

Simultaneous Visibility in the Integer Lattice

Daniel Berend^{*†} Rishi Kumar[‡] Andrew Pollington[§]

Abstract

Two lattice points are visible from one another if there is no lattice point on the open line segment joining them. Let S be a finite subset of \mathbf{Z}^k . The asymptotic density of the set of lattice points, visible from all points of S , was studied by several authors. Our main result is an improved upper bound on the error term. We also find the Schnirelmann density of the set of visible points from some sets S . Finally, we discuss these questions from the point of view of ergodic theory.

1 Introduction and Statement of Results

Let \mathbf{Z}^k be the k -dimensional integer lattice, $k \geq 2$. Two distinct points $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ in \mathbf{Z}^k are *mutually visible* if no other point of \mathbf{Z}^k lies on the line segment joining them. It is easily seen [53] that \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are mutually visible if and only if $\gcd(x_1 - y_1, \dots, x_k - y_k) = 1$. In this paper, we deal with sets defined by various visibility conditions. The questions belong to a big body of questions relating to lattice points.

1.1 Visibility from the Origin

Dirichlet considered the “size” of the set V_2 of points visible from the origin in \mathbf{N}^2 . More precisely, the *asymptotic density* of a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}^k$, denoted by $D(A)$, is defined by

$$D(A) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k},$$

provided the limit exists. Dirichlet showed that $D(V_2) = 1/\zeta(2)$, where ζ is the Riemann zeta function. In fact, Dirichlet’s result was stated in terms of the function $\Phi(L) = \sum_{n=1}^L \varphi(n)$, where φ is Euler’s totient function, directly related to our problem since

$$|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2| = 2\Phi(L) - 1.$$

^{*}Departments of Mathematics and Computer Science, Ben-Gurion University, Beer Sheva 84105, Israel. E-mail: berend@math.bgu.ac.il

[†]Research supported in part by the Milken Families Foundation Chair in Mathematics.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Ben-Gurion University, Beer Sheva 84105, Israel. E-mail: kumar@post.bgu.ac.il

[§]National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA 22230, USA. E-mail: adpollin@nsf.gov

2020 **Mathematics Subject Classification:** Primary 11P21, 11N36, Secondary 37A44.

Key words and phrases. Simultaneous Visibility, Selberg’s Sieve, Schnirelmann Densities, unique ergodicity.

Denote:

$$E(L) = \Phi(L) - \frac{3}{\pi^2}L^2.$$

Dirichlet showed that the error $E(L)$ is bounded by $O(L^\delta)$ for some $1 < \delta < 2$ (see, for example, [15]). The error term has been improved later [38, 70], and the currently best known bound, due to Liu [35], is $O(L(\log L)^{2/3}(\log \log L)^{1/3})$. Pillai and Chowla [51] showed that, on the other hand,

$$E(L) = \Omega(L \log \log \log L),$$

and

$$\sum_{n=1}^L E(n) \sim \frac{3}{2\pi^2}L^2.$$

Sylvester [64, 65] conjectured that $E(L) > 0$ for all positive L . However, Sarma [57] observed that $E(820) < 0$, and Erdős and Shapiro [15] proved that $E(L)$ changes sign infinitely often and, moreover,

$$E(L) = \Omega_{\pm}(L \log \log \log \log L).$$

Currently, the best-known estimate in this direction, due to Montgomery [39], is

$$E(L) = \Omega_{\pm}(L\sqrt{\log \log L}). \tag{1}$$

Montgomery also conjectured that $E(L) = O(L \log \log L)$ and $E(L) = \Omega_{\pm}(L \log \log L)$.

Lehmer [33] extended Dirichlet's result to any dimension $k \geq 3$, showing that the asymptotic density of the set of points of \mathbf{N}^k , visible from the origin, is $1/\zeta(k)$. Nyman [48] bounded the error in this case by $O(L^{k-1})$. We note, however, that the proportion of visible points is not close to the asymptotic density for all large cubes. In fact, by a simple use of the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we can see that there exist arbitrarily large cubes in \mathbf{Z}^k , containing no points visible from $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ (see [3, Theorem 5.29]).

