

VISIBLE LATTICE POINTS IN PÓLYA'S WALK

MEIJIE LU AND XIANCHANG MENG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, for any integer $k \geq 2$, we study the distribution of the visible lattice points in certain generalized Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k : perturbed Pólya's walk and twisted Pólya's walk. For the first case, we prove that the density of visible lattice points in a perturbed Pólya's walk is almost surely $1/\zeta(k)$, where $\zeta(s)$ denotes the Riemann zeta function. A trivial case of our result covers the standard Pólya's walk. Moreover, we do numerical experiments for the second case, we conjecture that the density is also almost surely $1/\zeta(k)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Visible lattice points on \mathbb{Z}^k .** Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, in the k -dimensional integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^k , a lattice point $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k)$ is said to be visible from $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ if the straight line segment joining \mathbf{n} and \mathbf{m} contains no other lattice point. If \mathbf{n} is visible from the origin, we simply call it a visible point. This concept has been studied and used in various areas such as integer optimization and theoretical physics [5, 12, 35].

Visible lattice points are also widely concerned in number theory, for example, their density (or their numbers) in certain regions. Dirichlet [16] and Sylvester [41] proved that the density of visible lattice points on \mathbb{Z}^2 is $1/\zeta(2) = 6/\pi^2 \approx 0.607928$, where $\zeta(s)$ stands for the Riemann zeta function. Lehmer [27] and Christopher [14] considered the visible lattice points in higher dimensional lattices. They showed that the proportion of such points on \mathbb{Z}^k is $1/\zeta(k)$. Moreover, in [8, 24, 42], the authors gave asymptotic formulas for the number of visible points within a suitable smooth convex domains in \mathbb{R}^2 .

All the above results focus on the lattice points which are visible to only one point (i.e. the origin). Rearick in his Ph.D. thesis [37] first considered the lattice points which are visible from multiple M ($M = 2$ or 3) points, he proved that the density of such points on \mathbb{Z}^2 is $\prod_p (1 - M/p^2)$, where p runs over all primes. Then in [38], he generalized this result to the higher dimensional lattice \mathbb{Z}^k , as well as a general M , and gave an asymptotic formula for the number of such visible points. Later, Liu, Lu and Meng [31] improved the error term of this asymptotic formula. Further works on simultaneous visibility can be found in [10, 13, 39].

Other interesting questions related to visible points have been investigated before. For example, the minimum number problem, that is, the least number of lattice points that can be selected from $[1, n]^k \cap \mathbb{Z}^k$ such that each point of this lattice cube is visible from at least one of them. The reader can refer to [1, 2, 3] for the bound of this minimum number. Also, the visible points can be considered from its diffraction pattern [7], its ergodic properties [6], or its percolative properties [33].

The above concept of visibility can be generalized, namely, to consider the visibility along certain type of curves. See some recent works in this direction in [9, 20, 23, 30, 31].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A05, 11H06, 60G50, 60F15.

Key words and phrases. Pólya's walk, visible lattice points, Dirichlet distribution, greatest common divisors.

1.2. Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k . Random walks have received extensive attention in various disciplines: in mathematics, in biology and even in chemistry [11, 26]. In number theory, Lifshits and Weber [28] and Srichan [40] considered the Lindelöf hypothesis in Cauchy random walk; Jouve [25] connected the large sieve method with random walks on cosets of arithmetic group; McNew [34] studied random walks on the residues modulo n . In this paper, we focus on another type of random walks which is the so-called Pólya's walk.

Let $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be the set of positive integers, as Hales mentioned in [22], we describe the standard Pólya's walk $(\mathbf{p}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ on \mathbb{Z}^2 as follows: the walker starts from the initial point $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, p_{0,2}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^2$, and the jumps of the walker $\mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_i$ can only take two possible values: $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ (that is, the walker moves one unit right or up in \mathbb{Z}^2 at each step), where $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{i,1}, p_{i,2})$ is the coordinate of the i th step of the walker, and the corresponding probabilities are

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_i = (1, 0)) = \frac{p_{i,1}}{p_{i,1} + p_{i,2}}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_i = (0, 1)) = \frac{p_{i,2}}{p_{i,1} + p_{i,2}}.$$

It is natural to generalize this concept to higher dimensional lattice. Here we are interested in a general Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k . Let $s(\mathbf{v}) := v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ for vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \cdots, v_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, we define the perturbed Pólya's walk as following:

Definition 1.1 (Perturbed Pólya's walk). *Suppose $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \cdots, p_{0,k}) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ with all $p_{0,r} \geq B$, here $B > 0$ is a fixed constant, for fixed vector $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_k)$ satisfying all $|\beta_r| < B$ and $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_k = 0$, a perturbed Pólya walk $(\mathbf{p}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ started from \mathbf{p}_0 is given by*

$$\mathbf{p}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{Y}_{i+1}$$

for $i = 0, 1, \cdots$, where $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{i,1}, \cdots, p_{i,k})$ is the coordinate of the i th step and the jumps

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{Y}_{i+1} := \begin{cases} (1, 0, \cdots, 0), & \text{with probability } \frac{p_{i,1} + \beta_1}{s(\mathbf{p}_i)}, \\ (0, 1, \cdots, 0), & \text{with probability } \frac{p_{i,2} + \beta_2}{s(\mathbf{p}_i)}, \\ \cdots \\ (0, 0, \cdots, 1), & \text{with probability } \frac{p_{i,k} + \beta_k}{s(\mathbf{p}_i)}. \end{cases}$$

We emphasize that the above jumps are not independent. Besides, if the constant $B = 1$, and there is no perturbation, i.e. all $\beta_r = 0$ in (1.1), then the corresponding walk is the standard Pólya's walk with initial position $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$. In fact, the standard Pólya's walk can be interpreted in a different way, i.e. the Pólya's urn model:

Suppose there is an urn that consists of k different colored balls, and for convenience, we number these colors as $1, 2, \cdots, k$. At the beginning, suppose there are $p_{0,r}$ balls of color r , $r = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. Drawing a ball uniformly at random from the urn at each time, and observe the color, then return the drawn ball to the urn and add a ball of the same color. Repeat this process indefinitely. Let $p_{n,r}$ be the number of balls of color r after n successive random drawings, then the list $(p_{n,1}, \cdots, p_{n,k})$ denotes the composition of Pólya's urn after n drawings, and it is also the coordinate of the n th step \mathbf{p}_n of the standard Pólya's walk. For more information about this model, see [32].

1.3. Visible lattice points in perturbed Pólya's walk. Associated to the perturbed Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k , we consider a sequence of Bernoulli random variables $(V_i)_{i \geq 1}$ with each

$$(1.2) \quad V_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{p}_i \text{ is visible,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For integer $N \geq 1$, we denote

$$(1.3) \quad \overline{R}_k(N) := \overline{R}_k(N; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{p}_0) = \frac{1}{N}(V_1 + \cdots + V_N),$$

then the random variable $\overline{R}_k(N)$ represents the proportion of visible steps in the perturbed Pólya's walk in first N steps.

Under the above notations, the first result of this paper is

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose \mathbf{p}_0 and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are given as in Definition 1.1, then for any integer $k \geq 2$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \overline{R}_k(N) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

Theorem 1.2 tells us that the density of visible lattice points on a random path of the above perturbed Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k is almost surely $1/\zeta(k)$. In other words, this density in such a random walk is almost surely the asymptotic density of visible points in the whole space.

If we assume $B = 1$ and $\beta_r = 0$ for all $1 \leq r \leq k$ in the definition of perturbed Pólya's walk, then Theorem 1.2 holds for the standard Pólya's walk, we give the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. *The density of visible lattice points visited by a k -dimensional standard Pólya's walk with starting point $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$ is almost surely $1/\zeta(k)$.*

Observe that Corollary 1.3 covers Theorem 1 of [18] for $k = 2$.

