

# THE SUM-OF-DIGITS FUNCTION ON ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS

LUKAS SPIEGELHOFER AND THOMAS STOLL

ABSTRACT. Let  $s_2$  be the sum-of-digits function in base 2, which returns the number of non-zero binary digits of a nonnegative integer  $n$ . We study  $s_2$  along arithmetic subsequences and show that — up to a shift — the set of  $m$ -tuples of integers that appear as an arithmetic subsequence of  $s_2$  has full complexity.

## 1. RESULTS

The binary sum-of-digits function  $s_2$  is an elementary object studied in number theory. It is defined by the equation

$$s_2(\varepsilon_\nu 2^\nu + \cdots + \varepsilon_0 2^0) = \varepsilon_\nu + \cdots + \varepsilon_0,$$

where  $\varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \nu$ . Despite the simplicity of definition, the behaviour of  $s_2$  on arithmetic progressions is not fully understood. Cusick’s conjecture on the sum-of-digits function [3, 9] concerns this area of research: for an integer  $t \geq 0$ , we define the limit

$$c_t = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\{n : 0 \leq n < N, s_2(n+t) \geq s_2(n)\}|.$$

(The limit exists, see for example Bésineau [2]. In fact, the set in this definition is periodic with period  $2^k$  for some  $k$ .) Cusick’s conjecture states that

$$(1.1) \quad c_t > 1/2$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ . Drmota, Kauers, and the first author [3] proved that  $c_t > 1/2$  for *almost all*  $t$  in the sense of asymptotic density; we also wish to note the works by Emme and Prikhod’ko [6] and Emme and Hubert [4, 5], and the recent partial result by the first author [9].

In the current note, motivated by Cusick’s conjecture, we are concerned with the  $(m+1)$ -tuple  $(s_2(n), s_2(n+t), \dots, s_2(n+mt))$ , where  $t \geq 0$  and  $m \geq 1$  are integers. We aim to understand the set of tuples that can occur, as  $n$  and  $t$  run. In fact, our theorem states that, up to a shift, all tuples occur.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . There exist  $n$  and  $t$  such that for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ ,*

$$k_\ell = s_2(n + \ell t) - s_2(n).$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A63, 11B25.

The authors acknowledge support by the project MuDeRa, which is a joint project between the FWF (Austrian Science Fund) and the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche). Moreover, the first author was supported by the FWF project F5502-N26, which is a part of the Special Research Program “Quasi Monte Carlo methods: Theory and Applications”; the second author was supported by the project ANR-18-CE40-0018.

This is a generalization of the statement that the Thue–Morse sequence  $\mathbf{t}$  has full *arithmetic complexity*, meaning that every finite word  $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^L$  occurs as an arithmetic subsequence of  $\mathbf{t}$ . This was first proved in [1] and also follows from Müllner and the first named author [8], and Konieczny [7].

Theorem 1.1 is not hard to prove for  $m = 1$ . We present three arguments leading to this fact.

- (1) Assume first that  $k \geq 0$ . Set  $n = 2^{k+1}$  and  $t = 2^k - 1$ . Then  $s_2(n+t) = k+1$  and  $s_2(n) = 1$ , yielding  $k = s_2(n+t) - s_2(n)$ . If  $k < 0$ , we set  $n = 2^{-k+1} - 1$  and  $t = 1$ . Then  $s_2(n) = -k+1$  and  $s_2(n+t) = 1$ , which yields  $s_2(n+t) - s_2(n) = k$ . Alternatively, we may also write, as in the case  $m = 2$  presented below,  $t = 2^c - 1$  and  $n = 2^{c-1}(2^a - 1)$ , for positive integers  $a$  and  $c$ . We obtain  $s_2(n+t) = c$  and  $s_2(n) = a$ , and clearly the difference  $c - a$  runs through all integers.
- (2) We have  $s_2(n+1) - s_2(n) = 1 - \nu_2(n+1) \leq 1$ , where  $\nu_2(m) = \max\{k \geq 0 : 2^k \mid m\}$  for  $m \geq 1$  is the 2-adic valuation of  $m$ . This formula follows by considering the number of 1s with which the binary expansion of  $n$  ends. Since  $s_2(2^\ell) = 1$  and  $s_2(2^{\ell+1} - 1) = \ell + 1$ , we obtain the fact that  $s_2(n)$  attains all values in  $\{1, \dots, \ell + 1\}$  as  $n$  varies in  $\{2^\ell, \dots, 2^{\ell+1} - 1\}$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  be given and set  $\ell = 2|k|$ . Choose  $n \in \{2^\ell, \dots, 2^{\ell+1} - 1\}$  such that  $s_2(n) = |k| + 1$  and  $n' \in \{2^{\ell+1}, \dots, 2^{\ell+2} - 1\}$  such that  $s_2(n') = |k| + 1 + k$ . Then  $s_2(n') - s_2(n) = k$ , which implies the statement.
- (3) Consider the densities

$$\delta(k, t) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\{n : 0 \leq n < N, s_2(n+t) - s_2(n) = k\}|$$

