

Prime-Residue-Class of Uniform Charges on the Integers

Michael Spece · Joseph B. Kadane

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract There is a probability charge on the power set of the integers that gives probability $1/p$ to every residue class modulo a prime p . There exists such a charge that gives probability w to the set of prime numbers iff $w \in [0, 1/2]$. Similarly, there is such a charge that gives probability x to a residue class modulo c , where c is composite, iff $x \in [0, 1/y]$, where y is the largest prime factor of c .

Keywords probability charge · finite additivity · uniform distribution · residue class · prime numbers

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) MSC 60A05

We thank David Donoho for posing the question of whether $PR = R$. The Department of Defense (DoD) supported the first author through the National Defense Science & Engineering Graduate Fellowship (NDSEG) Program.

M. Spece
Department of Statistics & Data Science and
Machine Learning Department
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Tel.: 412-268-2717
Fax: 412-268-7828
E-mail: spece@cmu.edu

J.B. Kadane
Department of Statistics & Data Science
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Tel.: 412-268-8726
Fax: 412-268-7828
E-mail: kadane@stat.cmu.edu

1 Distributions uniform on the integers

A **probability charge**¹ uniform on the integers assigns 0 to each integer, but that of 1 to \mathbb{Z} , precluding countable additivity. Every finite set has probability 0, and each cofinite set 1, leaving undetermined jointly infinite-coinfinite sets.

Suppose \mathcal{C} is a collection of subsets from Ω (here \mathbb{Z}) such that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$. Let μ be a non-negative function on \mathcal{C} such that $\mu(\Omega) = 1$. Theorem 1 of [1] gives a necessary and sufficient condition that μ can be extended to a finitely additive probability on the power set of Ω . Applying this result, they show the special case in which \mathcal{C} is the class of sets that have natural² densities³ admits such an extension, where μ is taken to assign a set its natural density, when that exists.

[2] study three classes of finitely additive probabilities: The class L extending limit relative frequency, the class S of shift⁴ invariant⁵ functions μ , and the class R assigning probability $1/m$ to each residue class mod m for all positive integers m . They show that

$$L \subset S \subset R$$

where each of the inclusions above are strict.

[4] study the class WT of weakly thinnable probabilities and show it is strictly less inclusive than L .

Each of the previously studied classes⁶ has an intuitive interpretation of uniformity that goes beyond assigning each integer 0. The inclusions indicate that these various notions of uniformity are strictly nested, with R comprising the weakest notion.

2 The Prime Residue Class

One may consider a potentially weaker notion of uniformity than that of R by specifying the probability of each residue class mod m for m in a strict subset of \mathbb{Z} . The primes are a natural choice for this subset. Therefore, consider the class PR of finitely additive probabilities on the integers that give probability $1/m$ to each residue class mod m where m is a prime number. Since this condition is weaker than that defining the class R , we must have

$$WT \subset L \subset S \subset R \subseteq PR$$

Given that every integer has a prime factorization, $R = PR$ is conceivable. To the contrary, we show that $R \subset PR$.

Since PR is the least demanding of these classes, it is important to establish at the outset that each member of PR is uniform on the integers. That is accomplished with the following easy result. First, a notation for sets of “natural” numbers:

Definition 1 (Natural Numbers) *Denote the nonnegative integers by \mathbb{Z}^+ and the positive ones by $\mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. Also, let \mathbb{N}_p denote the primes, \mathbb{Z} integers, \mathbb{Q} rationals, and \mathbb{R} reals.*

¹ Also known as a finitely additive probability or additive distribution, but these terms conflate with terminology for standard probability.

² Also, “asymptotic” and “arithmetic”.

³ Also known as limit (or limiting) relative frequencies.

⁴ Also, “translation”.

⁵ Equivalently, thinnable with respect to (i) affine transformations; or (ii) $2\times$ or (iii) general-scale invariance. See Theorem 1.11 of [3].

⁶ There are others, for example those based on “thinning out” sets in [3].

Proposition 1 (Uniformity) *Under PR, each integer has probability 0.*

Proof Let $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and let m be a prime greater than $1/\varepsilon$. Now $z \in j \bmod m$ for some $j, 0 \leq j \leq m-1$. Then

$$P\{z\} \leq P\{j \bmod m\} = 1/m < \varepsilon.$$

Hence, $P\{z\} = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 3 gives general upper bounds on the probability of sets. Sections 4 and 5 respectively apply these results to \mathbb{N}_p and residue classes, proving the claims thereon. Section 6 concludes.

3 Suprema of Probabilities

For every class of uniform distributions and every subset S of the space measured under these distributions, the probability range of S is a closed interval (Theorem 2 of [1]). Restricting to the class PR and the set \mathbb{N}_p of prime numbers, a greatest lower bound of 0, quoted below for future reference, is immediate from the inclusion $L \subset PR$.

Proposition 2 (Greatest Lower Bound for Primes)

$$\inf_{\mu \in PR} \mu(\mathbb{N}_p) = 0.$$

Thus, to prove the probability of the prime numbers can be any value in the interval $[0, 1/2]$, it suffices to show the least upper bound of the probability of the primes is $1/2$.

At the heart of affording measure to a set is the following theorem about general sets.

Theorem 1 (Probability Range) *Suppose \mathcal{C} is a subset of the power-set 2^Ω , that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, and finally that μ_0 is a function on \mathcal{C} that can be extended to a finitely additive probability on 2^Ω . Let \mathcal{M} be the family of such extensions. Then for every $S \in 2^\Omega$,*

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \mu(S) = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^a \mu_0(A_i) - \sum_{j=1}^b \mu_0(B_j) \right) \right\}, \quad (\text{Id1})$$

in which the inf is taken over $h \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}; a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+; A_i, B_j \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^a I_{A_i} - \sum_{j=1}^b I_{B_j} \geq hI_S. \quad (\text{Ct2})$$

Proof The proof is that of Theorem 2 in [1]. □

Remark (Notation):

- S typically denotes a set whose probability is of interest.
- The prefix of a number is an abbreviation. For example, **Ct2** is short for Constraint 2, and is referred to as Constraint **Ct2** in prose. “A” stands for approximation, the meaning of which is to be interpreted liberally.

