

4. Proof of the Theorem, conclusion

Objekttyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **32 (1986)**

Heft 1-2: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **25.04.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

then

$$\lambda\left(\frac{N}{5} \pm 1\right) = \frac{\lambda(N \pm 5)}{\lambda(5)} = 1 = -\lambda(N) = \lambda\left(\frac{N}{5}\right),$$

and $N/5 = 4n/5 \in I_n$ is good. We may therefore suppose that at least one of values $\lambda(N+5)$ and $\lambda(N-5)$ equals 1.

For definiteness we shall assume $\lambda(N+5) = 1$; the other case is treated in exactly the same way.

If $\lambda(N+3) = 1$ or $\lambda(N+6) = 1$, then $N+4 \in I_n$ or $N+5 \in I_n$ is good. But in the remaining case

$$\lambda(N+3) = \lambda(N+6) = -1$$

we have

$$\lambda\left(\frac{N}{3}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{N}{3} + 1\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{N}{3} + 2\right) = 1,$$

so that $(N+3)/3 \in I_n$ is good.

Thus (3) implies the existence of a good integer in the interval (4), as we had to show.

4. PROOF OF THE THEOREM, CONCLUSION

So far we have proved that (1) has infinitely many solutions in the cases $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_3 = 1$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_3 = -1$. But this obviously implies that for each of the triples $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3) = (1, 1, -1), (-1, -1, 1), (1, -1, -1)$ and $(-1, 1, 1)$ there are also infinitely many solutions to (1). It remains therefore to consider the triples $(1, -1, 1)$ and $(-1, 1, -1)$. Since the arguments in both cases are the same (with $+1$ and -1 interchanged), we shall confine ourselves to the case $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3) = (1, -1, 1)$. Accordingly, we call $n \geq 2$ good, whenever

$$\lambda(n+1) = \lambda(n-1) = 1, \quad \lambda(n) = -1.$$

We have to show that there are infinitely many such n .

Suppose, to get a contradiction, that there are only finitely many good integers, all of them $\leq N_0$, say. Suppose further that

$$(5) \quad \lambda(n) = 1 (m_0 \leq n \leq n_0)$$

holds for some integers $n_0 > m_0 \geq 2N_0$. We shall show that then

$$(6) \quad \lambda(n) = 1(m_i \leq n \leq n_i)$$

holds for all $i \geq 0$, where m_i and n_i are defined inductively by

$$(7) \quad m_{i+1} = \left\lceil \frac{3m_i + 1}{2} \right\rceil, \quad n_{i+1} = \left\lceil \frac{3n_i}{2} \right\rceil (i \geq 0).$$

This will easily lead to the desired contradiction.

By our assumption (5), (6) holds for $i = 0$. Assume now that (6) does not hold for all $i \geq 0$, and let $i \geq 0$ be minimal such that (6) holds for i and fails for $i + 1$. Thus, for some $n \in [m_{i+1}, n_{i+1}]$, which we shall fix, we have $\lambda(n) = -1$. Write

$$(8) \quad 2n = 3n' + \theta (\theta \in \{0, 1, -1\}).$$

From (7) we get

$$3m_i \leq 2m_{i+1} \leq 2n \leq 2n_{i+1} \leq 3n_i,$$

so that

$$m_i \leq n' \leq n_i,$$

and hence by (6) (which we assumed to hold for i)

$$\lambda(3n') = -\lambda(n') = -1.$$

Since, by our assumption $\lambda(n) = -1$,

$$\lambda(2n) = -\lambda(n) = 1,$$

we cannot have $\theta = 0$ in (8). The arguments in the cases $\theta = \pm 1$ being identical, we shall henceforth assume that (8) holds with $\theta = 1$.