Next we verify the above results by doing experiments using random generator in Python. In this process, we consider the perturbed Pólya's walk in two or three-dimensional lattice, and calculate the density of visible steps within 100000 steps. Since our results are "almost surely", we do the same calculation 10 times then take the average. We list the numerical densities on \mathbb{Z}^2 and \mathbb{Z}^3 for some values of \mathbf{p}_0 , $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and B in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

We should point out that the densities for $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (0, 0)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (0, 0, 0)$ in Tables 1 and 2 are the numerical densities in standard Pólya's walk started at \mathbf{p}_0 .

Recall from Theorem 1.2 that the theoretical density on \mathbb{Z}^2 (or \mathbb{Z}^3) is almost surely $1/\zeta(2) \approx 0.607928$ (or $1/\zeta(3) \approx 0.831907$). We see that, the numerical densities in the following two tables fit very well with the conclusion in our Theorem 1.2.

1.4. Visible lattice points in twisted Pólya's walk. We consider another generalization of the Pólya's walk in this subsection.

Definition 1.4 (Twisted Pólya's walk). *Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_r = (\gamma_{r,1}, \dots, \gamma_{r,k})$, $\forall 1 \leq r \leq k$ be fixed non-zero vectors such that $0 \leq \gamma_{r,1}, \dots, \gamma_{r,k} \leq 1$ for each r and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \cdots + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k = \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$, we define the twisted Pólya's walk $(\mathbf{q}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ with the starting point $\mathbf{q}_0 = (q_{0,1}, \dots, q_{0,k}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$:*

$$\mathbf{q}_{i+1} = \mathbf{q}_i + \mathbf{Z}_{i+1}$$

	\mathbf{p}_0	β	Numerical density
$B = 1$	(1, 1)	(0, 0)	0.607958
		(0.6, -0.6)	0.605907
	(2, 4)	(-0.3, 0.3)	0.607895
		(-0.8, 0.8)	0.607566
$B = 6.5$	(7, 9)	(2.5, -2.5)	0.608319
		(6, -6)	0.608122
	(10, 8)	(-3.5, 3.5)	0.608336
		(-5, 5)	0.607564
$B = 10$	(11, 14)	(7, -7)	0.607236
		(9.5, -9.5)	0.607387
	(12, 10)	(-7.5, 7.5)	0.608467
		(-8, 8)	0.606947
$B = 15.5$	(16, 18)	(11.5, -11.5)	0.608013
		(14, -14)	0.607194
	(20, 17)	(-12, 12)	0.607943
		(-13.5, 13.5)	0.607483

TABLE 1. Density of visible points in perturbed Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^2

	\mathbf{p}_0	β	Numerical density
$B = 1$	(1, 1, 1)	(0, 0, 0)	0.831783
		(0.2, -0.3, 0.1)	0.831642
	(2, 3, 6)	(-0.3, 0.5, -0.2)	0.831845
		(-0.7, -0.1, 0.8)	0.831466
$B = 6.5$	(7, 9, 7)	(2.5, 2, -4.5)	0.832073
		(3, -4.5, 1.5)	0.832442
	(10, 8, 9)	(-2.5, 4.5, -2)	0.832214
		(-1, 5.5, -4.5)	0.831663
$B = 10$	(11, 14, 15)	(7, -3.5, -3.5)	0.831966
		(8, 1.5, -9.5)	0.831787
	(12, 10, 10)	(-7.5, 7.5, 0)	0.831789
		(-8, -1.5, 9.5)	0.832312
$B = 15.5$	(16, 18, 19)	(11.5, -2, -9.5)	0.831314
		(14, -8.5, -5.5)	0.831345
	(20, 17, 18)	(-12, 11.5, 0.5)	0.832540
		(-13.5, -0.5, 14)	0.832322

TABLE 2. Density of visible points in perturbed Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^3

for $i = 0, 1, \dots$, where the random vectors

$$\mathbf{Z}_{i+1} := \begin{cases} (1, 0, \dots, 0), & \text{with probability } \frac{\gamma_1 \cdot \mathbf{q}_i}{s(\mathbf{q}_i)}, \\ (0, 1, \dots, 0), & \text{with probability } \frac{\gamma_2 \cdot \mathbf{q}_i}{s(\mathbf{q}_i)}, \\ \dots & \\ (0, 0, \dots, 1), & \text{with probability } \frac{\gamma_k \cdot \mathbf{q}_i}{s(\mathbf{q}_i)}. \end{cases}$$

with $\gamma \cdot \mathbf{q}$ denotes the inner product of the two vectors.

For the special case $\gamma_r = \mathbf{e}_r$ for all $1 \leq r \leq k$ (here $\mathbf{e}_r \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ stands for the vector whose r th component is 1 and 0 elsewhere), the above twisted walk gives the standard Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^k .

For the twisted Pólya's walk, we are not equipped with tools to theoretically derive the density of visible lattice points except for the special case when $\gamma_r = \mathbf{e}_r$. This is because in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we take advantage of the fact that the joint mass function of the jumps \mathbf{Y}_i only depend on the number of $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k$ appearing among $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ but not on the order of \mathbf{Y}_i (see Lemma 3.2), while in the generic twisted Pólya's walk, the joint mass function of these \mathbf{Z}_i does not have such property. Nevertheless, we do some experiments by Python to numerically predict the value of this density in the twisted walk. Here we also focus on the case $k = 2$ or 3 and take some values of γ_r and \mathbf{q}_0 , we give the numerical densities in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

γ_1	γ_2	Numerical for $\mathbf{q}_0 = (1, 1)$	Numerical for $\mathbf{q}_0 = (2, 4)$
(0, 1)	(1, 0)	0.608150	0.608135
(0.1, 0.2)	(0.9, 0.8)	0.607663	0.607611
(0.1, 0.35)	(0.9, 0.65)	0.608554	0.608025
(0.3, 0.45)	(0.7, 0.55)	0.607971	0.607023
(0.3, 0.6)	(0.7, 0.4)	0.607800	0.608095
(0.6, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.8)	0.607967	0.607320
(0.6, 0.6)	(0.4, 0.4)	0.607713	0.607452
(0.9, 0.75)	(0.1, 0.25)	0.607861	0.608326
(0.9, 0.9)	(0.1, 0.1)	0.607695	0.607914
(1, 0)	(0, 1)	0.608398	0.608098

TABLE 3. Density of visible points in twisted Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^2

γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	$\mathbf{q}_0 = (1, 1, 1)$	$\mathbf{q}_0 = (2, 3, 6)$
(0, 1, 0)	(0, 0, 1)	(1, 0, 0)	0.832074	0.832303
(0, 0, 1)	(1, 0, 0)	(0, 1, 0)	0.831954	0.832463
(0.1, 0.2, 0.3)	(0.1, 0.3, 0.4)	(0.8, 0.5, 0.3)	0.831710	0.832078
(0.2, 0.3, 0.4)	(0.2, 0.5, 0.6)	(0.6, 0.2, 0)	0.831557	0.831922
(0.3, 0.1, 0.6)	(0.3, 0.4, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.5, 0.2)	0.831985	0.831551
(0.5, 0.1, 0.4)	(0.5, 0.6, 0.5)	(0, 0.3, 0.1)	0.832265	0.832151
(0.7, 0.1, 0.1)	(0.1, 0.9, 0.2)	(0.2, 0, 0.7)	0.831360	0.832062
(0.8, 0.2, 0.1)	(0.1, 0.7, 0.1)	(0.1, 0.1, 0.8)	0.831532	0.832084
(0.9, 0.1, 0.1)	(0.1, 0.8, 0.1)	(0, 0.1, 0.8)	0.831906	0.832529
(1, 0, 0)	(0, 1, 0)	(0, 0, 1)	0.831914	0.831933

