We can also use higher order characters to obtain necessary conditions for (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross to lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when $k_+ + k_-$ is a prime. To that end we first need a simple lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let p be a prime and set $\omega = e^{2\pi i/p}$, $i = \sqrt{-1}$. If $a_0, \dots, a_{p-1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ are rational numbers such that $\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} a_j \omega^j = 0$, then $a_0 = a_1 = \dots = a_{p-1}$.*

Proof. Define the polynomial $a(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} a_j x^j \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$. It is therefore given that $a(\omega) = 0$, and hence all the conjugates of ω relative to \mathbb{Q} are also roots of $a(x)$. It is well-known (see for example [5]) that these are ω^j where $\gcd(j, p) = 1$. Since p is a prime, we have that all of ω^j , $1 \leq j \leq p-1$, are also roots of $a(x)$, i.e.,

$$(x - \omega^1)(x - \omega^2) \dots (x - \omega^{p-1}) \mid a(x).$$

However,

$$(x - \omega^1)(x - \omega^2) \dots (x - \omega^{p-1}) = \frac{x^p - 1}{x - 1} = 1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{p-1}.$$

We now have

$$1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{p-1} \mid a(x)$$

while the degree of $a(x)$ is at most $p - 1$, resulting in

$$a(x) = c(1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{p-1}),$$

for some constant $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. □

Theorem 11. *Let $1 \leq k_- < k_+$ be positive integers such that $k_+ + k_-$ is an odd prime. If the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross lattice tiles \mathbb{R}^n , and $n(k_+ + k_-) + 1$ is a prime, then $k_+ + k_- \mid n$.*

Proof. Denote $q = (k_+ + k_-)n + 1$, and assume $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$ is a splitting with $M = [-k_-, k_+]$. Since q is a prime \mathbb{Z}_q is a field, and let g be a primitive element in it.

We also denote $p = k_+ + k_-$, an odd prime, and let $\omega = e^{2\pi i/p}$ be a complex p -th root of unit. We define the character $\chi : R_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as $\chi(g^j) = \omega^j$. Using the same argument as in Theorem 9 we must have

$$\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) = 0.$$

We first check the characters of the elements in M . We have $1 \in M$ and necessarily $\chi(1) = 1 = \omega^0$. We also have $-1 \in M$, and since $(-1)^2 = 1$, we get $\chi(-1)^2 = \chi(1) = 1$, but p is an odd prime and so $\chi(-1) = 1 = \omega^0$ also. If $\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) = 0$ then by Lemma 10 each power of ω appears an equal number of times, and since we have p powers and p summands, each should appear exactly once. However, ω^0 appears at least twice, and so $\sum_{m \in M} \chi(m) \neq 0$.

It now follows that we must have $\sum_{s \in S} \chi(s) = 0$, which again by Lemma 10 implies that $k_+ + k_- = p \mid n$, as claimed. □

3.2. The Power Character

An altogether different flavor of necessary conditions is obtained by examining the power character which we now define: for any fixed positive integer r , the function $\chi_r : R_q \rightarrow R_q$ defined by $\chi_r(a) = a^r$, is a character we call the *power character*. Unlike the previous section, we do not require q to be prime.

Theorem 12. *There is no lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by $(4k - 1, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for all positive integers k such that $kn \equiv 5, 8 \pmod{9}$.*

Proof. Let us assume to the contrary that there exists a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_{4kn+1} = (M, S)$ with $M = [-1, 4k - 1]^*$ and $|S| = n$. Consider the power character $\chi_2 : R_{4kn+1} \rightarrow R_{4kn+1}$ defined by $\chi_2(a) = a^2$. By Theorem 4 it follows that

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} m^2 \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} s^2 \right) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{4kn} i^2 \pmod{4kn+1}.$$

