

Mathematical Journal of Okayama University

Volume 17, Issue 2

1974

Article 1

JUNE 1975

On the true maximum order of a class of arithmetical functions

D. Suryanarayana*

R. Sita Rama Chandra Rao†

*Andhra University

†Andhra University

Copyright ©1974 by the authors. *Mathematical Journal of Okayama University* is produced by
The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress). <http://escholarship.lib.okayama-u.ac.jp/mjou>

ON THE TRUE MAXIMUM ORDER OF A CLASS OF ARITHMETICAL FUNCTIONS

D. SURYANARAYANA
and
R. SITA RAMA CHANDRA RAO

1. Introduction. Let $f(n)$ be an arithmetical function, which is positive and satisfies the condition that $f(n) = O(n^\beta)$ for some fixed $\beta > 0$. Define the arithmetical function $F(n)$ by setting $F(1) = 1$ and $F(n) = f(a_1) f(a_2) \cdots f(a_r)$ if $1 < n = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{a_i}$. The main object of this paper is to prove the following theorem which gives a useful and easy way of obtaining the "true maximum order" of $F(n)$.

Theorem. *We have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log F(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m}.$$

The usefulness of the theorem is illustrated in § 3 by applying it to some known divisor functions.

The condition on $f(n)$, namely $f(n) = O(n^\beta)$ for some fixed $\beta > 0$ assures us that $\sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m}$ (denoted throughout the rest of the paper by K_f) is finite. We assume throughout the paper that $K_f > 0$.

In 1958 A. A. Drozdova and G. A. Freiman [1] proved the following result, namely

$$(1.1) \quad \log F(n) \leq K_f \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{(\log \log n)^2 \log \log \log n}\right),$$

where $f(n) > 0$ and satisfies the condition that

$$f(n) = f(n-1) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right\}$$

and $F(n)$ is as defined above. It can be easily shown that any arithmetical function $f(n)$ satisfying their condition also satisfies our condition, namely $f(n) = O(n^\beta)$ for some fixed $\beta > 0$, so that our class of functions $f(n)$ is more rich than the class discussed by them. In fact, for the function $F(n) = \tau^{(\epsilon)}(n)$ defined in § 3, $f(n) = \cdot(n)$ which satisfies our condition, but not their condition (see Remark in § 3). Moreover, from (1.1), it

only follows that K_f is an upper bound of $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log F(n) \log \log n}{\log n}$, whereas our theorem shows that K_f is exactly equal to this limit superior.

2. Proof of the theorem. Throughout the following the letter p with or without suffixes denotes a prime number, p_r denotes the r -th prime, $\pi(x)$ denotes the number of primes $\leq x$, where x is a real variable ≥ 2 , and $\theta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$. In the proof of the theorem, we make use of the well-known result that there exists a positive constant $A < 1$ such that $\theta(x) > Ax$ (cf. [2; Theorem 414]).

We first prove that given $\epsilon > 0$, there are infinitely many positive integers n such that

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{\log F(n) \log \log n}{\log n} > K_f - \epsilon.$$

For this, choose an integer $l > 1$ such that $\frac{\log f(l)}{l} > K_f - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Such an integer l exists, since $K_f = \sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m}$. Putting $n_r = (2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots p_r)^l$, we have

$$F(n_r) = \{f(l)\}^r = \{f(l)\}^{\pi(p_r)}.$$

Also, $A p_r < \theta(p_r) = \frac{1}{l} \log n_r$ and $\pi(p_r) \log p_r \geq \theta(p_r) = \frac{1}{l} \log n_r$.

Hence

$$\log F(n_r) = \pi(p_r) \log f(l) \geq \frac{\log n_r}{\log p_r} \frac{\log f(l)}{l}.$$

But we have

$$\log A + \log p_r < \log \left(\frac{\log n_r}{l} \right) \leq \log \log n_r,$$

so that

$$\log p_r < \log \log n_r - \log A.$$

Hence

$$\log F(n_r) > \frac{\log n_r}{\log \log n_r - \log A} \frac{\log f(l)}{l}.$$

Now, since $\frac{\log f(l)}{l} > K_f - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $A < 1$, we have

$$\frac{\log F(n_r) \log \log n_r}{\log n_r} > \frac{\log \log n_r}{\log \log n_r - \log A} \left(K_f - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right) > K_f - \epsilon,$$

for $r \geq r_0(\epsilon)$. Hence (2.1) follows.

