

Štefan Porubský

On theorems of Niven and Dressler

Mathematica Slovaca, Vol. 28 (1978), No. 3, 243--246

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/136180>

Terms of use:

© Mathematical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1978

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

ON THEOREMS OF NIVEN AND DRESSLER

ŠTEFAN PORUBSKÝ

Niven [2] and Dressler [1] have proved that the (asymptotic) density of sets $\{n: (n, \varphi(n)) \leq k\}$, $\{n: (n, \sigma_i(n)) \leq k\}$ and $\{n: (\varphi(n), \sigma_i(n)) \leq k\}$ is zero, where, as usual, $\varphi(n)$ is the Euler totient function and $\sigma_i(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^i$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots$). In this note we intend to extend these results to sets of the type $\{n: (f_1(n), f_2(n)) \leq g(n)\}$, where $f_1(n)$ and $f_2(n)$ are integer-valued multiplicative functions. The ideas behind our proofs are borrowed from those of Niven and Dressler.

Every positive integer n can be written in the form $n = n_1 \cdot n_2$, where n_1 is square-free and n_2 is square-full with $(n_1, n_2) = 1$. We shall call n_1 the square-free part of n and denote it by $s(n)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $g(n)$ be an integer-valued arithmetical function and $f_1(n), f_2(n)$ multiplicative ones. Assume, moreover, that there exists a set of primes $P = \{p_i\}$ which satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) $\sum_{p_i \in P} p_i^{-1}$ diverges,
- (ii) $f_1(p_i) \mid g(n)$ for every p_i from P and positive integer n ,
- (iii) If $P_i = \{q_{i,j}\}$ denotes the set of primes such that $f_1(p_i) \mid f_2(q_{i,j})$, then $\sum_{q_{i,j} \in P_i} q_{i,j}^{-1}$ diverges for every i .

Then the set $T = \{n: (f_1(n), f_2(n)) = g(n)\}$ has the density $d(T) = 0$.

Proof. Given a sequence A of positive integers and a prime q , A_q will denote the set of those elements n of A such that $q \mid s(n)$.

In the proof we shall use the following result due to I. Niven [2] or [3], p. 254:

(1) *If there is a set of primes $\{q_i\}$ such that $\sum q_i^{-1}$ diverges and $d(A_{q_i}) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, then $d(A) = 0$.*

Of particular interest will be the case of A_{q_i} being void for every i :

(2) *If there is a set of primes $\{q_i\}$ such that $\sum q_i^{-1}$ diverges and no member of A has its square-free part divisible by some q_i , then $d(A) = 0$.*

Now, according to (1) it is sufficient to show that $d(T_{p_i}) = 0$ for every p_i from P . This will immediately follow if we show that the set $M^{(i)} = \{m: m \cdot p_i \in T_{p_i}, (m, p_i) = 1\}$ has density zero. To do this we shall use (2) with $q_{i,j}$ in place of q_i . It can be easily verified that the hypotheses of (2) are really satisfied in this case. In

fact, the required divergence follows from (iii) and on the other hand, (ii) together with the fact that f_1 and f_2 are multiplicative implies that $q_{i,j} \neq p_i$ and that $M_{q_{i,j}}^{(i)}$ is void for every i . This proves the theorem.

Corollary 1. Let $f(n)$ be an integer-valued multiplicative function. Suppose that there exists a set of primes $\{p_i\}$ such that:

(j) $\sum p_i^{-1}$ diverges,

(jj) for every i the series $\sum_{p_i | f(q)} q^{-1}$ diverges, where the summation is extended over all the primes q satisfying the indicated property.

Then for every positive k the density of the set of positive integers n for which $(n, f(n)) \leq k$ is zero.

Corollary 2. Let $f(n)$ be an integer-valued multiplicative function. Suppose that there exists a non-constant polynomial $z(n)$, $z(0) \neq 0$ (with integer coefficients) such that $f(p) = z(p)$ for every prime p . Then for every positive k the density of the set of positive integers n for which $(n, f(n)) \leq k$ is zero.

Proof. By the preceding corollary it is sufficient to find a set $P = \{p_i\}$ of primes satisfying (j) and (jj). Define P' as the set of those primes for which the congruence

$$(Z) \quad z(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i}$$

has a solution. Then Schinzel's theorem on p. 403 of [4] asserts that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \in P'}} p^{-1} = \lambda \log \log x + D + O((\log x)^{-1})$$

with suitable constants λ and D . Now, if P denotes the set of those primes from P' for which there exists a solution n of (Z) with $(n, p_i) = 1$, then P differs from P' only in a finite number of terms. Thus Schinzel's result implies that (j) is fulfilled for this P .

Finally, for $p_i \in P$ the relation $p_i | f(q)$ is equivalent to $q \equiv n_0 \pmod{p_i}$, where n_0 denotes a solution of (Z) such that $(n_0, p_i) = 1$. At this stage, Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetical progression yields that also (jj) is satisfied; and the proof is finished.

Thus for instance, for $f(n) = \varphi(n)$ or $f(n) = \sigma_j(n)$ we obtain the above mentioned results of Niven and Dressler. Moreover, the first results can be extended in turn to functions $\varphi_j(n) = n^j \prod_{p|n} (1 - p^{-j})$ denoting the number of ordered sets of j (equal or not) positive integers, none of which exceeds n and whose g.c.d. is prime to n ($j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).