Definition 2 (Relations) For all sets A and B , define $A \setminus B := \{a \in A : a \notin B\}$ and, when $+$ is defined on $A \times B$, $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$.

The elements of a residue class are **shifts** or, less descriptively, **representatives**. For all $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $A \bmod m := \cup_{a \in A} a \bmod m$.

For all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $a|b$ denotes that a divides b . For every pair of \mathbb{R} -valued functions f and g with common domain X , $f \leq g$ is to be understood in the domination or Pareto sense, that is for all $x \in X$, $f(x) \leq g(x)$.

Definition 3 (Classes of Functions) For a function f with co-domain $Y \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, let $|f|_0$ be the counting measure of $f^{-1}(Y \setminus \{0\})$, that is the number of elements in the domain of f that are not mapped to zero; and for a collection of functions \mathcal{F} , $\ell^0(\mathcal{F}) := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : |f|_0 \neq \infty\}$. We often specify a collection of functions merely by their domain and co-domain, as follows:

For all sets A, B , let A^B denote the collection of functions mapping from B into A .

The difference of sums, in the form that appear in Identity [Id1](#) and Constraint [Ct2](#), can be re-written as a single sum, as follows.

Lemma 1 (Concise Rewrite) Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of sets and $\mathcal{F} := \ell^0(\mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{C}})$. For all $h \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}; a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+; A_i, B_j \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists a unique $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that, for all $g \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$,

$$\frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^a g(A_i) - \sum_{j=1}^b g(B_j) \right) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} f(C)g(C). \quad (\text{Id3})$$

Conversely, if $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $g \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$, then there exists $h \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}; a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+; A_i, B_j \in \mathcal{C}$ such that Identity [Id3](#) holds.

Proof Suppose $h \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}; a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+; A_i, B_j \in \mathcal{C}$.

Uniqueness follows from the flexibility in choosing g : for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$f(C) = \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^a I_{A_i=C} - \sum_{j=1}^b I_{B_j=C} \right). \quad (\text{Id4})$$

The question becomes whether, for all g ,

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^a I_{A_i=C} - \sum_{j=1}^b I_{B_j=C} \right) g(C) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^a g(A_i) - \sum_{j=1}^b g(B_j) \right),$$

for which the following system (if true) suffices

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i=1}^a I_{A_i=C} g(C) &= \sum_{i=1}^a g(A_i) \\ \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j=1}^b I_{B_j=C} g(C) &= \sum_{j=1}^b g(B_j). \end{aligned}$$

But indeed

$$\sum_{i=1}^a g(A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} I_{A_i=C} g(C) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i=1}^a I_{A_i=C} g(C)$$

and symmetrically for $\sum_{j=1}^b g(B_j)$.

Turning to the converse, invert Identity **Id4**. Since therein only A_i and B_j that equal C count, $\text{card}(i : A_i = C)$ and $\text{card}(j : B_j = C)$ can be set without regard to $a, b, (A_i)_{i:A_i \neq C}$, or $(B_j)_{j:A_j \neq C}$. Set h to a common denominator of $\{f(C) : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ so that $hf(C)$ is always an integer. Set $\text{card}(i : A_i = C) := hf(C)I_{f(C)>0}$ and $\text{card}(j : B_j = C) := hf(C)I_{f(C)<0}$. \square

Rewriting the sums appearing in Theorem 1 according to Lemma 1, one obtains the following theorem restatement.

Theorem 2 (Concise Form of Theorem 1) *Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^\Omega$, that $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, and finally that μ_0 is a function on \mathcal{C} that can be extended to a finitely additive probability on 2^Ω . Let \mathcal{M} be the family of such extensions. Then for every $S \in 2^\Omega$,*

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \mu(S) = \inf_{\alpha \in \ell^0(\mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{C}})} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \alpha(C) \mu_0(C), \quad (\text{Id5})$$

in which α is additionally subject to

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \alpha(C) I_C \geq I_S. \quad (\text{Ct6})$$

Proof Applying Lemma 1 simultaneously to $\mu_0, I \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ in Identity **Id1** and Constraint **Ct2**, respectively, yields the desired form of the objective function in the right-hand side of Identity **Id5** and in Constraint **Ct6**. The converse in Lemma 1 ensures the constraint set has not expanded. \square

Remark: In contrast to Theorem 1, each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ appears in at most one term in each of the sums appearing on the right (resp. left) hand side of Identity **Id5** and Constraint **Ct6**; therein, also, I_S has no coefficient. Both of these simplifications, especially the first, make bookkeeping easier when applying the theorem to *PR*.

Definition 4 (Subsets of Primes) *Let p_i be the i th largest prime ($i \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$), $p_0 := 1$, and $\{1, \dots, p_i\}$ or $\{1 : p_i\}$ the set of positive integers less than $p_i + 1$.*

For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $N!_p := \prod_{i=1}^N p_i$ and, for all $j \in \times_{i=1}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}$, $s(j)$ the shift of $\cap_{i=1}^N j_i \bmod p_i$ in $\{1, \dots, N!_p\}$ (which exists and is unique by the Chinese Remainder Theorem). Note s depends on N implicitly.