1.2 Simultaneous Visibility

Given a set $S \subseteq \mathbf{Z}^k$, denote by $V(S)$ the set of points of \mathbf{Z}^k , visible simultaneously from all points of S . The set S is *admissible* if every two points in S are mutually visible. Let S be an admissible set of cardinality r in \mathbf{Z}^k . Rearick [54] showed that $V(S, [1, L]^k) = |V(S) \cap [1, L]^k|$ is given by

$$V(S, [1, L]^k) = L^k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{r}{p^k}\right) + E(L), \tag{2}$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of all primes and the error term $E(L)$ satisfies:

$$E(L) = \begin{cases} O(L^{k-1}), & r < k - 1, \\ O(L^{k - \frac{k-1}{r} + \varepsilon}), \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, & r \geq k - 1. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Liu, Lu, and Meng [36] considered simultaneous visibility along curves. In some cases, their results, restricted to visibility along straight lines, improve Rearick's bound on the error (see also [9]).

Rumsey [55] dealt with the case where S is an arbitrary subset of \mathbf{Z}^k . Let

$$\pi_p : \mathbf{Z}^k \rightarrow (\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z})^k, \quad p \in \mathcal{P},$$

be the natural projection. Put:

$$s(p) = |\pi_p(S)|, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (4)$$

In the case when S is finite set, Rumsey [55] showed that

$$D(V(S)) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right). \quad (5)$$

He also generalized this result to the case of infinite sets S , satisfying appropriate conditions.

We continue with the same setup, and consider simultaneous visibility from any finite set of lattice points, not necessarily admissible. Unlike all previous studies, we do not confine ourselves to the set of visible points in a large cube $[1, L]^k$ starting at the origin. Rather, we consider visible points in any large box located anywhere. Thus, let

$$B = J_1 \times J_2 \times \cdots \times J_k, \quad (6)$$

be a box in \mathbf{Z}^k , where $J_i = [M_i, M_i + L_i)$ for some integers M_i and L_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $L_1 \geq \dots \geq L_k$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let S be a finite subset of \mathbf{Z}^k of cardinality r , and let B be as in (6) and $s(p)$ as in (4). Then the number of points of B , visible from S , satisfies, as $L_k = \min\{L_1, \dots, L_k\} \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$V(S, B) \leq L_1 \cdots L_k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right) + E, \quad (7)$$

where

$$E = \begin{cases} O(\max\{L_1 \log^{3r} L_2, (L_1 L_2)^{2/3+\varepsilon}\}), \forall \varepsilon > 0, & k = 2, \\ O(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1}), & k \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In particular, if $L_1 = L_2 = \dots = L_k = L$, then

$$V(S, B) \leq L^k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right) + E,$$

where

$$E = \begin{cases} O(L^{4/3+\varepsilon}), \forall \varepsilon > 0, & k = 2, \\ O(L^{k-1}), & k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1.2. For $k = 2$, if L_2 is not very small relative to L_1 , more precisely if $L_2 \geq L_1^{1/2}$, the maximum in the first line of (8) is attained by the second term, so that $E = O((L_1 L_2)^{2/3+\varepsilon})$. If L_2 is smaller, then $E = O(L_1 \log^{3r} L_2)$.

Note that, in (7), we have an inequality in one direction only. As mentioned above, $V(S, B)$ may even vanish for arbitrary large L_i -s. Comparing the upper bound in Theorem 1.1 with those of Rearick [54] and Liu et al. [36] (for admissible sets S of cardinality at least 2), where their results apply, we see that our results are better in some cases and equally good in others. The improvements are due to the method used. We use here the higher-dimensional Selberg sieve, whereas former papers used elementary methods.

As mentioned above, (7) cannot possibly have a counterpart with the direction of the inequality reversed, as there are always arbitrarily large boxes B for which $V(S, B) = 0$. We do believe, however, that (7) holds when inverting the direction of the inequality for “most” boxes. In particular, it seems plausible that the reverse inequality holds for cubes of the form $B = [1, L]^k$.

For $k \geq 3$, $S = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ and $B = [1, L]^k$, it readily follows from Takeda [66] that $E = \Omega(L^{k-1})$. We will show that the error may be both positive and negative.

