Literaturverzeichnis

[1] N. C. Ankeny and C. A. Rogers, *A conjecture of Chowla*, Ann. of Math. 53 (1951), pp. 541–550.
[2] H. Flanders, *Generalisation of a theorem of Ankeny and Rogers*, ibid. 57 (1953), pp. 392–400.
[3] I. Gerst, *On the theory of n-th power residues and a conjecture of Kronecker*, Acta Arith. 17 (1970), pp. 121–139.
[4] A. Schinzel, *On power residues and exponential congruences*, ibid. 27 (1975), pp. 397–420.
[5] — *A refinement of a theorem of Gerst on power residues*, ibid. 17 (1970), pp. 161–168.
[6] — *Abelian binomials, power residues and exponential congruences*, ibid. 32 (1977), pp. 245–274.
[7] V. Schulze, *Potenzreste*, ibid. 33 (1977), pp. 379–404.
[8] E. Trost, *Zur Theorie der Potenzreste*, Nieuw. Arch. Wiskunde 18 (1934), pp. 58–61.

FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN
II. MATH. INST. FB 19
Königin-Luise-Str. 24/26
D-1000 Berlin 33

Eingegangen am 4. 2. 1980
und in revidierter Form am 28. 11. 1980 (1235)

ACTA ARITHMETICA
XLI (1982)

Some asymptotic formulas on generalized divisor functions, III

by

P. Erdös and A. Sárközy (Budapest)

1. Throughout this paper, we use the following notation:

$c_1, c_2, \ldots, X_0, X_1, \ldots$ denote positive absolute constants. We denote the number of elements of the finite set S by $|S|$. We write $e^x = \exp(x)$. We denote the least prime factor of n by $p(n)$, while the greatest prime factor of n is denoted by $P(n)$. We write $p^\alpha \| n$ if $p^\alpha | n$ but $p^{\alpha+1} \nmid n$. $\omega(n)$ denotes the number of all the prime factors of n so that $\omega(n) = \sum_{p^\alpha \| n} \alpha$ and we write

$$\omega(n, x, y) = \sum_{\substack{p^\alpha \| n \\ x < p \leqslant y}} \alpha.$$

The divisor function is denoted by $d(n)$:

$$d(n) = \sum_{d|n} 1.$$

Let A be a finite or infinite sequence of positive integers $a_1 < a_2 < \ldots$ Then we write

$$N_A(x) = \sum_{\substack{a \in A \\ a \leqslant x}} 1, \quad f_A(x) = \sum_{\substack{a \in A \\ a \leqslant x}} \frac{1}{a}, \quad d_A(n) = \sum_{\substack{a \in A \\ a | n}} 1$$

(in other words, $d_A(n)$ denotes the number of divisors amongst the a_i's) and

$$D_A(x) = \max_{1 \leqslant n \leqslant x} d_A(x).$$

The aim of this series is to investigate the function $D_A(x)$. (See [1] and [2]; see also Hall [4].) Clearly,

$$\sum_{1 \leqslant n \leqslant x} d_A(n) = x f_A(x) + O(x).$$

Thus if $f_A(x)$ is large then we have $D_A(x)/f_A(x) \gg 1$. In Part II of this series (see [2]), we showed that $f_A(x) \to +\infty$ implies that

$$\limsup_{x\to+\infty} D_A(x)/f_A(x) = +\infty,$$

in fact, we have

$$\limsup_{x\to+\infty} D_A(x)\exp\left(c_1(\log f_A(x))^2\right) = +\infty.$$

We proved this by showing that if $f_A(x)$ is large (in fact, it is sufficient to assume that $N_A(x)$ is large) then there exists an integer y such that $x \leqslant y \leqslant \exp\left((\log x)^2\right)$ and $D_A(y)$ is large. In this paper, our aim is to prove that *if we have more information about $f_A(x)$ then $D_A(x)/f_A(x)$ must be large for the same x.* In fact we prove that

THEOREM 1. *For all $\omega > 0$ and for $x > X_0(\omega)$,*

$$f_A(x) > (\log\log x)^{20} \tag{1}$$

implies that

$$D_A(x) > \omega f_A(x). \tag{2}$$

(Note that by Theorem 1 in [1], the lower bound $(\log\log x)^{20}$ in (1) cannot be replaced by $\log\log x$.)

Sections 2 and 3 are devoted to the proof of this theorem while in Sections 4 and 5 we discuss some other related results.

2. In order to prove Theorem 1, we need some lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *There exists an absolute constant c_2 such that for all $u \geqslant 0$ and $y \geqslant 1$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{u<n\leqslant uy\\ p(n)>y}} \frac{1}{n} < c_2. \tag{3}$$

Proof. Lemma 1 can be proved easily by using Brun's sieve. In fact, (3) is trivial for $u \leqslant 1$ (since in this case, the left-hand side is equal to 0), while for $u > 1$, (3) is a consequence of [7], p. 53, Theorem 4.10.