Definition 5 (\cdot) *Let $\ell_{\mathbb{Q}} := \ell^0(\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^{>0}})$. For all $(\alpha_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}$, let $\alpha_{i,\cdot}$ denote the vector $\alpha_{i,1}, \alpha_{i,2}, \dots$. More generally, a dot is used as the placeholder for a function argument.*

Theorem 2—with $\mathcal{M} := PR$, \mathcal{C} the collection of prime residue classes, and $\mu_0(\cdot \bmod p_i) \equiv \frac{1}{p_i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ —gives

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) = \inf_{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}} f(\alpha), \quad (\text{Id7})$$

in which $f(\alpha) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{p_i}$ and α is additionally subject to

$$G(\alpha) \geq I_S, \quad (\text{Ct8})$$

where $G(\alpha) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \alpha_{i,j} I_{j \bmod p_i}$.

The following proposition provides a convenient avenue through which to make explicit the dependence of $\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (as appears in Identity **Id7**) on only a finite number of components.

Proposition 3 (Continuity) *Suppose (S1) $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and (S2) $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = A$. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n} f(\alpha) = \inf_{\alpha \in A} f(\alpha). \quad (\text{Id9})$$

Proof $\inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n} f(\alpha)$ over the weakening constraint $\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n$ is monotonic over N . Hence, the left-hand side of Identity [Id9](#) is well defined.

Because, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n \subseteq A$;

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n} f(\alpha) \geq \inf_{\alpha \in A} f(\alpha), \quad (\text{A10})$$

so it suffices to prove the reverse inequality of Approximation [A10](#).

By completeness of the real numbers, there exists $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in A^{\infty}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\alpha_n) = \inf_{\alpha \in A} f(\alpha). \quad (\text{Id11})$$

By Supposition [\(S2\)](#), there exists a subsequence $(N_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $(N)_{N=1}^{\infty}$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $\alpha_k \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{N_k} A_n$. Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n} f(\alpha) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{N_k} A_n} f(\alpha). \quad (\text{Id12})$$

Because, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $\inf_{\alpha \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{N_k} A_n} f(\alpha) \leq f(\alpha_k)$; the right-hand side of Identity [Id12](#) is upper bounded by

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(\alpha_k). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Combining Identity [Id11](#) and Approximation [A13](#), the reverse of Approximation [A10](#) holds. \square

The theorem following relies on the notion of multi-sets.

Definition 6 (Multi-sets) *Multi-set is an extension of set, endowing each of its **elements** with a multiplicity in $\mathbb{Z}^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$. Every set can be viewed as a multi-set each of whose elements has multiplicity 1. \mathcal{J} , or an embellishment thereof, denotes a multi-set.*

*The **cardinality** of a multi-set is the sum of its elements' multiplicities. Multi-set and set cardinalities coincide on countable sets.*

*Multi-set intersection also extends that for set. **Intersections** of multi-sets are taken to preserve the highest multiplicity of an element appearing in any of the multi-sets (excluding a multiplicity of zero).*

*Multi-set **inclusion** similarly takes multiplicity into consideration: $\mathcal{J}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ iff $\mathcal{J}_0 \cap \mathcal{J}$ does not increase the multiplicity of any element. However, multi-set inclusion in a set is only meant to indicate the elements of that multi-set are in that set.*

Definition 7 (Coordinates) *Given, either implicitly by its use or explicitly by its declaration, an $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, let $\mathcal{N} := \begin{cases} \{1, \dots, N\} & N < \infty \\ \mathbb{Z}^{>0} & N = \infty \end{cases}$.*

For all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, finite-cardinality multi-sets $A \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$, $a \in A$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, and $b \in \{1, \dots, p_i\}$,

– a_n is the n (of N)th coordinate of a

- $\text{proj}_n(A)$ (projection) is the set of n th coordinates from A , endowing each coordinate value with a multiplicity equal to the cardinality of $\text{proj}_n^{-1}(a) \cap A$,⁷ in which the inverse image is taken with respect to regarding $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$ as the domain of proj_n .
- $\text{card}_n(A) := \text{card}(\text{proj}_n(A))$
- $a_{-i} := (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_N)$
- $(a_{-i}, b) := (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_N)$.

Similarly, for all sets $A, B \in \times_{n=1}^N \{1, \dots, p_n\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $A_{-i} \times B_i := \{(a_{-i}, b_i) : a \in A, b \in B\}$.

Theorem 3 (Probability Range over PR) For every $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathcal{J}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p))}{N!_p}, \quad (\text{A14})$$

in which

(C1) For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the \mathcal{J} of

$$\max_{\mathcal{J}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p))}{N!_p}$$

within the right-hand side of Approximation A14 varies over multi-sets such that (i) $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{i=1}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}$ and (ii) for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) = \{1^{N!_p/p_n}, \dots, p_n^{N!_p/p_n}\}$; in which superscripts denote the multiplicity of elements in the multi-set with non-positive subscripts signifying the absence of that element.

Proof Invoking Proposition 3, with $A_n := \{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : |\alpha|_0 \leq n\}$, the right-hand side of Identity Id7

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \quad (\text{P15})$$

becomes

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}} : |\alpha|_0 \leq N} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{p_i} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}} \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{p_i}, \quad (\text{Id16})$$

in which, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the α of

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}} \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{p_i} \quad (17)$$

within the right-hand side of Identity Id16 is additionally subject to

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \alpha_{i,j} I_{j \bmod p_i} \geq I_S. \quad (\text{Ct18})$$

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, every $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to a

$$j_z \cdot \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}$$

⁷ That A is finite-cardinality ensures the endowed multiplicities are finite.

such that $z \bmod N!_p = s(j_{z,-0}) \bmod N!_p$. (j as defined is a branch of s^{-1} .) Moreover, z is in no other residue classes than $s(j_{z,k}) \bmod p_k$ for all positive integers $k \leq N$. Therefore, the left-hand side of Constraint Ct18 evaluated at z is $\sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_{z,i}}$ and Constraint Ct18 can be re-written as

$$\sum_{(j_0,j) \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \right) I_{s(j) \bmod N!_p} \geq I_S. \quad (\text{Ct19})$$