We next prove that given $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{\log F(n) \log \log n}{\log n} < (1 + \epsilon) K_f,$$

for all $n \geq N(\epsilon)$. For this, we choose a number δ such that $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ and a number η such that $0 < \eta < \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta}$. For $n \geq 3$, we define

$$\omega = \omega(n) = \frac{(1 + \delta)K_f}{\log \log n} \text{ and } \Omega = \Omega(n) = (\log n)^{1 - \eta}.$$

Then by the choice of η , we have

$$\Omega^\omega = e^{\omega \log \Omega} = e^{(1 - \eta)(1 + \delta)K_f} > e^{K_f}.$$

Now, if $n = \prod_{p|n} p^{a_p}$, then

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{F(n)}{n^\omega} = \prod_{p|n} \frac{f(a_p)}{p^{a_p \omega}} = \prod_{\substack{p \leq \Omega \\ p|n}} \frac{f(a_p)}{p^{a_p \omega}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{p > \Omega \\ p|n}} \frac{f(a_p)}{p^{a_p \omega}} = \Pi_1 \cdot \Pi_2,$$

say. Since

$$\Omega^\omega > e^{K_f} \text{ and } K_f \geq \frac{\log f(a_p)}{a_p},$$

we find that each factor in the product Π_2 is ≤ 1 , for

$$\frac{f(a_p)}{p^{a_p \omega}} < \frac{f(a_p)}{\Omega^{a_p \omega}} < \frac{f(a_p)}{e^{K_f a_p}} \leq 1.$$

Also, in the product Π_1 , since $f(n) = O(n^\beta)$, we have

$$\frac{f(a_p)}{p^{a_p \omega}} \leq \frac{f(a_p)}{2^{a_p \omega}} = \frac{f(a_p)}{e^{a_p \omega \log 2}} \leq \frac{B(a_p)^\beta}{(a_p \omega)^\beta} = \frac{B}{\omega^\beta},$$

where B is an absolute positive constant. Thus

$$\log \Pi_1 \leq \Omega \log \left(\frac{B}{\omega^\beta} \right) \sim \beta (\log n)^{1 - \eta} \log \log \log n = o \left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n} \right).$$

Hence by (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \log F(n) &= \omega \log n + \log \Pi_1 + \log \Pi_2 \\ &< \frac{(1 + \delta) K_f \log n}{\log \log n} + \frac{(\epsilon - \delta) K_f \log n}{\log \log n}, \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq N(\epsilon)$. Hence (2.2) follows.

Thus the theorem is completely proved.

3. Applications. First of all, let us apply the theorem to determine the "true maximum order" of $\tau(n)$, where $\tau(n)$ is the number of divisors

of the integer n . Let us take $f(n)=n+1$, then $F(n)=\tau(n)$. It is clear that $f(n)=O(n)$. Since

$$\sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m} = \sup_m \frac{\log (m+1)}{m} = \log 2,$$

in virtue of the theorem we have

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log 2.$$

This result is well known (f. [2; Theorem 317]).

Let us now take $f(n)=n$, then $F(n)=\alpha(n)$, where $\alpha(n)$ is the number of square-full divisors of n . A divisor d of n is called square-full, if a prime p divides d then p^2 also divides d (cf. [6]). In this case

$$\sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m} = \sup_m \frac{\log m}{m} = \frac{1}{3} \log 3.$$

Hence in virtue of the theorem, we have

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \alpha(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{3} \log 3.$$

Let us take $f(n)=\tau(n)$, then $F(n)=\tau^{(e)}(n)$, where $\tau^{(e)}(n)$ is the number of exponential divisors of n . A divisor $d = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{b_i}$ of $n = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{a_i}$ is called an exponential divisor of n , if $b_i | a_i$ for each i (cf. [3; p. 257]). Since $f(n) = \tau(n) < n$, the condition of the theorem is satisfied with $\beta=1$. In this case

$$\sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m} = \sup_m \frac{\log \tau(m)}{m} = \frac{1}{2} \log 2,$$

since $\tau(m) \leq 2^{m/2}$ for $m \geq 1$ and $\frac{\log \tau(2)}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \log 2$. Hence in virtue of the theorem, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau^{(e)}(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{2} \log 2.$$

This is a recently known result. A proof of this result due to P. Erdős may be found in [3; Theorem 6.2]. However, his proof is on different lines and is rather complicated (at least, not as straight forward as it is given here).

Remark. The function $f(n)=\tau(n)$ does not satisfy the condition laid down by A. A. Drozdova and G. A. Freĭman [1], namely $\frac{f(n)}{f(n-1)} = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, since $\frac{\tau(p)}{\tau(p-1)} \leq \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$ for every prime $p \geq 7$.