TABLE 4. Density of visible points in twisted Pólya's walk on \mathbb{Z}^3

We find that, on one hand, the numerical values of the corresponding densities in the above two tables are very close to $1/\zeta(2)$ and $1/\zeta(3)$, respectively; on the other hand, as we have already mentioned above, the twisted walk is the standard walk for $\gamma_r = \mathbf{e}_r$, $1 \leq r \leq k$, the numerical calculations show that as we vary the values of γ_r away from \mathbf{e}_r , we didn't

observe any dramatic change compared to the standard Pólya's walk of which case we have proved theoretically. Hence we propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.5. *For any integer $k \geq 2$ and any given initial point $\mathbf{q}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$, the density of visible lattice points visited by the twisted Pólya's walk in Definition 1.4 is almost surely $1/\zeta(k)$.*

Here we give a heuristic why we believe this conjecture. We may consider this twisted Pólya's walk in the following new coordinate system,

$$y_j := \gamma_j \cdot (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k), \quad 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Let $\mathbf{q}'_i = (q'_{i,1}, \dots, q'_{i,k})$ be the i -th step coordinate of the walker in the new coordinate system. Then the probability distribution of walking to each direction is the same as in the standard Pólya's walk in the new system, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{walking to the } j\text{-th direction}) = \frac{q'_{i,j}}{q'_{i,1} + \dots + q'_{i,k}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

However, after changing of variables, the possible waking directions in the new system are not the same as the positive axis directions anymore. This is where the difficulty is. Instead of considering visible steps in the first quadrant, in the new system we need to consider the distribution of visible steps in a restricted sector. In a sector shape, the density of all visible lattice points should be the same as in the whole plane. Hence, it is reasonable to believe this density result is also true for visible steps in such a Pólya's walk. Moreover, numerical experiments give strong support for our conjecture.

Notations. As usual, \mathbb{C} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Z} and $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ denote the sets of complex numbers, real numbers, integers and positive integers, respectively; $\Re(s)$ means the real part of a complex number s ; ε denotes a sufficiently small positive number and p represents a prime.

We apply $\log(x)$ for the logarithmic function $\ln x$ and $\gcd(m_1, \dots, m_l)$ for the greatest common divisor of integers m_1, \dots, m_l which are not all zero.

We use \mathbb{P} , \mathbb{E} and \mathbb{V} to mean taking probability, expectation and variances, respectively.

The expression $f(n) = O(g(n))$ (or $f \ll g$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ means there exist an integer $M \geq 1$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(n)| \leq Cg(n)$ for $n \geq M$. When the constant C depends on some parameters ρ , we write $f = O_\rho(g)$ (or $f \ll_\rho g$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, the vector $\mathbf{e}_r \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, $1 \leq r \leq k$, denotes the k -dimensional vector whose r th component is 1 and 0 elsewhere.

For vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, we always write $s(\mathbf{v}) := v_1 + \dots + v_k$.

For integer $k \geq 2$ and nonnegative integers n, u_1, \dots, u_k with $u_1 + \dots + u_k = n$, we always write the multinomial coefficient

$$\binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} := \frac{n!}{u_1! \dots u_k!}.$$

As a convention, the above formula is of value 1 for $n = 0$. Besides, assume $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})$ satisfying $0 < \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1} < 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{k-1} < 1$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$, we denote

$$(1.4) \quad P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} := \binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} \alpha_1^{u_1} \dots \alpha_{k-1}^{u_{k-1}} \left(1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r\right)^{u_k}.$$

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Review of number-theoretic functions and related results. For Möbius function $\mu(d)$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, it is known that

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 1, \\ 0, & n > 1. \end{cases}$$

Further, for integer $l \geq 2$, we have the identity

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^l} = \frac{1}{\zeta(l)}.$$

For divisor function $\tau(d) = \sum_{t|d} 1$, one may refer to page 296 of [4] to get an upper bound $\tau(d) \ll_{\varepsilon} d^{\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

The Euler gamma function $\Gamma(s)$, $s \in \mathbb{C}$, has the functional equation $\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s)$. Moreover, $\Gamma(s)$ satisfies the well-known Dirichlet integral formula (see [17] and [21]), namely, for integer $l \geq 1$ and real numbers $b_1, \dots, b_{l+1} > 0$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\Gamma(b_1) \cdots \Gamma(b_{l+1})}{\Gamma(b_1 + \cdots + b_{l+1})} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t_1^{b_1-1} \cdots t_l^{b_l-1} \left(1 - \sum_{m=1}^l t_m\right)^{b_{l+1}-1} dt_1 \cdots dt_l,$$

where the integration area T is

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{T} := \left\{ (t_1, \dots, t_l) : 0 < t_m < 1, \sum_{m=1}^l t_m < 1 \right\}.$$

The right hand side of the above (2.7) is the so-called multivariate Beta function:

$$(2.9) \quad \text{Beta}(\mathbf{b}) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} t_1^{b_1-1} \cdots t_l^{b_l-1} \left(1 - \sum_{m=1}^l t_m\right)^{b_{l+1}-1} dt_1 \cdots dt_l,$$

where $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{l+1})$.

2.2. The Dirichlet distribution. The Dirichlet distribution is also known as the multivariate Beta distribution. We give the following definition. Further properties of the Dirichlet distribution can be found in [19] and [36].

Definition 2.1. Let $l \geq 1$ be an integer and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{l+1})$ with all $a_m > 0$. A continuous random vector $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_l)$ has a Dirichlet distribution of dimension l , with parameter \mathbf{a} , if the probability density function $\text{Di}_l(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{a})$ is

$$\text{Di}_l(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{a}) = \prod_{m=1}^l t_m^{a_m-1} \left(1 - \sum_{m=1}^l t_m\right)^{a_{l+1}-1} \frac{1}{\text{Beta}(\mathbf{a})},$$

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_l)$ satisfying $0 < t_m < 1$ for any $1 \leq m \leq l$ and $\sum_{m=1}^l t_m < 1$.

Let $t_{l+1} := 1 - \sum_{m=1}^l t_m$, and \mathbb{T} be given by (2.8), then for $m \in \{1, \dots, l\}$,

$$(2.10) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} (t_m t_{l+1})^{-1/2} \text{Di}_l(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{a}) dt_1 \cdots dt_l < \infty$$

if and only if $a_m > 1/2$ and $a_{l+1} > 1/2$; and

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} (t_m t_{l+1})^{-1} \text{Di}_l(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{a}) dt_1 \cdots dt_l < \infty$$

if and only if $a_m > 1$ and $a_{l+1} > 1$.

2.3. Some useful lemmas from number theory. This subsection gives several results needed for this paper. We begin with the criteria of visibility of lattice points on \mathbb{Z}^k .

Lemma 2.2 ([37]). *For any integer $k \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, the lattice point \mathbf{n} is visible if and only if $\gcd(n_1, \dots, n_k) = 1$.*

The next two lemmas are used several times in Section 4.

Lemma 2.3 ([15]). *We have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} n^{-1} = \log x + \gamma + O(x^{-1})$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where γ is Euler's constant, and for any real number $\theta > 1$ and $x \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} n^{-1/2} = O(x^{1/2}), \quad \sum_{n > x} n^{-\theta} = O_\theta(x^{1-\theta}).$$

Lemma 2.4 ([29], Lemma 2.9). *For any real number $x \geq 2$, we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq x} n^{-1/2} = O(x^{3/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq x} (m - n)^{-1/2} = O(x^{3/2}).$$

3. DENSITY OF VISIBLE LATTICE POINTS IN PERTURBED PÓLYA'S WALK ON \mathbb{Z}^k

This section gives proof of Theorem 1.2. Without loss generality, we only deal with the perturbed Pólya's walk with the constant $B = 1$ in Definition 1.1. We start with the following lemma, which is essentially the second moment method from probability theory.

