



## Sets with prescribed lower and upper weighted densities

József Bukor

Department of Mathematics

J. Selye University

945 01 Komárno

Slovakia

email: [bukor.jozsef@selyeuni.sk](mailto:bukor.jozsef@selyeuni.sk)

Ferdinánd Filip

Department of Mathematics

J. Selye University

945 01 Komárno

Slovakia

email: [filip.ferdinand@selyeuni.sk](mailto:filip.ferdinand@selyeuni.sk)

**Abstract.** It is known that we can prescribe the lower and upper asymptotic and logarithmic density of a set of positive integers. The only limitation is the inequality between asymptotic and logarithmic density. We generalize this result.

### 1 Introduction

Denote by  $\mathbb{N}$  the set of all positive integers, let  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  and let  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be a weight function. For  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  denote

$$S_f(A, n) = \sum_{\substack{a \leq n \\ a \in A}} f(a), \quad S_f(n) = \sum_{a \leq n} f(a)$$

and define

$$\underline{d}_f(A) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_f(A, n)}{S_f(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{d}_f(A) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_f(A, n)}{S_f(n)}$$

the lower and upper  $f$ -densities of  $A$ , respectively. In the case when  $\underline{d}_f(A) = \overline{d}_f(A)$  we say that  $A$  possesses  $f$ -density  $d_f(A)$ .

---

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 11B05

**Key words and phrases:** asymptotic density, weighted density

Notice that the well-known asymptotic density corresponds to  $f(n) = 1$  and the logarithmic density corresponds to  $f(n) = \frac{1}{n}$ . The concept of weighted densities was introduced in [7] and [1]. The continuity of densities given by the weight function  $n^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \geq -1$ , was studied in [3]. Inequalities between upper and lower weighted densities for different weight functions were proved in [2].

The independence (within admissible bounds) of the asymptotic and logarithmic densities was proved in [6] and [5] showing that for any given real numbers  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \delta \leq 1$  there exists a set  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\underline{d}_1 = \alpha, \quad \underline{d}_{\frac{1}{n}}(A) = \beta, \quad \overline{d}_{\frac{1}{n}}(A) = \gamma, \quad \overline{d}_1(A) = \delta.$$

We generalize this result. We prove that under some assumptions on the weighted densities an analogous result holds. In [4], generalized asymptotic and logarithmic densities over an arithmetical semigroup were considered.

We call a weight function  $f$  *regular* if the corresponding weighted density fulfills the condition that for arbitrary positive integers  $a, b$  we have

$$d_f(a\mathbb{N} + b) = \frac{1}{a}$$

( $f$ -density of the terms of arbitrary infinite arithmetical progression with the same difference are equal). Note that from this condition follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(n)}{S_f(n)} = 0. \quad (1)$$

## 2 Results

The following lemma will be useful

**Lemma 1** *Let  $f, g$  be regular weight functions. Let  $B$  be a subset of positive integers such that*

$$\underline{d}_f(B) = 0, \quad \overline{d}_f(B) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_g(B) = 0.$$

*Then for any  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \delta \leq 1$ , rational numbers there exists a set  $E \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$d_g(E) = \underline{d}_f(E) = \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{d}_f(E) = \delta$$

*and a set  $H \subset \mathbb{N}$  with the property*

$$d_g(H) = \overline{d}_f(H) = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{d}_f(H) = \alpha.$$

**Proof.** Write  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  as fractions with a common denominator, let  $\gamma = \frac{p}{t}$  and  $\delta = \frac{q}{t}$ . Define

$$E = \bigcup_{i=1}^p (t\mathbb{N} + i) \cup \left( B \cap \left( \bigcup_{i=p+1}^q (t\mathbb{N} + i) \right) \right).$$

As  $d_g(B) = 0$ , therefore

$$d_g(E) = d_g\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^p (t\mathbb{N} + i)\right) = \frac{p}{t} = \gamma.$$

Analogously we get  $\underline{d}_f(E) = \frac{p}{t} = \gamma$ .