Let k be a fixed integer ≥ 2 . Let $\tau_k(n)$ denote the number of ordered k -tuples of positive integers, whose product equals n . Let $\theta_k(n)$ denote the number of ordered k -tuples of positive integers which are pairwise relatively prime and whose product equals n . Let $t_k(n)$ denote the number of ordered k -tuples of positive integers whose l. c. m. equals n . It is known (cf. [7; p. 5]) that

$$\tau_k(n) = \prod_{i=1}^r \binom{k+a_i-1}{a_i} \text{ if } n = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{a_i}$$

and (cf. [8; p. 587]) $\theta_k(n) = k^{\omega(n)}$, where $\binom{u}{v}$ is the binomial coefficient and $\omega(n)$ is the number of distinct prime factors of n . It can be easily shown that $\sum_{d|n} t_k(d) = (\tau(n))^k$, so that

$$t_k(n) = \prod_{i=1}^r \{(a_i+1)^k - a_i^k\} \text{ if } n = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{a_i}.$$

Let us now apply the theorem for the functions $\tau_k(n)$, $\theta_k(n)$ and $t_k(n)$. Taking $f(n) = \binom{k+n-1}{n}$, $f(n) = k$ and $f(n) = (n+1)^k - n^k$, we see that the condition of the theorem is satisfied with $\beta = k$, $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = k-1$ respectively. Also

$$\sup_m \frac{\log \binom{k+m-1}{m}}{m} = \log k,$$

since $\{\log \binom{k+m-1}{m}\} / m$ is monotonically decreasing for $m \geq 1$,

$$\sup_m \frac{\log k}{m} = \log k$$

and

$$\sup_m \frac{\log \{(m+1)^k - m^k\}}{m} = \log (2^k - 1).$$

Hence in virtue of the theorem, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \tau_k(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log k,$$

$$(3.5) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \theta_k(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log k$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log t_k(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log (2^k - 1).$$

As a particular case of (3.5) for $k=2$, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau^*(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log 2,$$

where $\tau^*(n)$ denotes the number of unitary divisors of n . By a unitary divisor of n , we mean as usual, a divisor d of n such that $(d, n/d)=1$.

Let us now take $f(n)=n$ if n is even and $f(n)=n+1$ if n is odd. Then $F(n)=\tau^{**}(n)$, where $\tau^{**}(n)$ is the number of bi-unitary divisors of n (cf. [5; §1]). By a bi-unitary divisor of n , we mean a divisor d of n such that $(d, n/d)^{**}=1$, where the symbol $(a, b)^{**}$ stands for the greatest unitary divisor of both a and b . In this case

$$\sup_m \frac{\log f(m)}{m} = \log 2.$$

Hence in virtue of the theorem, we have

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau^{**}(n) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log 2.$$

Similarly, we can establish the following results, by making use of the theorem :

$$(3.9) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau(n^k) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log(k+1),$$

$$(3.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau^{(e)}(n^k) \log \log n}{\log n} = \log \tau(k), \text{ if } k \geq 2,$$

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{\log \tau^{**}(n^k) \log \log n}{\log n} = \begin{cases} \log k, & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ \log(k+1), & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

It should be remarked that the result (3.8) and the result (3.11) in case $k=2$, were proved earlier by M. V. Subbarao and the first-named author (cf. [4; Theorem 3]) using the method adopted by P. Erdős in proving (3.3).

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. DROZDOVA and G. A. FREĪMAN : The estimation of certain arithmetic functions (in Russian). *Elabuž. Gos. Ped. Inst. Učen. Zap.* **3** (1958), 160—165. MR 40 #7213.
- [2] G. H. HARDY and E. M. WRIGHT : An introduction to the theory of numbers. 4th ed. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965
- [3] M. V. SUBBARAO : On some arithmetic convolutions. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol.

251. The theory of arithmetic functions. Springer-Verl., Berlin etc., 1972, pp. 247—271.
- [4] M. V. SUBBARAO and D. SURYANARAYANA : Arithmetical functions associated with the bi-unitary divisors of an integer. Abstract 71T-A241. Notices of the Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1971), 946.
- [5] D. SURYANARAYANA : The number of bi-unitary divisors of an integer. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **251**. The theory of arithmetic functions. Springer-Verl., Berlin etc., 1972, pp. 273—282.
- [6] D. SURYANARAYANA and R. SITA RAMA CHANDRA RAO : The number of square-full divisors of an integer. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **34** (1972), 79—80.
- [7] E. C. TITCHMARSH : The theory of the Riemann zeta function. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1951.
- [8] R. VAIDYANATHASWAMY : The theory of multiplicative arithmetical functions. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **33** (1931), 579—662.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,
ANDHRA UNIVERSITY,
WALTAIR, INDIA

(Received October 18, 1973)

Authors' remarks, added on July 18, 1975 at the time of proof correction: While the present paper was in the course of publication, the main theorem of this paper (in a more precise form) under yet weaker assumption, namely $f(n) = o(n/\log n)$ has been published by E. Heppner in Archiv der Mathematik **24** (1973), 63–66, under the title “Die maximale Ordnung primzahl-unabhängiger multiplikativer Funktionen”. However, our method of proof of the theorem is elementary and does not make use of the ‘Prime Number Theorem’ with or without an error term; where as E. Heppner’s proof is not as elementary as ours and moreover makes use of ‘Prime Number Theorem’ with an error term. We also remark that a proof of the result (3.2) has been published as Theorem 3 by J. Knopfmacher in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **40** (1973), 373–377, in his paper under the title “A prime-divisor function”. The main theorem with its proof as presented in this could be included in any of the forthcoming text books on Number Theory.