

## On the difference of integer-valued additive functions

By I. Z. RUZSA (Budapest) and R. TIJDEMAN (Leiden)

### 1. Introduction

A classical theorem of ERDŐS [4] asserts that if a real-valued additive function satisfies  $f(n+1) - f(n) \rightarrow 0$ , then it must be of the form  $f(n) = c \log n$ . Many generalizations and analogs have been found since then. An important one is the following (still unpublished) result of E. WIRSING: if a multiplicative function satisfies  $|g(n)| = 1$ ,  $g(n+1) - g(n) \rightarrow 0$ , then it must be of the form  $g(n) = n^{ic}$  with some real constant  $c$ .

DARÓCZY and KÁTAI [3] found the following common generalization of these results: if  $G$  is a locally compact, compactly generated abelian group (written additively) and a  $G$ -valued additive arithmetical function  $f$  satisfies  $f(n+1) - f(n) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $f$  is the restriction to the set of integers of a continuous homomorphism from the multiplicative group of positive real numbers to  $G$ .

DARÓCZY and KÁTAI's proof is based on an application of WIRSING's theorem to the functions  $g(n) = \chi(f(n))$ , where  $\chi$  runs over the (continuous) characters of  $G$ . This approach cannot handle groups that are not separated by their characters. AJTAI, HAVAS and KOMLÓS [1] have shown that there are commutative groups with a Hausdorff topology that do not admit any nontrivial continuous character. This leaves the question of existence of nontrivial group-valued additive functions with  $f(n+1) - f(n) \rightarrow 0$  open. We show that such functions do indeed exist, even for the simplest  $G$ , the additive group of integers.

**Theorem 1.** *There is an integer-valued completely additive function  $f$ , not identically 0, and a Hausdorff topology  $T$  on the set of integers which makes it a topological group with the operation of addition, such that*

$$f(n+1) - f(n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ in } T.$$

Before starting the proof we show why our function does not fall within the frames of a suitable extension of DARÓCZY and KÁTAI's theorem.

Let  $G$  be a topological group. It seems reasonable to call a  $G$ -valued additive function *regular*, if it can be extended to a continuous homomorphism from the multiplicative group of rational numbers to  $G$ . (The existence of an extension to the group of positive reals depends on completeness properties of  $G$ .) We show that our function does not possess such an extension.

**1.1. Statement.** *Let  $G$  be the group of integers with an arbitrary Hausdorff group topology. There is no nontrivial continuous homomorphism from  $\mathbf{Q}^*$ , the multiplicative group of positive rational numbers with the usual topology, to  $G$ .*

PROOF. Suppose that there is such a homomorphism  $\varphi$ . Take a prime  $p$  such that  $\varphi(p) \neq 0$ , and two other primes  $q$  and  $r$ . Write  $\varphi(p) = a$ ,  $\varphi(q) = b$ ,  $\varphi(r) = c$ ; we know  $a \neq 0$ . Define  $m = p^b q^{-a}$ ,  $n = p^c r^{-a}$ . Here  $m$  contains  $q$  but not  $r$  while  $n$  contains  $r$  but not  $q$  (they may and may not contain  $p$ ), thus they are different from 1 and not powers of a common base, therefore  $(\log m)/(\log n)$  is irrational. This implies that the numbers  $m^u n^v$ ,  $u, v$  integers, are dense in  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Since  $\varphi$  vanishes on this dense set, it must be identically zero.  $\square$

An even stronger requirement would be that the function cannot be extended to an algebraical homomorphism, in other words, that it is not completely additive. This is, however, impossible.

**1.2. Statement.** *An additive function with values in an arbitrary commutative topological group that satisfies  $f(n+1) - f(n) \rightarrow 0$  must be completely additive.*

PROOF. To prove complete additivity it is sufficient to show  $f(p^{k+1}) = f(p^k) + f(p)$  for every prime  $p$  and positive integer  $k$ . Now observe that the equality

$$f(p^{k+1}) - f(p^k) - f(p) = (f(p^k n + 1) - f(p^k n)) - (f(p^{k+1} n + p) - f(p^{k+1} n))$$

holds for every  $n$  coprime to  $p$ , and the right side tends to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

## 2. Proof of the Theorem

**2.1. Definition.** A Hausdorff topology on the set of integers is called an *arithmetical topology*, if it turns the set of integers with the operation of addition into a topological group.

**2.2. Definition.** We call a sequence  $a_n$  of integers *nullpotent*, if there is an arithmetical topology in which  $a_n \rightarrow 0$ .