LEMMA 2. *Let us write*

$$Q(x) = x-(1+x)\log(1+x). \tag{4}$$

Then for $1 \leqslant y$, $2y < z \leqslant v$, $0 \leqslant a \leqslant 1$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant v\\ \omega(n,y,z)\leqslant(1-a)\sum_{y<p\leqslant z}1/p}} 1 < c_3 v\exp\left(Q(-a)\log\frac{\log z}{\log y}\right). \tag{5}$$

Proof. Let $1 \leqslant v$, $0 \leqslant a \leqslant 1$, and let E be an arbitrary nonempty set of prime numbers not exceeding v. Put $E(v) = \sum_{p\in E} 1/p$. K. K. Norton proved (see [5], Theorem (5.9); see also Halász [3]) that

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant v\\ \sum_{p^\beta\|n,\,p\in E}\beta\leqslant(1-a)E(v)}} 1 < c_4 v\exp\left(Q(-a)E(v)\right).$$

By using this theorem with $E = \{p\colon y < p \leqslant z\}$ (note that $E \neq \emptyset$ by $2y < z$), and with respect to the well-known formula

$$\sum_{p\leqslant x} 1/p = \log\log x + c_5 + o(1), \tag{6}$$

we obtain (5).

LEMMA 3. *For $1 \leqslant y$, $2y < z \leqslant v$, $0 < a \leqslant \beta < 1$ we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant v\\ \omega(n,y,z)\geqslant(1+a)\sum_{y<p\leqslant z}1/p}} 1 < c_6(\beta)a^{-1}v\left(\sum_{y<p\leqslant z}\frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left(Q(a)\log\frac{\log z}{\log y}\right) \tag{7}$$

(where $Q(x)$ is defined by (4)).

Proof. Let $0 < a \leqslant \beta < 1$, and let E be an arbitrary nonempty set of prime numbers not exceeding v. Put $E(v) = \sum_{p\in E} 1/p$. K. K. Norton proved (see [5], Theorem (5.12); see also Halász [3]) that

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant v\\ \sum_{p^\gamma\|n,\,p\in E}\gamma\geqslant(1+a)E(v)}} 1 < c_7(\beta)a^{-1}v\left(E(v)\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left(Q(a)E(v)\right).$$

By using this theorem with $E = \{p\colon y < p \leqslant z\}$ (again, $E \neq \emptyset$ by $2y < z$), and with respect to (6), we obtain (7).

3. In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 1. Define the positive integer R by

$$x^{1-1/2^{R-1}} \leqslant xe^{-f_A(x)/3} < x^{1-1/2^R}, \tag{8}$$

i.e.,

$$2^{R-1} < \frac{3\log x}{f_A(x)} \leqslant 2^R, \qquad R-1 < \frac{1}{\log 2}\log\frac{3\log x}{f_A(x)} \leqslant R.$$

Then for large x, we have

$$R < \frac{1}{\log 2}\log\frac{3\log x}{f_A(x)} + 1 < 2\log\log x. \tag{9}$$

For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, R$, let

$$x_i = x^{1-1/2^i},$$

and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, R$, put

$$A_i = A \cap [x_{i-1}, x_i).$$

Then by (1) and (8), for large x we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{R}\Big(\sum_{a\in A_i}\frac{1}{a}\Big)=\sum_{\substack{a\in A\\ a<x_R}}\frac{1}{a}=\sum_{\substack{a\in A\\ a\leqslant x}}\frac{1}{a}-\sum_{\substack{a\in A\\ x_R\leqslant a\leqslant x}}\frac{1}{a}\tag{10}$$

$$\geqslant f_A(x)-\sum_{x_R\leqslant n\leqslant x}\frac{1}{n}\geqslant f_A(x)-\sum_{xe^{-f_A(x)/3}\leqslant n\leqslant x}\frac{1}{n}$$

$$=f_A(x)-\big(1+o(1)\big)\log e^{f_A(x)/3}>f_A(x)-\frac{f_A(x)}{2}=\frac{f_A(x)}{2}.$$

Obviously, there exists an integer j such that $1\leqslant j\leqslant R$ and

$$\sum_{a\in A_j}\frac{1}{a}\geqslant\frac{1}{R}\sum_{i=1}^{R}\Big(\sum_{a\in A_i}\frac{1}{a}\Big)$$

hence with respect to (9) and (10),

$$f_{A_j}(x)=\sum_{a\in A_j}\frac{1}{a}>\frac{1}{R}\,\frac{f_A(x)}{2}>\frac{f_A(x)}{4\log\log x}.\tag{11}$$

