

THE FUNCTIONS $\theta_s(x)$ AND $\bar{\theta}_s(x)$

by V. Seleacu and Șt. Zanfir

Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova,
Craiova (1100), Romania

In this paper we define the function $\theta_s: \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0,1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{\theta}_s: \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0,1,2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows :

$$\theta_s(x) = \sum_{\substack{p^x \\ 0 < p \leq x \\ p \text{-prime}}} S(p^x); \quad \bar{\theta}_s(x) = \sum_{\substack{p^k x \\ 0 < p \leq x \\ p \text{-prime}}} S(p^k),$$

where $S(p^x)$ is the Smarandache function defined in [3] ($S(n)$ is the smallest integer m such that $m!$ is divisible by n).

For the begining we give some properties of the θ function. Let us observe that, from the definition of θ_s it results:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_s(2) &= S(2^2) = 4, & \theta_s(8) &= S(2^8) = 10, \\ \theta_s(3) &= S(3^3) = 6, & \theta_s(9) &= S(3^9) = 21, \\ \theta_s(4) &= S(2^4) = 6, & \theta_s(10) &= S(2^{10}) + S(5^{10}) = 12 + 45 = 57, \\ \theta_s(5) &= S(5^5) = 25, & \theta_s(11) &= S(11^{11}) = 121, \\ \theta_s(6) &= S(2^6) + S(3^6) = 7 + 15 = 22, & \theta_s(12) &= S(2^{17}) + S(3^{12}) = 43. \\ \theta_s(7) &= S(7^7) = 49, \end{aligned}$$

We note also that if p -prime than $\theta_s(p^p) = p^2$.

Proposition 1. *The series $\sum_{x \geq 2} (\theta_s(x))^{-1}$ is convergent.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proof. } \sum_{x \geq 2} (\theta_s(x))^{-1} &= \frac{1}{S(2^2)} + \frac{1}{S(3^3)} + \frac{1}{S(5^5)} + \frac{1}{S(2^6) + S(3^6)} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{S(7^7)} + \frac{1}{S(2^8)} + \frac{1}{S(3^9)} + \frac{1}{S(2^{10}) + S(5^{10})} + \frac{1}{S(11^{11})} + \dots \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{i=2 \\ p_i \mid x}}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{p_i^2} + \frac{1}{(p_{V(x)} - 1)V(x)} \right) = \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_i^2} + \sum_{p_{V(x)}/x} \frac{1}{(p_{V(x)} - 1)V(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V(x)$ denote the number of the primes less or equal with x and divide by x .

Of course the series $\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_i^2}$ and $\sum_{p_{V(x)}/x} \frac{1}{(p_{V(x)}-1)V(x)}$ are convergent, so the proposition is proved.

Proposition 2. Let the sequence $T(n) = 1 - \lg \theta_3(n) + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{1}{\theta_3(i)}$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(n) = -\infty$.

The proof is immediate because the series $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\theta_3(n)}$ is convergent according by the proposition 1.

Proposition 3. The equation $\theta_3(x) = \theta_3(x+1)$ (0) has no solution if x is a prime.

Proof. If x is a prime number the equation become

$$x^2 = \theta_3(x+1), \text{ where}$$

$$\theta_3(x+1) = S(p_{i_1}^{x+1}) + S(p_{i_2}^{x+1}) + \dots + S(p_{i_{V(x+1)}}^{x+1}).$$

Using the inequality

$$(p-1)\alpha < S(p^\alpha) \leq p\alpha \quad (1)$$

given in [4], we have

$$\theta_3(x+1) \leq (x+1)(p_{i_1} + p_{i_2} + \dots + p_{i_{V(x+1)}})$$

Let us presume that the equation (0) has solution. We have the following relation:

$$x^2 \leq (x+1)(p_{i_1} + p_{i_2} + \dots + p_{i_{V(x+1)}}) \quad (2)$$

and we prove that

$$p_{i_1} + p_{i_2} + \dots + p_{i_{V(x+1)}} \leq x-1 \quad (3)$$

for $x \geq 9$.

