

ON THE ITERATES OF SHIFTED EULER'S FUNCTION

PAOLO LEONETTI AND FLORIAN LUCA

ABSTRACT. Let φ be the Euler's function and fix an integer $k \geq 0$. We show that, for every initial value $x_1 \geq 1$, the sequence of positive integers $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ defined by $x_{n+1} = \varphi(x_n) + k$ for all $n \geq 1$ is eventually periodic. Similarly, for every initial value $x_1, x_2 \geq 1$, the sequence of positive integers $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ defined by $x_{n+2} = \varphi(x_{n+1}) + \varphi(x_n) + k$ for all $n \geq 1$ is eventually periodic, provided that k is even.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Let \mathbb{N} be the set of positive integers and fix an arithmetic function $f : \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers which satisfies the recurrence

$$x_{n+d} = f(x_n, \dots, x_{n+d-2}, x_{n+d-1}) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

with starting values $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N}$. In the case where $d = 1$ the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is simply the orbit of x_1 with respect to f . The aim of this note is to study whether certain recurrence sequences $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of the type (1) are eventually periodic independently of their starting values, that is, for all $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $T \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n = x_{n+T}$ for all sufficiently large n .

Here and after, we will use implicitly the basic observation that a recurrence sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as in (1) is eventually periodic if and only if it is bounded, cf. [5, p. 45].

We start with a simple result for functions f which are not too large:

Proposition 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be an arithmetical function, with $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose that there exists $C \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$f(n_1, \dots, n_d) < \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\} \quad (2)$$

for all $n_1, \dots, n_d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_i \geq C$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a recurrence sequence as in (1), with starting values $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \leq \max\{f(n_1, \dots, n_d) : n_1, \dots, n_d \leq C - 1\}. \quad (3)$$

In particular, $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is upper bounded; hence, eventually periodic.

Special instances of Proposition 1 in the one-dimensional case $d = 1$ have been previously obtained in the literature. For example, Porges [15] considered the case where $f(n)$ is the sum of squares of the digits of n , cf. also [7, 11, 19]. Note that condition (2) holds if $f(n_1, \dots, n_d) = o(N)$ as $N = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\} \rightarrow \infty$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11A25, 11B37. Secondary 97I30.

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear recurrence sequences; periodic sequences; Euler's function; iterates.

Of course, there exist other functions f which do not satisfy condition (2) and such that every sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as in (1) is eventually periodic: as a trivial example, one can consider $f(n_1, \dots, n_d) := \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\}$ for all $(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. On the opposite extreme, if f is slightly bigger (for instance, $f(n_1, \dots, n_d) := \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\} + 1$) then there are no eventually periodic sequences $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as in (1). This is the starting point for this work, which motivates the following heuristic: *if a function f satisfies (2) “on average,” then every sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as (1) should be eventually periodic, independently of its starting values.*

We are going to confirm the above heuristic in two cases which involve (shifted iterates of) the Euler’s function φ (recall that $\varphi(n)$ is the number of integers in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ which are coprime with n). Our first main result follows.

Theorem 2. *Fix an integer $k \geq 0$ and let $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the recurrence sequence defined by*

$$x_{n+1} = \varphi(x_n) + k \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

with starting value $x_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n \leq \max\{x_1, k^4\} + (k+1)^2. \quad (4)$$

In particular, $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is eventually periodic.

Note that the dependence of the upper bound (4) on x_1 cannot be removed: indeed, if $k := x_1 - \varphi(x_1)$ for some $x_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is constantly equal to x_1 .

In addition, the trivial case $k = 0$ in Theorem 2 has been already considered in the literature from different viewpoints (and, of course, it follows by Proposition 1 since $\varphi(n) \leq n - 1$ for all $n \geq 2$). Indeed, given a starting value $x_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x_{n+1} = \varphi^{(n)}(x_1)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\varphi^{(m)}$ is the m -th fold iteration of φ . For instance, Pillai [12] showed that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\log x_1 - \log 2}{\log 3} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq N(x_1) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\log x_1}{\log 2} \right\rfloor + 1 \quad \text{for all } x_1 \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $N(x_1)$ is the minimal integer n for which $x_n = 1$ (see also [17]) and it has been conjectured by Erdős et al. [4] that $N(x_1) \sim \alpha \log x_1$ as $x_1 \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. It is known that the understanding of the multiplicative structure of φ and its iterates is in some sense equivalent to the study of the behavior of the integers of the form $p - 1$, where p is prime. See also [8, 10, 14, 18] for related works.

