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1. Introduction. Let $G$ be an abelian group of order $k$. Given a sequence of elements $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}$ in $G$ (possibly with repetitions), a $t$-sum is a sum of the form $a_{i_{1}}+\ldots+a_{i_{t}}\left(i_{1}<\ldots<i_{t}\right)$. In [6] Erdős, Ginzburg and Ziv proved an important result in Combinatorial Number Theory, which states that if $n=2 k-1$ then some $k$-sum is 0 . Since then, numerous other proofs and generalizations of this result have been given (see for example [2] and the survey paper [4]). More recently, Bollobás and Leader [3] proved the following interesting result: for $n=k+r(1 \leq r \leq k-1)$, if 0 is not a $k$-sum then there are at least $r+1 k$-sums. This clearly implies the Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv theorem, by taking $r=k-1$.

In this paper we shall prove several results concerning $k$-sums for abelian groups of order $k$. Our first result here is the following theorem, which settles a conjecture of Bollobás and Leader (see [3, Section 2]).

Theorem 1. Let $G$ be an abelian group of order $k$, and let $r \geq 1$. Then the minimum number of $k$-sums for a sequence $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+r}$ of elements of $G$ that does not have 0 as a $k$-sum is attained at the sequence $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{r+1}, 0, \ldots, 0$, where $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{r+1}$ is chosen to minimize the number of (non-empty) sums without 0 being a (non-empty) sum.

Our second result gives a characterization of the extremal cases in Bol-lobás-Leader's theorem mentioned above.

Theorem 2. Let $G$ be an abelian group of order $k$, and let $d(G)$ be the maximal order of an element in $G$. Let $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+r} \in G$. Then if 0 is not a $k$-sum then the number of $k$-sums is at least $r+1$, and the bound is attained if and only if $1 \leq r \leq d(G)-2$ and the sequence is of the form $a, \ldots, a, b, \ldots, b$ with the order of $a-b$ being at least $r+2$.

[^0]From Theorems 1 and 2 we see that to estimate the minimum number of $k$-sums for a sequence of elements of $G$ with length $k+r$ that does not have 0 as a $k$-sum, it suffices to consider the problem in the case of $G$ non-cyclic and $d(G)-1 \leq r \leq D(G)-2$, where $D(G)$ is the Davenport constant of $G$, i.e., the minimal $n$ such that, whenever $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in G$, some non-empty sum of the $a_{i}$ is 0 . We remark here that Eggleton and Erdős [5] have proved that $D(G) \leq k / 2+1$ for any abelian non-cyclic group $G$ of order $k$.

The following result can be easily deduced from Theorem 1 and the theorem of Olson and White [7], so its proof is omitted.

Theorem 3. Let $G$ be an abelian non-cyclic group of order $k$, and let $d(G)-1 \leq r \leq D(G)-2$. Let $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+r} \in G$. Then if 0 is not a $k$-sum then the number of $k$-sums is at least $2 r+1$.

We do not know whether the bound of Theorem 3 is sharp in general. It should be mentioned here that in the case of $G=\mathbb{Z}_{n}^{2}$ Bollobás and Leader have conjectured that the bound in question is $n(r-n+3)-1$ for $n-1 \leq r \leq 2 n-3\left(=D\left(\mathbb{Z}_{n}^{2}\right)-2\right)($ see $[3$, Section 2]).
2. Preliminary lemmas. In the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 we need the following two well known results. The first follows from Corollary 2.3 of Alon [1], and the second is Lemma 1 of Olson and White [7].

Lemma 1. Let $G$ be an abelian group of order $k$, and let $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}$ be a sequence of elements of $G$ in which no value is repeated $l+1$ times. If $n \geq k$ then the sequence has a $t$-sum equal to 0 for some $1 \leq t \leq l$.

