

POWER-FREE PALINDROMES AND REVERSED PRIMES

SHASHI CHOURASIYA AND DANIEL R. JOHNSTON

ABSTRACT. We prove new results related to the digital reverse \overleftarrow{n} of a positive integer n in a fixed base b . First we show that for $b \geq 26000$, there exists infinitely many primes p such that \overleftarrow{p} is square-free. Further, we show that there are infinitely many palindromes (with $n = \overleftarrow{n}$) that are 4th power-free. We also give asymptotic expressions for the counting functions corresponding to these results. The main tools we use are recent bounds from the literature on reversed primes and palindromes in arithmetic progressions.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we are interested in results concerning the digital reverse of a number. To make this notion precise, we fix a base $b \geq 2$ and for $N \geq 1$ set

$$\mathcal{B}_N = \{b^{N-1} \leq n < b^N : b \nmid n\} \quad (1.1)$$

to be the set of N -digit base- b numbers that are not divisible by b . The *digital reverse* of an integer n is then defined by

$$\overleftarrow{n} = \sum_{0 \leq i < N} n_i b^{N-1-i}. \quad (1.2)$$

So for example, in base 10,

$$\overleftarrow{1234} = 4321 \quad \text{and} \quad \overleftarrow{878787} = 787878.$$

We note that the condition that $b \nmid n$ in the definition (1.1) of \mathcal{B}_N is so that the last digit of n is non-zero, and the operator $\overleftarrow{\cdot}$ is an involution.

Throughout this paper, we also work with the more restrictive set

$$\mathcal{B}_N^* = \{b^{N-1} \leq n < b^N : (n, b^3 - b) = 1\}.$$

By only considering \overleftarrow{n} coprime to $b^3 - b = b(b^2 - 1)$ we avoid several arithmetical relations between n and \overleftarrow{n} which would otherwise complicate our results and proofs. Here, the modulus b is important since for any $m \leq N$, the residue of $\overleftarrow{n} \pmod{b^m}$ is determined by the first m digits of n . Then, in terms of the modulus $b^2 - 1$,

$$\overleftarrow{n} \equiv b^{N-1}n \pmod{b^2 - 1}$$

since $b \equiv b^{-1} \pmod{b^2 - 1}$. In particular, $(n, b^2 - 1) > 1$ if and only if $(\overleftarrow{n}, b^2 - 1) > 1$.

Date: March 28, 2025.

Corresponding author: Daniel Johnston (daniel.johnston@unsw.edu.au).

Affiliation: School of Science, The University of New South Wales Canberra, Australia.

Key phrases: palindromes, reversible primes, square-free, equidistribution

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11A63 (Primary) 11N37, 11Y35 (Secondary)

Both authors' research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship.

Historically, studies of the digital properties of numbers have been confined to the realm of elementary number theory. However, in recent years there has been a flurry of results obtained by applying deep analytical methods. Of particular note is Maynard's work [9] in 2019, which showed that there are infinitely many primes missing a fixed digit in base 10. Other significant works include [8] and [10].

With regard to the digital reverse of numbers, we have the following two long-standing conjectures.

Conjecture 1.1. *For every base $b \geq 2$, there are infinitely many reversible primes¹. That is, prime numbers p such that \overleftarrow{p} is also prime.*

Conjecture 1.2. *For every base $b \geq 2$, there are infinitely many palindromic primes. That is, prime numbers p such that $p = \overleftarrow{p}$.*

Currently, both of these conjectures appear out of reach, particularly Conjecture 1.2 which would imply Conjecture 1.1. From here onwards we focus on the following weakenings of Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2, which are more approachable with current methods.

Conjecture 1.3. *For every base $b \geq 2$, there are infinitely many primes p such that \overleftarrow{p} is square-free.*

Conjecture 1.4. *For every base $b \geq 2$, there are infinitely many square-free palindromes. That is, integers $n > 0$ such that n is square-free and $n = \overleftarrow{n}$.*

Conjectures 1.3 and 1.4 simply weaken the primality conditions in Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 to the property of being square-free. We note that Conjecture 1.4 is deceptively difficult due to the sparseness of palindromes, and has been mentioned several times in the literature (see e.g. [2, p. 10] and [4, p. 7]).