Let $\eta = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdot \dots \cdot p_r^{\alpha_r}$, $p_i \neq p_j$, $i \neq j$, the decomposition of n into primes. We define the function $f(n) = 1 + \alpha_1 p_1 + \dots + \alpha_r p_r$ and we show that $f(n) \leq n-2$ for $n \geq 9$. If $1 \leq n < 9$ the precedent inequality is verified by calculus). For $n \geq 9$, we prove the inequality by induction:

$$f(9) = 7, f(10) = 8, f(12) = 8 < 10, \text{ true.}$$

Now let us suppose that $f(n) \leq n - 2, \forall n \geq 12$, and we show that $f(n + 1) \leq n - 1$.

In this case we have three different situations:

I) $n + 1 = h = k_1 \cdot k_2$, where k_1, k_2 are composed members. Using the true relation, $f(h) = f(k_1 \cdot k_2) = f(k_1) + f(k_2) - 1$, we have

$$f(h) = f(n + 1) = f(k_1) + f(k_2) - 1 \leq k_1 - 2 + k_2 - 2 - 1 = k_1 \cdot k_2 - 8 - 5 \leq h - 2 = n + 1 - 2 = n - 1 \Rightarrow f(n + 1) \leq n - 1.$$

II) $n + 1 = h = k_1 \cdot k_2$, where, k_1 - prime, k_2 - compounded,

$$f(h) = f(k_1) + f(k_2) - 1 \leq k_1 + 1 + k_2 - 2 - 1 \leq k_1 \cdot k_2 - 2 = n - 1.$$

III) $n + 1 = h = k_1 \cdot k_2$, where k_1, k_2 - prime,

$$f(h) = 1 + k_1 + k_2 = k_1 k_2 + 2 - (k_1 - 1)(k_2 - 1) \leq h + 2 - 4 = h - 2 = n - 1.$$

Conclusion: $f(n) \leq n - 2, \forall n \geq 9$.

$$\text{Then } f(n) \leq n + 2 \Rightarrow 1 + \alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2 + \dots + \alpha_r p_r \leq n - 2 \Rightarrow$$

$$\alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2 + \dots + \alpha_r p_r \leq n - 3.$$

We obtain

$$p_1 + p_2 + \dots + p_r \leq \alpha_1 p_1 + \alpha_2 p_2 + \dots + \alpha_r p_r \leq n - 3 \leq n - 2$$

Using (3) in (2) we have

$$x^2 \leq (x + 1)(x - 1) \Rightarrow x^2 < x^2 - 1, \text{ impossible.}$$

Proposition 4. *The equation $\theta_s(x) = \theta_s(x + 1)$ has no solution for $(x + 1)$ - prime.*

Proof. We have $\theta_s(x + 1) = (x + 1)^2$.

We suppose that the equation has solution and with the inequalityes (1) is must that

$$(x + 1)^2 \leq x(p_{i_1}^x + p_{i_2}^x + \dots + p_{i_{v(x)}}^x) \leq x^2, \text{ impossible.}$$

We give some particular value for $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \sum_{\substack{p^x \\ p\text{-prime}}} S(p^x)$;

$\bar{\theta}_s(3) = S(2^3) = 4$	$\bar{\theta}_s(8) = S(3^8) + S(5^8) + S(7^8) = 18 + 35 + 49 = 102$
$\bar{\theta}_s(4) = S(3^4) = 9$	$\bar{\theta}_s(9) = S(2^9) + S(5^9) + S(7^9) = 12 + 40 + 56 = 108$
$\bar{\theta}_s(5) = S(2^5) + S(3^5) = 20$	$\bar{\theta}_s(10) = S(3^{10}) + S(7^{10}) = 24 + 63 = 87$
$\bar{\theta}_s(6) = S(5^6) = 30$	$\bar{\theta}_s(11) = S(2^{11}) + S(3^{11}) + S(5^{11}) + S(7^{11}) = 16 + 27 + 50 + 73 = 163$
$\bar{\theta}_s(7) = S(2^7) + S(3^7) + S(5^7) = 8 + 18 + 36 = 62$	$\bar{\theta}_s(12) = S(2^{12}) + S(7^{12}) + S(11^{12}) = 50 + 77 + 121 = 248$
	$\bar{\theta}_s(13) = S(2^{13}) + S(3^{13}) + S(5^{13}) + S(7^{13}) + S(11^{13}) = 16 + 27 + 60 + 84 + 132 = 319$

Proposition 5. The series $\sum_{x \geq 3} (\bar{\theta}_s(x))^{-1}$ is convergent.

