ROGER C. BAKER

GLYN HARMAN

Sparsely totient numbers

Sparsely totient numbers[*]

ROGER C. BAKER[1] and GLYN HARMAN[2]

RÉSUMÉ. — Soit $P_1(n) \geq P_2(n) \dots$ la suite décroissante des diviseurs premiers de l'entier n. Nous montrons le résultat suivant : si $\left(m > n \Rightarrow \phi(m) > \phi(n)\right)$, alors $P_1(n) < C(\log n)^{37/20}$, où C est une constante absolue. Nous utilisons le crible de Harman et les estimations de Fouvry et Iwaniec pour les sommes trigonométriques.

ABSTRACT. — Let $P_j(n)$ be the j-th largest prime dividing n. We show the following result: if $\left(m > n \Rightarrow \phi(m) > \phi(n)\right)$, then $P_1(n) < C(\log n)^{37/20}$, where C is a an absolute constant. We use Harman's sieve and the estimates of Fouvry and Iwaniec for trigonometric sums.

1. Introduction

A positive integer n is said to be *sparsely totient* if

$$\phi(m) > \phi(n)$$

for all $m > n$. This definition was introduced by Masser and Shiu [9], who proved several interesting properties of sparsely totient numbers. Subsequently Harman [6] sharpened some results from [9]. In particular, he showed that $P_j(n)$, the j-th largest prime dividing n, satisfies

$$P_j(n) \leq \left(\frac{j}{j-1} + \varepsilon\right) \log n \qquad (1.1)$$

for a given $j \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Here we suppose $n \geq n_0(j, \varepsilon)$. For $j = 1$, the corresponding bound is of weaker order [6, theorem 1]:

$$P_1(n) < \left(\log n \right)^{2 - 8/65 + \varepsilon} . \qquad (1.2)$$

As regards $Q_j(n)$, the j-th smallest prime dividing n, Harman showed in [6] that

$$Q_j(n) > \left(\frac{j}{j+1} - \varepsilon \right) \log n$$

for $n > n_1(j, \varepsilon)$.

In the present paper we sharpen the bound (1.2).

THEOREM .— *Let n be a sparsely totient number. Then*

$$P_1(n) < C \left(\log n \right)^{37/20}$$

where C is an absolute constant.

The key to the improvement is work of Fouvry and Iwaniec [4] on exponential sums

$$\sum_m \sum_{m_1} \sum_{m_2} a_m b_{m_1 m_2} e(A m^\alpha m_1^{\alpha_1} m_2^{\alpha_2}) \qquad (1.3)$$

vhere $e(\theta) = e^{2\pi i \theta}$. The sums we need here are of the particular form

$$\sum_h \sum_s \sum_t a_s b_t c_h e\left(\frac{hx}{st} \right) . \qquad (1.4)$$

It is well-known that there are devices for estimating this sum more efficiently than (1.3) (e.g. Iwaniec and Laborde [7], Baker [1], Fouvry and Iwaniec [4], Wu [10], Liu [8] and Baker and Harman [2]). These devices would make no difference to the final result if we employed them here; see the remark following the proof of Lemma 3.

We shall deduce the theorem from the following proposition.

PROPOSITION .— *For all x, v with v sufficiently large and*

$$v^{37/20} \leq x \leq v^2 \,,$$

there are

$$\gg \frac{x}{v \log x}$$

solutions in primes p to

$$1 - \frac{x}{16\,v^2} < \left\{\frac{x}{p}\right\} < 1 \,, \quad \textit{with } 2v < p < 3v \,. \tag{1.5}$$

The proposition is proved by the sieve method developed by Harman [5] and Baker, Harman and Rivat [3]. We are able to use the same numerical work as in [3]; this saves a great deal of space. Sums (1.4) arise, as one would expect, in bounding the remainder terms of the sieve.