Clearly  $\bar{d}_f(E) \leq \delta = \frac{q}{t}$ . The case  $\bar{d}_f(E) < \frac{q}{t}$  yields a contradiction because

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \bar{d}_f(B \cap \mathbb{N}) = \bar{d}_f\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^q (B \cap (t\mathbb{N} + i))\right) + \bar{d}_f\left(\bigcup_{i=q+1}^t (B \cap (t\mathbb{N} + i))\right) \leq \\ &\leq \bar{d}_f(E) + \bar{d}_f\left(\bigcup_{i=q+1}^t (t\mathbb{N} + i)\right) < \frac{q}{t} + \frac{t-q}{t} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

In analogous way we can prove the existence of the set  $H$  with the prescribed properties. For  $\alpha = \frac{r}{t}$  and  $\beta = \frac{s}{t}$  let

$$H = \bigcup_{i=1}^s (t\mathbb{N} + i) \setminus \left( B \cap \left( \bigcup_{i=r+1}^s (t\mathbb{N} + i) \right) \right).$$

Note, from the construction of the sets  $E$ ,  $H$  follows  $H \subset E$ . ■

**Theorem 1** *Let  $f, g$  be regular weight functions. Let  $B$  be a subset of positive integers such that*

$$\underline{d}_f(B) = 0, \quad \bar{d}_f(B) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_g(B) = 0.$$

*Let  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \delta \leq 1$  be given real numbers. Then there exists a set  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\underline{d}_f(A) = \alpha, \quad \underline{d}_g(A) = \beta, \quad \bar{d}_g(A) = \gamma, \quad \bar{d}_f(A) = \delta.$$

**Proof.** On the contrary, we suppose that there exist rational numbers  $0 < \alpha < \beta < \gamma < \delta < 1$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that at least one of the following inequalities does not hold.

$$|\underline{d}_f(A) - \alpha| < \varepsilon, \quad |\underline{d}_g(A) - \beta| < \varepsilon, \quad |\bar{d}_g(A) - \gamma| < \varepsilon, \quad |\bar{d}_f(A) - \delta| < \varepsilon$$

Using the sets  $H$ ,  $E$  defined in the previous lemma we construct a set  $A$  such that

$$H \subset A \subset E.$$

Then clearly

$$\underline{d}_f(A) \geq \underline{d}_f(H), \quad \underline{d}_g(A) \geq \underline{d}_g(H)$$

and

$$\overline{d}_f(A) \leq \overline{d}_f(E), \quad \overline{d}_g(A) \leq \overline{d}_g(E).$$

Define the set  $A$  by “intertwining” the sets  $E$  and  $H$

$$A = H \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} [n_{2k}, n_{2k+1}] \cap E,$$

where  $n_1 = 1$  and for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  let  $n_k$  be sufficiently large, such that for some  $i, j$  between  $n_{k-1}$  and  $n_k$  the

$$\left| \frac{S_f(A, i)}{S_f(i)} - \alpha \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{S_g(A, j)}{S_g(j)} - \beta \right| < \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

inequalities hold. Analogously, sufficiently large  $n_{2k+1}$  guarantees the inequalities

$$\left| \frac{S_f(A, m)}{S_f(m)} - \delta \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{S_g(A, l)}{S_g(l)} - \gamma \right| < \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

for some  $m, l$ . From this we can deduce that (2) and (3) hold for infinitely many  $i, j, m, l$  what is a contradiction to our assumption.  $\blacksquare$

Roughly speaking, the proved theorem says that under some conditions to prove the existence of a set  $A$  with prescribed upper and lower weighted densities it is sufficient to consider only one, the “worst” case.

**Lemma 2** *If the function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  satisfies the conditions*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = \infty, \quad (4)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(n)}{S_f(n)} = 0, \quad (5)$$

*then for the function  $g$  defined as*

$$g(n) = \frac{f(n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n f(i)} \quad (6)$$

we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(n) = \infty \quad (7)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{S_g(n)} = 0. \quad (8)$$

**Proof.** We prove only (7), using the fact  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n) = 0$  together with (7) it follows immediately (8).

For arbitrary positive integers  $m > n$  we have

$$\sum_{k=n}^m g(k) = \sum_{k=n}^m \frac{f(k)}{\sum_{i=1}^k f(i)} \geq \frac{\sum_{k=n}^m f(k)}{\sum_{i=1}^m f(i)}.$$

The proof is completed by showing that for given  $n$  and sufficiently large  $m$

$$\sum_{k=n}^m g(k) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

From (4) we see that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f(i) = \infty$ , therefore for arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=n}^m g(k) \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=n}^m f(k)}{\sum_{i=1}^m f(i)} = 1$$

and the lemma follows. ■

**Theorem 2** *Let the functions  $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  satisfy the assumptions (4)–(6). Then there exists a set  $B \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\underline{d}_f(B) = 0, \quad \overline{d}_f(B) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_g(B) = 0.$$