Lemma 2. Let $c_{1}, \ldots, c_{r+1}$ be a sequence of elements of an abelian group without 0 being a non-empty sum. Then there are at least $r+1$ non-empty sums, and the bound is attained only when $c_{1}=\ldots=c_{r+1}$.
3. Proof of Theorems 1 and 2. Let $N_{k+r}(A)$ be the number of $k$ sums for a sequence $A=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k+r}\right\}$ that does not have 0 as a $k$-sum. We observe that Theorem 1 together with Lemma 2 implies immediately that $N_{k+r}(A) \geq r+1$, and equality holds only if $1 \leq r \leq d(G)-2$. Therefore, to prove the theorems it suffices to prove the following assertions:
(i) Let $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{r+1}$ be as in Theorem 1, and let $N_{r+1}$ be the number of (non-empty) sums for this sequence. Then $N_{k+r}(A) \geq N_{r+1}$.
(ii) If $N_{k+r}(A)=r+1$ then $A$ must be of the form stated in Theorem 2.

Translating (which does not affect $k$-sums), we may assume that 0 is the most often repeated value in $A$. Let $L$ be the subsequence of all 0 in $A$, and write $l=|L|$ (here and below $|X|$ denotes the length of a sequence $X$ ). Clearly $l \leq k-1$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $l>r$. Then $|A \backslash L|<k$. Let $H$ be a subsequence of maximal cardinality of $A \backslash L$ summing to 0 ( $H$ may be empty), and let $h=|H|$. Clearly $0 \leq h \leq k-1$, which implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
l+h \leq k-1 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for otherwise, $H$ with $k-h$ zeros of $L$ added would be a subsequence of $A$ with length $k$ summing to 0 . Hence $|A \backslash L \cup H| \geq r+1$. Furthermore, $A \backslash L \cup H$ has no non-empty sum equal to 0 by the maximality of $H$. Take a subsequence $C \subseteq A \backslash L \cup H$ with $|C|=r+1$; then $C$ has at least $N_{r+1}$ non-empty sums (by the definition of $N_{r+1}$ ). It follows that $L \cup C$ has at least $N_{r+1} l+1$-sums (recall that $l>r$ ). Adding the sum of all elements of $A \backslash L \cup C$ to each $l+1$-sum of $L \cup C$, we obtain at least $N_{r+1} k$-sums of $A$ (noting that $|A \backslash L \cup C|=k-l-1$ ). This proves (i) in Case 1.

Suppose now that $N_{r+1}(A)=r+1$. By Lemma 2 and the argument above, it follows easily that the elements in $A \backslash L \cup H$ must be all equal to some $c \in G$, and hence $r+1 \leq d_{1}-1$, where $d_{1}$ is the order of $c$.

If $H \neq \emptyset$, we claim that all elements in $H$ are also equal to $c$. Suppose that there exists a $x \in H$ with $x \neq c$ (note that $x \neq 0$ ). Removing $x$ and $r-1$ zeros from $A$ we obtain a sequence of length $k$. Since $N_{k+r}(A)=r+1$, the sum of all elements of this sequence must be equal to some $k$-sum obtained in the above. It follows that there exists an integer $t(1<t \leq r)$ such that $x=t c$. Then, replacing $x$ in $H$ by $t$ elements $c$ of $A \backslash L \cup H$, we obtain a subsequence $H^{\prime}$ of $A \backslash L$ summing to 0 ; but $\left|H^{\prime}\right|>|H|$, contradicting the maximality of $H$. Hence the elements of $A \backslash L$ are all equal. This completes the proof of (ii) in Case 1.

