On a theorem of Kátai-Wirsing

BUI MINH PHONG

1. Introduction. An arithmetic function f(n) is said to be additive if (m, n)=1 implies that

$$f(mn) = f(m) + f(n)$$

and it is completely additive if the above equality holds for all positive integers m and n. Let \mathscr{A} and \mathscr{A}^* denote the set of complex-valued additive and completely additive functions, respectively.

The problem concerning the characterization of $\log n$ as an additive arithmetic function was studied by several authors. The first such characterization is apparently that of P. ERDŐS [3]. He proved in 1946 that if a real valued additive function f satisfies the condition

$$f(n+1)-f(n) \to 0$$
 as $n \to \infty$,

then f(n) is a constant multiple of log *n*. Later I. KATAI [4] and E. WIRSING [6] improving this result, proved that a function $f \in \mathscr{A}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{n \le x} |f(n+1) - f(n)| = o(x) \text{ as } x \to \infty$$

must be of the form $f=U\log$ for some complex constant U.

On the other hand, solving a conjecture of Kátai, P. D. T. A. ELLIOTT [1] showed that if a real function f is additive and satisfies the condition

(1)
$$f(An+B)-f(an+b) \rightarrow C \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for some integers A>0, B, a>0, b with $Ab-aB\neq 0$ and for a real constant C, then $f(n)=U\log n$ holds for all positive integers n which are prime to Aa(Ab-aB). In his proof Elliott relaxed the condition (1) to

$$\sum_{n \le x} |f(An+B) - f(an+b)|^2 = o(x)$$

for the case $A \neq a$.

Received March 13, 1991.

Our purpose in this paper is to give a complete characterization of those functions $f, g \in \mathscr{A}$ for which the relation

(2)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |g(an+b)-f(n)-d| = o(x)$$

holds for some fixed positive a, b and for a complex constant d.

We shall prove the following

Theorem 1. Assume that $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy (2) for some fixed positive integers a, b and for a complex constant d. Then there are a complex constant U and functions $F \in \mathcal{A}, G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$f(n) = U \log n + F(n)$$

$$g(n) = U \log n + G(n)$$
and

$$G(an+b)-F(n)-d+U\log a=0$$

hold for all positive integers n.

Theorem 2. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies the condition

(3)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |f(An+B) - f(Cn) - D| = o(x)$$

for some positive integers A, B, C and for a complex constant D. Then there are a complex constant U and a function $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

and

$$f(n) = U \log n + F(n)$$

$$F(n) = F[(n, BCC_A)]$$

hold for all positive integers n, where C_A denotes the product of all prime divisors of C which are prime to A.

We note that our theorems can be derived from a recent result due to P. D. T. A. ELLIOTT [2], which was obtained with analytic methods. Here we shall prove our results by using elementary methods, which were used in [5].

2. Auxiliary results. In this section we assume that a function $f \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfies (3), i.e.

$$\sum_{n\leq x} |f(An+B)-f(Cn)-D| = o(x)$$

holds for some positive integers A, B, C and for a complex constant D.

Let C_A denote the product of all prime divisors of C which are prime to A. For an arbitrary positive integer n, let $E(n) = E_B(n)$ be the product of all prime power factors of B composed from the prime divisors of n, i.e. E(n)|B, (E(n), B/E(n))=1and every prime divisor of E(n) is a divisor of n.

