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#### Abstract

We show that there exist infinitely many positive integers $r$ not of the form $(p-1) / 2-\phi(p-1)$, thus providing an affirmative answer to a question of Neville Robbins.


For every positive integer $n$ let $\phi(n)$ be the Euler function of $n$. For an odd prime number $p$ put $f(p)=(p-1) / 2-\phi(p-1)$. Note that $f(p)$ counts the number of quadratic nonresidues modulo $p$ which are not primitive roots. At the 2002 Western Number Theory Conference in San Francisco Neville Robbins asked if there exist infinitely many positive integers $r$ such that $f(p)=r$ has no solution. In this note, we show that the answer to this question is affirmative. Throughout, we use $p$ and $q$ for prime numbers. A related question from [3] regarding whether or not there exist infinitely many positive integers $m$ not in the range of the function $n-\phi(n)$ has been treated in [1] and [2].

Theorem 1. For every odd integer $w>1$ there exist infinitely many positive integers $r=2^{\gamma} w$ not represented by the function $f(p)=(p-1) / 2-$ $\phi(p-1)$ with an odd prime number $p$.

Proof. We let $r=2^{\gamma} w$. We shall show that there exist infinitely many values of $\gamma$ such that $r$ is not of the form $f(p)$ for some prime $p$. Let us assume that $f(p)=r$. Write $p-1=2^{\alpha} m$ with some positive integers $\alpha$ and $m$ where $m$ is odd. Then $f(p)=2^{\alpha-1}(m-\phi(m))$, and we are led to the equation $m-\phi(m)=2^{\gamma-(\alpha-1)} w$. Since $m-\phi(m)$ is odd (because $m$ is odd and $m>1$ because if $m=1$ then $m-\phi(m)=0$ contradicting the fact that $w>1$ ), it follows that the only possibility is $\gamma=\alpha-1$, i.e., $\alpha=\gamma+1$. Further, let $m_{1}, \ldots, m_{k}$ be all the solutions to the equation $m-\phi(m)=w$. It is clear that this equation has only finitely many solutions. Indeed, any such solution $m$ is composite (because $w>1$ ), therefore $w=m-\phi(m) \geq m / p(m) \geq m^{1 / 2}$, where $p(m)$ is the smallest prime factor of $m$. Thus, $w=m-\phi(m)$ implies $m \leq w^{2}$, which shows that $k$ is finite. If $k=0$, then we are through. Assume

[^0]now that $k \geq 1$ (this is always the case when $w$ is prime because $m=w^{2}$ is such a solution in this case). In fact, by letting $m=p_{1} p_{2}$ with distinct primes $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ the equation $m-\phi(m)=w$ leads to $p_{1}+p_{2}=w+1$ and Goldbach's conjecture would seem to suggest that such primes $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ should always exist, therefore that $k \geq 1$ holds always.

Backtracking, it follows that every solution of $f(p)=r$ is of the form $p-1=2^{\gamma+1} m_{i}$ for some $i=1, \ldots, k$. We conclude the proof with the following result.

Lemma 2. Let $m_{1}, \ldots, m_{k}$ be odd positive integers. Then there exist infinitely many positive integers $n$ such that $2^{n} m_{i}+1$ is composite for all $i=1, \ldots, k$.

