

## VIEW-OBSTRUCTION PROBLEMS. II

T. W. CUSICK

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $S^n$  denote the region  $0 < x_i < \infty$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) of  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space  $E^n$ . Suppose  $C$  is a closed convex body in  $E^n$  which contains the origin as an interior point. Define  $\alpha C$  for each real number  $\alpha > 0$  to be the magnification of  $C$  by the factor  $\alpha$  and define  $C + (m_1, \dots, m_n)$  for each point  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$  in  $E^n$  to be the translation of  $C$  by the vector  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ . Define the point set  $\Delta(C, \alpha)$  by  $\Delta(C, \alpha) = \{\alpha C + (m_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \dots, m_n + \frac{1}{2}) : m_1, \dots, m_n \text{ nonnegative integers}\}$ . The *view-obstruction problem* for  $C$  is the problem of finding the constant  $K(C)$  defined to be the lower bound of those  $\alpha$  such that any half-line  $L$  given by  $x_i = a_i t$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ), where the  $a_i$  ( $1 < i < n$ ) are positive real numbers, and the parameter  $t$  runs through  $[0, \infty)$ , intersects  $\Delta(C, \alpha)$ .

The paper considers the case where  $C$  is the  $n$ -dimensional cube with side 1, and in this case the constant  $K(C)$  is known for  $n < 3$ . The paper gives a new proof for the case  $n = 3$ . Unlike earlier proofs, this one could be extended to study the cases with  $n > 4$ .

**1. Introduction.** The view-obstruction problems defined in the abstract were first introduced in [2]. In this paper we only consider the case where the closed convex body  $C$  in  $E^n$  is the  $n$ -dimensional cube with side 1. We use the notation  $\lambda(n)$  for the constant  $K(C)$  in this case.

For any real number  $x$ , let  $\|x\|$  denote the distance from  $x$  to the nearest integer. The evaluation of  $\lambda(n)$  can be thought of as a problem in Diophantine approximation, since we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\lambda(n) = \sup \min_{0 < x < 1} \max_{1 < i < n} \|w_i x - \frac{1}{2}\|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all  $n$ -tuples  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  of positive integers. If we define

$$(1) \quad \kappa(n) = \inf \max_{0 < x < 1} \min_{1 < i < n} \|w_i x\|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $n$ -tuples  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  of positive integers, then since  $\|w_i x\| = \frac{1}{2} - \|w_i x - \frac{1}{2}\|$ , we have  $\lambda(n) = 1 - 2\kappa(n)$  for each  $n \geq 2$ . It will be convenient in the rest of the paper to concentrate on the problem of evaluating  $\kappa(n)$ .

The problem of evaluating  $\lambda(n)$  is equivalent to the following: Suppose the unit cube in  $E^n$  has faces which reflect a certain particle, and consider any motion of the particle, *starting in a corner* of the cube and not entirely contained in a hyperplane of dimension  $n - 1$ . What is the side length of the largest subcube,

---

Received by the editors January 25, 1980.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 10F10; Secondary 10E99.

© 1982 American Mathematical Society  
 0002-9939/82/0000-0006/\$02.00

centered in the unit cube, with the property that there exists such a motion of the particle which does not intersect the subcube? Plainly the largest such side length is  $\lambda(n)$ .

The corresponding problem, if the condition that the particle start in a corner is omitted, can be treated by methods entirely different from those in this paper. This has been done by I. J. Schoenberg [4], who solved this problem in every dimension; he showed that the largest subcube in dimension  $n$  has side  $1 - n^{-1}$ .

The natural conjecture for the value of  $\lambda(n)$  is  $(n - 1)/(n + 1)$  (as stated in [2, p. 166]). This is because Dirichlet's box principle gives  $\max_{0 < x < 1} \min_{1 < i < n} \|ix\| = 1/(n + 1)$ , so  $\kappa(n) < 1/(n + 1)$ , and it is reasonable to conjecture that equality holds. It is this conjecture that is proved in this paper for  $n < 3$ .

The case  $n = 2$  is very simple. The case  $n = 3$  is considerably more complicated, but several proofs have previously been published (Betke and Wills [1], Cusick [2, 3]), and another one is given here. The proof in this paper, unlike the earlier proofs, has the advantage that it can be extended to study the cases with  $n > 4$ ; however, the argument is then no longer elementary. The author hopes to return to this question elsewhere.