The deduction of the Theorem from the Proposition follows [6] closely, but we give it here for completeness. Suppose that n is a sparsely totient number and

$$P_1(n) \geq C(\log n)^{37/20} \,,$$

so that n is large. By (1.2), we know that

$$P_1(n) < (\log n)^2 \,.$$

Let $p_1 = P_1(n)$ and write $m = n/p_1$. We apply the Proposition with $x = p_1$, $v = \log n$. It follows that there are

$$\gg \frac{p_1}{v \log p_1}$$

solutions to (1.5). From (1.1), there are at most three primes between $2v$ and $3v$ which divide n. We deduce that (1.5) has a solution with $p \nmid n$. Let

$$r = \left[\frac{p_1}{p}\right] + 1 \,.$$

Evidently $mrp > n$. We now use (1.5) to show that $\phi(mrp) < \phi(n)$. We have

$$\phi(mrp) \leq r\phi(m)p\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \leq \frac{rp}{p_1}\frac{1 - 1/p}{1 - 1/p_1}\,\phi(n) \,. \tag{1.6}$$

Now

$$r - \frac{p_1}{p} = 1 - \left\{\frac{p_1}{p}\right\} < \frac{p_1}{16\,v^2} < \frac{9\,p_1}{16\,p^2}$$

from (1.5). Hence

$$\frac{rp}{p_1} < 1 + \frac{9}{16\,p}\,. \tag{1.7}$$

Combining (1.6) and (1.7),

$$\phi(mrp) \leq \phi(n)\left(1 - \frac{1}{p} + \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{1}{p_1}\right)\right)\left(1 + \frac{9}{16\,p}\right)$$

$$\leq \phi(n)\left(1 - \frac{7}{16\,p} + \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{1}{p^{37/20}}\right)\right)\,.$$

Since p is large, we have

$$\phi(mrp) < \phi(n)\,,$$

which is absurd. The Theorem is proved. $\square$

2. Exponential sums

Let ε be a sufficiently small positive number and let $\eta = \varepsilon^2$. Constants implied by " $\ll$ ", " $\gg$ " and " $\mathrm{O}_\varepsilon(\,\cdot\,)$ " will depend at most on ε. Constants implied by " $\mathrm{O}(\,\cdot\,)$ " will be absolute. We use the abbreviation " $m \sim M$ " for

$$M < m \leq 2M\,.$$

We write $\alpha = 3/20$.

LEMMA 1. — *Let a_s $(s \sim M)$, b_t $(t \sim N)$ be complex numbers of modulus ≤ 1. Suppose that*

$$v^{2-\alpha} \leq x \leq v^2\,, \tag{2.1}$$

$$v^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \ll N \ll v^{1-5\alpha-\varepsilon}\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Then

$$\sum_{h \leq v^{\alpha+5\eta}}\left|\sum_{\substack{s \sim M \\ 2v < st \leq 3n}}\sum_{t \sim N} a_s b_t\, e\left(\frac{hx}{st}\right)\right| \ll v^{1-6\eta}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. — This follows from Lemma 9 of [1], with $H \leq v^{\alpha+5\eta}$ and $Q = NH^{-1}v^{-\varepsilon}$, using the exponent pair $(1/2, 1/2)$.

LEMMA 2. — *The conclusion of Lemma 1 holds if the hypothesis (2.2) is replaced by*

$$v^{3\alpha+\varepsilon} \ll M \ll v^{1-3\alpha-\varepsilon} . \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. — Using the technique in [1, lemma 15], it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{n \sim H} \sum_{s \sim M} \sum_{t \sim N} a_s' b_t' c_h\, e\left(\frac{hx}{st}\right) \ll v^{1-7\eta}$$

for $H \leq v^{\alpha+5\eta}$, where a_s' and b_t' have modulus ≤ 1. We obtain this bound by an appeal to Lemma 1 for [3] (a variant of a result in [4]), taking (M_1, M_2, M) to be either (H, M, N) or (H, N, M).