**Proof.** Consider

$$B = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} [n_{2k}, n_{2k+1}].$$

Let  $n_1 = 1$ . Assume  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{2k-1}$  are given. We are looking for  $n_{2k}$  such that

$$\frac{f(n)}{f(1) + f(2) + \dots + f(n)} < \frac{1}{k+1} \quad \text{for arbitrary } n \geq n_{2k}, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{f(1) + f(2) + \cdots + f(n_{2k-1})}{f(1) + f(2) + \cdots + f(n_{2k})} < \frac{1}{k}, \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k-1})}{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k})} < \frac{1}{k}, \quad (11)$$

$$g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k}) > k^2. \quad (12)$$

Moreover, let  $n_{2k+1}$  satisfy the inequalities

$$\frac{k-1}{k+1} < \frac{f(n_{2k}) + f(n_{2k}+1) + \cdots + f(n_{2k+1})}{f(1) + f(2) + \cdots + f(n_{2k+1})} < \frac{k}{k+1}. \quad (13)$$

Inequalities (10)–(13) follow from the prescribed conditions on the functions  $f$  and  $g$ .

By (10) we have  $\underline{d}_f(B) = 0$ , by (11) we have  $\underline{d}_g(B) = 0$  and taking into account (13) we get  $\overline{d}_f(B) = 0$ .

We proceed to show that  $\overline{d}_g(B) = 0$ . In virtue of [2], Lemma 2.1 it is sufficient to consider only the values  $\frac{S_g(B, n_k)}{S_g(n_k)}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{S_g(B, n_{2k+1})}{S_g(n_{2k+1})} \leq \\ & \frac{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k-1}) + g(n_{2k}) + g(n_{2k}+1) + \cdots + g(n_{2k+1})}{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k+1})} < \\ & \frac{1}{k} + \frac{g(n_{2k}) + g(n_{2k}+1) + \cdots + g(n_{2k+1})}{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k})} \leq \frac{1}{k} + \frac{\frac{f(n_{2k})+f(n_{2k}+1)+\cdots+f(n_{2k+1})}{f(1)+f(2)+\cdots+f(n_{2k-1})}}{g(1) + g(2) + \cdots + g(n_{2k})}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (13) we can show the inequality

$$\frac{f(n_{2k}) + f(n_{2k}+1) + \cdots + f(n_{2k+1})}{f(1) + f(2) + \cdots + f(n_{2k-1})} < k.$$

Using this together with (12) we have

$$\frac{S_g(B, n_{2k+1})}{S_g(n_{2k+1})} < \frac{1}{k} + \frac{k}{k^2} = \frac{2}{k}$$

and hence  $\overline{d}_g(B) = 0$  and  $d_g(B) = 0$  follows. ■

It is not hard to show that if a monotone function  $f$  satisfies (4)–(5), then it is regular (see, e.g. [2], Example 2.1). If the function  $g$  defined by (6) is monotonely decreasing, then it is regular, too. We have

**Corollary 1** *Let the monotone function  $f$  and monotone decreasing function  $g$  satisfy the assumptions (4)–(6). Let  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq \delta \leq 1$  be given real numbers. Then there exists a set  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\underline{d}_f(A) = \alpha, \quad \underline{d}_g(A) = \beta, \quad \overline{d}_g(A) = \gamma, \quad \overline{d}_f(A) = \delta.$$

### Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the grants APW SK-HU-0009-08 and VEGA Grant no. 1/0753/10.

### References

- [1] R. Alexander, Density and multiplicative structure of sets of integers, *Acta Arith.*, **12** (1976), 321–332.
- [2] J. Bukor, L. Mišík, J. T. Tóth, Dependence of densities on a parameter, *Information Sciences*, (to appear).
- [3] R. Giuliano Antonini, G. Grekos, L. Mišík, On weighted densities, *Czech. Math. J.*, **57** (2007), 947–962.
- [4] F. Luca, C. Pomerance, Š. Porubský, Sets with prescribed arithmetic densities, *Uniform Distribution Theory*, **3** (2008), 67–80.
- [5] F. Luca, Š. Porubský, On asymptotic and logarithmic densities, *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.*, **31** (2005), 75–86.
- [6] L. Mišík, Sets of positive integers with prescribed values of densities, *Math. Slovaca*, **52** (2002), 289–296.
- [7] H. Rohrbach, B. Volkmann, Verallgemeinerte asymptotische Dichten, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **194** (1955), 195–209.

*Received: July 1, 2009; Revised: April 5, 2010*