

**CORRIGENDUM TO “PERIOD OF THE POWER GENERATOR  
 AND SMALL VALUES OF CARMICHAEL’S FUNCTION”**

JOHN B. FRIEDLANDER, CARL POMERANCE, AND IGOR E. SHPARLINSKI

We are indebted to Kelly Postelmans whose question drew our attention to a slip in the proof of Theorem 8 of [1]. In particular, we asserted that for a fixed number  $n$ , the number of pairs of primes  $p, l$  with  $\gcd(p-1, l-1) < D$  and  $\lambda(\lambda(pl)) = n$  is at most  $D\tau(n)$ , an assertion which now seems unjustified. (The notation is defined below.) In this note we give a corrected proof of Theorem 8.

As in [1] we consider the *power generator*

$$(1) \quad u_n \equiv u_{n-1}^e \pmod{m}, \quad 0 \leq u_n \leq m-1, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

with the *initial value*  $u_0 = \vartheta$  (an integer coprime to  $m$ ) and *exponent*  $e$  (an integer at least 2). We recall that for an integer  $n \geq 1$  the *Carmichael function*  $\lambda(n)$  is the largest order occurring amongst elements of the unit group in the residue ring modulo  $n$ . As usual,  $\varphi$  denotes Euler’s function. We let  $\tau(n)$  denote the number of natural divisors of  $n$ , we let  $\omega(n)$  denote the number of divisors of  $n$  that are prime, and we let  $\Omega(n)$  denote the number of divisors of  $n$  that are (either a prime or) a prime power. An integer  $n$  is said to be *squarefull* if for each prime  $p|n$  we have  $p^2|n$ . If  $p^a$  is the largest power of the prime  $p$  which divides  $n$ , and  $a$  is at least 1, we write  $p^a||n$ . The letters  $p, q, l$  always denote prime numbers.

The following is a slightly stronger form of Theorem 8 of [1].

**Theorem 1.** *For  $Q$  sufficiently large, for any  $\Delta \geq 6(\log \log Q)^3$ , and for all pairs  $(p, l)$  of primes,  $1 < p < l \leq Q$ , except at most  $Q^2 \exp(-0.1(\Delta \log \Delta)^{1/3})$  of them, the following statement holds. For all pairs  $(\vartheta, e)$  with*

$$1 \leq \vartheta \leq m-1, \quad 1 \leq e \leq \lambda(m), \quad \gcd(\vartheta, m) = \gcd(e, \lambda(m)) = 1,$$

where  $m = pl$ , except at most  $m\lambda(m)\exp(-\Delta/4)$  of them, the period  $t$  of the sequence  $(u_n)$  given by (1) satisfies

$$t \geq Q^2 \exp(-\Delta).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of pairs  $(p, l)$  of primes with  $1 < p < l \leq Q$  and let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the set of pairs  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{S}$  for which all of the following hold:

- (i)  $\lambda(\lambda(pl)) \geq Q^2 \exp(-\Delta/3)$ ,
- (ii)  $\tau(p-1), \tau(l-1) < 2\Delta^{2/5}$  (so that  $\omega(p-1), \omega(l-1) < \Delta^{2/5}$ ),
- (iii) for each prime  $q|\lambda(pl)$ ,  $\tau(q-1) < \exp(\Delta^{2/5})$ .

---

Received by the editor April 19, 2002.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11B50, 11N56, 11T71; Secondary 11Y55, 94A60.

By Theorem 6 of [1] we have that the number of pairs  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{S}$  that do not satisfy (i) is

$$E_1 \ll Q^2 \exp\left(-0.11 (\Delta \log \Delta)^{1/3}\right).$$

From the well-known bound

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \tau^2(n) \ll x \log^3 x,$$

it follows that the number of pairs  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{S}$  that do not satisfy (ii) is

$$E_2 \ll Q^2 \exp\left(-\Delta^{2/5}\right).$$

We now consider pairs  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{S}$  that do not satisfy (iii). Suppose  $\omega(q-1) \geq \Delta^{2/5}$  for some prime  $q | \lambda(pl)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq Q, \omega(n) \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{1}{n} &\leq \sum_{j \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{1}{j!} \left( \sum_{q \leq Q} \left( \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q^2} + \dots \right) \right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{1}{j!} \left( \sum_{q \leq Q} \frac{1}{q-1} \right)^j \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{1}{j!} (c + \log \log Q)^j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c$  is an absolute constant. Since  $\Delta \geq 6(\log \log Q)^3$ , it follows that if  $Q$  is sufficiently large, the terms in the above series decay at least geometrically, so that

$$\sum_{n \leq Q, \omega(n) \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{1}{n} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2/5} \log \Delta\right).$$