Currently the best result towards Conjecture 1.3 appears in the recent work of Dartyge et al. [4]. Here, the authors show [4, Theorem 1.4] that there are infinitely many numbers n such that both n and \overleftarrow{n} are square-free. Their result is only proven in base $b = 2$, although their techniques routinely generalise to larger bases. In this paper we qualitatively improve upon this result for large bases. In particular, we are able to prove Conjecture 1.3 provided $b \geq 26000$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $b \geq 26000$. Then, there are infinitely many primes p such that \overleftarrow{p} is square-free. More precisely, if*

$$r_b(N) = \#\{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^* : p \text{ prime and } \overleftarrow{p} \text{ square-free}\},$$

then,

$$r_b(N) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \frac{b^N - b^{N-1}}{\log b^N} \prod_{p|b^3-b} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + O_b\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\right), \quad (1.3)$$

where ζ is the Riemann zeta-function.

Notably, (1.3) indicates that the condition of $\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^*$ being square-free is independent from p being prime. In particular, the factor of $1/\zeta(2) = 6/\pi^2$ in (1.3) is the natural density of square-free numbers, and $\frac{b^N - b^{N-1}}{\log b^N}$ is (asymptotically) the number of primes with N -digits by the prime number theorem. Then, since we are only considering $\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^*$ with $(\overleftarrow{p}, b^3 - b) = 1$, the product in (1.3) naturally arises by removing primes $p \mid b^3 - b$ from the Euler product of $1/\zeta(2)$.

¹In some literature, a reversible prime is called an *emirp*. That is, "prime" spelt backwards.

The main tool required to prove Theorem 1.5 is an asymptotic expression for reversed primes in arithmetic progressions due to Bhowmik and Suzuki [3], which they refer to as the *Zsiflaw–Legeis*² theorem. In [3], the Zsiflaw–Legeis theorem is only proven for bases $b \geq 31699$, but we have taken the opportunity to lower this to $b \geq 26000$ using a simple computational argument.

Next, with regard to Conjecture 1.4, the current best result in this direction is due to recent work of Tuxanidy and Panario [11]. In [11], it is proven that there are infinitely many palindromes with at most 6 prime factors. Trivially, this yields infinitely many palindromes that are 7th power-free. However, by a different application of Tuxanidy and Panario’s equidistribution results, we are able to prove the following.

Theorem 1.6. *For all bases $b \geq 2$, there are infinitely many 4th power-free palindromes. More precisely, if*

$$\mathcal{P}_b^*(x) = \{n \leq x : n = \overleftarrow{n} \text{ and } (n, b^3 - b) = 1\}$$

and

$$p_{4,b}(x) = \#\{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) : n \text{ is 4th power-free}\},$$

then,

$$p_{4,b}(x) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\zeta(4)} \prod_{p|b^3-b} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^4}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + O_{A,b}\left(\frac{1}{\log^A x}\right)\right). \quad (1.4)$$

Therefore, whilst we can give a result for all bases $b \geq 2$ (unlike Theorem 1.5), more work is required to prove Conjecture 1.4. As in Theorem 1.5, the asymptotic (1.4) indicates that the condition of $n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)$ being a palindrome is independent of n being 4th power-free.

We also remark that we have made different notational choices between Theorem 1.5 and 1.6. Most notably, Theorem 1.5 is stated as an asymptotic over numbers of fixed digit length, whereas Theorem 1.6 is stated as a result over numbers less than x . Results in either of these forms are closely related, and our definitions and notation were chosen as to most closely agree with the existing literature on reversed primes and palindromes.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sections 2 and 3 we prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 respectively. Then in Section 4 we provide further discussion. In particular, we discuss further possible improvements to our results, along with some related questions. An appendix is also included which gives the computational details for our refinement of the Zsiflaw–Legeis theorem.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5 on square-free reversed primes. To do so, we require the following refinement of the Zsiflaw–Legeis theorem, which follows from the proof of [3, Corollary 1.2] and the computations in the Appendix. Here,

$$\overleftarrow{\pi}_N(a, q) := \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{B}_N \\ \overleftarrow{p} \equiv a \pmod{q}}} 1 \quad (2.1)$$

counts number of reversed primes $\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N$ congruent to $a \pmod{q}$.