Lemma 3.1 ([18], Proposition 8). *Let $(X_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of uniformly bounded random variables, and let*

$$\bar{S}_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_i.$$

If $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\bar{S}_N) = \rho$, and there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that the variance $\mathbb{V}(\bar{S}_N) = O(N^{-\delta})$ for $N \geq 1$, then we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{S}_N = \rho$$

almost surely.

By Lemma 3.1, the main work is to compute the mean and variance of $\bar{R}_k(N)$. Before that, we consider the joint mass function of the sequence of jumps $(\mathbf{Y}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined in Definition 1.1. Let $\mathbf{e}_r \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, $1 \leq r \leq k$, be the k -dimensional vector whose r th component is 1 and 0 elsewhere. We have the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})$ with $0 < \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1} < 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{k-1} < 1$, then for any integer $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k\}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) = \int_A \alpha_1^{t_n^{(1)}} \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^{t_n^{(k-1)}} \left(1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r\right)^{t_n^{(k)}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1},$$

where $t_n^{(r)}$ is the number of \mathbf{e}_r among $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$, and

$$(3.12) \quad A := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}) : 0 < \alpha_r < 1, \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r < 1 \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.2 tells us that, the joint mass function of these \mathbf{Y}_i only depends on the number of $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k$ among $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$ but not on the order of \mathbf{Y}_i .

Proof. We write $\mathbf{y}_i := (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,k})$ with $y_{i,r} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $y_{i,1} + \dots + y_{i,k} = 1$, then the conditional probability formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_2 = \mathbf{y}_2 \mid \mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1) \cdots \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n \mid \mathbf{Y}_{n-1} = \mathbf{y}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the definition of \mathbf{Y}_i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) \\ &= \prod_{r=1}^k \left(\frac{p_{0,r} + \beta_r}{s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \right)^{y_{1,r}} \prod_{r=1}^k \left(\frac{p_{0,r} + \beta_r + y_{1,r}}{s(\mathbf{p}_0) + 1} \right)^{y_{2,r}} \cdots \prod_{r=1}^k \left(\frac{p_{0,r} + \beta_r + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} y_{i,r}}{s(\mathbf{p}_0) + n - 1} \right)^{y_{n,r}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we infer that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) = \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{t_n^{(1)}-1} (p_{0,1} + \beta_1 + j) \cdots \prod_{j=0}^{t_n^{(k)}-1} (p_{0,k} + \beta_k + j)}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (s(\mathbf{p}_0) + j)},$$

where $t_n^{(r)}$ ($1 \leq r \leq k$) is the number of 1's in $y_{1,r}, \dots, y_{n,r}$ and is also the number of \mathbf{e}_r among $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$.

From the equation $\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s)$ and the fact that $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k = 0$, we represent the above joint mass function as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) = \frac{\Gamma(p_{0,1} + \beta_1 + t_n^{(1)}) \cdots \Gamma(p_{0,k} + \beta_k + t_n^{(k)}) \Gamma(s(\mathbf{p}_0))}{\Gamma(s(\mathbf{p}_0) + n) \Gamma(p_{0,1} + \beta_1) \cdots \Gamma(p_{0,k} + \beta_k)}.$$

Using formula (2.7) and (2.9), we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) = \frac{\text{Beta}(\mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta} + (t_n^{(1)}, \dots, t_n^{(k)}))}{\text{Beta}(\mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta})}.$$

We get immediately from the definition of Dirichlet distribution and (2.9) that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{y}_n) = \int_A \alpha_1^{t_n^{(1)}} \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^{t_n^{(k-1)}} \left(1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r\right)^{t_n^{(k)}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1},$$

where A is defined in (3.12), which is our desired result. \square

Remark. By the definition of perturbed Pólya's walk, we see that the n th step $\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Y}_i$, this implies \mathbf{p}_n is of the form $\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ for some $0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n$ with $u_1 + \dots + u_k = n$, where u_r denotes the number of \mathbf{e}_r among $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$, hence

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k)) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Y}_i = (u_1, \dots, u_k)\right) = \binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n).$$

Then Lemma 3.2 ensures that

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k)) = \int_A P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \alpha} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\alpha | \mathbf{p}_0 + \beta) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1},$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ and $P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \alpha}$ is defined by (1.4). Similarly, for $m > n \geq 1$ and some $0 \leq v_1, \dots, v_k \leq m - n$ with $v_1 + \dots + v_k = m - n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k), \mathbf{p}_m = \mathbf{p}_n + (v_1, \dots, v_k)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Y}_i = (u_1, \dots, u_k), \sum_{i=n+1}^m \mathbf{Y}_i = (v_1, \dots, v_k)\right) \\ &= \binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} \binom{m-n}{v_1, \dots, v_k} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_m), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that, for $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$,

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k), \mathbf{p}_m = \mathbf{p}_n + (v_1, \dots, v_k)) \\ &= \int_A P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \alpha} P_{m-n, \mathbf{v}, \alpha} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\alpha | \mathbf{p}_0 + \beta) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of Lemma 3.2, we have the following results for the expectation and variance of $\bar{R}_k(N)$. The proofs are given in Section 4.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ is the starting point of the perturbed walk with all $p_{0,r} \geq 2$, and the perturbation $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ satisfying all $|\beta_r| < 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{R}_k(N)) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ is the starting point of the perturbed walk with all $p_{0,r} \geq 2$, and the perturbation $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ satisfying all $|\beta_r| < 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{V}(\bar{R}_k(N)) = O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

The rest of this subsection is devoted to prove Theorem 1.2 by the above two propositions.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For the initial point $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ satisfying $p_{0,r} \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq r \leq k$, the result holds by Propositions 3.3 and 3.4, and Lemma 3.1.

If there exists some $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p_{0,t} = 1$, without loss of generality, we suppose $p_{0,k} = 1$ and $p_{0,r} \geq 1$ for any $1 \leq r \leq k-1$. Next we want to prove that the probability of $\mathbf{p}_n = (p_{n,1}, \dots, p_{n,k-1}, 1)$ tends to 0 as n approaches ∞ . Note that \mathbf{p}_n can be written as $\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ for some $0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n$ and $u_1 + \dots + u_k = n$, hence this is equivalent to prove $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) = 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By (3.13), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) = \frac{n!}{u_1! \cdots u_{k-1}!} \int_{\Lambda} \alpha_1^{u_1} \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^{u_{k-1}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1}$$

for some $0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_{k-1} \leq n$ and $u_1 + \dots + u_{k-1} = n$. The Dirichlet integral formula (2.7) gives us that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) = \frac{n!}{u_1! \cdots u_{k-1}!} \frac{\prod_{r=1}^{k-1} \Gamma(u_r + p_{0,r} + \beta_r) \Gamma(\beta_k + 1)}{\Gamma(n + 1 + p_{0,1} + \dots + p_{0,k-1})} \frac{1}{\text{Beta}(\mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta})}.$$

Using the estimate

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{\Gamma(s + u)}{\Gamma(s)} \ll (|s| + 1)^\kappa e^{\frac{\pi}{2}|u|}$$

with $|\arg s| \leq \pi - \varepsilon$, $\Re(s) = \sigma > 0$ and $\Re(u) = \kappa > -\sigma$, we obtain

$$\frac{\Gamma(u_r + p_{0,r} + \beta_r)}{u_r!} = \frac{\Gamma(u_r + 1 + p_{0,r} + \beta_r - 1)}{\Gamma(u_r + 1)} \ll (u_r + 2)^{p_{0,r} + \beta_r - 1}$$

for each $u_r \geq 0$, and for integer $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\frac{n!}{\Gamma(n + 1 + p_{0,1} + \dots + p_{0,k-1})} \ll (n + 2 + p_{0,1} + \dots + p_{0,k-1})^{-(p_{0,1} + \dots + p_{0,k-1})}.$$

Combining all above gives, we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) \ll \frac{\prod_{r=1}^{k-1} (u_r + 2)^{p_{0,r} + \beta_r}}{(n + 2)^{p_{0,1} + \dots + p_{0,k-1}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{r=1}^{k-1} (u_r + 2)} \ll \frac{1}{(n + 2)^{\beta_k}} \frac{1}{\prod_{r=1}^{k-1} (u_r + 2)},$$

where the fact $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_k = 0$ is used for the last estimate.