On the other hand, if $k \geq 1$ then the function $f(n) := \varphi(n) + k$ does not satisfy condition (2): indeed, $\varphi(p) = p - 1$ for all primes p , hence $f(p) \geq p$. However, it is well known that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(i) = \frac{3}{\pi^2} n + O(\log n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (5)$$

(see e.g. [2, Theorem 8.6]). Hence, approximating roughly $f(n)$ with $cn + k$, where $c = 3/\pi^2 \in (0, 1)$, we expect that (2) holds “on average,” which is the heuristic behind Theorem 2.

Our second main result is as follows.

Theorem 3. Fix an even integer $k \geq 0$ and let $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the recurrence sequence defined by

$$x_{n+2} = \varphi(x_{n+1}) + \varphi(x_n) + k \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

with starting values $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n \leq 4^{X^{3^{k+1}}}, \quad \text{where } X := \frac{3x_1 + 5x_2 + 7k}{2}. \quad (6)$$

In particular, $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is eventually periodic.

The heuristic supporting Theorem 3 is similar: thanks to (5), the value $f(n, m) := \varphi(n) + \varphi(m) + k$ can be roughly upper bounded by $2c \max\{n, m\} + k$, which is definitively smaller than $\max\{n, m\}$ since $2c = 6/\pi^2 < 1$.

We end with an open question to check whether, if d is sufficiently large, then there exist starting values $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ defined as in (1) with

$$f(n_1, \dots, n_d) = \varphi(n_1) + \dots + \varphi(n_d)$$

is *not* eventually periodic. In a sense, this is somehow related to the open question known as Lehmer's totient problem [9], which asks about the existence of a composite $q \geq 2$ such that $\varphi(q)$ divides $q - 1$: indeed, if $r := (q - 1)/\varphi(q)$, $d = r$, and $x_1 = \dots = x_d = q$, then the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ would be constant.

2. PROOFS

We start with the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. Let \mathcal{Q} be the set of d -uples $(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $n_i \leq C - 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Suppose that $(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$. Hence, we can pick the largest index $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $n_i = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\}$. In particular, $n_i \geq C$. We claim that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(n_{m+1}, \dots, n_{m+d}) \in \mathcal{Q}$. In addition, if m is the least such integer then $\max\{n_j, \dots, n_{j+d-1}\}$ is decreasing for $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. To this aim, suppose for the sake of contradiction that the claim does not hold. By the standing hypothesis (2), we get $n_{d+1} = f(n_1, \dots, n_d) < n_i$. Repeating this reasoning, we obtain that $n_{d+j} < \max\{n_j, \dots, n_{d+j-1}\} = n_i$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, i\}$. Hence, $\max\{n_{i+1}, \dots, n_{i+d}\} \leq n_i - 1$. Proceeding similarly, it follows that

$$\max\{n_{i+(k-1)d+1}, \dots, n_{i+kd}\} \leq n_i - k \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

However, if $k = n_i + 1 - C$ then $(n_{i+(k-1)d+1}, \dots, n_{i+kd}) \in \mathcal{Q}$, which proves the claim.