Lemma 1. For every fixed positive integer k and Q we have

(4)
$$f(BCC_AQ^k) = kf(BCC_AQ) - (k-1)f(BCC_A)$$

furthermore

J

(5)
$$f(ACC_A^2 E(C)) = 2f(CC_A E(C)) - f(E(C)) + D.$$

Proof. For each positive integer Q we define the sequence

$$R = R(AC_AQ) = \{R_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$$

by the initial term $R_1 = 1$ and by the formula

(6)
$$R_k = R_k (AC_A Q) = 1 + AC_A Q + \dots + (AC_A Q)^{k-1}$$

for all integers $k \ge 2$. Moreover, let

(7)
$$T_k(n, Q) = (AC_A Q)^k E(CQ) n + BR_k(AC_A Q)$$

By using (6) and (7), we have

 $T_{k+1}(n, Q) = AC_A QT_k(n, Q) + B$ (8)

and

(9)
$$\left(CC_A QE(CQ), T_k(n, Q)/E(CQ)\right) = 1$$

for all integers $k \ge 1$. Thus, using (3), (7), (8), (9) and the additivity of f, we have

$$\sum_{n \le x} \left| f(T_1(n, Q)) - f(CC_A QE(CQ) n) - D \right| = o(x)$$

$$\sum_{n \le x} \left| f(T_k(n, Q)) - f(T_{k-1}(n, Q)) - H(Q) \right| = o(x)$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \left| f(T_k(n, Q)) - f(T_{k-1}(n, Q)) - H(Q) \right| = o(x)$$

for all integers $k \ge 2$, where

$$H(Q):=f(CC_AQE(CQ))-f(E(CQ))+D.$$

These imply that

(10)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} \left| f(T_k(n, Q)) - f(CC_A Q E(CQ) n) - (k-1) H(Q) - D \right| = o(x)$$

holds for every integer $k \ge 1$.

We shall deduce from (10) that

(11)
$$f(A^{k-1}CC^k_AQ^kPE(CQ)) = (k-1)H(Q) + f(CC_AQPE(CQ))$$

holds for every positive integer k, Q and P.

Let k, Q and P be positive integers. Considering

(12)
$$n := PR_k(AC_AQ) \{APCQR_k(AC_AQ)m+1\}$$

and taking into account (10), it is easily seen that (11) holds if k, Q and P satisfy the

Bui Minh Phong

relation

(13)
$$(P, R_k(AC_AQ)) = (PE(CQ) + B, R_k(AC_AQ)) = 1.$$

It is obvious that (13) is satisfied in the following cases:

P = 1, Q = 2B; P = 1, Q = 2pB,

where p is a prime. Thus, we get from (11) that

$$f(p^{k}) = kf(p)$$
 if $(p, 2ABC) = 1$.

This with the additivity of f shows that

(14)
$$f(nm) = f(n) + f(m)$$
 if $(n, m, 2ABC) = 1$.

Thus, by using (10), (12) and (14), we see that (11) also holds if we relax the condition (13) to

(15)
$$(P, R_k(AC_AQ), 2B) = (PE(CQ) + B, R_k(AC_AQ), 2) = 1.$$

Assume that (2, ABC)=1 and k is an odd positive integer. In this case one can check that (15) holds for P=Q=1 and P=1, Q=2. Thus, we get from (11) that

(16)
$$f(2^k) = kf(2)$$
 for all odd positive integers k

On the other hand, (15) also holds for $P=2^{\nu}$, Q=2 and k=2, where $\nu \ge 0$ is an integer. From (11) we have

(17)
$$f(ACC_A^2 2^{\nu+2} E(C)) = H(2) + f(CC_A 2^{\nu+1} E(C)).$$

Thus, we get from (17) that

$$f(2^{k}) = kf(2) + (k-1)(H(1) + f(CC_{A}E(C)) - f(ACC_{A}^{2}E(C)))$$

holds for every positive integer k, which with (16) shows that

 $f(2^k) = kf(2)$ (k = 1, 2, ...).

