

## On the probability that $n$ and $g(n)$ are relatively prime\*

by

P. ERDÖS (London, Ontario) and G. G. LORENTZ (Syracuse)

**1. Introduction.** It is a well-known theorem of Čebyšev that the probability of the relation  $(n, m) = 1$  is  $6\pi^{-2}$ . One can expect this still to remain true if  $m = g(n)$  is a function of  $n$ , provided that  $g(n)$  does not preserve arithmetic properties of  $n$ . In this paper we consider the case when  $g(x)$  is the integral part of a smooth function  $f(x)$ , which increases slower than  $x$ . More exactly, let  $Q(x)$  be the number of  $n \leq x$  with the property  $(n, g(n)) = 1$ . The probability that  $n$  and  $g(n)$  are relatively prime is then by definition the limit  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \{Q(x)/x\}$ . Our main

result is that if  $f(x)$  satisfies some mild smoothness assumptions, has the property (A)  $f(x) = o(x/\log \log x)$  and satisfies condition (B) of § 2, then the probability in question exists and is equal to  $6\pi^{-2}$ . Condition (B) means roughly that  $f(x)$  increases faster than the function  $\log x \log_4 x$ . In § 3 we show that condition (B) is the best possible. Condition (A) may be perhaps relaxed; but it cannot be replaced by  $f(x) = O(x/\log \log \log x)$ . We also consider the average number of divisors of  $(n, g(n))$ . This is the limit  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \{S(x)/x\}$ , where  $S(x)$  is the sum of the numbers of divisors of all numbers  $(n, g(n))$ ,  $n \leq x$ . We assume throughout that  $f(x)$  is a monotone increasing positive function with a piecewise continuous derivative;  $F(y)$  will denote the inverse of  $f(x)$ . By  $\varphi, \mu, \sigma, d$  we denote the standard number-theoretic functions, by  $\log_2 x, \log_3 x, \dots$  the iterated logarithms of  $x$ .

We begin with some elementary identities. Let  $Q_k(x)$  be the number of integers  $n \leq x$  such that  $n$  and  $g(n)$  have no common factors  $\leq k$ . If  $S(x, d)$  is the number of  $n \leq x$  with  $d|(n, g(n))$ , then

$$\sum_{d|k!} \mu(d) S(x, d) = \sum_{d|k!} \mu(d) \sum_{d_1|(n, g(n))} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|(k!, n, g(n))} \mu(d).$$

---

\* This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant, NSF G-1975 held by one of the authors at Wayne State University.

By the properties of the function  $\mu$ , the inner sum is 1 if  $(k!, n, g(n)) = 1$ , i. e., if  $(n, g(n))$  has no divisors greater than 1 and not exceeding  $k$ , and otherwise is 0. Hence

$$(1) \quad Q_k(x) = \sum_{d|k!} \mu(d) S(x, d).$$

In particular, if  $k = n$ , then, since  $S(x, d) = 0$  for  $d > g(x)$ , we obtain

$$(2) \quad Q(x) = \sum_{d=1}^{g(x)} \mu(d) S(x, d).$$

There are similar but obvious formulas for  $S(x)$  and  $S_k(x)$  — the sum of the numbers of divisors, not exceeding  $k$ , of all numbers  $(n, g(n))$  with  $n \leq x$ , namely

$$(3) \quad S_k(x) = \sum_{d=1}^k S(x, d),$$

$$(4) \quad S(x) = \sum_{d=1}^{g(x)} S(x, d).$$

A function  $f(x)$  will be called *homogeneously equidistributed modulo 1* (or shortly h. e.) if for each integer  $d$ ,

$$h(x) = \frac{1}{d} f(dx)$$

is equidistributed modulo 1. This means that for each subinterval  $I$  of  $(0, 1)$ , the density of  $n$ 's for which  $h(n) - [h(n)]$  belongs to  $I$ , is equal to the length of  $I$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $f(x)$  is homogeneously equidistributed, then*

$$(5) \quad \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q(x)}{x} \leq 6\pi^{-2}, \quad \underline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(x)}{x} \geq \frac{1}{6} \pi^2.$$