By a simple induction one can easily prove that

$$3 \mid (-1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{4k-1} i^2$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Thus, we can write

$$3t \sum_{s \in S} s^2 \equiv \frac{4k(4kn+1)(8kn+1)}{6} \pmod{4kn+1} \quad (3)$$

for some integer t , where we used the well-known identity

$$\sum_{i=1}^a i^2 = \frac{a(a+1)(2a+1)}{6}.$$

We now note that $kn \equiv 5, 8 \pmod{9}$ implies $4kn + 1 \equiv 3, 6 \pmod{9}$, and so 3 is a zero divisor in R_{4kn+1} . The LHS of (3) is a multiple of 3. On the other hand, in the RHS of (3), $\frac{4kn}{2}$, $\frac{4kn+1}{3}$, and $8kn + 1$, are all integers leaving non-zero residue modulo 3. This is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 13. *There is no lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by $(4k + 2, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for all positive integers k , and $n \equiv 3, 7 \pmod{8}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 12. Assume to the contrary that there exists a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_{(4k+3)n+1} = (M, S)$ with $M = [-1, 4k + 2]^*$ and $|S| = n$. Consider the power character $\chi_3 : R_{(4k+3)n+1} \rightarrow R_{(4k+3)n+1}$ defined by $\chi_3(a) = a^3$. By Theorem 4 it follows that

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} m^3 \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} s^3 \right) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{(4k+3)n} i^3 \pmod{(4k+3)n+1}.$$

By a simple induction one can easily prove that

$$8 \mid (-1)^3 + \sum_{i=1}^{4k+2} i^3$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Thus, we can write

$$8t \sum_{s \in S} s^3 \equiv \frac{((4k+3)n)^2((4k+3)n+1)^2}{4} \pmod{(4k+3)n+1} \quad (4)$$

for some integer t , where we used the identity

$$\sum_{i=1}^a i^3 = \frac{a^2(a+1)^2}{4}.$$

At this point we note that $n \equiv 3, 7 \pmod{8}$ implies $(4k+3)n+1 \equiv 2, 6 \pmod{8}$, and so 2 is a zero divisor in $R_{(4k+3)n+1}$. The LHS of (4) is a multiple of 2. On the other hand, the RHS of (4) is odd since both $((4k+3)n)^2$, and $\frac{((4k+3)n+1)^2}{4}$, are odd integers. This is a contradiction. \square

More elaborate results may be reached by using other power characters. We turn to show a more general result using power characters.

Theorem 14. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$ be a splitting, $n = |S| < q - 1$. If q is a prime, then*

$$\sum_{m \in M} m^i \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$$

for some $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we consider the power character $\chi_i : R_q \rightarrow R_q$ defined by $\chi_i(a) = a^i$. By Theorem 4 we therefore have

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} m^i \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in S} s^i \right) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} j^i \pmod{q} \quad (5)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

If q is a prime then \mathbb{Z}_q is a field, its multiplicative group is cyclic, and so let $g \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ be a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_q . We can then write

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} j^i \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{q-2} g^{ij} \equiv \frac{g^{i(q-1)} - 1}{g^i - 1} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$$

since $g^i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n < q - 1$.

Since \mathbb{Z}_q is a field, it now follows from (5), that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$\sum_{s \in S} s^i \equiv 0 \pmod{q} \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{m \in M} m^i \equiv 0 \pmod{q}.$$

Assume to the contrary that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have

$$\sum_{m \in M} m^i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}.$$

If we define the matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} s_1^1 & s_1^2 & \cdots & s_1^n \\ s_2^1 & s_2^2 & \cdots & s_2^n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_n^1 & s_n^2 & \cdots & s_n^n \end{pmatrix}$$

then it follows that

$$(1, 1, \dots, 1)V \equiv (0, 0, \dots, 0) \pmod{q}$$

and so

$$\det(V) \equiv 0 \pmod{q}.$$

However, V is clearly a Vandermonde matrix, and the elements of S are distinct, which implies

$$\det(V) = \prod_{j < j'} (s_j - s_{j'}) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

a contradiction. □

Up to dimension 250 Theorem 14 rules out lattice tilings by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for a total of 59 cases.

3.3. Unique Representation

By carefully examining the way specific elements of the split group are represented we may sometimes reach a contradiction to the unique representation of the group elements required by the splitting. The following few results illustrate this method.

Lemma 15. *If an integer d divides $n(k_+ + k_-) + 1$, $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$, and $n < d < n(k_+ + k_-) + 1$, then the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proof. Denote $q = n(k_+ + k_-) + 1$. Assume to the contrary there is a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$ with $M = [-k_-, k_+)^*$. We note that d is a zero divisor in \mathbb{Z}_q but not zero itself. According to the splitting, there is a unique representation $d \equiv ms \pmod{q}$ with $m \in M$ and $s \in S$. Since $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$ it follows that $\gcd(d, m) = 1$ and therefore $d \mid s$. Denote, then, $s = ds'$.

