

## USING LARGE PRIME DIVISORS TO CONSTRUCT NORMAL NUMBERS

Jean-Marie De Koninck<sup>1</sup> (Québec, Canada)

Imre Kátai<sup>2</sup> (Budapest, Hungary)

*Dedicated to Professor Karl-Heinz Indlekofer  
on his seventieth anniversary*

Communicated by Ferenc Schipp

(Received September 24, 2012; accepted October 10, 2012)

**Abstract.** Given an integer  $q \geq 2$ , a  $q$ -normal number is an irrational number  $\xi$  such that any preassigned sequence of  $\ell$  digits occurs in the  $q$ -ary expansion of  $\xi$  at the expected frequency, namely  $1/q^\ell$ . Let  $\eta(x)$  be a slowly increasing function such that  $\frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log x} \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, letting  $P(n)$  stand for the largest prime factor of  $n$ , set  $Q(n)$  to be the smallest prime divisor of  $n$  which is larger than  $\eta(n)$ , while setting  $Q(n) = 1$  if  $P(n) > \eta(n)$ . Then, we show that the real number  $0.Q(1)Q(2)\dots$  is a normal number in base 10. With various similar constructions, we create large families of normal numbers in any given base  $q \geq 2$ . Finally, we consider exponential sums involving the  $Q(n)$  function.

### 1. Introduction

Given an integer  $q \geq 2$ , a  $q$ -normal number, or simply a normal number, is an irrational number whose  $q$ -ary expansion is such that any preassigned sequence, of length  $\ell \geq 1$ , of base  $q$  digits from this expansion, occurs at the expected frequency, namely  $1/q^\ell$ .

*Key words and phrases:* Normal numbers, largest prime factor, smallest prime factor.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 11K16, 11N37, 11A41.

<sup>1</sup> Research supported in part by a grant from NSERC.

<sup>2</sup> Research supported by ELTE IK and by the Hungarian and Vietnamese TET (grant agreement no. TET 10-1-2011-0645).

<https://doi.org/10.71352/ac.39.045>

Let  $A_q := \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ . Given an integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , an expression of the form  $i_1 i_2 \dots i_\ell$ , where each  $i_j \in A_q$  is called a *word* of length  $\ell$ . We sometimes write  $\lambda(\beta) = \ell$  to indicate that  $\beta$  is a *word* of length  $\ell$ . The symbol  $\Lambda$  will denote the *empty word*. We let  $A_q^\ell$  stand for the set of all words of length  $\ell$  and  $A_q^*$  stand for the set of all the words regardless of their length.

Given a positive integer  $n$ , we write its  $q$ -ary expansion as

$$(1.1) \quad n = \varepsilon_0(n) + \varepsilon_1(n)q + \dots + \varepsilon_t(n)q^t,$$

where  $\varepsilon_i(n) \in A_q$  for  $0 \leq i \leq t$  and  $\varepsilon_t(n) \neq 0$ . To this representation, we associate the word

$$(1.2) \quad \bar{n} = \varepsilon_0(n)\varepsilon_1(n)\dots\varepsilon_t(n) = \varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1\dots\varepsilon_t \in A_q^{t+1}.$$

Let  $P(n)$  stand for the largest prime factor of  $n \geq 2$ , with  $P(1) = 1$ . In a recent paper [5], we showed that if  $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  is a polynomial of positive degree with  $F(x) > 0$  for  $x > 0$ , then the real numbers

$$0.\overline{F(P(2))}\overline{F(P(3))}\dots\overline{F(P(n))}\dots$$

and

$$0.\overline{F(P(2+1))}\overline{F(P(3+1))}\dots\overline{F(P(p+1))}\dots,$$

where  $p$  runs through the sequence of primes, are  $q$ -normal numbers.

Let  $\eta(x)$  be a slowly increasing function, that is an increasing function satisfying  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\eta(cx)}{\eta(x)} = 1$  for any fixed constant  $c > 0$ . Being slowly increasing,

it satisfies in particular the condition  $\frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log x} \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .

We then let  $Q(n)$  be the smallest prime divisor of  $n$  which is larger than  $\eta(n)$ , while setting  $Q(n) = 1$  if  $P(n) > \eta(n)$ . Then, we show that the real number  $0.\overline{Q(1)}\overline{Q(2)}\overline{Q(3)}\dots$  is a  $q$ -normal number. With various similar constructions, we create large families of normal numbers in any given base  $q \geq 2$ .

Finally, we consider exponential sums involving the  $Q(n)$  function.

