

# (non)-automaticity of completely multiplicative sequences having negligible many non-trivial prime factors

Shuo LI

*CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-PRG  
Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Case 247  
4 Place Jussieu  
F-75252 Paris Cedex 05 (France)  
shuo.li@imj-prg.fr*

## Abstract

In this article we consider the completely multiplicative sequences  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  defined on a field  $\mathbf{K}$  and satisfying

$$\sum_{p|p \leq n, a_p \neq 1, p \in \mathbf{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty,$$

where  $\mathbf{P}$  is the set of prime numbers. We prove that if such sequences are automatic then they cannot have infinitely many prime numbers  $p$  such that  $a_p \neq 1$ . Using this fact, we prove that if a completely multiplicative sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , vanishing or not, can be written in the form  $a_n = b_n \chi_n$  such that  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a non ultimately periodic, completely multiplicative automatic sequence satisfying the above condition, and  $(\chi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a Dirichlet character or a constant sequence, then there exists only one prime number  $p$  such that  $b_p \neq 1$  or  $0$ .

## 1 Introduction

The propose of this article is to study the automaticity of some completely multiplicative sequences, which will be denoted as CMS. In article [5], the author proves that if a non vanishing CMS is automatic then it is almost periodic (defined in [5]). In article [1], the author gives a formal expression to all non vanishing automatic CMSs and also some examples in the vanishing case. In article [3], the author studies the CMSs taking values on a general field who have finitely many prime numbers such that  $a_p \neq 1$ , she proves that such CMSs have a complexity  $p_a(n) = O(n^k)$  where  $k = \# \{p|p \in \mathbf{P}, a_p \neq 1, 0\}$ . In this article we consider the CMSs  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  who satisfy the condition  $\mathcal{C}_1 : \sum_{p|p \leq n, a_p \neq 1, p \in \mathbf{P}} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$ . We prove that such sequences cannot satisfy the condition  $\mathcal{C}_2 : \# \{p_i|a_{p_i} \neq 1\} = \infty$ . This fact deduce that if a CMS  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , vanishing or not, can be written in the form  $a_n = b_n \chi_n$  with  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  a non ultimately periodic CMS satisfying the condition  $\mathcal{C}_1$ , and  $(\chi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  a Dirichlet character or a constant sequence, then there exists only one prime number  $p$  such that  $b_p \neq 1$  or  $0$ .

## 2 Definitions and notations

Here we declare some definitions and notations used in this article. We say a word of a sequences to be a finitely many long string of the sequence, we denote by  $\overline{w}_l$  a word of length  $l$ . Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a CMS, we say  $a_p$  is a prime factor of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  if  $p$  is a prime number and  $a_p \neq 1$ , and  $a_p$  is a non trivial prime factor if  $a_p \neq 0, 1$ . Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  and  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be two CMSs we say  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}} < (b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  if all prime factors of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  are prime factors of  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ . We say a sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is generated by  $a_{p_1}, a_{p_2}, \dots$  if and only if  $a_{p_1}, a_{p_2}, \dots$  are the whole prime factors of the sequence.

We note  $f(n) = O(g(n))$ :  $f$  is bounded above by  $g$  (up to constant factor);

$f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ :  $f$  is bounded both above and below (up to constant factors) by  $g$ .

We recall the definitions of the automaticity of a sequence.

**Definition** Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a infinite sequence and  $k \leq 2$  an integer, we say this sequence is  $k$ -automatic if there is a finite set of sequences containing  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  and closed under the map

$$a_n \rightarrow a_{kn+i}, i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$$

## 3 Automaticity

**Proposition 1** Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a CMS defined on the set  $G = \{\zeta^r | r \in \mathbf{N}\}$  included in  $\mathbf{F}$  where  $\zeta$  is a  $k$ -th root of unity and it has finitely many prime factors  $a_{p_1}, a_{p_2}, \dots, a_{p_u}$ , then for every sub-set  $G_1 = \{\zeta'^r | r \in \mathbf{N}, \zeta' \in G/\{1\}\}$ , there exists a word  $\overline{w}_u$  appearing periodically in the sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  such that none of its letters appears in the set  $G_1/\{1\}$ . What is more, the period does not have any other prime factors than  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_u$ .

**Proof** We prove it by recurrence, for  $u = 1$ , the above statement is trivial. It is easy to check that the sequence  $(a_{np_1^{k+1}+p_1^k})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a constant sequence of 1 and the period is  $p_1^{k+1}$ .