CASE 2: $l \leq r$. Then $|A \backslash L| \geq k$. By repeatedly applying Lemma 1 we can find a system of subsequences $S_{1}, \ldots, S_{q}$ of $A \backslash L$ with the following properties:
(2) The $S_{j}$ are disjoint.
(3) Each $S_{j}$ sums to 0 and $2 \leq\left|S_{j}\right| \leq l(j=1, \ldots, q)$.
(4) $\left|L \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{q-1}\right| \leq r<\left|L \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{q-1} \cup S_{q}\right|$
(where $S_{q-1}$ is interpreted to be $\emptyset$ when $q=1$ ).
Write

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{q}, \quad s=|S| \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then by (4), $|A \backslash L \cup S|<k$. Let $H$ be a subsequence of maximal cardinality of $A \backslash L \cup S$ summing to 0 , and let $h=|H|$. Then $0 \leq h \leq k-1$; and, in analogy to (1), $l+h \leq k-1$. We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|H \cup S| \leq k-1 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

To see this, we first note that $\left|H \cup S_{1}\right|=h+\left|S_{1}\right| \leq h+l \leq k-1$. Suppose
(6) is false. Then there exists some $u(1 \leq u \leq q-1)$ such that

$$
\left|H \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{u}\right| \leq k-1<\left|H \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{u} \cup S_{u+1}\right| .
$$

Since $\left|S_{u+1}\right| \leq l$, it follows that $1 \leq k-\left|H \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{u}\right| \leq l$. Then, by (2), (3) and the definition of $H, H \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{u}$ with $k-\left|H \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{u}\right|$ zeros of $L$ added would be a subsequence of $A$ with length $k$ summing to 0 , a contradiction. Hence (6) holds. Further, in analogy to (1), from (6) we deduce that $|L \cup H \cup S| \leq k-1$. Hence $|A \backslash L \cup H \cup S| \geq r+1$. Take a subsequence $C \subseteq A \backslash L \cup H \cup S$ with $|C|=r+1$. Then $C$ has no nonempty sum equal to 0 (by the maximality of $H$ ). Hence $C$ has at least $N_{r+1}$ non-empty sums.

We shall prove that $L \cup S \cup C$ has at least $N_{r+1} l+s+1$-sums. To do this it suffices to show that for each $i$-sum $\sigma_{i}$ of $C(1 \leq i \leq r+1), L \cup S \cup C$ has an $l+s+1$-sum equal to $\sigma_{i}$. We first note that $s \leq r<l+s$ by using (4), (5) and $\left|S_{q}\right| \leq l$. If $1 \leq i \leq l+1$, then $0 \leq l+1-i \leq l$. It is easily seen that $S \cup C$ with $l+1-i$ zeros from $L$ appended has an $l+s+1$-sum equal to $\sigma_{i}$. If $s+1 \leq i \leq r+1$, then $0 \leq l+s+1-i \leq l$. It follows that $C$ with $l+s+1-i$ zeros from $L$ appended has an $l+s+1$-sum equal to $\sigma_{i}$. Thus we are done unless $s>l+1$. In the latter case, for $l+1<i<s+1$, we have $i+\left|S_{1}\right| \leq i+l<l+s+1<i+s$. It follows that there exists a $v(1 \leq v \leq q-1)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
i+\left|S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{v}\right|<l+s+1 \leq i+\left|S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{v} \cup S_{v+1}\right| \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recalling that $\left|S_{v+1}\right| \leq l$, by (7) we have $1 \leq l+s+1-i-\left|S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{v}\right| \leq l$. Hence $C \cup S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{v}$ with $l+s+1-i-\left|S_{1} \cup \ldots \cup S_{v}\right|$ zeros from $L$ appended has an $l+s+1$-sum equal to $\sigma_{i}$. The desired result is thus proved.

Now, adding the sum of all elements of $A \backslash L \cup S \cup C$ to each of the $l+s+1$-sums of $L \cup S \cup C$, we obtain at least $N_{r+1} k$-sums of $A$ (noting that $|A \backslash L \cup S \cup C|=k-l-s-1$ ). This completes the proof of (i) in Case 2.

Finally, since $l \leq r$ and $|C|=r+1$, the elements in $C$ cannot be all equal (recalling the definition of $l$ ). Hence, by Lemma $2, C$ has at least $r+2$ non-empty sums and thus we must have $N_{k+r}(A)>r+1$ in Case 2.

The proof of Theorems 1 and 2 is now complete.
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