²Zsiflaw–Legeis is Siegel–Walfisz spelt backwards.

Lemma 2.1 (Refined Zsiflaw–Legeis theorem). *Let $b, a, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $q \geq 1$ and $b \geq 26000$. Then*

$$\overleftarrow{\pi}_N(a, q) = \frac{\rho_b(a, q)}{q} \frac{b^N}{\log b^N} \left(1 + O_b \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right) + O_b \left(b^N \exp(-c\sqrt{N}) \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where $c \in (0, 1)$ is some constant depending on b , and

$$\rho_b(a, q) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \mathbb{1}_{(q,b) \mid a} \frac{(q,b)}{b} \right) \prod_{p \mid (q, b^2 - 1)} \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right), & \text{if } (a, q, b^2 - 1) = 1 \text{ and } b \nmid (a, q), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Remark. In [3, Corollary 1.2] the restriction $q \geq 2$ is given. However, the case $q = 1$ follows from the prime number theorem so we have included it in Lemma 2.1.

We now prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. One has

$$r_b(N) = \sum_{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^*} \mu^2(\overleftarrow{p}) = \sum_{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^*} \sum_{d^2 \mid \overleftarrow{p}} \mu(d). \quad (2.4)$$

We split the double sum in (2.4) into $S_1(N) + S_2(N)$, with

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(N) &= \sum_{d \leq N^2} \sum_{\substack{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^* \\ d^2 \mid \overleftarrow{p}}} \mu(d) \\ S_2(N) &= \sum_{d > N^2} \sum_{\substack{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^* \\ d^2 \mid \overleftarrow{p}}} \mu(d). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

To begin with, we bound $S_2(N)$ as

$$|S_2(N)| \leq \sum_{d > N^2} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{B}_N^* \\ d^2 \mid n}} 1 \ll \sum_{d > N^2} \frac{|\mathcal{B}_N^*|}{d^2} \ll \frac{|\mathcal{B}_N^*|}{N^2} = O_b \left(\frac{b^N}{N \log b^N} \right)$$

noting that $|\mathcal{B}_N^*| < b^N$. Hence, $S_2(N)$ is sufficiently small so it suffices to show that $S_1(N)$ satisfies the asymptotic in (1.3). To estimate $S_1(N)$, we write

$$S_1(N) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{\overleftarrow{p} \in \mathcal{B}_N^* \\ d^2 \mid \overleftarrow{p}}} \mu(d) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \mu(d) \overleftarrow{\pi}_N(0, d^2)$$

with $\overleftarrow{\pi}_N$ as defined in (2.1). Hence, by Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(N) &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \mu(d) \left\{ \frac{\rho_b(0, d^2)}{d^2} \frac{b^N}{\log b^N} \left(1 + O_b \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right) + O_b \left(b^N \exp(-c\sqrt{N}) \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{b} \right) \frac{b^N}{\log b^N} \left(1 + O_b \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right) + O_b \left(N^2 b^N \exp(-c\sqrt{N}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

for all $b \geq 26000$, some constant $c \in (0, 1)$ and with $\rho_b(0, d^2)$ as defined in (2.3). Since $\exp(-c\sqrt{N}) \ll_{A,b} N^{-A}$ for any $A > 0$, the error term in (2.6) satisfies

$$N^2 b^N \exp(-c\sqrt{N}) \ll_b \frac{b^N}{N \log b^N}$$

so that we can focus on the main term in (2.6). To do so, we write

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} = \sum_{(d, b^3 - b) = 1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} - \sum_{\substack{d > N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2}. \quad (2.7)$$

