

On congruence classes of denominators of convergents

by

S. HARTMAN (Wrocław) and P. SZÜSZ (Budapest)

Denote by p_n/q_n the convergents of the continued fraction representing a given real α . Let $a > 0$ and b be integers. It will be shown that for almost every α one has $q_n \equiv b \pmod{a}$ for arbitrarily many n . Then, obviously, for almost every α , numbers from an arbitrary arithmetical progression occur among the q_n 's. Actually we are going to prove a stronger theorem:

THEOREM 1. *Given a decreasing sequence $\{c_k\}$ with $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k = \infty$ and the sequence $\{c'_k\}$ being defined by*

$$(1) \quad c'_k = \begin{cases} c_k & \text{for } k \equiv b \pmod{a}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

the inequality

$$(2) \quad |ak - p| < c'_k$$

is fulfilled for almost every α by infinitely many k with suitable p and $(k, p) = 1$.

The preceding statement follows from Theorem 1 by putting $c_k = 1/2k$ and observing that if $|ak - p| < 1/2k$ and $(k, p) = 1$ then p/k is a convergent of α , this being a well-known result.

The proof is based on the following theorem of Duffin and Schaeffer [1]:

If for non-negative numbers c'_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) with $\sum_k c'_k = \infty$ there is a constant K such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\varphi(k)}{k} c'_k > K \sum_{k=1}^n c'_k$$

for infinitely many n , φ being the Euler function, then (2) has for almost every α arbitrarily many solutions with $(k, p) = 1$.

The numbers c'_k being defined by (1) it suffices to show

$$(3) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{c_k \varphi'(k)}{k} > K \sum_{k=1}^n c'_k$$

where $\varphi'(k) = \varphi(k)$ or 0 according as $k \equiv b \pmod{a}$ or not. Since the sequence $\{c_k\}$ is monotonous, (3) will follow by partial summation from the inequality

$$(4) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\varphi'(k)}{k} > Kn,$$

which we are now going to prove.

Assume first $(a, b) = 1$ and let χ be characters mod a . It is known that

$$(5) \quad \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(k)}{\chi(b)} = \begin{cases} \varphi(a) & \text{if } k \equiv b \pmod{a}, \\ 0 & \text{if } k \not\equiv b \pmod{a}. \end{cases}$$

We have also

$$\frac{\varphi(k)}{k} = \sum_{d|k} \frac{\mu(d)}{d},$$

where μ denotes the Möbius function. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\varphi'(k)}{k} &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k \leq n \\ k \equiv b \pmod{a}}} \frac{\varphi(k)}{k} = \frac{1}{\varphi(a)} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(k)}{\chi(b)} \cdot \frac{\varphi(k)}{k} \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(a)} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(k)}{\chi(b)} \sum_{d|k} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} = \frac{1}{\varphi(a)} \sum_{d=1}^n \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{d|k \leq n \\ 1 \leq k \leq n}} \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(k)}{\chi(b)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(a)} \sum_{d=1}^n \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{l=1}^{[n/d]} \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(ld)}{\chi(b)}. \end{aligned}$$

If $(d, a) > 1$ then since $(a, b) = 1$, one has $ld \not\equiv b \pmod{a}$ and in virtue of (5)

$$\sum_{l=1}^{[n/d]} \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(ld)}{\chi(b)} = 0.$$

If $(d, a) = 1$ then this double sum equals the number of l 's for which $ld \equiv b \pmod{a}$ and $l \leq [n/d]$. This number being $n/ad + O(1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\varphi'(k)}{k} &= \frac{1}{\varphi(a)} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq d \leq n \\ (a,d)=1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \left(\frac{n}{ad} + O(1) \right) \\ &= \frac{n}{a\varphi(a)} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq d \leq n \\ (a,d)=1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O(\log n) \\ &= n \frac{1}{a\varphi(a)} \frac{6}{\pi^2} \prod_{p|a} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right)^{-1} + O(\log n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality can be deduced from

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq d \leq n \\ (a,d)=1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \prod_{p|a} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right)^{-1} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Thus, (4) is proved for the case $(a, b) = 1$. In the case $(a, b) = d > 1$ the estimation (4), and consequently (3), remain valid; this can be deduced by applying it to the numbers $a' = a/d$, $b' = b/d$ and observing that $\varphi(ld) \geq \varphi(l)\varphi(d)$. Thus, Theorem 1 is completely proved.

Let us observe that omitting the condition $(k, p) = 1$ in this Theorem we obtain a special case of a stronger result proved by de Vries ([3], p. 46, Stelling 13).