## 2. Main results

**Theorem 1.** *Given an arbitrary basis  $q \geq 2$  and for any integer  $n$ , let  $\bar{n}$  be as in (1.2). Then the number*

$$\xi_1 = 0.\overline{Q(1)}\overline{Q(2)}\overline{Q(3)}\dots$$

*is a  $q$ -normal number.*

Let  $\wp$  stand for the set of all primes. Given an integer  $q \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{R}, \wp_0, \wp_1, \dots, \wp_{q-1}$  be disjoint sets of prime numbers such that

$$\wp = \mathcal{R} \cup \wp_0 \cup \wp_1 \cup \dots \cup \wp_{q-1},$$

and such that, uniformly for  $2 \leq v \leq u$  as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\pi([u, u+v] \cap \wp_j) = \frac{1}{q} \pi([u, u+v]) + O\left(\frac{u}{\log^5 u}\right) \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, q-1),$$

so that, in particular,

$$\pi([u, u+v] \cap \mathcal{R}) = O\left(\frac{u}{\log^5 u}\right).$$

Then, consider the function  $\kappa$  defined on  $\wp$  as follows:

$$\kappa(p) = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } p \in \wp_\ell, \\ \Lambda & \text{if } p \in \mathcal{R}. \end{cases}$$

With this notation, we have

**Theorem 2.** *The number*

$$\xi_2 = 0.\kappa(Q(1))\kappa(Q(2))\kappa(Q(3))\dots$$

*is a  $q$ -normal number.*

**Remark 1.** In an earlier paper [4], we used such classification of prime numbers to create normal numbers, but by simply concatenating the numbers  $\kappa(1), \kappa(2), \kappa(3), \dots$

Let  $a$  be a fixed non zero integer. Then we have the following result.

**Theorem 3.** *The number*

$$\xi_3 = 0.\kappa(Q(2+a))\kappa(Q(3+a))\kappa(Q(5+a))\dots\kappa(Q(p+a))\dots,$$

*where  $p$  runs through the set of primes, is a  $q$ -normal number.*

Define  $\wp^*$  as the set of all the prime numbers  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Then, let  $\mathcal{R}^*, \wp_0^*, \wp_1^*, \dots, \wp_{q-1}^*$  be disjoint sets of prime numbers such that

$$\wp^* = \mathcal{R}^* \cup \wp_0^* \cup \wp_1^* \cup \dots \cup \wp_{q-1}^*,$$

and such that, uniformly for  $2 \leq v \leq u$  as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\pi([u, u+v] \cap \wp_j^*) = \frac{1}{q} \pi([u, u+v] \cap \wp^*) + O\left(\frac{u}{\log^5 u}\right) \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, q-1),$$

so that, in particular,

$$\pi([u, u+v] \cap \mathcal{R}^*) = O\left(\frac{u}{\log^5 u}\right).$$

Then, consider the following function defined on  $\wp$  as follows

$$\nu(p) = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } p \in \wp_\ell^*, \\ \Lambda & \text{if } p \notin \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \wp_\ell^*. \end{cases}$$

With this notation, we have the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *The number*

$$\xi_4 = 0.\nu(Q(1))\nu(Q(2))\nu(Q(3))\dots$$

*is a  $q$ -normal number.*

Consider the arithmetic function  $f(n) = n^2 + 1$ . Then, we have the following result.

**Theorem 5.** *The two numbers*

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_5 &= 0.\kappa(Q(f(1)))\kappa(Q(f(2)))\kappa(Q(f(3)))\dots, \\ \xi_6 &= 0.\kappa(Q(f(2)))\kappa(Q(f(3)))\kappa(Q(f(5)))\dots\kappa(Q(f(p)))\dots, \end{aligned}$$

*where  $p$  runs through the set of primes, are  $q$ -normal numbers.*

**Remark 2.** One can show that this last result remains true if  $f(n)$  is replaced by another non constant irreducible polynomial.

We now introduce the product function  $F(n) = n(n+1)\dots(n+q-1)$ . Observe that if for some positive integer  $n$ , we have  $p = Q(F(n)) > q$ , then  $p|n+\ell$  only for one  $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ , implying that  $\ell$  is uniquely determined for all positive integers  $n$  such that  $Q(F(n)) > q$ . Thus we may define the function

$$\tau(n) = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } p = Q(F(n)) > q \text{ and } p|n+\ell, \\ \Lambda & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using this notation, we have the following result.

**Theorem 6.** *The number*

$$\xi_7 = 0.\tau(q+1)\tau(q+2)\tau(q+3)\dots$$

*is a  $q$ -normal number.*

We now introduce the product function  $G(n) = (n+1)(n+2)\cdots(n+q)$  and further define the function

$$\rho(n) = \begin{cases} \ell & \text{if } p = Q(G(n)) > q+1 \text{ and } p|n+\ell+1, \\ \Lambda & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, let  $(p_j)_{j \geq 1}$  be the sequence of all primes larger than  $q$ , that is,  $q < p_1 < p_2 < \cdots$ . With this notation, we have the following result.