Since $u_1 + \dots + u_{k-1} = n$, there exists some $r_0 \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ satisfies $n/(k-1) \leq u_{r_0} \leq n$, then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) \ll \frac{1}{(n + 2)^{\beta_k}} \frac{1}{(u_{r_0} + 2)} \ll_k \frac{1}{(n + 2)^{1 + \beta_k}}$$

It follows from our assumption $|\beta_r| < 1$ for all r that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, 0)) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is what we want to prove.

From this we conclude that the walker will reach a new point \mathbf{p}'_0 satisfying $p'_{0,k} \geq 2$ with probability one. At this moment, if all $p'_{0,r} \geq 2$, then Theorem 1.2 holds; otherwise, we repeat the above process, then the walker eventually enters the region $\{(m_1, \dots, m_k) : m_r \geq 2, \forall 1 \leq r \leq k\}$ with probability 1. This gives Theorem 1.2. \square

4. COMPUTE THE EXPECTATION AND VARIANCE OF $\overline{R}_k(N)$

Our goal in this section is to prove Propositions 3.3 and 3.4. To get started, we introduce the following useful lemma which is a crucial ingredient in this paper.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $n \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$ be integers and $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})$ satisfying $0 < \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1} < 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{k-1} < 1$. Then for any integer $d \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ u_r \equiv c_r \pmod{d}, \\ \forall 1 \leq r \leq k-1}} \binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} \alpha_1^{u_1} \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^{u_{k-1}} \alpha_k^{u_k} = \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_k \left(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\alpha_k := 1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r$.

The proof of Lemma 4.1 is a little bit complicated, and we give the proof in Section 5. First we use it to prove Propositions 3.3 and 3.4.

4.1. The asymptotic formula for the expectation of $\bar{R}_k(N)$. We write Proposition 3.3 again for the convenience of the reader:

Proposition 3.3. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ is the starting point of the perturbed walk with all $p_{0,r} \geq 2$, and the perturbation $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ satisfying all $|\beta_r| < 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{R}_k(N)) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} + O_{k,\varepsilon,\mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. We recall from (1.2) and (1.3) that

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbb{E}(\bar{R}_k(N)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n \text{ is visible}).$$

Then by (3.13), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n) = \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k)) = \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1}$$

with $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$, here, for notational simplicity, we write

$$\sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} := \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ (u_1 + p_{0,1}, \dots, u_k + p_{0,k}) \text{ is visible}}}.$$

It is readily to seen from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ \gcd(u_1 + p_{0,1}, \dots, u_k + p_{0,k}) = 1}} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ \gcd(u_1 + p_{0,1}, \dots, u_{k-1} + p_{0,k-1}, n + s(\mathbf{p}_0)) = 1}} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}},$$

where $s(\mathbf{v}) := v_1 + \dots + v_k$ for vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$. Hence by the well-known formula (2.5), we may write

$$\sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{d | n + s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ d | u_r + p_{0,r}, \forall 1 \leq r \leq k-1}} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}}.$$

We apply Lemma 4.1 for the inner sum and use the fact $|\mu(d)| \leq 1$, there holds

$$(4.17) \quad \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_k(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \tau(n+s(\mathbf{p}_0))),$$

here we used the formula that $\log x = O_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $x \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the bound of divisor function is

$$\tau(n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)) \ll_\varepsilon (n+s(\mathbf{p}_0))^\varepsilon \ll_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0} n^\varepsilon,$$

which implies

$$\sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Gathering the above results we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n) = \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1}.$$

Since $p_{0,r} \geq 2$ implies that $p_{0,r} + \beta_r > 1$ for any $1 \leq r \leq k$, by (2.10), the above integral is convergent, which gives

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n) = \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$$

for all $p_{0,r} \geq 2$. This combines (4.16) and Lemma 2.3 yields

$$(4.18) \quad \mathbb{E}(\bar{R}_k(N)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

For the first term on the right hand of the above equation, we denote

$$G_{N,k} := G_{N,k}(\mathbf{p}_0) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} = \sum_{1 \leq d \leq N+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq N \\ n \equiv -s(\mathbf{p}_0) \pmod{d}}} 1.$$

Observe that the number of $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfying $n \equiv -s(\mathbf{p}_0) \pmod{d}$ has the asymptotic formula $N/d + O(1)$, then we arrive at

$$G_{N,k} = N \sum_{1 \leq d \leq N+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^k} + O\left(\sum_{1 \leq d \leq N+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{1}{d} \right).$$

Appealing to Lemma 2.3 for the O -term, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} G_{N,k} &= N \sum_{1 \leq d \leq N+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^k} + O_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^\varepsilon) \\ &= N \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^k} + O\left(N \sum_{d > N+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{1}{d^k} \right) + O_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Then we get from Lemma 2.3 and (2.6) that

$$(4.19) \quad G_{N,k} = \frac{N}{\zeta(k)} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^\varepsilon).$$

This completes our proof by collecting (4.18) and (4.19). \square

4.2. **Estimating the variance of $\overline{R}_k(N)$.** We recall Proposition 3.4 as follows:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Suppose $\mathbf{p}_0 = (p_{0,1}, \dots, p_{0,k})$ is the starting point of the perturbed walk with all $p_{0,r} \geq 2$, and the perturbation $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ satisfying all $|\beta_r| < 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{V}(\overline{R}_k(N)) = O_{k,\varepsilon,\mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. We write the variance

$$(4.20) \quad \mathbb{V}(\overline{R}_k(N)) = \mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N)^2) - \mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N))^2.$$

By virtue of Proposition 3.3, the contribution of the last term to the variance of $\overline{R}_k(N)$ is

$$(4.21) \quad \mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N))^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(k)}\right)^2 + O_{k,\varepsilon,\mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

To compute $\mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N)^2)$, we expand the square and obtain

$$(4.22) \quad \mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N)^2) = \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n^2).$$

For the last sum of (4.22), we have trivially

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n^2) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n \text{ is visible}) = O(N).$$

For $1 \leq n < m \leq N$, note that

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n \text{ and } \mathbf{p}_m \text{ are both visible}).$$

Recall from (3.14) that

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) &= \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_n = \mathbf{p}_0 + (u_1, \dots, u_k), \mathbf{p}_m = \mathbf{p}_n + (v_1, \dots, v_k)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{A}} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} P_{m-n, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \text{Di}_{k-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} | \mathbf{p}_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta}) d\alpha_1 \cdots d\alpha_{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} := \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ (u_1 + p_{0,1}, \dots, u_k + p_{0,k}) \text{ is visible}}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_1, \dots, v_k \leq m-n \\ v_1 + \dots + v_k = m-n \\ (u_1 + p_{0,1} + v_1, \dots, u_k + p_{0,k} + v_k) \text{ is visible}}}.$$