Constraint Ct19 can be decomposed point-by-point as the set of constraints

$$\left\{ \sum_{(j_0,j) \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} I_{s(j) \bmod N!_p}(z) \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \geq I_S(z) \right\}_{z \in \mathbb{Z}}. \quad (\text{Ct20})$$

Breaking the left and right-hand sides of the inequalities Ct20 into cases of which modular class representative and which value in the indicator range are picked out by z , respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \mid z \in s(j) \bmod N!_p \right\}_{(j_0,j) \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \geq \begin{cases} 0 & z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus S \\ 1 & z \in S \end{cases} \\ & = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \geq \begin{cases} 0 & z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus S \cap s(j) \bmod N!_p \\ 1 & z \in S \cap s(j) \bmod N!_p \end{cases} \right\}_{(j_0,j) \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} && \text{Combine conditions} \\ & = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \geq \begin{cases} 1 & S \cap s(j) \bmod N!_p \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right\}_{(j_0,j) \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} && \text{Combine inequalities} \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \geq \begin{cases} 1 & (j_0, j) : s(j) \in S \bmod N!_p \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \text{Condition on } j \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \geq \begin{cases} 1 & j \in \{1\} \times s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} && \text{Definition of } \cdot^{-1}. \quad (\text{Ct21}) \end{aligned}$$

Expression 17 is, dividing out repetitions,

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \ell_{\mathbb{Q}}} \sum_{j \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq i} p_k} \frac{\alpha_{i,j}}{p_i}, \quad (22)$$

due to there being $\prod_{k \neq i} p_k$ repetitions of each $\{1, \dots, p_i\}$ in the i th component of

$$\times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}.$$

Factoring out (the constant) $\frac{1}{N!_p}$ from Expression 22 obtains

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \times_{i=0}^N \mathbb{Q}^{p_i}} \frac{1}{N!_p} \sum_{j \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i}. \quad (23)$$

The indices of α being summed over in

$$\sum_{j \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \quad (24)$$

of Expression 23 forms a multi-set of pairs

$$\left\{ (i, j) \begin{cases} 0 & j > p_i \\ N!_p/p_i & j \in \{1, \dots, p_i\} \end{cases} \right\} \quad (25)$$

whose multiplicities depend on the second coordinate j . (Because p_i divides $N!_p$, the multiplicities are non-negative integers, and thus valid.)

For every \mathcal{J} obeying Condition (C1), the indices of α being summed over in

$$\sum_{j \in \{1\} \times \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \quad (26)$$

forms the multi-set 25 as well. Therefore, sums 24 and 26 must have the same multi-sets of terms and so, themselves being the sums of precisely the terms thereof, must be equal:

$$\sum_{j \in \times_{i=0}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} = \sum_{j \in \{1\} \times \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} \quad (\text{Id27})$$

By Identity Id27, Expression 23, and in turn Expressions 22 and 17, are equal to

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \times_{i=0}^N \mathbb{Q}^{p_i}} \frac{1}{N!_p} \sum_{j \in \{1\} \times \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i}, \quad (28)$$

for every \mathcal{J} obeying (C1).

Sums 26 can be split up as

$$\sum_{j \in \{1\} \times [\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)]} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i} + \sum_{j \in \{1\} \times [\mathcal{J} \setminus s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)]} \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_{i,j_i}. \quad (29)$$

Imposing Constraint Ct21 on Expression 29 yields a lower bound, that of

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in \{1\} \times [\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)]} 1 + \sum_{j \in \{1\} \times [\mathcal{J} \setminus s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)]} 0 \\ &= \text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

in which the equality leading to A30 is by the definition of cardinality (6).

Combining Expression 29 and Approximation A30, Expression 17 is bounded below by

$$\max_{\mathcal{J}} \inf_{\alpha \in \times_{i=1}^N \mathbb{Q}^{p_i}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p))}{N!_p} = \max_{\mathcal{J}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p))}{N!_p}, \quad (\text{A31})$$

in which, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, \mathcal{J} obeys Condition (C1). (The left-hand side of Approximation A31 does not depend on α , so can be dropped to obtain the right-hand side.)

Taking $N \rightarrow \infty$ in Approximation A31 and Expression 17, while equating the latter limit to the left-hand side of Identity Id7, yields Approximation A14. \square

Remark: The \mathcal{J} of Condition (C1) is in some sense a re-arrangement of the components of $\times_{i=1}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}$.

Remark: The requirement $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) = \{1^{N!_p/p_n}, \dots, p_n^{N!_p/p_n}\}$ of Condition (C1) can be weakened to

$$\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq \{1^{N!_p/p_n}, \dots, p_n^{N!_p/p_n}\}.$$

Moreover, the maximum in Approximation A14 is attained by some \mathcal{J} for which $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq \text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) \cap \text{proj}_n(s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p))$ (where the intersection obeys Definition 6).

The following proposition further concerns the projections of a multi-set (which appear in the constraint set specified in Condition (C1)).


Proposition 4 (Exchange Preserving $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J})$) Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$, a multi-set with at least two elements, say j, k , and $n_* \in \mathcal{N}$. Let $\mathcal{J}' := \mathcal{J} \setminus \{j, k\} \cup \{j', k'\}$; where 1. $j' := (j_{-n_*}, k_{n_*})$, 2. $k' := (k_{-n_*}, j_{n_*})$, 3. decrements multiplicities as follows: for all objects a and $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\{a^b, \dots\} \setminus \{a^c, \dots\} = \{a^{b-c}, \dots\}$, and 4. \cup increments them as follows: for all objects a and $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\{a^b, \dots\} \cup \{a^c, \dots\} = \{a^{b+c}, \dots\}$. Then, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}') = \text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J})$.