**Theorem 7.** *The number*

$$\xi_8 = 0.\rho(p_1)\rho(p_2)\rho(p_3)\dots$$

*is a  $q$ -normal number.*

Let  $\alpha$  be an arbitrary irrational number. We will be using the standard notation  $e(y) = \exp\{2\pi i y\}$ . We then have the following.

**Theorem 8.** *Let*

$$A(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)e(\alpha Q(n)),$$

*where  $f$  is any given multiplicative function satisfying  $|f(n)| = 1$  for all positive integers  $n$ . Then,*

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A(x)}{x} = 0.$$

### 3. Notation and preliminary lemmas

For each integer  $n \geq 2$ , let  $L(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{\log q} \right\rfloor$ . Let  $\beta \in A_q^\ell$  and  $n$  be written as in (1.1). We then let  $\nu_\beta(\bar{n})$  stand for the number of occurrences of the word  $\beta$  in the  $q$ -ary expansion of the positive integer  $n$ , that is, the number of times that  $\varepsilon_j(n) \dots \varepsilon_{j+\ell-1}(n) = \beta$  as  $j$  varies from 0 to  $t - (\ell - 1)$ .

The letters  $p$  and  $\pi$  will always denote prime numbers. The letter  $c$  with or without subscript always denotes a positive constant but not necessarily the same at each occurrence.

We will be using a key result obtained by Bassily and Kátai [1] and which we state here as two lemmas, a proof of which, in a more general context, can be found in our earlier paper [5].

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\kappa_u$  be a function of  $u$  such that  $\kappa_u > 1$  for all  $u$ . Given a word  $\beta \in A_q^\ell$  and setting*

$$V_\beta(u) := \# \left\{ p \in \wp : u \leq p \leq 2u \text{ such that } \left| \nu_\beta(\bar{p}) - \frac{L(u)}{q^\ell} \right| > \kappa_u \sqrt{L(u)} \right\},$$

*then, there exists a positive constant  $c$  such that*

$$V_\beta(u) \leq \frac{cu}{(\log u) \kappa_u^2}.$$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\kappa_u$  be as in Lemma 1. Given  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in A_q^\ell$  with  $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ , set*

$$\Delta_{\beta_1, \beta_2}(u) := \# \left\{ p \in \wp : u \leq p \leq 2u \text{ such that } |\nu_{\beta_1}(\bar{p}) - \nu_{\beta_2}(\bar{p})| > \kappa_u \sqrt{L(u)} \right\}.$$

*Then, for some positive constant  $c$ ,*

$$\Delta_{\beta_1, \beta_2}(u) \leq \frac{cu}{(\log u) \kappa_u^2}.$$

#### 4. Proof of Theorem 2

We start by proving Theorem 2 since its content will be useful for the proof of Theorem 1.

Let  $I_x = [x, 2x]$  and first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \#\{n \in I_x : \text{there exists } p|n, p \in [\eta(x), \eta(2x)]\} \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{\eta(x) \leq p \leq \eta(2x)} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{2x}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{x}{p} \right\rfloor \right) \leq cx \sum_{\eta(x) \leq p \leq \eta(2x)} \frac{1}{p} = \\ & = o(1) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

This means that with the exception of  $o(x)$  integers  $n \in I_x$ , the number  $Q(n)$  is the smallest prime divisor of  $n$  bigger than  $\eta(x)$ .

Secondly, observe that we may assume that, given any fixed small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we may assume that  $Q(n) \leq \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}$ . Indeed,

$$(4.1) \quad \#\{n \in I_x : Q(n) > \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}\} \ll x \prod_{\eta(x) < p \leq \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \ll \varepsilon x.$$

Now let  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}$  be any distinct primes belonging to the interval  $(\eta(x), \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon})$ , and let  $p_0^* < p_1^* < \dots < p_{k-1}^*$  be the unique permutation of the primes  $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}$ , namely the one such that has all its members appear in increasing order, so that we have

$$\eta(x) < p_0^* < p_1^* < \dots < p_{k-1}^* < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}.$$

Our first goal will be to estimate the size of

$$N(x|p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}) := \#\{n \leq x : Q(n+j) = p_j, j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1\}.$$

We must therefore estimate the number of those integers  $n \in I_x$  for which  $p_j|n+j$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ ), while at the same time  $(\pi_j, n+j) = 1$  if  $\eta(x) < \pi_j < p_j$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ ). Before moving on, let us set

$$Q_k = p_0 p_1 \cdots p_{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad T_j = \prod_{\eta(x) < \pi < p_j} \pi \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1).$$

It is then easy to see that, say by using the Eratosthenian sieve (see for instance Chapter 12 in the book of De Koninck and Luca [2]), we obtain

$$(4.2) \quad N(x|p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{Q_k} \Sigma_0 \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where

$$\Sigma_0 = \sum_{\substack{\delta_0, \dots, \delta_{k-1} \\ \delta_j | T_j \quad (j=0, 1, \dots, k-1) \\ (\delta_i, \delta_j)=1 \text{ if } i \neq j}} \frac{\mu(\delta_0) \cdots \mu(\delta_{k-1})}{\delta_0 \cdots \delta_{k-1}}$$