Proof. We will prove more than asserted, namely that the positive integers $n$ can be chosen to be primes. Assume that this is not true. Then there exists a positive constant $c_{1}$ such that if $p>c_{1}$ is a prime, then $2^{p} m_{i}+1$ is prime for some $i=1, \ldots, k$. We let $M=\operatorname{lcm}\left[m_{1}, \ldots, m_{k}\right]$. We may assume that $c_{1}>M$. We set $\Pi=\left\{p>c_{1}\right\}$ and $\Pi_{i}=\left\{p>c_{1} \mid 2^{p} m_{i}+1\right.$ is prime $\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, k$. Assume that $\Pi=\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \Pi_{i}$. Let $p_{1}$ be the first prime number in $\Pi$. Up to relabeling the $m_{i}$ 's, we may assume that $P_{1}=2^{p_{1}} m_{1}+1$ is prime. Let $\mathcal{A}_{1}=\left\{p>p_{1} \mid p \equiv p_{1}\left(\bmod 2^{p_{1}} M\right)\right\}$. Since $p_{1}>c_{1}>M$, it follows, by Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progressions, that $\mathcal{A}_{1}$ is infinite. Note that $P_{1}-1 \mid 2^{p_{1}} M$, and therefore, by Fermat's Little Theorem, if $p \in \mathcal{A}_{1}$, then $2^{p} \equiv 2^{p_{1}}\left(\bmod P_{1}\right)$. In particular, $2^{p} m_{1}+1 \equiv 2^{p_{1}} m_{1}+1$ $\left(\bmod P_{1}\right) \equiv 0\left(\bmod P_{1}\right)$, and since $p>p_{1}$ it follows that $2^{p} m_{1}+1$ is composite. Thus, if $p \in \mathcal{A}_{1}$ it follows that $p \notin \Pi_{1}$. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{1} \subseteq\left(\bigcup_{i=2}^{k} \Pi_{i}\right) \backslash \Pi_{1}$.

Now let $p_{2}$ be the first prime in $\mathcal{A}_{1}$. We may assume that $p_{2} \in \Pi_{2}$. Write $P_{2}=2^{p_{2}} m_{2}+1$ and let $\mathcal{A}_{2}=\left\{p>p_{2} \mid p \equiv p_{2}\left(\bmod 2^{p_{2}} M\right)\right\}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}_{2} \subset \mathcal{A}_{1}$. Moreover, the previous argument shows that $P_{2}-1 \mid 2^{p_{2}} M$, therefore $2^{p} \equiv 2^{p_{2}}\left(\bmod P_{2}\right)$ holds for all $p \in \mathcal{A}_{2}$. In particular, $2^{p} m_{2}+1$ is a multiple of $P_{2}$, and therefore $p \notin \Pi_{2}$. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{2} \subseteq\left(\bigcup_{i=3}^{k} \Pi_{i}\right) \backslash\left(\Pi_{1} \cup \Pi_{2}\right)$. Inductively, we construct infinite sets of primes $\mathcal{A}_{j}$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{j} \subseteq\left(\bigcup_{i=j+1}^{k} \Pi_{i}\right) \backslash\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{j} \Pi_{i}\right)$. Of course, this is absurd for $j=k$, which completes the proof of Lemma 2 and hence of Theorem 1.

Example 3. Let $w=3$. The only solution of the equation $m-\phi(m)=3$ is $m=9$. Thus, if $r=2^{\gamma} \cdot 3$, then $p=2^{\gamma+1} \cdot 9+1$. Taking $\gamma=4 t-1$ we note that $2^{\gamma+1} \cdot 9+1$ is always a multipe of 5 , therefore it cannot be a prime. Hence, numbers of the form $2^{4 t-1} \cdot 3$ are not of the form $f(p)$ with any odd prime number $p$. Similarly, taking $w=5$, the only $m$ such that $m-\phi(m)=5$ is $m=25$. Thus, $p=2^{\gamma+1} \cdot 25+1$. Taking $\gamma=2 t$, we find that $2^{\gamma+1} \cdot 25+1$ is a multiple of 3 , therefore it cannot be prime. Hence, numbers of the form $2^{2 t} .5$ are not of the form $f(p)$ with any odd prime number $p$ either.

Remarks 4. The conclusion of Theorem 1 is probably false when $w=1$. Indeed, let $\gamma \geq 0$. The well known Prime $k$-Tuplets Conjecture suggests that there should exist a pair of primes ( $p, q$ ) (in fact, infinitely many such) with $p=2^{\gamma+1} q+1$ and for such primes $p$ and $q$ we certainly have $f(p)=2^{\gamma}$.
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