With this terminology, we need to construct a nonzero completely additive function for which the sequence  $f(n + 1) - f(n)$  is nullpotent. We prove slightly more.

**Theorem 2.** *There is a positive-valued function  $F(n)$  such that the sequence  $f(n + 1) - f(n)$  is nullpotent for every completely additive function  $f$  which satisfies*

$$(2.1) \quad |f(q)| > F(q) \max_{p < q} |f(p)|$$

for all but finitely many primes  $q$ .

We quote the following arithmetical description of nullpotency from RUZSA [5].

**2.3. Lemma.** *A sequence  $a_n$  is nullpotent if and only if for every integer  $u \neq 0$  and positive integer  $k$  the equation*

$$(2.2) \quad u = e_1 a_{n_1} + e_2 a_{n_2} + \dots + e_k a_{n_k}, \quad e_n = \pm 1$$

has only finitely many primitive solutions. Here a solution of (2.2) is called primitive, if none of the  $2^k - 1$  nonempty subsums is 0.

Substituting  $a_n = f(n + 1) - f(n)$  into (2.2), we obtain the equation

$$(2.3) \quad u = \sum e_i (f(n_i + 1) - f(n_i)).$$

If we extend  $f$  to rational numbers naturally by putting  $f(a/b) = f(a) - f(b)$ , then (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$(2.4) \quad u = f(Q), \quad Q = \prod \left( \frac{n_i + 1}{n_i} \right)^{e_i} = \prod \left( \frac{m_i + e_i}{m_i} \right),$$

where

$$(2.5) \quad m_i = \begin{cases} n_i & \text{if } e_i = 1, \\ n_i + 1 & \text{if } e_i = -1. \end{cases}$$

For the proof the following lemma on prime factors of such products  $Q$  is fundamental.

**2.4. Lemma.** *Let  $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_k$  be positive integers,  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  integers such that  $|b_i| \leq A$  and  $m_i + b_i > 0$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ). Write*

$$Q = \prod_{i=1}^k \left( \frac{m_i + b_i}{m_i} \right).$$

Assume that all prime factors in the numerator and denominator of  $Q$  are  $\leq P$  and that

$$(2.6) \quad \prod_{i=j}^k \left( \frac{m_i + b_i}{m_i} \right) \neq 1 \quad (j = 1, \dots, k).$$

Then we have  $m_k \leq G(k, P, A)$ , an effectively computable number depending only on  $k$ ,  $P$  and  $A$ .

This lemma, which will be proved in the next section, finishes our preparation to the proof of the theorem.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 2.** We put  $F(q) = 4qG(q, q, 1)$  with the function  $G$  of Lemma 2.4. We have to prove that (2.3) has only finitely many primitive solutions. Let  $q_0$  be such a number that (2.1) holds for  $q \geq q_0$ , and also that  $f(p)$  is not identically 0 for  $p < q_0$ , in which case (2.1) also means  $|f(q)| > F(q)$  ( $q > q_0$ ).

Without restricting the generality we may assume that the  $m_i$  given by (2.5) are increasing. Consider a primitive solution and let  $q$  be the largest prime that occurs in the numerator or denominator of the number  $Q$  given in (2.4). From Lemma 2.4 we infer  $m_k \leq G(k, q, 1)$ ; condition (2.6) follows from the primitivity of (2.3) (in fact, we needed only the  $k$  interval-subsums).

Let  $K = \max(k, |u|, q_0)$ . Assume first  $q > K$ . We have obviously

$$(2.7) \quad |f(Q)| \geq |f(q)| - r \max_{p < q} |f(p)| \geq |f(q)|(1 - r/F(q)),$$

where  $r$  is the total number of primes, counted with multiplicity, that occur in any of the numbers  $n_i$  or  $n_i + 1$ . Since  $k < q$ , we have  $n_i \leq G(q, q, 1)$ , thus the number of prime factors in any of these numbers is at most  $G(q, q, 1)$  and we have  $r \leq 2kG(q, q, 1) < F(q)/2$ . Hence (2.7) yields

$$|u| = |f(Q)| \geq |f(q)|/2 \geq F(q)/2 > q > |u|,$$

a contradiction.

Thus we have  $q \leq K$ , and from Lemma 2.4 we infer  $m_k \leq G(k, K, 1)$ , a finite number of choices.  $\square$

### 3. Proof of Lemma 2.4

We use the following result of BAKER [2] in the form given by SHOREY et al. [6], p. 66 (we specialized the formulation to integers).