(here  $\mu$  stands for the Möbius function). One can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0 &= \\ &= \prod_{\eta(x) < \pi < p_0^*} \left(1 - \frac{k}{\pi}\right) \cdot \prod_{p_0^* < \pi < p_1^*} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{\pi}\right) \cdots \prod_{p_{k-2}^* < \pi < p_{k-1}^*} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\pi}\right) \\ (4.3) \quad &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{\log p_0^*}{\log \eta(x)}\right)^{-k} \left(\frac{\log p_1^*}{\log p_0^*}\right)^{-k+1} \cdots \left(\frac{\log p_{k-1}^*}{\log p_{k-2}^*}\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we set  $\sigma(p) := \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log p}$ , it follows from (4.3) that

$$(4.4) \quad \Sigma_0 = (1 + o(1)) \sigma(p_0) \cdots \sigma(p_{k-1}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Substituting (4.4) in (4.2), we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad N(x|p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}) = (1 + o(1)) x \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{\sigma(p_j)}{p_j} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

an estimate which holds uniformly for  $\eta(x) \leq p_j \leq \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ ).

We will now use a technique which we first used in [3] to study the distribution of subsets of primes in the prime factorization of integers. We first introduce the sequence

$$u_0 = \eta(x), \quad u_{j+1} = u_j + \frac{u_j}{\log^2 u_j} \quad \text{for each } j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and then let  $T$  be the unique positive integer satisfying  $u_{T-1} < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon} \leq u_T$ . Then, consider the intervals

$$J_0 := [u_0, u_1), \quad J_1 := [u_1, u_2), \dots, \quad J_{T-1} := [u_{T-1}, u_T).$$

Choose  $k$  arbitrary integers  $j_0, \dots, j_{k-1} \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$ , as well as  $k$  arbitrary integers  $i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}$  from the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ , and consider the quantity

$$(4.6) \quad M \left( x \left| \begin{array}{c} j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \\ i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} \end{array} \right. \right) = \sum_{p_\ell \in J_\ell \cap \wp_{i_\ell}} N(x | p_0, \dots, p_{k-1}).$$

Observe that  $\frac{\sigma(p_h)}{p_h} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\sigma(u_h)}{u_h}$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  if  $p \in J_h$ . It follows from this observation and using (4.5) and (4.6) that

$$(4.7) \quad M \left( x \left| \begin{array}{c} j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \\ i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} \end{array} \right. \right) = (1 + o(1))x \sum_{p_\ell \in J_\ell \cap \wp_{i_\ell}} \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{\sigma(u_j)}{u_j}.$$

Using Theorem 1 of our 1995 paper [3] in combination with (4.7), we obtain that

$$(4.8) \quad M \left( x \left| \begin{array}{c} j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \\ i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{k-1} \end{array} \right. \right) = (1 + o(1))M \left( x \left| \begin{array}{c} j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{k-1} \\ i'_0, i'_1, \dots, i'_{k-1} \end{array} \right. \right) \\ (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where  $(i'_0, i'_1, \dots, i'_k)$  is any arbitrary sequence of length  $k$  composed of integers from the set  $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$ .

Finally, consider the expression

$$A_x := \kappa(Q(\lfloor x \rfloor)) \dots \kappa(Q(\lfloor 2x \rfloor - 1)).$$

It follows from (4.8) that, for any given word  $\beta \in A_q^k$ , the number of occurrences of  $\beta$  as a subword in the word  $A_x$  is equal to  $(1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{q^k}$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , thus completing the proof of Theorem 2. ■

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1

Let

$$B_x = \overline{Q(\lfloor x \rfloor)} \dots \overline{Q(\lfloor 2x \rfloor - 1)}.$$

Also, let  $Q^*(n) = \min_{\substack{p|n \\ p > \eta(x)}} p$  and observe that  $Q^*(n) \leq Q(n)$ , while if  $Q^*(n) \neq Q(n)$ , then  $p|n$  if  $\eta(x) < p < \eta(2x)$ .