**Proof.** It follows from the definition of  $S(x, d)$  that this is the number of integers  $k$  with  $kd \leq x$  and  $d|g(kd)$ ; or the number of  $k \leq xd^{-1}$  so that

$$\frac{1}{d} f(kd) - \left[ \frac{1}{d} f(kd) \right]$$

is in the interval  $(0, 1/d)$ . Since  $f(x)$  is h. e.,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} [S(x, d)/x] = d^{-2}$ . Taking now into consideration the relations (1), (3) and the inequalities  $Q_k(x) \geq Q(x)$ ,  $S_k(x) \leq S(x)$ , we obtain (5), since

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} d^{-2} \mu(d) = 6\pi^{-2}, \quad \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} d^{-2} = \frac{1}{6} \pi^2.$$

All known simple criteria for  $f(x)$  to be equidistributed modulo 1 (by Weyl, Pólya-Szegő, see Koksma [2], p. 88) guarantee also that  $af(bx)$  is equidistributed for arbitrary positive constants  $a, b$ . The simplest set of conditions is

$$(A_1) \quad f(x) = o(x) \quad \text{for} \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(B_1) \quad xf'(x) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for} \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the additional hypothesis that  $f'(x)$  decreases. We shall mention here that the last assumption and  $(B_1)$  can be replaced by

$$(C_1) \quad \int_0^y |F''(u)| du = o(F'(y))$$

( $F(y)$  is assumed here to have a piecewise continuous second derivative). If  $f'(x)$  decreases, the last integral is equal to  $1/f'(x) + \text{const}$  with  $x = F'(y)$ , and hence  $(C_1)$  is implied by  $(B_1)$ . Further natural conditions which in the presence of  $(B_1)$  imply  $(C_1)$  are

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \{F''(u)/F'(u)\} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \int_0^y |F''(u)| du = O(F'(y)).$$

To establish our statement it is sufficient to show that  $f(n)$  is equidistributed mod 1 if it satisfies  $(A_1)$  and  $(C_1)$ . Let  $I = (\alpha, \alpha + \delta) \subset (0, 1)$ , then the number of  $n$ 's for which  $[f(n)] = k$  and  $f(n) - [f(n)] \in I$ , is  $\Delta F_k + O(1)$ , where  $\Delta F_k = F(s_k) - F(t_k)$ ,  $s_k = k + \alpha + \delta$ ,  $t_k = k + \alpha$ , except if  $k + \alpha + \delta > f(n) = y$ , when  $s_k = y$ . Because of  $(A_1)$ , the total number of  $n \leq x$  with  $f(x) - [f(n)] \in I$  is

$$N = \sum_{k+\alpha \leq f(x)} \Delta F_k + o(x).$$

Now

$$\left| \frac{\Delta F_k}{\delta} - \{F(s_k) - F(s_{k-1})\} \right| = |F'(\eta_2) - F'(\eta_1)| \leq \int_{k-1}^{s_k} |F''(u)| du,$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{x} N = \frac{\delta}{x} \sum_{k+\alpha \leq f(x)} \{F(s_k) - F(s_{k+1})\} + O\left(\frac{1}{x} \int_0^{f(x)} |F''(u)| du\right) = \delta + o(1),$$

by  $(C_1)$ .

**2. The Main Theorem.** Our main result is the following:

**THEOREM 2.** Let  $f(x)$  be h. e. and let

$$(A) \quad f(x) = o(x/\log_2 x),$$

$$(B) \quad \frac{xf'(x)}{\log_3 f(x)} \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(C) \quad f'(y) \leq Mf'(x) \text{ for some constant } M \text{ for all } y \geq x > 0.$$

Then

$$(6) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q(x)}{x} = \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

Proof. Let  $Q_k(x)$  be defined as in § 1. Then by (1),

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_k(x)}{x} = \sum_{d|k!} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} + \delta_k,$$

where  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  for  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . To prove the theorem it is therefore sufficient to show that

$$(7) \quad \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_k(x)}{x}$$

is arbitrarily small if  $k$  is sufficiently large. Here  $R_k(x) = Q_k(x) - Q(x)$  is the number of  $n \leq x$  such that for some prime  $p$  with  $k < p \leq g(x)$  we have  $p|n$ ,  $p|g(n)$ . It follows that

$$(8) \quad R_k(x) \leq \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} S(x, p).$$

