

ASYMPTOTIC FORMULAS FOR SOME  
ARITHMETIC FUNCTIONS

P. Erdős  
(received April 9, 1958)

Let  $f(x)$  be an increasing function. Recently <sup>1)</sup> there have been several papers which proved that under fairly general conditions on  $f(x)$  the density of integers  $n$  for which  $(n, f(n)) = 1$  is  $6/\pi^2$  and that  $(d(n)$  denotes the number of divisors of  $n$ )

$$\sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [f(n)]) = (1 + o(1)) \pi^{2x}/6.$$

In particular both of these results hold if  $f(x) = x^\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and the first holds if  $f(x) = [\alpha x]$ ,  $\alpha$  irrational.

In this note we are going to prove the following:

**THEOREM 1.** The necessary and sufficient condition that for an irrational  $\alpha$  we should have

$$(1) \sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [\alpha n]) = (1 + o(1)) \pi^{2x}/6$$

is that for every  $c > 0$  the number of solutions of

$$(2) \alpha < a/b < \alpha + 1/(1+c)^b$$

should be finite in positive integers  $a$  and  $b$ .

Denote  $\sigma(n) = \sum_{d|n} d$ . It is easy to see that for  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$

$$(3) \sum_{n=1}^x \sigma(n, [n^\alpha]) = (1 + o(1)) x \log x$$

Very likely (3) also holds for  $1/2 < \alpha < 1$  but I have not yet been able to show this. By more complicated arguments I can show

Can. Math. Bull., vol. 1, no. 3, Sept. 1958

THEOREM 2. The necessary and sufficient condition that for an irrational  $\alpha$  we should have

$$(4) \sum_{n=1}^x \sigma(n, [n\alpha]) = (1/2 + o(1)) x \log x$$

is that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  the number of solutions in positive integers  $a$  and  $b$  of

$$(5) \left| \alpha - a/b \right| < \frac{1}{b^{k+\varepsilon}}$$

and of

$$(6) \alpha < a/b < \alpha + \varepsilon b^{-2}/\log b$$

should be finite.

It is easy to see that conditions (5) and (6) are equivalent to the following: Put  $\alpha = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \dots}}$ , then

$$(1/n) \log a_n \rightarrow 0, \quad (1/n) a_{2n+1} \rightarrow 0.$$

In the present note we will not prove Theorem 2 since the proof is similar to that of Theorem 1, but is rather more complicated.

Similarly one could try to obtain an asymptotic formula for

$$\sum_{n=1}^x \sigma(n, [f(n)])$$

for more general functions  $f(x)$ , but I have not succeeded in obtaining any interesting results.

Now we prove Theorem 1. Denote by  $N(y, 1/k)$  the number of integers  $1 < n < y$  for which

$$0 < n\alpha - [n\alpha] < 1/k.$$

$$(n, [n\alpha]) \equiv 0 \pmod{k} \text{ holds if and only if } n = vk \text{ and}$$

$$vk\alpha = uk + \theta, \quad 0 < \theta < 1,$$

that is  $(n, [n\alpha]) \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$  holds if and only if

$$0 < v\alpha - [v\alpha] < 1/k.$$

Thus the number of integers  $n < x$  satisfying  $(n, [n\alpha]) \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$  equals  $N(x/k, 1/k)$ , (since  $n = vk$  implies  $v < x/k$ ). Thus by interchanging the order of summation

$$(7) \sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [n\alpha]) = \sum_{k=1}^x N(x/k, 1/k).$$

Since  $n\alpha - [n\alpha]$  is equidistributed  $(\text{mod } 1)$  we evidently have

$$(8) N(x/k, 1/k) = (1 + o(1)) (x/k^2),$$

for fixed  $k$  as  $x$  tends to infinity. Thus from (7) and (8) for every irrational  $\alpha$

$$(9) \sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [n\alpha]) \geq (1 + o(1)) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x/k^2 = (1 + o(1)) \pi^2 x/6$$