Moreover, let

$$B_x^* = \overline{Q^*(\lfloor x \rfloor)} \dots \overline{Q^*(\lfloor 2x \rfloor - 1)}.$$

Clearly, we have, since  $\eta(x)$  was chosen to be a slowly oscillating function,

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \leq \lambda(B_x) - \lambda(B_x^*) \leq cx \sum_{\eta(x) < p < \eta(2x)} \frac{\log p}{\log q} \leq c_1 x \log \frac{\eta(2x)}{\eta(x)} = o(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

It follows from (5.1) that we now only need to estimate  $\lambda(B_x^*)$ . To do so, we first let  $\delta_x$  be a function tending to 0 very slowly as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , in a manner specified below. If  $p < x^{\delta_x}$ , we have

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} R_p(x) &:= \#\{n \in I_x : Q^*(n) = p\} = \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{p} \prod_{\eta(x) < \pi < p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\pi}\right) = \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{p} \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log p} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

while on the other hand, if  $x^{\delta_x} \leq p \leq 2x$ , we have

$$(5.3) \quad R_p(x) < c \frac{x \log \eta(x)}{p \log p}.$$

Now, observe that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda(B_x^*) &= \sum_{\eta(x) < p \leq 2x} R_p(x) \lambda(p) = \sum_{\eta(x) < p \leq 2x} R_p(x) \left[ \frac{\log p}{\log q} \right] = \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{\log q} \sum_{\eta(x) < p \leq 2x} \frac{\log \eta(x)}{p} + O \left( x \log \eta(x) \sum_{x^{\delta_x} < p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) x \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log q} \log \frac{\log x}{\log \eta(x)} + O \left( x \log \eta(x) \log \frac{1}{\delta_x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing the function  $\delta_x$  in such a way that

$$\log \frac{1}{\delta_x} = o\left(\log \frac{\log x}{\log \eta(x)}\right)$$

allows us to replace (5.4) with

$$(5.5) \quad \lambda(B_x^*) = (1 + o(1))x \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log q} \log \frac{\log x}{\log \eta(x)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Now, let  $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in A_q^k$ . We will now make use of Lemmas 1 and 2. For this, we first write

$$[\eta(x), x^{\delta_x}] = \bigcup_{j=0}^T I_{u_j},$$

where

$$I_{u_j} = [u_j, u_{j+1}), \quad \text{with } u_0 = \eta(x), \quad u_j = 2^j \eta(x) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, T+1,$$

where  $T$  is defined as the unique positive integer satisfying  $u_T < x^{\delta_x} \leq u_{T+1}$ .

In the spirit of Lemma 1, we will say that the prime  $p \in I_u$  is a *bad prime* if

$$\max_{\beta \in A_q^k} \left| \nu_\beta(\bar{p}) - \frac{L(u)}{q^\ell} \right| > \kappa_u \sqrt{L(u)}$$

and a *good prime* if

$$\left| \nu_\beta(\bar{p}) - \frac{L(u)}{q^\ell} \right| \leq \kappa_u \sqrt{L(u)}.$$

We will now separate the sum  $\sum R_p(x) \lambda(p)$  running over the primes  $p$  located in the intervals  $[u_j, u_{j+1})$  into two categories, namely the bad primes and the good primes.

First, using (5.2) and (5.3), we have

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{p \in [u_j, u_{j+1}) \\ p \text{ bad}}} R_p(x) \lambda(p) &\leq c \kappa(u_j) \sum_{p \in [u_j, u_{j+1})} \frac{x \log \eta(x)}{p \log p} \ll \\ &\ll x \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\log \eta(x) + j \log 2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $p$  is a good prime, one can easily establish that the number of occurrences of the words  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  in the word  $B_x^*$  are close to each other, in the sense that

$$(5.7) \quad \nu_{\beta_1}(B_x^*) - \nu_{\beta_2}(B_x^*) = o(\lambda(B_x^*)).$$

Hence, proceeding as in [5], it follows, considering the true size of  $\lambda(B_x^*)$  given by (5.5) and in light of (5.1), (5.6) and (5.7), that the number of words  $\beta \in A_q^k$  appearing in  $B_x$  is equal to  $(1 + o(1)) \frac{\lambda(B_x)}{q^k}$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .

We then proceed in a same manner to obtain similar estimates successively for the intervals  $I_{x/2}, I_{x/2^2}, \dots$ . Thus, repeating the argument used in [5], Theorem 1 follows immediately.  $\blacksquare$

The proofs of Theorems 3 through 7 can be obtained along the same lines and will therefore be omitted.

## 6. Proof of Theorem 8

To prove this theorem, we will consider two cases separately.

Let us first assume that

$$(6.1) \quad \sum_p \frac{\Re(1 - f(p)p^{-i\tau})}{p} < \infty \quad \text{for some real number } \tau.$$

It can be proved (as we did in [6]) that one can assume that  $\tau = 0$ .

For a start, define the additive function  $u$  implicitly on prime powers by  $f(p^\beta) = e^{iu(p^\beta)}$ . Then, for each large number  $D$ , define the multiplicative function  $f_D$  on prime powers by

$$f_D(p^\beta) = \begin{cases} f(p^\beta) & \text{if } p \leq D, \\ 1 & \text{if } p > D. \end{cases}$$

In light of (6.1), we have that

$$(6.2) \quad \sum_p \frac{u^2(p)}{p} < \infty.$$

Further set

$$a_D(x) = \sum_{D < p \leq x} \frac{u(p)}{p-1}, \quad b_D^2(x) = \sum_{D < p \leq x} \frac{u^2(p)}{p}.$$

Since

$$f(n) = f_D(n) \exp \left\{ i \sum_{p^\beta \parallel n} u(p^\beta) \right\} = f_D(n) \exp \{ iu_D(n) \},$$

say, then, by using the Turán–Kubilius inequality, we obtain that

$$A(x) - A_D(x) = O(xb_D(x)),$$

where

$$A_D(x) = \eta_D(x) \sum_{n \leq x} f_D(n) e(\alpha Q(n)),$$

where  $\eta_D(x) = e^{ia_D(x)}$ .

