

Multiplicative functions with nearly integer values

I. KÁTAI and B. KOVÁCS

Dedicated to Professor Károly Tandori on the occasion of his 60th birthday

We shall say that a realvalued arithmetical function $f(n)$ is completely multiplicative if $f(mn) = f(m) \cdot f(n)$ holds for each pairs of integers. Let $\|z\|$ denote the distance of z to the nearest integer, and $[z]$ denote the integer part of z .

We are interested in to determine the class of those completely multiplicative functions for which

$$(1) \quad \|f(n)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

It is obvious that the validity of (1) does not depend on the sign of $f(n)$, since $\|z\| = \|-z\|$, so we may assume that $f(n) \geq 0$.

We shall say that a real number θ is a Pisot-number, if it is an algebraic integer, $\theta > 1$, and if all conjugates $\theta_2, \dots, \theta_r$, are in the domain $|z| < 1$. It is well known for a Pisot-number the relation

$$(2) \quad \|\theta^n\| \rightarrow 0$$

holds. (See [1].)

Let now the whole set of primes \mathcal{P} be divided into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ and $f(n)$ be defined for $p \in \mathcal{P}$ as follows:

$$f(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p \in \mathcal{P}_1 \\ \theta^{x(p)} & \text{if } p \in \mathcal{P}_2, \end{cases}$$

where $x(p)$ is a positive integer for each $p \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $x(p) \rightarrow \infty$ if $p \rightarrow \infty$, furthermore θ is a Pisot-number. Then the completely multiplicative $f(n)$ determined by these values satisfies the relation (1).

For an algebraic α let $Q(\alpha)$ denote the simple extension of the rational number field generated by α .

Lemma 1. *Let β be an algebraic number, $f(n)$ be completely multiplicative with values in $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$. Let β_2, \dots, β_r be the conjugates of β over Ω . Let $\varphi_j(n)$ denote the conjugate of $f(n)$ defined by the substitution $\beta \rightarrow \beta_j$. Then $\varphi_j(n)$ are completely multiplicative functions as well.*

Proof. Let $f(n) = r_n(\beta)$. Then $\varphi_j(n) = r_n(\beta_j)$. Since $r_{mn}(\beta) = f(mn) = f(m) \cdot f(n) = r_m(\beta) \cdot r_n(\beta)$, therefore $\varphi_j(mn) = r_{mn}(\beta_j) = r_m(\beta_j) r_n(\beta_j) = \varphi_j(m) \varphi_j(n)$.

Lemma 2. *Let β be an algebraic number and $f(n)$ a completely multiplicative function the values $f(n)$ of which are integers in $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$. Assume that*

$$(3) \quad \varphi_j(p) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } p \rightarrow \infty, \quad (j = 2, \dots, r),$$

where p runs over the set of primes. Then (1) holds.

Proof. It is obvious that (3) involves that $\varphi_j(n) \rightarrow 0$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$). Furthermore $\varphi_j(n)$ are algebraic integers, and so

$$f(n) + \varphi_2(n) + \dots + \varphi_r(n) = E_n = \text{rational integer},$$

whence (1) follows immediately.

To give a partial answer for our problem we shall use the following known theorems [1] as Lemma 3 and 4.

Lemma 3. *Let $\alpha > 1$ be an algebraic number, $\lambda \neq 0$ be a real number and*

$$(4) \quad \|\lambda \alpha^n\| \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Then α is a Pisot-number, $\lambda = \alpha^{-N} \mu$, where $N \geq 0$ is a suitable integer, $\mu \in \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\alpha > 1$, $\lambda \neq 0$ be a real number and*

$$(5) \quad \sum_{0 \leq n < \infty} \|\lambda \alpha^n\|^2 < \infty.$$

Then α is an algebraic number, consequently the assertion stated in Lemma 3 holds.

Lemma 5. *Let $f(n) \geq 0$ be a completely multiplicative function for which (1) holds. If $f(n_0) > 1$ for at least one n_0 , then $f(n) \geq 1$ or $f(n) = 0$ for each values of n .*

Proof. Assume in contrary that $0 < f(m_0) < 1$. Let $b = f(n_0)$, $a = f(m_0)$, $x_0 = [-3 \log a] + 1$. For infinitely many k, l pairs of positive integers we have

$$\frac{-2x_0}{\log a} > k + l \frac{\log b}{\log a} > \frac{-x_0}{\log a},$$

since the length of the interval $\left(\frac{-x_0}{\log a}, \frac{-2x_0}{\log a} \right)$ is at least three. For such pairs

k, l we have $2^{-2x_0} < a^k b^l < 2^{-x_0}$, consequently

$$2^{-2x_0} < \|f(m_0^k n_0^l)\| = \|a^k b^l\| < 2^{-x_0}.$$

But this contradicts to (1).

Lemma 6. *Let $f \geq 0$ be a completely multiplicative function satisfying (1). Assume that there exists an m for which $f(m) > 1$ and $f(m)$ is algebraic over \mathcal{Q} . Let \mathcal{P}_1 be the set of those primes p for which $f(p) \neq 0$. Then the values $f(p)$ are Pisot-numbers for each $p \in \mathcal{P}_1$, and for every $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1$ we have $Q(\alpha_{p_1}) = Q(\alpha_{p_2})$, $\alpha_{p_1} = f(p_1)$, $\alpha_{p_2} = f(p_2)$.*

Proof. Let $f(m) = \alpha$. Since $\alpha > 1$, α algebraic; and $\|f(m^k)\| = \|\alpha^k\| \rightarrow 0$ ($k \rightarrow \infty$), by Lemma 3 we get that $f(m)$ is a Pisot-number.