We consider the contribution to the sum (8) of the part of the curve  $y = g(x)$  given by  $g(n) = m$ ; these  $n$  satisfy  $F(m) \leq n < F(m+1)$ . We put  $k_m = F(m+1) - F(m)$ , except when  $m+1 > x$ , in which case we put  $k_m = F(x) - F(m)$ . The contribution to  $S(x, p)$  is zero if  $p \nmid m$ , otherwise it does not exceed

$$\frac{1}{p} [F(m+1) - F(m)] + 1 = \frac{k_m}{p} + 1.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (9) \quad R_k(x) &\leq \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ p|m}}^{g(x)} \left( \frac{k_m}{p} + 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} \sum_{l \leq g(x)/p} \left( \frac{k_{lp}}{p} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} \frac{g(x)}{p} + \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} \sum_{l \leq l_0 - 1} \frac{k_{lp}}{p} + \sum_{k < p \leq g(x)} \frac{k_{l_0 p}}{p} \\ &= \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3, \end{aligned}$$

say, where  $l_0 = [g(x)/p]$ . For  $x \rightarrow \infty$  we have by (A)

$$\Sigma_1 \leq g(x) \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = O(g(x) \log_2 x) = o(x).$$

For  $l > m$  we have with properly chosen  $\xi, \xi_1, \xi \leq \xi_1$ ,

$$k_l = \frac{1}{f'(\xi_1)}, \quad k_m = \frac{1}{f'(\xi)},$$

hence by (C),

$$(10) \quad k_m \leq M k_l, \quad l > m.$$

Therefore,

$$k_p + k_{2p} + \dots + k_{(l_0-1)p} \leq \frac{M}{p} (k_p + k_{p+1} + \dots + k_{l_0 p-1}) \leq \frac{Mx}{p},$$

so that for an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\Sigma'_2 \leq \sum_{p \geq k} \frac{Mx}{p^2} < \varepsilon x,$$

if  $k$  is sufficiently large.

The sum  $\Sigma_3$  we split into two parts  $\Sigma'_3, \Sigma''_3$ , the first sum being extended over all  $p$  for which

$$(11) \quad l_0 p < g(x) + 1 - A \log_2 g(x),$$

and where  $A = M\varepsilon^{-1}$ , and the second corresponding to  $p$  for which the opposite inequality holds. In the first case by (10) and (C),

$$\begin{aligned} k_{l_0 p} &\leq \frac{M}{g(x) - l_0 p + 1} (k_{l_0 p} + k_{l_0 p+1} + \dots + k_{g(x)}) \\ &\leq \frac{Mx}{g(x) - l_0 p + 1} < \frac{Mx}{A \log_2 g(x)} = \frac{\varepsilon x}{\log_2 g(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

hence for large  $x$ ,

$$\Sigma'_3 \leq \frac{\varepsilon x}{\log_2 g(x)} \sum_{p \leq g(x)} \frac{1}{p} \leq 2\varepsilon x.$$

In the second case,  $g(x) + 1 - A \log_2 g(x) \leq l_0 p \leq g(x)$ , hence  $p$  divides one of the consecutive numbers  $g(x) + 1 - [A \log_2 g(x)], \dots, g(x)$ , hence also their product  $N$ . Clearly,

$$N \leq f(x)^{A \log_2 f(x)}.$$

We use the relation<sup>(1)</sup>

$$\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p} \leq C \log_3 n$$

and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_3'' &\leq \max_{m \leq g(x)} k_m \sum_{p|N} \frac{1}{p} \leq \max_{\xi \leq x} \frac{1}{f'(\xi)} C \log_3 f(x)^{A \log_2 f(x)} \\ &\leq C_1 \max_{\xi \leq x} \frac{1}{f'(\xi)} \log_3 f(x) \leq \varepsilon x \end{aligned}$$

for large  $x$ , by (C) and (B). Substituting our estimates into (9), we obtain that (7) does not exceed  $5\varepsilon$  for large  $x$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $f(x)$  be h. e. and satisfy (C), moreover*

$$(A') \quad f(x) = o(x/\log x),$$

$$(B') \quad x f'(x) / \log_2 f(x) \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Then the average order of the number of divisors of  $(n, g(n))$  is  $\frac{1}{6}\pi^2$ :*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(x)}{x} = \frac{1}{6} \pi^2.$$

Instead of (8) we have now

$$S(x) - S_k(x) = \sum_{k < n \leq g(x)} S(x, n),$$

where  $n$  runs through all integers, prime or not. The proof is similar to that of theorem 2, but simpler.

