

June 17, 2009

Hi Kevin,

I mentioned before that I have what seems like a proof that almost none of the numbers  $\phi(pq)$  are in the range of  $\sigma$ . I now believe I have proofs of the following two additional theorems:

**Theorem A.** *For each fixed  $k \geq 1$ , a positive proportion of the totients of the form  $\phi(p_1 \cdots p_k)$  are not in the range of  $\sigma$ .*

**Theorem B.** *The number of totients  $\leq x$  not in the range of  $\sigma$  is at least*

$$\frac{x}{\log x} \exp((C + o(1))(\log_3 x)^2),$$

where  $C = 0.817\dots$  is the expected constant.

Of course Theorem B is too imprecise to say anything about the proportion of totients that are  $\sigma$ -values, but I think it's an interesting step in that direction. The proofs of Theorems A and B are based on the same idea, so I will only sketch what I have in mind for B. I haven't included all the details (such as the precise definition of 'normal prime' below) but hopefully it's enough to follow – please let me know if anything looks suspicious!

*Proof of Theorem B (sketch).* Put  $y = \exp((\log x)^{1/4})$ . Consider the integers  $m \leq x$  of the form

$$m = (p_0 - 1)T,$$

where  $p_0 > 2y$  and  $T < y$  is a totient with a not too abnormally large number of prime factors, say

$$\Omega(T) < 0.6 \log_2 x.$$

Note that each  $m$  constructed in this way is itself a totient. Lemma 2 from the 1976 Erdős–Hall paper guarantees that the number of distinct  $m$  is

$$\gg \frac{x}{\log x} \sum \frac{1}{T},$$

which from Maier–Pomerance (or your work) is at least

$$\frac{x}{\log x} \exp((C + o(1))(\log_3 x)^2).$$

(Here we use that  $\log_3 y$  is asymptotic to  $\log_3 x$ .) We claim that such an  $m$  is almost never a  $\sigma$ -value. In fact, the argument below shows that the number of such  $m$  that are  $\sigma$ -values is  $\ll x/(\log x)^{1+\delta}$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

Indeed, suppose  $m = \sigma(n)$ . Let  $q_0$  be the largest prime dividing  $n$ ; we can assume  $q_0 \geq x^{\frac{1}{10 \log_2 x}}$  and that  $q_0^2 \nmid n$ . Write

$$n = q_0 n',$$

and put  $S = \sigma(n')$ , so that

$$m = (p_0 - 1)T = (q_0 + 1)S. \tag{1}$$

I claim we can assume that  $S$  is small, say smaller than  $\exp((\log x)^{0.26})$ . We prove this claim in two steps: We bound the largest prime factor  $P(S)$  of  $S$  and then bound the total number  $\Omega(S)$  of prime factors of  $S$ .

First observe we can assume that each prime  $q$  exactly dividing  $n'$  is at most  $\exp((\log x)^{0.251})$ : Indeed, if there is a  $q$  which exceeds this bound, then it should be that the number of prime factors of  $\sigma(n)$  in

$$[\exp((\log x)^{0.25}), \exp((\log x)^{0.251})]$$

coming from  $q_0 + 1$  and  $q + 1$  exceeds the number of prime factors of  $(p_0 - 1)T$  in the same interval by about  $0.001 \log_2 x$  – otherwise either  $q_0 + 1$ ,  $q + 1$ , or  $p - 1$  is abnormal for a shifted prime. But then either  $m$  is a rare  $\sigma$ -value or  $m$  is a rare totient, and so we can assume that doesn't happen. In particular, for any  $q$  exactly dividing  $n'$ ,

$$P(\sigma(q)) = P(q + 1) \leq \max\{3, q\} \leq \exp((\log x)^{0.251}).$$

Moreover, we can assume that the squarefull part of  $n$  (and so *a fortiori*  $n'$ ) is smaller than  $(\log x)^2$ . Thus if  $q$  is a prime for which  $q^e \parallel n'$  with  $e > 1$ , then  $q^e \leq (\log x)^2$ , and so

$$P(\sigma(q^e)) \leq \sigma(q^e) \leq q^{2e} \leq (\log x)^4.$$

Hence

$$P(S) = \max_{q^e \parallel n'} P(\sigma(q^e)) \leq \max\{(\log x)^4, \exp((\log x)^{0.251})\} = \exp((\log x)^{0.251}).$$

We obviously have

$$\Omega(S) \leq \Omega(m) = \Omega(p_0 - 1) + \Omega(T) < 2 \log_2 x.$$

(Assuming, as we may, that  $p_0$  is normal in the appropriate sense, and using our assumption on  $\Omega(T)$ .) So

$$S \leq P(S)^{\Omega(S)} \leq \exp(2 \log_2 x (\log x)^{0.251}) < \exp((\log x)^{0.26}).$$

Now we are home free! We fix  $T, S \leq \exp((\log x)^{0.26})$  and count the number of corresponding  $p_0, q_0$  giving equality in (1). The usual sieve argument shows that the number of such  $p_0, q_0$  is

$$\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} \frac{(T, S)}{TS}.$$

Summing over all integers  $T, S$  in our range and using a trivial bound, we get

$$\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} ((\log x)^{0.26})^3 = \frac{x}{(\log x)^{1.22}}.$$

□

What do you think?

Best regards,  
Paul