We must have

$$\lambda(2(n-1)) = \lambda(3n'-1) = -1,$$

since otherwise $3n'$ would be good and

$$3n' \geq 3m_i \geq 3m_0 > N_0,$$

in contradiction to our assumption. Also, since

$$m_i \leq n' + 1 = \frac{2}{3}(n+1) \leq \left\lceil \frac{2}{3}(n_{i+1}+1) \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{2}{3} \left(\left\lceil \frac{3n_i}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \right\rceil \leq n_i,$$

we have by (6)

$$\lambda(2(n+1)) = \lambda(3(n'+1)) = -\lambda(n'+1) = -1.$$

These two identities imply

$$\lambda(n \pm 1) = -\lambda(2(n \pm 1)) = 1,$$

and since $\lambda(n) = -1$, we conclude that $n(>N_0)$ is good and therefore arrive at a contradiction.

Thus (5) (with $n_0 > m_0 \geq 2N_0$) implies (6) for all $i \geq 0$. To derive from this the desired contradiction, we suppose first that (5) holds for some $n_0 > m_0 \geq 2N_0$ satisfying

$$(9) \quad n_0 - m_0 \geq 3.$$

In other words, we suppose (for the moment) that there exist four consecutive integers $n \geq 2N_0$, for which $\lambda(n) = 1$. Putting $d_i = n_i - m_i$, we have, by the recursion formulae (7),

$$d_{i+1} \geq \frac{3}{2} d_i - 1 = \frac{3}{2} d_i \left(1 - \frac{2}{3d_i}\right) \quad (i \geq 0).$$

Taking into account (9), we obtain by induction in turn

$$d_i \geq 3 \quad (i \geq 0),$$

$$d_i \geq 3 \left(\frac{7}{6}\right)^i \quad (i \geq 0),$$

and finally

$$d_i \geq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^i \prod_{j=0}^i \left(1 - \frac{2}{3d_j}\right) \geq C \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^i \quad (i \geq 0),$$

where

$$C = \prod_{j \geq 0} \left(1 - \frac{2}{9} \left(\frac{6}{7}\right)^j\right) > 0.$$

Since on the other hand by (7)

$$d_i \leq n_i \leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^i n_0 \quad (i \geq 0),$$

we see from (6), that there are arbitrary large values of x , such that $\lambda(n)$ is constant in the interval $[x(1-\varepsilon), x]$, where $\varepsilon = C/n_0$. But this is impossible since, for x sufficiently large, every such interval contains integers n and n' of the form

$$n = 4^a 9^b, \quad n' = 2 \cdot 4^c 9^d (a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{N}),$$

for which

$$\lambda(n) = 1, \quad \lambda(n') = -1.$$

We therefore have obtained the desired contradiction under the assumption that there exist four consecutive integers $n \geq 2N_0$, for which $\lambda(n) = 1$. By the part of the theorem already proved, there exist at least three such integers. Therefore (5) holds for some $m_0 > 2N_0$ with $n_0 = m_0 + 2$, and we may now assume that

$$\lambda(m_0 - 1) = \lambda(m_0 + 3) = -1.$$

If m_0 is odd, then this implies

$$\lambda\left(\frac{m_0 - 1}{2}\right) = \lambda\left(\frac{m_0 + 3}{2}\right) = 1, \quad \lambda\left(\frac{m_0 + 1}{2}\right) = -1,$$

so that $(m_0 + 1)/2 > N_0$ is good, in contradiction to our assumption. But if m_0 is even, then defining m_1 and n_1 by (7), (6) holds for $i = 1$, and we have

$$m_1 \geq 2N_0, \quad n_1 - m_1 = \frac{3(m_0 + 2)}{2} - \frac{3m_0}{2} = 3.$$

Thus we are back in the case already treated.

By contradiction, we therefore conclude that (1) has infinitely many solutions for $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3) = (1, -1, 1)$, and the proof of the theorem is complete.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the foregoing proof, the relevant property of the Liouville function was that $\lambda(n)$ is completely multiplicative and assumes only the values ± 1 . Besides this, we used only the fact that $\lambda(2) = \lambda(3) = \lambda(5) = -1$ and (in the proof of the lemma)

$$\lambda(14) = \lambda(16) = 1, \quad \lambda(29) = \lambda(31) = -1.$$

The proof, as it stands, works for any completely multiplicative function $f(n) = \pm 1$ with these properties. By suitably modifying the proof, it is possible to cover other classes of multiplicative functions as well.