

ON THE ADDITIVE UNIQUENESS OF GENERALIZED NONAGONAL NUMBERS FOR MULTIPLICATIVE FUNCTIONS

Poo-Sung Park¹

Department of Mathematics Education, Kyungnam University, Changwon, Republic of Korea pspark@kyungnam.ac.kr

Received: 2/28/25, Revised: 6/30/25, Accepted: 10/10/25, Published: 11/5/25

Abstract

We prove that the set \mathcal{N} of all nonzero generalized nonagonal numbers is an additive uniqueness set. If a multiplicative function f satisfies the equation

$$f(a+b) = f(a) + f(b)$$

for all $a, b \in \mathcal{N}$, then f is the identity function.

1. Introduction

In 1992, C. Spiro [11] introduced the notion of an additive uniqueness set, briefly AU set, $E \subset \mathbb{N}$ of a subset S of arithmetic functions, which means $f \in S$ is uniquely determined by the condition f(a+b) = f(a) + f(b) for all $a, b \in E$. She showed that the set of primes is an additive uniqueness set for the set

$$S = \{f \mid f \text{ is multiplicative and } f(p_0) \neq 0 \text{ for some prime } p_0\},$$

where f is multiplicative if f(1) = 1 and f(ab) = f(a)f(b) for all a and b with gcd(a,b) = 1. Since her paper was published, many mathematicians have been studying the k-additive uniqueness, briefly k-AU, of various sets of natural numbers with the condition

$$f(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k) = f(a_1) + f(a_2) + \dots + f(a_k).$$

In 1999, Chung and Phong [2] showed that the set of triangular numbers is an AU set for the set of multiplicative functions. This set is also a k-AU set with $k \geq 3$

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17535282

¹This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (RS-2021-NR058832).

[9]. However, the set of squares is not a 2-AU set for multiplicative functions [1] and it is a k-AU set for $k \ge 3$ [8].

Let us consider the additive uniqueness of polygonal numbers for multiplicative functions to generalize the above results. The author and colleagues [6] proved that the set $\mathcal{P} = \{\frac{n(3n-2)}{2} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0\}$ of generalized pentagonal numbers is an AU set for multiplicative functions. This is also a k-AU set for $k \geq 3$ [3, 10].

It is much more difficult to consider the set $\mathcal{P}^+ = \{\frac{n(3n-2)}{2} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1\}$ of ordinary pentagonal numbers. This set is also a 2-AU set, which was proved in [7]. The set $\mathcal{H}^+ = \{n(2n-1) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1\}$ of ordinary hexagonal numbers is also a 2-AU set [7]. In [5], it is proved that \mathcal{H}^+ is also a k-AU set for all $k \geq 3$. Recently, Hasanalizade and the author [4] showed that the set $\mathcal{O} = \{n(n-2) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0\}$ of generalized octagonal numbers is not a 2-AU set and is not a 3-AU set, but it is a k-AU set for $k \geq 4$.

In this article we prove the additive uniqueness of the set

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ N_n = \frac{n(7n-5)}{2} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \neq 0 \right\}$$
$$= \left\{ 1, 6, 9, 19, 24, 39, 46, 66, 75, 100, 111, 141, 154, \dots \right\}$$

of generalized nonagonal numbers. The following theorem holds.

Theorem 1. If a multiplicative function f satisfies

$$f(a+b) = f(a) + f(b)$$

for all nonzero generalized nonagonal numbers a and b, then f is the identity function.

2. Strategy

We use induction to prove the main theorem. That is, assuming f(n) = n for all n < N, we show that f(N) = N. If N = ab with $a, b \ge 2$ and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then f(N) = f(a) f(b) = ab = N by the induction hypothesis. So we may check whether $f(p^r) = p^r$ or not for primes p.

In proving we use $f(N_a + N_b) = f(N_a) + f(N_b)$ for suitable a and b. Since two factors n and 7n - 5 of $2N_n = n(7n - 5)$ can have a common divisor 5, we cannot split $f(N_n)$ into f(n) f(7n - 5) for the case.

