

# COVERING SHRINKING POLYNOMIALS BY QUASI PROGRESSIONS

NORBERT HEGYVÁRI

ABSTRACT. Erdős introduced the quantity  $S = T \sum_{i=1}^T X_i$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_T$  are arithmetic progressions, and cover the square numbers up to  $N$ . He conjectured that  $S$  is close to  $N$ , i.e. the square numbers cannot be covered "economically" by arithmetic progressions. Sárközy confirmed this conjecture and proved that  $S \geq cN/\log^2 N$ . In this paper, we extend this to shrinking polynomials and so-called  $\{X_i\}$  quasi progressions.

AMS 2010 Primary 11B75, Secondary 11B13,

Keywords: Covering problems, quasi progressions,

*Dedicated to Imre Ruzsa on the occasion of his 70th birthday*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A long-standing and challenging problem in combinatorial number theory is to give an upper bound on the number of squares in any arithmetic progression. In relation to this problem, Erdős posed the following question, which he formulated as follows: Is it true that square numbers cannot be "economically" covered by arithmetic progressions? More precisely let  $X_i = \{m_i j + r_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$  be a system of arithmetic progressions such that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^T \{m_i j + r_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i} \supseteq \mathcal{Q}_N$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  is the set of squares up to  $N$ . Let  $F(\mathcal{Q}_N) := \min_{\{X_i\}, T} T \sum_{i=1}^T k_i$ . Is it true that  $F(\mathcal{Q}_N) > N^{1-\varepsilon}$ ?

Maybe this conjecture was motivated by two examples. When we cover  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  by arithmetic progression with length two (i.e. the squares are covered by piecewise),

then  $T \sim \sqrt{N}$ , so  $T \sum_{i=1}^T k_i \sim 2N$ . The other example, when  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  is covered by the interval  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , then  $T = 1$ , so  $T \sum_{i=1}^T k_i = N$ .

In [8] this conjecture was proved in a sharper form:

**Theorem 1.1** (Sárközy). *Denote by  $\mathcal{Q}_N := \{1^2, 2^2, 3^2, \dots, \lfloor \sqrt{N} \rfloor^2\}$ . There exists an  $N_0$  such that  $N > N_0$  and*

$$F(\mathcal{Q}_N) > \frac{1}{700} \frac{N}{\log^2 N}.$$

The purpose of this note is to investigate what happens if we allow quasi-progression to cover  $\mathcal{Q}_N$  and shrinking polynomials (see Section 3). Quasi progression properties have been studied by several authors (see [2],[3] and [4]).

**1.1. Erdős conjecture under some arithmetic constrain.** One can ask if we restrict ourself to some additively behaved moduli  $m_i$ s, then what happens?

The following result shows that for "good covering" the moduli must be highly composite.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume that  $K := \max\{\tau(m_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^T \{m_i j + r_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i} \supseteq \mathcal{Q}_N$  where  $\tau(x)$  is the Euler totien function. Then  $T \sum_{i=1}^T k_i \geq \frac{N}{(K+1)^2 \log N}$ .*

*Proof.* In [5] I proved the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.3.** *For every  $i \in [T]$*

$$|\mathcal{Q}_N \cap \{r_i + jm_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i}| \leq (K+1) \sqrt{k_i \log k_i}.$$

*Proof of the lemma.* Write shortly  $m = m_i$ ;  $r = r_i$ ;  $k = k_i$ .

Let  $J := \{j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_t\}$  be the sequence of indices for which  $r + i_j m \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,  $r = 1, 2, \dots, t$ . Let  $J_1 \subseteq J$  be the set of indices for which  $i_{j_{s+1}} - i_{j_s} > \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}$ .

Clearly  $|J_1| \leq k / \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}} = \sqrt{k \log k}$ .

Now let  $J_2 := J \setminus J_1$ . For this indices we have  $i_{j_{r+1}} - i_{j_r} \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}$  and so

$$(1) \quad i_{j_{r+1}}m - i_{j_r}m = (r + i_{j_{r+1}}m) - (r + i_{j_r}m) = x^2 - y^2 = (x - y)(x + y)$$

for some  $x, y$ . Fix the couple  $i_{j_{r+1}}, i_{j_r}$ . Denote by  $N$  the number of pairs  $(x, y)$  for which (1) holds. Then  $N \leq \tau(i_{j_{r+1}}m - i_{j_r}m)$ . Thus we have

$$|J_2| \leq \sum_{x \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}} \tau(mx) \leq \tau(m) \sum_{x \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}} \tau(x) \leq K \sum_{x \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}} \tau(x)$$

using the fact that  $\tau(mx) \leq \tau(m)\tau(x)$ . It is well-known that

$$\sum_{x \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}} \tau(x) \leq \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}} \log \left( \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}} \right) \leq \sqrt{k \log k}.$$