Since $d > n$ we have

$$\frac{q}{d} = \frac{n(k_+ + k_-) + 1}{d} \leq k_+ + k_-.$$

Thus, there exist $m_1, m_2 \in M$, $m_2 \leq k_-$, such that

$$m_1 + m_2 = \frac{q}{d}.$$

Then,

$$m_1s + m_2s = \frac{q}{d}s = qs' \equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

and so

$$m_1s \equiv -m_2s \pmod{q}.$$

Since $m_1, -m_2 \in M$ we have a contradiction to the splitting. \square

The previous lemma gives rise to the following theorem.

Theorem 16. *For any $1 < r < k_+ + k_-$, the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when*

$$(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 \equiv ru \pmod{r \cdot k_+\#}$$

for all integers u such that $\gcd(u, k_+\#) = 1$.

Proof. We first note that reducing the requirement on n modulo r gives

$$(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r}.$$

Thus, $\frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1}{r}$ is an integer and

$$\frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1}{r} \equiv u \pmod{k_+\#}.$$

We can now use Lemma 15 with $d = \frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1}{r} > n$, and the claim follows. \square

If we try to apply Theorem 16 to the case of $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses by setting $r = 3$ we get the exact same result as Theorem 12, i.e., no lattice tiling when $n \equiv 5, 8 \pmod{9}$. We do, however, get new results for larger quasi-crosses as the following example shows.

Corollary 17. *Both the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross and the $(4, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross do not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when*

1. $n \equiv 5, 9 \pmod{12}$, or
2. $n \equiv 4, 10 \pmod{18}$, or
3. $n \equiv 15, 23 \pmod{24}$.

Proof. We use Theorem 16 with $r = 2, 3, 4$ for the three cases respectively. \square

3.4. Recursion

Recursion is also a powerful tool for formulating necessary conditions for tilings. We present a simple recursion which may be used in several ways to rule out lattice tilings.

Theorem 18. *If there is a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$, with $M = [-k_-, k_+)^*$, and some positive integer $d \mid q$, $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$, then*

$$(k_+ + k_-)d \mid q - d,$$

and there is a splitting $\mathbb{Z}_{q/d} = (M, S')$.

Proof. Let us consider the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}_q defined by

$$H = d\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{Z}_q = \left\{ 0, d, 2d, \dots, \left(\frac{q}{d} - 1\right)d \right\}.$$

Each element $id \in H$, $1 \leq i \leq q/d - 1$, has a unique representation as

$$id \equiv ms \pmod{q} \tag{6}$$

with $m \in M$ and $s \in S$. Since d is a zero divisor in \mathbb{Z}_q , and $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$, it follows that $\gcd(d, m) = 1$ and $d \mid s$. Denote $s = ds'$ and reduce (6) modulo q/d to get

$$i \equiv ms' \pmod{\frac{q}{d}}.$$

Define $S' = \{s' \mid ds' \in S\}$. Since every element of H has a unique factorization as in (6), it follows that $\mathbb{Z}_{q/d} = (M, S')$ is indeed a splitting. Furthermore, the size of S' ,

$$|S'| = \frac{|\mathbb{Z}_{q/d} - 1|}{|M|} = \frac{q - d}{(k_+ + k_-)d}$$

must be an integer. \square

The following two corollaries follow immediately from Theorem 18: The first is in fact a recursive construction, while the second may be used to prove non-existence of lattice tilings.

Corollary 19. *If the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross lattice tiles \mathbb{R}^n , and for some positive integer $d \mid (k_+ + k_-)n + 1$ we have $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$, then the (k_+, k_-, n') -quasi-cross lattice tiles $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$, $n' = \frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 - d}{(k_+ + k_-)d}$.*

Corollary 20. *If there exists a positive integer $d \mid (k_+ + k_-)n + 1$, $\gcd(d, k_+\#) = 1$, but $\frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 - d}{(k_+ + k_-)d}$ is not an integer, then the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n .*

We can turn Corollary 20 into a more convenient form of non-existence result in the following theorem.