Let us fix an integer j $(1\leqslant j\leqslant R)$ satisfying (11), and write A_j in the form

$$A_j=A_j'\cup A_j''\tag{12}$$

where A_j' consists of the integers a such that $a\in A_j$ and there exists an integer d satisfying

$$(\log x)^3<d\leqslant x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}\tag{13}$$

and $d\,|\,a$, while A_j'' consists of the integers a such that $a\in A_j$ and $d\nmid a$ for all d satisfying (13). (For $x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}\leqslant(\log x)^3$, we have $A_j'=\emptyset$.) We have to distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Assume first that

$$f_{A_j'}(x)=\sum_{a\in A_j'}\frac{1}{a}>\frac{1}{2}f_{A_j}(x).$$

Then by (11), we have

$$f_{A_j'}(x)=\sum_{a\in A_j'}\frac{1}{a}>\frac{1}{2}f_{A_j}(x)>\frac{f_A(x)}{8\log\log x}.\tag{14}$$

For $a\in A_j'$, write a in the form

$$a=d^*(a)\,b(a),$$

where $d^*(a)$ denotes the least integer d such that d satisfies (13) and $d\,|\,a$. Then for $a\in A_j'$ we have $b(a)\leqslant a<x_j=x^{1-1/2^j}$ and $(\log x)^3<d^*(a)$ so that

$$\sum_{a\in A_j'}\frac{1}{a}=\sum_{a\in A_j'}\frac{1}{d^*(a)b(a)}=\sum_{b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\frac{1}{b}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}\frac{1}{d^*(a)}\tag{15}$$

$$<\sum_{b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\frac{1}{b}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}\frac{1}{(\log x)^3}=\frac{1}{(\log x)^3}\sum_{b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\frac{1}{b}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}1$$

$$\leqslant\frac{1}{(\log x)^3}\Big(\max_{1\leqslant b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}1\Big)\sum_{b<x}\frac{1}{b}$$

$$<\frac{1}{(\log x)^3}\Big(\max_{1\leqslant b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}1\Big)2\log x=\frac{2}{(\log x)^2}\Big(\max_{1\leqslant b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}1\Big).$$

If x is large enough (in terms of ω) then (14) and (15) yield that

$$\max_{1\leqslant b\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}}\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b}}1>\frac{(\log x)^2}{2}\sum_{a\in A_j'}\frac{1}{a}>\frac{(\log x)^2}{16\log\log x}f_A(x)>\omega f_A(x)+1$$

so that there exists an integer b_0 for which

$$1\leqslant b_0\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}\tag{16}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'\\ b^*(a)=b_0}}1>\omega f_A(x)+1.\tag{17}$$

Put $s=[\omega f_A(x)]+1$. Then by (17), there exist distinct integers $a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_s$ such that a_i can be written in the form

$$a_i=b_0d^*(a_i)=b_0d_i$$

where

$$\big((\log x)^3<\big)\,d_i\leqslant x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}.\tag{18}$$

Let

$$u=b_0d_1d_2\ldots d_s.$$

Then by (16) and (18), we have

$$u=b_0d_1d_2\ldots d_s\leqslant x^{1-1/2^j}\big(x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}\big)^s<x^{1-1/2^j}\big(x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}\big)^{2\omega f_A(x)}=x,\tag{19}$$

and obviously, $a_i = b_0 d_i/u$ and $a_i = b_0 d_i \in A$ so that

$$d_A(u) \geqslant s = [\omega f_A(x)]+1 > \omega f_A(x). \tag{20}$$

(19) and (20) yield (2) and this completes the proof of Theorem 1 in this case.

Case 2. Assume now that

$$f_{A_j'}(x) = \sum_{a\in A_j'} \frac{1}{a} \leqslant \frac{1}{2} f_{A_j}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a\in A_j} \frac{1}{a}. \tag{21}$$

Then (12) and (21) yield that

$$f_{A_j''}(x) = \sum_{a\in A_j''} \frac{1}{a} \geqslant \sum_{a\in A_j} \frac{1}{a} - \sum_{a\in A_j'} \frac{1}{a} \tag{22}$$

$$\geqslant f_{A_j}(x) - \frac{1}{2} f_{A_j}(x) = \frac{1}{2} f_{A_j}(x) > \frac{f_A(x)}{8\log\log x}.$$

