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: §3. Proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.11, and related results

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: 09.01.2026

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

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

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

and hence

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

The right-hand side is approximately minimized by taking

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

and we obtain

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

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

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

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

LEMMA 3.3. *Suppose that there exists a real number* $\gamma(E) > 0$ *such that* (1.7) *holds. Then for* $x > c_{11}(E)$,

$$\theta(x;E) = \pi(x;E)\left\{\log \pi(x;E) + \log_2 \pi(x;E) - 1 - \log \gamma(E) + \frac{\log_2 \pi(x;E)}{\log \pi(x;E)} + O_E\left(\frac{1}{\log \pi(x;E)}\right)\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof: For notational simplicity, we write $l_r = \log_r x$, $L_r = \log_r \pi(x;E)$ whenever these are defined. First note that for $x > c_{12}(E)$, (1.7) implies

$$L_1 = l_1 - l_2 + \log \gamma(E) + O_E(1/l_1). \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, $L_1 \sim l_1$ and $L_2 \sim l_2$ as $x \to +\infty$, so for $x > c_{13}(E)$, (3.5) implies

$$L_1 = l_1\{1 + O_E(L_2/L_1)\},$$

and multiplication by $(L_1 l_1)^{-1}$ yields

$$l_1^{-1} = L_1^{-1}\{1 + O_E(L_2/L_1)\} \qquad \text{for} \qquad x > c_{13}(E). \tag{3.6}$$

Taking logarithms in (3.5), then using (3.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 &= l_2\left(1 - 1/l_1 + O_E(1/l_1 l_2)\right) \\ &= l_2\left(1 - 1/L_1 + O_E(1/L_1 L_2)\right) \qquad \text{for} \qquad x > c_{14}(E). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$l_2 = L_2\left(1 + 1/L_1 + O_E(1/L_1 L_2)\right) \qquad \text{for} \quad x > c_{15}(E). \tag{3.7}$$

Substituting (3.7) in (3.5), replacing $O_E(1/l_1)$ by $O_E(1/L_1)$, and solving for l_1, we get

$$l_1 = L_1 + L_2 - \log \gamma(E) + L_2/L_1 + O_E(1/L_1) \qquad \text{for} \qquad x > c_{16}(E). \tag{3.8}$$

We now need to estimate $\theta(x;E)$ in terms of $\pi(x;E)$. We use the Stieltjes integral, then integrate by parts and combine with (1.7):

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(x;E) &= \int_1^x (\log t)\, d\pi(t;E) = \pi(x;E)\, l_1 - \int_2^x \frac{\gamma(E)}{\log t}\, dt \\ &\quad + O_E\left(\int_2^x \frac{dt}{(\log t)^2}\right) = \pi(x;E)\, l_1 - \gamma(E)(x/l_1) + O_E(x/l_1^2) \\ &= \pi(x;E)\, l_1 - \pi(x;E) + O_E(x/l_1^2) \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

for $x \geqslant 2$. Now, (1.7) shows that

$$x/l_1^2 = O_E(\pi(x; E)/l_1) = O_E(\pi(x; E)/L_1) \qquad \text{for} \quad x > c_{17}(E).$$

Using this fact as well as (3.9) and (3.8), we get (3.4). Q.E.D.

Proof of Theorem 1.6: Write $E = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots\}$, where $p_1 < p_2 < p_3 < \ldots$. Define $n_r = p_1 p_2 \ldots p_r$ for $r \geqslant 1$. By (3.4),

$$\log n_r = \theta(p_r; E) = (r \log r)\left\{1 + \frac{\log_2 r}{\log r} - \frac{1 + \log \gamma(E)}{\log r} + \frac{\log_2 r}{(\log r)^2} + O_E\left(\frac{1}{(\log r)^2}\right)\right. \tag{3.10}$$

for $r > c_{11}(E)$. Hence for $r > c_{18}(E)$,

$$\log_2 n_r = \log r + \log_2 r + \frac{\log_2 r}{\log r} + O_E\left(\frac{1}{\log r}\right). \tag{3.11}$$

If $r > c_{19}(E)$, then (3.10) and (3.11) yield

$$\log n_r = r\{\log_2 n_r - 1 - \log \gamma(E) + O_E(1/\log_2 n_r)\}. \tag{3.12}$$