By converting to an Euler product,

$$\sum_{(d, b^3 - b) = 1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \prod_{p|b^3 - b} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1}. \quad (2.8)$$

Then,

$$\sum_{\substack{d > N^2 \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \leq \sum_{d > N^2} \frac{1}{d^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (2.9)$$

Substituting (2.8) and (2.9) into (2.7), we see that (2.6) reduces to the claimed asymptotic (1.3), thereby completing the proof. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.6

In this section we prove Theorem 1.6 by utilising an equidistribution estimate due to Tuxanidy and Panario [11]. To begin with, for any base $b \geq 2$ we let

$$\mathcal{P}_b(x) = \{n \leq x : b \nmid n \text{ and } n = \overleftarrow{n}\}$$

denote the set of base- b palindromes less than x , and $\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)$ be as defined in the statement of Theorem 1.6.

Since any N -digit palindrome is fully determined by its first $\lceil N/2 \rceil$ digits, a simple combinatorial argument yields that

$$|\mathcal{P}_b(x)| \asymp_b \sqrt{x}.$$

It turns out that the same is true for $|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|$, as proven in [11].

Lemma 3.1 ([11, Lemma 9.1]). *For any base $b \geq 2$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)| \asymp_b \sqrt{x}$$

Next we state an equidistribution result for square moduli, which was proven in [11] by applying a variant of the large sieve inequality [1].

Lemma 3.2 ([11, Proposition 10.1]). *For any $b \geq 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A > 0$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq x^{1/4 - \varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3 - b) = 1}} \mu^2(d) \sup_{y \leq x} \max_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(y)} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n \equiv a \pmod{d^2}} - \frac{1}{d^2} \right) \right| \ll_{A,b,\varepsilon} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}. \quad (3.1)$$

We now use specific cases of Lemma 3.2 to obtain two equidistribution results which are more related to our problem at hand.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $b \geq 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A > 0$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{x^{1/8-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \mu^2(d) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)} \left(\mathbb{1}_{d^2|n} - \frac{1}{d^2} \right) \ll_{A,b,\varepsilon} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \mu(d) \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)} \left(\mathbb{1}_{d^4|n} - \frac{1}{d^4} \right) \ll_{A,b,\varepsilon} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Firstly, (3.2) follows from Lemma 3.2 as $d^2 | n$ is equivalent to $n \equiv 0 \pmod{d^2}$ so that the absolute value of the left-hand side of (3.2) is bounded above by the left-hand side of (3.1). Similarly, the absolute value of the left-hand side of (3.3) is bounded by

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \mu^2(d) \sup_{y \leq x} \max_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n \equiv 0 \pmod{d^4}} - \frac{1}{d^4} \right) \right|. \quad (3.4)$$

Replacing d^2 with d in (3.4) then gives the left-hand side of (3.1) restricted to square d , and the desired result follows. \square

Using the above lemmas, we now prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We proceed in a similar fashion to the proof of Theorem 1.5. In particular, we begin by writing

$$p_{4,b}(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)} \sum_{d^4|n} \mu(d). \quad (3.5)$$

Let $\varepsilon = 1/100$. We split the double sum in (3.5) into $S_1(x) + S_2(x) + S_3(x)$, with

$$S_1(x) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) \\ d^4|n}} \mu(d), \quad (3.6)$$

$$S_2(x) = \sum_{\substack{x^{1/8-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) \\ d^4|n}} \mu(d). \quad (3.7)$$

$$S_3(x) = \sum_{\substack{x^{1/4-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) \\ d^4|n}} \mu(d). \quad (3.8)$$

Here, the condition $(d, b^3 - b) = 1$ has been vacuously added, noting that every $n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)$ satisfies $(n, b^3 - b) = 1$. Now, (3.3) in Lemma 3.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(x) &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \mu(d) \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{d^4} + O_A \left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x} \right) \\ &= |\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)| \left(\sum_{(d, b^3-b)=1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^4} - \sum_{\substack{d > x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^4} \right) + O_{A,b} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