For $u \geqslant 1$, let

$$g(u) = \left(\frac{3\log f_A(x)}{u}\right)^u.$$

Then for $1 \leqslant u < \frac{3}{e}\log f_A(x)$, the function $g(u)$ is increasing since

$$g'(u) = g(u)\log\frac{3\log f_A(x)}{eu} > 0$$

and for large x, we have

$$g(1) = 3\log f_A(x) < \frac{f_A(x)}{(\log\log x)^2}$$

and

$$g\left(\frac{3}{e}\log f_A(x)\right) = \left(f_A(x)\right)^{3/e} > \frac{f_A(x)}{(\log\log x)^2}.$$

Thus there exists a uniquely determined real number t such that

$$1 < t < \frac{3}{e}\log f_A(x) \tag{23}$$

and

$$g(t) = \left(\frac{3\log f_A(x)}{t}\right)^t = \frac{f_A(x)}{(\log\log x)^2}. \tag{24}$$

We need a lower bound for this number t. By (1), we have

$$g\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\log f_A(x)\right) = (6^{1/2})^{\log f_A(x)} = \left(f_A(x)\right)^{(1/2)\log 6} \tag{25}$$

$$< \left(f_A(x)\right)^{9/10} = \frac{f_A(x)}{\left(f_A(x)\right)^{1/10}} < \frac{f_A(x)}{(\log\log x)^2}.$$

(23), (24) and (25) imply that

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\log f_A(x) < t \tag{26}$$

(since $g(u)$ is increasing for $1 < u < \frac{3}{e}\log f_A(x)$).

Let us write

$$z_j = \max\{x^{1/2^j+1}\omega f_A(x), (\log x)^3\}.$$

Let A_j^* denote the set of the integers a such that $a \in A_j''$ and

$$\omega(a, z_j, x^{1/2^j}) > t.$$

Now we are going to give an upper estimate for

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'' \\ a\notin A_j^*}} \frac{1}{a} = \sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'' \\ \omega(a,z_j,x^{1/2^j})\leqslant t}} \frac{1}{a}.$$

If $a \in A_j''$ and $\omega(a, z_j, x^{1/2^j}) \leqslant t$ then by the definition of A_j'', we have

$$x^{1-1/2^{j-1}} = x_{j-1} \leqslant a < x_j = x^{1-1/2^j}$$

and a can be written in the form

$$a = up_1^{\alpha_1}\dots p_m^{\alpha_m}v$$

where $P(u) \leqslant (\log x)^3$, $z_j < p_1 < \dots < p_m \leqslant x^{1/2^j}$, $m \leqslant \omega(a, z_j, x^{1/2^j}) \leqslant t$ and $p(v) > x^{1/2^j}$.

Thus by Lemma 1, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j'' \\ a\notin A_j^*}} \frac{1}{a} \leqslant \sum_{P(u)\leqslant(\log x)^3} \frac{1}{u}\Bigg\{\sum_{0\leqslant m\leqslant t}\ \sum_{z_j<p_1<\dots<p_m\leqslant x^{1/2^j}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=0}^{m} p_i^{\alpha_i}} \times \tag{27}$$

$$\times\Bigg(\sum_{\substack{p(v)>x^{1/2^j} \\ x_{j-1}<up_1^{\alpha_1}\dots p_m^{\alpha_m}v<x_j=x_{j-1}x^{1/2^j}}} \frac{1}{v}\Bigg)\Bigg\}$$

$$< c_2\Big(\sum_{P(u)\leqslant(\log x)^3}\frac{1}{u}\Big)\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}\Big(\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{p^\alpha}\Big)^m\Big)$$

$$= c_2\Big(\prod_{p\leqslant(\log x)^3}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{p^\alpha}\Big)\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}\Big(\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{p^\alpha}\Big)^m\Big)$$

$$= c_2\Big(\prod_{p\leqslant(\log x)^3}\frac{1}{1-1/p}\Big)\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}\Big(\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{p^\alpha}\Big)^m\Big).$$

It is well-known that

$$\prod_{p\leqslant y}\frac{1}{1-1/p} < c_8\log y$$

and

$$\sum_{p\leqslant y}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{p^\alpha} = \log\log y + c_9 + o(1).$$

Thus with respect to (1), (23), (24) and (26), and by using the Stirling-formula, we obtain from (27) that for $x > X_1(\omega)$,

$$\sum_{\substack{a\in A_j''\\ a\notin A_j^*}}\frac{1}{a} < c_{10}\log\big((\log x)^3\big)\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}(\log\log x^{1/2^j}-\log\log z_j+c_{11})^m\Big) \tag{28}$$

$$= c_{10}\log\log x\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}\Big(\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log z_j}+c_{11}\Big)^m\Big)$$

$$\leqslant c_{10}\log\log x\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}\Big(\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}}+c_{11}\Big)^m\Big)$$

$$= c_{10}\log\log x\Big(1+\sum_{m=1}^{[t]}\frac{1}{m!}(\log 2\omega f_A(x)+c_{11})^m\Big)$$

$$< c_{12}t\log\log x\,\frac{(\log\omega f_A(x)+c_{13})^t}{t!}$$

$$< c_{14}t^{1/2}\log\log x\Big(\frac{e(\log\omega f_A(x)+c_{13})}{t}\Big)^t$$

$$< \frac{1}{16}\log\log x\Big(\frac{3\log f_A(x)}{t}\Big)^t = \frac{1}{16}\log\log x\,\frac{f_A(x)}{(\log\log x)^2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{16}\,\frac{f_A(x)}{\log\log x}.$$