If $r > c_{20}(E)$, we can solve (3.12) for r to get

$$\omega(n_r; E) = r = \frac{\log n_r}{\log_2 n_r}\left\{1 + \frac{1 + \log \gamma(E)}{\log_2 n_r} + O_E\left(\frac{1}{(\log_2 n_r)^2}\right)\right\}. \tag{3.13}$$

Now let n be any integer $\geqslant 3$, and write $\omega(n; E) = r$. Define

$$f(n, \alpha) = \frac{\log n}{\log_2 n} + \frac{\{1 + \log \gamma(E)\} \log n}{(\log_2 n)^2} + \alpha \frac{\log n}{(\log_2 n)^3}$$

for real α. For fixed positive α, $f(n, \alpha)$ increases with n for $n > c_{21}(\alpha, E)$. Thus if $r > c_{22}(E)$, it follows from (3.13) (since $n \geqslant n_r$) that

$$\omega(n; E) = \omega(n_r; E) \leqslant f(n_r, c_{23}(E)) \leqslant f(n, c_{23}(E)).$$

Now suppose that $0 \leqslant r = \omega(n; E) \leqslant c_{22}(E)$. If $n \geqslant c_{24}(E)$, then clearly

$$f(n, c_{23}(E)) \geqslant c_{22}(E) \geqslant \omega(n; E).$$

If $3 \leqslant n < c_{24}(E)$ and $c_{25}(E)$ is sufficiently large, then (since $\gamma(E) \leqslant 1$)

$$f(n, c_{25}(E)) \geqslant \frac{\log n}{(\log_2 n)^3}\left\{c_{25}(E) + (\log \gamma(E)) \log_2 c_{24}(E)\right\}$$
$$\geqslant c_{22}(E) \geqslant \omega(n; E).$$

It follows that if

$$c_{26}(E) = \max\{c_{23}(E), c_{25}(E)\},$$

then

$$\omega(n; E) \leqslant f(n, c_{26}(E))$$

for all $n \geqslant 3$. This proves (1.8), and (3.13) shows that equality holds in (1.8) for infinitely many n. Q.E.D.

For a more precise version of (1.8) when E is the set of all primes, see [12, p. 99].

Even a much weaker hypothesis than (1.7) implies that the maximum order of $\omega(n; E)$ is nearly $(\log n)(\log_2 n)^{-1}$. Specifically, suppose that there exist positive real numbers δ, x_0 such that

$$\pi(x; E) \geqslant x^{\delta} \qquad \text{for all} \quad x \geqslant x_0 . \tag{3.14}$$

In the notation of the preceding proof, it is then clear that for $r \geqslant x_0$,

$$\log n_r = \theta(p_r; E) \geqslant \pi(p_r; E) - 1 \geqslant p_r^{\delta} - 1 . \tag{3.15}$$

But trivially $\theta(p_r; E) \leqslant r \log p_r$, so

$$\omega(n_r; E) = r \geqslant (\log n_r)(\log p_r)^{-1},$$

and hence by (3.15),

$$\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{\omega(n; E) \log_2 n}{\log n} \geqslant \delta . \tag{3.16}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.11: We use the method of Erdös and Nicolas [2], which we can refine and generalize by appealing to Lemma 3.3. As before, write

$$E = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots\},$$

where

$$p_1 < p_2 < p_3 < \ldots .$$

Assume that y satisfies (1.12) (where $c_2(E)$ is sufficiently large), take $r = [y] + 1$, and let $n_r = p_1 p_2 \ldots p_r$. There are exactly $[x/n_r]$ multiples n of n_r such that $n \leqslant x$, and for each such n we have $\omega(n; E) \geqslant r > y$. Hence

$$S(x, y; E, \omega) \geqslant [x/n_r] . \tag{3.17}$$

By (3.4),

$$\log n_r = r\{\log r + \log_2 r - 1 - \log \gamma(E) + O_E((\log_2 r)/\log r)\}$$

for $r > c_{11}(E)$. Define

$$g(t) = t\{\log t + \log_2 t - 1 - \log \gamma(E)\}$$

for real $t \geqslant 3$ and note that

$$0 < g'(t) = O_E(\log t) \qquad \text{for} \quad t \geqslant 3 .$$

By the mean-value theorem for derivatives,

$$g(r) = g(y) + O_E(\log y),$$

and hence

$$\log n_r = g(y) + O_E(y(\log_2 y)/\log y) \qquad \text{if} \quad y > c_{27}(E). \tag{3.18}$$