(as it was the case for  $c_t$ , this asymptotic density exists [2]). These quantities satisfy the following recurrence [3]:

$$\delta(k, 1) = \begin{cases} 2^{k-2}, & k \leq 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\delta(k, 2t) = \delta(k, t);$$

$$\delta(k, 2t+1) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(k-1, t) + \frac{1}{2}\delta(k+1, t+1).$$

From this, it is very easy to show that  $\delta(k, t) > 0$  for all  $k \leq s_2(t)$ . For  $k$  given, choose  $t$  in such a way that  $s_2(t) \geq k$ ; the positivity of the density  $\delta(k, t)$  implies that there exists an  $n$  such that  $s_2(n+t) - s_2(n) = k$ .

For  $m = 2$ , it is also possible to obtain the statement by elementary considerations: consider integers  $a, c \geq 1, b, d \geq 0$  and choose the integers  $n$  and  $t$  in such a way that the binary expansions look as follows:

$$\begin{array}{r} n : \quad \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^a 1 0 \cdots 0 \quad \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^b 0 \cdots 0 \\ t : \quad \quad \quad \underbrace{1 1 \cdots 1}_c 0 \cdots 0 \quad \underbrace{0 1 \cdots 1}_d. \end{array}$$

The sums of digits of  $n$ ,  $n+t$  and  $n+2t$  respectively are  $a+b$ ,  $b+c+d$  and  $c+d$  respectively. By varying the variables, we can obtain the statement for all integers  $k_1$

and  $k_2$  such that  $k_2 \leq k_1$ . For the case  $k_1 < k_2$ , we use the following configuration of the integers  $n$  and  $t$ , where  $a, d \geq 1$  and  $c \geq 0$ :

$$\begin{array}{r} n : \quad \quad \quad \overbrace{1 \cdots 110 \cdots 0}^a \\ t : \quad \underbrace{1 \cdots 10 \cdots 0}_{c} \underbrace{11 \cdots 1}_{d} \end{array}$$

The sums of digits of  $n$ ,  $n+t$  and  $n+2t$  are  $a$ ,  $d$  and  $c+d$  respectively, and we see that we obtain all pairs  $(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that  $k_1 \leq k_2$ .

However, the method quickly experiences difficulties, as multiplication by 3 is not a shift of the binary digits anymore. While we believe that the case  $m=3$  can be made work by some effort, a general principle is not apparent. Therefore we choose a different approach.

We prove Theorem 1.1 by induction on  $m$ , the cases  $m=1, 2$  having been discussed above. Assume that  $m \geq 3$  and let  $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{Z}$  be given. By induction hypothesis, there exist  $t_0$  and  $n_0$  such that  $k_\ell = s_2(n_0 + \ell t_0) - s_2(n_0 + (\ell-1)t_0)$  for  $1 \leq \ell < m$ . Set  $k'_m = s_2(n_0 + m t_0) - s_2(n_0 + (m-1)t_0)$ . We are going to show that we may vary  $k'_m$  by steps of  $\pm 1$ , thus yielding the full statement.

By concatenation of binary expansions, it is sufficient to show the following statement.

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{There exist } t_1, n_1 \text{ such that } s_2(n_1 + \ell t_1) - s_2(n_1 + (\ell-1)t_1) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell < m \\ \text{and } s_2(n_1 + m t_1) - s_2(n_1 + (m-1)t_1) = \pm 1. \end{array}$$

This concatenation is straightforward and summarized in the following lemma, which we will also use again in a moment.

**Lemma 1.2.** *Let  $\ell \geq 1$ ,  $m \geq 1$ ,  $n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}$  and  $t_0, \dots, t_{k-1}$  be nonnegative integers. There exist nonnegative integers  $n$  and  $t$  such that*

$$s_2(n + \ell t) - s_2(n + (\ell-1)t) = \sum_{0 \leq j < k} (s_2(n_j + \ell t_j) - s_2(n_j + (\ell-1)t_j))$$

for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ .

*Proof.* The base case  $k=1$  is trivial; it is sufficient to prove the statement for  $k=2$ , the general case following easily from repeated application of this case.

Let  $N$  be so large that  $n_0 + m t_0 < 2^N$ , and set  $n = 2^N n_1 + n_0$  and  $t = 2^N t_1 + t_0$ . Since no carry propagation between the digits below and above  $N$  occurs, we can add up the contribution of the two blocks in order to yield the statement.  $\square$

We reduce the problem further, using this block representation again: choose  $t_j = 1$  for all  $0 \leq j < k$ ; it is sufficient to find a  $k \geq 1$  and nonnegative integers  $n_j$  for  $0 \leq j < k$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \sum_{0 \leq j < k} (s_2(n_j + \ell) - s_2(n_j + \ell - 1)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell < m; \\ \pm 1, & \text{if } \ell = m. \end{cases}$$

In order to show (1.3), we use the telescoping sum

$$\sum_{a \leq j < a+2^L} g(j) = s_2(a + 2^L) - s_2(a) = g(\lfloor a/2^L \rfloor),$$

where  $g(j) = s_2(j+1) - s_2(j)$ . This representation yields for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ , where  $L$  is chosen such that  $2^L \leq m < 2^{L+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{2 \cdot 2^L - m + \ell \leq j < 3 \cdot 2^L - m + \ell} g(j) &= g(2 + \lfloor (-m + \ell)/2^L \rfloor) = \begin{cases} g(1) = 0, & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell < m; \\ g(2) = 1, & \text{if } \ell = m; \end{cases} \\ \sum_{2^L - m + \ell \leq j < 2 \cdot 2^L - m + \ell} g(j) &= g(1 + \lfloor (-m + \ell)/2^L \rfloor) = \begin{cases} g(0) = 1, & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell < m; \\ g(1) = 0, & \text{if } \ell = m; \end{cases} \\ \sum_{3 \cdot 2^{L+1} + \ell \leq j < 4 \cdot 2^{L+1} + \ell} g(j) &= g(3) = -1 \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m. \end{aligned}$$

The first of these three identities yields the “+”-part of (1.3) by choosing  $k = 2^L$  and  $n_j = 2 \cdot 2^L - m + j$  for  $0 \leq j < k$ .

The “-”-part is obtained from the second and third identities: by considering the disjoint union  $J = [2^L - m, 2 \cdot 2^L - m) \cup [3 \cdot 2^{L+1}, 4 \cdot 2^{L+1})$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in J} (s_2(j + \ell) - s_2(j + \ell - 1)) = \begin{cases} g(0) = 0, & \text{if } 1 \leq \ell < m; \\ g(1) = -1, & \text{if } \ell = m. \end{cases}$$

The statement follows by merging the two intervals and choosing  $n_j$  accordingly. This finishes the proof of our theorem.

## 2. POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS

From our proof, it is possible to actually construct integers  $n$  and  $t$  such that  $s_2(n + \ell t) - s_2(n) = k_\ell$  for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ . In particular, this yields integers  $n$  and  $t$  such that  $\mathbf{t}_{n+\ell t} = \omega_\ell$  for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ , where  $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \{0, 1\}^m$  and  $\mathbf{t}$  is the Thue–Morse sequence on  $\{0, 1\}$ . (Note that we also used  $\mathbf{t}(2n+1) = 1 - \mathbf{t}(n)$ .) This gives a constructive result concerning the problem of full arithmetic complexity of the Thue–Morse sequence considered in [1, 7, 8].

As an extension of the presented line of research, we are interested in the proportion of cases in which  $s_2(n + \ell t) - s_2(n) = k_\ell$  occurs (for  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ ). For this, we define more generally

$$\delta(\mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, t) = \text{dens} \{n : s_2(n + \ell t + \varepsilon_\ell) - s_2(n) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\},$$

