

Some Considerations Concerning the Sumatory Function Associated to Generalised Smarandache Function

E. Radescu and N. Radescu

Let us denote by $\overset{d}{V}$ the least common multiple, by $\overset{d}{\Lambda}$ the greatest common divisor and $\Lambda = \min, V = \max$. It is known that $N_0 = (N^*, \Lambda, V)$ and $N_d = (N^*, \overset{d}{\Lambda}, \overset{d}{V})$ are lattices. The order on the set $N^* : n_1 \leq n_2 \Leftrightarrow n_1 \Lambda n_2 = n_1$, corresponding to the first of these lattices and it is known that this is a total order. But the order \leq_d induced on the same set by $\overset{d}{\Lambda}$ and $\overset{d}{V}$ and defined by: $n_1 \leq_d n_2 \Leftrightarrow n_1 \overset{d}{\Lambda} n_2 = n_1 \Leftrightarrow n_1 \text{ divides } n_2$ is only a partial order.

Let $\sigma : N_0 \rightarrow N_d$ (1) a sequence of positive integers defined on the set N^* .

The sequence (1) is said to be a multiplicatively convergent to zero sequence (mcz) if:

$$\forall n \in N^*, \exists m_n \in N^*, \forall m > m_n \Rightarrow n \leq_d \sigma(m) \quad (2).$$

The sequence

$$\sigma : N_d \rightarrow N_d \quad (3)$$

is said to be a divisibility sequence (ds) if: $n \leq_d m \Rightarrow \sigma(n) \leq_d \sigma(m)$ and it is said to be a strong divisibility sequence (sds) if:

$$\sigma\left(n \overset{d}{\Lambda} m\right) = \sigma(n) \overset{d}{\Lambda} \sigma(m) \text{ for every } n, m \in N^* \quad (4).$$

Let the lattices N_0 and N_d . We'll use the following notations:

- (a) a sequence $\sigma_{00} : N_0 \rightarrow N_0$ is a (oo) - sequences;
- (b) a sequence $\sigma_{0d} : N_0 \rightarrow N_d$ is a (od) - sequences;
- (c) a sequence $\sigma_{d0} : N_d \rightarrow N_0$ is a (do) - sequences;
- (d) a sequence $\sigma_{dd} : N_d \rightarrow N_d$ is a (dd) - sequences.

Then A(do) - sequence σ_{d0} the monotonicity yields:

$$(m_{d0}) \forall n_1, n_2 \in N^*, n_1 \leq_d n_2 \Rightarrow \sigma_{d0}(n_1) \leq \sigma_{d0}(n_2) \quad (5)$$

and the condition of convergence to infinity is:

$$(c_{d0}) \forall n \in N^*, \exists m_n \in N^*, \forall m \leq_d m_n \Rightarrow \sigma_{d0}(m) \geq n \quad (6).$$

Analogously, for a (dd) - sequence σ_{dd} the monotonicity yields:

$$(m_{dd}) \forall n_1, n_2 \in N^*, n_1 \leq_d n_2 \Rightarrow \sigma_{dd}(n_1) \leq_d \sigma_{dd}(n_2) \quad (7)$$

and the convergence to zero is:

$$(c_{dd}) \forall n \in N^*, \exists m_n \in N^*, \forall m \geq_d m_n \Rightarrow \sigma_{dd}(m) \geq n. \quad (8)$$

To each sequence σ_{ij} , with $i, j \in \{0, d\}$, satisfying the condition (c_{ij}) , one may attach a sequence S_{ij} (a generalised Smarandache function) defined by:

$$S_{ij} = \min \{m_n : m_n \text{ is given by the condition } (c_{ij})\} \quad (9).$$

For the properties the functions S_{ij} , see [2].

It is said that for every numerical function f it can be attached the sumatory function:

$$F_A(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) \quad (10)$$

The function f is expressed as:

$$f(n) = \sum_{u,v=n} \mu(u) F_f(v) \quad (11)$$

where μ is the Möbius function ($\mu(1) = 1, \mu(n) = 0$ if n is divisible by the square of a prime number, $\mu(n) = (-1)^k$ if n the product of k different prime numbers).

If f is the a generalised Smarandache function, S_{ij} then

$$F_{ij}^S(n) = \sum_{d|n} S_{ij}(d), i, j \in \{0, d\}. \quad (12)$$

Now let us consider $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k$, with $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_k$ primes number and $S_{ij}(p_1) \leq S_{ij}(p_2) \leq \dots \leq S_{ij}(p_k)$, for example. If $i=0, j=d$, then $S_{0d}(n_1 \vee n_2) = S_{0d}(n_1) \vee S_{0d}(n_2)$ and

$$F_{0d}^S(n) = S_{0d}(1) + \sum_{h=1}^k S_{0d}(p_h) + \sum_{h,t=1, h \neq t}^k S_{0d}(p_h p_t) + \sum_{h,t,q=1, h \neq t, q \neq t}^k S_{0d}(p_h p_t p_q) + \dots + S_{0d}(n). \text{ It result:}$$

$$F_{0d}^S(1) = S_{0d}(1);$$

$$F_{0d}^S(p_1) = S_{0d}(1) + S_{0d}(p_1) = F_{0d}^S(1) + 2^0 S_{0d}(p_1);$$

$$F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2) = S_{0d}(1) + S_{0d}(p_1) + S_{0d}(p_2) + S_{0d}(p_1 p_2) = S_{0d}(1) + S_{0d}(p_1) + 2 S_{0d}(p_2) = F_{0d}^S(p_1) + 2 S_{0d}(p_2);$$

$$F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 p_3) = F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2) + 2^2 S_{0d}(p_3);$$

$$F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4) = F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 p_3) + 2^3 S_{0d}(p_4);$$

$$F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 \dots p_k) = F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k-1}) + 2^{k-1} S_{0d}(p_k).$$

$$\text{That is } F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 \dots p_k) = S_{0d}(1) + \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{i-1} S_{0d}(p_i).$$