By converting to an Euler product,

$$\sum_{(d, b^3-b)=1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^4} = \frac{1}{\zeta(4)} \prod_{p|b^3-b} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^4}\right)^{-1}. \quad (3.10)$$

Then,

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{d > x^{1/8-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^4} \right| \leq \sum_{d > x^{1/8-\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{d^4} \ll \frac{1}{x^{3/8-3\varepsilon}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Substituting (3.10) and (3.11) into (3.9) yields

$$S_1(x) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\zeta(4)} \prod_{p|b^3-b} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^4}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + O_{A,b} \left(\frac{1}{\log^A x}\right)\right),$$

which is the asymptotic expression we wish to prove for $p_{4,b}(x)$. Hence, to finish, it suffices to show that $S_2(x)$ and $S_3(x)$ can be absorbed into the error term of (1.4).

For $S_2(x)$, since $d^4 \mid n$ implies $d^2 \mid n$, we have

$$|S_2(x)| \leq \sum_{\substack{x^{1/8-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) \\ d^4 \mid n}} \mu^2(d) \leq \sum_{\substack{x^{1/8-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x) \\ d^2 \mid n}} \mu^2(d).$$

Therefore, (3.2) of Lemma 3.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} |S_2(x)| &\leq |\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)| \sum_{\substack{x^{1/8-\varepsilon} < d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \\ (d, b^3-b)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d^2} + O_{A,b} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}\right) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)| \sum_{d > x^{1/8-\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{d^2} + O_{A,b} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}\right) \\ &\ll_{A,b} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. Finally, for $S_3(x)$, we have

$$|S_3(x)| \leq \sum_{d > x^{1/4-\varepsilon}} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^4 \mid n}} 1 \leq \sum_{d > x^{1/4-\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{d^4} \ll \frac{1}{x^{3/4-\varepsilon}}. \quad (3.12)$$

By Lemma 3.1, we can then further bound (3.12) by

$$|S_3(x)| \ll_b \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{x^{1/4-\varepsilon}} \ll_{A,b} \frac{|\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)|}{\log^A x}, \quad (3.13)$$

as required. \square

4 Further discussion

4.1 Possible improvements

In order to prove Conjecture 1.3, one would have to increase the valid range of bases $b \geq 26000$ in Theorem 1.5. Certainly, one could expand on our computational argument in the Appendix. However, we performed some rough calculations and found this method limits out around $b = 25960$, so that no significant improvement

is possible. Thus, to lower the base further, one would need to introduce new analytic techniques. For example, one could try to adapt some of the methods in [9], which were used to detect primes with restricted digits in base $b = 10$.

On the other hand, a proof of Conjecture 1.4 appears difficult, even for sufficiently large bases. A more achievable goal would be to prove the existence of infinitely many cube-free palindromes. In this setting, one would need to approximate

$$p_{3,b}(x) := \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_b^*(x)} \sum_{d^3 | n} \mu(d).$$

Following the proof of Theorem 1.6 with an analogous decomposition ((3.6)–(3.8)):

$$p_{3,b}(x) = S_1(x) + S_2(x) + S_3(x)$$

would yield (cf. (3.13))

$$S_3(x) \ll |\mathcal{P}_b^*(x)| x^\varepsilon.$$

In particular, $S_3(x)$ is too large to give an asymptotic, or even a lower bound, for $p_{3,b}(x)$. To overcome this, one would need to find a less trivial way of bounding $S_3(x)$ or obtain a better equidistribution result than Lemma 3.2 (with level of distribution greater than $1/4$).

4.2 Related problems

In [4], Dartyge et al. prove that for infinitely many numbers n , one has³

$$\Omega(n \overleftarrow{n}) \leq 8 \tag{4.1}$$

in base $b = 2$, where $\Omega(\cdot)$ is the number of prime factors of an integer, counting multiplicity. In a similar vein to our Theorem 1.5, one could try to prove an analogous result to (4.1), fixing n to be prime.

Question 4.1. *Can one prove the existence of an integer $K > 0$ such that for all, or a range of bases $b \geq 2$,*

$$\Omega(\overleftarrow{p}) \leq K$$

for infinitely many primes p .