This with (14) implies that

(18)
$$f(nm) = f(n) + f(m)$$
 if $(n, m, ABC) = 1$

Similarly as above, by using (10), (12) and (18) we also have (11) if k, Q and P satisfy

(19)
$$(P, R_k(AC_AQ), B) = 1$$

Finally, let $P = P_1 \cdot P_2$, where $(P_1, P_2) = (P_1, AC_AQ) = 1$ and every prime divisor of P_2 is a divisor of AC_AQ . We have

$$(P_2, R_k(AC_AQ), B) = 1,$$

240

therefore by (11) and (19) it follows that

$$f(A^{k-1}CC_A^k Q^k P_2 E(CQ)) = (k-1) H(Q) + f(CC_A P_2 E(CQ)).$$

Since $(P_1, AC_AQP_2) = 1$, by using the additivity of f, we get

$$f(A^{k-1}CC_{A}^{k}Q^{k}PE(CQ)) = f(A^{k-1}CC_{A}Q^{k}P_{2}E(CQ)) + f(P_{1}) =$$

 $= (k-1)H(Q) + f(CC_AQPE(CQ)),$

which proves (11).

Applying (11) in the case Q=1, we obtain that

$$f(A^{k-1}CC_{A}^{k}PE(C)) = (k-1)H(1) + f(CC_{A}PE(C))$$

holds for every positive integer k and P, consequenly

(20)
$$f(A^{k-1}CC_A^kQ^kE(CQ)) = (k-1)H(1) + f(CC_AQ^kE(CQ)).$$

On the other hand, (11) with P=1 implies

$$f(A^{k-1}CC^k_AQ^kE(CQ)) = (k-1)H(Q) + f(CC_AQE(CQ)),$$

which with (20) gives

$$f(CC_AQ^kE(CQ)) = (k-1)(H(Q)-H(1)) + f(CC_AQE(CQ)).$$

This, using the fact (E(CQ), B/E(CQ))=1 and the additivity of f, shows that

$$f(BCC_AQ^k) = kf(BCC_AQ) - (k-1)f(BCC_A)$$

So, we have proved Lemma 1, because (5) follows from (11) in the case k=2 and P=Q=1.

Lemma 2. Let A, B be positive integers and D be a complex constant. If $f \in \mathscr{A}^*$ satisfies the condition

(21)
$$\sum_{n\leq x} |f(An+B)-f(n)-D| = o(x) \text{ as } x \to \infty,$$

then there is a complex constant U such that

$$f(n) = U \log n$$
 $(n = 1, 2, 3, ...).$

Proof. We first note that, by using (5) of Lemma 1 and the fact $f \in \mathscr{A}^*$, (21) implies

$$(22) f(A) = D.$$

If A=1, then our assertion follows from the theorem of I. Kátai—E. Wirsing mentioned in Section 1. In the following we assume that $A \ge 2$ and

(23)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |f(An+B)-f(An)| = o(x).$$

Bui Minh Phong

Let I_f denote those pairs (k, r) of positive integers for which

$$\sum_{n\leq x} |f(kn+r)-f(kn)| = o(x).$$

Since $(A, B) \in I_f$ and $f \in \mathscr{A}^*$, we have $(A, 1) \in I_f$, furthermore if $(k_0, 1) \in I_f$, then $(k, 1) \in I_f$ for all integers $k \ge k_0$, because

$$f((k+1)n+1) - f((k+1)n) = \{f(kn+1) - f(kn)\} - \{f[k((k+1)n+1) + 1] - f[k((k+1)n+1)]\}.$$

Thus, we have $(k, 1) \in I_f$ for every integer $k \ge A$.

We shall prove that if $(h+1, 1) \in I_f$ and integers k, r satisfy

(24)
$$0 < r < k/h$$
 and $(k, r) = 1$,

then $(k, r) \in I_r$. We prove this by using induction on r. For r=1 our assertion is true, because 1 < k/h implies k > h. Assume that for every integer k, r satisfying (24) and r < R we have $(k, r) \in I_r$. Let K be an integer such that

(25)
$$0 < R < K/h$$
 and $(K, R) = 1$.

Let k and r be positive integers which satisfy

It is easily seen by (25) and (26) that (k, r) = 1, furthermore

$$Kr < Kr + 1 = Rk < Kk/h,$$

which implies that r < k/h. Thus, k, r satisfy (24), and so $(k, r) \in I_r$.