Further define the function  $\tau_D$  implicitly by the equation  $f_D(n) = \sum_{d|n} \tau_D(d)$ . It is clear that  $\tau_D(d) = 0$  if  $(d, D) > 1$ , while  $|\tau_D(p^\beta)| \leq 2$  for all prime powers  $p^\beta$ .

We clearly have

$$(6.3) \quad A_D(x) = \eta_D(x) \sum_{P(d) \leq D} \tau_D(d) \sum_{md \leq x} e(\alpha Q(md)) = \eta_D(x) \sum_{P(d) \leq D} \tau_D(d) \Sigma_d,$$

say. On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{P(d) \leq D} |\tau_D(d)| |\Sigma_d| \leq \sum_{P(d) \leq D} \frac{|\tau_D(d)|}{d} \leq \prod_{p \leq D} \left(1 + \frac{2}{p-1}\right).$$

Therefore, for some  $k_D$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{d > k_D} |\tau_D(d)| |\Sigma_d| \leq \rho_D,$$

where  $\rho_D \rightarrow 0$  as  $D \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let us now consider the sum

$$(6.4) \quad T_Y = \sum_{Y \leq m \leq 2Y} e(\alpha Q(m)).$$

Recall that  $Q(m)$  is the smallest prime divisor of  $m$  which is larger than  $\eta(m)$ . Now, consider the somewhat similar function  $Q_1(m)$ , which stands for the smallest prime divisor of  $m$  which is larger than  $\eta(x)$ . Recalling the argument used at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 2, we easily see that

$$(6.5) \quad \#\{m \in [Y, 2Y] : Q_1(m) \neq Q(m)\} = cY \log \frac{\eta(2Y)}{\eta(Y)} = o(Y) \quad \text{as } Y \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, setting

$$T_Y^{(1)} = \sum_{Y \leq m \leq 2Y} e(\alpha Q_1(m)),$$

it is clear that

$$\left| T_Y - T_Y^{(1)} \right| = o(Y) \quad (Y \rightarrow \infty).$$

Moreover, as  $Y \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{m \in [Y, 2Y] : Q_1(m) = p\} &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{Y}{p} \prod_{\eta(Y) < \pi < p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\pi}\right) = \\ (6.6) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{Y}{p} \frac{\log \eta(Y)}{\log p}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as we obtained (4.1), we easily prove that

$$(6.7) \qquad \qquad \#\{m \in [Y, 2Y] : Q(m) > \eta(Y)^{1/\varepsilon}\} \ll \varepsilon Y.$$

On the other hand, using (6.4), (6.6) and (4.1), we have

$$(6.8) \qquad T_Y = Y \sum_{\eta(Y) < p < \eta(Y)^{1/\varepsilon}} \frac{e(\alpha p) \log \eta(Y)}{p \log p} + O(\varepsilon Y).$$

By using the well known I.M. Vinogradov theorem [10] asserting that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{p \leq x} e(\alpha p) = 0,$$

we obtain from (6.8) that

$$(6.9) \qquad \qquad \left| \frac{T_Y}{Y} \right| \leq \varepsilon + o(1) \quad (Y \rightarrow \infty).$$

Using this, we can estimate  $\Sigma_d$ . Indeed, we have

$$(6.10) \qquad |\Sigma_d| \leq \left| \sum_{\frac{x}{2^L d} < m < \frac{x}{d}} e(\alpha Q(dm)) \right| + \frac{x}{2^L d}.$$

Let  $\ell_D$  be an arbitrary large number and choose  $L$  so that

$$\eta\left(\frac{x}{2^L d}\right) > \ell_D.$$

Note that for an arbitrary large  $L$ , this inequality will hold provided  $x$  is large enough. Applying (6.9), it follows from (6.10) that

$$(6.11) \qquad |\Sigma_d| \leq \frac{x}{2^L d} + c\varepsilon \frac{x}{d}.$$

Using (6.11) in (6.3), we obtain that

$$(6.12) \quad |A_D(x)| \leq x \left( c\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2L} \right) \prod_{p \leq D} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{p-1} \right) + x \sum_{d > \ell_D} \frac{|\tau_D(d)|}{d}.$$

Since  $D$  and  $L$  were chosen to be arbitrary numbers, it follows from (6.12) that

$$(6.13) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_D(x)}{x} = 0.$$

Since

$$\frac{A(x)}{x} = \frac{A_D(x)}{x} + O(b_D(x))$$

and recalling the definition of  $b_D(x)$  and estimate (6.2), it follows from (6.13) that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A(x)}{x} \leq cb_D(x) = o(1),$$

so that if  $D \rightarrow \infty$ , we immediately obtain (2.1) for the first case, that is when (6.1) holds.