The equality (11) becomes:

$$S_{0d}(p_k) = S(n) = \sum_{ab=n} \mu(a) F_{0d}^S(b) = \\ = F_{0d}^S(n) - \sum_i F_{0d}^S\left(\frac{n}{p_i}\right) + \sum_{i \neq j} F_{0d}^S\left(\frac{n}{p_i p_j}\right) + \dots$$

$$\text{with } F_{0d}^S\left(\frac{n}{p_i}\right) = F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 \dots p_{i-1} p_{i+1} \dots p_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} 2^{j-1} S_{0d}(p_j) + \sum_{j=i+1}^k 2^{j-1} S_{0d}(p_j) = \\ = F_{0d}^S(p_1 p_2 \dots p_{i-1}) + 2^{i-1} F_{0d}^S(p_{i+1} \dots p_k).$$

Analogously,

$$F_{0d}^S\left(\frac{n}{p_i p_j}\right) = F_{0d}^S(p_1 \dots p_{i-1}) + 2^{i-1} F_{0d}^S(p_{i+1} \dots p_{j-1}) + 2^{j-1} F_{0d}^S(p_{j+1} \dots p_k) = \\ = \sum_{h=1}^{i-1} 2^{h-1} S_{0d}(p_h) + \sum_{h=i+1}^{j-1} 2^{h-2} S_{0d}(p_h) + \sum_{h=j+1}^k 2^{h-3} S_{0d}(p_h).$$

In particulary, for $n = p^a$, p prime number, it result:

$$S_{0d}(p^a) = \sum_{a+q=a} \mu(p^q) F_{0d}^S(p^q) = F_{0d}^S(p^a) - F_{0d}^S(p^{a-1}).$$

If $n = p^a q^b$ with $\max\{S_{0d}(p), \dots, S_{0d}(p^a)\} \leq \min\{S_{0d}(q), \dots, S_{0d}(q^b)\}$, then

$$F_{0d}^S(p^a q^b) = F_{0d}^S(p^a) + (a+1) F_{0d}^S(q^b).$$

If $i=d, j=d$ and if σ_{dd} is a (sds) satisfying the condition (c_{dd}) , then

$$S_{dd}(n_1 \vee n_2) = S_{dd}(n_1) \vee S_{dd}(n_2) \quad (13)$$

$$\text{and } F_{dd}^S(n) = S_{dd}(1) + \sum_{h=1}^k S_{dd}(p_h) + \sum_{h,t=1, h \neq t}^k \left[S_{dd}(p_h) \vee S_{dd}(p_t) \right] +$$

$$+ \sum_{h,t,q=1, h \neq t, q \neq t}^k \left[S_{dd}(p_h) \vee S_{dd}(p_t) \vee S_{dd}(p_q) \right] + \dots + S_{dd}(n) \quad (14)$$

$$S_{dd}(p^a) + F_{dd}^S(p^a) - F_{dd}^S(p^{a-1}). \quad (15)$$

Example: The Fibonacci sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1}$, with $F_1 = F_2 = 1$ ia s (sds), so for the generalised Smarandache function S_F attached to this sequence we have: $S_F(n_1 \vee n_2) = S_F(n_1) \vee S_F(n_2)$, and the calculus of $S_p(n)$ is reduced to the calculus of $S_F(p^a)$,

with p a prime number. For instance:

n	$S_F(n)$	n	$S_F(n)$	n	$S_F(n)$
1	1	7	8	13	21
2	3	8	6	14	24
3	4	9	24	15	20
4	6	10	15	16	12
5	5	11	20	17	
6	12	12	12	18	

$$F_{dd}^S(4) = 10, F_{dd}^S(8) = 16, F_{dd}^S(16) = 28, F_{dd}^S(15) = 30.$$

References:

- [1] M. Andrei, C. Dumitrescu, E. Radescu, N. Radescu, Some consideration concerning the Sumatory Function associated with Smarandache Function, Smarandache Notions Journal, vol.7, No.1-3, August 1996, p.63-69;
- [2] C. Dumitrescu, C. Rocsoreanu, Some connections between the Smarandache Function and the Fibonacci sequence, to appear;
- [3] E. Radescu, N. Radescu, C. Dumitrescu, On the Sumatory Function associated to the Smarandache Function, Smarandache Function Journal, vol 4-5, No.1, September 1994, p.17-21.

Current address:

University of Craiova - Department of Mathematics, Al. I. Cuza Street # 13
1100 Craiova, Romania.