Theorem 21. *Let $p > k_+$ be a prime, $p \not\equiv 1 \pmod{k_+ + k_-}$, and $p \neq k_+ + k_-$. Then the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n for $n \equiv -(k_+ + k_-)^{-1} \pmod{p}$, where $(k_+ + k_-)^{-1}$ is the multiplicative inverse of $k_+ + k_-$ in \mathbb{Z}_p .*

Proof. We start by noting that $1 \leq k_- < k_+ < p$ and $p \neq k_+ + k_-$ which means $p \nmid k_+ + k_-$ and so $k_+ + k_-$ has a multiplicative inverse in \mathbb{Z}_p . If

$$n \equiv -(k_+ + k_-)^{-1} \pmod{p}$$

then

$$(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Thus, $p \mid (k_+ + k_-)n + 1$. However,

$$p \not\equiv 1 \pmod{k_+ + k_-}$$

implies

$$(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 - p \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(k_+ + k_-)p}.$$

Since $p > k_+$ we must have $\gcd(p, k_+\#) = 1$. We now use Corollary 20 with $d = p$. \square

Even though Corollary 19 was phrased as a recursive construction, it can also be used to prove the non-existence of a lattice tiling, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 22. *Let p be a prime, $p \equiv 1 \pmod{k_+ + k_-}$. If the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n , then the (k_+, k_-, n') -quasi-cross does not lattice tile $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$,*

$$n' = \frac{((k_+ + k_-)n + 1)p^i - 1}{k_+ + k_-},$$

for all positive integers i .

Proof. Assume to the contrary there is a lattice tiling of $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$ by (k_+, k_-, n') -quasi-crosses, where $n' = pn + \frac{p-1}{k_+ + k_-}$. We note that $p \mid (k_+ + k_-)n' + 1$, and that $p > k_+$ and so $\gcd(p, k_+ \#) = 1$. We now use Corollary 19 and get that there must be a lattice tiling of $\mathbb{R}^{n''}$ by (k_+, k_-, n'') -quasi-crosses, where

$$n'' = \frac{(k_+ + k_-)n' + 1 - p}{(k_+ + k_-)p} = n,$$

a contradiction. Thus, there is not lattice tiling of $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$ by (k_+, k_-, n') -quasi-crosses. Repeating this argument i times, for any positive integer i , completes the proof. \square

3.5. Accounting for Zero Divisors

The final approach we discuss is that of accounting for the way zero divisors of the split Abelian group are represented, resulting in a strong non-existence result.

Theorem 23. *Let p be a prime, and let k_+ and k_- be non-negative integers such that $k_- \leq k_+$ and $p \leq k_+ < p^2$. Then the (k_+, k_-, n) -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when $(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$ unless*

$$n = \frac{p-1}{(k_+ \bmod p) + (k_- \bmod p)}.$$

Proof. Denote $q = (k_+ + k_-)n + 1$, and assume to the contrary that $\mathbb{Z}_q = (M, S)$ is a splitting with $M = [-k_-, k_+]^*$ and $q \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. Let us consider the way the elements of

$$H = \frac{q}{p}\mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \{0\} = \left\{ i\frac{q}{p} \mid 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \right\}$$

are represented under this splitting.

We start by noting that $S \cap H = \emptyset$, for if some $ip/q \in S$ then $p \cdot (ip/q) \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ together with $p \in M$ contradict the splitting. We also note that all the elements of H are multiples of p , which is a zero divisor in \mathbb{Z}_q . Hence, every element of H is uniquely represented as ms , $m \in M$, $s \in S$, where m is a multiple of p . It follows that the number of multiples of p in M times the size of S equals the size of H , i.e.,

$$\left(\left\lfloor \frac{k_+}{p} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{k_-}{p} \right\rfloor \right) n = \frac{q}{p} - 1 = \frac{(k_+ + k_-)n + 1 - p}{p}.$$

Hence, there is no splitting unless

$$n = \frac{p-1}{(k_+ \bmod p) + (k_- \bmod p)}.$$

□

Theorem 23 results in the following two corollaries.

Corollary 24. *The $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when $n \equiv 2 \pmod{9}$, $n > 2$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 23 with $p = 3$.

□

Corollary 25. *The $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross does not lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n when*

1. $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, or
2. $n \equiv 7 \pmod{9}$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 23 with $p = 2, 3$ respectively.

□

4. Conclusion

In this work we showed, using a variety of techniques, several necessary conditions for a quasi-cross of a given size to lattice tile \mathbb{R}^n . Some of the results apply to general quasi-crosses, while others are specific to quasi-crosses of small size. To conclude we shall aggregate the results for the smallest unclassified cases of the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross and the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross.