Assume now that (2) is not satisfied. Then there is a fixed  $c > 0$  and arbitrarily large values of  $b$  for which

$$(10) \alpha < a/b < \alpha + 1/(1+c)^b.$$

Put  $(1+c)^b = x$ . Write

$$(11) \sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [n\alpha]) = \sum_1 + \sum_2$$

where in  $\sum_1$ ,  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}$  and in  $\sum_2$ ,  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$ . From the equidistribution of  $n\alpha - [n\alpha]$  it follows that for fixed  $k$  the number of integers satisfying

$$1 < n < x, \quad n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{b}, \quad 0 < n\alpha - [n\alpha] < 1/k$$

is not less than

$$(12) N(x/k, 1/k) - x/b = (1 + o(1)) x/k^2 - x/b.$$

Thus from (7) and (12) we have for every fixed  $t$

$$(13) \sum_1 > \sum_{k=1}^t ((1 + o(1)) x/k^2) - tx/b = (1 + o(1)) \pi^2 x/6.$$

In  $\sum_2$ ,  $n = vb \leq x$ . Thus from (10) and  $vb \leq x$ ,  $(1+c)^b = x$  we have

$$[n\alpha] = [vb\alpha] = [va + \theta vb/(1+c)^b] = va \quad (0 < \theta < 1)$$

Thus  $(vb, [vb\alpha]) \equiv 0 \pmod{v}$  for all  $1 \leq v \leq x/b$ . Hence

$$(14) \sum_2 \geq \sum_{1 \leq v < x/b} d(v) = (1 + o(1))(x/b) \log(x/b) \\ = (1 + o(1))x \log(1 + c)$$

Now (11), (13) and (14) show that (1) does not hold. Thus (2) is a necessary condition for the validity of (1).

To show that (2) is sufficient we need an upper estimation for  $N(x/k, 1/k)$  for large  $k$ . Put  $x/k = y$ : it is well known that there exists an  $a/b$  satisfying

$$(15) \quad |a - a/b| < 1/(2by), \quad b < 2y, \quad (a, b) = 1.$$

Now we distinguish two cases. First assume  $b \geq k/2$ . Clearly for  $1 \leq n \leq y$

$$(16) \quad n\alpha - [n\alpha] = u/b + \theta/b, \quad |\theta| < 1/2.$$

Thus  $0 < n\alpha - [n\alpha] < 1/k$  can only hold if  $u = 0, 1, \dots, z+1$  where

$$(17) \quad z/b \leq 1/k < (z+1)/k, \quad \text{or } z \leq b/k.$$

The number of  $n$ 's not exceeding  $y$  for which  $u$  has a given value is clearly less than  $2y/b + 1$ . Thus from (17) and  $b \geq k/2$  we have

$$(18) \quad N(x/k, 1/k) < (b/k + 1)(2y/b + 1) \leq (3b/k)(4y/b) = 12x/k^2.$$

Next assume  $b < k/2$ . If  $a/b < \alpha$  then  $N(x/k, 1/k) = 0$  since in (16)  $\theta \leq 0$ , thus for  $u = 0$   $n\alpha - [n\alpha]$  is not in  $(0, 1/k)$  and for  $u = 1$   $n\alpha - [n\alpha] > 1/2b > 1/k$ .

Thus  $a/b > \alpha$ . Clearly  $0 < n\alpha - [n\alpha] < 1/k$  is only possible if  $u = 0$ , that is if  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$ . Thus

$$(19) \quad N(x/k, 1/k) \leq (x/(bk)).$$

If  $N(x/k, 1/k) > 0$ , then (since all the  $n < x/k$  for which  $0 < n\alpha - [n\alpha] < 1/k$  are multiples of  $b$ ) we have by (15)

$$b\alpha - [b\alpha] < \min(k/x, 1/k) \leq x^{-1/2},$$

but this implies by (2) that

$$(20) \quad b/\log x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus finally from (7), (8), (18) and (19) we have for every fixed  $t$

$$\sum_{n=1}^x d(n, n \leq t) \leq (1 + o(1)) \pi^{2x/6} + 12x \sum_{k>t} (1/k^2)^{(x/b)} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{1}{d}$$

hence by (20)

$$(21) \quad \sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [n \leq t]) \leq (1 + o(1)) \pi^{2x/6}.$$

From (9) and (21) we have that if (2) is satisfied, then

$$\sum_{n=1}^x d(n, [n \leq t]) = (1 + o(1)) \pi^{2x/6}.$$

Thus condition (2) is sufficient, which completes the proof of our Theorem.

University of British Columbia

- 1) See G.L. Watson, Canadian Journal of Math. 5(1953), 451-455, T. Estermann, *ibid* 5(1953), 456-459 and J. Lambek and L. Moser, *ibid* 7(1955), 155-158. See also a forthcoming paper by P. Erdős and G.G. Lorentz in Acta Arithmetica.

CORRECTION

In the paper "On an elementary problem in number theory" by Paul Erdős in Vol. 1, no. 1 of this Bulletin, P. 5, line 5 should read

$$0 \leq u, v < f(x) \text{ and } (x+u, y+v) \neq 1.$$