Proof $j, k \in \mathcal{J}$ implies subtracting (or adding) $\{j, k\}$ has the reverse effect on proj_n of the resultant multi-set, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, as adding $\{j', k'\}$ (or subtracting, respectively). \square

Given the frequency with which $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$ occurs, a descriptive notation specific to its elements is given.

Definition 8 (Paths) Given any $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, multi-set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, and

$$b^m \in \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\},$$



b is a **path**. An illustration of the path $(1, 2)$ ($N = 2$): $\begin{matrix} \textcircled{1} & \textcircled{2} \\ & 1 \end{matrix}$, where each column array of integers corresponds to a set in the product $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$.

For every $j \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and set $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, p_j\}$, b **passes through**, in its j th component, A iff $b_j \in A$. In the illustration above, the path shown passes through $\{1\}$ (both $\{2\}$ and $\{1, 2\}$) in the first (second) component, respectively.

Combinatorial arguments are described using the following terminology.

Definition 9 (Life) Given any $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$, set $A \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$, and multi-set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$, a path in \mathcal{J} is **alive** iff it is in A . Exchanging components as in Proposition 4 is **enlivening** iff j is dead and j' alive or k is dead and k' is alive; and is (life) **preserving** iff, for each $i \in \{j, k\}$ that is alive, so is i' . An enlivening and preserving exchange between an alive path and dead one is a (successful) **donation** (that leaves both j', k' alive).

Proposition 5 (Re-Directing Paths) Fix arbitrary

1. $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ (not necessarily distinct),
2. a multi-set $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ of finite cardinality,
3. and, $\forall k \in \{i, j\}$, $A_k \subseteq \{1, \dots, p_k\}$.

Suppose (C2) $\text{card}(\text{proj}_i(\mathcal{J}) \cap A_i) \leq \text{card}(\text{proj}_j(\mathcal{J}) \cap A_j)$. Then there exists a multiset \mathcal{J}' such that (C3) $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}') = \text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J})$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and (C4) for all $v \in \mathcal{J}'$, $v_i \in A_i \implies v_j \in A_j$.

Proof Suppose $i = j$. Substituting j into A_i shows $A_i = A_j$, and the conclusion is trivial.

Suppose instead $i \neq j$.

Let $\mathcal{J}_{\text{donor}}$ be the sub-multiset of all paths (and their multiplicities) in \mathcal{J} whose j th components pass through A_j but whose i th ones do not pass through A_i and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{recipient}}$ the sub-multiset of all paths whose i th components pass through A_i but whose j th ones do not pass through A_j . Then Condition (C4) is equivalent to the condition that all paths of \mathcal{J}' whose i th component passes through A_i are alive with respect to $\times_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \setminus \{i,j\}} \{1, \dots, p_n\} \times A_i \times A_j$. As for \mathcal{J} , each path in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{donor}}$ is a potential donor to each path in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{recipient}}$ (with the donations occurring in the j th components). Therefore, by Proposition 4, it suffices to show (C5) $\text{card}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{donor}}) \geq \text{card}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{recipient}})$. To invoke Condition (C2), observe

$$\begin{aligned} \text{card}(\text{proj}_i(\mathcal{J}) \cap A_i) &= \text{card}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{recipient}}) + \text{card}\left(\mathcal{J} \cap \times_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \setminus \{i,j\}} \{1, \dots, p_n\} \times A_i \times A_j\right) \\ \text{card}(\text{proj}_j(\mathcal{J}) \cap A_j) &= \text{card}(\mathcal{J}_{\text{donor}}) + \text{card}\left(\mathcal{J} \cap \times_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \setminus \{i,j\}} \{1, \dots, p_n\} \times A_i \times A_j\right), \end{aligned}$$

which by plugging into Condition (C2) gives (C5). \square

Remark: If $j = 1$, the proposition is trivial.

The point of Proposition 5 is its corollary:

Corollary 1 Fix arbitrary $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ such that, for $n \in \{i, j\}$,

$$\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}) = \left\{ 1^{N!_p/p_n}, \dots, p_n^{N!_p/p_n} \right\}. \quad (\text{Ct32})$$

Let A_i and B_i be ordinary sets that partition $\{1, \dots, p_i\}$ and, similarly, $\{A_j, B_j\}$ a partition of $\{1, \dots, p_j\}$; and suppose $\frac{\text{card}(A_i)}{\text{card}(B_i)} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A_j)}{\text{card}(B_j)}$. Then there exists \mathcal{J}' such that (i) $\text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J}') = \text{proj}_n(\mathcal{J})$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and (ii) for all $v \in \mathcal{J}'$, $v_i \in A_i \implies v_j \in A_j$.

Proof Let $a_i := \text{card}(A_i)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\text{card}(A_i)}{\text{card}(B_i)} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A_j)}{\text{card}(B_j)} \right) &\iff \left(\frac{a_i}{\text{card}(\{1, \dots, p_i\} \setminus A_i)} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A_j)}{\text{card}(\{1, \dots, p_j\} \setminus A_j)} \right) \\ &\iff \left(\frac{a_i}{p_i - a_i} \leq \frac{\text{card}(A_j)}{p_j - \text{card}(A_j)} \right) \\ &\iff (a_i p_j - a_i \text{card}(A_j) \leq p_i \text{card}(A_j) - a_i \text{card}(A_j)) \\ &\iff (p_j a_i \leq p_i \text{card}(A_j)). \end{aligned}$$

By Constraint Ct32, $\text{card}(A_j)N!_p/p_j$ paths pass through, in their j th components, A_j , whereas only $a_i N!_p/p_i \leq \frac{p_i}{p_j} \text{card}(A_j) \frac{N!_p}{p_i} = \text{card}(A_j)N!_p/p_j$ paths pass through, in their i th components, A_i . Thus Proposition 5 can be invoked. \square

The upshot of Corollary 1 is the following lemma.