(22) and (28) yield that

$$f_{A_j^*}(x) = \sum_{a\in A_j^*}\frac{1}{a} = \sum_{a\in A_j''}\frac{1}{a} - \sum_{\substack{a\in A_j''\\ a\notin A_j^*}}\frac{1}{a} \tag{29}$$

$$> \frac{f_A(x)}{8\log\log x} - \frac{f_A(x)}{16\log\log x} = \frac{f_A(x)}{16\log\log x}.$$

Let S denote the set of the integers n such that $n\leqslant x$ and n can be written in the form

$$n = au \quad \text{where} \quad a\in A_j^* \text{ and } \omega(u, z_j, x^{1/2^j}) > \frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x). \tag{30}$$

For fixed $n\in S$, let $\varphi(n)$ denote the number of representations of n in the form (30).

Then we have

$$\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n) = \sum_{a\in A_j^*}\sum_{\substack{au\leqslant x\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)}} 1 \tag{31}$$

$$= \sum_{a\in A_j^*}\Big(\sum_{u\leqslant x/a}1 - \sum_{\substack{u\leqslant x/a\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})\leqslant\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)}} 1\Big).$$

In order to estimate the last sum, we use Lemma 2 with z_j, $x^{1/2^j}$, x/a and $1/400$ in place of y, z, v and α, respectively. Then $1\leqslant y$ and $2y<z$ hold trivially by the definition of z_j (and by $j\leqslant R$), and also $z\leqslant v$ holds by

$$z = x^{1/2^j} = \frac{x}{x^{1-1/2^j}} = \frac{x}{x_j} < \frac{x}{a} = v$$

(since we have $a\in A_j^*$ and thus $a<x_j$). Thus Lemma 2 can be applied, and we obtain with respect to (1) and the definition of z_j that for large x

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant x/a\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})\leqslant\frac{399}{400}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}}} 1 < c_3\frac{x}{a}\exp\Big(Q\Big(-\frac{1}{400}\Big)\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log z_j}\Big) \tag{32}$$

$$< c_3\frac{x}{a}\exp\Big(-3\cdot 10^{-6}\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}}\Big)$$

$$= c_3\frac{x}{a}\exp\big(-3\cdot 10^{-6}\log 2\omega f_A(x)\big) < \frac{1}{3}\frac{x}{a}.$$

Furthermore, by (6) we have

$$\frac{399}{400}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}>\frac{399}{400}\left(\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log z_j}-c_{15}\right). \tag{33}$$

By (8), we have

$$\frac{f_A(x)}{6}\leqslant\log x^{1/2^R}\leqslant\log x^{1/2^j}. \tag{34}$$

We obtain from (1) and (34) that

$$\begin{aligned}\log z_j &= \log\max\{(\log x)^3,\, x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}\}\\ &= \max\left\{3\log\log x,\ \frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{2\omega f_A(x)}\right\}\\ &= \max\left\{\log x^{1/2^j}\frac{3\log\log x}{\log x^{1/2^j}},\ \frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{2\omega f_A(x)}\right\}\\ &\leqslant \max\left\{\log x^{1/2^j}\frac{3\log\log x}{f_A(x)/6},\ \frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{2\omega f_A(x)}\right\}\\ &\leqslant \max\left\{\log x^{1/2^j}\frac{3\,(f_A(x))^{1/20}}{f_A(x)/6},\ \frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{2\omega f_A(x)}\right\}\\ &= \frac{18\log x^{1/2^j}}{(f_A(x))^{19/20}}.\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

(33) and (35) yield for large x that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{399}{400}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p} &> \frac{399}{400}\left(\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log z_j}-c_{15}\right)\\ &\geqslant \frac{399}{400}\left(\log\frac{(f_A(x))^{19/20}}{18}-c_{15}\right)>\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

hence

$$\sum_{\substack{u\leqslant x/a\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})<\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)}} 1 \leqslant \sum_{\substack{u\leqslant x/a\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})\leqslant\frac{399}{400}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}}} 1. \tag{37}$$