LEMMA 3. — *Let $M \leq v^{3-3\alpha-\varepsilon}$. We have*

$$\sum_{h \leq v^{\alpha+5\eta}} \left| \sum_{s \sim M} a_s \sum_{\substack{N < t \leq N_1 \\ 2v < st < 3v}} e\left(\frac{hx}{st}\right) \right| \ll v^{1-6\eta} \tag{2.5}$$

for any complex numbers a_s of modulus ≤ 1.

Proof. — Suppose first that

$$M \leq v^{1/2} .$$

Then (2.5) follows from Lemma 2 of [3], with X, K replaced by v, M, and with $H \leq v^{\alpha+5\eta}$. Now suppose that

$$v^{1/2} < M \leq v^{3-3\alpha-\varepsilon} .$$

Then Lemma 3 follows from Lemma 2.

We have not been able to improve the bound $v^{3-3\alpha-\varepsilon}$ in Lemma 3 by taking advantage of the fact that $b_t = 1$ in (2.5), together with the special features of sums (1.4) mentioned in the section 1. This is perhaps surprising.

3. Proof of the proposition

We write $\delta = x/(16\,v^2)$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of integers in $(2v, 3v)$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of k in $\mathcal{B}$ for which

$$1 - \delta < \left\{ \frac{x}{k} \right\} < 1.$$

For $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{B}$, we write

$$\mathcal{E}_d = \{ k \in \mathcal{E} : d \mid k \},$$

$$S(\mathcal{E}, z) = \left| \{ k \in \mathcal{E} : p \mid k \Rightarrow p \geq z \} \right|.$$

Thus the number of primes in $\mathcal{A}$ is $S\big(A, (3v)^{1/2}\big)$. We shall prove that

$$S\big(A, (3v)^{1/2}\big) > \frac{\delta v}{4 \log v} \tag{3.1}$$

which establishes the Proposition.

LEMMA 4. — *Let a_s, $s \leq 2M$, and b_t, $t \sim N$, by complex numbers with $|a_s|$, $|b_t| \ll v^\eta$.*

For $M \leq v^{1-3\alpha-\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\sum_{s \leq M} a_s |\mathcal{A}_s| = \delta v \sum_{s \leq M} \frac{a_s}{s} + O(\delta v^{1-3\eta}). \tag{3.2}$$

For M in any of the intervals

$$\left[v^{\alpha+\varepsilon}, v^{1-5\alpha-\varepsilon} \right], \quad \left[v^{3\alpha+\varepsilon}, v^{1-3\alpha-\varepsilon} \right], \quad \left[v^{5\alpha+\varepsilon}, v^{1-\alpha-\varepsilon} \right], \tag{3.3}$$

we have

$$\sum_{\substack{st \in \mathcal{A} \\ s \sim M \\ t \sim N}} a_s b_t = \delta v \sum_{\substack{st \in \mathcal{B} \\ s \sim M \\ t \sim N}} \frac{a_s b_t}{st} + O(\delta v^{1-3\eta}). \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. — We prove (3.1) by combining the argument of Lemma 2 of [5] with Lemma 3. The proof of (3.4) is similar, using Lemma 1 or Lemma 2 in place of Lemma 3.

We may now follow the analysis of [3] very closely indeed. In place of Lemmas 6 and 7 of [3] we have Lemma 4, with v, α playing the roles of X and $1 - \gamma$. We summarize the results obtained, leaving the details of proof to the reader. Let

$$P(y) = \prod_{p < y} p \,, \quad g(x) = \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{x}\log\frac{1}{x}\right) \,.$$

LEMMA 5. — *For* $M \leq x^{11/20-\varepsilon}$, *we have*

$$\sum_{m \sim M} a_m S(\mathcal{A}_m, v^\varepsilon) =$$

$$= \delta \sum_{m \sim M} a_m S(\mathcal{B}_m, x^\varepsilon)\left(1 + O\big(g(\lambda)\big) + O_\varepsilon(L^{-1})\right) + O_\varepsilon(\delta v^{1-2\eta}) \,.$$

Here $\lambda = 30\,\varepsilon$, $|a_m| \ll v^\eta$ *and* $a_m = 0$ *unless* $\big(m, P(x^\varepsilon)\big) = 1$.

