

Ernie,
 We are tasked with asserting
 That the following proof
 is correct:

Theorem 1.2. There is an absolute constant $B_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \times \sum_{k \leq n} \log C_\Omega(k) = B_0 \cdot (\log \log n)(\log \log \log n) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log n}\right)\right), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first use (1.9) to see that there is an absolute constant $P_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \Omega(n)=k}} \log C_\Omega(n) = \sum_{k \geq 1} P_0 \times \#\{n \leq x : \Omega(n) = k\} \times \log(k!). \quad (2.2)$$

For $x \geq 3$, consider the following partial sums:

$$L_\Omega(x) := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \frac{3}{2} \log \log x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \Omega(n)=k}} \log C_\Omega(n).$$

For any $z \geq 0$, we cite the following known form of Binet's formula for the log-gamma function [17, §5.9(i)]:

$$\log z! = \left(z + \frac{1}{2}\right) \log(1+z) - z + O(1).$$

Then provided that (2.2) holds, there is an absolute constant $B_0^* > 0$ such that

$$L_\Omega(x) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \frac{3}{2} \log \log x} \frac{B_0^* x (\log \log x)^{k-1}}{(\log x)(k-1)!} \left(\left(k + \frac{1}{2}\right) \log(1+k) - k \right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log x}\right)\right). \quad (2.3)$$

The right-hand-side of (2.3) can be approximated by Abel summation using the functions

$$A_x(u) := \frac{B_0^* x \Gamma(u, \log \log x)}{\Gamma(u)}; f(u) := \frac{(2u+1)}{2} \log(1+u) - \frac{(2u+1)}{2}, f'(u) = \log(1+u) - \frac{1}{2(1+u)}.$$

Then we have by Proposition C.3 that for some absolute constant $B_0 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} L_\Omega(x) &= A_x\left(\frac{3}{2} \log \log x\right) f\left(\frac{3}{2} \log \log x\right) - \int_0^{\frac{3}{2}} A_x(\alpha \log \log x) f'(\alpha \log \log x) d\alpha \\ &= B_0 x (\log \log x) (\log \log \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log x}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show

$$\sum \log C_\Omega(n) = o(x \log \log x), \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

First, some motivation for why to expect the result in Thm 1.2 is correct:

(1) Erdős-Kac type CLT for $\sigma(n)$:

$$\#\left\{n \leq x : \frac{\sigma(n) - \ell x}{\sqrt{\ell x}} \in \left[-\frac{z}{2}, \frac{z}{2} \right] \right\} = \frac{x}{4\pi^2} \cdot \Phi(z) + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell x}}\right),$$

here, $\ell x = \log \log x$, and

Similarly hence for Th,

$\ell \ell x = \log \log \log x$.

(2) We also have the next result

stated in Appendix B.

Note that $f(r) := r^{-1} - r \log r$

is ~~smile~~ when $r=1$, and f is decreasing for both $r \in (0, 1)$ and $r \in (1, 2)$.

Theorem B.1. For $x \geq 2$ and $r > 0$, let

$$A(x, r) := \#\{n \leq x : \Omega(n) \leq r \log \log x\},$$

$$B(x, r) := \#\{n \leq x : \Omega(n) \geq r \log \log x\}.$$

If $0 < r \leq 1$, then

$$A(x, r) \ll x(\log x)^{r-1-r \log r}, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

If $1 \leq r \leq R < 2$, then

$$B(x, r) \ll_R x(\log x)^{r-1-r \log r}, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

- Now, the asymptotic density of the squareful integers is

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \pi^2(n) = \frac{6}{\pi^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}\right)$$

with $0 < \frac{6}{\pi^2} \approx 0.61 < 1$.

- Recall that for all squarefree $n \geq 1$, $C_\ell(n) = (\varphi(n))!$
- Hence, we expect there to be a limiting absolute constant $R_0 > \frac{6}{\pi^2}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \log C_\ell(n) = \log [R_0 \Gamma(\ell \ln x)] (1 + o(1))$$

$$= (\ell \ln x) (\ln \ln x) (1 + o(1)).$$

That's it for intuition. Now let's prove that this result holds formally, let's see what we've got:

- Let $S_n(x) := \sum_{n \leq r \leq x} \log C_r(x)$.