The proof is done in a few steps. First, we evaluate f(n) for some n's in Lemma 1. Using this evaluation, in Sections 3-5, we prove that $f(p^r) = p^r$ for p = 3, 5, 7. In Section 6 we prove that $f(2^r) = 2^r$. Finally, in Section 7, we prove that $f(p^r) = p^r$ for other primes p.

For convenience, we introduce a notation for relatively prime factors. If n=ab and $\gcd(a,b)=1$, then we write $n=a\times b$. For example, $n=2\cdot 2\cdot 3\cdot 5$ can be written as

$$4 \times 3 \cdot 5 = 4 \cdot 3 \times 5 = 3 \times 4 \cdot 5$$
,

which means

$$\gcd(4, 3 \cdot 5) = \gcd(4 \cdot 3, 5) = \gcd(3, 4 \cdot 5) = 1.$$

Lemma 1. f(n) = n for $n \le 11$.

Proof. We have f(2) = 2. Note that

$$f(3) f(4) = f(2 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 3) = f(2) f(3) + f(2) f(3) = 4f(3).$$

If f(3) = 0, then we cannot determine f(4) yet. In this case, we have f(9) = 0 from

$$f(3) f(5) = f(9) + f(2) f(3)$$

and $f(5) = \frac{1}{2}$ from f(2) f(5) = f(1) + f(9).

Also, f(7) = f(1) + f(2) f(3) = 1 and, thus, f(4) = f(19) by f(4) f(7) = f(9) + f(19). Then f(4) = f(19) = -2 from

$$f(4) f(5) = f(1) + f(19)$$

and $f(23) = \frac{1}{2}$ from

$$f(2) f(5) f(7) = f(3) f(8) + f(2) f(23).$$

A contradiction occurs in solving

$$f(4) f(23) = f(2) f(23) + f(2) f(23)$$

and we can conclude that $f(3) \neq 0$.

Then f(4) = 4 from f(3) f(4) = f(2) f(3) + f(2) f(3). Note that

$$f(7) = f(2) f(3) + f(1) \iff f(7) = 2f(3) + 1$$

$$f(2) f(5) = f(9) + f(1) \iff f(9) = 2f(5) - 1$$

$$f(4) f(5) = f(19) + f(1) \iff f(19) = 4f(5) - 1$$

$$f(4) f(7) = f(19) + f(9) \iff f(19) = 4f(7) - f(9).$$

We obtain

$$4f(5) - 1 = 4(2f(3) + 1) - (2f(5) - 1)$$

from the last two equations and thus

$$3f(5) = 4f(3) + 3.$$

Then, since

$$f(3) f(5) = f(9) + f(2) f(3) = 2f(5) - 1 + 2f(3),$$

we can find two solutions:

$$f(3) = 3$$
, $f(5) = 5$, $f(7) = 7$, $f(9) = 9$, $f(19) = 19$; $f(3) = -\frac{1}{4}$, $f(5) = \frac{2}{3}$, $f(7) = \frac{1}{2}$, $f(9) = \frac{1}{3}$, $f(19) = \frac{5}{3}$.

Next, we deduce that f(8) = 8 or $f(8) = -\frac{2}{3}$ from

$$f(2) f(3) f(5) = f(3) f(8) + f(2) f(3).$$

The second solution set cannot satisfy

$$f(3) f(11) = f(3) f(8) + f(9)$$

$$f(8) f(9) = f(2) f(3) f(11) + f(2) f(3).$$

So, f(n) is determined to be n up to 11.

3. Proof for $f(3^r) = 3^r$

The basic idea of the proof is to use induction under the assumption f(n) = n for all $n < 3^r$. This assumption is too loose. In Section 7 we use $f(3^r) = 3^r$ to prove $f(p^s) = p^s$ for all primes p > 7. In this case we need to check $f(3^r)$ for some $3^r > p^s$ with the induction hypothesis that f(n) = n for all $n < p^r$. To do this we need the stronger induction hypothesis for $f(3^r)$. That is, we should find a function $\alpha(x)$ such that f(n) = n for all $n < \alpha(3^r) < p^r$.

