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ABSTRACT. We prove that any \( q \)-automatic multiplicative function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) either essentially coincides with a Dirichlet character, or vanishes on all sufficiently large primes. This confirms a strong form of a conjecture of J. Bell, N. Bruin, and M. Coons.

1. INTRODUCTION

Automatic sequences play important role in computer science and number theory. For a detailed account of the theory and applications we refer the reader to the classical monograph [AS03]. One of the applications of such sequences in number theory stems from a celebrated theorem of Cobham [Co62], which asserts that in order to show the transcendence of the power series \( \sum_{n \geq 1} f(n) z^n \) it is enough to establish that the function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) is not automatic. In this note, rather than working within the general set up, we confine ourselves to functions with the range in \( \mathbb{C} \). There are several equivalent definitions of automatic (or more precisely, \( q \)-automatic) sequences. It will be convenient for us to use the following one.

Definition 1.1. The sequence \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) is called \( q \)-automatic if the \( q \)-kernel of it, defined as a set of subsequences

\[
K_q(f) = \{ f(q^i n + r)_{n \geq 0} | i \geq 1, 0 \leq r \leq q^i - 1 \},
\]

is finite.

We remark that any \( q \)–automatic sequence takes only finitely many values, since it is a function on the states of finite automata. A function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) is called multiplicative if \( f(mn) = f(m)f(n) \) for all pairs \( (m, n) = 1 \). The question of which multiplicative functions are \( q \)-automatic attracted considerable attention of several authors including [Yaz01], [SP11], [BBC12], [SP03], [Li], [KK] and [AG18]. In particular, the following conjecture was made in [BBC12].

Conjecture 1.2 (Bell-Bruin-Coons). For any multiplicative \( q \)-automatic function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) there exists an eventually periodic function \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \), such that \( f(p) = g(p) \) for all primes \( p \).
Some progress towards this conjecture has been made when \( f \) is assumed to be completely multiplicative. In particular, Schlage-Puchta [SP11] showed that a completely multiplicative \( q \)-automatic sequence which does not vanish is almost periodic. Hu [Hu17] improved on that result by showing that the same conclusion holds under a slightly weaker hypothesis. Allouche and Goldmakher [AG18] considered related question classifying what they called “mock” Dirichlet characters. Finally Li [Li] and the authors [KK] very recently proved Conjecture 1.2 when \( f \) is additionally assumed to be completely multiplicative. Moreover, the methods of [KK] settled the Conjecture 1.2 fully under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. The key tool there was a variant of Heath-Brown’s results [HB86] on Artin’s primitive root conjecture. In this article, we develop alternative, more combinatorial approach, and prove a strong form of Conjecture 1.2.

**Theorem 1.3.** Let \( q \geq 2 \) and let \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) be multiplicative \( q \)-automatic sequence. Then, there exists a Dirichlet character \( \chi \) and an integer \( Q \geq 1 \) such that either \( f(n) = \chi(n) \), for all \( (n, Q) = 1 \) or \( f(p) = 0 \) for all sufficiently large \( p \).

In fact, our proof yields a more refined information about the set of values of \( f \) (cf. Remark 2.8.) We remark that J. Koneczny, in forthcoming work (private communication), established a variant of Theorem 1.3 using different methods relying on the structure theory of automatic sequences.

## 2. Proof of the Main Result

Let \( \mathbb{P}_0 \) the set of primes for which \( f(p) = 0 \). Since \( f \) is \( q \)-automatic, it is well-known that the image of \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) is finite and therefore if we define the sets

\[
\mathbb{P}_{>1} = \{ p \text{ prime} : |f(p^e)| > 1 \text{ for some } e \geq 1 \}
\]

and

\[
\mathbb{P}_{<1} = \{ p \text{ prime} : |f(p^e)| < 1 \text{ for some } e \geq 1 \},
\]

then, from multiplicativity of \( f \) we easily deduce \( |\mathbb{P}_{>1}|, |\mathbb{P}_{<1}| < \infty \). We begin by assuming additionally that \( |\mathbb{P}_0| < \infty \).

**Proposition 2.1.** Let \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) be a \( q \)-automatic multiplicative function and suppose that \( |\mathbb{P}_0| < \infty \). Then \( f(p^k) = \chi(p^k) \) for all \( p \notin \mathbb{P}_{>1} \cup \mathbb{P}_{<1} \cup \mathbb{P}_0 \) and any \( k \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** Since \( f \) is \( q \)-automatic, we have that the kernel \( K_q(f) \) is finite. By the pigeonhole principle, there exist positive integers \( i_1 \neq i_2 \) such that \( f(q^{i_1}n + 1) = f(q^{i_2}n + 1) \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). If \( n = m \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}_{>1} \cup \mathbb{P}_{<1} \cup \mathbb{P}_0} p \) then

\[
\frac{f(q^{i_1}m \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}_{>1} \cup \mathbb{P}_{<1} \cup \mathbb{P}_0} p + 1)}{f(q^{i_2}m \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}_{>1} \cup \mathbb{P}_{<1} \cup \mathbb{P}_0} p + 1)} = 1 \neq 0,
\]

for all \( m \geq 1 \). The conclusion now immediately follows from Theorem 2 of [EK17] (the result is stated only for completely multiplicative functions,
but the proof is in fact also valid for multiplicative functions). Alternatively, one could also apply correlation formulas developed in [Klu17] to get the result.

In what follows we will assume that \(|\mathbb{P}_0| = \infty\) and show that in this case \(f(p) = 0\) for all sufficiently large primes \(p\). To this end, we perform the following two reductions:

- replace \(f\) by \(g = |f|\) which is also \(q\)-automatic
- change each value \(|f(p^k)| \neq \{0, 1\}\) to \(g(p^k) := 1\).

These two operations preserve \(q\)-automaticity of the modified multiplicative sequence \(\{g(n)\}_{n \geq 1}\) and do not change the zero set \(\mathbb{P}_0\). It is therefore enough to prove the claim for the binary valued \(f : \mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1\}\).

To facilitate our discussion, we introduce the set

\[
\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1 := \{ p \text{ prime : } f(p^e) = 1 \text{ for some } e \geq 1 \}.
\]

Let \(s_0 < \infty\) denote the number of distinct sequences \(\{f(q^i m + r)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\) as \(i, r \geq 0\) ranges over pairs of integers such that \(r \in [0, q^i]\). Given prime \(p\) and \(\delta \geq 1\), we define \(\alpha_{p,\delta}\) by \(q^{\alpha_{p,\delta}} | p^{\delta \phi(n)} - 1\). Further, given \(p \in \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\), let

\[
\alpha_p := \min \{ \alpha_{p,\delta} : f(p^\delta) = 1 \},
\]

and let

\[
\delta_p := \min \{ \delta : \alpha_{p,\delta} = \alpha_p \}.
\]

We also note that if \(f\) is \(q\)-automatic, then there exists \(k_0 = k_0(f)\) with the following property: if for some \(i \geq 1\) and \(0 < r \leq q^i - 1\) the equality \(f(q^i n + r) = 0\) holds for all integer \(n \in [1, k_0]\), then \(f(q^i n + r) = 0\) for all \(n \geq 1\).

### 2.1. Preparatory lemmas.

#### Lemma 2.2. Assume that \(|\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1| = \infty\) and let \(r > 0\) be an integer such that \(f(r) = 1\). Select \(A\) such that \(q^A > r\). Then there exists \(i, j \in (A, A + s_0)\) such that \(0 < j - i \leq s_0\) with the property that

\[
f(q^i m + r) = f(q^j m + r) \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N},
\]

and \(f(q^i m_0 + r) = 1\) for some integer \(m_0 \in [1, k_0]\).

**Proof.** By our assumption, there exists an infinite subset \(S \subset \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1\) and \(r_S \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(p^{e_p} \equiv r_S \mod q^{A+s_0}\) and \(f(p^{e_p}) = 1\) for all \(p \in S\). Select

\[
R := \prod_{p_q \in S, i_0 \leq \phi(q^{A+s_0})} p_i^{e_p}
\]

and let \(r_1 = r R\). Clearly \(r_1 \equiv r \mod q^{A+s_0}\) and for any integer \(l \in (A, A + s_0)\) we can write \(r_1 = q^m l + r\). Since the sequence \(\{f(n)\}_{n \geq 1}\) is \(q\)-automatic, by the pigeonhole principle there exist two indices \(i, j \in (A, A + s_0)\) (say with \(i < j\)) such that \(f(q^i m + r) = f(q^j m + r)\) for all \(m \in \mathbb{N}\). Moreover, \(f(q^i m_0 + r) = f(r_1) = f(r)f(R) = 1\). Since \(r_1\) can be made arbitrary large, we see that any sequence \(\{f(q^i m + r)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\),
$i \in (A, A + s_0]$ contains infinitely many ones. Hence there exists some $m_0 \leq k_0$ such that $f(q^m_0 + r) = f(q^m_0 + r) = 1$. □

We next show that $f$ is non-vanishing along an exponentially growing subsequence.

**Corollary 2.3.** Assume that $|F_1| = \infty$. Given an integer $r > aq^2$ such that $f(r) = 1$ there exist integers $A, C \geq 0$ and $1 \leq m_0 \leq k_0$, with $C \leq s_0$, with the property that

$$f(q^{A+C_n}m_0 + r) = 1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

**Proof.** We apply Lemma 2.2 to find $i, j \in (A, A + s_0)$, such that

$$f(q^i + m + r) = f(q^j + m + r) \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$  

Without loss of generality we may assume that $A = i$; for convenience set $C = j - i$, we then have $0 < C \leq s_0$. Note that $f(q^{A+C}m + r) = f(q^{j-i}m + r) = f(q^m + r) = f(q^m + r) = f(q^m + r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. An easy induction argument now shows that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f(q^{A+C_n}m + r) = f(q^m + r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 2.2 also yields an integer $m_0 \in (0, k_0]$ such that $f(q^m + r) = 1$. This concludes the proof. □

In order to better illustrate the main idea of our proof, we first focus on the case $q$ being prime and then point out necessary modifications needed to treat the general case in Section 2.3.

**Lemma 2.4.** Assume that $f(q^{A+C_n}m_0 + r) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and that $p^\delta || q^{A+C_n}m_0 + r$ for some $n_0 \geq 0$ with $\delta > \gamma$ where $p^{\gamma} || (q^C)^{\text{ord}_p(q^C)} - 1$, and $p \nmid m_0$. Then, given any $k \geq \gamma$, there exist $n_k$ such that $p^k || q^{A+C_{n_k}m_0 + r}$. In particular, $f(p^k) = 1$ for all $k \geq \gamma$, and there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\alpha_1 > \alpha$, any element in $1 + q^\alpha \mathbb{Z}_q / 1 + q^{\alpha_1} \mathbb{Z}_q$ is of the form $p_0$ for some (arbitrarily large) $k \in \mathbb{N}$. (With $\mathbb{Z}_q$ denoting the $q$-adic integers, we identify the unit subgroup $\{u \in \mathbb{Z}/q^{\alpha_1} \mathbb{Z} : u \equiv 1 \text{ mod } q^\alpha\}$ with $1 + q^\alpha \mathbb{Z}_q / 1 + q^{\alpha_1} \mathbb{Z}_q$.)

**Proof.** By the lifting exponent lemma (cf. [wik]) we have that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\nu_p(q^{C_{\text{ord}_p}(q^C)n} - 1) = \nu_p(q^{C_{\text{ord}_p}(q^C)} - 1) + \nu_p(n) = \gamma + \nu_p(n).$$

Therefore, we have

$$q^{A+C(n_0 + n \text{ ord}_p(q^C))}m_0 + r = (q^{A+C_{n_0}}m_0 + r)q^{n \text{ ord}_p(q^C)} - r(q^{n \text{ ord}_p(q^C)} - 1).$$

Note that for any $0 \leq \alpha < \delta - \gamma$ we therefore have

$$p^{\alpha + \gamma} || q^{A+C(n_0 + p^\alpha \text{ ord}_p(q^C))}m_0 + r$$

and

$$p^\delta || q^{A+C(n_0 + p^{\delta-\gamma+1} \text{ ord}_p(q^C))}m_0 + r_0.$$
Select \( n_t = t p^\delta - \gamma \) for some \( 1 \leq t < p \) and write \( q^{\delta - \gamma C \operatorname{ord}_p(q^C)} = 1 + p^\delta B \) with \( (B, p) = 1 \). By the binomial theorem, we have

\[
q^{t p^\delta - \gamma C \operatorname{ord}_p(q^C)} = (1 + p^\delta B)^t = 1 + t p^\delta B + p^{2\delta} D.
\]

Consequently,

\[
q^{A + C (n + n_t \operatorname{ord}_p(q^C)) m_0 + r} \equiv (q^{A + C n + n_t \operatorname{ord}_p(q^C)}) m_0 + r \equiv (1 + t B p^\delta)^t - r t B p^\delta \pmod{q^{\delta + 1}}.
\]

Select \( t = t_{\delta + 1} \), such that \( p \mid rt B t_{\delta + 1} - (q^{A + C n + n t_{\delta + 1} \operatorname{ord}_p(q^C)}) m_0 + r \). Replacing now \( \delta \to \delta + 1 \) in the statement of the lemma and running the same proof again the first claim follows. Moreover, by choosing appropriate \( n_k \) such that for \( k \geq \gamma \) we have \( p^k \mid q^{A + C n_k m_0} + r \), we ensure that \( f(p^k) = 1 \). Finally, using the lifting exponent lemma together with the binomial theorem as before for the sequence \( \{p^a(q^C)\}_{n \geq 1} \) yields the last claim of the lemma. \( \square \)

2.2. Concluding the proof. We are ready to prove the first key proposition.

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1\} \) be multiplicative \( q \)-automatic sequence and suppose that \( |\hat{P}_1| = \infty \). Then

\[
|\{p \in \hat{P}_1 : \alpha_p = \alpha\}| = \infty,
\]

for some \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof.** Suppose that \( |\{p \in \hat{P}_1 : \alpha_p = \alpha\}| < \infty \) for all \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N} \), and consequently, for any \( \beta \in \mathbb{N} \) we have

\[
|\{p \in \hat{P}_1 : \alpha_p \leq \beta\}| < \infty. \tag{2.3}
\]

Let \( S = (\hat{P}_1 \cap [1, k_0]) \setminus \{q\} \), and given cut off parameter \( \beta \in \mathbb{N} \), we define the sets of “medium” and “large” primes as follows:

\[
M = M_\beta := \{p \in \hat{P}_1 : (p, q) = 1, p > k_0, \alpha_p \leq \beta\}
\]

and

\[
L = L_\beta := \{p \in \hat{P}_1 : (p, q) = 1, p > k_0, \alpha_p > \beta\}.
\]

By (2.3), we find that both sets \( M \) and \( S \) are finite.

Let

\[
r = \prod_{p \in S} p^{e_p} \cdot \prod_{p \in M} p^{e_p}
\]

with the exponents \( e_p \) chosen as follows.
For \( p \in S \), take \( e_p = 0 \) if the set of exponents \( \{ \delta : f(p^\delta) = 1 \} \) is finite. Otherwise chose \( e_p \) so that \( p^{e_p} > k_0 \) and \( f(p^{e_p}) = 1 \). In both cases, there exists \( D = O(1) \) with the property that for any \( p \in S \) such that \( p^\delta q^m n_0 + r \) for some \( 1 \leq m_0 \leq k_0 \) and \( n \) such that \( f(q^n m_0 + r) = 1 \), we have \( \delta \leq D \).

For \( p \in M \), let \( e_p = \delta_p \) and observe that \( f(p^{\delta_p}) = 1 \).

We first choose \( \Delta \) such that \( q^{\Delta} \equiv 1 \mod \prod_{p \in S} p^D \). We then select primes \( p_1, \ldots, p_l \in M \) with \( l \) to be specified later, such that \( \alpha_{p_i} < \alpha_{p_{i+1}} \), and so that for any \( C \in [1, k_0] \),

\[
q^{C\Delta} \not\equiv 1 \mod p_i
\]

for all \( i \in [1, l] \). Note that such primes exist if we take \( \beta \) sufficiently large. Further, we can assume that \( \beta \) is large enough so that \( \alpha_{p_i} < \beta \). Finally, for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \) we define

\[
r_i := \frac{r}{p_i^{e_{p_i}}},
\]

We note that \( f(r_i) = 1 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq l \). Corollary 2.3 now implies that there exists \( A_i, C_i, m_i \) with \( C_i \leq s_0, m_i \leq k_0 \), and \( f(q^{A_i + C_i n m_i} + r_i) = 1 \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Now, if \( k_i = k_i(n) = q^{A_i + C_i n m_i + r_i} \), for \( n \geq \beta + 1 \), write

\[
k_i = \prod_p p^{f_p,i} = k_i^S k_i^M k_i^L
\]

where for a subset \( X \) of primes, we set \( k_i^X = \prod_{p \in X} p^{f_p,i} \).

For each \( k_i^S \) we have \( k_i^S = \prod_{p \in S} p^{f_p,i} \) with \( f_{p,i} \leq D \). Thus the set of possible \( k_i^S \)'s is finite, and there exists \( i \neq j \) such that \( k_i^S = k_j^S =: k^S \) (provided \( l \) is chosen large enough; note that \( l \) only depends on the number of possible \( k_i^S \), which in turn depends on \( S \), and hence \( l = O(1) \)).

For such defined \( i \neq j \), by the construction

\[
(r_j/k^S)^{\phi(q) : (r_i/k^S)^{\phi(q)} = (p_i^{e_{p_i}} p_j^{e_{p_j}})^{\phi(q)}
\]

and since \( \alpha_i < \alpha_j < \beta \), we have that at least one of \( (r_i/k^S)^{\phi(q)} \), \( (r_j/k^S)^{\phi(q)} \) does not belong to \( 1 + q^{\beta+1} \mathbb{Z}_q \). Without loss of generality we may assume

\[
(r_i/k^S)^{\phi(q)} \not\in 1 + q^{\beta+1} \mathbb{Z}_q.
\]

Clearly \( k_i \) is coprime to all \( p \in M \setminus \{p_l\} \) and thus the only possibility is \( k_i^M = p_i^e \) for some \( e \geq 0 \). We note that replacing \( n \) by \( n + \Delta \) does not change \( k_i^S(n) = k_i^S(n + \Delta) = k_i^S \), whereas by the choice \( (2.4) \) \( k_i \) cannot remain divisible by \( p_i \). In particular we can chose \( n \) so that \( k_i^S = k_i^S \) and \( k_i^M = 1 \). Hence, provided \( n \) is large enough, we find that \( r_i/k^S = k_i^L \mod q^{\beta+1} \), which contradicts (2.5) since \( (k_i^L)^{\phi(q)} \in 1 + q^{\beta+1} \mathbb{Z}_q \). \( \square \)

We also need the following simple lemma.

**Lemma 2.6.** If \( \{|p \in \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1 : \alpha_p = \alpha\}| = \infty \) for some \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), then for any \( \alpha_1 > \alpha \) all elements in \( 1 + q^\alpha \mathbb{Z}_q \) can be written as finite products of coprime elements \( p_i^{e_i} \) for \( p \in \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_1 \).
\textbf{Proposition 2.7.} Let \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\} \) be multiplicative \( q \)-automatic sequence and \( |P_0| = \infty \). Then \( f(p) = 0 \) for sufficiently large \( p \).

\textit{Proof.} If \( \widehat{P}_1 \) is finite, then to conclusion is immediate. Otherwise, Proposition 2.5 implies that \( |\{p \in \widehat{P}_1 : \alpha_p = \alpha\}| = \infty \) for some \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Given \( q < p_1, \ldots, p_{k_0} \in P_0 \), i.e., primes such that \( f(p_i) = 0 \), let

\[ Q := \prod_{i \leq k_0} p_i. \]

Given any \( A \) such that \( q^A > 100Q^2 \), select \( r_A \) modulo \( Q^2 \) via the Chinese remainder theorem to satisfy

\[ r_A \equiv -sq^A + p_s \mod p_s^2, \quad 1 \leq s \leq k_0. \]

For such \( r_A \), we have \( 0 < r_A < Q^2 < q^A \) and \( p_s \mid r_A + q^A s \). Hence \( f(q^A s + r_A) = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq s \leq k_0 \). Moreover, for \( m < q^A/Q^2 - 1 \), we have

\[ r_{A,m} := r_A + mQ^2 < q^A. \]

Thus, as \( f(q^A n + r_{A,M}) = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq n \leq k_0 \), we find that in fact \( f(q^A n + r_{A,M}) = 0 \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). Define the set

\[ N_A := \{ r_{A,m} : m < q^A/Q^2 - 1 \} \subset \mathbb{Z}/q^A\mathbb{Z}, \]

and note that \( m \mod q^A \in N_A \) implies that \( f(m) = 0 \). We next show that \( N_A \) has a certain multiplicative invariance property: let \( t \) be any prime such that \( f(t) = 1 \). Then, if \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) has the property that \( t \not| n \) and \( tn \mod q^A \in N_A \), we find that

\[ 0 = f(tn) = f(t)f(n) \]

which forces \( f(n) = 0 \). In other words, if \( n \mod q^A \in t^{-1}N_A \), then \( f(n) = 0 \), provided that \( t \not| n \).

Now choose \( e \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( q^e > Q^2 \) and \( A \) so that \( A - e > \alpha \), with \( \alpha \) as in Lemma 2.6. Applying Lemma 2.6 yields a finite set \( Y \subset \widehat{P}_1 \) such that

any element \( m \in 1 + q^{A-e} \mathbb{Z}_q/1 + q^{A} \mathbb{Z}_q \) can be written as

\[ m = \prod_{p \in Y} p^\epsilon_p^{p^\epsilon_p} \mod q^A, \]

with \( \epsilon_p \in \{0,1\} \) and \( f(p^\epsilon_p^{p^\epsilon_p}) = 1 \).

Let \( t \) be a sufficiently large prime so that \( (t,q) = 1 \) and \( t \not\in Y \) holds.

Then \( t \equiv n \mod q^{A-e} \) for some \( n \in N_A \), and consequently there exists \( m \equiv 1 + q^{A-e} \mathbb{Z}_q/1 + q^{A} \mathbb{Z}_q \) such that \( tm \equiv n \mod q^A \).

In particular, \( tm \in N_A \) and thus, choosing \( \epsilon_p \in \{0,1\} \) such that \( m \equiv \prod_{p \in Y} p^\epsilon_p^{p^\epsilon_p} \mod q^A \), we arrive at

\[ 0 = f(tm) = f(t)f(m) = f(t) \prod_{p \in Y : \epsilon_p = 1} f(p^\epsilon_p) = f(t). \]
This concludes the proof. □

2.3. The case when $q$ is composite. We now give a brief outline how to modify the argument for the non-prime case. Let $q = \prod_{i=1}^{k} q_i^{e_i}$ with $q_i$ prime. Take $\epsilon$ large enough that $q_1^{\epsilon} > Q^2$. Then the image of set (cf. the proof of Proposition 2.7)

$$\{r_A + mQ^2\}_{m < q^A/Q^2 - 1}$$

under the reduction modulo $q_1^{\epsilon} \prod_{i=2}^{k} q_i^{e_i}$ map is onto. The same argument as before (i.e., define $\alpha_{p, \delta}$ by $q_1^{\alpha_{p, \delta}} || p^{\delta\phi(q_1)} - 1$ and arguing as before in the proof of Proposition 2.5) yields a finite set $Y \subset \mathbb{P}_1$ such that any element $m \in 1 + q_1^{\epsilon} \mathbb{Z}_{q_1} / 1 + q_1^{\epsilon} \mathbb{Z}_{q_1}$ can be written as

$$m = \prod_{p \in Y} p^{\epsilon_p \delta_p} \mod q_1^A,$$

with $\epsilon_p \in \{0, 1\}$ and $f(p^{\epsilon_p \delta_p}) = 1$. The same argument used to prove Proposition 2.7 now applies.

Remark 2.8. Our proof gives somewhat stronger conclusion, namely if $|\mathbb{P}_0| = \infty$ then $|\mathbb{P}_1| < \infty$. From here one can easily get a more refined information about the set of values of $\{f(p^n)\}_{n \geq 1}$. We leave the details to the interested reader.

REFERENCES