**3. Counterexamples.** To show that condition (B) is the best possible in Theorem 2, we shall use the following fact. There is an absolute constant

---

(<sup>1</sup>) This result is well known, but since we do not know who first proved it we give a short proof. It follows from the prime number theorem (or from a more elementary result) that

$$\prod_{p < 2 \log x} p > n.$$

Therefore by a simple argument

$$\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p} < \sum_{p < 2 \log x} \frac{1}{p} < c \log_3 x.$$

$C$  such that for each  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ , there is an  $\varepsilon_2 > 0$  and infinitely many values of  $n$  with the property

$$(12) \quad \frac{\varphi(m)}{m} < \varepsilon_1 \text{ for all } m \text{ with } n \leq m \leq n + \varepsilon_2 \log_3 n.$$

See [1], p. 129, where  $\sigma(m)/m > 2$  is shown to be possible for  $n \leq m \leq n + C_1 \log_3 n$ . The same proof establishes  $\sigma(m)/m > 1/\varepsilon_1$  in intervals  $n \leq m \leq n + \varepsilon_2 \log_3 n$ , and the known connections between  $\varphi$  and  $\sigma$  give (12).

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $f(x)$  be increasing and let*

$$(B'') \quad \frac{xf'(x)}{\log_3 f(x)} \leq M.$$

Then

$$(13) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q(x)}{x} < \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

**Proof.** From (B'') we obtain by integration  $f(x) \leq \log^2 x$  for all large  $x$ . It follows also that  $f'(x) \rightarrow 0$ , hence that  $g(x)$  takes all large integral values. From (2), using the argument and notations of § 2 we have, if  $d(n)$  is the number of divisors on  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (14) \quad Q(x) &= \sum_{d=1}^{g(x)} \mu(d) S(x, d) = \sum_{d=1}^{g(x)} \mu(d) \sum_{d|m} \left\{ \frac{k_m}{d} + O(1) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{g(x)} \sum_{d|m} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} k_m + \sum_{m=1}^{g(x)} O(d(m)) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{g(x)} k_m \frac{\varphi(m)}{m} + O(g(x) \log g(x)) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{g(x)} k_m \frac{\varphi(m)}{m} + O(\log^3 x). \end{aligned}$$

We take  $x$  such that  $g(x) = n$  is one of the  $n$  for which (12) holds. Let  $x_1 = (1 + \delta/M)x$ ,  $\delta > 0$ ,  $n_1 = g(x_1)$ . Then we have by (B'') for some  $x < \xi < x_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 - n &\leq 1 + f'(\xi)(x_1 - x) \leq 1 + \frac{\delta}{M} \xi f'(\xi) \\ &\leq 1 + \delta \log_3 f(\xi) \leq 1 + \delta \log_3 n_1, \end{aligned}$$

hence  $n_1 - n \leq \text{const} \cdot \delta \log_3 n$ . By (14) and (12),

$$Q(x_1) - Q(x) = \sum_{n < m \leq n_1} k_m \frac{\varphi(m)}{m} + O(\log^3 x) < \varepsilon(x_1 - x) + O(\log^3 x),$$

for an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if  $\delta$  is sufficiently small. This gives

$$\frac{Q(x_1)}{x_1} = \frac{Q(x)}{x} \cdot \frac{x}{x_1} + \varepsilon \frac{x_1 - x}{x_1} + o(1),$$

and if  $\alpha$  denotes the constant  $\alpha = (1 + \delta/M)^{-1} < 1$ , we obtain by Theorem 1,

$$\overline{\lim} \frac{Q(x_1)}{x_1} \leq \frac{6}{\pi^2} \alpha + \varepsilon(1 - \alpha) < \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

A simple computation shows that  $f(x) = c \log x \log_4 x$  satisfies (B'') as stated in the introduction.

In the same way we can prove  $\overline{\lim} [Q(x)/x] = 0$ , if instead of (B'') we have  $xf'(x)/\log_3 f(x) \rightarrow 0$ .

Similar statements hold for the condition (B') of Theorem 3. If  $f(x)$  is increasing and

$$(B''') \quad xf'(x)/\log_2 f(x) \leq M,$$

then

$$(15) \quad \overline{\lim} \frac{S(x)}{x} > \frac{\pi^2}{6};$$

and if even  $xf'(x)/\log_2 f(x) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\overline{\lim} \{S(x)/x\} = +\infty$ .