By a similar argument as that yields (4.17), we obtain

$$\sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} P_{m-n, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{d|m-n+s(\mathbf{p}_0+\mathbf{u})} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_k((m-n)^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \tau(m-n+s(\mathbf{p}_0+\mathbf{u}))).$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \alpha} P_{m-n, \mathbf{v}, \alpha} \\ &= \left(\sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) \right) \\ & \left(\sum_{d|m+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}((m-n)^{-1/2+\varepsilon} m^\varepsilon) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. We use the bound

$$(4.25) \quad \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \ll \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} \ll \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} 1 \ll_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0} n^\varepsilon$$

to expand the above formula, and for the sum related to $\alpha_t \alpha_k$, we apply the estimate $1/\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k} \leq 1/\alpha_t \alpha_k$ and

$$\left(\sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} \right)^2 \ll_k \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\alpha_t \alpha_k},$$

then there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_k} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_k} P_{n, \mathbf{u}, \alpha} P_{m-n, \mathbf{v}, \alpha} \\ &= \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{d|m+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\alpha_t \alpha_k} O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^\varepsilon m^\varepsilon (m-n)^{-1/2+\varepsilon} + n^{-1/2+\varepsilon} m^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Next we insert this identity into (4.24), and then use (2.11) for the convergence of the integral, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) = \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{d|m+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(n^\varepsilon m^\varepsilon (m-n)^{-1/2+\varepsilon} + n^{-1/2+\varepsilon} m^\varepsilon)$$

for $p_{0,r} \geq 2$, $\forall 1 \leq r \leq k$. To continue the computation, we sum over $1 \leq n < m \leq N$, getting

$$\sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) = \sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{d|m+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{3/2+\varepsilon}),$$

thanks to Lemma 2.4. To simplify the first term on the right side of the equation, by (4.25), we may add diagonal terms up to an error term $O_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{1+\varepsilon})$, then

$$\sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sum_{d|n+s(\mathbf{p}_0)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \right)^2 + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{3/2+\varepsilon}).$$

We get immediately from (4.19) that

$$(4.26) \quad \sum_{1 \leq n < m \leq N} \mathbb{E}(V_n V_m) = \frac{N^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(k)} \right)^2 + O_{k, \varepsilon, \mathbf{p}_0}(N^{3/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Gathering together all the pieces (4.22), (4.23) and (4.26), we get

$$\mathbb{E}(\overline{R}_k(N)^2) = \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(k)}\right)^2 + O_{k,\varepsilon,\mathbf{p}_0}(N^{-1/2+\varepsilon}),$$

which together with (4.21) and (4.20) yields our required result. \square

5. THE PROOF OF KEY LEMMA

In this section, we provide a proof of Lemma 4.1 by tools from analytic number theory. In order to prove Lemma 4.1, we need the following Lemmas 5.1-5.4.

Lemma 5.1. *For any integer $m \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have*

$$\alpha^m \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Proof. The result is essentially from the bound for binomial probability in [18]

$$\max_{0 \leq t \leq m} \binom{m}{t} \alpha^t (1-\alpha)^{m-t} \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{m\alpha(1-\alpha)}},$$

where $C > 0$ is a certain constant. \square

We use the following estimate in terms of cosine function.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $d > 2$ be an integer, then we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) \ll \sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h}{d}\right)$$

for integer $l \geq 0$, and for $l \geq 1$, there holds

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < \frac{d}{2}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h}{d}\right) \ll \frac{d}{\sqrt{l}}.$$

Proof. For the first estimate, we only consider $l \geq 1$. Using change of variable $h' = 2h$, we obtain

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h' < d \\ h' \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h'}{d}\right).$$

Splitting the sum into two parts gives us

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h' < d/2 \\ h' \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h'}{d}\right) + \sum_{\substack{d/2 < h' < d \\ h' \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h'}{d}\right).$$

For the last summation, we write $t = d - h'$ and obtain

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h' < d/2 \\ h' \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h'}{d}\right) + (-1)^l \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t < d/2 \\ t \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi t}{d}\right)$$

for even d , and

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h' < d/2 \\ h' \text{ even}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h'}{d}\right) + (-1)^l \sum_{\substack{1 \leq t < d/2 \\ t \text{ odd}}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi t}{d}\right)$$

for odd d , which is our desired result.

For the second assertion, since $\cos^l(\pi t/d)$ is decreasing for $t \in [0, d/2]$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq h < \frac{d}{2}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h}{d}\right) \ll \int_0^{\frac{d}{2}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi t}{d}\right) dt.$$

Using change of variable $x = \pi t/d$ and the formula

$$\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos^l(x) dx = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\frac{l+1}{2})}{2\Gamma(\frac{l+2}{2})},$$

where $\Gamma(s)$ is the Euler gamma function, we obtain

$$(5.27) \quad \sum_{1 \leq h < \frac{d}{2}} \cos^l\left(\frac{\pi h}{d}\right) \ll d \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos^l(x) dx \ll \frac{d\Gamma(\frac{l+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{l+2}{2})}.$$

Applying the estimate (3.15) with $s = (l+2)/2$ and $u = -1/2$, we arrive at

$$\frac{\Gamma(\frac{l+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{l+2}{2})} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{l+2}{2} - \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{l+2}{2})} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{l}}.$$

This together with (5.27) gives our desired result. \square

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then for any integer $d > 1$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq d-1} \left(1 - \delta + \delta \cos\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right)\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} O\left(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. To simplify our notations, we denote

$$H_{n,\delta} = H_{n,\delta}(d) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq d-1} \left(1 - \delta + \delta \cos\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right)\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

For the case $d = 2$, by virtue of Lemma 5.1, we get

$$H_{n,\delta} \ll (1 - 2\delta)^{\frac{n}{2}} \ll (1 - \delta)^{\frac{n}{2}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

So we only need to handle the remaining case $d > 2$.

If $n = 2m$ is even, we resort to the binomial theorem and obtain

$$H_{n,\delta} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m} \binom{m}{l} (1 - \delta)^{m-l} \delta^l \sum_{1 \leq h \leq d-1} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right).$$

By an elementary argument, we derive

$$\sum_{1 \leq h \leq d-1} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) = 2 \sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right) + \epsilon_d (-1)^l,$$

where

$$\epsilon_d = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d \text{ is even,} \\ 0, & \text{if } d \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 5.2 and the binomial theorem again, we have

$$H_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{d} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m} \binom{m}{l} (1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l I(l, d) + (1-2\delta)^m,$$

where

$$I(l, d) := \sum_{1 \leq h < d/2} \cos^l \left(\frac{\pi h}{d} \right).$$

Then Lemma 5.1 tells us that the bound of the last term is

$$(1-2\delta)^m \ll (1-\delta)^m \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

We divide the sum over l into two parts according to $l \leq m/\log^2 m$ or not, then

$$(5.28) \quad H_{n,\delta} \ll H'_{n,\delta} + H''_{n,\delta} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}},$$

where

$$H'_{n,\delta} := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m/\log^2 m} \binom{m}{l} (1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l I(l, d)$$

and

$$H''_{n,\delta} := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m/\log^2 m < l \leq m} \binom{m}{l} (1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l I(l, d).$$

For $H'_{n,\delta}$, we use the trivial bound $|\cos(x)| \leq 1$ and the assumption that $\delta \leq 1/2$, then

$$H'_{n,\delta} \ll \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m/\log^2 m} \binom{m}{l} (1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l \ll (1-\delta)^m \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m/\log^2 m} \binom{m}{l},$$

Notice that the binomial coefficient

$$\binom{m}{l} = \frac{m!}{l! (m-l)!} \leq \frac{m^l}{l!},$$

which yields

$$H'_{n,\delta} \ll (1-\delta)^m m^{m/\log^2 m} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m/\log^2 m} \frac{1}{l!} \ll (1-\delta)^m m^{m/\log^2 m}.$$