Thus, the number of primes  $p \leq Q$  such that  $p-1$  is divisible by a prime  $q$  with  $\omega(q-1) \geq \Delta^{2/5}$  is at most

$$(2) \quad \sum_{n \leq Q, \omega(n) \geq \Delta^{2/5}} \frac{Q}{n+1} \leq Q \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2/5} \log \Delta\right),$$

as can be seen by forgetting just for the moment that  $p$  and  $q$  are primes and using only that they are integers at least 2. Now suppose that  $q | p-1$ ,  $\omega(q-1) < \Delta^{2/5}$ , and  $\tau(q-1) \geq \exp(\Delta^{2/5})$ . Note that if  $\omega(n) < \Delta^{2/5}$  and  $\tau(n) \geq \exp(\Delta^{2/5})$ , then  $2^{\Omega(n)} \geq \exp(\Delta^{2/5}) > \exp(\omega(n))$ , so that  $\Omega(n) - \omega(n) > \frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2/5}$ . (The constant  $\frac{1}{3}$  can be improved to  $0.75679\dots$  using the inequality  $\tau(n) \leq (3/2)^{\Omega(n) - \omega(n)} 2^{\omega(n)}$ .) Every such number  $n$  may be factored as  $n_1 n_2$ , where  $n_1$  is squarefull,  $\Omega(n_1) > \frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2/5}$ , and  $n_2 \leq Q$ . Thus the sum of reciprocals of such numbers  $n \leq Q$  is at most

$$\sum_{n_1} \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{n_2} \frac{1}{n_2} \ll 2^{-\frac{1}{6} \Delta^{2/5}} \log Q \ll \exp\left(-\frac{1}{9} \Delta^{2/5}\right),$$

where  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  independently run through integers of the above types. (Here we have used that the least squarefull number  $n$  with  $\Omega(n) \geq k > 1$  is  $2^k$  and that the sum of the reciprocals of the squarefull numbers that are at least  $B$  is  $\ll B^{-1/2}$ , the latter following from partial summation and the fact that there are  $O(x^{1/2})$  squarefull numbers in  $[1, x]$ .) Thus, the number of primes  $p \leq Q$  such that

$p - 1$  is divisible by a prime  $q$  with  $\tau(q - 1) \geq \exp(\Delta^{2/5})$  and  $\omega(q - 1) \leq \Delta^{2/5}$  is  $\ll Q \exp(-\frac{1}{9}\Delta^{2/5})$  and, by (2), this latter condition (on  $\omega$ ) may be dropped. Hence, the number of pairs  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{S}$  which do not satisfy (iii) is

$$E_3 \ll Q^2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{9}\Delta^{2/5}\right).$$

We conclude that for sufficiently large  $Q$ ,

$$|\mathcal{R}| \geq \binom{\pi(Q)}{2} - E_1 - E_2 - E_3 \geq \binom{\pi(Q)}{2} - Q^2 \exp\left(-0.1(\Delta \log \Delta)^{1/3}\right).$$

We shall show that the conclusion of the theorem holds for every pair  $(p, l)$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let us fix some pair  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{R}$  and put  $m = pl$ . We have, by (ii),

$$\tau(\lambda(m)) \leq \tau(\varphi(m)) \leq \tau(p - 1)\tau(l - 1) < \exp\left(2\Delta^{2/5}\right).$$

Further, using that  $\varphi(ab) | \varphi(a)\varphi(b)$  for all positive integers  $a, b$ ,

$$\tau(\lambda(\lambda(m))) \leq \tau(\varphi((p - 1)(l - 1))) \leq \tau(\varphi(p - 1))\tau(\varphi(l - 1))\tau(l - 1).$$

Here, we have  $\tau(l - 1) \leq \exp(\Delta^{2/5})$ , by (ii). Moreover, for  $(p, l) \in \mathcal{R}$ , we have, by (ii) and (iii),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\varphi(p - 1)) &\leq \prod_{q^a \parallel p-1} \tau(\varphi(q^a)) = \prod_{q^a \parallel p-1} a\tau(q - 1) \leq \tau(p - 1) \prod_{q \mid p-1} \tau(q - 1) \\ &< \exp\left(\Delta^{2/5}\right) \exp\left(\Delta^{2/5}\omega(p - 1)\right) < \exp\left(\Delta^{4/5} + \Delta^{2/5}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and the same bound holds for  $\tau(\varphi(l - 1))$ . We conclude that

$$\tau(\lambda(\lambda(m))) < \exp\left(2\Delta^{4/5} + 3\Delta^{2/5}\right).$$

We apply Lemma 3 of [1] with  $K_1 = K_2 = \exp(\Delta/3)$ . It follows that for sufficiently large  $Q$ , apart from at most

$$\varphi(m)\varphi(\lambda(m)) \left( \frac{\tau(\lambda(m))}{\exp(\Delta/3)} + \frac{\tau(\lambda(\lambda(m)))}{\exp(\Delta/3)} \right) \leq m\lambda(m) \exp(-\Delta/4)$$

exceptional pairs  $(\vartheta, e)$ , the period  $t$  of the power generator satisfies

$$t \geq \lambda(\lambda(m)) \exp(-2\Delta/3) \geq Q^2 \exp(-\Delta),$$

by (i), so the result follows. □

We remark that Kelly Postelmans also pointed out to us a slip in the proof of Lemma 1 concerning reduced residues modulo a prime power  $p^m$ . This slip is easily fixed by replacing in the last paragraph of the proof our incorrect assertion that  $g$  be a  $d$ -th power modulo  $p^m$  by the condition that it be a  $\lambda(p^m)/d$ -th root of unity. (In case  $p = 2$ , these are not quite the same.)

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. B. Friedlander, C. Pomerance and I. E. Shparlinski, *Period of the power generator and small values of Carmichael's function*, Math. Comp., **70** (2001), 1591–1605.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 3G3,  
CANADA

*E-mail address:* `frdlndr@math.toronto.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL MATHEMATICS, BELL LABS, MURRAY HILL, NEW JERSEY  
07974-0636

*E-mail address:* `carlp@research.bell-labs.com`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY, SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES 2109,  
AUSTRALIA

*E-mail address:* `igor@ics.mq.edu.au`