An affirmative answer to Question 4.1 would be a deeper result (and closer to Conjecture 1.1) than Theorem 1.5. This is due to the fact that the set of integers with a bounded number of prime factors has a natural density of 0, whereas a proportion of $6/\pi^2 \approx 0.608$ numbers are square-free. To prove Question 4.1 using classical sieve methods, one would need an equidistribution result for reversed primes in arithmetic progressions, as opposed to the pointwise bound given by the Zsigmondy–Lejeune theorem (Lemma 2.1).

The methods in this paper could also be used to study the following Goldbach-like conjecture.

Conjecture 4.2 (Hcabdlog’s conjecture). *For every base $b \geq 2$, every sufficiently large number N can be expressed as*

$$N = \overleftarrow{p_1} + p_2 \tag{4.2}$$

for some primes p_1 and p_2 .

³Dartyge et al. actually give a weaker statement [4, Corollary 1.3]. However, (4.1) still follows from their main result [4, Theorem 1.1].

In base 10, a simple computation yields 44 exceptions to (4.2) for $4 \leq N \leq 10^6$, the largest of which is $N = 989$.

As an approximation to Conjecture 4.2, one could apply the Zsigmondy–Lejeune theorem as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 to count representations of large N as

$$N = \overleftarrow{p} + \eta, \quad (4.3)$$

where p is prime and η is square-free. In particular, if $h_b(N)$ represents the number of representations of N in the form (4.3), then

$$h_b(N) = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{B}_N} \mu^2(N - \overleftarrow{p}) = \sum_{d < \sqrt{N}} \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{B}_N \\ \overleftarrow{p} \equiv N \pmod{d}}} \mu(d),$$

which directly depends on estimates for $\overleftarrow{\pi}(N, d)$. Obtaining an asymptotic expression for $h_b(N)$ would be analogous to Estermann’s classical result on the sum of a prime and a square-free number [6], which was proven in relation to the standard Goldbach conjecture.

Appendix: Refining the Zsigmondy–Lejeune theorem

In this appendix, we prove that the stated bound $b \geq 26000$ is admissible in the Zsigmondy–Lejeune theorem (Lemma 2.1). To do so, we note that in [3], it is proven that the asymptotic expression (2.2) holds provided

$$\alpha_b := \frac{\log(C_b)}{\log b} < \frac{1}{5}, \quad (A.4)$$

where $C_b > 0$ is any number such that

$$f(\theta) := \sum_{0 \leq h < b} \min \left(b, \frac{1}{|\sin \pi (\frac{h}{b} + \theta)|} \right) \leq C_b b \quad (A.5)$$

uniformly for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. In [3, Lemma 6], an analytic expression for C_b is provided which gives that (A.4) holds for all $b \geq 31699$. However, by utilising the periodicity of $f(\theta)$, it is possible to perform a moderate computation to expand the range of b . The relevant code is given in the Github repository [7].

Proposition A.1. *The condition (A.4) holds for all $b \geq 26000$.*

Proof. The case $b \geq 31699$ is proven in [3], so we restrict to $26000 \leq b \leq 31698$. Let

$$f_h(\theta) = \min \left(b, \frac{1}{|\sin(\pi(\frac{h}{b} + \theta))|} \right)$$

so that

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{0 \leq h < b} f_h(\theta).$$

Combining (A.4) and (A.5), we aim to show that for $26000 \leq b < 31698$ and all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$f(\theta) < b^{6/5}. \quad (A.6)$$

First we note that it suffices to consider $\theta \in [0, 1/b]$ since if $\theta' = \theta + 1/b$ then

$$f(\theta') = \sum_{0 \leq h < b} f_h(\theta') = \sum_{0 \leq h < b} f_{h+1}(\theta) = f(\theta)$$




FIGURE 1. A plot of $f_h(\theta)$ generated by Desmos [5]. Here, $b = 3$ and $h = 0$. Increasing b increases the height of the peaks and reduces L_b . Changing h shifts the plot along the θ -axis.