Theorem 2. Let $\alpha(x) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot x - \frac{12}{17}$. If f(n) = n for all $n < \alpha(3^r)$, then $f(3^r) = 3^r$

Proof. The weird coefficients of $\alpha(x)$ are determined by the extremal inequality of Case I of Section 7.

If r=2s, then we can show easily $f(3^{2s})=3^{2s}$ by using

$$N_{-m} + N_m = m \times \frac{7m+5}{2} + m \times \frac{7m-5}{2} = 7 \times m^2$$

with $m=3^s$. Note the $a\times b$ notation and that $f(3^2)=3^2$ was already showed in Lemma 1 and

$$\max\left\{m, \frac{7m+5}{2}, \frac{7m-5}{2}\right\} = \frac{7m+5}{2} < \alpha(m^2) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3}m^2 - \frac{12}{17}$$

when $m \geq 9$.

Now assume that r=2s+1. We have that $3^{2s+1}\equiv 3,13,5\pmod{14}$. We consider it in three cases.

Case I: $3^{2s+1} \equiv 3 \cdot 1 \pmod{14}$. We let $3^{2s+1} = 3(14m+1)$ and use

$$N_{4m+1} + N_{-10m} = (4m+1)(14m+1) + 25m(14m+1)$$
$$= (14m+1)(29m+1).$$

Note that $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and, in the first term (4m+1)(14m+1),

$$gcd(4m+1, 14m+1) = gcd(5, m-1) = 1 \text{ or } 5.$$

Since $14m + 1 = 3^{2s}$, we have that m - 1 is not divisible by 5 and $N_{4m+1} = (4m+1) \times (14m+1)$ by the $a \times b$ notation. Similarly, $N_{-10m} = 25m \times (14m+1)$.

For the second term 25m(14m+1), if $m=5^k$, then $14 \cdot 5^k + 1 = 3^{2s}$. However, this is impossible by comparing both sides modulo 8. Thus, m has a divisor d such that $d \neq 1, 5$ and $\gcd(m/d, d) = 1$.

Now consider (14m + 1)(29m + 1). Since $3 \mid (m - 1), 5 \nmid (m - 1)$ and

$$\gcd(14m+1,29m+1) = \gcd(14m+1,m-1) = \gcd(15,m-1),$$

we have that gcd(14m + 1, 29m + 1) = 3. Thus,

$$f(N_{4m+1}) + f(N_{-10m}) = f(4m+1) f(14m+1) + f\left(25 \cdot \frac{m}{d}\right) f(d) f(14m+1)$$

and

$$f(N_{4m+1} + N_{-10m}) = f\left(3(14m+1) \times \frac{29m+1}{3}\right)$$
$$= f(3^{2s+1}) f\left(\frac{29m+1}{3}\right).$$

Then, since

$$\max \left\{ 4m + 1, 14m + 1, 25 \cdot \frac{m}{d}, d, \frac{29m + 1}{3} \right\}$$

$$= 14m + 1$$

$$< \alpha(3(14m + 1)) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot 3(14m + 1) - \frac{12}{17},$$

we can deduce that $f(3^{2s+1}) = 3^{2s+1}$ by the induction hypothesis.

Case II: $3^{2s+1} \equiv 3 \cdot 9 \pmod{14}$. For this case, $3^{2s+1} = 3(14m+9)$ and we use

$$N_{3m+2} + N_{-12m-7} = \frac{3}{2}(3m+2)(7m+3) + 3(12m+7)(14m+9)$$
$$= \frac{9}{2}(7m+4)(17m+11).$$

Note that m is a multiple of 9, since $14m+9=3^{2s}$. Also, comparing both sides of $14m+9=3^{2s}$ modulo 8, we have that m is a multiple of 4. Similarly, we deduce that $\gcd(3m+2,7m+3)=\gcd(5,m-1)=1$ by comparing both sides of $14m+9=3^{2s}$ modulo 5. Thus, the first term can be written as $3^2\times\frac{3m+2}{2}\times\frac{7m+3}{3}$. Since $14m+9=3^{2s}$, we have that $\gcd(12m+7,14m+9)=1$ and thus the second term can be written as $(12m+7)\times 3(14m+9)$.