We infer from Lemma 5.1 that, for m being sufficiently large,

$$(1-\delta)^m m^{m/\log^2 m} = ((1-\delta)e^{1/\log m})^m \leq (1-\frac{1}{2}\delta)^m \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\delta(1-\frac{1}{2}\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Hence we have

$$(5.29) \quad H'_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

For $H''_{n,\delta}$, we use the second bound in Lemma 5.2 that

$$H''_{n,\delta} \ll \sum_{m/\log^2 m < l \leq m} \binom{m}{l} \frac{(1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l}{\sqrt{l}} \ll \frac{\log m}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{m/\log^2 m < l \leq m} \binom{m}{l} (1-\delta)^{m-l} \delta^l \ll \frac{\log m}{\sqrt{m}},$$

this immediately gives

$$(5.30) \quad H''_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Inserting (5.29) and (5.30) into (5.28), we get

$$H_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Further by the estimate that $\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)} \leq (\delta + 1 - \delta)/2 = 1/2$, we have, for even n ,

$$(5.31) \quad H_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

It remains to consider the case when n is odd. We employ the bound $|1 - \delta + \delta \cos(2\pi h/d)| \leq 1$ and obtain

$$H_{n,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq d-1} \left(1 - \delta + \delta \cos\left(\frac{2\pi h}{d}\right)\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = H_{n-1,\delta}.$$

Since $n - 1$ is even, we have

$$H_{n,\delta} \ll H_{n-1,\delta} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{\log(n-1)}{\sqrt{n-1}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta(1-\delta)}} \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}$$

for odd n . This combines with (5.31) gives our results. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let $n \geq 1$, $l \geq 2$ be integers. Suppose integer $1 \leq i \leq l-1$ is fixed and integers $1 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_i \leq l-1$, and $0 < \lambda_{t_1}, \dots, \lambda_{t_i}, \eta_i < 1$ with $\eta_i = 1 - (\lambda_{t_1} + \dots + \lambda_{t_i})$. Then for any integer $d > 1$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{d^{l-1}} \sum_{1 \leq h_{t_1}, \dots, h_{t_i} \leq d-1} \left| \lambda_{t_1} e\left(\frac{h_{t_1}}{d}\right) + \dots + \lambda_{t_i} e\left(\frac{h_{t_i}}{d}\right) + \eta_i \right|^n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta_i \lambda_{t_i} (1 - 2\eta_i \lambda_{t_i})}} O\left(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $e(x) := e^{2\pi i x}$ for any real number x .

Proof. We write

$$J_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} = J_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}}(d, l) := \frac{1}{d^{l-1}} \sum_{1 \leq h_{t_1}, \dots, h_{t_i} \leq d-1} \left| \lambda_{t_1} e\left(\frac{h_{t_1}}{d}\right) + \dots + \lambda_{t_i} e\left(\frac{h_{t_i}}{d}\right) + \eta_i \right|^n.$$

By the definition of $e(x)$ and the formula $\cos(2\theta) = 2 \cos^2(\theta) - 1$, we expand the n -th power inside the above sum, then

$$J_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} = \frac{1}{d^{l-1}} \sum_{1 \leq h_{t_1}, \dots, h_{t_i} \leq d-1} \left(\sum_{1 \leq a \leq i} \lambda_{t_a}^2 + \eta_i^2 - 2 \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq i} \lambda_{t_a} \lambda_{t_b} - 2 \eta_i \sum_{1 \leq b \leq i} \lambda_{t_b} + J'_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}},$$

where

$$J'_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} := 4 \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq i} \lambda_{t_a} \lambda_{t_b} \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi(h_{t_a} - h_{t_b})}{d}\right) + 4\eta_i \sum_{1 \leq b \leq i} \lambda_{t_b} \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi h_{t_b}}{d}\right).$$

Trivially, we have

$$J'_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} \leq 4 \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq i} \lambda_{t_a} \lambda_{t_b} + 4\eta_i \sum_{1 \leq b \leq i-1} \lambda_{t_b} + 4\eta_i \lambda_{t_i} \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi h_{t_i}}{d}\right).$$

Then we apply $\cos(2\theta) = 2\cos^2(\theta) - 1$ again, there holds

$$J_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} \ll \frac{1}{d^{l-1}} \sum_{1 \leq h_{t_1}, \dots, h_{t_i} \leq d-1} \left(\sum_{1 \leq a \leq i} \lambda_{t_a}^2 + \eta_i^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq a < b \leq i} \lambda_{t_a} \lambda_{t_b} + 2\eta_i \sum_{1 \leq b \leq i-1} \lambda_{t_b} + 2\eta_i \lambda_{t_i} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi h_{t_i}}{d}\right) \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

If we set $\delta = 2\eta_i \lambda_{t_i}$, then $0 < \delta \leq 1/2$ and

$$J_{n,(\lambda_{t_a})_{a \leq i}} \ll \frac{1}{d} \sum_{1 \leq h_{t_i} \leq d-1} \left(1 - \delta + \delta \cos\left(\frac{2\pi h_{t_i}}{d}\right) \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

It is then straightforward to complete the proof by Lemma 5.3. \square

Now we begin to prove Lemma 4.1 by the above useful lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $n \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$ be integers and $c_1, \dots, c_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1})$ satisfying $0 < \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1} < 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{k-1} < 1$. Then for any integer $d \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ u_r \equiv c_r \pmod{d}, \\ \forall 1 \leq r \leq k-1}} \binom{n}{u_1, \dots, u_k} \alpha_1^{u_1} \cdots \alpha_{k-1}^{u_{k-1}} \alpha_k^{u_k} = \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}} O_k\left(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\alpha_k := 1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r$.

Proof. For the sake of simplicity, denote

$$L_{n,d,k,\alpha} = L_{n,d,k,\alpha}(c_r)_{r \leq k-1} := \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n \\ u_r \equiv c_r \pmod{d}, \\ \forall 1 \leq r \leq k-1}} P_{n,\mathbf{u},\alpha},$$

where $P_{n,\mathbf{u},\alpha}$ is defined by (1.4). Appealing to the orthogonality of additive characters

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{0 \leq h \leq d-1} e\left(\frac{hn}{d}\right) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d \mid n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$L_{n,d,k,\alpha} = \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u_1, \dots, u_k \leq n \\ u_1 + \dots + u_k = n}} P_{n,\mathbf{u},\alpha} \prod_{r=1}^{k-1} \sum_{0 \leq h_r \leq d-1} e\left(\frac{h_r(u_r - c_r)}{d}\right).$$

We change the order of the summations and apply the binomial theorem, then

$$L_{n,d,k,\alpha} = \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{0 \leq h_1, \dots, h_{k-1} \leq d-1} \prod_{r=1}^{k-1} e\left(-\frac{h_r c_r}{d}\right) \left(\alpha_1 e\left(\frac{h_1}{d}\right) + \cdots + \alpha_{k-1} e\left(\frac{h_{k-1}}{d}\right) + \alpha_k \right)^n,$$

where $\alpha_k := 1 - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} \alpha_r$. Taking out the term $h_1 = h_2 = \cdots = h_{k-1} = 0$ and using the fact $|e(x)| = 1$, we obtain

$$(5.32) \quad L_{n,d,k,\alpha} = \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} + O(L'_{n,d,k,\alpha}),$$

where

$$L'_{n,d,k,\alpha} := \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_i \leq k-1 \\ m_1 < \dots < m_i}} \sum_{1 \leq h_{m_1}, \dots, h_{m_i} \leq d-1} \left| \alpha_{m_1} e\left(\frac{h_{m_1}}{d}\right) + \dots + \alpha_{m_i} e\left(\frac{h_{m_i}}{d}\right) + \eta_i \right|^n$$

with $\eta_i := 1 - (\alpha_{m_1} + \dots + \alpha_{m_i})$. Then Lemma 5.4 indicates that

$$L'_{n,d,k,\alpha} \ll \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_i \leq k-1 \\ m_1 < \dots < m_i}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta_i \alpha_{m_i} (1 - 2\eta_i \alpha_{m_i})}},$$

where $0 < 2\eta_i \alpha_{m_i} \leq 1/2$. It follows $\sqrt{1 - 2\eta_i \alpha_{m_i}} \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ and

$$2\eta_i \alpha_{m_i} = 2\alpha_{m_i} (1 - (\alpha_{m_1} + \dots + \alpha_{m_i})) \geq 2(1 - (\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{k-1})) = 2\alpha_k \alpha_{m_i}$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} L'_{n,d,k,\alpha} &\ll \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \sum_{1 \leq m_i \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_{m_i} \alpha_k}} \sum_{1 \leq m_1, \dots, m_{i-1} \leq k-1} 1 \\ (5.33) \quad &\ll_k \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t \alpha_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now our required result follows by (5.32) and (5.33). \square

