

Several Results on Systems of Residue Classes

Sun Zhiwei (孙智伟)

(Nanjing University)

Communicated by Pan Chengbiao Received Dec. 26, 1988.

Let (m, n) and $a(n)$ denote the g.c.d. of m, n and the residue class $\{x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \equiv a \pmod{n}\}$ respectively. Any period of the characteristic function of $\bigcup_{i=1}^k a_i(n_i)$ is called a covering period of $\{a_i(n_i)\}_{i=1}^k$.

Theorem 1 Let $A = \{a_i(n_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ be a disjoint system (i. e. $a_1(n_1), \dots, a_k(n_k)$ are pairwise disjoint). Let $[n_1, \dots, n_k]$ (the l.c.m. of n_1, \dots, n_k) have the prime factorization $[n_1, \dots, n_k] = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\alpha_i}$ and $T = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\beta_i}$ ($\beta_i \geq 0$) be the smallest positive covering period of A . Then

$$p_r^{\min(\delta_r, \alpha_r - \beta_r)} \leq \max_{\substack{1 \leq s \leq k \\ p_r^{\alpha_r} | n_s}} |\{1 \leq i \leq k : n_i = n_s\}| \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \frac{p_i}{p_i - 1},$$

where

$$\delta_r = \min\{\delta \geq 1 : p_r^{\alpha_r - \delta} \parallel n_i \text{ for some } 0 \leq i \leq k\} \text{ and } n_0 = 1.$$

In the case $T = 1$, our theorem gives an improvement to Burshtein's conjecture which is better than that of R. J. Simpson (1986).

Theorem 2 Let $\{a_i(n_i)\}_{i=1}^k$ be a disjoint covering system (i.e. $a_i(n_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, form a partition of \mathbb{Z}). Let $n_0 = 1$. If $d > 1$ divides some n_i then

$$|\{1 \leq i \leq k : d | n_i\}| \geq |\{a_i \pmod{d} : d | n_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}| \geq \min_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ d \nmid n_i}} \frac{d}{d + n_i}.$$

This improves the Newman-Znám result. The improvement is better than that of Berger, Felzenbaum and Fraenkel (1988).

In the following \mathbf{F} will denote the class of all complex functions defined on $D = \{\langle r, n \rangle : 0 \leq r < n, r, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Theorem 3 For any $f \in \mathbf{F}$ the following statements are equivalent.

(a) If $0 \leq a_i < n_i$, $a_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and λ_i is complex for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x \equiv a_i \pmod{n_i}}}^k \lambda_i = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i f(a_i, n_i) = 0.$$

(b) There exists a function $g \in \mathbf{F}$ such that

$$f(a, n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} g\left(\frac{m}{(m, n)}, \frac{n}{(m, n)}\right) e^{2\pi i \frac{m}{n} a} \text{ for all } \langle a, n \rangle \in D.$$

The key idea of the proof is that both (a) and (b) are equivalent to

$$(*) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(a + jd, nd) = f(a, d) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \text{ and } \langle a, d \rangle \in D.$$

Theorem 4 If $f \in F$ satisfies (b) or (*) and

$$\sum_{r=0}^{n_j-1} f(r, n_j) e^{2\pi i \frac{r}{n_j} s} \neq 0 \text{ for } s = 0, 1, \dots, n_j - 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

then for any numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x \equiv a_i \pmod{n_i}}}^k \lambda_i \equiv 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i f((x - a_i) \bmod n_i, n_i) \equiv 0.$$

(By $g(x) \equiv 0$ we mean $g(x) = 0$ for each x .)

Corollary If positive integers n_1, \dots, n_k are all squarefree then

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ n_i | x - a_i}}^k \lambda_i \equiv 0 \iff \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ (x - a_i, n_i) = 1}}^k \frac{\lambda_i}{\varphi(n_i)} \equiv 0$$

where φ denotes Euler's totient function.