On the other hand, we have

$$f(Kn+R) - f(Kn) = \{f[K(kn+r)+1] - f[K(kn+r)]\} + \{f(kn+r) - f(kn)\},\$$

therefore, by using the fact $(K, 1) \in I_f$ and $(k, r) \in I_f$, we have $(K, R) \in I_f$. Thus we have proved (24).

We now deduce from (23) that $(2, 1) \in I_f$. To see this enough show that

(27)
$$(h+1, 1) \in I_f$$
 with $h+1 > 2$ implies $(h, 1) \in I_f$.

Assume that $(h+1, 1) \in I_f$ and h+1>2. Let

$$S(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} |f(hn+1) - f(hn)|.$$

For each integer d with $0 \le d \le h-1$ we can choose positive integers K = K(d)and R = R(d) such that (

- 3

(28)
$$(hd+1)K = h^2R+1.$$

242

We have

(29)

$$S(x) = \sum_{n \le x} |f(hn+1) - f(hn)| = \sum_{d=0}^{h-1} \sum_{hm+d \le x} |f(h^2m+hd+1) - f(h(hm+d))| =$$

$$= \sum_{d=0}^{h-1} \sum_{hm+d \le x} |f(h^2(Km+R)+1) - f(h^2(Km+R)) +$$

$$+ f(K(hm+d) + hR - Kd) - f(K(hm+d))|$$

and so S(x)=o(x) if hR-Kd=0, because $(h+1, 1)\in I_f$ and h+1>2 implies $(h^2, 1)\in I_f$. If $hR-Kd\neq 0$, then we get from (28) that

$$0 < hR - Kd = (K-1)/h < K/h$$

and

$$(K, hR - Kd) = (K, hR) = 1.$$

Thus, k:=K and r:=hR-Kd satisfy the condition (24), and so $(K, hR-Kd)\in I_f$. By using this and the fact $(h^2, 1)\in I_f$, we also get from (29) that S(x)=o(x). This shows that $(h, 1)\in I_f$, consequently $(2, 1)\in I_f$.

Assume now that

(30)
$$A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} |f(2n+1) - f(2n)| = o(x).$$

Let q be a fixed prime. As we have proved above, from (30) we have $(q, r) \in I_f$ if 0 < r < q (see (24)). Let

$$T(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} f(n).$$

Then, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0 \mod q}} f(n) = \sum_{m \leq x/q} \left\{ f(q) + f(m) \right\} = \left[\frac{x}{q} \right] f(q) + T\left(\frac{x}{q} \right).$$

Let r be an integer for which 0 < r < q. Then $(q, r) \in I_f$, and so

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv r \bmod q}} f(n) = \sum_{qm+r \leq x} \left\{ f(qm+r) - f(qm) \right\} + \sum_{qm+r \leq x} f(qm) = o(x) + \left\lfloor \frac{x}{q} \right\rfloor f(q) + T\left(\frac{x}{q}\right).$$

These imply that

$$T(x) = q\left[\frac{x}{q}\right]f(q) + qT\left(\frac{x}{q}\right) + o(x) = xf(q) + qT\left(\frac{x}{q}\right) + o(x)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$, from which we get

$$\frac{f(q)}{\log q} = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{T(x)}{x \log x} =: U.$$

From this and using $f \in \mathscr{A}^*$ the proof of Lemma 2 is finished.

3. Proof of Theorem 2. Assume that $f \in \mathscr{A}$ satisfies the condition (3). Then from Lemma 1 we get that

(31)
$$f(BCC_A Q^k) = kf(BCC_A Q) - (k-1)f(BCC_A)$$

holds for every positive integer k and Q, where C_A denotes the product of all prime divisors of C which are prime to A.