**2. Another proof that  $\kappa(3) = \frac{1}{4}$ .** By (1), in order to show that  $\kappa(n) = 1/(n + 1)$  it is enough to prove that given any  $n$ -tuple  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  of positive integers with the property that, for any integers  $m$  and  $q$ ,

$$(2) \quad \|w_i q/m\| \leq 1/(n + 1) \quad \text{for some } i, 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

there exists some pair  $m, q$  such that (2) does not hold if  $\leq$  is replaced by  $<$ .

If we assume (as we may with no loss of generality) that  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  have no common prime factor, then we would expect that there are only finitely many  $n$ -tuples  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  such that (2) holds for any  $m$  and  $q$ . Further, we might hope that by considering only finitely many values of  $m$ , we could identify all of these  $n$ -tuples, and so reduce the determination of  $\kappa(n)$  to a finite calculation. It is easy to carry out this procedure when  $n = 2$ , and so prove  $\kappa(2) = \frac{1}{3}$ . In the remaining portion of this paper, we show that the procedure can also be successfully carried out when  $n = 3$ .

For the rest of this section, we take  $n = 3$  and suppose  $w_1, w_2, w_3$  is a triple of integers, having no common prime factor, such that (2) holds for any integers  $m$  and  $q$ . Our goal is to show that we can always find a pair of integers  $m$  and  $q$  such that

$$(3) \quad \min_{1 < i < 3} \|w_i \frac{q}{m}\| > \frac{1}{4}.$$

If  $w$  is odd, then  $\|\frac{w}{2}\| = \frac{1}{2}$ , so we can assume that at least one of the  $w_i$  is even. It is easy to prove that (3) holds if exactly two of the  $w_i$  are even. First suppose that  $w_1 = 2^k a$ ,  $w_2 = 2^k b$  and  $w_3 = c$ , where  $a, b, c$  are odd and  $k$  is  $> 1$ . If we take  $m = 2^{k+1}$  and choose  $q$  to be any odd integer such that  $qc \equiv 2^k + 1 \pmod{2^{k+1}}$ , then (3) holds. Next suppose that  $w_1 = 2^{j+k} a$ ,  $w_2 = 2^k b$  and  $w_3 = c$ , where  $a, b, c$  are odd and  $j, k$  are  $> 1$ . We take  $m = 2^{j+k+1}$  and will take  $q$  to be odd, so

$\|w_1q/m\| = \frac{1}{2}$ . In order to specify  $q$ , we first choose an odd  $q_0$  such that  $bq_0 \equiv t \pmod{2^{j+1}}$ , where  $t$  is an odd integer satisfying  $\|t/2^{j+1}\| > \frac{1}{4}$ . We define  $q$  to be  $q_0 + 2^{j+1}r$ , where  $r$  is chosen so that  $\|w_3 \frac{q}{m}\| > \frac{1}{4}$  (such a choice of  $r$  is possible since changing  $r$  by 1 changes  $\|w_3 \frac{q}{m}\|$  by  $\|c/2^k\|$ ). With this choice of  $q$ , (3) holds.

Now we suppose that exactly one of the  $w_i$  is even, say  $w_1 = 2^ka$ ,  $w_2 = b$ ,  $w_3 = c$ , where  $a, b, c$  are odd and  $k$  is  $\geq 1$ . For this case we need the following elementary lemma.

LEMMA 1. For  $u$  any odd integer and  $n$  any integer  $> 3$ , define  $S_n(u) = S(u) = \{ \text{least positive residues mod } 2^n \text{ of odd } t \text{ satisfying } \|tu/2^n\| > \frac{1}{4} \}$ . Then for any pair  $u, v$  such that  $1 < u, v < 2^{n-1}$ , we have

$$(4) \quad S(u) \cup S(v) = \{ \text{all odd } t \pmod{2^n} \}$$

if and only if  $u + v \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{n-1}}$ .

PROOF. The "if" part of the lemma is clear, since  $u + v \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{n-1}}$  and  $1 < u, v < 2^{n-1}$  means  $u + v = 2^{n-1}$ , so  $\|tu/2^n\| = \|(2^{n-1} - t)v/2^n\|$ . Since  $t$  belongs to  $S(u)$  if and only if  $2^{n-1} - t$  does not belong to  $S(u)$ , we have (4).