For an arbitrary sub-group  $G_1$  of  $G$  defined as above, supposing the statement is true for some  $n_0$ , that is to say, there exists a word  $\overline{w}_{n_0}$  who does not contain any letters in the set  $G_1/\{1\}$  can be extracted periodically, and the first letter of such word lies repeatedly on the sequence  $(a_{m_{n_0}n+l_{n_0}})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  where  $m_{n_0} = \prod_{j=1}^{n_0} p_j^{c_j}$  for some  $c_j \in \mathbf{N}^+$ . Let us consider the case  $u = n_0 + 1$ , we firstly consider the the sequence  $(a'_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  defined as  $a'_n = \frac{a_n}{v_{p_{n_0+1}}(n)}$ , a sequence having  $n_0$  prime factors. Using the recurrence hypothesis we get a word  $\overline{w}_{n_0}$  appearing periodically and the first letter of this word lies on  $(a'_{m_{n_0}n+l_{n_0}})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  defined as above. We can extract this sequence once more to the form  $(a_{m'_{n_0}n+l_{n_0}})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  such that  $m'_{n_0} = m_{n_0} \prod_{j=1}^{n_0} p_j^{d_j}$  for some  $d_j \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $v_{p_j}(m'_{n_0}n + l_{n_0} + n_0) = v_{p_j}(l_{n_0} + n_0)$  for all  $j \leq n_0$ . In this case the sequence  $(a'_{m'_{n_0}n+l_{n_0}+n_0})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a constant sequence, say all letters equal  $C$ .

Here we consider the sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , we want to find a sequence  $N(n) = np_{n_0+1}^k + r$  for some  $k$  and  $r \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $p_{n_0+1} | m'_{n_0}N(n) + l_{n_0} + n_0$  for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $(a_{m'_{n_0}N(n)+l_{n_0}+n_0})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  to be a constant sequence, what is more, the constant is not in  $G_1/\{1\}$ . We discuss the cases as following:

If  $C \in G_1/\{1\}$  while  $a_{p_{n_0+1}} \notin G_1$ , as while as the case  $C \notin G_1/\{1\}$  while  $a_{p_{n_0+1}} \in G_1$ , we can find a sequence  $N(n)_n \in \mathbf{N}$  satisfying

$$m'_{n_0}N(n) \equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}}$$

$$m_{n_0}' N(n) \not\equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}^2}$$

for all  $n$  to guarantee the sequence  $(a_{m_{n_0}' n + l_{n_0} + n_0})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  to satisfy the above hypothesis. Take for example  $N(n) = np_{n_0+1}^2 - l_{n_0} - n_0 + kp_{n_0+1}$  for some  $k$ .

If  $C \in G_1/\{1\}$  while  $a_{p_{n_0+1}} \in G_1$ , then there exists a  $s_1 \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $Ca_{p_{n_0+1}}^{s_1} = 1$ . we want a sequence  $N(n)_n \in \mathbf{N}$  satisfying

$$m_{n_0}' N(n) \equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}^{s_1}}$$

$$m_{n_0}' N(n) \not\equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}^{s_1+1}}$$

for all  $n$ . Take for example  $N(n) = np_{n_0+1}^{s_1+1} - l_{n_0} - n_0 + kp_{n_0+1}^{s_1}$  for some  $k$ .

If  $C \notin G_1/\{1\}$  while  $a_{p_{n_0+1}} \notin G_1$ , then there exists a  $s_2 \in \mathbf{N}$  such that  $Ca_{p_{n_0+1}}^{s_2} \notin G_1/\{1\}$ . we want a sequence  $N(n)_n \in \mathbf{N}$  satisfying

$$m_{n_0}' N(n) \equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}^{s_2}}$$

$$m_{n_0}' N(n) \not\equiv -l_{n_0} - n_0 \pmod{p_{n_0+1}^{s_2+1}}$$

for all  $n$ . Take for example  $N(n) = np_{n_0+1}^{s_2+1} - l_{n_0} - n_0 + kp_{n_0+1}^{s_2}$  for some  $k$ .

The above argument shows that there exist  $m_{n_0+1} \in \mathbf{N}, l_{n_0+1} \in \mathbf{N}$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , the word  $\frac{a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1}}}{a_{p_{n_0+1}}^{v_{p_{n_0+1}}(m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1})}} \frac{a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + 1}}{a_{p_{n_0+1}}^{v_{p_{n_0+1}}(m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + 1)}} \dots \frac{a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + n_0 - 1}}{a_{p_{n_0+1}}^{v_{p_{n_0+1}}(m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + n_0 - 1)}}$  is constant and none of its letters in  $G_1/\{1\}$ , and  $(a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + n_0})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  is a constant sequence not in  $G_1/\{1\}$ . We remark that the prime number  $p_{n_0+1}$  satisfies  $p_{n_0+1} > n_0 + 1$  and  $p_{n_0+1} | m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + n_0$  because of the construction. These properties imply that for all  $0 \leq j \leq n_0 - 1$ ,  $p_{n_0+1} \nmid m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + j$ . So we conclude that for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $0 \leq j \leq n_0 - 1$ ,  $v_{p_{n_0+1}}(m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + j) = 0$ , that means the word  $\overline{a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1}} a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + 1} \dots a_{m_{n_0+1}n + l_{n_0+1} + n_0}}$  is a constant word of length  $n_0 + 1$  and none of its letters in  $G_1/\{1\}$ , what is more  $m_{n_0+1}$  does not have any other prime factors other than  $p_1, p_2 \dots p_{n_0}$ .