Finally

$$|J_1| + |J_2| = |J| \leq \sqrt{k \log k} + K \sqrt{k \log k}.$$

□

Assume that some system of arithmetic progressions cover the squares up to  $N$ , i.e.  $\bigcup_{i=1}^T \{m_i j + r_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i} \supseteq Q_N$ . Thus  $\sqrt{N} \leq \sum_{i=1}^T |\mathcal{Q}_N \cap \{r_i + jm_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i}|$ . Now by Lemma 1.3 and the Cauchy inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} N &\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^T |\mathcal{Q}_N \cap \{r_i + jm_i\}_{j=1}^{k_i}| \right)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^T (K+1) \sqrt{k_i \log k_i} \right)^2 \leq \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^T (K+1) \sqrt{k_i \log N} \right)^2 \leq (K+1)^2 T \sum_{i=1}^T k_i \log N \end{aligned}$$

which implies the theorem.

□

## 2. COVERING BY QUASI PROGRESSIONS

In [3] Brown, Erdős and Freedman introduced the generalization of arithmetic progressions. For  $k \geq 1$  let  $X = \{x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_k\}$ .  $X$  is said to be a  $k$ -term quasi (or combinatorial) progression of order  $d$  (briefly CP- $d$ ) if the diameter of the set of  $\{x_{i+1} - x_i : 1 \leq i \leq k - 1\}$  is bounded by  $d$ .

We will consider the case of  $d = 2$ , especially when  $x_{i+1} - x_i \in \{D, D + 1\}$ , as this is the most similar to arithmetic progression. In this case we write that  $X$  is CP- $\{D, D + 1\}$

**Definition.** Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_T \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a system of sequences, where for each  $1 \leq i \leq T$ ,  $X_i$  is CP- $\{D_i, D_i + 1\}$ . Assume that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^T X_i \supseteq \mathcal{Q}_N$ . Let  $G(\mathcal{Q}_N) := \min_{\{D_i\}, T} T \sum_{i=1}^T |X_i|$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *We have*

$$G(\mathcal{Q}_N) < CN^{3/4} \log_2 N,$$

where  $C = \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{2} \frac{2^{3/2}}{2^{3/4}-1}$ , ( $\log_2 N$  is the logarithm in base 2).

*Proof.* Let  $T = \lfloor \log_2(N) \rfloor$  and for every  $1 \leq i \leq T$  let  $I_i := [N/2^i, N/2^{i-1}]$ .

We cover first  $I_1$  (and since each  $I_i$  and  $X_i$  the treatment will be similar to  $I_1$  and  $X_i$  respectively, we can briefly give a bound for  $G(\mathcal{Q}_N)$ ).

Let  $n_1^2 < n_2^2 < \dots < n_k^2$  be the squares in  $I_1$  and let  $D_1 = \lfloor \sqrt{n_1} \rfloor$ .

We have that  $\frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \geq \frac{2n_1 + 1}{\sqrt{n_1}} = 2\sqrt{n_1} \geq \sqrt{n_1} + 1 \geq D_1$  if  $n_1 \geq 1$ . Note that  $\Delta := n_2^2 - n_1^2 - \lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor D_1 < D_1$  and  $\lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor > D_1$ .

Now we are going to define the elements of  $X_1$  in the interval  $[n_1^2, n_2^2]$ . Let  $x_1 = n_1^2$  and from the differences  $x_{i+1} - x_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor$ ) let  $\Delta$  be many  $D_1 + 1$  and  $\lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor - \Delta$  be many  $D_1$ . From the definition of  $D_1$  we obtain that  $\lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor$ th element is just  $n_2^2$ .

Now consider the interval  $[n_j^2, n_{j+1}^2]$ ,  $j \geq 2$ . Since  $\lfloor \frac{n_{j+1}^2 - n_j^2}{D_1} \rfloor > \lfloor \frac{n_2^2 - n_1^2}{D_1} \rfloor$  we can repeat the previous process; i.e. let  $n_{j+1}^2 - n_j^2 - \lfloor \frac{n_{j+1}^2 - n_j^2}{D_1} \rfloor D_1$  be many of the consecutive differences  $D_1 + 1$ , and let the rest be  $D_1$ .