LEMMA 6. — *Let* $u \geq 1$ *be given and suppose that* $\mathcal{D} \subset \{1, \ldots, u\}$ *and* M *lies in one of the intervals (3.3). Then*

$$\sum_{p_1} \cdots \sum_{p_u}^{*} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 \ldots p_u}, p_1) =$$

$$= \delta \sum_{p_1} \cdots \sum_{p_u}^{*} S(\mathcal{B}_{p_1 \ldots p_u}, p_1)(1 + O_\varepsilon(L^{-1})) + O(\delta v^{1-2\eta}) \,.$$

Here * *indicates that* $p_1, \ldots, p_u$ *satisfy*

$$v^\varepsilon \leq p_1 < \cdots < p_u \,, \quad \prod_{j \in \mathcal{D}} p_j \sim M \,,$$

together with no more than ε^{-1} *further conditions which take the form*

$$R \leq \prod_{j \in \mathcal{F}} p_j \leq S \,.$$

LEMMA 7. — *Let* $M \leq v^{11/20-\varepsilon}$. *We have*

$$\sum_{m \sim M} a_m S(\mathcal{A}_m, v^{1/10-2\varepsilon}) =$$

$$= \delta \sum_{m \sim M} a_m S(\mathcal{B}_m, v^{1/10-2\varepsilon})\left(1 + O\big(g(\nu)\big) + O_\varepsilon(L^{-1})\right) + O(\delta v^{1-2\eta})$$

where $\nu = 100\,\varepsilon$, $0 \leq a_m \ll v^\eta$ *and* $a_m = 0$ *unless* $\big(m, P(v^{1/10-2\varepsilon})\big) = 1$.

We may now carry out the decomposition of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}, (3v)^{1/2})$ in exactly the same fashion as [3, sect. 5] with v in the role of X. A few changes by a factor v^{ε} in the endpoints of intervals will occur. These will in turn alter the coefficients in the inequalities defining the regions of integration by $O(\varepsilon)$. this clearly does not alter the final result, which is the lower bound (3.1). This completes the proof of the Proposition.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] BAKER (R. C.) . — *The greatest prime factor of the integers in an interval*, Acta Arithmetica **47** (1986), pp. 193-231.

[2] BAKER (R. C.) and HARMAN . — *Numbers with a large prime factor*, Acta Arith. **73** (1995), pp. 119-145.

[3] BAKER (R. C.), HARMAN and RIVAT (J.) . — *Primes of the form $[n^c]$*, J. of Number Theory, **50** (1995), pp. 261-277.

[4] FOUVRY (E.) and IWANIEC (H.) . — *Exponential sums with monomials*, J. Number Theory **33** (1989), pp. 311-333.

[5] HARMAN (G.) . — *On the distribution of αp modulo one*, J. London Math. Soc. **27** (1983), pp. 9-18.

[6] HARMAN (G.) . — *On sparsely totient numbers*, Glasgow Math. J. **33** (1991), pp. 349-358.

[7] IWANIEC (H.) and LABORDE (M.) . — *P_2 in short intervals*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, **31** (1981), pp. 37-56.

[8] LIU (H.-Q.) . — *The greatest prime factor of the integers in an interval*, Acta Arith., **65** (1993), pp. 301-328.

[9] MASSER (D. W.) and SHIU (P.) . — *On sparsely totient numbers*, Pacific J. Math. **121** (1986), pp. 407-426.

[10] WU (J.) . — *P_2 dans les petits intervalles*, Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres de Paris (1989-90), Birkhaüser.