Since the last term can be written as $9 \times \frac{7m+4}{2} \times (17m+11)$,

$$\max \left\{ 9, \frac{3m+2}{2}, \frac{7m+3}{3}, 12m+7, \frac{7m+4}{2}, 17m+11 \right\}$$
$$= 17m+11$$
$$< \alpha(3(14m+9)) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot 3(14m+9) - \frac{12}{17}$$

and $f(3^{2s+1}) = 3^{2s+1}$ by the induction.

Case III: $3^{2s+1} \equiv 3 \cdot 11 \pmod{14}$. In this case, $2s+1 \geq 5$ and we consider $3^{2s+1} = 3^3(14m+9)$ instead of the form 3(14m+11). Note that

$$N_{-6m-3} + N_{12m+8} = 3(2m+1)(21m+13) + 6(3m+2)(28m+17)$$
$$= 9(5m+3)(14m+9)$$

and

$$\gcd(2m+1,21m+13) = \gcd(5,m+3),$$

 $\gcd(3m+2,28m+17) = \gcd(5,m-1),$
 $\gcd(5m+3,14m+9) = \gcd(m,3) = 3.$

If $m+3\equiv 0\pmod 5$, then $14m+9\equiv 2\pmod 5$. We have $3^{2(s-1)}\equiv 2\pmod 5$ has no solution. So, $\gcd(2m+1,21m+13)=1$. By the similar reasoning $\gcd(3m+2,28m+17)=1$, too. Thus, we can write, by the $a\times b$ notation,

$$\begin{split} N_{-6m-3} &= 3 \times (2m+1) \times (21m+13) \\ N_{12m+8} &= 3 \times 2(3m+2) \times (28m+17) \\ N_{-6m-3} + N_{12m+8} &= \frac{5m+3}{3} \times 27(14m+9) = \frac{5m+3}{3} \times 3^{2s+1}. \end{split}$$

Then, since the maximal factor 28m + 17 is smaller than $\alpha(3^3(14m + 9))$, we can conclude that $f(3^{2s+1}) = 3^{2s+1}$ by the induction hypothesis.

4. Proof for $f(5^r) = 5^r$

In the previous section we proved that $f(3^r) = 3^r$ by induction under the stronger assumption that f(n) = n for all $n < \alpha(3^r) < 3^r$. We need the similar condition

for $f(5^r)$. That is, the assumption f(n) = n for all $n < 5^r$ is too loose to be used in proving $f(p^s) = p^s$ for other prime p > 7 and p = 2.

Theorem 3. Let $\beta(x) = \frac{1}{4}x$. If f(n) = n for all $n \leq \beta(5^r)$ with $r \geq 3$, then $f(5^r) = 5^r$.

Proof. The coefficient of $\beta(x)$ can be reduced to $\frac{17}{70}$ by the extremal inequality of Case I-ii of this proof. For convenience, it is enough to set $\beta(x) = \frac{1}{4}x$.

When r is even, we set r = 2s and use

$$N_{-m} + N_m = 5m \times \frac{7m+5}{2 \cdot 5} + 5m \times \frac{7m-5}{2 \cdot 5} = 7 \times m^2$$

with $m = 5^s$. Then $f(5^{2s}) = 5^{2s}$ by the induction hypothesis, since the maximal factor $5m = 5\sqrt{5^r}$ is smaller than $\beta(m^2)$.

Now assume that r is odd. Then

$$5^r = 5^{2s+1} \equiv 5, 13, 17 \pmod{28}$$
 and $5^{r-1} = 5^{2s} \equiv 1, 9, 25 \pmod{28}$.

We check $f(5^r) = f(5 \cdot (28m + t))$ with $t \in \{1, 9, 25\}$.

Case I: $5^{2s+1} = 5(28m+1) \equiv 5 \pmod{28}$. In this case we have $m \equiv 8 \pmod{25}$. We will consider two subcases.

