Regularity of a function related to the 2-adic logarithm

Jan-Christoph Schlage-Puchta

For a function $f: \mathbb{N} \to X$ mapping the positive integers to some set X, define the q-kernel $K_q(f)$ as the set of functions $\{f_{k,\ell}: k \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \le \ell < q^k\}$, where $f_{k,\ell}(n) = f(q^k n + \ell)$. The q-kernel is related to the concept of q-automaticity by the following criterion due to Eilenberg [2] (see also [1, Theorem 6.6.2]).

Theorem 1. A function f is q-automatic if and only if $K_q(f)$ is finite.

The notion of q-regularity generalizes the concept of q-automaticity in the case that X is the set of integers. A function f is called q-regular if $K_q(f)$ is contained in a finitely generated \mathbb{Z} -module.

Motivated by work of Lengyel [3] on the 2-adic logarithm, Allouche and Shallit [1, Problem 16.7.4] asked whether the function

$$f(n) = \min_{k \ge n} (k - \nu_2(k)), \tag{1}$$

where $v_2(k)$ is the 2-adic valuation, is 2-regular or not. Here we give a negative answer to this question. More precisely, we show the following.

Theorem 2. The functions $f_{k,0}: n \mapsto f(2^k n)$ are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent.

For the proof we need the following simple statements concerning f.

Proposition 1. 1. We have $f(n) = n - O(\log n)$.

2. For
$$n = (2^{\ell+2} - 3)2^m$$
 we have $f(n) = \min(n - m, n - m - \ell - 2 + 3 \cdot 2^m)$.

Received by the editors January 2010 - In revised form in June 2010.

Communicated by A. Weiermann.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 68Q45, 68Q70.

Key words and phrases: automatic sequence, regular sequence, 2-adic logarithm.

Proof. (1) We trivially have the bound $f(n) \le n$. On the other hand we have $\nu_2(k) \le \frac{\log k}{\log 2}$, and hence $f(n) \ge \min_{k \ge n} k - \frac{\log k}{\log 2}$. Since the derivative of the function $t - \frac{\log t}{\log 2}$ is $1 - \frac{1}{t \log 2}$, which is positive for $t \ge 2$, for $n \ge 2$ the minimum is attained for k = n and we conclude $f(n) \ge n - \frac{\log n}{\log 2}$, and the first claim is proven.

(2) We want to show that as k runs over all integers \geq n the minimum in (1) is attained at k=n or at $k=2^{\ell+m+2}=n+3\cdot 2^m$. From this our claim follows by computing the value of $k-v_2(k)$ at these two positions. Assume first that $k\geq n$ is not divisible by 2^{m+1} . Then we have $k-v_2(k)\geq n-v_2(k)\geq n-m$, which is what we want to have. Next assume that $v_2(k)>m$ and $k<2^{\ell+m+2}$. Then $k=(2^{\ell+2}-2)2^m$, that is, $v_2(k)=m+1$, and we have $k-v_2(k)=(n+2^m)-(m+1)\geq n-m$, which is also consistent with our claim. For $k=2^{\ell+m+2}$ we have $k-v_2(k)=n-m-\ell-2+3\cdot 2^m$, and thus it remains to consider the range $k>2^{\ell+m+2}$. For $2^{\ell+m+2}< k<2^{\ell+m+3}$ we have $k-v_2(k)\geq 2^{\ell+m+2}+1-(\ell+m+1)>2^{\ell+m+2}-(\ell+m+2)$, and hence this range cannot contribute to the minimum. Finally, if $k\geq 2^{\ell+m+3}$, then $k-v_2(k)\geq k-\frac{\log k}{\log 2}\geq 2^{\ell+m+3}-(\ell+m+3)>2^{\ell+m+2}-(\ell+m+2)$, and this range is also of no importance. Hence, the second claim follows as well.

We now turn to the proof of the theorem. Assume the family of functions $(f_{k,0})_{k\geq 0}$ was linearly dependent. Then there exist rational numbers $\lambda_0,\ldots,\lambda_p$, not all 0, such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{p} \lambda_j f(2^j n) = 0 \tag{2}$$

holds for all integers n. Evaluating this equation asymptotically for $n \to \infty$ we see that the left hand side is $n \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^p 2^j \lambda_j\right) + \mathcal{O}(\log n)$. This expression can only vanish identically if

$$\sum_{j=0}^{p} 2^j \lambda_j = 0. (3)$$

Let j_0 be the least integer satisfying $\lambda_{j_0} = 0$. Then define $\ell = 3 \cdot 2^{j_0} - 1$, and put $n = 2^{\ell} - 3$ into (2). We have

$$n - j_0 > n - j_0 - \ell - 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{j_0} = n - j_0 - 1.$$

On the other hand we have

$$n-j < n-j-\ell-2+3 \cdot 2^{j} = n-j-1-(j-j_0)+3 \cdot (2^{j}-2^{j_0})$$

for all $j > j_0$, hence, by the second part of the proposition relation (2) becomes

$$\lambda_{j_0}(2^{j_0}n - j_0 - \ell - 2 + 3 \cdot 2^{j_0}) + \sum_{j=j_0}^p \lambda_j(2^j n - j) = 0.$$
 (4)

Finally we put $n' = 2^{\ell+1} - 3$ into (2). The same computation as the one used for n yields the equation

$$\lambda_{j_0}(2^{j_0}n'-j_0-\ell-3+3\cdot 2^{j_0})+\sum_{j=j_0}^p\lambda_j(2^jn'-j)=0.$$
 (5)

Note that the difference between (4) and (5) is that n is replaced by n', and -2 is replaced by -3. If we take the difference of (4) and (5), we therefore obtain

$$\lambda_{j_0}(2^{j_0}(n'-n)+1)+\sum_{j=j_0}^p\lambda_j2^j(n'-n)=0.$$

If we now multiply (3) by (n-n'), and subtract the result from the last equation, all that remains is $\lambda_{j_0}=0$. But j_0 was chosen subject to the condition $\lambda_{j_0}\neq 0$. Hence, the initial assumption that not all λ_j are 0 is wrong, and we conclude that there is no linear relation among the functions $f_{k,0}$.

The reader might wonder why we restricted our attention to the functions $f_{k,0}$. Essentially the same method of proof can be used to show that the dimension of the linear span $\langle f_{k,0}, f_{k_1}, \ldots, f_{k,2^{k-1}} \rangle$ tends to infinity with k. However, things become notationally more involved, since these functions are no longer linearly independent. In fact, we have $f_{k,a} = f_{k,a+1}$ for every odd a and many more identities like this, that is, these functions are not even different, and to give a lower bound for the dimension we have to choose a suitable subset.

References

- [1] J.-P. Allouche, J. Shallit, *Automatic Sequences*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [2] Eilenberg, Automata, Languages, and Machines, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [3] T. Lengyel, Characterizing the 2-adic order of the logarithm. *Fibonacci Quart*. **32** (1994), 397–401.

Krijgslaan 281 Gebouw S22 9000 Gent Belgium email:jcsp@cage.ugent.be