

Zeitschrift: L'Enseignement Mathématique
Herausgeber: Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique
Band: 28 (1982)
Heft: 1-2: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

Artikel: ON THE NUMBER OF RESTRICTED PRIME FACTORS OF AN INTEGER. III
Autor: Norton, Karl K.
Kapitel: §2. Notation
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-52232>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 27.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

There are just $[xp_1^{-k}]$ of these $n \leq x$, and since $[z] \geq z/2$ for $z \geq 1$, we get the result.

It is clear that Theorem 1.24 is essentially best possible in certain extreme cases (for example, if $E = \{p_1\}$, or if $x = p_1^a$ and $y = a - 1$).

When $E = P$ (the set of all primes), we can take $v = \log_2 x$. Then $\Lambda = O(1)$, and we have the following corollary of Theorems 1.21 and 1.24:

COROLLARY 1.25. *If $x \geq e^e$ and $0 \leq y \leq (\log x)(\log 2)^{-1} - 1$, then*

$$2^{-y-2} x \leq S(x, y; P, \Omega) \leq c_6 2^{-y} x (\log x) (\log_2 x)^{1/2}.$$

Corollary 1.25 should be compared with the Erdős-Sárközy result (1.20) and with the asymptotic formula of Selberg mentioned after Theorem 1.18. When $y < 2 \log_2 x$ (roughly), more precise estimates for $S(x, y; P, \Omega)$ can be obtained from [13] and [14].

In a later paper, we shall show that if p_1 is the smallest member of E and $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed, then the precise order of magnitude of $S(x, y; E, \Omega)$ is

$$p_1^{-y} x \exp \{(p_1 - 1) E(x)\}$$

when $E(x)$ is sufficiently large and

$$p_1 E(x) \leq y \leq (1 - \varepsilon) (\log x) (\log p_1)^{-1}.$$

This theorem is much more difficult to prove than Theorem 1.21. Its proof depends on Theorem 1.21 and on an extension of Halász's work [4] concerning the local distribution of $\Omega(n; E)$. Theorem 1.21 remains our best upper bound when y is close to $(\log x) (\log p_1)^{-1}$ (cf. Theorem 1.18), and it seems to be the most we can achieve by a fairly simple method.

§2. NOTATION

The symbols a, m, n always represent integers with $a \geq 0, m \geq 0, n > 0$. The letter p always denotes a prime, while $v, w, x, y, z, \alpha, \beta, \delta, \varepsilon, \sigma$ are real numbers. $[x]$ means the largest integer $\leq x$. The notation $\log_2 x$ is defined by (1.5), and the notations $O, O_{\delta, \varepsilon, \dots}, c_i, c_i(\delta, \varepsilon, \dots)$ are explained after Theorem 1.6. If a condition such as " $x \geq c_i(\delta, \varepsilon, \dots)$ " is used as a hypothesis, it is to be understood that $c_i(\delta, \varepsilon, \dots)$ is sufficiently large. We shall occasionally use the notations \ll, \gg to imply constants which are *absolute*. (Thus $A = O(B)$ is equivalent to $A \ll B$.)

Empty sums mean 0, empty products 1, and we define $0^0 = 1$. The notation

$$x_1 \cdots x_m / y_1 \cdots y_n$$

is sometimes used instead of

$$(x_1 \cdots x_m) (y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1}.$$

Throughout this paper, E denotes a nonempty set of primes, to be regarded as quite arbitrary unless further assumptions are stated. $E(x)$ is always defined by (1.2). p_1 always means the smallest member of E , and if

$$E - \{p_1\} = \{p : p \in E \quad \text{and} \quad p \neq p_1\}$$

is not empty, then p_2 denotes the smallest member of $E - \{p_1\}$. When x and v are positive, the function $\Lambda = \Lambda(x, v; E)$ is always defined by (1.22).

§3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.6 AND 1.11, AND RELATED RESULTS

Before proving (1.8), we observe that a similar but weaker inequality has a very simple proof. For if $y > 1$, then

$$\log n \geq \sum_{p|n} \log p \geq \sum_{p|n, p \geq y} \log p \geq (\log y) \sum_{p|n, p \geq y} 1,$$

and hence

$$\omega(n) = \sum_{p|n, p < y} 1 + \sum_{p|n, p \geq y} 1 \leq y + (\log n) (\log y)^{-1}.$$

The right-hand side is approximately minimized by taking

$$y = (\log n) (\log_2 n)^{-2},$$

and we obtain

$$\omega(n) \leq \frac{\log n}{\log_2 n} \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log_3 n}{\log_2 n}\right) \right\} \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq 16 (> e^e). \quad (3.1)$$

Another simple proof of (3.1) can be based on Newman's observation [11, p. 652] that if $\omega(n) = r$, then $n \geq r!$.

To get the sharper inequality (1.8), it seems to be necessary to use an assumption such as (1.7) about the distribution of E . First we need a lemma relating $\pi(x; E)$ (defined by (1.4)) and

$$\theta(x; E) = \sum_{p \leq x, p \in E} \log p. \quad (3.2)$$