I-i: $m \not\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Note that

$$N_{2m} + N_{8m+1} = m(14m - 5) + (8m + 1)(28m + 1)$$
$$= (14m + 1)(17m + 1).$$

Since $\gcd(m, 14m-5) = 1$ and $\gcd(8m+1, 28m+1) = 5$, we can write, by the $a \times b$ notation,

$$f(N_{2m}) + f(N_{8m+1}) = f(m \times (14m - 5)) + f\left(\frac{8m + 1}{5} \times 5(28m + 1)\right)$$
$$= f(m) f(14m - 5) + f\left(\frac{8m + 1}{5}\right) f(5^{r}).$$

On the other hand, since gcd(14m + 1, 17m + 1) = gcd(3, m - 1) = 1,

$$f(N_{2m} + N_{8m+1}) = f((14m+1) \times (17m+1))$$

= $f(14m+1) f(17m+1)$.

Thus, maximal factor $17m + 1 = \frac{17}{5 \cdot 28} 5^r + \frac{11}{28}$ is smaller than $\beta(5^r) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 5^r$ and $f(5^r) = 5^r$.

I-ii: $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. For this case, we use

$$N_{-2m} + N_{8m+1} = m(14m+5) + (8m+1)(28m+1)$$
$$= (14m+1)(34m+1).$$

We have that gcd(m, 14m + 5) = 1, gcd(8m + 1, 28m + 1) = 5, and gcd(14m + 1, 34m + 1) = gcd(2m + 3, 10) = 1. Thus,

$$f(N_{-2m}) + f(N_{8m+1}) = f(m \times (14m+5)) + f\left(\frac{8m+1}{5} \times 5(28m+1)\right)$$
$$= f(m) f(14m+5) + f\left(\frac{8m+1}{5}\right) f(5^r)$$

and

$$f(N_{-2m} + N_{8m+1}) = f((14m+1) \times (34m+1))$$

= $f(14m+1) f(34m+1)$.

The maximal factor $34m + 1 = \frac{17}{5 \cdot 14} 5^r - \frac{3}{14}$ is smaller than $\beta(5^r) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 5^r$ and $f(5^r) = 5^r$.

Case II: $5^{2s+1} = 5(28m+9) \equiv 17 \pmod{28}$. We have $m \equiv 22 \pmod{25}$. We use

$$N_{-2m-1} + N_{4m+2} = (2m+1)(7m+6) + (2m+1)(28m+9)$$
$$= (2m+1)(7m+3).$$

Note that

$$f(N_{-2m-1}) + f(N_{4m+2})$$

$$= f\left(5^2 \times \frac{2m+1}{5} \times \frac{7m+6}{5}\right) + f\left(\frac{2m+1}{5} \times 5(28m+9)\right)$$

and

$$f(N_{-2m-1} + N_{4m+2}) = f((2m+1) \times (7m+3)).$$

Thus, $f(5^r)=5^r$, since the maximal factor $7m+3=\frac{1}{5\cdot 4}5^r+\frac{3}{4}$ is smaller than $\beta(5^r)=\frac{1}{4}\cdot 5^r$.

Case III: $5^{2s+1} = 5(28m + 25) \equiv 13 \pmod{28}$. Note that $m \equiv 0 \pmod{25}$ and

$$N_{6m+5} + N_{-12m-10} = 3(6m+5)(7m+5) + 3(6m+5)(28m+25)$$
$$= 15(6m+5)(7m+6).$$

Then

$$f(N_{6m+5}) + f(N_{-12m-10})$$

$$= f\left(5^2 \times \frac{6m+5}{5} \times \frac{3(7m+5)}{5}\right) + f\left(3 \times \frac{2m+1}{5} \times 5(28m+25)\right)$$

and

$$f(N_{6m+5} + N_{-12m-10}) = f((6m+5) \times (7m+6)).$$

Thus, $f(5^r) = 5^r$, since the maximal factor $7m + 6 = \frac{1}{5 \cdot 4} \cdot 5^r - \frac{1}{4}$ is smaller than $\beta(5^r) = \frac{1}{5 \cdot 4} \cdot 5^r$.

5. Proof for $f(7^r) = 7^r$

We prove that f fixes 7^r . To do this we need to consider powers of 3 under some assumption, which was proved to be fixed by f in Section 3.