Putting $c_k = 1/2k \log k$ we deduce at once from Theorem 1 the following

THEOREM 2. For almost every a and every positive integer l the sequence $\{q_n\}$ contains a subsequence $\{q_n\}$ which consists of multiples of l and is such that

$$\lim_n \frac{q_{n+1}}{q_n} = \infty.$$

For this result, in spite of its being a consequence of the preceding one, we will now supply a direct and more elementary proof. This seems justified, since Theorem 2 may have some independent significance and can be applied to a problem treated formerly by one of us [2].

Evidently it will be sufficient to prove that a number l being prescribed, the desired subsequence exists for almost every a . We proceed by induction with respect to the number m of distinct prime factors of l . For $m = 0$, i. e. $l = 1$, the statement is trivial. Assume that it is true

for a given m ; then fix arbitrarily a positive integer a having m distinct prime factors and choose a prime s not entering into a . One has to prove that for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and $l = as^k$ a sequence $\{q_n\}$ with required properties can be found for almost every a .

Let us suppose that $0 \leq a < 1$. Writing $a_1 + a_2$ we mean addition mod 1. Denote by E_k the set of those a for which our statement is satisfied for $l = a$ by the numbers $a + r/s^k$ ($r = 1, 2, \dots, s^k - 1$). The inductive hypothesis obviously implies

$$(6) \quad |E_k| = 1.$$

Thus, for an $a \in E_k$ and arbitrarily fixed r ($1 \leq r < s^k$) we can find a sequence $\{P_n/Q_n\}$ of convergents of $a + r/s^k$ for which

$$(7) \quad a/Q_n,$$

$$(8) \quad \left| a + \frac{r}{s^k} - \frac{P_n}{Q_n} \right| < \frac{c_n}{Q_n^2},$$

$$(9) \quad c_n \rightarrow 0, \quad c_n \leq \frac{1}{2s^{2k}}.$$

From (8) we obtain

$$(10) \quad \left| a - \frac{P_n s^k - r Q_n}{Q_n s^k} \right| < \frac{c_n s^{2k}}{Q_n^2 s^{2k}}.$$

Since $c_n s^{2k} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the fraction on the left of (10) equals a convergent p_n/q_n of a ; moreover, on account of (9) one has

$$\lim_n \frac{q_{n+1}}{q_n} = \infty.$$

From (7) and $(P_n, Q_n) = 1$ follows $(a, P_n) = 1$, and since $(a, s) = 1$, we have

$$a/q_n.$$

Let the integer λ ($0 \leq \lambda < k$) be defined by conditions

$$r = s^\lambda u, \quad (u, s) = 1.$$

LEMMA 1. For every n at least one of the following two cases occurs

$$(a) \quad s^{k-\lambda}/q_n,$$

$$(b) \quad s^{k-\lambda}/Q_n.$$

Let

$$(11) \quad Q_n = s^\mu t \quad (\mu \geq 0; (s, t) = 1).$$

Then

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} = \frac{P_n s^k - r Q_n}{Q_n s^k} = \frac{P_n s^{k-\mu} - s^\lambda u t}{t s^k}.$$

If $0 \leq k - \mu < \lambda$, then

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} = \frac{P_n - s^{\lambda+\mu-k} u t}{t s^\mu}.$$

Since in this case $\mu > 0$, we have $(P_n, s) = 1$; hence s^μ/q_n and this implies (a). If $k - \mu > \lambda$, then

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} = \frac{P_n s^{k-\mu-\lambda} - u t}{t s^{k-\lambda}}.$$

Since $(u, s) = 1$, we have $s^{k-\lambda}/q_n$ and (a) holds again. It $\mu > k$ or $k - \mu = \lambda$, then (b) holds by (11).

Now let M_i^k ($i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$) denote the set of those a 's for which the sequence $\{q_n\}$ contains infinitely many terms q_n divisible by as^{k-i} and fulfilling the condition $q_{n+1}/q_n \rightarrow \infty$. Put

$$N_i^k = E_k \setminus M_i^k.$$

LEMMA 2. If $a \in N_i^k$, then $a + r/s^k \in M_i^k$ for every $r = 1, 2, \dots, s^i - 1$.