Lemma 2 (Intersecting Products) Fix arbitrary $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and partitions (A_n, B_n) of $\{1, \dots, p_n\}$ for $n = 1, \dots, N$. Let $n_* \in \text{argmin}_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\text{card}(A_n)}{\text{card}(B_n)}$. Then there exists \mathcal{J} satisfying Condition (C1) for which

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} B_n) = \frac{N!_p}{p_{n_*}} \text{card}(B_{n_*}).$$

Proof Start with any \mathcal{J} satisfying Condition (C1), for example $\times_{i=1}^N \{1, \dots, p_i\}$. By construction of n_* , Corollary 1 can be iteratively applied over all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ path components, with $i := n$ and $j := n_*$.

Then, in the final \mathcal{J}' for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, there are $\frac{N!_p}{p_{n_*}}$ paths passing through, in their n th components, B_n and, in the n_* th ones, B_{n_*} . Moreover, every such path cannot pass through, in its n' th component, some $A_{n'}$ by construction of \mathcal{J}' (doing so would have to pass through, in the n_* th component, A_{n_*} , a contradiction). Therefore, all of these paths are in $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} B_n$. \square

The following two corollaries give simpler approximations of Problem P15 than Theorem 3, and are collectively adequate, that is without further use of the theorem, for ascertaining the probability of \mathbb{N}_p and residue classes.

Corollary 2 (Product) Fix an arbitrary $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and $\mathcal{J}_n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ (for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$),

$$s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p) \supseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{J}_n. \quad (\text{A33})$$

Then

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J}_n)}{p_n}.$$

Proof Combining Approximation A33 and Approximation A14 yields

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathcal{J}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J} \cap \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{J}_n)}{N!_p},$$

which, by Lemma 2, is lower bounded by

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\min_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{N!_p}{p_n} \text{card}(\mathcal{J}_n)}{N!_p} \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{J}_n)}{p_n}.$$

\square

In the next corollary, the total number of paths that can be made to pass through \mathcal{J}_n in their n th components is once again the basis for bounding Problem P15, albeit this time such a bound cannot be further simplified. That is because $s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)$ may no longer be well approximated by a product as it was in Approximation A33; instead it is approximated by a product $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{J}_n$ minus another one, say $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{K}_n$. Because of this complication, paths must be re-arranged more intricately to realize the maximum in Approximation A14. The ability to re-arrange enough paths to “make up for” the subtraction of $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{K}_n$ depends on the relative sizes of the sets \mathcal{J}_n and \mathcal{K}_n . (Namely, Approximation A35 below suffices.)

Corollary 3 (Difference of Products) Fix an arbitrary $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ and let for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ (recall Definition 7),

1. $\mathcal{J}_n, \mathcal{K}_n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$,
2. $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{J}_n \setminus \mathcal{K}_n$,
3. $I_n := \text{card}(\mathcal{J}_n)$,
4. $K_n := \text{card}(\mathcal{K}_n)$, and
5. $H_n := \text{card}(\mathcal{H}_n)$.

Further, let $\mathcal{N}_* := \{k \in \mathcal{N} : \mathcal{H}_k \neq \emptyset\}$ and $N_* := \text{card}(\mathcal{N}_*)$; and, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, let $\mathcal{N}_*^{-i} := \mathcal{N}_* \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{-i} := \mathcal{N} \setminus (\mathcal{N}_* \cup \{i_1, \dots, i_m\})$. Note $\{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}, \mathcal{N}_*^{-i}, \mathcal{N}^{-i}\}$ partitions \mathcal{N} .

Suppose, for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,

$$s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p) \supseteq \mathcal{J}^N, \quad (\text{A34})$$

in which $\mathcal{I}^N := \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{I}_n \setminus \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{K}_n$ and

$$\sum_{m=0}^{N_*-2} (N_* - 1 - m) \sum_{\substack{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_* \\ i_1 < \dots < i_m}} \left[\prod_{n \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} K_n \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_*^{-i}} H_n \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}^{-i}} I_n \right] \geq \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} K_n. \quad (\text{A35})$$

Then


$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} I_n}{N!_p}.$$

Proof Combining Approximations A34 and A14 yields

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}^N)}{N!_p}. \quad (\text{A36})$$

By definition of s^{-1} (4), for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, \mathcal{I}_n and \mathcal{K}_n are subsets of $\{1, \dots, p_n\}$. Hence, $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$ contains $\cup_{m \in \{0, \dots, N_*-2\}, i_1 < \dots < i_m} \times_{n \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \mathcal{K}_n \times \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}_*^{-i}} \mathcal{H}_n \times \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}^{-i}} \mathcal{I}_n$.

Every $k \in \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{K}_n$ can be enlivened by exchanging its n th component with the same of any element $k_* \in \times_{n \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \mathcal{H}_n \times \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}_*^{-i}} \mathcal{H}_n \times \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}^{-i}} \mathcal{I}_n$ for any $m \in \{0, \dots, N_*-2\}$ (in which $\{0, \dots, \text{negative number}\} := \{0\}$), $i_1 < \dots < i_m$, and $n \in \mathcal{N}_*^{-i}$. For example, if $N = 2$, $\mathcal{I}_1 = 1 = \mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_2$, $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 2\}$, then $\mathcal{H}_1 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{2\}$, $\mathcal{N}_* = \{2\}$, $N_* - 2 < 0$, and $k = (1, 1)$ is (dead and) can be enlivened by exchanging its second component with the same of $(1, 2) \in \mathcal{I}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2$. In this simple case with no overlapping paths, the live and



dead paths can be distinguished by thickness (or, alternatively, color) with thick denoting alive:

Returning to the general case, every such k_* could make $N_* - 1 - m$ donations before another exchange would kill it or there were no more recipients in $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{K}_n$, which would only be the case if every path therein had been enlivened. When inequality A35 is satisfied, the latter is possible. Beginning with $\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n\}$ and exhausting donations yields some \mathcal{I} satisfying Condition (C1). Because the foregoing procedure begins with $\text{card}(\mathcal{I}^N)$ lives and performs at least $\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} K_n$ donations, \mathcal{I} satisfies