Theorem 4. If f(n) = n for all $n < 7^r$, then $f(7^r) = 7^r$.

Proof. If r = 2s + 1, then $f(7^{2s+1}) = 7^{2s+1}$ by

$$N_{-m} + N_m = m \times \frac{7m+5}{2} + m \times \frac{7m-5}{2} = 7m^2,$$

where $m=7^s$.

If r is even, note that $7^r = 12m + 1$ for some m. Then m is divisible by 4 and $m \equiv 0, 4 \pmod{5}$. Note that

$$N_{-12m-1} + N_{9m+2} = 6(7m+1)(12m+1) + 9(7m+1) \cdot \frac{9m+2}{2}$$
$$= 15(7m+1) \cdot \frac{15m+2}{2}$$

and each pair of linear factors is relatively prime. Thus, each factors can be split, but we cannot split 3 and 7m + 1 yet.

If $7m+1=3^k\times d$ for some $d\neq 1,3$, then $d\geq 11$, since $\gcd(2,7m+1)=\gcd(5,7m+1)=1$. In this case,

$$\begin{split} N_{-12m-1} &= 2 \times 3 \cdot \frac{7m+1}{d} \times d \times (12m+1) \\ N_{9m+2} &= 9 \cdot \frac{7m+1}{d} \times d \times \frac{9m+2}{2} \\ N_{-12m-1} + N_{9m+2} &= 5 \times 3 \cdot \frac{7m+1}{d} \times d \times \frac{15m+2}{2} \end{split}$$

and each factor is smaller than $7^r = 12m + 1$. Hence, $f(7^r) = 7^r$.

Now assume $7m+1=3^k$. Then

$$7^r = 12 \cdot \frac{3^k - 1}{7} + 1$$
 if and only if $7^{r+1} = 12 \cdot 3^k - 5$.

This equation has a trivial solution r = k = 0. If $r \ge 1$, then we obtain $k = 42\ell + 18$ by comparing both sides modulo 7^2 .

Note that $3^{42} \equiv 1 \pmod{43}$ and $\operatorname{ord}_{43} 7 = 6$. Thus,

$$7^{r+1} \equiv 12 \cdot 3^{18} - 5 \equiv 28 \pmod{43}$$
.

However, it has no solution for r. Hence, 7m+1 cannot be a power of 3 and we can conclude that $f(7^r) = 7^r$.

6. Proof for $f(2^r) = 2^r$

To prove 2^r is fixed by f, we need to consider powers of 5.

Theorem 5. If f(n) = n for all $n < 2^r$, then $f(2^r) = 2^r$.

Proof. Note that $2^r \equiv 1, 2, 4 \pmod{7}$ holds. If $2^r = 7m + 1$, then m is odd and, by $a \times b$ notation,

$$N_{-5m} + N_{-5m} = 25m \cdot \frac{7m+1}{2} + 25m \cdot \frac{7m+1}{2}$$
$$= 25m \times 2^{r-1} + 25m \times 2^{r-1}$$
$$= 25m \times 2^{r}.$$

Since $25m > 7m + 1 = 2^r$, we are not sure yet if f fixes 25m.

Note that f(25) = f(3) f(8) + f(1) = 25. If gcd(25, m) = 1, then we obtain $f(2^r) = 2f(2^{r-1}) = 2^r$ by

$$f(N_{-5m} + N_{-5m}) = f(25) f(m) f(2^r)$$

= $f(25) f(m) f(2^{r-1}) + f(25) f(m) f(2^{r-1}).$

Otherwise, we may not be able to split f(25m) into f(25) and f(m).

Assume that $m = 5^k \times d$ with $k \ge 1$ and $5 \nmid d$. Then

$$f(25m) = f(5^{k+2}d) = f(5^{k+2}) f(d).$$

By Theorem 3 we have $f(5^{k+2}) = 5^{k+2}$ since

$$\beta(5^{k+2}) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 5^{k+2} = \frac{25}{4d} \cdot m < 7m + 1 = 2^r.$$

Thus, we can deduce that $f(2^r) = 2^r$.

