

JOURNAL FÜR DIE REINE UND ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK
CRELLES JOURNAL

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON PROF. DR. H. HASSE UND PROF. DR. H. ROHRBACH

Professor Dr. Helmut Hasse
207 Ahrensburg
Hagener Allee 35

Ahrensburg, den 8. Juni 1974

Mrs. Melvina Baica
1203 N., Dearborn St., Apt. 306
Chicago, IL 60616
U S A

Dear Mrs. Baica,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript "Putting the last k digits first" for publication in our Journal.

Your results are certainly very interesting, and I admire your courage and skill in managing such giant numbers.

Let me also say sincere thanks for dedicating this paper to me on the occasion of my 75 th birthday. Results of this kind are exactly what I like in number theory.

Allow me, however, to make a few comments and proposals on the form of your representation.

1.) Your paper consists of an Introduction and Chapter I. It is somewhat unusual to have only one chapter and, accordingly, put the digit 1. in front of all formula numbers. If you do not want to divide this one chapter in at least two, it would be better to let the headline Main Part follow the end of the Introduction and remove the digits 1. in all formula numbers.

2.) In the Introduction one misses a clear statement of what Bernstein had already found and what are your new results. I think it best to give the numerical results as "the pearls" of the paper explicitly in the Introduction, so that the reader finds in the Introduction already those "pearls". +)

What now follows are minor details.

3.) On p.2 you refer to the Bibliography for a paper of Bernstein. It would be better to ~~to~~ number the two Bernstein publications in the Bibliography and refer on p.2 to the one you mean by its number.

4.) On p.2 of Chapter One you use the term "multiplicative k -twin". This term must be introduced (explained) in the Introduction. In the following line I am not sure whether the k must not be replaced by s .

5.) From the following text the reader does not see where the Proof, begun on p.4, comes to an end.

6.) In theorem 2 (p.10) it would be clearer to write

$$a = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}; \dots; a_1, a_0, \dots, a_{d-1}]$$

in order to emphasize the fact that this sequence of periods is finite.

+) In the Main Part then every single one of these results has to be mentioned as "proved" when this has been achieved. Thus the whole paper would become much easier to understand.

It would of course be interesting to consider not only decadic digits and numbers. Perhaps you consider this generalization for a further paper. I am sure that the basis 10 is not distinguished among all possible bases by the results you found.

I am enclosing a copy of the instructions for our readers. Unfortunately I have not got it yet in English. One of its points is that we ask for a 'through pagination'; but this is of minor importance.

=====

Yours sincerely,

H. Hassk