To complete the proof, fix starting values $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N}$. By the above claim and the finiteness of \mathcal{Q} , it follows that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is upper bounded by the constant

$$\max(\{x_1, \dots, x_d\} \cup \{f(n_1, \dots, n_d) : (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathcal{Q}\})$$

and that the upper limit in (3) holds. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. First, let us suppose $k \leq 1$ and fix a starting value $x_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$x_{n+1} = \varphi(x_n) + k \leq \max\{1, x_n - 1\} + 1 = \max\{2, x_n\}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with the consequence that $x_n \leq \max\{x_1, 2\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose hereafter that $k \geq 2$. Note that, for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+m} &\leq \max\{x_{n+m-1} - 1, 1\} + k \\ &= \max\{x_{n+m-1} + k - 1, k + 1\} \leq \max\{x_n + m(k-1), k + 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let us suppose for the sake of contradiction that $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not upper bounded. Hence, there exists a minimal $r_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{r_1} \geq k^4$ (in particular, $x_{r_1} > 4$).

CLAIM 1. There exists $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $x_{r_1+i} < x_{r_1}$.

Proof. Since $\varphi(n) \leq n - \sqrt{n}$ whenever n is composite (by the fact that there exists a divisor of n which is at most \sqrt{n}), it follows that, if x_{r_1+i-1} is composite for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, then

$$x_{r_1+i} = \varphi(x_{r_1+i-1}) + k \leq x_{r_1+i-1} - \sqrt{x_{r_1+i-1}} + k.$$

Considering that the map $x \mapsto x - \sqrt{x}$ is increasing on $(4, \infty)$ and using (7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_{r_1+i} &\leq x_{r_1} + (i-1)(k-1) - \sqrt{x_{r_1} + (i-1)(k-1)} + k \\ &\leq x_{r_1} + (k-1)^2 - \sqrt{k^4} + k < x_{r_1}. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we show that there exists some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ for which x_{r_1+i-1} is composite. Indeed, in the opposite, these x_{r_1+i-1} s are all primes (and greater than k), hence

$$x_{r_1+i-1} = x_{r_1} + (i-1)(k-1) \equiv x_{r_1} - (i-1) \pmod{k}$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. This is impossible, because there would exist $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that k divides x_{r_1+i-1} . \blacksquare

At this point, inequality (7) and Claim 1 imply that there exists a minimal $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $x_{r_1+i_1} < x_{r_1}$; hence

$$\max\{x_1, \dots, x_{r_1+i_1-1}\} \leq x_{r_1} + (i_1-1)(k-1) < x_{r_1} + k^2. \quad (8)$$

With the same reasoning, we can construct recursively sequences of positive integers (r_n) and (i_n) such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

- (i) r_{n+1} is the minimal integer such that $r_{n+1} \geq r_n + i_n$ and $x_{r_{n+1}} \geq k^4$;
- (ii) i_{n+1} is the minimal integer in $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $x_{r_{n+1}+i_{n+1}} < x_{r_n}$; hence,

$$\max\{x_{r_n+i_n}, \dots, x_{r_{n+1}+i_{n+1}-1}\} \leq x_{r_{n+1}} + (i_{n+1}-1)(k-1) < x_{r_{n+1}} + k^2. \quad (9)$$

Lastly, note that

$$x_{r_n} = \varphi(x_{r_n-1}) + k \leq x_{r_n-1} + k \leq k^4 + k \leq x_{r_1} + k \quad (10)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using inequalities (8), (9), and (10), we conclude that

$$x_n < x_{r_1} + k^2 + k \leq \max\{x_1, k^4 + k\} + k^2 + k < \max\{x_1, k^4\} + (k+1)^2$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This proves (4), concluding the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 4. A sketch of a shorter proof that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in Theorem 2 is eventually periodic goes as follows: Set $y_n := \varphi(x_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and note that $y_n \leq Cn$ with $C := \max\{x_1, k\}$. Hence $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ is contained in $V_n := \varphi(\mathbb{N}) \cap [1, Cn]$. By a classical result of Pillai [13], cf. also [6] and references therein, we have $|V_n| = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence there exist distinct $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $y_i = y_j$. This implies that $x_{i+1} = x_{j+1}$, therefore $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is eventually periodic. However, this does not lead to an effective upper bound as in (4).

In the proof of Theorem 3, we will need also the effective version of the third Mertens' theorem given by Rosser and Schoenfeld [16] in 1962 (see also [1, 3]). As usual, hereafter we reserve the letter p for primes.