Acknowledgements. The authors are partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12201346) and Shandong Provincial Foundation (No. 2022HWYQ-046 & No. ZR2022QA001). The second listed author thanks the support of the Chinese Scholarship Council and the hospitality of the Institute of Financial Mathematics and Applied Number Theory at the Johannes Kepler University Linz.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. L. Abbott, Some results in combinatorial geometry, *Discrete Math.*, **9** (1974), 199-204.
- [2] S. D. Adhikari, R. Balasubramanian, On a question regarding visibility of lattice points, *Mathematika*, **43** (1996), 155-158.
- [3] S. D. Adhikari, Y. Chen, On a question regarding visibility of lattice points II, *Acta Arith.*, **89**(3) (1999), 279-282.
- [4] T. M. Apostol, *Introduction to analytic number theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [5] M. Baake, U. Grimm, D. H. Warrington, Some remarks on the visible points of a lattice, *J. Physics A: Math. Gen.*, **27** (1994), 2669-2674.
- [6] M. Baake, C. Huck, Ergodic properties of visible lattice points, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, **288**(1) (2015), 165-188.
- [7] M. Baake, R. V. Moody, P. Pleasants, Diffraction from visible lattice points and k th power free integers, *Discrete Math.*, **221**(1-3) (2000), 3-42.
- [8] R. C. Baker, Primitive lattice points in planar domains, *Acta Arith.*, **142**(3) (2010), 267-302.
- [9] C. Benedetti, S. Estupiñan, P. E. Harris, Generalized lattice-point visibility in \mathbb{N}^k , *Involve*, **14**(1) (2021), 103-118.
- [10] D. Berend, R. Kumar, A. Pollington, Simultaneous visibility in the integer lattice, *J. number theory*, **250** (2023), 84-123.
- [11] H. C. Berg, *Random walks in biology*, Princeton Univ. Press, USA, 1993.
- [12] F. P. Boca, C. Cobeli, A. Zaharescu, Distribution of lattice points visible from the origin, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **213**(2) (2000), 433-470.
- [13] S. Chaubey, A. Tamazyan, A. Zaharescu, Lattice point problems involving index and joint visibility, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, **147**(8) (2019), 3273-3288.

- [14] J. Christopher, The Asymptotic density of some k -dimensional sets, *Am. Math. Mon.*, **63**(6) (1956), 399-401.
- [15] E. Cohen, Arithmetical functions of greatest common divisor. I, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, **11**(2) (1960), 164-171.
- [16] P. G. L. Dirichlet, Über die Bestimmung der mittleren Werte in der Zahlentheorie, *Abhandl. Kgl. Preuss. Acad. Wiss., Berlin* (1849), 69-83.
- [17] P. G. L. Dirichlet, Sur une nouvelle méthode pour la détermination des intégrales multiples, *Liouville, J. de Mathématiques*, Ser. I, 4, 164-168. Reprinted in Dirichlet's Werke, Vol. I, 377-380.
- [18] J. L. Fernández, P. Fernández, Some arithmetic properties of Pólya's urn, *Electron. J. Comb.*, **30**(2) (2023), 1-32.
- [19] B. A. Frigyik, A. Kapila, M. R. Gupta, Introduction to the Dirichlet distribution and related processes, Technical report, Technical report UWEETR-2010-0006, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, 2010.
- [20] E. H. Goins, P. E. Harris, B. Kubik, A. Mbirika, Lattice point visibility on generalized lines of sight, *Am. Math. Mon.*, **125**(7) (2018), 593-601.
- [21] R. D. Gupta, D. S. P. Richards, The history of the Dirichlet and Liouville distributions, *Int. Stat. Rev.*, **69** (3) (2001), 433-446.
- [22] A. W. Hales, Random walks on visible points, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **64** (4) (2018), 3150-3152.
- [23] P. E. Harris, M. Omar, Lattice point visibility on power functions, *Integers*, **18** (2018), A90, 1-7.
- [24] M. N. Huxley, W. G. Nowak, Primitive lattice points in convex planar domains, *Acta Arith.*, **76** (1996), 271-283.
- [25] F. Jouve, The large sieve and random walks on left cosets of arithmetic groups, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **85**(3) (2010), 647-704.
- [26] D. J. Klein, J. L. Palacios, M. Randić, N. Trinajstić, Random walks and chemical graph theory, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, **44** (2004), 1521-1525.
- [27] D. N. Lehmer, Asymptotic evaluation of certain totient sums, *Am. J. Math.*, **22** (1900), 293-335.
- [28] M. Lifshits and M. Weber, Sampling the Lindelöf hypothesis with the Cauchy random walk, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **98** (2009), 241-270.
- [29] K. Liu, X. Meng, Random walks on generalied visible points. Preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03609>.
- [30] K. Liu, X. Meng, Visible lattice points along curves, *Ramanujan J.*, **56**(3) (2021), 1073-1086.
- [31] K. Liu, M. Lu, X. Meng, Generalized visibility of lattice points in higher dimensions, *J. number theory*, **241**(2022), 314-329.
- [32] H. Mahmoud, *Pólya urn models*, CRC press, 2008.
- [33] S. Martineau, On coprime percolation, the visibility graphon, and the local limit of the gcd profile, *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, **27**(8) (2022), 1-14.
- [34] N. McNew, Random multiplicative walks on the residues modulo n , *Mathematika*, **63**(2) (2017), 602-621.
- [35] R. Mosseri, Visible points in a lattice, *J. Physics, A: Math. Gen.*, **25** (1992), L25-L29.
- [36] K. W. Ng, G. L. Tian, M. L. Tang, *Dirichlet and related distributions: Theory, methods and applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [37] D. F. Rearick, Some visibility problems in point lattices, Dissertation (Ph.D.), California Institute of Technology, 1960.
- [38] D. F. Rearick, Mutually visible lattice points, *Norske Vid. Selsk. Forh. (Trondheim)*, **39** (1966), 41-45.
- [39] H. Rumsey, Sets of visible points, *Duke Math. J.*, **33** (1966) 263-274.
- [40] T. Srichan, Sampling the Lindelöf hypothesis for Dirichlet L-functions by the Cauchy random walk, *Eur. J. Math.*, **1** (2015) 351-366.
- [41] J. J. Sylvester, Sur le nombre de fractions ordinaires inegales quon peut exprimer en se servant de chiffres qui nexcedent pas un nombre donne, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris XCVI* (1883), 409-413. Reprinted in H. F. Baker (Ed.), The Collected Mathematical Papers of James Joseph Sylvester, vol. 4, Cambridge University Press, p. 86.
- [42] W. Zhai, On primitive lattice points in planar domains, *Acta Arith.*, **109**(1) (2003), 1-26.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN 250100, SHANDONG, CHINA
Email address: meijie.lu@hotmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN 250100, SHANDONG, CHINA & JOHANNES
KEPLER UNIVERSITY LINZ, LINZ 4040, AUSTRIA
Email address: xianchang.meng@jku.at