For the first shape, the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross, we recall there exists a construction of lattice tilings from [12] for dimensions $n = (5^i - 1)/4$, $i \geq 1$. In addition, certain primes were shown in [18] to induce lattice tilings, as well as a recursive

construction, though a closed analytic form for the dimension appears to be hard to obtain. Using a computer to verify the requirements for the construction from [18], for $n \leq 250$ we also have lattice tilings of \mathbb{R}^n by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses for dimensions

$$n = 37, 43, 97, 102, 115, 139, 163, 169, 186, 199, 216.$$

On the other hand, combining the non-existence results with a nice analytic form we achieved the following:

Corollary 26. *If the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross lattice tiles \mathbb{R}^n then $n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$.*

Proof. The case of $n \equiv 5, 8 \pmod{9}$ is ruled out by Theorem 12. The case of $n \equiv 2 \pmod{9}$, $n > 2$, is ruled out by Theorem 23. Finally, the case of $n = 2$ is ruled out by Theorem 1. \square

However, especially for the $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-cross, numerous other non-existence results lacking a nice analytic form ensue from the previous section. Aggregating the entire set of necessary conditions, for $n \leq 250$, apart from the dimensions mentioned above allowing a lattice tiling, no other lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by $(3, 1, n)$ -quasi-crosses exists except perhaps in the remaining unclassified cases of

$$n = 22, 24, 60, 111, 114, 121, 144, 220, 234, 235.$$

For the second shape, the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross, no lattice tiling is known except for the trivial tiling of \mathbb{R}^1 . The combined non-existence results we obtained in this work, with a nice analytic form, are much stronger in this case:

Corollary 27. *If the $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-cross lattice tiles \mathbb{R}^n then $n \equiv 1, 13 \pmod{36}$.*

Proof. This is a simple combination of Theorem 3 stating $5n + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, of Corollary 17 stating $n \not\equiv 4, 10 \pmod{18}$, and of Corollary 25. \square

Aggregating this result with the other recursive necessary conditions, for $2 \leq n \leq 250$, no lattice tiling of \mathbb{R}^n by $(3, 2, n)$ -quasi-crosses exists except perhaps in the remaining unclassified cases of

$$n = 13, 37, 49, 73, 85, 121, 145, 157, 181, 217, 229.$$

References

- [1] S. Buzaglo, T. Etzion, Tilings with n -dimensional chairs and their applications to asymmetric codes Submitted to the IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory. URL: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1204.4204v3>.
- [2] Y. Cassuto, M. Schwartz, V. Bohossian, J. Bruck, Codes for asymmetric limited-magnitude errors with applications to multilevel flash memories, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 56 (4) (2010) 1582–1595.
- [3] T. Etzion, Product constructions for perfect Lee codes, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 57 (11) (2011) 7473–7481.
- [4] S. W. Golomb, L. R. Welch, Perfect codes in the Lee metric and the packing of polyominoes, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 18 (2) (1970) 302–317.
- [5] G. H. Hardy, E. M. Wright, An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 6th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [6] D. Hickerson, S. Stein, Abelian groups and packing by semicrosses, Pacific J. Math. 122 (1) (1986) 95–109.
- [7] P. Horak, B. F. AlBdaiwi, Diameter perfect Lee codes, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 58 (2012) 5490–5499.
- [8] P. Horak, On perfect Lee codes, Discrete Math. 309 (2009) 5551–5561.
- [9] P. Horak, Tilings in Lee metric, European J. of Combin. 30 (2009) 480–489.
- [10] H. Minkowski, Diophantische Approximationen, Teubner, Leipzig, 1907.
- [11] K. A. Post, Nonexistence theorems on perfect Lee codes over large alphabets, Inform. and Control 29 (1975) 369–380.
- [12] M. Schwartz, Quasi-cross lattice tilings with applications to flash memory, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 58 (4) (2012) 2397–2405.
- [13] S. K. Stein, Factoring by subsets, Pacific J. Math. 22 (3) (1967) 523–541.
- [14] S. Stein, Packings of R^n by certain error spheres, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 30 (2) (1984) 356–363.

- [15] S. Stein, S. Szabó, Algebra and Tiling, The Mathematical Association of America, 1994.
- [16] U. Tamm, Splittings of cyclic groups and perfect shift codes, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory 44 (5) (1998) 2003–2009.
- [17] U. Tamm, On perfect integer codes, in: Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT2005), Adelaide, SA, Australia, 2005, pp. 117–120.
- [18] S. Yari, T. Kløve, B. Bose, Some codes correcting unbalanced errors of limited magnitude for flash memories, submitted to IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory.