

# Computational Aspects of Sturdy and Flimsy Numbers

Trevor Clokie, Thomas F. Lidbetter\*, Antonio Molina Lovett†

Jeffrey Shallit, and Leon Witzman

School of Computer Science

University of Waterloo

Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1

Canada

[trevor.clokie@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:trevor.clokie@uwaterloo.ca)

[finnlidbetter@gmail.com](mailto:finnlidbetter@gmail.com)

[antonio@amolina.ca](mailto:antonio@amolina.ca)

[shallit@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:shallit@uwaterloo.ca)

[lwitzman@edu.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:lwitzman@edu.uwaterloo.ca)

## Abstract

Following Stolarsky, we say that a natural number  $n$  is *flimsy* in base  $b$  if some positive multiple of  $n$  has smaller digit sum in base  $b$  than  $n$  does; otherwise it is *sturdy*. We develop algorithmic methods for the study of sturdy and flimsy numbers.

We provide some criteria for determining whether a number is sturdy. Focusing on the case of base  $b = 2$ , we study the computational problem of checking whether a given number is sturdy, giving several algorithms for the problem. We find two additional, previously unknown sturdy primes. We develop a method for determining which numbers with a fixed number of 0's in binary are flimsy. Finally, we develop a method that allows us to estimate the number of  $k$ -flimsy numbers with  $n$  bits, and we provide explicit results for  $k = 3$  and  $k = 5$ . Our results demonstrate the utility (and fun) of creating algorithms for number theory problems, based on methods of automata theory.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $s_b(n)$  denote the sum of the digits of  $n$ , when expressed in base  $b$ . Thus, for example,  $s_2(9) = 2$ . A number  $n$  is said to be  *$k$ -flimsy in base  $b$*  if there exists a positive integer  $k$  such

---

\*Author's current address: RideCo, Waterloo, ON, Canada.

†Author's current address: Department of Computer Science, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA.

that  $s_b(kn) < s_b(n)$ . Any such  $k$ , if one exists, is called a *flimsy witness* for  $n$ . If  $n$  is  $k$ -flimsy for some  $k$ , it is said to be *flimsy*. If there is no such  $k$ , then  $n$  is said to be *sturdy in base  $b$* . For example, 7 is sturdy in base 2, while 13 is flimsy, because  $s_2(13) = 3 > 2 = s_2(5 \cdot 13)$ . Thus 5 is a flimsy witness for 13. In this paper we examine the computational aspects of sturdy and flimsy numbers.

Sturdy and flimsy numbers were introduced by Stolarsky in 1980 [28]. For other papers on the topic, see [25, 10, 8, 6].

Many of the sequences we discuss appear in the *On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences* [27]. For example, the base-2 sturdy numbers form sequence [A125121](#) in the OEIS, while the base-2 sturdy primes form sequence [A143027](#). The base-2 flimsy numbers form sequence [A005360](#), while the base-2 flimsy primes form sequence [A330696](#). The base-10 sturdy numbers form sequence [A181862](#), while the base-10 sturdy primes form sequence [A181863](#). Sequence [A086342](#) gives the value of  $\min_{k \geq 1} s_2(kn)$ , while sequence [A143069](#) gives  $\operatorname{argmin}_{k \geq 1} s_2(kn) = \min\{k : s_2(kn) = \min_{k \geq 1} s_2(kn)\}$ .

The goal of this paper is to examine the algorithmic aspects of sturdy and flimsy numbers. The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we prove some basic properties of digit sums of multiples. In Section 3, we give a criterion for determining if a number is flimsy, and use it to find two previously unknown sturdy primes.

Next, we turn to algorithms for sturdy and flimsy numbers. A priori it is not immediately clear that it is even decidable whether a given  $n$  is flimsy or sturdy. Indeed, in a recent paper by Elsholtz [11], he asks, ‘‘How can one algorithmically find a ‘sparse’ representation of a multiple of  $p$ ?’’

More precisely, there are four computational problems worthy of study:

1. Given a positive integer  $n$ , decide whether it is sturdy in base  $b$ .
2. Compute  $\operatorname{swm}_b(n) := \min_{k \geq 1} s_b(kn)$ . This is the smallest digit sum of a multiple of  $n$ ; if  $n$  is sturdy, then  $\operatorname{swm}_b(n) = s_b(n)$ .
3. Compute  $\operatorname{msw}_b(n) := \operatorname{argmin}_{k \geq 1} s_b(kn)$ . This is the smallest  $k$  such that  $kn$  achieves its minimum digit sum; if  $n$  is sturdy, then  $\operatorname{msw}_b(n) = 1$ .
4. Given that  $n$  is flimsy, determine  $\operatorname{mfw}_b(n) := \min\{k : s_b(kn) < s_b(n)\}$ . This is the *minimal flimsy witness*.

A table of these functions is given in Appendix C. In Sections 4–7, we discuss algorithms to solve these problems. The fastest, based on automata theory, shows that we can check whether a number  $n$  is sturdy in  $O(n)$  time. Section 10 gives our computational results achieved with our algorithms.

In Section 11 we give an application of automata to help characterize the flimsy numbers with a fixed number of 0’s.

Finally, in Section 12, we turn to estimating the number of  $k$ -flimsy numbers with  $n$  bits. We use techniques from formal language theory to solve the problem.

## 2 Basic properties

In this section, we prove some of the basic properties of digit sums of multiples.

We start with some notation. For  $n \geq 0$ , we define  $(n)_b$  to be the base- $b$  representation of  $n$ , starting with the most significant digit. If  $x$  is a string, we define  $[x]_b$  to be the integer that  $x$  represents when interpreted in base  $b$ . If  $b$  is fixed, we define  $\bar{x}$  to be the base- $b$  complement of  $x$ , that is, the string where each digit  $d$  in  $x$  is replaced by  $b - 1 - d$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $b \geq 2$  be an integer, and  $t$  be a positive divisor of  $b$ . Then for all integers  $n, r \geq 1$ , there exists a positive integer  $j$  such that  $s_b(jn) = r$  if and only if there exists a positive integer  $k$  such that  $s_b(ktn) = r$ .*

*Proof.* For one direction, take  $k = j$  and  $t = 1$ .

For the other direction, assume that there exists  $j \geq 1$  such that  $s_b(jn) = r$ . Let  $k = bj/t$ . Then  $s_b(ktn) = s_b(bjn) = s_b(jn) = r$ .  $\square$

We now show that in order to compute  $\text{swm}_b$ , it suffices to consider only those arguments relatively prime to  $b$ .

**Corollary 2.** *Write the prime factorization of  $n$  as  $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq t} p_i^{e_i}$ , and define  $g = \prod_{p_i | b} p_i^{e_i}$ . Then  $\text{swm}_b(n) = \text{swm}(n/g)$ , and  $\gcd(b, n/g) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be any prime dividing both  $b$  and  $n$ . From Theorem 1, we see that  $\text{swm}_b(n) = \text{swm}_b(n/p)$ . By repeatedly applying this observation, and replacing  $n$  with  $n/p$ , we can remove from  $n$  all primes dividing both  $b$  and  $n$ , while maintaining the same value of  $\text{swm}_b$ . At the end, the resulting  $n/g$  is relatively prime to  $b$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *There exists  $j \geq 1$  such that  $s_b(jn) = t$  if and only if there exist  $t$  distinct powers of  $b$  that sum to a multiple of  $n$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 2, we may assume that  $n$  is coprime with  $b$ .

In such cases,  $b$  has finite order, say  $\nu$ , modulo  $n$ . Suppose  $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} c_i b^i \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  where each  $c_i \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} c_i = t$ . Then  $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} \sum_{j=0}^{c_i-1} b^{j\nu+i} \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ , and this sum consists of distinct powers of  $b$ .  $\square$

Empirical evidence suggests that if  $b = 2$  and  $\text{swm}_b(n) = t$ , then for all  $i \geq 0$ , some multiple of  $n$  has digit sum  $t + i$ . However, the analogous result is false for  $b = 3$ . For example,  $\text{swm}_3(13) = 3$ , but no multiple of 13 has digit sum 4. These observations are explained in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose  $j, n$  are positive integers such that  $s_b(jn) = t$ . Then for all  $r \geq 0$ , there exists  $k \geq 1$  such that  $s_b(kn) = t + r(b - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $s_b(jn) = t$  for some  $t \geq 1$ . Then from Theorem 3 we know that  $\sum_{i=1}^t b^{m_i} \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  for some strictly increasing  $m_i$  and (replacing  $j$  by  $bj$  if needed) we can assume  $m_t \geq 1$ . Now replace the high-order bit  $b^{m_t}$  in this sum with the sum of  $b$  terms  $b^{\nu+m_t-1} +$

$b^{2\nu+m_t-1} + \dots + b^{(b-1)\nu+m_t-1}$ , where  $\nu$  is the order of  $b$ , modulo  $n$ . This has the effect removing 1 bit, while adding  $b$  additional bits, and each of the  $b$  new terms is congruent to  $b^{m_t-1} \pmod{n}$ . So we have found another multiple of  $n$  with digit sum  $t + b - 1$ . We can repeat this transformation any number of times.  $\square$

### 3 Infinite classes of sturdy numbers

We first give a criterion for deciding whether a number is flimsy. This shows that Problem 1 on our list, determining whether a given positive integer is sturdy, is decidable.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $n, b, j$  be positive integers,  $b \geq 2$  such that  $n$  divides  $b^j - 1$ . Then  $n$  is flimsy in base  $b$  if and only if  $s_b(kn) < s_b(n)$  for some  $k$  satisfying  $1 \leq k \leq \frac{b^j-1}{n}$ .*

*Proof.* One direction is easy: if  $s_b(kn) < s_b(n)$  for some  $k$ , then  $n$  is flimsy in base  $b$ .

For the other direction, suppose  $n$  is flimsy, but  $s_b(kn) \geq s_b(n)$  for all  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq \frac{b^j-1}{n}$ . Let  $k'$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $s_b(k'n) < s_b(n)$ . By assumption  $k'n \geq b^j$ , and so we can write  $k'n = cb^j + d$  for uniquely-determined  $c \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq d < b^j$ . Since  $b^j \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ , it follows that  $cb^j + d \equiv c + d \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . Then  $c + d = fn < cb^j + d = k'n$  for some integer  $f$  with  $1 \leq f < k'$ . Thus  $s_b(k'n) = s_b(cb^j + d) = s_b(c) + s_b(d) \geq s_b(c + d) = s_b(fn) \geq s_b(n)$ , achieving the desired contradiction.  $\square$

*Remark 6.* Since  $j \leq \varphi(n)$ , this together with Theorem 1 shows that sturdiness is reduced to a finite search. The result for  $b = 10$  was observed by Phedotov [20].

We applied Theorem 5 to known prime factors of composite Mersenne numbers [29] and found

$$57912614113275649087721 = \frac{2^{83} - 1}{167}$$

and

$$10350794431055162386718619237468234569 = \frac{2^{131} - 1}{263}$$

as previously unknown sturdy primes in base 2.

**Corollary 7.** *If  $b, j$  are positive integers, with  $b \geq 2$ , then  $\frac{b^j-1}{m}$  is sturdy in base  $b$  for every positive  $m$  dividing  $b - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k$  be an integer with  $1 \leq k \leq m$ . Then we have

$$s_b\left(k \frac{b^j - 1}{m}\right) = s_b\left(\frac{k(b-1)}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} b^i\right) = kj \frac{b-1}{m} \geq j \frac{b-1}{m},$$

where we have used the fact that  $k \leq m$ . The result now follows by Theorem 5.  $\square$

We can also get a generalization of a theorem of Stolarsky [28, Thm. 2.1].

**Corollary 8.** *Let  $b \geq 2$ , and let  $r, e$  be integers. Define  $n = \frac{b^{re}-1}{b^e-1}$ . Then  $n$  is sturdy in base  $b$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that  $(n)_b = (10^{e-1})^{r-1} 1$ , and so  $s_b(n) = r$ . On the other hand, if  $1 \leq k \leq b^{e-1}$ , then  $(kn)_b$  consists of  $r$  copies of  $(k)_b$ , concatenated, separated by some number of 0's. So  $s_b(kn) = rs_b(k) \geq r$ . The result now follows by Theorem 5.  $\square$

The next theorem gives an infinite class of sturdy numbers.

**Theorem 9.** *Fix  $b \geq 2$ . Let  $n$  be a positive integer, and  $x$  be the base- $b$  representation of  $n$ . Then every integer with base- $b$  representation of the form  $x(b-1)^i \bar{x}$ , where  $i \geq 0$  and  $\bar{x}$  is the base- $b$  complement of  $x$ , is sturdy in base  $b$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $y = x(b-1)^i \bar{x}$  for some  $i \geq 0$ . Then  $[y]_b + n = nb^{|x|+i} + b^{|x|+i} - 1$ . Then  $[y]_b = (n+1)(b^{|x|+i} - 1)$ . Observe that  $s_b(b^{|x|+i} - 1) = (|x|+i)(b-1) = s_b([y]_b)$ . Then for every positive integer  $k$  we have  $s_b(k[y]_b) = s_b(k(n+1)(b^{|x|+i} - 1)) \geq s_b(b^{|x|+i} - 1) = s_b([y]_b)$ . By Corollary 7 it follows that  $b^{|x|+i} - 1$  is sturdy in base  $b$ , and hence  $y$  is.  $\square$

**Corollary 10.** *Let  $b \geq 2$  be an integer, and  $m$  be an integer such that  $m^2$  divides  $b-1$ . Then  $\frac{(b^n-1)^2}{m^2}$  is sturdy in base  $b$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $m^2$  divides  $b-1$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(b^n-1)^2}{m^2} &= \frac{b^n-1}{m^2} b^n - \frac{(b^n-1)}{m^2} \\ &= \frac{b^n-1}{m^2} b^n - b^n + b^n - \frac{(b^n-1)}{m^2} \\ &= \left( \frac{b^n-1}{m^2} - 1 \right) b^n + b^n - \frac{(b^n-1)}{m^2} \\ &= \left( \frac{b^n-1}{m^2} - 1 \right) b^n + (b^n-1) - \left( \frac{(b^n-1)}{m^2} - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

which has base- $b$  representation  $x\bar{x}$  where  $[x]_b = \frac{b^n-1}{m^2} - 1$ . Then by Theorem 9, the number  $\frac{(b^n-1)^2}{m^2}$  is sturdy.  $\square$

In the rest of this paper we are almost exclusively concerned with the case  $b = 2$ , and so from now on we omit the subscripts on the functions  $m_{sw}$ ,  $s_{wm}$ ,  $m_{fw}$ , and use the terms *flimsy* or *sturdy* without further elaboration. In this case  $s_2(n)$  equals the number of 1's in the binary representation of  $n$ , also known as the *Hamming weight* of  $n$ .

**Theorem 11.** *Let  $r, e$  be positive integers. Every integer with base-2 representation  $(1^e 0^e)^r 1^e$  is sturdy in base 2.*

*Proof.* Let  $n = [(1^{e0^e})^r 1^e]_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (2^e - 1)2^{2ie} = \frac{2^{2re} - 1}{2^e - 1} = -1 + 2^e - 2^{2e} + \dots + 2^{(2r-1)e}$ . We must show  $s_2(kn) \geq s_2(n)$  for all positive integers  $k$ . We proceed by induction on  $k$ . The statement is clearly true for all  $k \leq 2^e + 1$ . Consider  $k \geq 2^e + 2$ . Then there exist uniquely-defined integers  $s, t$  such that  $k = 2^e s + t$  where  $s \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq t < 2^e$ . When  $t$  is even, we have  $s_2(kn) = s_2(\frac{k}{2}n) \geq s_2(n)$  by the inductive hypothesis. Now assume  $t = 2t' + 1$  for some  $t' \geq 0$ .

Case 1:  $s$  odd. Write  $s = 2s' + 1$  for some  $s' \geq 0$ . Using the properties that  $s_2(2a + 1) = s_2(a) + 1$  and  $s_2(a + 2^b - 2^b) \geq s_2(a + 2^b) - 1$  for all integers  $a, b \geq 0$  [28], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_2(kn) &= s_2((2^e s + t)n) \\
&= s_2((s + t)n + (2^e + 1)sn - 2sn) \\
&= s_2((s + t)n + 2s'(2^{er} - 1) + (2 + 2^2 + \dots + 2^{er-1} + 2^{er}) - 2sn - 2^{er}) + 1 \\
&\geq s_2((s + t)n + 2s'(2^{er} - 1) + 2(2^{er} - 1) - 2sn) \\
&= s_2((s' + t' + 1)n + (s' + 1)(2^e + 1)n - sn) \\
&= s_2((t' + (s' + 1)2^e + 2)n) \geq s_2(n)
\end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis, since  $t' + (s' + 1)2^e + 2 < 2^e s + t$  when  $k \geq 2^e + 2$ .

Case 2:  $s$  even. Write  $s = 2s'$  for some  $s' \geq 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_2(kn) &= s_2((2^e s + t)n) \\
&= s_2(2^e sn + 2t'n + 2n - n) \\
&= s_2(2^e sn + 2t'n + 2n + (1 - 2^e + 2^{2e} - \dots - 2^{(2r-1)e})) \\
&= s_2(2^e sn + 2t'n + 2n + 2^e(-1 + 2^e - 2^{2e} + \dots + 2^{(2r-1)e}) - 2^{2re}) + 1 \\
&\geq s_2(2^e sn + 2t'n + 2n + 2^e n) \\
&= s_2((2^e s' + 2^{e-1} + t' + 1)n) \geq s_2(n)
\end{aligned}$$

by the inductive hypothesis, since  $2^e s' + 2^{e-1} + t' + 1 < 2^e s + t$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Algorithms when $\text{swm}(n)$ is small

As we will see in Section 5, for general  $n$  we can determine whether  $n$  is sturdy in  $O(n)$  time. We call this a linear-time algorithm.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, it is of interest to see when this can be improved.

If  $\text{swm}(n)$  is small, this fact can be verified efficiently in some cases. This is particularly relevant in the case where  $n$  is prime because, according to a recent result of Elsholtz [11], almost all primes  $p$  have  $\text{swm}(p) \leq 7$ . Furthermore, we know from results of Hasse [14] and Odoni [18] that a positive proportion of all primes satisfy  $\text{swm}(p) = 2$ ; asymptotically, this fraction is  $17/24$ . For general  $n$ , however, the situation is different: the set of  $n$  for which  $\text{swm}(n) = 2$  has density 0; see the results of Moree in [21, Appendix B].

<sup>1</sup>Strictly speaking, the usage “linear-time” in the context of algorithms on integers would usually mean an algorithm that runs in  $O(\log n)$  time. But since no algorithm is this efficient, we stray from the common usage for brevity.

## 4.1 The case $\text{swm}(n) = 2$

If  $\text{swm}(n) = 2$ , then  $n \cdot \text{msw}(n) = 2^k + 1$  for some integer  $k \geq 1$ . Hence  $n \mid 2^k + 1$ , and so  $-1$  belongs to the subgroup generated by  $2 \pmod{n}$ . We can decide if  $-1$  belongs to the subgroup generated by  $2 \pmod{n}$  by using an algorithm for the discrete logarithm problem. For example, the baby-step giant-step algorithm can be used to find  $k$  such that  $2^k \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$ , if such a  $k$  exists, with time complexity  $O(\sqrt{n} \log n)$  [26]. If the factorization of  $n$  is known, this running time can be substantially improved.

## 4.2 The case $\text{swm}(n) = 3$

If  $\text{swm}(n) = 3$ , then  $n \cdot \text{msw}(n) = 2^k + 2^\ell + 1$  for some integers  $k > \ell \geq 1$ . It follows that  $2^k + 2^\ell \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$ , which means that we are dealing with a 2-SUM problem. This can be solved in  $O(n \log n)$  time using sorting and binary search. (Briefly, compute a table of powers of  $2 \pmod{n}$ ; sort them in ascending order, and then for each power  $2^k$  use binary search to see if there is an  $\ell$  such that  $2^\ell \equiv -1 - 2^k \pmod{n}$ .) Although this does not beat our  $O(n)$  algorithm given below asymptotically, in many cases it will run more quickly because of the simplicity of the operations. This is particularly true if the subgroup generated by  $2 \pmod{n}$  is small.

# 5 A dynamic programming algorithm

In this section we show how to check whether  $n$  is sturdy using dynamic programming.

By Corollary 2, we can restrict our attention to the case where  $n$  is odd. In this case, the powers of two  $P_n = \{2^i : i \geq 0\}$  form a cyclic subgroup of  $(\mathbb{Z}/(n))^*$ , the multiplicative group of integers relatively prime to  $n$ . Define  $\nu = \text{ord}_2 n = |P_n|$ , the order of 2 in the group  $(\mathbb{Z}/(n))^*$ . Hence, to find a positive multiple of  $n$  whose binary expansion contains exactly  $k$  1's, it suffices to find an appropriate linear combination of  $k$  elements of  $P_n$  (counted with repetition) that sums to  $0 \pmod{n}$ . More precisely, we need to find non-negative integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i$  and distinct elements  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i \in P_n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 e_1 + \dots + a_i e_i &\equiv 0 \pmod{n} \\ a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_i &= k, \end{aligned}$$

for integers  $k \geq 1$ . This is the kind of problem that dynamic programming is well-suited for. To restrict the amount of work required in a dynamic programming algorithm for this we make use of the following lemma.

**Lemma 12.** *For an integer base  $b \geq 2$  let  $P_{b,n} = \{b^i \pmod{n} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and suppose that  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m$  are the distinct elements of  $P_{b,n}$ . If there exist non-negative integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m$  such that  $a_1 e_1 + a_2 e_2 + \dots + a_m e_m \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  and  $a_1 + \dots + a_m = k$ , then there exist non-negative integers  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m < b$  and  $l \leq k$  such that  $c_1 e_1 + c_2 e_2 + \dots + c_m e_m \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  and  $c_1 + \dots + c_m = l$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose we have non-negative integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m$  such that  $a_1e_1 + a_2e_2 + \dots + a_me_m \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  and  $a_1 + \dots + a_m = k$ . If we have  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m < b$  then we are done. So suppose that there is some  $i$  such that  $a_i \geq b$ . Let  $j$  be the integer such that  $be_i \equiv e_j \pmod{n}$ . Then we can take

$$\left( \sum_{r=1, r \neq i, r \neq j}^m a_r e_r \right) + (a_i - b)e_i + (a_j + 1)e_j \equiv 0 \pmod{n},$$

giving

$$\left( \sum_{r=1, r \neq i, r \neq j}^m a_r \right) + (a_i - b) + (a_j + 1) = a_1 + \dots + a_m - b + 1 = k - b + 1 < k.$$

Setting  $a_i := a_i - b$  and  $a_j := a_j + 1$  and  $k := k - b + 1$ , we can repeat this argument until  $a_1, \dots, a_m < b$ .  $\square$

Let us start with determining whether  $n$  is sturdy. It suffices to solve the problem of the previous paragraph for  $1 \leq k < s_2(n)$ . The idea is that we will fill in the entries of a 3-dimensional boolean array  $x$  with the following meaning: the entry  $x[i, j, r]$  is **true** if and only if the integer  $j$  has a representation as a sum of  $i \geq 1$  powers of 2, using as summands only the first  $r$  elements of the set  $P_n$  without repetition. We fill in the array  $x$  in increasing order of  $r$ .

For initialization, we set all elements of  $x$  to **false**, except that we set  $x[0, 0, r]$  to **true** for  $0 \leq r \leq \nu$ .

To solve the remaining three problems, we need to record more information than just the ability to represent  $j$  as a sum of powers of 2. The integer array  $y[i, j, r]$  is used to record the smallest integer congruent to  $j \pmod{n}$  that is the sum of exactly  $i$  powers of 2 (without repetition), using only the first  $r$  elements of the set  $P_n$ .

The complete algorithm is given in Appendix A.

Our dynamic programming algorithm has three nested loops, which gives a running time of  $O(\nu \cdot n \cdot s_2(n))$ . Since  $\nu = \text{ord}_n 2$  could be as large as  $n - 1$ , and  $s_2(n)$  could be as big as  $\log_2 n$ , this gives a worst-case running time of  $O(n^2 \log n)$ , where we are measuring the run time in terms of RAM operations on integers of size about  $n$ . This means that this algorithm will only be feasible for integers smaller than about  $10^7$ .

## 6 An algorithm based on finite automata

In this section we provide a different, much faster algorithm for checking sturdiness, based on finite automata.

The idea is simple. It is easy to create a deterministic finite automaton (DFA) accepting the binary representations of the positive integers divisible by  $n$ . Such an automaton has  $n$  states [1] and exactly one final state. Next, we can easily construct a DFA  $A_t$  accepting those strings starting with a 1 and having at most  $t$  ones. Using the standard “direct

product” construction [15, pp. 59–60], we can construct a DFA  $M_t$  of  $(t + 2)n$  states for the intersection of these two languages; it has exactly  $t + 1$  final states  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_t$  corresponding to positive integers divisible by  $n$  with  $0, 1, \dots, t$  1’s respectively. Then some multiple of  $n$  has at most  $t$  1’s iff  $M_t$  accepts at least one string. We can test this condition (and even find the lexicographically least string accepted) using breadth-first search to decide if some  $f_i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq t$  is reachable from the start state of  $M_t$ , in linear time in the size of  $M$ , so in  $O((t + 2)n)$  time.

By choosing  $t = s_2(n) - 1$  we can determine if  $n$  is sturdy in  $O(n \log n)$  steps. Similarly, by allowing the breadth-first search to run to completion and keeping track of the least string in radix order used to reach each state, we can recover  $\text{swm}(n)$ ,  $\text{msw}(n)$ , and  $\text{mfw}(n)$  by examining each of the final states for whether or not they were visited in the search and looking at the least string in radix order used in each case. More precisely, the value of  $\text{swm}(n)$  is the least integer  $i$  such that final state  $f_i$  in  $M_t$  is reached in the breadth-first search, or  $s_2(n)$  if no final state is reached. The value of  $\text{msw}(n)$  is the least string in radix order used to reach  $f_{\text{swm}(n)}$  interpreted as an integer and divided by  $n$ , or 1 if  $n$  is sturdy. The value of  $\text{mfw}(n)$ , if it is defined, is the least string in radix order among all such strings used to reach a final state, interpreted as an integer and divided by  $n$ . To avoid needing to store the representation of large integers, we instead store the exponents of the current power of 2 and a pointer to the previous power. From this linked list we can reconstruct the appropriate number.

**Theorem 13.** *We can decide whether  $n$  is sturdy  $O(n \log n)$  steps. In the same time bound we can compute  $\text{swm}(n)$  and  $\text{msw}(n)$ . If  $n$  is flimsy, we can compute  $\text{mfw}(n)$  in the same time bound.*

This algorithm is practical for  $n$  up to about  $10^{10}$ . The main constraint is likely to be space and not time.

## 7 Improving the automaton-based algorithm

With a small modification to this idea of using a breadth-first search on the graph defined by automaton  $M$ , we can make further improvements to the time complexity. Consider the deterministic finite automaton  $M_n$  accepting the binary representations of the positive integers divisible by  $n$ . We then define a directed graph  $G_n$  with vertices given by the states of  $M_n$  and directed, weighted edges given by the transitions of  $M_n$  where transitions on the symbol 0 are given an edge weight of 0 in  $G_n$  and transitions on the symbol 1 are given an edge weight of 1 in  $G_n$ . We augment  $G_n$  with one additional vertex,  $v_s$ , with a single outgoing edge of weight 1 to the vertex corresponding to the state reached when  $M_n$  reads any input of the form  $0^*1$ . If  $v_f$  is the vertex corresponding to the accepting state in  $M_n$ , then there is a path from  $v_s$  to  $v_f$  of weight  $k$  if and only if there is a non-zero multiple of  $n$  with Hamming weight  $k$ . The shortest path problem on a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with edge weights in  $\{0, 1\}$  can be solved in time  $O(|V| + |E|)$  using a variation of the breadth-first search algorithm. In place of the queue used in a standard breadth-first search, we use a double ended queue.

We process a node by traversing incident edges of weight 0 and pushing the nodes reached to the front of the queue if they have not been processed already. Edges of weight 1 are also traversed, but the nodes reached are pushed to the back of the queue provided that they have not been processed already. After a node has been processed, the next node at the front of the queue is dequeued and processed if it has not been processed already, otherwise it is just discarded. The depth of the search can be tracked as in a standard breadth-first search. Thus we achieve the following improvement.

**Theorem 14.** *We can test if  $n$  is sturdy in  $O(n)$  steps.*

From this approach we are still able to construct an example of a multiple of  $n$  achieving the minimum Hamming weight over all multiples of  $n$ . It is simply a matter of maintaining the path used in the breadth-first search algorithm finding the shortest path from  $v_s$  to  $v_f$  in  $G_n$ . However, there is no guarantee that this is the least multiple of  $n$  with this property. To find the least multiple we can use the linear-time algorithm to first determine the minimum Hamming weight. For minimum Hamming weight  $k$ , we take the direct product of automaton  $M_n$  accepting the base-2 representations of all multiples of  $n$  and the automaton accepting all binary strings with exactly  $k$  1's. A breadth-first search on this product automaton gives the least non-zero multiple of  $n$  with Hamming weight  $k$ . This second breadth-first search has worst case time complexity  $O(n \log n)$ , giving overall complexity  $O(n \log n)$  for finding the least non-zero multiple of  $n$  having the minimum Hamming weight over all non-zero multiples of  $n$ .

## 8 Another breadth-first search approach

We can take advantage of Lemma 12 to evaluate sturdiness and compute swm and msw using a breadth-first search on a different graph structure. As before, to test the sturdiness of an integer  $n \geq 3$ , we construct an  $(n + 1)$ -vertex graph with  $n$  of the vertices representing the distinct residue classes modulo  $n$ , which we will refer to as  $[0], [1], \dots, [n - 1]$ , and one special vertex,  $v_0$ , corresponding to the number 0. The graph contains a directed edge from vertex  $[x]$  to vertex  $[y]$  if and only if  $x + 2^j \equiv y \pmod{n}$  for some integer  $j \geq 0$ . Similarly, there is an edge from  $v_0$  to  $[y]$  if and only if  $2^j \equiv y \pmod{n}$ . Hence each vertex has out-degree  $\nu = \text{ord}_n 2$ . The idea of this construction is to treat traversing an edge from  $[x]$  to  $[x + 2^j]$  as choosing to use the  $j$ th power of 2 as a summand in a summation to a value congruent to 0 modulo  $n$ . Thus, to compute  $\text{swm}(n)$  we are looking for the length of the shortest path from  $v_0$  to  $[0]$  and this can be found via a breadth-first search. Furthermore, by keeping track of the smallest sum required to reach each state, we can also recover  $\text{msw}(n)$  from such a breadth-first search. Rather than running the breadth-first search to completion, we can terminate as soon as we reach a depth equal to  $s_2(n)$ , as we will know by then whether or not  $n$  is sturdy.

With this approach we can take advantage of the structure of the graph to speed up testing for sturdiness. If during the breadth first search we visit a node  $[x]$  such that  $[n - x]$  has already been visited, then since the length of the shortest path from  $[x]$  to  $[0]$  is equal to

the length of the shortest path from  $v_0$  to  $[n - x]$  either we will know that  $n$  is not sturdy, or that it is not necessary to continue searching from  $[x]$ . This greatly improves the efficiency of the testing for sturdiness.

The complexity of this approach, for evaluating sturdiness, and computing  $\text{swm}(n)$  and  $\text{msw}(n)$  is  $O(n^2)$  since we are performing a breadth-first search on a graph with  $n + 1$  vertices each with  $\nu = O(n)$  outgoing edges. In practice this approach seems to perform much better than our naive  $O(n^2)$  upper bound would suggest, especially in testing for sturdiness, due to the early exit conditions.

## 9 Running time comparison

To demonstrate how these algorithms behave in practice, we compiled timing information for each of the approaches and each of the four functions of interest for consecutive integers starting from 1. Each of the algorithms are implemented as described above. However, before applying each algorithm the baby-step giant-step algorithm, as in Section 4.1, is used to exit faster in those cases where  $\text{swm}(n) = 2$ . Running times for the `mfw` function with the `order_deg_bfs` algorithm are not given because there does not seem to be a natural approach for using this idea to evaluate `mfw`. The computations producing the given running times were performed on macOS Catalina version 10.15.2 on a 2.3 GHz Intel Core i5 processor. Implementations of our algorithms can be found in the Github repository

<https://github.com/FinnLidbetter/sturdy-numbers> .

In the tables below, the algorithmic approaches are named according to the commands used in the program-runner in the Github repository. Here, the `dp` algorithm refers to the dynamic programming approach described in Section 5, the `aut` algorithm refers to the automaton-based approach described in Section 6, the `bfs01` algorithm refers to the improved automaton-based approach described in Section 7, and the `order_deg_bfs` algorithm refers to the alternative breadth-first search approach described in Section 8.

Algorithm	<code>is_sturdy</code>	<code>swm</code>	<code>msw</code>	<code>mfw</code>
<code>dp</code>	22836	2667063	5675228	5167556
<code>aut</code>	1042	1050	1473	1430
<code>order_deg_bfs</code>	322	1646	4339	—
<code>bfs01</code>	224	226	650	1416

Table 1: Running time in milliseconds for each of the algorithms to evaluate the functions for all values of  $n$  (odd and even) between 1 and 2000 inclusive.

Algorithm	is_sturdy	swm	msw	mfw
aut	31950	31990	42229	41747
order_deg_bfs	7378	164543	439794	—
bfs01	5209	5207	15515	41761

Table 2: Running time in milliseconds for the algorithms to evaluate the functions for all values of  $n$  (odd and even) between 1 and 10000 inclusive. The dynamic programming algorithm was not included because it was not feasible to evaluate the functions for all integers between 1 and 10000 with this approach.

## 10 Computational results

Sequence [A143027](#) in the OEIS [27] gives a list of the first few sturdy primes, namely,

2, 3, 5, 7, 17, 31, 73, 89, 127, 257, 1801, 2089, 8191, 65537, 131071, 178481, 262657, 524287, 2099863,

and mentions 616318177 as an additional sturdy prime, although it was not known if this was the next sturdy prime to occur in the sequence. Using our methods, we checked all primes  $p < 2^{32}$ . We confirmed the results in the OEIS and found that 616318177 and 2147483647 are the only remaining sturdy primes in that range. The computation took approximately 23 hours on a laptop.

We also computed frequency counts for the values of swm for odd  $n > 1$ , not just primes, and they are given in Table 10.

$\text{swm}(n)$	$n < 2^{20}$	$2^{20} < n < 2^{21}$	$2^{21} < n < 2^{22}$	$2^{22} < n < 2^{23}$
2	115931	107650	208333	403823
3	286681	294938	596522	1205753
4	83895	83958	168138	336448
5	19287	19242	38566	77071
6	9903	9892	19812	39635
7	4246	4265	8510	17023
8	2274	2269	4548	9104
9	1027	1030	2058	4119
10	529	527	1059	2118
11	256	257	514	1024
12	130	131	260	521
13	64	64	128	256
14	32	33	64	129
15	16	16	32	64
16	8	8	16	32
17	4	4	8	16
18	2	2	4	8
19	1	1	2	4
20	1	0	1	2
21	0	1	0	1
22	0	0	1	0
23	0	0	0	1

Table 3: Counts of swm.

We also computed counts of sturdy numbers up to  $10^i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , and they are given below:

$i$	Number of sturdy numbers $< 10^i$
1	5
2	22
3	81
4	292
5	995
6	3438

Table 4: Counts of sturdy numbers

## 11 Numbers with few 0's

We can also use finite automata to determine when numbers with few 0's are flimsy. More precisely, for each pair of integers  $j, k$  we can build a DFA  $M_2(j, k)$  accepting those  $(n)_2$  for which  $(n)_2$  has  $j$  0's and  $(kn)_2$  has more than  $j + t$  0's, where  $t = |(kn)_2| - |(n)_2|$ . Such an  $n$  is guaranteed to be flimsy. We can determine  $t$  by reading the input  $n$ , least significant digit first, and computing  $(kn)_2$  on the fly, keeping track of the carries.

Let  $j$  be a fixed natural number. By choosing an appropriate set of flimsy witnesses  $k$  (which can be guessed empirically), we can determine all flimsy numbers having exactly  $j$  0's in their binary representation. We do this by computing the DFA's  $M_2(j, k)$  and unioning them together to get a final automaton  $M'_j$ . We expect there to be a finite set of "sporadic" sturdy exceptions, and (according to Theorem 9) an infinite set of sturdy exceptions consisting of those numbers with binary representation of the form  $s1^i\bar{s}$ , where  $s$  begins with 1 and ends with 0. This expectation can then be verified by considering the language accepted by  $M'_j$ ; the finite set of sturdy exceptions can be tested using our algorithms previously discussed. The multipliers we used in constructing  $M'_j$  are the odd numbers  $\leq 2^{j+1} + 1$ .

With these ideas we can prove the following theorem.

### Theorem 15.

- (a) *Every integer with no 0's is sturdy.*
- (b) *Every odd integer with one 0 is flimsy, with the exception of  $5 = [101]_2$ , and is proven flimsy by multiplier 3 or 5.*
- (c) *Every odd integer with two 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 51 and numbers of the form  $101^i01$ ,  $i \geq 0$ , which are all sturdy.*
- (d) *Every odd integer with three 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 17, 85, 89, 455 and numbers of the form  $1001^i011$  or  $1101^i001$ ,  $i \geq 0$ , which are all sturdy.*
- (e) *Every odd integer with four 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 33, 69, 73, 153, 3855, and numbers of the form  $10001^i0111$ ,  $11001^i0011$ ,  $10101^i0101$ ,  $11101^i0001$ ,  $i \geq 0$ , which are all sturdy.*
- (f) *Every odd integer with five 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 65, 133, 161, 267, 275, 1365, 31775, and numbers specified by Theorem 9.*
- (g) *Every odd integer with six 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 129, 259, 261, 273, 385, 525, 549, 561, 585, 645, 657, 705, 771, 777, 801, 1729, 1801, 2275, 3185, 11565, 13107, 258111, and numbers specified by Theorem 9.*
- (h) *Every odd integer with seven 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 257, 515, 517, 529, 1035, 1065, 1105, 1155, 1157, 1185, 1285, 1545, 1665, 2077, 2201, 2325, 2449, 2573, 2697, 2821, 2945, 19065, 19275, 21845, 26985, 95325, 2080895, and numbers specified by Theorem 9.*

- (i) Every odd integer with eight 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 513, 1027, 1029, 1057, 1281, 2055, 2085, 2089, 2097, 2115, 2145, 2193, 2313, 2337, 2563, 2565, 2625, 3075, 3105, 3585, 4123, 4185, 4371, 4389, 4433, 4619, 4675, 4681, 4867, 4929, 5187, 6169, 6417, 6665, 6913, 8253, 8505, 8525, 8645, 8757, 9009, 9261, 9513, 9765, 10017, 10269, 10465, 10521, 10773, 11025, 11277, 11529, 11781, 12033, 12483, 13505, 14497, 18631, 25623, 34695, 39321, 42405, 50115, 57825, 158875, 222425, 774333, 16711935, and numbers specified by Theorem 9.
- (j) Every odd integer with nine 0's is flimsy, with the exception of 1025, 2051, 2057, 2065, 2177, 3073, 4131, 4165, 4233, 4361, 4369, 4417, 4641, 5129, 5185, 6273, 8215, 8277, 8339, 8401, 8711, 8773, 8835, 8897, 10261, 10385, 10757, 10881, 12307, 12369, 12803, 12865, 14353, 14849, 16443, 16569, 16835, 16947, 17073, 17451, 17577, 17745, 17955, 18081, 18459, 18585, 18963, 19089, 19467, 19593, 19971, 20097, 24605, 24633, 25025, 25137, 25641, 26145, 26649, 26691, 27153, 27657, 28161, 28679, 32893, 33401, 33909, 34417, 34925, 35433, 35941, 36449, 36957, 37465, 37973, 38481, 38989, 39497, 40005, 40513, 41021, 41529, 41769, 42037, 42545, 43053, 43561, 44069, 44577, 45085, 45593, 46101, 46609, 47117, 47625, 48133, 48641, 178481, 285975, 349525, 413075, 476625, 1290555, 1806777, 1864135, 6242685, 133956095, and numbers specified by Theorem 9.

Based on this theorem, we make the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 16.** Every number with  $j$  0's is flimsy, with exceptions of the form  $s1^i\bar{s}$ ,  $i \geq 0$ , where  $|s| = j$  and  $s$  begins with 1 and ends with 0, and only finitely many additional exceptions.

## 12 The $k$ -flimsy numbers via formal language theory

In this section we describe a new approach, based on formal language theory, for understanding the distribution of the  $k$ -flimsy numbers. Recall these are the numbers

$$F_k = \{n \geq 1 : s_2(kn) < s_2(n)\}.$$

The majority of the results in this section are about the case  $k = 3$ , although in principle our technique can be applied to any odd  $k$ .

Kátai [16] studied the difference  $s_2(3n) - s_2(n)$ , and proved that this quantity is essentially normally distributed, in a certain sense. Stolarsky [28] conjectured that the natural density of the  $k$ -flimsy numbers is  $1/2$  for all odd  $k$ . His conjecture was later proved by W. M. Schmidt [25] and J. Schmid [24]. All these results use rather sophisticated tools of number theory and probability.


In contrast, in this section we obtain rather detailed results on the distribution of 3-flimsy numbers through a (more or less) purely mechanical approach based on formal language theory. The main result of this section is the following:

**Theorem 17.** *The number of 3-flimsy numbers in the interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N)$  is*

$$2^N \left( \frac{1}{4} - cN^{-1/2} + O(N^{-3/2}) \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $c = \frac{7\sqrt{6}}{24\sqrt{\pi}} \doteq 0.4030765$ .

Our method starts with a pushdown automaton (PDA) recognizing the  $k$ -flimsy numbers, and by a series of steps, it is converted into an asymptotic series expansion for the number of  $k$ -flimsy numbers with  $N$  bits. Previously, the basic approach has been used for a wide variety of combinatorial enumerations; see, for example, [4, 5, 2, 3]. We have implemented all the steps, and the flow of control is explained in the diagram below.



We now explain briefly what each box in the diagram does, with more detailed explanation to follow. For all undefined terms, see any textbook on automata theory or formal languages, such as [15].

First, given an odd integer  $k \geq 3$ , we build an unambiguous pushdown automaton (PDA)  $M_k$  that recognizes the base-2 representation of elements of  $F_k$ ; more precisely,  $M_k$  recognizes the language  $(F_k)_2^R$ . The length- $N$  strings in  $(F_k)_2^R$  are in 1-1 correspondence with the flimsy numbers in the half-open interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N)$ , so our goal is to estimate the cardinality of  $(F_k)_2^R \cap \{0, 1\}^N$  as precisely as possible.

Second, we convert  $M_k$  to an unambiguous context-free grammar  $G_k$  generating  $(F_k)_2^R$ .

We simplify this context-free grammar by deleting useless symbols (those symbols that do not participate in the derivation of any terminal string, or are not reachable from the start variable), obtaining a new CFG  $G'_k$ .

Third, we convert  $G'_k$  to a system of equations in the variables of  $G'_k$ . These variables represent formal power series, with the property that the number of length- $N$  strings generated by a variable  $A$  is given by  $[x^N]A(x)$ , the coefficient of  $x^N$  in the power series  $A$ .

Fourth, using Gröbner bases, we solve this system of equations, obtaining an algebraic equation satisfied by the formal power series  $S(x)$ , where  $S$  is the start variable of the grammar  $G'_k$ .

Finally, using Bruno Salvy's `gdev` package, written in Maple, we can determine the asymptotic behavior of  $[x^N]S(x)$  using the saddle-point method (as discussed by, e.g., Flajolet and Sedgewick [12]). In principle, we can obtain as many terms as we wish of the asymptotic expansion.

Theorem 17 now follows by performing each of these steps. The first four steps are done with original code written by the first author in Python, and the last two steps are done with Maple. The code for each step is available at

<https://github.com/FinnLidbetter/sturdy-numbers> .

We now give more complete details of some of the steps.

## 12.1 Constructing the PDA $M_k$

The general idea is as follows: we create a PDA accepting the base-2 representation of  $k$ -flimsy numbers  $n$ . We use the stack of the PDA to record the absolute value of  $s_2(n) - s_2(kn)$ , and we use the state to record both the carry needed when multiplying input by  $k$ , and the sign of  $s_2(n) - s_2(kn)$ . We accept the input if the carry is 0, the sign of  $s_2(n) - s_2(kn)$  is positive, and the stack has at least one counter.

Our PDA is assumed to begin its computation with a special symbol,  $Z$ , on top of the stack, and if the input is accepted, to end its computation when the stack becomes empty.

The sketch above is not quite enough because of two technical issues. First, (a) in some cases this approach requires reading extra leading zeroes (which, because we are representing numbers starting with the least significant digit first, would be at the end of the input), in order to guarantee that the carry for  $s_2(kn)$  was taken into account and (b) we must have that the leading bit of the input is 1, to avoid incorrectly counting smaller numbers as having  $n$  bits.

To handle both these issues, we slightly modify the construction in several ways. First, if the state has a minus sign, then the stack holds  $|y|_1 - |x|_1$   $X$ 's, where  $x$  is the input seen so far and  $y$  is the  $|x|$  least significant bits of  $k(x)_2^R$ . On the other hand, if the state has a positive sign, then the stack holds  $|x|_1 - |y|_1 - 1$   $X$ 's.

Second, to simulate the needed leading zeroes required to handle the carry, without actually reading them, we use a special series of  $\log_2 k$  states to pop  $X$ 's from the stack.

Finally, we have a special state used to empty the stack when acceptance is detected. The total number of states is therefore at most  $2k + \log_2 k$ .

The resulting PDA  $M_3$  is depicted in Figure 12.1.




Figure 1: PDA  $M_3$ .

One important property of our construction is that our PDA  $M_k$  is *unambiguous*. By this we mean that every accepted word has exactly one accepting computational path.

## 12.2 Converting the PDA to a CFG

We can convert  $M_k$  to an equivalent context-free grammar  $G_k$  using a standard technique called the “triple construction” [15, pp. 115–119]. This gives us a grammar  $G_k$  with  $O(k^2)$  variables and  $O(k^3)$  productions.

Now we use the fact, proved in [13, Thm. 5.4.3, p. 151], that performing the triple

construction on an unambiguous PDA gives us an unambiguous grammar.

### 12.3 Cleaning the CFG

We can remove useless symbols from our grammar  $G_k$  by removing all variables that do not derive a terminal string, then removing all productions containing these removed variables, and then removing all variables and terminals that are not reachable from the start variable. This is a standard procedure, and is described in greater detail in [15, pp. 88–90].

Once this is complete, it may be found that there is a variable  $X$  that has only one production  $X \rightarrow \alpha$ . If  $X$  is not the start variable, then it can be deleted from the set of variables, and all instances of  $X$  in production rules can be replaced with  $\alpha$ .

For example, when we convert our PDA  $M_3$ , we get an unambiguous grammar  $G_3$ ; cleaning  $G_3$  using this procedure gives us the following grammar  $G'_3$ :

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 S \rightarrow 1F \mid 0S & A \rightarrow 1E \mid 0A \\
 B \rightarrow 1G \mid 0B & C \rightarrow 1H \mid 1 \mid 0C \\
 D \rightarrow 1I \mid 0D & E \rightarrow 1 \mid 0AJ \\
 F \rightarrow 1N \mid 0AK & G \rightarrow 1LB \mid 0 \\
 H \rightarrow 1M \mid 1LC \mid 1 & I \rightarrow 1M \mid 1LD \mid 1 \mid 0S \\
 J \rightarrow 1J \mid 0E & K \rightarrow 1K \mid 0F \\
 L \rightarrow 1L \mid 0G & M \rightarrow 1M \mid 1 \mid 0H \\
 N \rightarrow 1N \mid 0I &
 \end{array}$$

### 12.4 Converting the CFG to a system of equations

This transformation was discussed in [9]. It suffices to replace, in each set of productions  $A \rightarrow \alpha_1 \mid \alpha_2 \mid \dots \mid \alpha_i$  of a grammar  $G$ , each terminal symbol by the indeterminate  $x$ , each  $\mid$  symbol by a plus sign, and the  $\rightarrow$  with an equals sign. For a proof of correctness, see [17, 19].

Performing this transformation on  $G'_3$  gives us the following system of equations:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 S = xF + xS & A = xE + xA \\
 B = xG + xB & C = xH + x + xC \\
 D = xI + xD & E = x + xAJ \\
 F = xN + xAK & G = xLB + x \\
 H = xM + xLC + x & I = xM + xLD + x + xS \\
 J = xJ + xE & K = xK + xF \\
 L = xL + xG & M = xM + x + xH \\
 N = xN + xI &
 \end{array}$$

## 12.5 Solving the system

We can now solve the resulting system of equations for  $S$ , obtaining an algebraic equation for which  $S$  is the root. The main tool is Groebner bases, for which a helpful package already exists in `Maple`.

Using the code given in Appendix B, we find the following quadratic equation for  $S$  in the case  $k = 3$ .

$$x(2x-1)^2(x+1)(2x^2-x+1)S(x)^2 + (2x-1)(x-1)^2(x+1)(2x^2-x+1)S(x) + x^4(x^2-x+1) = 0.$$

Solving this quadratic for  $S$  gives

$$S(x) = \frac{-(x-1)^2(x+1)(2x^2-x+1) + \sqrt{-(x-1)(2x-1)(2x^2-x+1)(x^3+x^2-x+1)^2}}{2x(2x-1)(x+1)(2x^2-x+1)}.$$

Since the grammar  $G'_3$  is unambiguous, the formal power series  $S(x)$  is the census generating function for the set  $(F_3)_2^R$ . In particular, this means that  $[x^N]S(x) = |F_3 \cap [2^{N-1}, 2^N]|$ , or in other words, the coefficient of  $x^N$  in  $S(x)$  is the number  $k$ -flimsy numbers in  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N]$ .

## 12.6 Asymptotic expansion of the coefficients of the power series

Finally, we use Flajolet-Sedgewick-style asymptotic analysis [12, §VII. 7.1] to determine an asymptotic formula for the  $N$ 'th coefficient of the power series expansion for  $S(x)$ . Conveniently, there is a `Maple` package `algolib`, written by Bruno Salvy [23], to accomplish this. When we run this on our formula for  $S(x)$ , we get our desired result.

This completes our discussion of the proof of Theorem 17.

*Remark 18.* We could easily determine more terms in the asymptotic expansion, if we wanted, using the same ideas. For example, we can find that the number of 3-flimsy numbers in the interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N]$  is

$$2^N \left( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left( \frac{7}{24}N^{-1/2} + \frac{13}{72}N^{-3/2} - \frac{17}{64}N^{-5/2} + \frac{3365}{13824}N^{-7/2} + \dots \right) \right).$$

**Corollary 19.** *The number of 3-flimsy numbers  $< 2^N$  is  $2^{N-1} - O(2^N N^{-1/2})$ .*

*Proof.* For any real number  $a > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2^N N^{-a} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} 2^n n^{-a} \leq \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N/2} 2^n n^{-a} + \sum_{N/2 < n \leq N} 2^n n^{-a} \\ &\leq \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N/2} 2^n + (N/2)^{-a} \sum_{N/2 < n \leq N} 2^n \\ &\leq 2^{N/2+1} + (N/2)^{-a} 2^{N+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing (1) and applying the inequalities above gives the desired result.  $\square$

**Theorem 20.** *The number of 5-flimsy numbers in the interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N)$  is*

$$2^N \left( \frac{1}{4} - cN^{-1/2} + O(N^{-3/2}) \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $c = \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \doteq 0.473087348$ .

*Proof.* This is determined using the same method as the proof for Theorem 17. In this process, we compute the unambiguous PDA  $M_5$ , depicted in Figure 12.6.




Figure 2: PDA  $M_5$ .

From  $M_5$  we construct the (simplified) unambiguous grammar  $G'_5$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
S \rightarrow 1V_1 \mid 0S & V_1 \rightarrow 1V_{29} \mid 0V_{27} \\
V_2 \rightarrow 1V_{36} \mid 1 \mid 0V_2 & V_3 \rightarrow 1V_3 \mid 0V_{12} \\
V_4 \rightarrow 1V_4 \mid 1 \mid 0V_{36} & V_5 \rightarrow 1V_{10}V_{37} \mid 1V_{20}V_2 \mid 1V_{24} \mid 1V_4 \mid 1 \\
V_6 \rightarrow 1V_{28} \mid 0V_6 & V_7 \rightarrow 1V_{10}V_{21} \mid 1V_{20}V_{11} \mid 0 \\
V_8 \rightarrow 1V_7V_8 \mid 1V_{22}V_{25} & V_9 \rightarrow 1V_7V_9 \mid 1V_{22}V_{19} \mid 1V_5 \mid 0S \\
V_{10} \rightarrow 1V_{10} \mid 0V_{23} & V_{11} \rightarrow 1V_{23} \mid 0V_{11} \\
V_{12} \rightarrow 1V_{14} \mid 0V_9 & V_{13} \rightarrow 1V_{13} \mid 0V_{39} \\
V_{14} \rightarrow 1V_{10}V_9 \mid 1V_{20}V_{19} \mid 1V_4 \mid 1 \mid 0V_{27} & V_{15} \rightarrow 1V_7V_{15} \mid 1V_{22}V_{26} \mid 0 \\
V_{16} \rightarrow 1V_{10}V_8 \mid 1V_{20}V_{25} & V_{17} \rightarrow 0V_6V_{33} \mid 0V_{18}V_{34} \\
V_{18} \rightarrow 1V_{39} \mid 0V_{18} & V_{19} \rightarrow 1V_{12} \mid 0V_{19} \\
V_{20} \rightarrow 1V_{20} \mid 0V_{31} & V_{21} \rightarrow 1V_7V_{21} \mid 1V_{22}V_{11} \\
V_{22} \rightarrow 1V_{10}V_{15} \mid 1V_{20}V_{26} & V_{23} \rightarrow 1V_7 \mid 0V_{21} \\
V_{24} \rightarrow 1V_{24} \mid 0V_{35} & V_{25} \rightarrow 1V_{35} \mid 0V_{25} \\
V_{26} \rightarrow 1V_{31} \mid 0V_{26} & V_{27} \rightarrow 1V_{14} \mid 0V_6V_{30} \mid 0V_{18}V_{29} \\
V_{28} \rightarrow 1V_{34} \mid 0V_{17} & V_{29} \rightarrow 1V_3 \mid 0V_{17}V_{30} \mid 0V_{32}V_{29} \\
V_{30} \rightarrow 1V_{30} \mid 0V_1 & V_{31} \rightarrow 1V_{22} \mid 0V_{15} \\
V_{32} \rightarrow 1 \mid 0V_6V_{13} \mid 0V_{18}V_{38} & V_{33} \rightarrow 1V_{33} \mid 0V_{28} \\
V_{34} \rightarrow 1 \mid 0V_{17}V_{33} \mid 0V_{32}V_{34} & V_{35} \rightarrow 1V_{16} \mid 1 \mid 0V_8 \\
V_{36} \rightarrow 1V_5 \mid 0V_{37} & V_{37} \rightarrow 1V_7V_{37} \mid 1V_{22}V_2 \mid 1V_{16} \mid 1V_5 \mid 1 \\
V_{38} \rightarrow 0V_{17}V_{13} \mid 0V_{32}V_{38} & V_{39} \rightarrow 1V_{38} \mid 0V_{32}
\end{array}$$

This gives us the system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= xV_1 + xS & V_1 &= xV_{29} + xV_{27} \\
V_2 &= xV_{36} + x + xV_2 & V_3 &= xV_3 + xV_{12} \\
V_4 &= xV_4 + x + xV_{36} & V_5 &= xV_{10}V_{37} + xV_{20}V_2 + xV_{24} + xV_4 + x \\
V_6 &= xV_{28} + xV_6 & V_7 &= xV_{10}V_{21} + xV_{20}V_{11} + x \\
V_8 &= xV_7V_8 + xV_{22}V_{25} & V_9 &= xV_7V_9 + xV_{22}V_{19} + xV_5 + xS \\
V_{10} &= xV_{10} + xV_{23} & V_{11} &= xV_{23} + xV_{11} \\
V_{12} &= xV_{14} + xV_9 & V_{13} &= xV_{13} + xV_{39} \\
V_{14} &= xV_{10}V_9 + xV_{20}V_{19} + xV_4 + x + xV_{27} & V_{15} &= xV_7V_{15} + xV_{22}V_{26} + x \\
V_{16} &= xV_{10}V_8 + xV_{20}V_{25} & V_{17} &= xV_6V_{33} + xV_{18}V_{34} \\
V_{18} &= xV_{39} + xV_{18} & V_{19} &= xV_{12} + xV_{19} \\
V_{20} &= xV_{20} + xV_{31} & V_{21} &= xV_7V_{21} + xV_{22}V_{11} \\
V_{22} &= xV_{10}V_{15} + xV_{20}V_{26} & V_{23} &= xV_7 + xV_{21} \\
V_{24} &= xV_{24} + xV_{35} & V_{25} &= xV_{35} + xV_{25} \\
V_{26} &= xV_{31} + xV_{26} & V_{27} &= xV_{14} + xV_6V_{30} + xV_{18}V_{29} \\
V_{28} &= xV_{34} + xV_{17} & V_{29} &= xV_3 + xV_{17}V_{30} + xV_{32}V_{29} \\
V_{30} &= xV_{30} + xV_1 & V_{31} &= xV_{22} + xV_{15} \\
V_{32} &= x + xV_6V_{13} + xV_{18}V_{38} & V_{33} &= xV_{33} + xV_{28} \\
V_{34} &= x + xV_{17}V_{33} + xV_{32}V_{34} & V_{35} &= xV_{16} + x + xV_8 \\
V_{36} &= xV_5 + xV_{37} & V_{37} &= xV_7V_{37} + xV_{22}V_2 + xV_{16} + xV_5 + x \\
V_{38} &= xV_{17}V_{13} + xV_{32}V_{38} & V_{39} &= xV_{38} + xV_{32}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we employ the same methods and Maple packages used in Sections 12.5 and 12.6, which give us our desired result.

We can also use the same ideas to compute the distribution of flimsy numbers in other bases. As an example we proved

**Theorem 21.** *The number of integers in the range  $[3^{N-1}, 3^N)$  that are 2-flimsy in base 3 is*

$$3^N \left( \frac{1}{3} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{\pi N}} \left( -\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{48N} - \frac{13}{1536N^2} - \frac{65}{24576N^3} + O(N^{-4}) \right) \right).$$

*Proof.* As before. We omit the details. □

### 13 The $k$ -equal numbers via formal language theory

Another quantity of interest is the number of  $n$  for which  $s_2(n) = s_2(kn)$ . We call such  $n$  *k-equal*. By generalizing the approach used in Section 12, we can compute how many integers

$n \in [2^{N-1}, 2^N)$  are  $k$ -equal.

In particular, we modify PDA  $M_k$  by changing the transitions to the **END** states. Whereas  $M_k$  transitions to **END** when reading a 1 if following that 1 with sufficiently many zeros would reach the state  $(+, 0)$ , instead we want such an input to reach the state  $(-, 0)$  with no counters on the stack.

This modification gives us the following unambiguous PDAs  $M'_k$  that recognize the  $k$ -equal numbers for  $k = 3, 5$ :




Figure 3: PDA  $M'_3$  recognizing 3-equal numbers.




Figure 4: PDA  $M'_5$  recognizing the 5-equal numbers.

Following the same procedure described in Theorem 17 of converting  $M'_3$  and  $M'_5$  into unambiguous CFGs and simplifying them gives us the following:

The unambiguous CFG for 3-equal numbers:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
S \rightarrow 0S \mid 1V_6 & V_1 \rightarrow 0V_{11} \mid 1V_1 \\
V_2 \rightarrow 0V_5V_{10} \mid 1 & V_3 \rightarrow 0V_3 \mid 1V_{11} \\
V_4 \rightarrow 0V_4 \mid 1V_7 \mid 1 & V_5 \rightarrow 0V_5 \mid 1V_2 \\
V_6 \rightarrow 0V_5V_9 \mid 1V_8 \mid 1 & V_7 \rightarrow 0S \mid 1V_1V_4 \\
V_8 \rightarrow 0V_7 \mid 1V_8 \mid 1 & V_9 \rightarrow 0V_6 \mid 1V_9 \\
V_{10} \rightarrow 0V_2 \mid 1V_{10} & V_{11} \rightarrow 0 \mid 1V_1V_3
\end{array}$$

The unambiguous CFG for 5-equal numbers:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
S \rightarrow 0S \mid 1V_{29} & V_1 \rightarrow 0V_{32} \mid 1V_{33} \\
V_2 \rightarrow 0V_5V_8 \mid 0V_{14}V_2 \mid 1 & V_3 \rightarrow 1V_{33}V_{34} \mid 1V_{21}V_3 \\
V_4 \rightarrow 0V_4 \mid 1V_{23} & V_5 \rightarrow 0V_{30}V_8 \mid 0V_4V_2 \\
V_6 \rightarrow 1V_{27}V_{34} \mid 1V_{28}V_3 & V_7 \rightarrow 0V_7 \mid 1V_1 \\
V_8 \rightarrow 0V_{15} \mid 1V_8 & V_9 \rightarrow 0V_9 \mid 1V_{26} \mid 1 \\
V_{10} \rightarrow 0V_{10} \mid 1V_{19} & V_{11} \rightarrow 0V_{30}V_{17} \mid 0V_4V_{12} \mid 1V_{22} \\
V_{12} \rightarrow 0V_5V_{17} \mid 0V_{14}V_{12} \mid 1V_{31} \mid 1 & V_{13} \rightarrow 1V_{33}V_{10} \mid 1V_{21}V_{13} \\
V_{14} \rightarrow 0V_{30}V_{24} \mid 0V_4V_{18} \mid 1 & V_{15} \rightarrow 0V_5 \mid 1V_2 \\
V_{16} \rightarrow 0S \mid 1V_{33}V_9 \mid 1V_6 \mid 1V_{21}V_{16} \mid 1 & V_{17} \rightarrow 0V_{29} \mid 1V_{17} \\
V_{18} \rightarrow 0V_5V_{24} \mid 0V_{14}V_{18} & V_{19} \rightarrow 0V_{13} \mid 1V_{21} \\
V_{20} \rightarrow 0V_{25} \mid 1V_{20} & V_{21} \rightarrow 0 \mid 1V_{27}V_{10} \mid 1V_{28}V_{13} \\
V_{22} \rightarrow 0V_{11} \mid 1V_{27}V_9 \mid 1V_{20} \mid 1V_{28}V_{16} & V_{23} \rightarrow 0V_{14} \mid 1V_{18} \\
V_{24} \rightarrow 0V_{23} \mid 1V_{24} & V_{25} \rightarrow 0V_3 \mid 1V_6 \mid 1 \\
V_{26} \rightarrow 0V_{16} \mid 1V_{22} & V_{27} \rightarrow 0V_1 \mid 1V_{27} \\
V_{28} \rightarrow 0V_{19} \mid 1V_{28} & V_{29} \rightarrow 0V_{11} \mid 1V_{12} \\
V_{30} \rightarrow 0V_{30} \mid 1V_{15} & V_{31} \rightarrow 0V_{26} \mid 1V_{31} \mid 1 \\
V_{32} \rightarrow 0 \mid 1V_{33}V_7 \mid 1V_{21}V_{32} & V_{33} \rightarrow 1V_{27}V_7 \mid 1V_{28}V_{32} \\
V_{34} \rightarrow 0V_{34} \mid 1V_{25} &
\end{array}$$

Finally, converting these grammars into systems of equations, solving, and finding the asymptotics gives us the following results.

**Theorem 22.** *The number of 3-equal numbers in the interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N)$  is*

$$2^N (cN^{-1/2} + O(N^{-3/2})), \quad (3)$$

where  $c = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \doteq 0.345494149$ .

**Theorem 23.** *The number of 5-equal numbers in the interval  $[2^{N-1}, 2^N)$  is*

$$2^N (cN^{-1/2} + O(N^{-3/2})), \quad (4)$$

where  $c = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{4\sqrt{\pi}} \doteq 0.315391565$ .

## 14 Conclusions and open problems

We have shown that techniques from automata theory can be used to solve problems in number theory. For other fun along these lines, see [7, 22].

It would be interesting to understand the distribution of values of  $\text{msw}(n)$  and  $\text{mfw}(n)$  for  $n$  flimsy. We leave this as an open problem.

## 15 Acknowledgments

We thank Kenneth Stolarsky for helpful comments.

## References

- [1] B. Alexeev. Minimal DFAs for testing divisibility. *J. Comput. System Sci.* **69** (2004), 235–243.
- [2] A. Asinowski, A. Bacher, C. Banderier, and B. Gittenberger. Analytic combinatorics of lattice paths with forbidden patterns: enumerative aspects. In S. T. Klein et al., editors, *LATA 2018*, Vol. 10792 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 195–206. Springer-Verlag, 2018.
- [3] A. Asinowski, A. Bacher, C. Banderier, and B. Gittenberger. Analytic combinatorics of lattice paths with forbidden patterns, the vectorial kernel method, and generating functions for pushdown automata. *Algorithmica*, to appear, 2019.
- [4] C. Banderier and M. Drmota. Coefficients of algebraic functions: formulae and asymptotics. In *FPSAC 2013*, Vol. AS of *DMTCS Proc.*, pp. 1065–1076. 2013.
- [5] C. Banderier and M. Drmota. Formulae and asymptotics for coefficients of algebraic functions. *Combin. Prob. Comput.* **24** (2015), 1–53.
- [6] B. Bašić. The existence of  $n$ -flimsy numbers in a given base. *Ramanujan J.* **43** (2017), 359–369.
- [7] J. Bell, K. Hare, and J. Shallit. When is an automatic set an additive basis? *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B* **5** (2018), 50–63.
- [8] L. H. Y. Chen, H.-K. Hwang, and V. Zacharovas. Distribution of the sum-of-digits function of random integers: a survey. *Prob. Surveys* **11** (2014), 177–236.
- [9] N. Chomsky and M. P. Schützenberger. The algebraic theory of context-free languages. In P. Braffort and D. Hirschberg, editors, *Computer Programming and Formal Systems*, pp. 118–161. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1963.

- [10] C. Dartyge, F. Luca, and P. Stănică. On digit sums of multiples of an integer. *J. Number Theory* **129** (2009), 2820–2830.
- [11] C. Elsholtz. Almost all primes have a multiple of small Hamming weight. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **94** (2016), 224–235.
- [12] P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [13] M. A. Harrison. *Introduction to Formal Language Theory*. Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- [14] H. Hasse. Über die Dichte der Primzahlen  $p$ , für die eine vorgegebene ganz rationale Zahl  $a \neq 0$  von gerader bzw. ungerader Ordnung mod  $p$  ist. *Math. Annalen* **166** (1966), 19–23.
- [15] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- [16] I. Kátai. Change of the sum of digits by multiplication. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **39** (1977), 319–328.
- [17] W. Kuich and A. Salomaa. *Semirings, Automata, Languages*. Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- [18] R. W. K. Odoni. A conjecture of Krishnamurthy on decimal periods and some allied problems. *J. Number Theory* **13** (1981), 303–319.
- [19] A. Panholzer. Gröbner bases and the defining polynomial of a context-free grammar generating function. *J. Automata, Languages, and Combinatorics* **10** (2005), 79–97.
- [20] Pavel V. Phedotov. Sum of digits of a multiple of a given number (in Russian), 2002. Available at <http://digitsum.narod.ru/Index.htm>.
- [21] V. Pless, P. Solé, and Z. Qian. Cyclic self-dual  $Z_4$ -codes. *Finite Fields Appl.* **3** (1997), 48–69.
- [22] A. Rajasekaran, J. Shallit, and T. Smith. Additive number theory via automata theory. *Theor. Comput. Sys.*, 2019, to appear.
- [23] B. Salvy. gdev package of algolib version 17.0. Available at <http://algo.inria.fr/libraries/>, 2013.
- [24] J. Schmid. The joint distribution of the binary digits of integer multiples. *Acta Arith.* **43** (1984), 391–415.
- [25] W. M. Schmidt. The joint distributions of the digits of certain integer  $s$ -tuples. In P. Erdős, editor, *Studies in Pure Mathematics to the Memory of Paul Turán*, pp. 605–622. Birkhäuser, 1983.

- [26] D. Shanks. Class number, a theory of factorization and genera. In *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, Vol. 20, pp. 415–440, 1969.
- [27] N. J. A. Sloane et al. The on-line encyclopedia of integer sequences. Available at <https://oeis.org>, 2019.
- [28] K. B. Stolarsky. Integers whose multiples have anomalous digital frequencies. *Acta Arith.* **38** (1980/81), 117–128.
- [29] S. S. Wagstaff et al. The Cunningham project. Available at <https://homes.cerias.purdue.edu/~ssw/cun/index.html>, 2019.

## A Appendix: the dynamic programming algorithm

In the pseudocode that follows, the scope of loops is indicated by the indentation.

```

minrep(n)  { assumes n odd and at least 3 }

sumd := sumdig(2,n);  {sum of base-2 digits of n}

{make a table of powers of 2}
b := 1;
a := 0;
repeat
  b := (2*b) mod n;
  a := a+1;
until
  b = 1;
ord2 := a;  { the order of 2 mod n }
power2 := array[0..ord2-1] of integer;
for m := 0 to ord2-1 do
  power2[m] := b;
  b := (2*b) mod n;

{ the intent is that x[i,j,r] = true, if j (mod n) has a representation
as a sum of exactly i powers of 2, using only the first r elements of
power2 (without repetition), and false otherwise.
y[i,j,r] = smallest integer congruent to j (mod n)
representable by the sum of exactly i powers of 2,
using only the first r elements of power2 (without repetition) }

x := array[0..sumd-1, 0..n-1, 0..ord2] of boolean;
y := array[0..sumd-1, 0..n-1, 0..ord2] of integer;

```

```

{ initialize }

for r := 0 to ord2 do
  for i := 1 to sumd-1 do
    for j := 0 to n-1 do
      x[i,j,r] := false;
      y[i,j,r] := infinity;
x[0,0,r] := true;
y[0,0,r] := 0;

{ fill in table }

for r := 1 to ord2 do {consider summand 2^{r-1} mod p}
  for j := 0 to n-1 do { check position j }
    for i := 1 to sumd-1 do {fill in level i of the array}
      x[i,j,r] := x[i,j,r-1];
      y[i,j,r] := y[i,j,r-1];
      {check if we can use 2^{r-1} }
      if x[i-1, (j-power2[r-1]) mod n, r-1] then
        x[i,j,r] := true;
        y[i,j,r] := min(y[i,j,r],
          y[i-1, (j-power2[r-1]) mod n, r-1] + 2^{r-1});

sturdy := true;
for i := 2 to sumd-1 do
  sturdy := sturdy and x[i,0,ord2];

if (sturdy) then
  print("swm(n) = ",sumd);
  print("msw(n) = ",1);
else
  i := 1;
  while (not x[i,0,ord2]) do i := i+1;
  print("swm(n) = ",i);
  print("msw(n) = ",y[i,0,ord2]/n);
  mfw := infinity;
  while (i < sumd) do
    mfw := min(mfw, y[i,0,ord2]);
    i := i+1;
  print("mfw(n) = ",mfw);

```

end;

## B Appendix: Maple code

To use this code, you will first need to download the `algolib` package from <http://algo.inria.fr/libraries/>.

```
eqs := [-S + x*V_F + x*S,  
-V_A + x*V_E + x*V_A,  
-V_B + x*V_G + x*V_B,  
-V_C + x*V_H + x + x*V_C,  
-V_D + x*V_I + x*V_D,  
-V_E + x + x*V_A*V_J,  
-V_F + x*V_N + x*V_A*V_K,  
-V_G + x*V_L*V_B + x,  
-V_H + x*V_M + x*V_L*V_C + x,  
-V_I + x*V_M + x*V_L*V_D + x + x*S,  
-V_J + x*V_J + x*V_E,  
-V_K + x*V_K + x*V_F,  
-V_L + x*V_L + x*V_G,  
-V_M + x*V_M + x + x*V_H,  
-V_N + x*V_N + x*V_I]:  
Groebner[Basis](eqs, lexdeg([V_A, V_B, V_C, V_D, V_E, V_F, V_G, V_H,  
V_I, V_J, V_K, V_L, V_M, V_N], [S]));  
algeq := %[1]:  
map(series, [solve(algeq, S)], x);  
f := solve(algeq,S);  
ps := f[1]:  
assume(x, positive):  
series(ps, x, 40);  
libname:="<insert current directory path>",libname:  
combine(equivalent(ps,x,n,5));
```

## C Table of values

Here the column labeled “char” is F if the number is flimsy and S if it is sturdy.

$n$	char	swm( $n$ )	msw( $n$ )	mfw( $n$ )	$n$	char	swm( $n$ )	msw( $n$ )	mfw( $n$ )
3	S	2	1	-	5	S	2	1	-
7	S	3	1	-	9	S	2	1	-
11	F	2	3	3	13	F	2	5	5
15	S	4	1	-	17	S	2	1	-
19	F	2	27	27	21	S	3	1	-
23	F	3	3	3	25	F	2	41	41
27	F	2	19	3	29	F	2	565	5
31	S	5	1	-	33	S	2	1	-
35	S	3	1	-	37	F	2	7085	7085
39	F	3	7	7	41	F	2	25	25
43	F	2	3	3	45	S	4	1	-
47	F	3	11	3	49	S	3	1	-
51	S	4	1	-	53	F	2	1266205	5
55	F	3	7	3	57	F	2	9	9
59	F	2	9099507	3	61	F	2	17602325	5
63	S	6	1	-	65	S	2	1	-
67	F	2	128207979	128207979	69	S	3	1	-
71	F	3	119	119	73	S	3	1	-
75	S	4	1	-	77	F	3	5	5
79	F	3	13	7	81	F	2	1657009	1657009
83	F	2	26494256091	395	85	S	4	1	-
87	F	3	3	3	89	S	4	1	-
91	F	3	3	3	93	S	5	1	-
95	F	3	5519	3	97	F	2	172961	172961
99	F	2	331	11	101	F	2	11147523830125	365
103	F	3	5	5	105	S	4	1	-
107	F	2	84179432287299	3	109	F	2	2405	5
111	F	3	591	3	113	F	2	145	145
115	F	3	571	9	117	F	4	5	5
119	F	3	71	3	121	F	2	297758653049289	9
123	F	4	19	3	125	F	2	9007199254741	5
127	S	7	1	-	129	S	2	1	-