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}^N) \geq \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n). \quad (\text{A37})$$

Combining Approximations A37 and A36 concludes. \square

4 Application to \mathbb{N}_p

For an application of Theorem 3 or one of its corollaries (2 and 3) to a given S , the approximation of $s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p)$ for all N is fundamental. The following propositions concern the intersections of residue classes. When there is an infinite number of intersections, there is a simple characterization:

Proposition 6 (Infinite Intersections) Suppose 1. \mathcal{I} is a set, 2. for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $j_i, m_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, and 3. $\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} m_i = \infty$. Then

$$\cap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} j_i \bmod m_i \quad (\text{38})$$

can have at most one element s , in which case, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$j_i \bmod m_i = s \bmod m_i.$$

Proof The three suppositions guarantee Set 38 is well defined. The gaps between elements of (38) must be at least $m_i - 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, implying the gaps must be arbitrarily close to $\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} m_i - 1 = \infty$, by Supposition 3. This excludes the possibility of multiple elements. One element, say s , is possible precisely when, for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $s \in j_i \pmod{m_i}$. But for every given i , $s \in j_i \pmod{m_i}$ iff $j_i \pmod{m_i} = s \pmod{m_i}$. \square

The following proposition examines the nature of individual residue classes within a non-empty intersection thereof.

Proposition 7 (Computation of Shift) *Suppose*

- $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,
- m_1, \dots, m_N are co-prime,
- s_1, \dots, s_N are positive integers,
- $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and
- m_k divides the shifts of $\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{m_i}$.

Then $s_k \in 0 \pmod{m_k}$.

Proof By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, $\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{m_i}$ is indeed a residue class.

Suppose the shifts of $\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{m_i}$ are divisible by m_k . Then

$$(0 \pmod{m_k}) \cap (\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{m_i}) \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular, $(0 \pmod{m_k}) \cap (s_k \pmod{m_k})$ is non-empty. Hence, $s_k \in 0 \pmod{m_k}$. \square

The point of Proposition 7 is its corollary:

Corollary 4 *Suppose s_1, \dots, s_N are integers and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ $s_i \notin 0 \pmod{p_i}$. Then the shift and modulus of $\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{p_i}$ are co-prime.*

Proof Suppose, contrarily, that the shift and modulus of $\cap_{i=1}^N s_i \pmod{p_i}$ have a common divisor greater than 1, it is equal to p_k for some $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Then the previous proposition gives $s_k \in 0 \pmod{p_k}$. \square

Finally a computation of s^{-1} :

Lemma 3 (Primes in the Intersection of Residue Classes) *For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,*

$$s^{-1}(\mathbb{N}_p \pmod{N!_p}) \supseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1, \dots, p_n - 1\}.$$

Proof If, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $j_n \in \{1, \dots, p_n - 1\}$, then, by Corollary 4, the shift and modulus of $\cap_{i=1}^N j_i \pmod{p_i}$ are co-prime. Hence, by Dirichlet's theorem on the distribution of primes in residue classes, $\cap_{i=1}^N j_i \pmod{p_i} \cap \mathbb{N}_p \neq \emptyset$. \square

Theorem 4 (Probability Range of Primes) $\{\mu(\mathbb{N}_p) : \mu \in PR\} = [0, 1/2]$.

Proof By Corollary 2, with Approximation A33 given by Lemma 3 and $\mathcal{S}_n := \{1, \dots, p_n - 1\}$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \inf_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{S}_i)}{p_i} = \inf_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{p_i - 1}{p_i} = \frac{1}{2},$$

with $i = 1$ attaining the infimum.

$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \leq 1/2$ by virtue of the primes inclusion in the odd numbers union $\{2\}$. Therefore the least upper bound is $1/2$. The greatest lower bound of 0 is the content of Proposition 2. \square

5 Application to Residue Classes

Because the primes have zero mass under R ([1]), we know a priori that there must be a residue class on which PR and R can disagree. It turns out the residue classes that have non-singleton bounds under PR are those mod neither 1 nor a prime; that is all residue classes on which PR was not initially defined!

The following two lemmas instantiate Approximations A33 and A34, respectively.

Lemma 4 (Intersection of Residue Classes) *Let $r, m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and $S := r \bmod m$ be an arbitrary residue class. For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, let $\mathcal{J}_n^S := \{1 : p_n\}$ if p_n does not divide m and $r \bmod p_n \in \{1 : p_n\}$ otherwise. For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,*

$$s^{-1}(S) \supseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{J}_n^S$$

Proof For all $j \in \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{J}_n^S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}: p_n | m} j_n \bmod p_n \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}: \neg p_n | m} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}: p_n | m} r \bmod p_n \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}: \neg p_n | m} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}: \neg p_n | m} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

the last equality holds because $r \bmod p_n \subseteq S$ for all p_n dividing m . By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, set 39 is non-empty. \square

Lemma 5 (Intersecting a Residue Class Union) *Suppose $r, m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ is such that m is made up of two (not necessarily unique) prime factors m_1, m_2 . Let $S := \mathbb{Z} \setminus r \bmod m$. For all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$,*

$$s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p) \supseteq [\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1 : p_n\}] \setminus [(\times_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}} \{1 : p_n\}) \times \times_{n \in \{i_1, i_2\}} r \bmod p_n], \quad (A40)$$

in which i_1 and i_2 are such that $p_{i_1} = m_1$ and $p_{i_2} = m_2$.

