
ATTI ACCADEMIA NAZIONALE DEI LINCEI
CLASSE SCIENZE FISICHE MATEMATICHE NATURALI

RENDICONTI

PÁL ERDŐS

On a problem of Sierpiński

Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali. Rendiconti, Serie 8, Vol. 33 (1962), n.3-4, p. 122–124.

Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei

http://www.bdim.eu/item?id=RLINA_1962_8_33_3-4_122_0

L'utilizzo e la stampa di questo documento digitale è consentito liberamente per motivi di ricerca e studio. Non è consentito l'utilizzo dello stesso per motivi commerciali. Tutte le copie di questo documento devono riportare questo avvertimento.

*Articolo digitalizzato nel quadro del programma
bdim (Biblioteca Digitale Italiana di Matematica)
SIMAI & UMI*

<http://www.bdim.eu/>

Teoria dei numeri. — *On a problem of Sierpiński.* Nota (*) di PAUL ERDŐS, presentata dal Socio straniero W. SIERPIŃSKI.

Let n be a positive integer and denote by $s_n^{(k)}$ the sum of the digits of n written in the k -ary system, and denote by $2 = p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ the sequence of consecution primes. In a recent paper Sierpiński [1] investigated $s^{(k)}(p_n)$; he proves, among others, that for every k

$$(1) \quad \limsup_{n=\infty} s^{(k)}(p_n) = \infty$$

and immediately deduces from (1) that for infinitely many n

$$(2) \quad s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) > s^{(k)}(p_n).$$

The question whether for infinitely many n the opposite inequality holds i.e. whether for infinitely many n $s^{(k)}(p_n) > s^{(k)}(p_{n+1})$ remained open. In the present note we shall settle this question of Sierpiński by proving the following

THEOREM. — *For every k there are infinitely many n for which*

$$s^{(k)}(p_n) > s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}).$$

I can not decide if $s^{(k)}(p_n) = s^{(k)}(p_{n+1})$ has infinitely many solutions. Sierpiński [1] deduces this from a conjecture of Schinzel [2]. Presumably

$$(3) \quad \limsup_{n=\infty} (s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) - s^{(k)}(p_n)) = \infty \text{ and } \liminf_{n=\infty} (s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) - s^{(k)}(p_n)) = -\infty$$

and even

$$(4) \quad \limsup_{n=\infty} ((s^{(k)}(p_{n+1})_{|s(p_n)}^{(k)}) = \infty \text{ and } \liminf_{n=\infty} ((s^{(k)}(p_{n+1})_{|s(p_n)}^{(k)}) = 0,$$

but I can not prove (3) or (4). In fact I can not disprove

$$|s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) - s^{(k)}(p_n)| < C$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s^{(k)}(p_{n+1})_{|s(p_n)}^{(k)}) = 1.$$

Put $d_n = p_{n+1} - p_n$. Turán and I [3] proved that $d_{n+1} > d_n$ and $d_n < d_{n+1}$ have both infinitely many solutions and that $\limsup_{n=\infty} d_{n+1}/d_n > 1$, $\liminf_{n=\infty} d_{n+1}/d_n < 1$. But we were unable to exclude the possibility that there is an n_0 so that the following inequalities hold:

$$d_{n_0+1} > d_{n_0}, \quad d_{n_0+2} < d_{n_0+1}, \quad d_{n_0+3} > d_{n_0+2} \quad \text{etc.}$$

(*) Pervenuta all'Accademia il 13 ottobre 1962.

In other words $d_n > d_{n+1} > d_{n+2}$ and $d_n < d_{n+1} < d_{n+2}$ have both only a finite number of solutions. Similarly I can not prove that at least one of the equations $s^{(k)}(p_n) > s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) > s^{(k)}(p_{n+2})$ and $s^{(k)}(p_n) < s^{(k)}(p_{n+1}) < s^{(k)}(p_{n+2})$ have infinitely many solutions. Sierpiński deduces from the hypothesis of Schinzel that both these inequalities have infinitely many solutions [1].