For each prime p let e=e(p) be a non-negative integer for which $p^e || BCC_A$. Then for all integers $\beta \ge e$ we deduce from (31) that

(32)
$$f(p^{\beta+1}) - f(p^{\beta}) = f(p^{e+1}) - f(p^{e}).$$
Now we write

 $f(n) = f_1(n) + F(n),$

where f_1 is a completely additive function defined as follows:

(33)
$$f_1(p) := f(p^{e+1}) - f(p^e), e = e(p).$$

Then, from (32) and (33) it follows that

$$F(p^{\beta+1})=F(p^{\beta}),$$

which implies

$$F(p^k) = F[(p^k, BCC_A)] \quad (k = 0, 1, 2, ...).$$

Thus, we have

(34)
$$F(n) = F[(n, BCC_A)]$$
 $(n = 1, 2, 3, ...).$

We shall prove that $f_1 = U \log$ for some constant U. We note that by (3) we have

(35)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |f(ABC_A n + B) - f(BCC_A n) - D| = o(x).$$

By using $f=f_1+F$ and (34) we get that

$$f(ABC_A n + B) - f(BCC_A n) - D = f_1(ABC_A n + B) - f_1(BCC_A n) + F(ABC_A n + B) - F(BCC_A n) - D = f_1(ABC_A n + B) - f_1(n) - \{f_1(BCC_A) - F(B) + F(BCC_A) + D\}$$

and so, by (35) and Lemma 2, there is a complex constant U such that $f_1 = U \log$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4. Proof of Theorem 1. Assume that $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy the condition (2), i.e.

(36)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} \left| g(an+b) - f(n) - d \right| = o(x),$$

where a and b are positive integers and d is a complex constant.

For each positive integer N we have

$$(abN+1, a(abN+1)n+b) = 1$$

and

$$(abN+1)(a(abN+1)n+b) = a[(abN+1)^2n+b^2N]+b$$

for every positive integer n. Thus, by using the additivity of f, we get

$$f[(abN+1)^{2}n+b^{2}N]-f[(abN+1)n]-g(abN+1) =$$

= -{g[(abN+1)(a(abN+1)n+b)]-f[(abN+1)^{2}n+b^{2}N]-d}+
+{g[a(abN+1)n+b]-f[(abN+1)n]-d},

which with (36) implies that

(37)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |f[(abN+1)^2n + b^2N] - f[(abN+1)n] - g(abN+1)| = o(x).$$

Applying Lemma 1 with $A = (abN+1)^2$, $B = b^2N$ and C = (abN+1) it follows from (37) that

(38)
$$f[b^2(abN+1)NQ^k] = kf[b^2(abN+1)NQ] - (k-1)f[b^2(abN+1)N]$$

holds for every positive integer k and Q. Since (38) holds for each fixed positive integer N, so (38) also holds for every positive integer N.

For each prime p, let N_p be the smallest positive integer for which $p \nmid abN_p + 1$. It is obvious that $N_p \in \{1, 2\}$ for all primes p. We apply (38) with Q = p and $N = N_p$ to get

(39)
$$f(b^2 N_p p^k) = k f(b^2 N_p p) - (k-1) f(b^2 N_p).$$

Similarly, as in the proof of Theorem 2, we can deduce from (39) that there are functions $f_1 \in \mathscr{A}^*$ and $F \in \mathscr{A}$ such that

$$(40) f = f_1 + F$$

and

(41)
$$F(p^k) = F[(p^k, b^2 N_p)] \quad (k = 0, 1, 2...),$$

where p is a prime number. Since $N_p \in \{1, 2\}$, one can check from (41) and the fact $(b, N_2) = 1$ that

(42)
$$F(n) = F[(n, b^2)] + F[(n, N_2)] \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, ...).$$

By using (40) and (42), we have

(43)
$$f[(abN+1)^2N_2m+b^2N] - f[(abN+1)N_2m] - g(abN+1) =$$
$$= f_1[(abN+1)^2N_2m+b^2N] - f_1(m) - D,$$

where

$$D := g(abN+1) + f_1[(abN+1)N_2] - F[(abN+1)^2N_2m + b^2N] + F[(abN+1)N_2m] =$$

= g(abN+1) + f_1[(abN+1)N_2] - {F[(m, b^2)] + F[(N, N_2)]} + {F[(m, b^2)] + F(N_2)} =
= g(abN+1) + f_1((abN+1)N_2) + F[(ab+1, N_2)].