In [1] Dressler proved using a completely different idea that the set $\{n: (\varphi(n),$

$\sigma_j(n) \leq k$ has density zero. In the case $j = 1$ this result follows also from our theorem. However, Dressler's idea of the proof of this statement will be employed in the proof of the next theorem. In what follows, $\omega(n)$ and $\Omega(n)$ will denote the number of distinct prime divisors and the total number of prime divisors of n , resp.

Lemma. *Let $h(n)$ be an arithmetical function such that*

$$(H) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(n)}{\log \log n} = a < 1 .$$

Then the set $T_h = \{n : \omega(s(n)) \geq h(n)\}$ has density one.

Proof. Let α be such that

$$1 > \alpha > a > \max \{0, 3\alpha - 2\} .$$

Such an α always exists, e.g., if $a < 2/3$ put $\alpha = 2/3$, and if $a > 2/3$ take α from the interval $(a, (a + 2)/3)$. Let $\delta = \delta(\alpha)$ be determined by the equality $a = \delta \cdot \alpha$. Obviously

$$1 > \delta > \max \left\{ 0, 3 - \frac{2}{\alpha} \right\} .$$

Further, put $g(n) = \delta^{-1} \cdot h(n)$. Then

$$(G) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{\log \log n} = \alpha < 1 .$$

Finally put $\varepsilon = (1 - \delta)/(3 - \delta)$. Then $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \alpha$ and $\varepsilon < 1/3$.

It follows from (G) that $g(n) < (1 - \varepsilon) \log \log n$ holds for all sufficiently large n . On the other hand, $(1 - \varepsilon) \log \log n < \omega(n)$ is satisfied for almost all n , because $\log \log n$ is the normal order of $\omega(n)$. Thus the density of the set $M = \{n : g(n) < \omega(n)\}$ is one. Therefore to finish the proof it is sufficient to show that $d(M - T_h) = 0$, that is, that the density of the set of integers m for which $g(m) < \omega(m)$ and simultaneously $h(m) > \omega(m)$ is zero. But $h(m) = \delta g(m) = (1 - 3\varepsilon)/(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot g(m)$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(m) \geq \omega(s(m)) + 2(\omega(m) - \omega(s(m))) &> 2\omega(m) - \delta g(m) > \\ &> \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \omega(m) . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\Omega(m)$ and $\omega(m)$ have the same normal order $\log \log n$. This yields that the inequality $\Omega(m)/\omega(m) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)/(1 - \varepsilon)$ holds for almost all n , which proves the lemma.

Remark. By the way, it follows from our lemma that the set of integers n with $\omega(s(n)) \leq \text{const.}$ has density zero.

Theorem 2. *Let $g(n)$ and $h(n)$ be arithmetical functions such that $h(n)$ satisfies*

(H). Moreover, let $f_1(n)$ and $f_2(n)$ be multiplicative integer-valued functions. Finally assume, that for every n from $T_h = \{n: \omega(s(n)) \cong h(n)\}$ we have

$$\prod_{p|s(n)} (f_1(p), f_2(p)) > g(n).$$

Then the set of positive integers n for which $(f_1(n), f_2(n)) \leq g(n)$ has density zero.

The theorem is an immediate consequence of our Lemma, because the investigated set is a subset of a set of density zero, more precisely

$$\{n: (f_1(n), f_2(n)) \leq g(n)\} \subseteq \text{compl}(T_h).$$

Corollary. If $g(n) = o(\log \log n)$, then the set of positive integers such that $(\varphi(n), \sigma_j(n)) \leq g(n)$ is zero for every $j = 1, 2, \dots$

Proof. If p is an odd prime, the $2 | (\varphi(p), \sigma_j(p))$. Therefore, if $n \in T_{2g}$, then

$$\prod_{p|n} (\varphi(p), \sigma_j(p)) \geq 2^{\omega(s(n))-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \omega(s(n)) \geq g(n)$$

and the conclusion follows.

The author wishes to acknowledge numerous helpful suggestions offered by Professor Š. Schwarz and Professor T. Šalát which substantially improved the presentation.

REFERENCES

- [1] DRESSLER, R. E.: On a theorem of Niven. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 17, 1974, 109—110.
- [2] NIVEN, I.: The asymptotic density of sequences. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 57, 1951, 420—434.
- [3] NIVEN, I.—ZUCKERMANN, H. S.: *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*. J. Wiley, New York 1967.
- [4] SCOURFIELD, E. J.: An asymptotic formula for the property $(n, f(n)) = 1$ for a class of multiplicative functions. *Acta Arith.*, 29, 1976, 401—423.

Received May 27, 1976;
revised March 10, 1977

*Matematický ústav SAV
Obrancov mieru 49
886 25 Bratislava*

О ТЕОРЕМАХ НИВЕНА И ДРЕСЛЕРА

Штефан Порубски

резюме

Пусть $g(n)$, $f_1(n)$, $f_2(n)$ — целозначные арифметические функции, причем $f_1(n)$, $f_2(n)$ — мультипликативны. В работе обобщаются некоторые результаты Нивена и Дреслера. Приводятся несколько достаточных условий таких, чтобы множества типа $\{n: (f_1(n), f_2(n)) \leq g(n)\}$ имели нулевую асимптотическую плотность.