

ON THE SCHNIRELMANN DENSITY OF M -FREE INTEGERS

V. Siva Rama Prasad and M. V. S. Bhramarambica

Osmania University, Hyderabad-500 007, India

(Submitted August 1987)

It is well known that a positive integer is said to be r -free ($r \geq 2$) if it contains no r^{th} power factor greater than 1. Let Q_r denote the set of all r -free integers. If the integers r and k are such that $2 \leq r < k$, an integer of the form $a^k b$, where a is any natural number and b is r -free is called a (k, r) -integer. The set of all (k, r) -integers is denoted by $Q_{k,r}$. The (k, r) -integers were introduced by Cohen [1] and by Subbarao & Harris [6], independently, under different notations. Observe that (∞, r) -integers are the r -free integers; therefore, the (k, r) -integers can be considered as generalized r -free integers.

The Schnirelmann density for a set, S , of positive integers is denoted by $D(S)$. That is,

$$D(S) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{S(n)}{n},$$

where $S(n)$ is the number of integers in S not exceeding n .

Using computational methods, Rogers [5] proved that $D(Q_2) = 53/88$. Duncan [2] showed, by elementary methods, that

$$D(Q_r) > 1 - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r}, \tag{1}$$

in which the summation is over all primes p . Later, Feng & Subbarao [3] established

$$D(Q_{k,r}) \geq a_{k,r}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$a_{k,r} = \zeta(k) \left(1 - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} \right) - \frac{1}{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} \right)^{k-1}, \tag{3}$$

in which $\zeta(k)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

Rieger [4] introduced M -free integers as follows: Suppose M is a set of positive integers with minimal element $r > 1$. A positive integer $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_t^{\alpha_t}$, where p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t are distinct primes, is said to be M -free if $\alpha_i \notin M$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$. The set of all M -free integers is denoted by Q_M .

If r, k are integers such that $2 \leq r < k$, write

$$A = \{r, r+1, r+2, \dots\},$$

$$B = \{n: n \geq r, n \equiv j \pmod{k} \text{ for some } j (r \leq j \leq k-1)\},$$

$$C = \{r\},$$

$$D = \{r, 2r, 3r, \dots\}.$$

Then observe that $Q_A = Q_r$; $Q_B = Q_{k,r}$, the set of all (k, r) -integers; $Q_C = S_r$, the set of all semi- r -free integers introduced by Suryanarayana [7]; and $Q_D = U_r$, the set of all unitarily r -free integers given by Cohen [1].

The object of this note is to obtain a lower bound for $D(Q_M)$. This bound improves (2) in the case $M = B$. In fact, we prove the following:

Theorem: $D(Q_M) \geq 1 - 2 \sum_p (p - 1) \sum_{\alpha \in M} p^{-\alpha-1}$.

Proof: If $Q_M(n)$ is the number of integers in Q_M not exceeding n , then

$$Q_M(n) \geq n - \sum_p \alpha_{M,n}(p), \tag{4}$$

where $\alpha_{M,n}(p)$ is the number of integers $m \leq n$ such that $p^\alpha \parallel m$ for some $\alpha \in M$. To count $\alpha_{M,n}(p)$, for each fixed $\alpha \in M$, we find the number of integers $m \leq n$ with $p^\alpha \mid m$ and $p^{\alpha+1} \nmid m$, and the latter number is

$$[n/p^\alpha] - [n/p^{\alpha+1}]$$

so that

$$\alpha_{M,n}(p) = \sum_{\alpha \in M} \left([n/p^\alpha] - [n/p^{\alpha+1}] \right) \leq \sum_{\alpha \in M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \left([n/p^\alpha] + 1 \right). \tag{5}$$

Now, from (4) and (5), we obtain

$$Q_M(n) \geq n - \sum_p \sum_{\alpha \in M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \left([n/p^\alpha] + 1 \right) \geq n - 2 \sum_p (p - 1) \sum_{\alpha \in M} n \cdot p^{-\alpha-1},$$

where the sum on the right side is over primes p with $p^\alpha \leq n$ for some $\alpha \in M$, which gives

$$\frac{Q_M(n)}{n} \geq 1 - 2 \sum_p (p - 1) \sum_{\alpha \in M} p^{-\alpha-1}.$$

Since this is also true when summed over all primes, the theorem follows.