Similarly, we can show that $N=2^r$ is fixed by f when $2^r\equiv 2,4\pmod 7$ by using the equalities:

$$N_{m+1} + N_{m+1} = (m+1) \times \frac{7m+2}{2} + (m+1) \times \frac{7m+2}{2}$$
$$= (m+1) \times 2^{r-1} + (m+1) \times 2^{r-1}$$
$$= (m+1) \times 2^{r}$$

and

$$N_{-3m-1} + N_{-3m-1} = 3 \times (3m+1) \times \frac{7m+4}{2} + 3 \times (3m+1) \times \frac{7m+4}{2}$$
$$= 3 \times (3m+1) \times 2^{r-1} + 3 \times (3m+1) \times 2^{r-1}$$
$$= 3 \times (3m+1) \times 2^{r}.$$

Note that the above equalities are written by the $a \times b$ notation.

7. Proof for $f(p^r) = p^r$

We prove that $f(p^r) = p^r$ for primes $p \ge 11$.

Case I: $p^r = 14m + 1$ with $m \not\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $m \not\equiv 1 \pmod{5}$. Assume that f(n) = n for all n < 14m + 1. We use two equations according to the parity of m:

$$N_{-m} + N_{4m+1} = m \cdot \frac{7m+5}{2} + (4m+1) \times (14m+1)$$
$$= (7m+2) \times \frac{17m+1}{2}$$

when m is odd and

$$N_m + N_{4m+1} = \frac{m}{2} \cdot (7m - 5) + (4m + 1) \times (14m + 1)$$
$$= (7m + 1) \cdot \frac{17m + 2}{2}$$

when m is even.

Since $gcd(m, 7m \pm 5) = gcd(m, 5),$

$$m \cdot (7m \pm 5) = \begin{cases} 5^2 \times \frac{m}{5} \times \frac{7m \pm 5}{5} & \text{if } 5 \parallel m \text{ and } 5 \parallel (7m \pm 5) \\ \frac{m}{5} \times 5(7m \pm 5) & \text{if } 5 \parallel m \text{ and } 5^2 \mid (7m \pm 5) \\ 5m \times \frac{7m \pm 5}{5} & \text{if } 5^2 \mid m \text{ and } 5 \parallel (7m \pm 5) \end{cases}$$

and the maximal factor of $m(7m \pm 5)$ can be

$$\frac{5(7m+5)}{2}$$
 or $5(7m-5)$

when they are powers of 5. So, f fixes $\frac{5(7m+5)}{2}$ and 5(7m-5) by Theorem 3, since

$$\beta \left(\frac{5(7m+5)}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{5(7m+5)}{2} \right) < 14m+1,$$

$$\beta (5(7m-5)) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 5(7m-5) < 14m+1.$$

For the last term $(7m+2) \times \frac{17m+1}{2}$ of the first equation is fixed by f by the induction hypothesis. So, now, we check $f((7m+1) \cdot \frac{17m+2}{2})$ of the second equation. Since $\gcd(7m+1,17m+2) = \gcd(m+1,3)$, we can write

$$(7m+1) \cdot \frac{17m+2}{2} = \begin{cases} (7m+1) \times \frac{17m+2}{2} & \text{if } m \equiv 0,1 \pmod{3} \\ 3^2 \times \frac{7m+1}{3} \times \frac{17m+2}{2 \cdot 3} & \text{if } 3 \parallel (7m+1) \text{ and } 3 \parallel (17m+2) \\ \frac{7m+1}{3} \times \frac{3(17m+2)}{2} & \text{if } 3 \parallel (7m+1) \text{ and } 3^2 \mid (17m+2) \\ 3(7m+1) \times \frac{17m+2}{2 \cdot 3} & \text{if } 3^2 \mid (7m+1) \text{ and } 3 \parallel (17m+2). \end{cases}$$

Thus, the maximal factor is $\frac{3(17m+2)}{2}$ when it is a power of 3. It is fixed by f by Theorem 2 since

$$\alpha\bigg(\frac{3(17m+2)}{2}\bigg) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3(17m+2)}{2} - \frac{12}{17} < 14m + 1.$$