In order to derive (1.13) from (3.17) and (3.18), we need to show that

$$[x/n_r] \gg x/n_r, \tag{3.19}$$

i.e., that $n_r \leqslant x$. For the remainder of this proof, write

$$l_k = \log_k x, \beta = 1 + \log \gamma(E) - \varepsilon,$$

and

$$z = (l_1/l_2) + \beta(l_1/l_2^2).$$

It follows from (1.12) that

$$y(\log_2 y)/\log y = O_E(l_1 l_3/l_2^2).$$

Also, if $x > c_{28}(E, \varepsilon)$, then

$$\log z \leqslant l_2 - l_3 + (\beta/l_2) \leqslant l_2 - l_3 + (\varepsilon/2),$$
$$\log_2 z \leqslant l_3 .$$

It follows from these inequalities and (3.18) that if $x > c_1(E, \varepsilon)$ (sufficiently large) and (1.12) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned}\log n_r &\leqslant g(z) + O_E(l_1 l_3/l_2^2)\\ &\leqslant (l_1/l_2)(1+\beta/l_2)\{l_2 - l_3 + (\varepsilon/2) + l_3 - (\beta+\varepsilon)\}\\ &\quad + O_E(l_1 l_3/l_2^2)\\ &= l_1(1-\varepsilon/2l_2) + O_{E,\varepsilon}(l_1 l_3/l_2^2) < l_1,\end{aligned}$$

so $n_r < x$. Thus (3.19) holds, and (1.13) follows from (3.17) and (3.18). Q.E.D.

It is interesting to observe that a result somewhat like (1.13) can be deduced from a much weaker assumption than (1.7):

THEOREM 3.20. *Suppose there exist real numbers* $\delta > 0$, $x_0 \geqslant 2$ *such that* (3.14) *holds. If* $x \geqslant c_{29}(\delta)$ *and* $x_0 \leqslant y \leqslant \delta (\log x)(\log_2 x)^{-1}$, *then*

$$S(x, y; E, \omega) \gg x \exp\{-\delta^{-1}(y \log y + \log y + 2)\}.$$

Proof: In the notation of the preceding proof, (3.17) holds, and trivially $\log n_r \leqslant r \log p_r$. If $y \geqslant x_0$, then $p_r > r \geqslant x_0$ and $r = \pi(p_r; E) \geqslant p_r^{\delta}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \log n_r &\leqslant \delta^{-1} r \log r \leqslant \delta^{-1}(y+1)(\log y + y^{-1}) \\ &\leqslant \delta^{-1}(y \log y + \log y + 2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

But $\log y \leqslant \log_2 x - \log_3 x$, so $\log n_r < \log x$ if $x \geqslant c_{29}(\delta)$. Hence (3.19) holds, and the result follows from (3.17) and (3.21). Q.E.D.

§4. PROOFS OF THEOREM 1.14 AND RELATED RESULTS

We begin by quoting the following easy result from [13, pp. 689-690]:

LEMMA 4.1. *For* $x \geqslant 1$ *and* $z \geqslant 1$,

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} z^{\omega(n; E)} \leqslant x \prod_{p \leqslant x,\, p \in E} \{1 + (z-1)p^{-1}\}.$$

To put this in a more convenient form, we prove

LEMMA 4.2. *If* $x \geqslant 1$ *and* $w \geqslant -2$, *then (cf.* (1.2)*)*

$$\prod_{p \leqslant x,\, p \in E} (1 + wp^{-1}) \leqslant e^{wE(x)}. \tag{4.3}$$

If $1 \leqslant w \leqslant x$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{p \leqslant x,\, p \in E} (1 + wp^{-1}) \\ &= \exp\{w(E(x) - E(w)) + O(w/\log(2w))\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Proof: (4.3) follows immediately from the inequalities

$$0 \leqslant 1 + wp^{-1} \leqslant \exp(wp^{-1}).$$

To get (4.4), we first write

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{p \leqslant x,\, p \in E} (1 + wp^{-1}) &\leqslant \prod_{p \leqslant w} (2wp^{-1}) \cdot \prod_{w < p \leqslant x,\, p \in E} \exp(wp^{-1}) \\ &= \exp\{w(E(x) - E(w)) + \pi(w)\log(2w) - \theta(w)\}, \end{aligned}$$