**Proposition 2** Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a CMS defined on a finite set  $G$  of  $F$  satisfying conditions  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$ , and let  $(a_n')_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be another CMS generated by the first  $r$  prime factors of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , say  $a_{p_1}, a_{p_2}, \dots, a_{p_r}$ . If there is a word  $\overline{w}_r$  appears periodically in  $(a_n')_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , and the periodic does not have any other prime factors than  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r$ , then this word appears at least once in  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ .

**Proof** Let us denote by  $p_1, p_2 \dots$  the sequence of prime numbers such that  $a_{p_i} \neq 1$ . Supposing the first letter of the word  $\overline{w}_r$  lies on the sequence  $(a_{m_r n + l_r}')_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  for some  $m_r \in \mathbf{N}, l_r \in \mathbf{N}$ , by hypothesis,  $m_r$  does not has any other prime factors than  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r$ . So the total number of such word in the sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  can be bounded by the inequality:

$$\#\{a_k | k \leq n, \overline{a_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_{k+r-1}} = \overline{w}_r\} \geq \#\left\{a_k | k \leq n, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_i, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, \forall i > r\right\} \quad (1)$$

Let us consider the sequence defined as  $N(i) = \prod_{j=1}^i p_{r+j}$ , we have

$$\#\left\{a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_k, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, r < k \leq r+i\right\} = \prod_{j=1}^i (p_{r+j} - r) \quad (2)$$

This equality holds because of Chinese reminder theorem, and the fact that  $p_{r+i} \nmid m_r$  and  $p_{r+j} > r$  for all  $i \geq 1$ .

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_i, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, \forall i > r \right\} \\
> & \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_k, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, r < k \leq r+i \right\} \\
& - \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_k, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, k > r+i \right\} \\
> & \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_k, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, r < k \leq r+i \right\} \quad (3) \\
& - \sum_{k > r+i} \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_k, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1 \right\} \\
> & \prod_{j=1}^i (p_{r+j} - r) - \sum_{k > r+i} \frac{N(i)}{p_k} - O(\log(N(i)))
\end{aligned}$$

However,

$$\prod_{j=1}^i (p_{r+j} - r) = \prod_{j=1}^i \frac{p_{r+j} - r}{p_{r+j}} N(i) \geq \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_{r+j} - r}{p_{r+j}} N(i) \quad (4)$$

as  $\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_{r+j} - r}{p_{r+j}} = \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \log(\frac{p_{r+j} - r}{p_{r+j}})) = \exp(-\Theta(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{r}{p_{r+j}}))$ , because of  $\mathbf{C}_1$ , the above equation does not converge to 0, We conclude that there exists  $0 < c < 1$  such that  $\prod_{j=1}^i (p_{r+j} - r) > cN(i)$ .

On the other hand, we remark that for all  $k > r+i$ ,  $p_k^i > \prod_{j=1}^i p_{r+j} = N(i)$ , so  $p_k > N(i)^{\frac{1}{i}}$

$$\sum_{k > r+i} \frac{N(i)}{p_k} < N(i) \sum_{N(i)^{\frac{1}{i}} < p < N(i)} \frac{1}{p} \quad (5)$$

However,

$$N(i)^{\frac{1}{i}} = \left( \prod_{j=1}^i p_{r+j} \right)^{\frac{1}{i}} \geq \frac{i}{\sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{p_{r+j}}} > \frac{i}{\sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{q_j}} \quad (6)$$

where  $q_j$  is the  $j$ -th prime number in  $\mathbf{N}$ . For any  $x \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $\# \{p_i | p_i \leq x\} = \Theta(\log(x))$  and  $\sum_{p_i \leq x} \frac{1}{p_i} = \Theta(\log \log(x))$ , so  $N(i)^{\frac{1}{i}}$  tends to infinity when  $i$  tends to infinity, because of  $\mathbf{C}_1$ , we can conclude there exists some  $i_0 \in \mathbf{N}$  such that for all  $i > i_0$ ,  $\sum_{N(i)^{\frac{1}{i}} < p < N(i)} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{2}c$ .