Proposition 5. Let $\gamma := \lim_n \left(\sum_{i \leq n} 1/i - \log n \right) = 0.57721\dots$ be the Euler–Mascheroni's constant. Then the following inequality holds for all $x \geq 2$:

$$\frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log^2 x} \right) < \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) < \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2 \log^2 x} \right).$$

Proof. See [16, Theorem 7 and its Corollary]. \blacksquare

Corollary 6. If $x \geq 6$ then

$$\prod_{x < p \leq x^3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 5, for each $r \geq 2$ there exists $c_r \in (-1, 1/2)$ such that

$$\prod_{p \leq r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) = \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 + \frac{c_r}{\log^2 x} \right).$$

At this point, fix $x \geq 6$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{x < p \leq x^3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) &= \frac{\prod_{p \leq x^3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)}{\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\gamma}/(\log x^3)}{e^{-\gamma}/\log x} \cdot \frac{(1 + c_{x^3}/(\log x^3)^2)}{1 + c_x/(\log x)^2} \\ &< \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1 + 0.5/(9 \log^2 x)}{1 - 1/(\log^2 x)} < \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the last inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{2}{3} \left(1 + \frac{1}{18 \log^2 x} \right) < 1 - \frac{1}{\log^2 x},$$

which holds if and only if

$$x > e^{\sqrt{3(1 + \frac{1}{27})}}.$$

The conclusion follows since the value of the right hand side above is smaller than 6. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 3. If $\max\{x_1, x_2\} \leq 2$ and $k = 0$ then $x_n = 2$ for all $n \geq 3$, so the claimed inequality (6) holds since $4^{X^{3^{k+1}}} \geq 4 > x_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hence, suppose hereafter that $\max\{x_1, x_2\} \geq 3$ or $k \geq 1$, and note that $X = \frac{1}{2}(3x_1 + 5x_2 + 7k) \geq 6$. We obtain that $\min\{x_3, x_4\} \geq 3$; hence, x_n is even for all $n \geq 5$. In addition, since $\max\{x_1, \dots, x_6\} \leq 2X$ and

$$4^{X^{3^{k+1}}} \geq 4^X = 2^{2X} > 2X,$$

it follows that the claimed inequality holds for all $n \leq 6$.

Let $(p_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the increasing enumeration of the primes greater than X . Considering that $\prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)$ converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 5, one can find integers $1 =: r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_{k+1}$ such that

$$\prod_{i=r_j}^{r_{j+1}-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right) < \frac{1}{2} < \prod_{i=r_j}^{r_{j+1}-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right) \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (11)$$

Define also

$$q_j := \prod_{i=r_j}^{r_{j+1}-1} p_i \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Since $\{q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ are pairwise coprime, the Chinese remainder theorem yields the existence of some $y \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $y \equiv j \pmod{q_j}$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. In particular

$$y \geq q_0 \geq p_{r_0} > X. \quad (12)$$

Let us suppose for the sake of contradiction that $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not bounded. Then, there exists a minimal $v \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_v \geq 2y$. Since $\max\{x_1, \dots, x_6\} \leq 2X$, it follows by (12) that $v \geq 7$. In particular, x_{v-1} and x_{v-2} are even.

CLAIM 2. $\max\{\varphi(x_{v-1}), \varphi(x_{v-2})\} < y - k$.

Proof. If $x_{v-1} < 2y - 2k$ then, by the fact that x_{v-1} is even, $\varphi(x_{v-1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}x_{v-1} < y - k$. Otherwise, recalling that v is the minimal integer such that $x_v \geq 2y$, then $2y - 2k \leq x_{v-1} < 2y$. In addition, x_{v-1} is even, so $x_{v-1} = 2y - 2j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. It follows that

$$\varphi(x_{v-1}) = x_{v-1} \prod_{p|x_{v-1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = (y - j) \prod'_{p|x_{v-1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

where the last product is extended over the odd prime divisors of x_{v-1} . Since by construction we have $y \equiv j \pmod{q_j}$, we obtain by (11) that

$$\varphi(x_{v-1}) \leq (y - j) \prod_{i=r_j}^{r_{j+1}-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right) < \frac{y - j}{2} < y - k.$$

Note that the last inequality holds because $y > 2k$, thanks to (12).