(32) and (37) yield that

$$\sum_{\substack{u\leqslant x/a\\ \omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)}} 1<\frac{1}{3}\,\frac{x}{a}.$$

Thus we obtain from (29) and (31) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n) &\geqslant \sum_{a\in A_j^*}\left(\left[\frac{x}{a}\right]-\frac{1}{3}\,\frac{x}{a}\right)>\sum_{a\in A_j^*}\frac{x}{2a}\\ &=\frac{x}{2}f_{A_j^*}(x)>\frac{xf_A(x)}{32\log\log x}.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Now we are going to give an upper estimate for $\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n)$. Obviously, for $n\leqslant x$ we have $\varphi(n)\leqslant d_A(n)\leqslant D_A(x)$ hence

$$\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n)=\sum_{n\in S}\varphi(n)\leqslant\sum_{n\in S}D_A(x)=|S|D_A(x). \tag{39}$$

Thus in order to obtain an upper bound for $\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n)$, we have to estimate $|S|$.

If $n\in S$ then by (26), (30) and the definition of the set A_j^*, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(n,z_j,x^{1/2^j}) &= \omega(au,z_j,x^{1/2^j})=\omega(a,z_j,x^{1/2^j})+\omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})\\ &> t+\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)>\frac{1}{2}\log f_A(x)+\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)=\frac{55}{38}\log f_A(x)\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$|S|\leqslant\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant x\\ \omega(n,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{55}{38}\log f_A(x)}} 1. \tag{40}$$

In order to estimate this sum, we use Lemma 3 with z_j, $x^{1/2^j}$, x, $17/37$ and $9/10$ in place of y, z, v, α and β, respectively. ($1\leqslant y$, $2y<z\leqslant v$ and $0<\alpha\leqslant\beta<1$ hold trivially with respect to the definition of z_j.) We obtain with respect to (8) and the definition of z_j that for $x>X_2(\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant x\\ \omega(n,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{54}{37}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}}} 1\\ &< c_6x\left(\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1/2}\exp\left(Q\left(\frac{17}{37}\right)\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log z_j}\right)\\ &< c_6x\exp\left(-\frac{91}{1000}\log\frac{\log x^{1/2^j}}{\log x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}}\right)\\ &< c_6x\exp\left(-\frac{91}{1000}\log\omega f_A(x)\right)<x\exp\left(-\frac{9}{100}\log f_A(x)\right)=x(f_A(x))^{-9/100}.\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Furthermore, with respect to (6) and the definition of z_j we have

$$\frac{54}{37}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}\leqslant\frac{54}{37}\sum_{x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}$$
$$=\frac{54}{37}\Bigg(\sum_{p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}-\sum_{p\leqslant x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}}\frac{1}{p}\Bigg)$$
$$<\frac{54}{37}\left(\log\log x^{1/2^j}-\log\log x^{1/2^{j+1}\omega f_A(x)}+c_{16}\right)$$
$$=\frac{54}{37}\left(\log 2\omega f_A(x)+c_{16}\right)<\frac{55}{38}\log f_A(x)$$

and thus

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant x\\ \omega(n,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{55}{38}\log f_A(x)}}1\leqslant\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant x\\ \omega(n,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{54}{37}\sum_{z_j<p\leqslant x^{1/2^j}}\frac{1}{p}}}1. \tag{42}$$

(40), (41) and (42) yield that

$$|S|<x\left(f_A(x)\right)^{-9/100}. \tag{43}$$

Finally, we obtain from (38), (39) and (43) that

$$\frac{xf_A(x)}{32\log\log x}<\sum_{n\leqslant x}\varphi(n)\leqslant|S|D_A(x)<x\left(f_A(x)\right)^{-9/100}D_A(x)$$

hence with respect to (1),

$$D_A(x)>f_A(x)\frac{\left(f_A(x)\right)^{9/100}}{32\log\log x}>f_A(x)\frac{\left(f_A(x)\right)^{9/100}}{32\left(f_A(x)\right)^{1/20}}$$
$$=f_A(x)\cdot\frac{1}{32}\left(f_A(x)\right)^{1/25}>\omega f_A(x)$$

for $x>X_3(\omega)$. Thus (2) holds also in Case 2 and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.