It remains to consider the case

$$(6.14) \quad \sum_p \frac{\Re(1 - f(p)p^{-i\tau})}{p} = \infty \quad \text{for all real numbers } \tau.$$

First, it is clear that, using (6.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(x) &:= \sum_{x < n \leq 2x} f(n)e(\alpha Q(n)) = \\ (6.15) \quad &= \sum_{x < n \leq 2x} f(n)e(\alpha Q_1(n)) + \sum_{\substack{x < n \leq 2x \\ Q_1(n) \neq Q(n)}} f(n)e(\alpha Q(n)) = \\ &= \sum_{x < n \leq 2x} f(n)e(\alpha Q_1(n)) + o(x) = \\ &= E_1(x) + o(x), \end{aligned}$$

say.

In light of (6.7), we may ignore those  $n \in (x, 2x]$  for which  $Q_1(n) > \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}$ , that is,

$$(6.16) \quad \sum_{\substack{x < n \leq 2x \\ Q_1(n) > \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}}} f(n)e(\alpha Q_1(n)) \ll \varepsilon x.$$

Combining (6.15) and (6.16), we can write that

$$(6.17) \quad E(x) = \sum_{\eta(x) < p < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}} f(p) e(\alpha p) \Sigma_p + O(\varepsilon x),$$

where, setting  $\Pi_p := \prod_{\eta(x) < \pi < p} \pi$ ,

$$(6.18) \quad \Sigma_p = \sum_{\substack{\frac{x}{p} < m \leq \frac{2x}{p} \\ (m, \Pi_p) = 1}} f(m).$$

Now, consider the summation

$$S(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} f(n).$$

In light of (6.14), it follows from a classical theorem of Halász (see [9]) that there exists a function  $\varepsilon(x)$  which tends to 0 monotonically as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  such that

$$\frac{|S(x)|}{x} \leq \varepsilon(x),$$

which in turn implies that

$$(6.19) \quad \frac{|S(2x) - S(x)|}{x} \leq \varepsilon(x).$$

From (6.18), we get that

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \Sigma_p &= \sum_{\frac{x}{p} < m \leq \frac{2x}{p}} f(m) \sum_{\delta | (\Pi_p, m)} \mu(\delta) = \\ &= \sum_{\delta | \Pi_p} \mu(\delta) \sum_{x < m\delta p \leq 2x} f(m\delta) = \\ &= \sum_{\delta | \Pi_p} \mu(\delta) f(\delta) \left( S\left(\frac{2x}{\delta p}\right) - S\left(\frac{x}{\delta p}\right) \right) + Er_p, \end{aligned}$$

where  $Er_p$  is the error term coming from those terms for which  $(m, \delta) > 1$ .

Thus, it follows from (6.19) and (6.20) that

$$(6.21) \quad |\Sigma_p| \leq \sum_{\delta | \Pi_p} \mu^2(\delta) \varepsilon\left(\frac{x}{\delta p}\right) + |Er_p| \leq \frac{x}{p} \sum_{\delta | \Pi_p} \frac{\mu^2(\delta)}{\delta} + |Er_p|,$$

where we used the fact that since

$$\max_{\substack{\eta(x) < p < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon} \\ \delta | \Pi_p}} \frac{p\delta}{x} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

then  $\varepsilon(x/\delta p) = o(x/\delta p)$  uniformly for  $\eta(x) < p < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}$  and  $\delta | \Pi_p$ .

Now, since

$$\sum_{\delta | \Pi_p} \frac{\mu^2(\delta)}{\delta} \leq \prod_{\eta(x) < \pi < \eta(n)^{1/\varepsilon}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\pi}\right) \leq c \frac{1}{\varepsilon},$$

it follows from (6.21) that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(6.22) \quad |\Sigma_p| \leq \frac{cx}{p\varepsilon} \cdot o(1) + |Er_p|.$$

Using (6.22) in (6.17), we obtain that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(6.23) \quad |E(x)| \leq \frac{cx}{\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{\eta(x) < p < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{p} \right) \cdot o(1) + V(x) + O(\varepsilon x),$$

where

$$V(x) = \sum_{\eta(x) < p < \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon}} |Er_p|.$$

