# 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 $\operatorname{gcd}(p-1, l-1)<D$ and $\lambda(\lambda(p l))=n$ 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{n} \equiv u_{n-1}^{e} \quad(\bmod m), \quad 0 \leq u_{n} \leq m-1, \quad n=1,2, \ldots, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

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 $p \mid n$ we have $p^{2} \mid n$. 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 $Q^{2} \exp \left(-0.1(\Delta \log \Delta)^{1 / 3}\right)$ of them, the following statement holds. For all pairs $(\vartheta, e)$ with

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

where $m=p l$, 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) $\lambda(\lambda(p l)) \geq Q^{2} \exp (-\Delta / 3)$,
(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 $q \mid \lambda(p l), \tau(q-1)<\exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$.

[^0]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 $q \mid \lambda(p l)$. We have

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

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

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

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 $q \mid p-1, \omega(q-1)<\Delta^{2 / 5}$, and $\tau(q-1) \geq \exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$. Note that if $\omega(n)<\Delta^{2 / 5}$ and $\tau(n) \geq \exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$, then $2^{\Omega(n)} \geq \exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)>\exp (\omega(n))$, so that $\Omega(n)-\omega(n)>\frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2 / 5}$. (The constant $\frac{1}{3}$ can be improved to $0.75679 \ldots$ 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, $\Omega\left(n_{1}\right)>\frac{1}{3} \Delta^{2 / 5}$, 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 $O\left(x^{1 / 2}\right)$ squarefull numbers in $[1, x]$.) Thus, the number of primes $p \leq Q$ such that
$p-1$ is divisible by a prime $q$ with $\tau(q-1) \geq \exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$ and $\omega(q-1) \leq \Delta^{2 / 5}$ is $\ll Q \exp \left(-\frac{1}{9} \Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$ 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 $m=p l$. 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 $\varphi(a b) \mid \varphi(a) \varphi(b) b$ 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 $\tau(l-1) \leq \exp \left(\Delta^{2 / 5}\right)$, by (ii). Moreover, for $(p, l) \in \mathcal{R}$, we have, by (ii) and (iii),

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

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 $\lambda\left(p^{m}\right) / d$-th root of unity. (In case $p=2$, these are not quite the same.)
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