Proof of the Theorem. I have not been able to find an elementary proof. We have to use the following well known theorem of Hoheisel-Ingham [4]: There exists an absolute constant c_1 so that

$$(5) \quad \pi(x + x^{5/8}) - \pi(x) > c_1 x^{5/8} / \log x$$

($\pi(x)$ denotes the number of primes $\leq x$). Put $s^{(2)}(n) = s(n)$ for sake of simplicity: we will only prove our Theorem for $s(n)$. The proof of the general case is almost identical with the case $k = 2$.

Let $2^k < q_1 < \dots < q_{t_k} < 2^k + 2^{5k/8}$ be the primes in $(2^k, 2^k + 2^{5k/8})$, further let $2^k - 2^{5k/8} < r_1 < \dots < r_{s_k} < 2^k$ be the primes in $(2^k - 2^{5k/8}, 2^k)^{(1)}$. By (5) we have

$$(6) \quad t_k > c_2 2^{5k/8} / k, \quad s_k > c_2 2^{5k/8} / k.$$

Now we prove the following

LEMMA. — For all but $o(2^{5k/8}/k)$ primes q_i and r_j we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k > k_0(\varepsilon)$

$$(7) \quad s(q_i) < (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{5k}{16}$$

and

$$(8) \quad s(r_j) > \frac{3k}{8} + (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{5k}{16} > \frac{11k}{16} - \varepsilon k.$$

Assume that the Lemma is already proved. Then from (6), (7) and (8) it follows that for all sufficiently large k there are primes r_j and q_i satisfying

$$(9) \quad s(r_j) > s(q_i).$$

From (9) and $q_i > r_j$ it clearly follows that for every $k > k_0$ there is a prime p_n satisfying

$$r_j \leq p_n < q_i$$

and

$$s(p_n) > s(p_{n+1})$$

which proves our Theorem.

Thus we only have to prove our Lemma.

First we prove (7). The primes q_i are all of the form.

$$(10) \quad 2^k + \sum_{i=0}^l \varepsilon_i 2^i, \quad \varepsilon_i = 0 \text{ or } 1, \quad l = \left\lfloor \frac{5k}{8} \right\rfloor.$$

(1) The primes q_i and r_j depend on k , but since there is no danger of confusion we do not indicate this.

If (7) does not hold we clearly must have for $\frac{c_3 2^l}{l}$ primes q_i

$$(11) \quad \sum_{i=0}^l \varepsilon_i > \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) l.$$

The number of integers of the form (10) for which (11) holds clearly equals

$$\sum_{r > \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) l} \binom{l}{r}.$$

By a simple and well known computation we obtain ($\eta = \eta(\varepsilon)$ depends only on ε)

$$\sum_{r > \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) l} \binom{l}{r} < 2^{(1-\eta)l} = o\left(\frac{2^l}{l}\right) = o\left(\frac{2^{5k/8}}{l}\right)$$

which proves (7).

The primes r_j are all of the form

$$2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2} + \cdots + 2^{l+1} + \sum_{i=0}^l \varepsilon_i 2^i$$

and the proof of (8) proceeds as in the proof of (7). Hence the proof of the Lemma and of our Theorem is complete.

REFERENCES.

- [1] W. SIERPIŃSKI, *Sur la somme des chiffres de nombres premiers*, « Rend. del Circ. Mat., Palermo », ser. II, 10, 1-4 (1961).
- [2] A. SCHINZEL et W. SIERPIŃSKI, *Sur certaines hypothèses concernant les nombres premiers*, « Acta Arithmetica », 4, 185-207 (1958).
- [3] P. ERDŐS and P. TURÁN, *On some sequences of integers*, « Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. », 54, 371-378 (1948); and P. ERDŐS, *On the difference of consecutive primes*, Ibid., 885-889.
- [4] G. HOHEISEL, *Primzahlprobleme in der Analysis*, « Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. Phys. Math. Klasse », 580-588 (1930); see also A. E. INGHAM, *On the difference between consecutive primes*, « Quarterly Journal of Math. », 8, 255-266 (1937).