4. By using the same method, we can show that Theorem 1 is true also with $(\log\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}$ in place of $(\log\log x)^{20}$ on the right-hand side of (1). In fact, in order to prove this, the only non-trivial modifications are that t must be defined as $t=\eta\log f_A(x)$ where $\eta=\eta(\varepsilon)$ (>0) is sufficiently small in terms of ε, and in (30), the condition $\omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>\frac{18}{19}\log f_A(x)$ must be replaced by $\omega(u,z_j,x^{1/2^j})>K\log f_A(x)$ where $K=K(\varepsilon)$ is sufficiently large in terms of ε. Furthermore, then Lemmas 2

and 3 must be replaced by lower and upper estimates for

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leqslant v\\ \omega(n,y,z)\geqslant L\sum_{y<p\leqslant z}1/p}}1$$

where L is arbitrary large but fixed. Such estimates could be deduced by the methods used by K. K. Norton in [6]. (Norton's estimates cannot be used in the original form since the error terms in his lower and upper estimates depend implicitly on the set E of the prime numbers whose multiples we investigate. Thus in our case, these results would yield lower and upper bounds depending implicitly on $\{p\colon y<p\leqslant z\}$, i.e., on y and z, instead of the explicit estimates needed by us.)

On the other hand, we guess that also the exponent $2+\varepsilon$ could be improved, and, perhaps, Theorem 1 is true also with $(\log\log x)^{1+\varepsilon}$ or even $c_{17}(\omega)\log\log x$ on the right-hand side of (1). This is the reason of that that we preferred to work out the slightly weaker estimate given in Theorem 1 whose proof is much simpler.

5. One may expect that if we know that $f_A(y)$ is large for *all* $y\leqslant x$ then Theorem 1 can be sharpened in the sense that the lower bound given for $f_A(x)$ in (1) (for fixed x) can be replaced by a much smaller lower bound for $f_A(y)$ (for all y). In fact, we show in this section that

THEOREM 2. *For all $\omega>0$, there exists a real number $X_4=X_4(\omega)$ such that if $x>X_4$ and writing $y=\exp\left(\dfrac{\log x}{(\log\log x)^{21}}\right)$, we have*

$$f_A(y)>22\log\log\log y, \tag{44}$$

then

$$D_A(x)>\omega f_A(x). \tag{45}$$

Furthermore, we show that Theorem 2 is best possible except the value of the constant factor on the right of (44):

THEOREM 3. *There exist positive constants c_{18}, c_{19}, X_5 and an infinite sequence A such that*

$$f_A(x)>c_{18}\log\log\log x\quad \textit{for all } x>X_5 \tag{46}$$

and

$$\liminf_{x\to+\infty}\frac{D_A(x)}{f_A(x)}<c_{19}. \tag{47}$$

In order to prove Theorem 2, we need the following lemma:

LEMMA 4. *If $x>1$, $t\geqslant 1$ and A is an arbitrary sequence of positive integers such that*

$$D_A(x)\leqslant t \tag{48}$$

then we have

$$N_A(x^{1/(t+1)}) \leqslant t.$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Assume indirectly that

$$N_A(x^{1/(t+1)}) > t,$$

i.e.,

$$N_A(x^{1/(t+1)}) \geqslant [t]+1.$$

Then there exist integers $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{[t]+1}$ such that $a_1 \in A$, $a_2 \in A, \ldots$ $\ldots, a_{[t]+1} \in A$ and

(49) $$a_1 < a_2 < \ldots < a_{[t]+1} \leqslant x^{1/(t+1)}.$$

Put $u = a_1 a_2 \ldots a_{[t]+1}$. Then $a_i | u$ for $1 \leqslant u \leqslant [t]+1$ and thus

(50) $$d_A(u) \geqslant [t]+1 > t.$$

On the other hand, by (49) we have

(51) $$u = a_1 a_2 \ldots a_{[t]+1} \leqslant (x^{1/(t+1)})^{[t]+1} \leqslant (x^{1/(t+1)})^{t+1} = x.$$

(50) and (51) imply that

$$D_A(x) > t$$

in contradiction with (48) which completes the proof of Lemma 4.

Proof of Theorem 2. We have to distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Let

$$f_A(x) > (\log\log x)^{20}.$$

Then for $x > X_6(\omega)$, (45) holds by Theorem 1.

Case 2. Let

(52) $$f_A(x) \leqslant (\log\log x)^{20}.$$

Assume indirectly that

(53) $$D_A(x) \leqslant \omega f_A(x).$$

Then by using Lemma 4 with $t = \omega f_A(x)$, we obtain that

(54) $$N_A(x^{1/(t+1)}) = N_A(x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)}) \leqslant t = \omega f_A(x).$$

Put $M = N_A(x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)})$ and let $a_1 < a_2 < \ldots < a_M$ denote the a's not exceeding $x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)}$. Then by (52) and (54), we have

(55) $$f_A(x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{1}{a_i} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{1}{i} < \log M + c_{20}$$
$$\leqslant \log \omega f_A(x) + c_{20} \leqslant \log \omega (\log\log x)^{20} + c_{20}$$
$$< 21 \log\log\log x.$$