Now we calculate the cardinality of the quasi-progression  $X_1$ .  $N/2 \leq n_1^2$ , so  $D_1 = \lfloor \sqrt{n_1} \rfloor > \sqrt{n_1} - 1 \geq \sqrt[4]{N/2} - 1 > \sqrt[4]{N/3}$ . Furthermore  $X_1 \subseteq [N/2, N]$ , and  $x_{i+1} - x_i > D_1$  for all  $i$ , hence  $|X_1| \leq \frac{N/2}{D_1} < \frac{N/2}{\sqrt[4]{N/3}} = \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{2} N^{3/4}$ .

The calculation for every  $X_i$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, T$  is the same so we have

$$T \sum_{i=1}^T |X_i| < \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{2} \sum_{i=1}^T \left(\frac{N}{2^i}\right)^{3/4} \log_2 N < \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{2} N^{3/4} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2^{3/4})^i} \log_2 N = C N^{3/4} \log_2 N,$$

where  $C = \frac{\sqrt[4]{3}}{2} \frac{2^{3/2}}{2^{3/4}-1}$ . □

**Remark.** The reason we can cover the squares "well" is that we use a lot of  $D_i + 1$  in addition to  $D_i$ . The above proof works even if we require that the number of  $(D_i + 1)$ s in each quasi-progression is at most  $N^\varepsilon$  (in the sense that the squares are "well" covered, i.e.  $G(\mathcal{Q}_N) \leq N^{1-c(\varepsilon)}$ , where  $0 < c(\varepsilon) < 1$ ). So in the rest of the paper we assume that there are  $M = M(N)$  many  $D_i + 1$  and the other are  $D_i$  (where  $M$  varies and will be determined later).

In the next section we extend the result of Sárközy to the Erdős problem for a wide class of polynomials.

### 3. COVERING SHRINKING POLYNOMIALS BY QUASI PROGRESSIONS

A sub-sequence of prime numbers  $P' = \{p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_s < \dots\}$  is said to be  $\eta$ -dense if there exists an  $\eta > 0$  for which  $|P' \cap [1, x]|/\pi(x) > \eta$  holds for every large  $x$ .

**Definition.** Let  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . We say that  $f$  is an  $(\eta, \mu)$ -shrinking polynomial if there is an  $\eta$ -dense sequence of primes  $P' = \{p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_s < \dots\}$  such that

for all  $i$  large enough,  $|f(\mathbb{F}_{p_i})| < \mu p_i$  (here  $f(\mathbb{F}_{p_i}) := \{f(x) : x \in \mathbb{F}_{p_i}\}$ ). We say the  $f$  is shrinking if for some  $0 < \eta, \mu \leq 1$   $f$  is  $(\eta, \mu)$ -shrinking polynomial

Clearly all functions  $f(x) = x^n$ ;  $n \geq 2$  are shrinking, since for  $1 < d = g.c.d.(p - 1, n)$ ,  $|\{x^n : x \in \{1, 2, \dots, p - 1\}\}| = \frac{p-1}{d}$ , and  $\pi(x, 1, d) = \frac{1}{\phi(d)} \frac{x}{\ln x}$ , where  $\pi(x, 1, d)$  denotes the number of primes  $\equiv 1 \pmod{d}$ . Further example is the polynomial  $f(x) = x^3 + x$ . In [6] it was proved for any prime  $p > 2$  the number of distinct residues in the form  $x^3 + x \pmod{p}$  is  $2p/3 + O(\sqrt{p} \log x)$ . For a generic polynomial  $g(x)$  it is known that the number of distinct residues  $x$  represented by  $g(x)$  is  $p(1 - 1/2 + 1/3 - \dots - (-1)^d/d!) + O(\sqrt{p})$ , where  $d$  is the degree of  $g$  and  $p \geq 2$  prime (see [1]). Note that the sequence in the first brackets tends to  $1 - 1/e$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ .

The aim of the present section is to extend Erdős' problem of covering shrinking polynomials with quasi progressions.