If, further, $i_1 = i_2$,

$$s^{-1}(S \bmod N!_p) \supseteq \times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1 : p_n\}, \quad (A41)$$

Proof Fix an element j in the right-hand side

$$[\times_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \{1 : p_n\}] \setminus [(\times_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}} \{1 : p_n\}) \times \times_{n \in \{i_1, i_2\}} r \bmod p_n] \quad (42)$$

of Approximation A40. Then, if $i_1 \neq i_2$, for some $i_* \in \{i_1, i_2\}$,

$$S_* := j_{i_*} \bmod p_{i_*} \subset S. \quad (43)$$

In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S &= \bigcap_{n \in \{i_1, i_2\}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap S \\ &= (S_* \cap S) \cap \bigcap_{n \in \{i_1, i_2\} \setminus \{i_*\}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}} j_n \bmod p_n \\ &= \bigcap_{n \in \{i_1, i_2\}} j_n \bmod p_n \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}} j_n \bmod p_n, \end{aligned}$$

the latter equality by Expression 43. In summary,

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}} j_n \bmod p_n \subset S \quad (A44)$$

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, the left-hand side of Approximation A44 is non-empty. In particular, $S \bmod N!_p \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathcal{N}} j_n \bmod p_n \neq \emptyset$. Because j was an arbitrary element of set 42, Approximation A40 holds.

If, instead, $r = m_1^2$ and j in the right-hand side of Approximation A41, then Approximation A44 still holds. \square

Theorem 5 (Probability Range of Residue Class) For every $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \setminus \{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$,

$$\{\mu(r \bmod m) : \mu \in PR\} = \left[0, \frac{1}{\max\{p \in \mathbb{N}_p : p|m\}}\right].$$

Proof With Approximation A33 given by Lemma 4 and $\mathcal{I}_n := \mathcal{I}_n^S$, by Corollary 2,

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{\text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n^S)}{p_n} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}: p_n|m} \frac{1}{p_n} = \frac{1}{\max\{p \in \mathbb{N}_p : p|m\}}.$$

For p_n dividing m , $\mu(S)$ can be no larger than the measure $\mu(r \bmod p_n)$ of a set containing it, so

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) = \frac{1}{\max\{p \in \mathbb{N}_p : p|m\}}.$$

It remains to show merely

$$\inf_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) = 0. \quad (\text{Id45})$$

It suffices to consider m with at most two prime factors, as every residue class of a modulus with more prime factors is a subset of some class with two; and thus has probability at most that of the superset. Classes with one prime factor are defined. Therefore, it suffices to consider moduli with exactly two prime factors m_1 and m_2 .

Since our theory is based on suprema rather than infima, consider the set complement S^c , itself a union of residue classes. Claimed Identity Id45 is equivalent to $\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S^c) = 1$, which in turn is equivalent to

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S^c) \geq 1 \quad (\text{A46})$$

by definition of finitely additive probability.

If $m_1 = m_2$, then by Corollary 2, with Approximation A33 given by Approximation A41 and $\mathcal{I}_n := \{1, \dots, p_n\}$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S^c) \geq \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{\text{card}(\{1, \dots, p_n\})}{p_n} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}} \frac{p_n}{p_n} = 1.$$

Now consider $m_1 \neq m_2$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. Let, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{I}_n := \{1 : p_n\}$ and

$$\mathcal{K}_n := \begin{cases} \{1 : p_n\} & n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\} \\ r \bmod p_n \cap \{1 : p_n\} & n \in \{i_1, i_2\} \end{cases},$$

in which i_1 and i_2 are such that $p_{i_1} = m_1$ and $p_{i_2} = m_2$. (Compare to the setup of Lemma 5.) Then

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{K}_n) = \begin{cases} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n) & n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{i_1, i_2\} \\ 1 & n \in \{i_1, i_2\} \end{cases} \quad (\text{Id47})$$

and $\mathcal{N}_* := \{n \in \mathcal{N} : \mathcal{I}_n \setminus \mathcal{K}_n \neq \emptyset\} = \{i_1, i_2\}$. Plugging $N_* = \text{card}(\{i_1, i_2\}) = 2$ into the left-hand side of A35 yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=0}^0 (2-1-m) \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_* : i_1 < \dots < i_m} \left[\prod_{n \in \emptyset} K_n \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_*} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n \setminus \mathcal{K}_n) \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_*} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n) \right] \\ &= \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_*} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n \setminus \mathcal{K}_n) \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_*} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n), \end{aligned}$$

matching Identity Id47 and thereby satisfying inequality A35.

Therefore, with Approximation A34 given by (i) Approximation A40 of Lemma 5 and (ii) S^c in place of S , by Corollary 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mu \in PR} \mu(S) &\geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_n)}{N!_p} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n}{N!_p} \\ &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad \text{Definition 4,}$$

which, in turn, gives Approximation A46, all that remained to prove. \square

Remark: The proof of the lower bound in the case $m = p^2$ for some prime p could have appealed to Corollary 2 rather than 3, but the former has more conditions to check.

6 Conclusion

PR is a distinct family of uniform finitely additive probabilities over \mathbb{Z} . From the strict inclusions

$$WT \subset L \subset S \subset R \subset PR,$$

we have shown the last. We have given necessary and sufficient conditions for there to exist a probability charge in PR assigning w to \mathbb{N}_p , namely $w \in [0, 1/2]$. We have also given necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a probability charge in PR assigning x to a class modulo c , where c is composite, namely $x \in [0, 1/y]$, where y is the largest prime factor of c .

References

1. J.B. Kadane, A. O'Hagan, Using finitely additive probability: Uniform distributions on the natural numbers, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90**, 626 (1995)
2. O. Schirokauer, J.B. Kadane, Uniform distributions on the natural numbers, *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **20**(3), 429 (2007)
3. E.K. van Douwen, Finitely additive measures on \mathbb{N} , *Topology and its Applications* **47**(3), 223 (1992)
4. T. Kerkvliet, R. Meester, Uniquely determined uniform probability on the natural numbers, *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **29**(3), 797 (2016)