Corollary: For $k > r \geq 2$, $D(Q_{k,r}) \geq b_{k,r}$, where

$$b_{k,r} = 1 - 2 \sum_p \frac{p^{k-r} - 1}{p^k - 1}.$$

Proof: Since

$$\sum_{\alpha \in B} p^{-\alpha-1} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{p^{m+k+j+1}} = \frac{p^{k-r} - 1}{(p - 1)(p^k - 1)}$$

and $Q_B = Q_{k,r}$, the Corollary follows from the Theorem.

Remark 1: For any $k > r \geq 2$, $a_{k,r} < b_{k,r}$. In fact, since

$$\begin{aligned} b_{k,r} &= 1 - 2 \sum_p \left(\frac{1}{p^r} - \frac{1}{p^k} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^k} \right)^{-1} \\ &= 1 - 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p^k} + \frac{1}{p^{2k}} + \dots \right) + 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^k} \right)^{-1} \\ &= 1 - 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} - 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{r+k}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^k} \right)^{-1} + 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^k} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} \right) - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} + 2 \sum_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^r} \right) \frac{1}{p^k - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3), it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^r}\right) \frac{1}{p^k - 1} > \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r} + \left(1 - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^r}\right) \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k}\right) \\ & = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k} + \left(\sum_p \frac{1}{p^r}\right) \left(1 - \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and this follows if we prove that

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k} - 2 \sum_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^r}\right) \frac{1}{p^k - 1} < \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k} - 1\right) \left(\sum_p \frac{1}{p^r}\right). \tag{6}$$

If $a_n = -1$ or 1 , according as $n = 1$ or $n > 1$, then $b_n = n^{k-r}$ or 0 , according as n is a prime or not and $c_n = [(n^r - 1)/(n^k - 1)]b_n$, so the inequality in (6) can be written as

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n^k} - 2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{c_n}{n^k} < \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n^k}\right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{n^k}\right). \tag{7}$$

But, by the multiplication of Dirichlet series, the right side of (7) is:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_n}{n^k}, \text{ where } d_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 1, \\ -p^{k-r} & \text{if } n = p, \text{ a prime,} \\ \sum_{\substack{p|n \\ p < n}} p^{k-r} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $d_n > a_n - 2c_n$ for all n , the inequality (7) holds; hence

$$a_{k,r} < b_{k,r}.$$

Thus, the Corollary improves (2). However, the inequality (1) gives a better lower bound for $D(Q_p)$ than the one obtained from the Theorem.

Remark 2: In the special cases of $Q_C = S_r$ and $Q_D = U_r$, defined earlier, the Theorem gives

$$D(S_r) \geq 1 - 2 \sum_p \frac{p-1}{p^{r+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad D(U_r) \geq 1 - 2 \sum_p \frac{p-1}{p(p^r-1)}.$$

The authors are grateful to the referee for helpful comments.

References

1. E. Cohen. "Some Sets of Integers Related to the k -Free Integers." *Acta Sci. Math.* (Szeged) 22 (1961):223-233.
2. R. L. Duncan. "The Schnirelmann Density of the k -Free Integers." *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16 (1965):1090-1091.
3. Y. K. Feng & M. V. Subbarao. "On the Density of (k, r) -Integers." *Pacific J. Math.* 38 (1971):613-618.
4. G. J. Rieger. "Einige Verteilungsfragen mit K -Leeren Zahlen, r -Zahlen und primzahlen." *J. Reine. Angew. Math.* 262/263 (1973):189-193.
5. K. Rogers. "The Schnirelmann Density of Squarefree Integers." *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 15 (1964):515-516.
6. M. V. Subbarao & V. C. Harris. "A New Generalization of Ramanujan's Sum." *J. London Math. Soc.* 41 (1966):595-604.
7. D. Suryanarayana. "Semi- k -Free Integers." *Elem. Math.* 26 (1971):39-40.