So let  $f$  be an  $(\eta, \mu)$ -shrinking polynomial  $f_N = f(\mathbb{N}) \cap \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_T \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a system of quasi progressions, where for each  $1 \leq i \leq T$   $X_i$  is CP- $\{D_i, D_i + 1\}$ . As we have seen in the previous section we have to bound the number of  $(D_i + 1)$ s. So we assume that for every  $1 \leq i \leq T$   $(D_i + 1)$  occurs at most  $\log^A N$  times for some  $A > 0$ . We will write that  $X_i$  is CP- $\{D_i, (D_i + 1)_{\log^A N}\}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $f$  be an  $(\eta, \mu)$ -shrinking polynomial with degree  $d$ . Assume that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^T X_i \supseteq f_N$ . Let  $H_{A,d}(f_N) := \min_{\bigcup_{i=1}^T X_i \supseteq f_N} T \sum_{i=1}^T |X_i|$ . We have*

$$H_{A,d}(f_N) \geq (1 + o(1)) \frac{C' N^{2/d}}{\log^{A+2} N}$$

where  $C' = \frac{(1-\mu)^2 \eta^2}{200}$

Note that trivially  $T \sum_i |X_i| \leq CN^{2/d}$ ; when  $f_N$  is covered by singletons.

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a CP- $\{D, D+1\}$  quasi-progression where the number of gaps  $D+1$  is at most  $M \leq \log^A N$ . Let  $I = \{x_{i_1} < x_{i_2} < \dots < x_{i_M}\}$  be the sequence of subscripts for which  $x_{i_{j+1}} - x_{i_j} = D+1$ . Furthermore let  $I' \subseteq I$  be the sub-sequence of indices for which  $i_{j+1} - i_j \geq \log^2 N$ . Write  $Z_{i_j} = \{x_{i_{j+1}} < x_{i_{j+2}} < \dots < x_{i_{j+1}-1}\}$ . Here we assume that  $Z_{i_j}$  is non-empty set. Actually we split  $X$  into not too short arithmetic progressions with difference  $D$ .

From this point by some modification of the proof of Sárközy, we could extend his result. For this we need the arithmetic form of the large sieve (see [7] p. 560):

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $U \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Denote by  $U(p, h) := |\{u : u \in U; u \equiv h \pmod{p}\}|$  we have*

$$\sum_{p \leq W} p \sum_{h=0}^{p-1} \left| U(p, h) - \frac{1}{p} |U| \right|^2 \leq (N + W^2) |U|.$$

Let  $U = \{i : x_i \in X_j \cap f_N\}$ ,  $N = s = |X_j|$ , and  $W = \sqrt{s}$ . Now we use the large sieve in the form  $\sum_{p \leq \sqrt{s}} p \sum_{h=0}^{p-1} \left| U(p, h) - \frac{1}{p} |U| \right|^2 \leq 2s |U|$ .

Now we are going to sieve just for the primes for which  $f$  is shrinking, i.e. if  $\sqrt{s} > x_0$  and then there is an  $\eta$ -dense sequence of primes  $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_t \leq \sqrt{s}$  such that for all  $i$ ,  $|f(\mathbb{F}_{p_i})| < \mu p_i$ . Write  $\mathcal{I} = \{p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_t\}$ . Here  $t \geq \eta\pi(\sqrt{s})$ .

Since  $f$  is  $(\eta, \mu)$ -shrinking we conclude that for every  $1 \leq i \leq t$  the number of residues  $h$  modulo  $p_i$  for which  $U(h, p_i) = 0$  is at least  $(1 - \mu)p_i$ . Furthermore we have to leave those  $p$  from  $\mathcal{I}$  for which  $p|D$ . Clearly it is  $\omega(D)$  (the number of distinct prime factors of  $D$ ) which is at most  $(1 + o(1)) \log N / \log \log N$ . Denote the remaining set by  $\mathcal{I}'$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \leq \sqrt{s}} p \sum_{h=0}^{p-1} \left| U(p, h) - \frac{1}{p} |U| \right|^2 \geq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{I}'} p(1 - \mu)p \left| \frac{1}{p} |U| \right|^2 = \\ & = (1 - \mu) |U|^2 (\eta\pi(\sqrt{s}) - (1 + o(1)) \log N / \log \log N) > \frac{(1 - \mu)\eta}{10} |U|^2 \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\log s}, \end{aligned}$$

since we assume that  $s = |X_j| \geq \log^2 N$ . Comparing the left and right hand side of the sieve inequality we get

$$|U| \leq \frac{20}{(1-\mu)\eta} \sqrt{s} \log s.$$

Now we are going to estimate the number of values of  $f$  in  $X$ . Write  $X = \cup_{i_j \in \mathcal{I}'} Z_{i_j} \cup (X \setminus \cup_{i_j \in \mathcal{I}'} Z_{i_j})$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{I}'$ , the number of values of  $f$  is at most  $|X \setminus \cup_{i_j \in \mathcal{I}'} Z_{i_j}| \leq \log^A N \cdot \log^2 N = \log^{A+2} N$ .