To conclude, for all  $i > i_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \# \left\{ a_k | k \leq N(i)m_r + l_r, k = m_r k' + l_r, k' \in \mathbf{N}; k + j \nmid p_i, \forall 0 \leq j \leq r-1, \forall i > r \right\} \\
> & \prod_{j=1}^i (p_{r+j} - r) - \sum_{k > r+i} \frac{N(i)}{p_k} - O(\log(N(i))) \quad (7) \\
> & cN(i) - \frac{1}{2}cN(i) - O(\log(N(i)))
\end{aligned}$$

When  $i$  tends to infinity, the set  $\# \{a_k | k \leq n, \overline{a_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_{k+r-1}} = \overline{w_r}\}$  is not empty.

**Proposition 3** *Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be a  $p$ -automatic CMS, vanishing or not. If it can be written in the form  $a_n = b_n \chi_n$  with  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  a non ultimately periodic CMS satisfying the condition  $\mathbf{C}_1$ , and  $(\chi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  a Dirichlet character or a constant sequence, then there exists only one prime number  $p$  such that  $b_p \neq 1$  or 0*

**Proof** Let us consider the sequence  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , who is also a  $p$ -automatic CMS, if this sequence satisfies the condition  $\mathbf{C}_1$  and  $\mathbf{C}_2$ , then we can complete this sequence to  $(b'_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  in such a way that  $b'_n = b_n$  if  $b_n \neq 0$ , and  $b'_p = 1$  for all prime numbers  $p$  such that  $b_p = 0$  and all other  $b'_m$  when  $b_m = 0$  by multiplicity. In this way we obtain a completely multiplicative sequence satisfying the hypotheses of proposition 2. Let  $G_1$  be a sub-group defined as in proposition 1. Let us consider the automaton generating the sequence  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , if it has  $q$  states, the above proposition proves there exists a word of length  $p^{2q!}$ , say  $\overline{w_{p^{2q!}}}$ , of the sequence  $(b'_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  such that none of its letters appears in  $G_1 / \{1\}$ . Then we can extract a sub-word  $\overline{w'_{p^{q!}}}$  contained in  $\overline{w_{p^{2q!}}}$  and of the form  $\overline{b'_{up^{q!}} b'_{up^{q!}+2} \dots b'_{(u+1)p^{q!}-1}}$  for some  $u \in \mathbf{N}$ . Because of the construction of the sequence  $(b'_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ , we can conclude that the word  $\overline{b_{up^{q!}} b_{up^{q!}+2} \dots b_{(u+1)p^{q!}-1}}$  does not have any letters in  $G_1 / \{1\}$ . However, in article [1](Lemma 3 and Theory 1), the author proves that in a automaton, every state which can be reached from a specific state, say  $s$ , with  $q!$  steps, can be reached with  $yq!$  steps for every  $y \geq 1$ ; and inversely, if a state can be reached with  $yq!$  steps for some  $y \geq 1$ , then it can already be reached with  $q!$  steps. so we can conclude that for every  $y \geq 1$  and every  $0 \leq m \leq p^{yq!} - 1$ ,  $a_{up^{yq!}+m} \notin G_1 / \{1\}$ .

On the other hand, the article [4] proves that for every finite Abelian group (Theory 3.10) or a semi-group(Theory 7.3)  $G$ ,  $g \in G$  and  $G$ -multiplicative  $f$  the sequence  $f^{-1}(g) = \{n : f(n) = g\}$  has a non zero natural density. If we denote by  $\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_i\}$  the set of letters appearing in  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  and  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i$  their densities associated. Then we have for every  $1 \leq j \leq i$ ,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p^{yq!}} \# \{a_s = l_k | up^{yq!} \leq s < (u+1)p^{yq!}\} = k_j.$$

The above fact shows that all  $l_r \in G_1 / \{1\}$  have a 0 density, contradiction to theory 7.3 of article 2. So we deduce that the sequence  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  must have a finitely many prime numbers satisfying  $b_p \neq 1$ . However, the corollary 2 of article [3] proves in this case, the sequence  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  can only have one prime  $p$  such that  $b_p \neq 1$  or 0. we conclude.

## 4 Reference

- [1] J.-P. Allouche, Mock characters and the Kronecker symbol. arxiv
- [2] A. Cobham, Uniform tag sequences, Math. Systems Theory 6 (1972), 164192.
- [3] Y. Hu, Subword Complexity and (non)-automaticity of certain completely multiplicative functions
- [4] I.Z. Ruzsa, General multiplicatives functions, ibid. 32 (1977), pp. 313-347.
- [5] J.-C. Schlage-Puchta, (2011). Completely multiplicative automatic functions. INTEGERS,