THE SCHOLZ-BRAUER PROBLEM IN ADDITION CHAINS

BY A. A. GIOIA, M. V. SUBBARAO, AND M. SUGUNAMMA

1. Introduction. Following A. Scholz [3], we say that a sequence of integers

$$1 = a_0, \quad a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_r = n$$

is an addition chain for the positive integer n provided for each i > 0 we have

(1.1)
$$a_i = a_i + a_k$$
 for some $j, k < i$ $(j = k$ is allowed).

The integer r is called the length of the chain. The smallest possible value of r is denoted l(n). Our interest here is in the *shortest* chains for n, i.e. chains of smallest possible length.

Scholz proposed and Alfred Brauer proved that

(1.2)
$$q+1 \le l(n) \le 2q$$
, for $2^{q}+1 \le n \le 2^{q+1}$, $q \ge 1$

$$(1.3) l(ab) \le l(a) + l(b).$$

Scholz conjectured that $l(2^{\alpha} - 1) \leq l(q) + q - 1$, $q \geq 1$. We will refer to this in the sequel as *Scholz's conjecture*. This conjecture has not yet been completely solved for general values of q. Partial solutions have been offered by Brauer [1], W. R. Utz [4], and Walter Hansen [2].

Brauer proved that Scholz's conjecture is true provided that among the shortest chains of q, there is at least one satisfying

(1.4)
$$a_i = a_{i-1} + a_j$$
, some $j < i$ $(i = 1, 2, \dots, r)$.

(We refer to any chain satisfying (1.4) as a special chain of type A.) The minimal length of a special chain of type A for n is denoted $l^*(n)$. Hansen has shown that there are integers n for which $l^*(n) > l(n)$; thus, Scholz's conjecture is not proved by arguing that among the chains of shortest length there is one of type A.

Utz has shown that Scholz's conjecture is true whenever q has the form $q = 2^t$ or $q = 2^s + 2^t$, $s > t \ge 0$, s and t integral.

In this paper we will extend Utz's results by showing that the conjecture holds when q is of the form $q = 2^{c_1} + 2^{c_2} + 2^{c_3}$, $c_1 > c_2 > c_3 \ge 0$. In attempting to extend the result to the case when q is of the form $2^{c_1} + 2^{c_2} + 2^{c_3} + 2^{c_4}$, we encountered some difficulties which we could not completely resolve. Our results are contained in Theorem 2. The question to be settled here is the value of l(n) when $n = 2^{c_1} + 2^{c_2} + \cdots + 2^{c_i}$, $c_1 > c_2 > \cdots > c_i \ge 0$. When i = 1, $l(n) = c_1$; when i = 2, $l(n) = c_1 + 1$; when i = 3, $l(n) = c_1 + 2$. However, when i = 4, l(n) is $c_1 + 2$ is some cases and $c_1 + 3$ in others. We are not able to distinguish these two cases completely.

Received July 24, 1961; in revised form, April 20, 1962.