Applying (37) with $n = N_2 m$, by (43) we have

$$\sum_{n \le x} |f_1[(abN+1)^2N_2m+b^2N] - f_1(m) - D| = o(x),$$

which, by using Lemma 2, implies

(44)
$$f_1 = U \log$$
 for some constant U and

$$g(abN+1) + F[(abN+1, N_2)] = f_1(abN+1) = U\log(abN+1).$$

The last equality holds for every positive integer N, consequently

 $g(m) + F[(m, N_2)] = U \log m$

holds for all positive integers m which are prime to ab. Let

 $G(m) := g(m) - U \log m \quad (m = 1, 2, 3, ...).$ (45) Then, we have (46)

$$G(m) = 0$$
 if $(m, 2ab) = 1$.

Finally, we shall prove that

$$G(an+b)-F(n)-d+U\log a = 0$$
 (n = 1, 2, 3, ...),

which with (40), (44), (45) gives the proof of Theorem 1.

Since

$$G(an+b) - F(n) - d + U\log a =$$

= {g(an+b) - f(n) - d} - {U log (an+b) - U log n - U log a}

we obtain from (36) that

(47)
$$\sum_{n \leq x} |G(an+b) - F(n) - d + U \log a| = o(x).$$

Let r be an arbitrary integer for which $0 \le r < 2b^2$. Then we get from (42) and (47) that

$$F(2b^2m+r) = F(r) \quad (m = 1, 2, ...)$$

and

(48)
$$\sum_{m \leq x} |G(2ab^2m + ar + b) - F(r) - d + U\log a| = o(x).$$

Let M be a positive integer. By (46), we have $G(2ab^2t+1)=0$ (t=1, 2, ...), con-

246

sequently

(49)

$$G(2ab^{2}M + ar + b) - F(r) - d + U\log a =$$

$$= G(2ab^{2}M + ar + b) + G(2ab^{2}t + 1) - F(r) - d + U\log a =$$

$$= G[2ab^{2}((2ab^{2}M + ar + b)t + M) + ar + b] - F(r) - d + U\log a$$

holds for every positive integer t. Thus, we get from (48) and (49) that

$$\sum_{t \leq x} |G(2ab^2M + ar + b) - F(r) - d + U\log a| = o(x),$$

which implies

(50) $G(2ab^2M + ar + b) - F(r) - d + U\log a = 0$

for each positive integer M, i.e. (50) holds for every positive integer M. Since r is an arbitrary integer for which $0 \le r < 2b^2$, and (50) holds for every positive integer M, we have

$$G(an+b)-F(n)-d+U\log a = 0$$
 (n = 1, 2, ...).

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

References

- [1] P. D. T. A. ELLIOTT, Arithmetic Functions and Integer Products, Springer-Verlag (New York, 1985).
- [2] P. D. T. A. ELLIOTT, The values distribution of differences of additive arithmetic functions, Journal of Number Theory, 32 (1989), 339-370.
- [3] P. ERDŐS, On the distribution function of additive functions, Ann. of Math., (2) 47 (1946), 1-20.
- [4] I. KÁTAI, On a problem of P. Erdős, J. Number Theory, 2 (1970), 1-6.
- [5] B. M. PHONG, A characterization of some arithmetical multiplicative functions, Acta Math. Hungar., to appear.
- [6] E. WIRSING, A characterization of log n as an additive function, Symposia Math., IV (1970), 45-75.

EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY COMPUTER CENTER BOGDÁNFY U. 10/B H—1117 BUDAPEST