Case II: $p^r = 14m + 3$ with $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ and $m \not\equiv 3 \pmod{5}$. Assume that f(n) = n for all n < 14m + 3. We use

$$N_{-3m-1} + N_{6m+2} = \frac{3}{2}(3m+1)(7m+4) + 3(3m+1)(14m+3)$$
$$= \frac{15}{2}(3m+1)(7m+2).$$

Since gcd(3m+1,7m+4) = gcd(5,m+2) = 1, we can write

$$\frac{3}{2}(3m+1)(7m+4) = \begin{cases} 3 \times \frac{3m+1}{2} \times (7m+4) & \text{if } m \equiv 1 \pmod{6} \\ (3m+1) \times \frac{3(7m+4)}{2} & \text{if } m \equiv 2 \pmod{6} \\ 3 \times (3m+1) \times \frac{7m+4}{2} & \text{if } m \equiv 4 \pmod{6} \\ \frac{3m+1}{2} \times 3(7m+4) & \text{if } m \equiv 5 \pmod{6}. \end{cases}$$

The only case which we cannot apply the induction hypothesis is 3(7m+4) when 7m+4 is a power of 3. In this case, we can verify f(3(7m+4)) = 3(7m+4) by Theorem 2 since

$$\alpha(3(7+4)) = \frac{14}{17} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot 3(7m+4) - \frac{12}{17} < 14m+3.$$

Case III: $p^r = 14m + 5$ with $m \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ and $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{5}$. Assume that f(n) = n for all n < 14m + 5. For this case we consider

$$N_m + N_{-2m} = \frac{1}{2}m(7m - 5) + m(14m + 5)$$
$$= \frac{5}{2}m(7m + 1).$$

Note that each pair of linear factors is relatively prime. Thus, the only factor we should check is 5(7m+1) when 7m+1 is a power of 5. Since $\beta(5(7m+1)) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot 5(7m+1) < 14m+5$, f should fix 5(7m+1) by Theorem 3. Thus, f(14m+5) = 14m+5. Other cases of 14m-t with t=1,3,5 can be treated in the same ways as Cases I-III. So, we can conclude that $f(p^r) = p^r$.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank the referee for their thorough review and pointing out mistakes.

INTEGERS: 25 (2025) 13

References

[1] P. V. Chung, Multiplicative functions satisfying the equation $f(m^2 + n^2) = f(m^2) + f(n^2)$, Math. Slovaca 46 (1996), 165-171.

- [2] P. V. Chung and B. M. Phong, Additive uniqueness sets for multiplicative functions, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 55 (1999), 237-243.
- [3] E. Hasanalizade, Multiplicative functions k-additive on generalized pentagonal numbers, Integers 22 (2022), #A43.
- [4] E. Hasanalizade and P.-S. Park, Multiplicative functions k-additive on generalized octagonal numbers, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc., Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 111, no. 2 (2025), 212-222.
- E. Hasanalizade and P.-S. Park, and E. Inochkin, Multiplicative functions k-additive on hexagonal numbers, preprint.
- [6] B. Kim, J. Y. Kim, C. G. Lee, and P.-S. Park, Multiplicative functions additive on generalized pentagonal numbers, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 356 (2018), 125-128.
- [7] B. Kim, J. Y. Kim, C. G. Lee, and P.-S. Park, Multiplicative functions additive on polygonal numbers, *Aequationes Math.* **95** (2021), 601-621.
- [8] P.-S. Park, On k-additive uniqueness of the set of squares for multiplicative functions, Aequat. Math. 92 (2018), no. 3, 487-495.
- [9] P.-S. Park, Multiplicative functions which are additive on triangular numbers, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 58 (2021), no. 3, 603-608.
- [10] P.-S. Park, The 3-additive uniqueness of generalized pentagonal numbers for multiplicative functions, J. Integer Seq. 26 (2023), no. 5, Article 23.5.7, 5 pp.
- [11] C. A. Spiro, Additive uniqueness sets for arithmetic functions, J. Number Theory 42 (1992), 232-246.