The same argument can be repeated for x_{v-2} . ■

We conclude by Claim 2 that

$$2y \leq x_v = \varphi(x_{v-1}) + \varphi(x_{v-2}) + k < 2(y - k) + k \leq 2y,$$

which is contradiction. It follows that $x_n < 2y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

To complete the proof, it will be enough to show that $2y \leq 4^{X_{3^{k+1}}}$. For this, define $X_n := X^{3^n}$ for all $n \geq 0$ and note that, thanks to Corollary 6, we have

$$\prod_{X_n < p \leq X_n^3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

By the definition of r_j , it follows that

$$r_j \leq X_j \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k+1\}.$$

Lastly, since $\prod_{p \leq x} p < 4^x$ for all $x \geq 1$ (see e.g. [2, Lemma 2.8]), we conclude that

$$2y \leq 2 \prod_{j=0}^k q_j \leq \prod_{i=1}^{r_{k+1}} p_i \leq \prod_{p \leq X_{k+1}} p \leq 4^{X_{k+1}}.$$

Therefore $x_n \leq 4^{X_{k+1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Axler, *New estimates for some functions defined over primes*, Integers **18** (2018), Paper No. A52, 21.
- [2] J.-M. De Koninck and F. Luca, *Analytic number theory*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 134, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012, Exploring the anatomy of integers.
- [3] P. Dusart, *Estimates of ψ, θ for large values of x without the Riemann hypothesis*, Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 298, 875–888.
- [4] P. Erdős, A. Granville, C. Pomerance, and C. Spiro, *On the normal behavior of the iterates of some arithmetic functions*, Analytic number theory (Allerton Park, IL, 1989), Progr. Math., vol. 85, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 165–204.
- [5] G. Everest, A. van der Poorten, I. Shparlinski, and T. Ward, *Recurrence sequences*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 104, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [6] K. Ford, *The distribution of totients*, vol. 2, 1998, Paul Erdős (1913–1996), pp. 67–151.
- [7] R. Isaacs, *Iterates of fractional order*, Canad. J. Math. **2** (1950), 409–416.
- [8] Y. Lamzouri, *Smooth values of the iterates of the Euler phi-function*, Canad. J. Math. **59** (2007), no. 1, 127–147.
- [9] D. H. Lehmer, *On Euler's totient function*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **38** (1932), no. 10, 745–751.
- [10] P. Loomis and F. Luca, *On totient abundant numbers*, Integers **8** (2008), A6, 7.
- [11] D. Lorenzini, M. Melistas, A. Suresh, M. Suwama, and H. Wang, *Integer dynamics*, Int. J. Number Theory **18** (2022), no. 2, 397–415.
- [12] S. S. Pillai, *On a function connected with $\phi(n)$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (1929), no. 6, 837–841.
- [13] S. S. Pillai, *On some functions connected with $\phi(n)$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (1929), no. 6, 832–836.
- [14] P. Pollack, *Two remarks on iterates of Euler's totient function*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **97** (2011), no. 5, 443–452.
- [15] A. Porges, *A set of eight numbers*, Amer. Math. Monthly **52** (1945), 379–382.
- [16] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math. **6** (1962), 64–94.
- [17] H. Shapiro, *An arithmetic function arising from the ϕ function*, Amer. Math. Monthly **50** (1943), 18–30.

- [18] I. E. Shparlinski, *On the sum of iterations of the Euler function*, J. Integer Seq. **9** (2006), no. 1, Article 06.1.6, 5.
- [19] B. M. Stewart, *Sums of functions of digits*, Canadian J. Math. **12** (1960), 374–389.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'INSUBRIA, VIA MONTE GENEROSO 71, 21100 VARESE, ITALY

Email address: `leonetti.paolo@gmail.com`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, PRIVATE BAG 3, WITS 2050, SOUTH AFRICA

Email address: `Florian.Luca@wits.ac.za`