To prove the "only if" part of the lemma, it is enough to show that  $S(u) = S(v)$  cannot happen if  $u \neq v$  and  $1 < u, v < 2^{n-1}$ ; for if (4) holds with  $1 < u, v < 2^{n-1}$ , then  $S(2^{n-1} - v) = S(u)$ . Define

$$M = \{ \text{odd } m \text{ satisfying } 2^{n-2} < m < 3 \cdot 2^{n-2} \},$$

so  $r$  is in  $S(u)$  if and only if  $ru \equiv m \pmod{2^n}$  for some  $m$  in  $M$ . Thus  $S(u) = S(v)$  means that the set  $M$  is unchanged when the elements of  $M$  are multiplied by  $u^{-1}v$  and reduced mod  $2^n$ ; we use the notation  $u^{-1}vM = M$  for this. We prove that if  $x$  is any integer such that  $xM = M$ , then  $x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{2^n}$ . This will complete the proof of the lemma; for then  $S(u) = S(v)$  implies either  $u^{-1}v \equiv -1 \pmod{2^n}$  (so  $u + v \equiv 0 \pmod{2^n}$ , which is impossible if  $1 < u, v < 2^{n-1}$ ) or  $u^{-1}v \equiv 1 \pmod{2^n}$  (so  $u = v$ ).

So we suppose  $xM = M$  with  $1 < x < 2^n$ . Clearly this implies  $x^iM = M$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Let  $d$  be the order of  $x \pmod{2^n}$ ; note  $d$  is even since  $d > 1$  and  $d$  divides  $\phi(2^n) = 2^{n-1}$ . We have  $(x^{d/2})^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^n}$ , and the roots of  $y^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^n}$  for  $n \geq 3$  are  $y \equiv 1, -1, 2^{n-1} + 1$  or  $2^{n-1} - 1$ . We cannot have  $x^{d/2} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^n}$  (this contradicts the definition of  $d$ ) or  $x^{d/2} \equiv 2^{n-1} \pm 1 \pmod{2^n}$  (for then  $x^{d/2}M = M$ , but the element  $x^{d/2}(2^{n-1} \pm 1) \equiv 1$  is not in  $M$ -contradiction). Hence  $x^{d/2} \equiv -1 \pmod{2^n}$ ; if  $d$  is divisible by 4 this is impossible because  $y^2 \equiv -1 \pmod{2^n}$  has no solutions. Hence  $d = 2$ , so  $x \equiv -1 \pmod{2^n}$  and the proof is complete.

Now we turn to the proof of (3) for  $w_1 = 2^ka$ ,  $w_2 = b$ ,  $w_3 = c$ . We will choose  $q$  odd and  $m$  equal to either  $2^{k+1}$  or  $2^{k+2}$ , so we may assume without loss of generality that  $1 \leq b, c < 2^{k+1}$ . First suppose that  $m = 2^{k+2}$ . If we can find an integer  $q$  such that  $q$  belongs to both  $S_{k+2}(b)$  and  $S_{k+2}(c)$  (using the notation of Lemma 1), then (3) holds. If no such  $q$  exists, then by Lemma 1 with  $n = k + 2$  we have  $b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{k+1}}$ . This means  $S_{k+1}(b) = S_{k+1}(c)$ , so if we choose  $q$  to be any integer in  $S_{k+1}(b)$  and take  $m = 2^{k+1}$ , then (3) holds. This finishes the proof that  $\kappa(3) = \frac{1}{4}$ .

## REFERENCES

1. U. Betke and J. M. Wills, *Untere Schranken für zwei diophantische Approximations-Funktionen*, *Monatsh. Math.* **76** (1972), 214–217.
2. T. W. Cusick, *View-obstruction problems*, *Aequationes Math.* **9** (1973), 165–170.
3. \_\_\_\_\_, *View-obstruction problems in n-dimensional geometry*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **16** (1974), 1–11.
4. I. J. Schoenberg, *Extremum problems for the motions of a billiard ball. II. The  $L_\infty$  norm*, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* **79** = *Indag. Math.* **38** (1976), 263–279.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NEW YORK  
14214