On the other hand, by (51) we have

$$x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)} = \exp\left(\frac{\log x}{\omega f_A(x)+1}\right) \geqslant \exp\left(\frac{\log x}{\omega(\log\log x)^{20}+1}\right)$$
$$\geqslant \exp\left(\frac{\log x}{(\log\log x)^{21}}\right) = y.$$

Thus (44) yields that

$$f_A(x^{1/(\omega f_A(x)+1)}) \geqslant f_A(y) > 22 \log\log\log y$$
$$= 22 \log\log \frac{\log x}{(\log\log x)^{21}} > 21 \log\log\log x$$

in contradiction with (55) which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 3. In the proof of Theorem 1 in [1], for $x \geqslant X_7$ we constructed a sequence $B(x)$ such that

(56) $$f_{B(x)}(x) > c_{21} \log\log x$$

and

(57) $$D_{B(x)}(x) < 2 \log\log x.$$

Let us define the infinite sequence $x_1 < x_2 < \ldots$ by the following recursion: let

$$x_1 = X_7 \quad \text{and} \quad x_k = \exp\big(\exp(\exp(x_{k-1}))\big).$$

For $x > 1$, let

$$E(x) = \{n\colon \sqrt{x} < n \leqslant x\}.$$

Finally, let

$$A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{+\infty} B(x_k) \cup E(\log\log x_k).$$

We are going to show that this sequence A satisfies both (46) and (47).

First we prove (46). Assume that $x > X_7$. Then there exists a uniquely determined positive integer k $(\geqslant 2)$ such that $x_{k-1} < x \leqslant x_k$. Then either

(58) $$x_{k-1} < x \leqslant \exp(x_{k-1}) = \log\log x_k$$

or

(59) $$\exp(x_{k-1}) = \log\log x_k < x \leqslant x_k$$

holds. If (58) holds, then by (56) we have

$$f_A(x) \geqslant f_A(x_{k-1}) \geqslant f_{B(x_{k-1})}(x_{k-1}) > c_{21} \log\log x_{k-1} \geqslant c_{21} \log\log\log x$$

while if (59) holds then

$$f_A(x) \geqslant E(\log\log x_k) = \sum_{(\log\log x_k)^{1/2} < n \leqslant \log\log x_k} \frac{1}{n}$$
$$> \tfrac{1}{3}\log\log\log x_k \geqslant \tfrac{1}{3}\log\log\log x.$$

Thus in fact, (46) holds in both cases.

In order to prove that also (47) holds, it is sufficient to show that for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, we have

$$\frac{D_A(x_k)}{f_A(x_k)} < c_{22}. \tag{60}$$

If $u \leqslant x_k$ then by (57) we have

$$d_A(u) = \sum_{\substack{a|u\\ a\in A}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{a\leqslant\log\log x_k\\ a|u, a\in A}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{\log\log x_k < a\\ a|u, a\in A}} 1$$
$$= \sum_{\substack{a\leqslant\log\log x_k\\ a|u, a\in A}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{a|u\\ a\in B(x_k)}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{a\leqslant\log\log x_k\\ a|u, a\in A}} 1 + d_{B(x_k)}(u)$$
$$\leqslant \log\log x_k + D_{B(x_k)}(u) < 3\log\log x_k$$

hence

$$D_A(x_k) < 3\log\log x_k. \tag{61}$$

Furthermore, by (56), we have

$$f_A(x_k) = \sum_{\substack{a\leqslant x_k\\ a\in A}} \frac{1}{a} \geqslant \sum_{a\in B(x_k)} \frac{1}{a} = f_{B(x_k)}(x_k) > c_{21}\log\log x_k. \tag{62}$$

(61) and (62) yield (60) and the proof of Theorem 3 is completed.

References

[1] P. Erdös and A. Sárközy, *Some asymptotic formulas on generalized divisor functions*, I, Studies in Pure Mathematics to the Memory of Paul Turán, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, to appear.

[2] P. Erdös and A. Sárközy, *Some asymptotic formulas on generalized divisor functions*, II, J. Number Theory, to appear.

[3] G. Halász, *Remarks to my paper "On the distribution of additive and the mean values of multiplicative arithmetic functions"*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 23 (1972), pp. 425–432.

[4] R. R. Hall, *On a conjecture of Erdös and Sárközy*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 12 (1980), pp. 21–24.

[5] K. K. Norton, *On the number of restricted prime factors of an integer*, I, Illinois J. Math. 20 (1976), pp. 681–705.

[6] K. K. Norton, *On the number of restricted prime factors of an integer*, III, to appear.

[7] K. Prachar, *Primzahlverteilung*, Springer Verlag, Berlin 1957.

Received on 9. 1. 1981 (1238)