The number of values of  $f$  in the rest of  $X$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{20}{(1-\mu)\eta} \sum_{i_j \in \mathcal{I}'} \sqrt{|Z_{i_j}|} \log |Z_{i_j}| &\leq \frac{20}{(1-\mu)\eta} \sqrt{\log^A N \sum_{i_j \in \mathcal{I}'} |Z_{i_j}|} \log N \leq \\ &\leq \frac{20}{(1-\mu)\eta} \sqrt{|X|} \log^{A/2+1} N. \end{aligned}$$

using Jensen inequality. Now we complete the proof of the theorem. Since the degree of  $f$  is  $d$  thus  $|f_N| = (1+o(1))N^{1/d}$ . Assume that the union of  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_T$  covers  $f_N$ , and for every  $1 \leq i \leq T$ ,  $X_i$  is CP- $\{D_i, (D_i+1)_{\log^A N}\}$  quasi progression. Write  $X'_i = X_i \cap f_N$ . The above sieving estimation can only be used for "long" quasi-progressions, so we divide the sum  $\sum_i |X'_i|$  into two parts. We have

$$(1+o(1))N^{2/d} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^T |X'_i| \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{|X_i| \leq \log^2 N} |X'_i| \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X'_i| \right)^2$$

since  $(a+b)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}a^2 + \frac{1}{2}b^2$ . Let  $T_1$  be the number of terms in the first sum and  $T_2 = T - T_1$ . Then  $(\sum_{|X_i| \leq \log^2 N} |X'_i|)^2 \leq T_1 \log^2 N (\sum_{|X_i| \leq \log^2 N} |X_i|)$ . By the Cauchy inequality the first sum can be estimated as

$$\left( \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X'_i| \right)^2 \leq T_2 \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X'_i|^2 \leq T_2 \frac{400}{(1-\mu)^2 \eta^2} \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X_i| \log^{A+2} N.$$

Putting everything together we get

$$(1+o(1))N^{2/d} \leq \frac{1}{2} T_1 \log^2 N \sum_{|X_i| \leq \log^2 N} |X_i| + T_2 \frac{200}{(1-\mu)^2 \eta^2} \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X_i| \log^{A+2} N \leq$$



$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{200}{(1-\mu)^2\eta^2} \log^{A+2} N (T_1 \sum_{|X_i| \leq \log^2 N} |X_i| + T_2 \sum_{|X_i| > \log^2 N} |X_i|) \\ &= \frac{200}{(1-\mu)^2\eta^2} \log^{A+2} N (T \sum_{i=1}^T |X_i|). \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the inequality we obtain the statement.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by grant K-129335.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Birch, H Swinnerton-Dyer: Note on a problem of Chowla, *Acta Arithmetica* (1959), Vol. 5, Issue: 4, page 417-423
- [2] T. C. Brown, P. Erdős, and A. R. Freedman, Quasi-progressions and descending waves, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. 53*, No. 1 (1990), 81-95.
- [3] T. C. Brown and A. R. Freedman, Small sets which meet all the  $k(n)$ -term arithmetic progressions in the interval  $[1, n]$ , *J. Combinatorial Theory Series A* 51 (1989), 244-249.
- [4] P. Ding and A. R. Freedman: Semi-Progressions, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 76, 99-107 (1996)
- [5] N. Hegyvári: Extremal Problems in Combinatorial Number Theory, unpublished master thesis, 1980. Eötvös Loránd university, Hungary, (in Hungarian)
- [6] K. McCann and K.S.Williams, The distribution of the residues of a quartic polynomial, *Glasgow Math. J.* 8 (1967) 67-88.
- [7] Hugh L. Montgomery: The analytic principle of the large sieve, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 84(4): 547-567 (July 1978).
- [8] A. Sárközy: On squares in arithmetic progressions, *Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös* 25 (1982), 267-272.

NORBERT HEGYVÁRI, ELTE TTK, EÖTVÖS UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS,  
PÁZMÁNY ST. 1/C, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY AND ASSOCIATED MEMBER OF ALFRÉD RÉNYI IN-  
STITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, H-1364 BUDAPEST, P.O.Box  
127.

*Email address:* `hegyvari@renyi.hu`