- We should expect (pf. to follow) that the remainder for $S_n(x)$ comes from the restricted sum

$$L_n(x) := \sum_{\substack{n \leq r \leq x \\ S(r) \leq \sum_{k < r} L_k}} \log C_r(x).$$

- We can evaluate an asymptotic formula for $L_n(x)$ using the following result proved in Appendix C.

Proposition C.3. Let a, z, ρ be positive real parameters such that $z = \rho a$. If $\rho \in (0, 1)$, then as $z \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Gamma(a, z) = \Gamma(a) + O_\rho(z^{a-1} e^{-z}).$$

If $\rho > 1$, then as $z \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Gamma(a, z) = \frac{z^{a-1} e^{-z}}{1 - \rho^{-1}} + O_\rho(z^{a-2} e^{-z}).$$

If $\rho > W(1) \approx 0.56714$, then as $z \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Gamma(a, ze^{\pm\pi i}) = -e^{\pm\pi i a} \frac{z^{a-1} e^z}{1 + \rho^{-1}} + O_\rho(z^{a-2} e^z).$$

(use cases of $P < \frac{2}{3}$, $P > \frac{2}{3}$)

To bound the error term for $S_p(x)$, consider the sums defined by

$$L_p^*(x) := \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \sqrt{n} \geq \frac{3}{2} \ln x}} \log(n/x)$$

$$L_p^*(x) := \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \sqrt{n} \geq \frac{3}{2} \ln x}} \log(n/x)$$

By the argument above, we know that the asymptotic density of the square-free $n \leq x$ is $\delta < \frac{6}{\pi^2} < 1$, we see that

for "most" $n \leq x$, $C_n(n) = \Gamma(n)$!

Then by Binet's asymptotic expansion for the log-gamma function, for "most" of the $n \leq x$, $\log C_n(n) \ll n(n) \cdot \log \ln(n)$

So we can construct a good enough upper bound on $\Gamma_n(x)$ as follows:

$$\Gamma_n(x) \ll \sum_{n \leq x} n(n) \log \ln(n) \quad (\text{**})$$

We know that for $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies $x_n > 1$ for $n \geq 1$:

$$\sum_{n \leq x} x_n \leq \left(\sum_{n \leq x} x_n^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (\text{***})$$

let $L_n^*(x) := \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \log \zeta(n)$.

By (***) and the Landau-Schwarz inequalities, we have

$$L_n^*(x) \ll \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \zeta(n)^2 \right)^{1/2} \cdot L_2(x)$$

$$\ll L_2(x) \cdot \sum_{n \leq x} \zeta(n)^3 \cdot \frac{\zeta(2n)}{\zeta(2)}$$

$$\ll x \cdot (\log x)^{1/2} \cdot L_2(x)$$

where $L_2 := \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum \log \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)$



Smile Problem B.1

$$= 0.108198 \dots$$

- Finally, we just need to show that the remainder of $L_n^*(x)$ is sufficiently small.

- Recall a form of the AGM inequality for a sequence of $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\left(\prod_{1 \leq j \leq x} a_j \right)^{\frac{1}{x}} \leq \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \log(a_n).$$

- With $a_n := \mathcal{R}(n)$ for all $n \geq 1$:

$$\left(\prod_{j \leq x} \mathcal{R}(j) \right)^{\frac{1}{x}} \leq \text{Smile} \exp \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mathcal{R}(n) > \frac{3}{2}x}} \mathcal{R}(n) \right)$$

$\ll x \cdot \exp((\log x)^{1-\beta})$,
where $\beta := 1 - \varepsilon$

$$\ll x^{1 + \frac{1}{(\log x)^\beta}}$$

$$= x(1 + o(1)), \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty^*$$

(*4)

• Hence, by (*4), we see that

$$L_2(x) = o((\ell x)(\ell \ell x)).$$

• In total, we find that

$$\frac{1}{x} L_2(x) \ll \frac{(\ell x)(\ell \ell x)}{(\log x)^{1.108}}$$

• I conclude in response to your last comments over email that the p. of Thm. 1.2 is cogent.

• May we please now drop bickering over slicker proofs and try to work towards verifying that the rest of the paper is reasonably undersized?



—SmileDS



"Kush" is her
new cat bed
(gift from Mauna
to her grand-kitten
off Wayfair)