Let now n be an arbitrary natural number for which $f(n) \neq 0$. Since $\|f(nm^k)\| = \|f(n)\alpha^k\| \rightarrow 0$ ($k \rightarrow \infty$), from Lemma 3 we deduce that $f(n) = \alpha^{-N}\gamma$, $N \geq 0$, integer, $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}(\alpha)$. Hence $\beta = f(n) = \alpha^{-N}\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}(\alpha)$. Since $\beta \neq 0$, from Lemma 3 we get that $\beta > 1$, and so by repeating the above argument with β instead of α , we deduce that β is a Pisot-number and $\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(\beta)$. The assertion is proved.

Corollary. Let $f(n) \geq 0$ be a completely multiplicative function satisfying (1). If $1 < f(n) \in \mathcal{Q}$ holds for at least one n , then $f(n)$ takes on integer values for every n .

Lemma 7. *Let $f(n) \geq 0$ be a completely multiplicative function satisfying the relation*

$$(6) \quad \|f(n)\| \leq \varepsilon(n),$$

where $\varepsilon(n)$ is a monotonically decreasing function, with

$$(7) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^2(2^k) < \infty.$$

Then the following possibilities are:

- a) f takes on integer values for every n .
- b) For a suitable n $0 < f(n) < 1$. Then $f(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- c) For a suitable m $f(m) > 1$. Let \mathcal{P}_1 denote the whole set of those primes p for which $f(p) \neq 0$. Then there exists a Pisot-number Θ such that $Q(f(p)) = Q(\Theta)$ for each $p \in \mathcal{P}_1$.

Proof. The relation (6) involves (4). If $0 < f(n) < 1$ then from Lemma 5 $f(m) \leq 1$ for every m . If $f(m) = 1$, then $\|f(nm^k)\| = \|f(n)\|$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$; that contradicts to (1). Consequently $f(m) < 1$ for each $m > 1$. Assume that there exists a subsequence $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that $f(n_j) \rightarrow 1$. Then $f(nm_j) \rightarrow f(n)$ ($j \rightarrow \infty$) that contradicts to (1). Consequently $f(m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us consider the case c). Taking into account (6) and (7), the conditions of Lemma 4 are satisfied with $\lambda=1, \alpha=f(m)>1$. Consequently α is an algebraic number, and the assertion is an immediate consequence of Lemma 6.

Theorem 1. *Let $f(n)\geq 0$ be a completely multiplicative function that takes on at least one algebraic value $f(n_0)=\alpha>1$. Let \mathcal{P}_1 denote those set of primes p for which $f(p)\neq 0$.*

If (1) holds, then the values $f(p)=\alpha_p$ are Pisot-numbers, for each $p_1, p_2\in\mathcal{P}_1$ we have $Q(\alpha_{p_1})=Q(\alpha_{p_2})$. Let Θ denote one of the values α_p ($p\in\mathcal{P}_1$), $\Theta_2, \dots, \Theta_r$ its conjugates, $\varphi_2(n), \dots, \varphi_r(n)$ be defined as in Lemma 1. Then

$$(8) \quad \varphi_j(n) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad j = 2, \dots, r.$$

In contrary, let us assume that the values $f(p)$ are zeros or Pisot-numbers from a given algebraic number field $\Omega(\Theta)$. If

$$(9) \quad \varphi_j(p) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \infty \quad (j = 2, \dots, r)$$

then (1) holds.

Proof. Let us assume that (1) holds. From Lemma 6 we get that the values $f(n)$ are zeros or Pisot-numbers taken from a given number field $\Omega(\Theta)$. Let us consider the vector

$$\Psi(n) = (\varphi_2(n), \dots, \varphi_r(n)),$$

and denote by X the set of the limit points of $\psi(n)$ ($n\rightarrow\infty$). Let $(x_2, \dots, x_r)\in X$. Since

$$f(n) + \varphi_2(n) + \dots + \varphi_r(n) = \text{rational integer},$$

$\|f(n)\|\rightarrow 0$, we get that $x_2 + \dots + x_r = \text{rational integer}$. Let m_j be such a sequence for which

$$\Psi(m_j) \rightarrow (x_2, \dots, x_r).$$

Then $\Psi(m_j^h) \rightarrow (x_2^h, \dots, x_r^h)$, $x_2^h + \dots + x_r^h = \text{rational integer}$, consequently $0 < |x_j| < 1$ is impossible, that is $x_j = 0$ or $|x_j| = 1$. Let now n be fixed such that $f(n) \neq 0$. Then $\varphi_j(n) \neq 0$, $0 < |\varphi_j(n)| < 1$,

$$\Psi(nm_j) \rightarrow (\varphi_2(n) x_2, \dots, \varphi_r(n) x_r) \in X.$$

If $x_l \neq 0$ for a suitable l , then $0 \neq |\varphi_l(n) x_l| < 1$, which is impossible. Consequently we have (8).

The converse assertion is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.

Theorem 2. *Let $f(n) \equiv 0$ be a completely multiplicative function satisfying the conditions (6), (7). Let us assume that $f(n) \rightarrow 0$, and that $f(n)$ takes on at least one nonintegral value. Then $f(n)$ takes on algebraic values, and the first assertion, stated in Theorem 1, holds.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7 and Theorem 1.

Reference

- [1] J. W. S. CASSELS, *An introduction to Diophantine approximation*, Cambridge Univ. Press (1957), Ch. VIII.

(I. K.)
MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF
EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY
1088 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

(B. K.)
MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF
KOSSUTH LAJOS UNIVERSITY
4010 DEBRECEN 10, HUNGARY