To prove for example (15), we note that there are arbitrary large  $n$  with  $\sigma(n)/n \geq C \log_2 n$ ; if  $n$  has this property, we put  $f(x) = n$  and  $x_1 = x + M^{-1}x/\log_2 f(x)$ ; then  $x_1/x \rightarrow 1$  and

$$f(x_1) - f(x) = f'(\xi)(x_1 - x) \leq \frac{1}{M} f'(\xi) \xi / \log_2 f(\xi) \leq 1$$

by (B'''). Hence  $k_n \geq x_1 - x$ . As in (14) we obtain

$$S(x_1) - S(x) = k_n \frac{\sigma(n)}{n} + O(\log^3 x) \geq CM^{-1}x + O(\log^3 x),$$

therefore by Theorem 1,

$$\overline{\lim} \{S(x_1)/x_1\} \geq \overline{\lim} \{S(x)/x\} + CM^{-1} > \frac{1}{6}\pi^2.$$

THEOREM 5. *There exists a function  $f(x)$  with the properties*

$$(A'') \quad f(x) = O(x/\log_3 x),$$

$$(C'') \quad f(x) \text{ is concave and } f'(x) \rightarrow 0,$$

such that  $\overline{\lim} [Q(x)/x] < 6\pi^{-2}$ .

Proof. Let  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  be arbitrary; we select  $\delta = \varepsilon_2$  according to (12) and put  $l = [\delta \log_3 n]$ . For some of the integers  $n$  of type (12) we put

$$(16) \quad f(x) = \frac{1}{l}(x-n) \quad \text{for} \quad N_n = nl + n \leq x < 2N_n.$$

We choose a sequence of  $n$ 's satisfying (12) in such a way that the intervals  $(N_n, 2N_n)$  are disjoint; the function  $f(x)$  is obtained by linear interpolation outside of the intervals  $(N_n, 2N_n)$ . It is easy to check that  $f(x)$  is concave and satisfies (A''), (C'').

Moreover,  $g(x) = n + s$  for  $x = nl + n + sl + t$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq n$ ,  $0 \leq t < l$ . Hence the numbers  $(m, g(m))$  for  $N_n \leq m < 2N_n$  are exactly the numbers

$$(17) \quad (nl + n + sl + t, n + s) = (n + t, n + s); \quad t = 0, 1, \dots, l-1, \\ s = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Fixing  $t$ , we see that the number of  $s = 0, 1, \dots, n$  with  $(n + t, n + s) = 1$  is at most  $2\varepsilon_1(n + t)$ , since  $\varphi(n + t)/(n + t) < \varepsilon_1$  by (12). Therefore,

$$Q(2N_n) - Q(N_n) \leq 2\varepsilon_1(n + l)l + 1, \\ \underline{\lim} \{Q(2N_n)/2N_n\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \overline{\lim} \{Q(N_n)/N_n\} + \varepsilon_1 < 6\pi^{-2},$$

which proves our assertion.

Similarly, there are functions  $f(x)$  satisfying (C'') with  $f(x) = O(x/\log_2 x)$  for which (15) holds. We take in (16),  $l = [\delta \log_2 n]$  and  $n$  such that  $\sigma(n)/n > C \log_2 n$ . Then the sum of the number of divisors of the numbers (17) is greater than

$$\sum_{s=1}^n d((n, n + s)) = \sum_{d|n} \frac{n}{d} = \sigma(n) \geq Cn \log_2 n > C_1 N_n$$

with large  $C_1$ . Therefore

$$S(2N_n) - S(N_n) \geq C_1 N_n,$$

and (15) follows.

At present we can not decide whether condition (A) of Theorem 2 can be weakened to  $o(x/\log_3 x)$ .

## References

- [1] P. Erdős, *Note on consecutive abundant numbers*, J. London Math. Soc., 10 (1935), p. 128-131.
- [2] J. F. Koksma, *Diophantische Approximationen*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik, Bd. 4 Heft 4, Berlin 1936.
- [3] J. Lambek and L. Moser, *On integers  $n$  relatively prime to  $f(n)$* , Canadian J. of Math., 7 (1955), p. 155-158.
- [4] G. L. Watson, *On integers  $n$  relatively prime to  $[an]$* , Canadian J. of Math. 5 (1953), p. 451-455.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO  
and  
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 15. 3. 1958*

---