In fact, for such r 's we have $\lambda \leq i - 1$. For a fixed r and a fixed sequence $\{P_n/Q_n\}$ satisfying (7)-(9) the case (a) can occur at most finitely often; otherwise we should have s^{k-i}/q_n for infinitely many n , and hence $a \in M_i^k$, against the assumption. Thus, by Lemma 1, it is the case (b) which occurs for infinitely many n . This case implies s^{k-i}/Q_n , and therefore $a + r/s^k \in M_i^k$. The sets

$$(12) \quad \left\{ a: a - \frac{r}{s^k} \in N_i^k \right\}$$

are disjoint for $r = 0, 1, \dots, s^i - 1$. In fact, otherwise there would exist two integers r_1 and r_2 ($0 \leq r_1 < r_2 \leq s^i - 1$) and two numbers $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in N_i^k$ such that $\beta_1 + r_1/s^k = \beta_2 + r_2/s^k$. However, the equality $\beta_1 - \beta_2 = (r_1 - r_2)/s^k$ implies together with Lemma 2 that β_1 and β_2 cannot both belong to N_i^k . The sets (12) are evidently L -measurable and congruent to N_i^k . Since they are disjoint, their Lebesgue measure fulfils the inequality

$$|N_i^k| \leq \frac{1}{s^i}.$$

Hence, by (1), we have

$$(13) \quad |M_i^k| > 1 - \frac{1}{s^i} \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1).$$

Now let k run over all even integers and put $i = k/2$. Then (13) yields $|M_{k/2}^k| \rightarrow 1$, and since $M_1^2 \supset M_2^4 \supset M_3^6 \supset \dots$, it follows that

$$|M_{k/2}^k| = 1$$

for every k . This means that for $l = as^{k/2}$ ($k = 2, 4, 6, \dots$) and for almost every a a required sequence $\{q_n\}$ does exist.

Application. In [2] it was proved that for almost every a the inequalities $|qa - p| < 1/t$, $|q| < ct$ (p, q integers) cannot be solved simultaneously for every $t > 1$ with an odd q , however large constant c is chosen. For this proof it is essential that for almost every a the sequence $\{q_n\}$ should contain a subsequence $\{q_{n_i}\}$ consisting of even numbers and such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (q_{n_i+1}/q_{n_i}) = \infty$. Replacing this proposition by Theorem 2 we can obtain without further modification of arguments the following generalization of the result in [2]:

For almost every a , every $c > 0$ and every integer l the inequalities $|qa - p| < 1/t$ and $|q| < ct$ are not simultaneously solvable for arbitrary $t > 1$ if it is required that q should not be divisible by l .

It may be observed that the theorem of Duffin and Schaeffer and the estimation of the number of primes in arithmetical progressions enable us to prove that for almost every a the sequence $\{q_n\}$ contains primes belonging to any progression $b + na$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) with $(a, b) = 1$.

References

- [1] R. J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer, *Khintchine's problem in metric diophantine approximation*, Duke Math. J. 8 (1941), p. 243-255.
- [2] S. Hartman, *A feature of Dirichlet's approximation theorem*, Acta Arithmetica 5 (1959), p. 261-263.
- [3] O. de Vries, *Metrische onderzoeken van diophantische benaderingsproblemen in het niet-lacunaire geval* (thesis), Amsterdam 1955.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCE
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Reçu par la Rédaction le 14. 1. 1960

On a generalization of Wilson's theorem

by

B. GYIRES (Debrecen, Hungary)

1. In the present paper we denote by printed Latin capitals quadratic matrices of order n , and by written Latin capitals quadratic matrices of order nr . In particular, E and O will denote the unit matrix and the zero matrix of order n , respectively, whereas \mathcal{E} will be the unit matrix of order nr . $\langle A_1, \dots, A_r \rangle$ stands for a hypermatrix of order nr , built from matrices of order n , in which all elements outside the matrices in the main diagonal are zero matrices, and the k th element of the main diagonal is A_k . We shall call this matrix a diagonal-matrix, whereas the (evidently regular) matrix

$$(1) \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_r \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \lambda_1^{r-1} & \lambda_2^{r-1} & \dots & \lambda_r^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

built from the pairwise different numbers

$$(2) \quad \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r$$

will be called the Vandermonde-matrix generated by the elements (2). The direct product of the matrix E with the matrix (1) is also regular, since by the well-known theorem on determinants of Kronecker the determinant of the direct product is the n th power of the determinant of the matrix (2).

A quadratic matrix whose elements are rational integers will be called regular with respect to the module p (p a prime), if its determinant is not divisible by p . By Cramer's rule for linear systems of congruences any matrix regular mod p has an inverse in the sense that there exists a matrix, such that the product of multiplying by it the original matrix will be congruent mod p with the unit matrix. If the elements (2) are rational integers incongruent mod p , then it follows from the product