by the 1-periodicity of $|\sin(\pi x)|$. We now divide the interval $[0, 1/b]$ into $K \geq 2$ segments of length $1/Kb$:

$$S_i = \left[\frac{i}{Kb}, \frac{i+1}{Kb} \right], \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, K-1.$$

For each value of i and h , we then note that

$$\max_{\theta \in S_i} f_h(\theta) = \max \left\{ f_h \left(\frac{i}{Kb} \right), f_h \left(\frac{i+1}{Kb} \right) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

To see why (A.7) holds, we refer to Figure 1, which shows the general structure of the function $f_h(x)$. In particular, $f_h(x)$ is a uniform sequence of concave up arches, connected by straight line segments at height b and of length

$$L_b := \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \left(\frac{1}{b} \right).$$

Since

$$\arcsin(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} dt > x$$

it follows that

$$L_b > \frac{2}{\pi b},$$

which is greater than the length of S_i for all $K \geq 2$. Thus, each interval S_i is either:

- (a) Entirely within one of the concave up arches of $f_h(x)$,
- (b) Entirely within one of the straight line segments of $f_h(x)$, or
- (c) Partially within one of the arches, and partially within one of the adjacent straight line segments.

In each case, the maximum of $f_h(\theta)$ occurs at an endpoint of S_i as stated in (A.7).

Therefore, to verify (A.6), we compute an upper bound for $f(\theta)$ on each segment S_i by using that

$$\max_{\theta \in S_i} f(\theta) \leq \sum_{0 \leq h < b} \max_{\theta \in S_i} f_h(\theta), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the right-hand side of (A.8) is evaluated using (A.7). In Table 1 we provide, for different ranges of $b \in [b_0, b_1]$ a suitable value of K such that the above computational procedure gives the inequality (A.6). This completes the proof. \square

TABLE 1. Suitable values of K to verify that (A.6) holds for all bases b with $b_0 \leq b \leq b_1$. The time to check each range of b is also included, as computed on a laptop with a 2.20 GHz processor.

b_0	b_1	K	Computation time (minutes)
28500	31698	8	34
26500	28499	34	55
26100	26499	122	47
26000	26099	367	35

References

- [1] S. Baier and L. Zhao. “An improvement for the large sieve for square moduli”. *J. Number Theory* 128.1 (2008), pp. 154–174.
- [2] W. D. Banks and I. E. Shparlinski. “Prime divisors of palindromes”. *Period. Math. Hungar.* 51 (2005), pp. 1–10.
- [3] G. Bhowmik and Y. Suzuki. “On Telhcirid’s theorem on arithmetic progressions”. *preprint available at arXiv:2406.13334* (2024).
- [4] C. Dartyge, B. Martin, J. Rivat, I. E. Shparlinski, and C. Swaenepoel. “Reversible primes”. *J. London Math. Soc.* 109.3 (2024), e12883.
- [5] *Desmos Graphing Calculator*. available at www.desmos.com/calculator.
- [6] T. Estermann. “On the representations of a number as the sum of a prime and a quadratfrei number”. *J. London Math. Soc.* 6.3 (1931), pp. 219–221.
- [7] D. R. Johnston. Code for checking bases in the Zsigmondy–Lejeune theorem, available at github.com/DJmath1729/powerfreereverse. 2025.
- [8] C. Mauduit and J. Rivat. “Sur un problème de Gelfond: la somme des chiffres des nombres premiers”. *Ann. of Math.* (2010), pp. 1591–1646.
- [9] J. Maynard. “Primes with restricted digits”. *Invent. Math.* 217 (2019), pp. 127–218.
- [10] C. Swaenepoel. “Prime numbers with a positive proportion of preassigned digits”. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 121.1 (2020), pp. 83–151.
- [11] A. Tuxanidy and D. Panario. “Infinitude of palindromic almost-prime numbers”. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2024.18 (2024), pp. 12466–12503.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, UNSW CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA
Email address: s.chourasiya@unsw.edu.au

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, UNSW CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA
Email address: daniel.johnston@unsw.edu.au