In discussing unique factorization and ideal theory, C. C. Mac-Duffee [1, p. 122] cites the multiplicative system of positive integers of the form $1+7k$ as an example where unique factorization fails, since $792 = 2^2 \cdot 3^6 = 8 \cdot 99$, and 8, 22, 36, 99 are all primes in the system. H. Davenport [2, p. 21] uses positive integers of the form $1+4k$ for the same purpose, with the numerical case $693 = 9 \cdot 77 = 21 \cdot 33$. In this paper we examine all multiplicative systems made up of arithmetic progressions, and decide the question of unique factorization.

For a fixed positive integer $n$, let $M$ be a multiplicatively closed system of positive integers such that if $x \in M$ and $y \equiv x \pmod{n}$, $y > 0$, then $y \in M$. It will be assumed that $n$ is the smallest positive integer which can be used to define $M$. For example the set $M$ of all positive integers congruent to 1, 3, or 5 modulo 6 is also the set congruent to 1 modulo 2, and in this case $n = 2$. We divide the integers 1, 2, \cdots, $n$ into two classes: the set $A$, $\phi(n)$ in number, of those relatively prime to $n$, and the others in set $B$, $n - \phi(n)$ in number.

**Theorem.** $M$ has unique factorization if and only if $M \cap A = A$, $M \cap B = 0$, i.e. if and only if $M$ consists of all positive integers relatively prime to $n$.

The proof will be in several parts, and will employ the following additional notation. Write $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$ where the $p_i$ are primes of $I$, the set of all positive integers. Numbers $m$ belonging to $M$ which cannot be factored in $M$ are called pseudo-primes.

**Case 1.** $M \cap A = A$, $M \cap B = 0$. Thus $m \in M$ if and only if $(m, n) = 1$ and so the pseudo-primes of $M$ are the primes of $I$ with $p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_r$ deleted. Unique factorization in $M$ is implied by that in $I$.

**Case 2.** $M \cap B \neq 0$, $M \cap A = 0$. To any $m \in M$ there corresponds $b \in (M \cap B)$ such that $m \equiv b \pmod{n}$, whence $(m, n) = (b, n)$. For any $b_i$ in $M \cap B$, define $d_i = (b_i, n)$, so that $d_i > 1$. Among the elements of $M \cap B$, choose $b_1$ so that its corresponding $d_1$ is a minimum. Thus $(b_1, n) = d_1$ with say $b_1 = d_1 q_1$ and $n = d_1 q_2$, $(q_1, q_2) = 1$. Choose distinct primes $\pi_1 > n$ and $\pi_2 > n$ of the form $q_1 + xq_2$, and also the prime $\pi_3$ of the form $1 + xn$. Since $\pi_1 > n$ we have $(\pi_1, n) = 1$ and $\pi_1 \notin M$. Similarly $\pi_2$, $\pi_3$, $\pi_1 \pi_3$, and $\pi_2 \pi_3$ are not in $M$.

Next we establish that $d_1 \pi_1 \pi_3$, which is of the form $b_1 + xn$, is a
pseudo-prime in $M$. For any nontrivial factorization in $M$ would be either of the form $(\delta_1)(\delta_2 \pi_1 \pi_2)$ or $(\delta_1 \pi_1)(\delta_2 \pi_3)$ where $\delta_1 \delta_2 = d_1$ with $1 < \delta_1 < d_1$. But these are not valid factorizations in $M$, inasmuch as $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2 \pi_1$ are not in $M$, since $(\delta_1, n) = (\delta_1 \pi_1, n) = \delta_1 < d_1$ would contradict the minimum principle used in the selection of $d_1$. Similarly $d_1 \pi_2 \pi_3$ is a pseudo-prime in $M$.

Also $d_1 \pi_1$ and $d_1 \pi_2$ are pseudo-primes in $M$. For any nontrivial factorization of $d_1 \pi_1$ in $M$ would have the form $(\delta_1)(\delta_2 \pi_1)$ with $1 < \delta_1 < d_1$, but as before $\delta_1$ is not in $M$.

The proof of Case 2 is completed by observing that

$$(d_1 \pi_1)(d_1 \pi_2 \pi_3) = (d_1 \pi_2)(d_1 \pi_2 \pi_3),$$

each term in parentheses being a pseudo-prime, and the factorizations being different since $\pi_1 \neq \pi_2$.