**3.1. Lemma.** *Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$  be positive integers,  $\ell \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha_i \leq A_i \geq 4$  for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . Put*

$$\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \log A_i, \quad \Omega' = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \log A_i.$$

*Let  $b_1, \dots, b_\ell$  be integers with  $|b_j| \leq B \geq 4$ . Then either  $\alpha_1^{b_1} \dots \alpha_\ell^{b_\ell} = 1$  or*

$$(3.1) \quad \log |\alpha_1^{b_1} \dots \alpha_\ell^{b_\ell} - 1| > -\ell^{c\ell} \Omega \log \Omega' \log B$$

*with an absolute constant  $c$ .*

**PROOF OF LEMMA 2.4.** We use Vinogradov's symbol  $\ll$  where the implicit constant may depend on  $k$ ,  $A$  and  $P$ .

Write  $Q$  in the form  $Q = p_1^{t_1} \dots p_s^{t_s}$  with distinct primes  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  and integers  $t_i$ . We have

$$|t_i| \leq 2k \log(m_k + A) \ll \log m_k$$

for all  $i$ . The lemma above yields

$$\log |Q - 1| \gg -\log \log m_k,$$

while a direct computation gives  $|Q - 1| \ll 1/m_1$ . Combining the two we obtain

$$\log m_1 \ll \log \log m_k.$$

Now we prove the inequalities

$$(3.2) \quad \log m_j \ll (\log \log m_k)^j$$

by induction on  $j$ . Suppose it holds for  $1, \dots, j - 1$ . On one hand we have

$$(3.3) \quad \left| \frac{m_j + b_j}{m_j} \frac{m_{j+1} + b_{j+1}}{m_{j+1}} \dots \frac{m_k + b_k}{m_k} - 1 \right| \ll \frac{1}{m_j}.$$

On the other hand

$$\left| \frac{m_j + b_j}{m_j} \frac{m_{j+1} + b_{j+1}}{m_{j+1}} \dots \frac{m_k + b_k}{m_k} - 1 \right| = \left| Q \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{m_i}{m_i + b_i} - 1 \right|.$$

To this expression we apply our Lemma with  $\ell = s + 1$ ,

$\alpha_\ell = \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (m_i / (m_i + b_i))$ ,  $b_\ell = 1$ . By the induction hypothesis we have

$$\log A_\ell \leq j \log(m_{j-1} + |b_{j-1}|) \ll (\log \log m_k)^{j-1},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left| \frac{m_j + b_j}{m_j} \frac{m_{j+1} + b_{j+1}}{m_{j+1}} \dots \frac{m_k + b_k}{m_k} - 1 \right| &\gg \\ &\gg -(\log \log m_k)^{j-1} \log \log m_k. \end{aligned}$$

On combining this inequality with (3.3) we obtain (3.2) for  $j$ .  
Finally, the case  $j = k$  of (3.2) means

$$\log m_k \ll (\log \log m_k)^k,$$

which implies  $m_k \ll 1$ .  $\square$

### References

- [1] M. AJTAI, I. HAVAS and J. KOMLÓS, Every group admits a bad topology, in: *Studies in pure mathematics to the memory of P. Turán (ed. P. Erdős)*, Birkhäuser — Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1983, pp. 21–34.
- [2] A. BAKER, The theory of linear forms in logarithms, in: *Transcendence theory: advances and applications, Proc. Conf., Cambridge 1976*, Academic Press, London, 1977, pp. 1–27.
- [3] Z. DARÓCZY and I. KÁTAI, On additive arithmetical functions with values in topological groups I., *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **33** (1986), 287–291.
- [4] P. ERDŐS, On the distribution of additive functions, *Annals of Math.* **47** (1946), 1–20.
- [5] I. Z. RUZSA, Arithmetical topology, in: *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai 51, Number Theory (Budapest 1987)*, North-Holland – Bolyai Társulat, Budapest, 1990, pp. 473–504.
- [6] T. N. SHOREY, A. J. VAN DER POORTEN, R. TIJDEMAN and A. SCHINZEL, Applications of the Gel'fond-Baker method to Diophantine equations, in: *Transcendence theory: advances and applications, Proc. Conf., Cambridge 1976*, Academic Press, London, 1977, pp. 59–77.

I. Z. RUZSA  
MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
BUDAPEST, PF. 127,  
H-1364 HUNGARY

R. TIJDEMAN  
MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE  
RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT LEIDEN  
P.O.B. 9512  
2300 RA LEIDEN  
THE NETHERLANDS

(Received April 22, 1990)