where  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ . This generalizes the array  $\delta$  defined before. As in the one-dimensional case, the densities in this definition actually exist, and they satisfy the following recurrence relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, 2t) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{dens} \{n : s(2n + 2\ell t + \varepsilon_\ell) - s(2n) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{dens} \{n : s(2n + 2\ell t + \varepsilon_\ell + 1) - s(2n + 1) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \delta(\mathbf{k}', \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}', t) + \frac{1}{2} \delta(\mathbf{k}'', \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'', t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $k'_\ell = k_\ell - \varepsilon_\ell \pmod 2$ ,  $k''_\ell = k_\ell + 1 - (\varepsilon_\ell + 1) \pmod 2$ ,  $\varepsilon'_\ell = \lfloor \varepsilon_\ell / 2 \rfloor$  and  $\varepsilon''_\ell = \lfloor (\varepsilon_\ell + 1) / 2 \rfloor$ ; moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, 2t + 1) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{dens}\{n : s(2n + 2\ell t + \varepsilon_\ell + \ell) - s(2n) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{dens}\{n : s(2n + 2\ell t + \varepsilon_\ell + \ell + 1) - s(2n + 1) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \delta(\mathbf{k}', \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}', t) + \frac{1}{2} \delta(\mathbf{k}'', \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'', t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $k'_\ell = k_\ell - (\varepsilon_\ell + \ell) \pmod 2$ ,  $k''_\ell = k_\ell + 1 - (\varepsilon_\ell + \ell + 1) \pmod 2$ ,  $\varepsilon'_\ell = \lfloor (\varepsilon_\ell + \ell) / 2 \rfloor$  and  $\varepsilon''_\ell = \lfloor (\varepsilon_\ell + \ell + 1) / 2 \rfloor$ . This recurrence is the reason for the introduction of  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ .

This recurrence can be used to prove statements on the densities  $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, t)$ . On the one hand, we may ask for generalizations of Cusick's conjecture, relating the relative sizes of the values  $s_2(n), s_2(n + t), \dots, s_2(n + mt)$  to one another.

**Problem 1.** Consider generalizations of Cusick's conjecture, proving for example, for many  $t$ , that

$$\text{dens}\{n : s_2(n + t) \geq s_2(n) \text{ and } s_2(n + 2t) \leq s_2(n + t)\} > 1/4.$$

Moreover, show that the constant  $1/4$  is optimal.

On the other hand, we could ask for the overall shape of the  $m$ -dimensional probability distribution defined by  $\delta(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, t)$ .

**Problem 2.** Prove a multidimensional generalization of the theorem by Emme and Hubert [4]: for most  $t$ , the densities  $\text{dens}\{n : s_2(n + \ell t) - s_2(n) = k_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m\}$  should define a probability distribution that is close to a multivariate Gaussian law.

We expect that nontrivial statements on both Problem 1 and Problem 2, at least for small  $m$ , can be obtained by extending the study of moments set forward by Emme and Hubert [4]. The transition to arbitrary dimensions  $m$  however will necessitate new ideas.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. V. AVGUSTINOVICH, D. G. FON-DER-FLAASS, AND A. E. FRID, *Arithmetical complexity of infinite words*, in Words, languages & combinatorics, III (Kyoto, 2000), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2003, pp. 51–62.
- [2] J. BÉSINEAU, *Indépendance statistique d'ensembles liés à la fonction "somme des chiffres"*, Acta Arith., 20 (1972), pp. 401–416.
- [3] M. DRMOTA, M. KAUSERS, AND L. SPIEGELHOFER, *On a Conjecture of Cusick Concerning the Sum of Digits of  $n$  and  $n + t$* , SIAM J. Discrete Math., 30 (2016), pp. 621–649.
- [4] J. EMME AND P. HUBERT, *Central Limit Theorem for Probability Measures Defined by Sum-of-digits Function in Base 2*, 2018. To appear in Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore.
- [5] ———, *Normal distribution of correlation measures of binary sum-of-digits functions*, Preprint, 2018. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11234>.
- [6] J. EMME AND A. PRIKHOD'KO, *On the Asymptotic Behavior of Density of Sets Defined by Sum-of-digits Function in Base 2*, Integers, 17 (2017), pp. A58, 28.
- [7] J. KONIECZNY, *Gowers norms for the Thue-Morse and Rudin-Shapiro sequences*, Preprint, 2017. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09985>.
- [8] C. MÜLLNER AND L. SPIEGELHOFER, *Normality of the Thue–Morse sequence along Piatetski-Shapiro sequences, II*, Israel J. Math., 220 (2017), pp. 691–738.

- [9] L. SPIEGELHOFER, *Approaching Cusick's conjecture on the sum-of-digits function*, 2019. Accepted for publication in *Integers*; <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08646>.

INSTITUTE OF DISCRETE MATHEMATICS AND GEOMETRY, VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,  
VIENNA, AUSTRIA

INSTITUT ÉLIE CARTAN DE LORRAINE, UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE, VANDŒUVRE-LÈS-NANCY, FRANCE