Case 3. $A \neq A \cap M \neq 0$. Let $a \in M$, so that $a^\phi(n) \in M$, and $a^\phi(n) \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$, so that $1 \in M$. Let $\alpha$ be a member of $A$ which is not in $M$. Since $\alpha^\phi(n) \in M$, there is a least exponent $e > 1$ such that $\alpha^e \in M$. Choose distinct primes $\pi_1 > n$ and $\pi_2 > n$ of the form $\alpha + xn$, and it follows that $\pi_1^e$ and $\pi_2^e$ are pseudo-primes in $M$. Also $\pi_1 \pi_2^{-1}$ and $\pi_2 \pi_1^{-1}$ are pseudo-primes in $M$, so the proof is complete by the factorization

$$(\pi_1^e)(\pi_2^e) = (\pi_1 \pi_2^{-1})(\pi_2 \pi_1^{-1}).$$

Case 4. $M \cap A = A$, $B \neq M \cap B \neq 0$. As in Case 1, the pseudo-primes of $M$ include all primes $p$ such that $(p, n) = 1$. But since $M \cap B \neq 0$, there are other pseudo-primes of $M$, and we now prove that these others have no prime factors apart from the prime factors of $n$.

If $q$ is any pseudo-prime with $(q, n) > 1$, write $q = q_1 q_2$ where the prime factors of $q_1$ are also prime factors of $n$, but $(q_2, n) = 1$. We can readily prove that $q_2 = 1$. For the congruence $\mu q_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ has a positive solution $\mu$, and all of $\mu$, $q_2$, $q$, $\mu q$ are in $M$. Thus $\mu q \equiv q_1 \pmod{n}$, so $q_1$ is in $M$. Thus $q = q_1 q_2$ is a factorization in $M$, and $(q, n) > 1$ implies $(q_1, n) > 1$ and $q_1 \neq 1$, so $q_2 = 1$ since $q$ is a pseudo-prime.

Thus we have established that the pseudo-primes of $M$ are of two types: (1) all primes $p$ with $(p, n) = 1$; (2) at least one pseudo-prime $q$ whose prime factors are contained in the set $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_r$, the prime factors of $n$. Let us order these primes so that precisely $p_1, \ldots, p_h$ are the prime factors of these pseudo-primes, with $1 \leq h \leq r$.

**Lemma 1.** $M$ lacks unique factorization if it contains more than $h$ pseudo-primes of type (2) above.

**Proof.** If we have $h+1$ distinct pseudo-primes
\[ q_i = p_1^{a_{i1}} p_2^{a_{i2}} \cdots p_h^{a_{ih}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, h + 1, \]

we can solve the \( h \) equations

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{h+1} x_i \alpha_{ij} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, h, \]

for integral values \( x_j \) not all zero. Thus we would have

\[ \prod_{j=1}^{h+1} q_j^{x_j} = 1 \]

and multiplying both sides by \( q_j^{-x_j} \) in all cases of negative \( x_j \), we obtain a counter-example to unique factorization.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( p \) be any one of the primes \( p_1, \ldots, p_h \). If no pseudo-prime of \( M \) is of the form \( p^i \), then \( M \) has infinitely many pseudo-primes of type (2).

**Proof.** There is no loss of generality in taking \( p = p_1 \). Now \( M \) contains a pseudo-prime with \( p_1 \) as a factor, say

\[ q = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\beta_2} \cdots p_h^{\beta_h} \]

where \( \beta_1 > 0 \) and \( \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \cdots + \beta_h > 0 \) by the hypothesis of the lemma. For \( j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \), choose positive \( x_j \) to satisfy \( x_j \equiv 1 (\text{mod } \alpha_j) \) and \( x_j = 1 (\text{mod } p_j) \). Choose a positive integer \( \gamma \) so that \( \gamma \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \), so that \( q^\gamma (x_j - p_1^i) \) is divisible by \( n \), that is,

\[ x_j q^\gamma \equiv p_1^i q^\gamma \equiv p_1^{i+\gamma \beta_1} p_2^{\gamma \beta_2} \cdots p_h^{\gamma \beta_h} (\text{mod } n). \]

Also \( (x_j, n) = 1 \) so that \( x_j \) and \( x_j q^\gamma \) are in \( M \). If \( M \) contained only a finite number of pseudo-primes of type (2), then

\[ p_1^{i+\gamma \beta_1} p_2^{\gamma \beta_2} \cdots p_h^{\gamma \beta_h} \]

could not be factored into pseudo-primes for \( j \) very large, the exponents \( \gamma \beta_2, \ldots, \gamma \beta_h \) being fixed. This completes the proof of Lemma 2, and in view of Lemma 1, we can now complete Case 4 by proving the following result.