We will now show that

$$(6.24) \quad V(x) = o(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Setting  $J = J(x) = (\eta(x), \eta(x)^{1/\varepsilon})$  and writing those  $m\delta p$  such that  $(m, \delta) > 1$  as  $m\delta p = \ell \kappa^2 \delta_1 p$ , where  $\kappa$  and  $\delta_1$  are squarefree numbers whose prime factors all belong to  $J$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.25) \quad V(x) &\leq \sum_{\kappa \geq \eta(x)} \mu^2(\kappa) \sum_{\substack{x < \ell \kappa^2 \delta_1 p \leq 2x \\ p \in J \\ \pi | \delta_1 \Rightarrow \pi \in J}} \mu^2(\delta_1) = \\ &= \sum_{\kappa \geq \eta(x)} \mu^2(\kappa) \sum_{\substack{p \in J \\ \pi | \delta_1 \Rightarrow \pi \in J}} \mu^2(\delta_1) \sum_{\substack{\frac{x}{\kappa^2 \delta_1 p} < \ell \leq \frac{2x}{\kappa^2 \delta_1 p}}} 1 \leq \\ &\leq cx \sum_{\kappa \geq \eta(x)} \frac{\mu^2(\kappa)}{\kappa^2} \sum_{\substack{p \in J \\ \pi | \delta_1 \Rightarrow \pi \in J}} \frac{\mu^2(\delta_1)}{\delta_1 p}. \end{aligned}$$

Since it is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \in J} \frac{1}{p} &\leq c_1 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \\ \sum_{\pi | \delta_1 \Rightarrow \pi \in J} \frac{\mu^2(\delta_1)}{\delta_1} &\leq \prod_{\pi \in J} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\pi}\right) \leq \frac{c_2}{\varepsilon} \log \eta(x), \\ \sum_{\kappa \geq \eta(x)} \frac{1}{\kappa^2} &\leq \frac{c_3}{\eta(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

then using these estimates in (6.25), we obtain that

$$V(x) \leq c_4 x \frac{\log \eta(x)}{\eta(x)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} = o(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

thus proving our claim (6.24).

Substituting (6.24) in (6.23), we obtain that

$$|E(x)| \leq cx \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot o(1) + o(x) + O(\varepsilon x) = o(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

from which it follows that given any arbitrarily small number  $\xi > 0$ , there is some  $x_0 = x_0(\xi)$  such that

$$(6.26) \quad |E(X)| \leq \xi X \quad \text{for all } X > x_0.$$

Therefore, given any fixed large number  $x$  and letting  $L$  be the smallest integer such that  $2^L > x/2$ , we have that, using (6.26) repetitively,

$$|A(x)| = \left| \sum_{a=1}^L E\left(\frac{x}{2^a}\right) \right| \leq c\xi \sum_{a=1}^L \frac{x}{2^a} < c\xi x,$$

thus proving (2.1) in the second case, as requested.

This completes the proof of Theorem 8. ■

## References

- [1] **Bassily, N.L. and I. Kátai**, Distribution of consecutive digits in the  $q$ -ary expansions of some sequences of integers, *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **78(1)** (1996), 11–17.

- [2] **De Koninck, J.M. and F. Luca**, *Analytic Number Theory: Exploring the Anatomy of Integers*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 134, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2012.
- [3] **De Koninck, J.M. and I. Kátai**, On the distribution of subsets of primes in the prime factorization of integers, *Acta Arithmetica*, **72**(2) (1995), 169–200.
- [4] **De Koninck, J.M. and I. Kátai**, Construction of normal numbers by classified prime divisors of integers, *Functiones et Approximatio*, **45**(2) (2011), 231–253.
- [5] **De Koninck, J.M. and I. Kátai**, On a problem on normal numbers raised by Igor Shparlinski, *Bulletin of the Austr. Math. Soc.*, **84** (2011), 337–349.
- [6] **De Koninck, J.M. and I. Kátai**, Exponential sums involving the largest prime factor function, *Acta Arithmetica*, **146** (2011), 233–245.
- [7] **De Koninck, J.M. and I. Kátai**, Construction of normal numbers using the distribution of the  $k$ -th largest prime factor, *Bull. Australian Mathematical Society*, to appear.
- [8] **Halász, G.**, Über die Mittelwerte multiplikativen zahlentheoretischer Funktionen, *Acta Math. Acad. Scient. Hungar.*, **19** (1968), 365–404.
- [9] **Halberstam, H.H. and H.E. Richert**, *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press, London, 1974.
- [10] **Vinogradov, I.M.**, *The Method of Trigonometric Sums in the Theory of Numbers*, translated, revised and annotated by A. Davenport and K.F. Roth, Interscience, New York, 1954.

**J.-M. De Koninck**

Département de mathématiques  
et de statistique  
Université Laval  
Québec  
Québec G1V 0A6  
Canada  
jmdk@mat.ulaval.ca

**I. Kátai**

Department of Computer Algebra  
Faculty of Informatics  
Eötvös Loránd University  
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/C  
H-1117 Budapest, Hungary  
katai@compalg.inf.elte.hu