Proof.

$$\sum_{x \geq 3} (\bar{\theta}_s(x))^{-1} = \frac{1}{S(2^3)} + \frac{1}{S(3^4)} + \frac{1}{S(2^5) + S(3^5)} + \frac{1}{S(2^8) + S(5^8) + S(7^8)} + \frac{1}{S(2^9) + S(5^9) + S(7^9)}$$

$$+ \dots \leq \frac{1}{S(2^3)} + \frac{1}{S(3^4)} + \frac{1}{S(5^6)} + \frac{1}{S(2^7)} + \dots \leq \sum_{\substack{x \geq 3 \\ p_i \nmid x \\ p_i - \text{prime}}} \frac{1}{S(p_i^x)} \leq \sum_{\substack{x \geq 3 \\ p_i \nmid x \\ p_i - \text{prime}}} \frac{1}{p_i^2} \leq \sum_{x \geq 3} \frac{1}{x^2}$$

Because the series $\sum_{x \geq 3} \frac{1}{x^2}$ is convergent, we have that our series is convergent.

Proposition 6. If $T(n) = 1 - \lg \bar{\theta}_s(n) + \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{1}{\bar{\theta}_s(i)}$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(n) = -\infty$.

Proposition 7. The equation $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$ has no solution if $x+1 = p$ -prime.

Proof. If $x+1$ is prime he wouldn't divide with any of prime numbers then him

$$\bar{\theta}_s(x+1) = \sum_{\substack{p^{x+1} \\ 0 < p \leq x+1}} S(p^{x+1}) = S(p_{i_1}^{x+1}) + S(p_{i_2}^{x+1}) + \dots + S(p_{i_{\pi(x)}}^{x+1}).$$

The number x is divisible with at least two prime numbers then him. In the case $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \sum_{\substack{p^x \\ 0 < p \leq x}} S(p^x)$ will have at least two terms $S(p_{i_k}^x)$ less then they are in $\bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$.

Moreover $S(p_i^x) \leq S(p_i^{x+1})$ and it results that $\bar{\theta}_s(x) < \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$.

Proposition 8. *The equation $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$ has no solution if $x=p$ -prime, $x \geq 9$.*

Proof. using the function $F_s(x) = \sum_{\substack{p^x \\ 0 < p \leq x \\ p\text{-prime}}} S(p^x)$ defined in [2] we have

$$F_s(x) = \theta_s(x) + \bar{\theta}_s(x)$$

$$F_s(x+1) = \theta_s(x+1) + \bar{\theta}_s(x+1).$$

If our equation have solution $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$ then

$$F_s(x) - F_s(x+1) = \theta_s(x) - \theta_s(x+1)$$

or

$$F_s(x) - F_s(x+1) = x^2 - \theta_s(x+1).$$

Is known [2] that $F_s(x) - F_s(x+1) < 0$. We have $x^2 - \theta_s(x+1) < 0 \Rightarrow x^2 < \theta_s(x+1)$. Using (3) we have

$$\theta_s(x+1) \leq (x+1)(x-1) = x^2 - 1, \text{ therefore } x^2 < x^2 - 1, \text{ imposible.}$$

For $x < 9$ is verified by calculus that the equation $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$ has not solution.

Proposed problem

1. $\theta_s(x) = \theta_s(x+1)$, $x, x+1$ are composed numbers.
2. $\bar{\theta}_s(x) = \bar{\theta}_s(x+1)$, $x, x+1$, are composed numbers.

Calculate

3. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta_s(n)}{n^\alpha}, \alpha \in \mathbf{R}.$

4. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\theta}_s(n)}{n^\alpha}, \alpha \in \mathbf{R}.$

References

1. M.Andrei, C. Dumitrescu, V.Selcacu, L. Tuțescu, Șt. Zanfir, *Some remarks on the Smarandache Function*, Smarandache Function Jurnal, vol 4-5, No 1 (1994).
2. I.Bălăcnoiu, V.Selcacu, N.Virlan *Properties of the numerical Function F_s* , Smarandache Function Jurnal, vol 6 No1(1995)
3. F. Smarandache *A Function in the Number Theory*, Smarandache Function Jurnal, vol. 1, No 1 (1990), 1-17
4. Pål Gronas *A proof the non existenc of "Samma"*, Smarandache Function Jurnal, vol. 4-5, No 1 Sept(1994)