**Lemma 3.** If \( M \) contains only a finite number of pseudo-primes of type (2), the number exceeds \( h \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2, \( M \) contains \( h \) pseudo-primes of the form \( p_1^{\gamma_1}, p_2^{\gamma_2}, \ldots, p_h^{\gamma_h} \). We assume that these are all the pseudo-primes of type (2) in \( M \), and obtain a contradiction.
First we establish that \( \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \cdots = \gamma_h = 1 \). Choose the positive integer \( \mu \) so that \( \mu \gamma_1 \geq \alpha_1 \), and the positive integer \( x \) to satisfy simultaneously \( x \equiv p_1 \pmod{n/p_1^{\gamma_1}} \) and \( x \equiv 1 \pmod{p_1} \). Thus \( n \) is a divisor of \( p_1^{\mu \gamma_1}(x - p_1) \), that is

\[
x p_1^{\mu \gamma_1} \equiv p_1^{1+\mu \gamma_1} \pmod{n}.
\]

Now \( (x, n) = 1 \), so that \( x \) is in \( M \), and so is \( p_1^{\gamma_1} \), whence \( xp_1^{\mu \gamma_1} \) is in \( M \). Thus \( p_1^{1+\mu \gamma_1} \) is in \( M \). But by the opening remark of this proof the only powers of \( p_1 \) which are in \( M \) are also powers of \( p_1^{\gamma_1} \). Hence \( \gamma_1 = 1 \). Similarly \( \gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = \cdots = \gamma_h = 1 \).

We have established that the pseudo-primes of type (2) in \( M \) are \( p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_h \). Thus the set \( M \) can be characterized as all positive integers relatively prime to \( p_{h+1}, \cdots, p_r \), if such primes exist. So the set \( M \) can be described in terms of the modulus \( p_{h+1}p_{h+2} \cdots p_r \), which is less than \( n \) since \( h \geq 1 \). This contradicts our basic hypothesis that \( n \) is the smallest modulus available to define \( M \). This completes the proof of Lemma 3 and Case 4.

Remark on the proofs. The Dirichlet theorem on the infinitude of primes in an arithmetic progression is used in Cases 2 and 3, but is not essential in these proofs, as we now show.

In Case 2 it is not necessary that \( \pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3 \) be primes, but merely that they have the following properties:

\[
\pi_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}, \quad (\pi_1, n) = (\pi_2, n) = 1,
\]

\[
d_1 \pi_1 = d_2 \pi_2 = b_1 \pmod{n}, \quad \pi_1 \neq \pi_2.
\]

It can be verified that these are all satisfied by the choices \( \pi_3 = 1 + n \), \( \pi_1 = q_1 + uq_2 \) where \( u \) is defined as the product of all primes dividing \( n \) but not dividing \( q_1 \), and \( \pi_2 = q_1 + u\pi q_2 \) where \( \pi \) is any prime exceeding \( n \).

To remove the Dirichlet theorem from the proof of Case 3 we proceed as follows. Let \( p \) be the smallest integer in \( A \) which is not in \( M \). Our notation is justified since \( p \) is a prime in \( I \), for if \( p = qv \) it would follow that \( q \) and \( v \) were in \( A \) but not both in \( M \), contradicting the minimal property of \( p \). Define \( e \) as the least exponent such that \( p^e \in M \), and so \( 1 < e \leq \phi(n) \). Define \( b = n + p^{e-1} \), whence \( b^e \equiv (p^e)^{e-1} \pmod{n} \) so that \( b \in M \) but \( b^e \notin M \) and \( pb \in M \).

Now consider the factorization in \( M \), not all factors being necessarily pseudo-primes,

\[
(p^e)(b^e) = (pb)(pb) \cdots (pb).
\]

However, \( p^e \) is a pseudo-prime, and \( p^e \) is not a divisor of \( pb \), since \( (p, n) = 1 \) implies \( (p, b) = 1 \).
ON A PROBLEM OF ADDITIVE NUMBER THEORY

G. G. LORENTZ

Let \( A, B, \ldots \) denote sets of natural numbers. The counting function \( A(n) \) of \( A \) is the number of elements \( a \in A \) which satisfy the inequality \( a \leq n \). We shall call two sets \( A, B \) complementary to each other if \( A + B \) contains all sufficiently large natural numbers.

In a talk with the author P. Erdős conjectured that each infinite set \( A \) has a complementary set \( B \) of asymptotic density zero. Here we wish to establish a theorem which gives an upper estimate for \( B(n) \) in terms of \( A(n) \). As a particular case, the truth of Erdős' conjecture will follow. The estimate (1) below should be compared with the (trivial) lower estimate \( B(n) \geq (1 - e)n/A(n) \), which holds for all large \( n \).

**Theorem 1.** For each infinite set \( A \) there is a complementary set \( B \) such that

\[
B(n) \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\log A(k)}{A(k)} ;
\]

\( C \) is an absolute constant and the terms of the sum with \( A(k) = 0 \) are to be replaced by one.

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be given and let \( m < n \) denote two natural numbers. We shall choose certain integers \( b \) in the interval \( m \leq b < 2n \) in such a way that the sums \( a + b, a \in A \), fill the whole interval \( n < a + b \leq 2n \). Our concern will be to obtain the upper estimate (4) for the number \( K \) of the \( b \)'s.

First we take a \( b_1 \) in \([m, 2n)\) in such a way that the portion of \( A + b_1 \) contained in \( (n, 2n] \) has the maximal possible number \( S \) of elements and choose this \( b_1 \) as one of our \( b \)'s. Then we take another
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