1.3 Schnirelmann Density

One may also be interested in the Schnirelmann density of the set $V(S)$. Recall that the *Schnirelmann density* of a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ is given by:

$$\text{SD}(A) = \inf_{L \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{|A \cap [1, L]|}{L}.$$

(See [58]; for details on the Schnirelmann density we refer to [43].) Similarly, we can define the Schnirelmann density of a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}^k$ by:

$$\text{SD}(A) = \inf_{L \in \mathbf{N}} \frac{|A \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k}.$$

Later, we will discuss the Schnirelmann density of some sets of visible points. (We mention that, while for regular density it matters little whether we consider the set of visible points in \mathbf{N}^k or in \mathbf{Z}^k , when it comes to Schnirelmann density we will consider only \mathbf{N}^k .) We note that our interest in the Schnirelmann density of sets of visible points started from a question of Moser and Pach, posed in [41, Problem 64] (which is a forerunner of [7]). There they asked about an estimate and bounds for $\text{SD}(V_2)$. They raised a similar question regarding the set of points simultaneously visible from $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$.

The Schnirelmann density of a set is, in general, smaller than its regular density; as an extreme example, we have $D(\{2, 3, 4, \dots\}) = 1$, while $\text{SD}\{2, 3, 4, \dots\} = 0$. Calculating $|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2|$ for some values of L , one may be tempted to believe that $\text{SD}(V_2) = D(V_2)$. In fact, not until $L = 820$ does one get a square $[1, L]^2$ with $|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2| < L^2/\zeta(2)$ (see Sarma [57]). The following result shows that there are infinitely many counter-examples in every dimension.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $k \geq 2$, and let $V_k = V(\{(0, \dots, 0)\})$ be the set of points visible from the origin in \mathbf{N}^k . Then*

$$|V_k \cap [1, L]^k| = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + \Omega_{\pm}(L^{k-1}). \quad (9)$$

In particular, the Schnirelmann density of V_k is strictly below the regular density:

$$\text{SD}(V_k) < D(V_k), \quad k \geq 2. \quad (10)$$

Remark 1.4. For $k = 2$, it follows from (1) that the second term on the right-hand side of (9) may be replaced by $\Omega_{\pm}(L\sqrt{\log \log L})$. By Nymann's result [48], mentioned above, no such improvement is possible for $k \geq 3$. Still, for $k \geq 3$, the Ω_+ -direction of (9) may be made explicit as follows:

$$|V_k \cap [1, L]^k| = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + k \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(k)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k-1)} \right) L^{k-1} + \Omega_+(L^{k-1}).$$

See Remark 5.6 below for further details.

How does one calculate $\text{SD}(V_k)$ for a given k ? Theorem 1.3 guarantees that a finite computation will provide an L_0 such that

$$\frac{|V_k \cap [1, L_0]^k|}{L_0^k} < \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}.$$

Suppose we have an explicit lower bound on $\frac{|V_k \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}$, which goes to 0 as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Then the computation of $\text{SD}(V_k)$ becomes a finite problem. Indeed, we only need to compute $\frac{|V_k \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k}$ up to the point where the error becomes smaller in absolute value than $\left| \frac{|V_k \cap [1, L_0]^k|}{L_0^k} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} \right|$. We will apply this method to compute $\text{SD}(V_2)$ and $\text{SD}(V_3)$, as follows.

Proposition 1.5. For $k = 2$,

$$\text{SD}(V_2) = \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, 1276]^2|}{1276^2} = 0.60787\dots < 0.60792\dots = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} = D(V_2).$$

Proposition 1.6. For $k = 3$,

$$\text{SD}(V_3) = \frac{|V_3 \cap [1, 169170]^3|}{169170^3} = 0.831907366\dots < 0.831907372\dots = \frac{1}{\zeta(3)} = D(V_3).$$

What about $\text{SD}(V_4)$? By a computer program, we have verified that $\frac{|V_4 \cap [1, L]^4|}{L^4} > \frac{1}{\zeta(4)}$ for every $L \leq 10^9$. Pétermann [50] opined, based on his computations in [49], on which Lemma 5.5 below also hinges, that the smallest L for $\frac{|V_4 \cap [1, L]^4|}{L^4} < \frac{1}{\zeta(4)}$ may be of order of magnitude 10^{12} .

We can similarly deal with the abovementioned problem regarding simultaneous visibility in \mathbf{N}^2 .

Proposition 1.7. Consider the set $A = V(\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\})$ of points simultaneously visible from both $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ in \mathbf{N}^2 . Then

$$\text{SD}(A) = \frac{|A \cap [1, 7]^2|}{7^2} = \frac{15}{49} = 0.306\dots < 0.322\dots = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2} \right) = D(A).$$

Can one find algorithmically $\text{SD}(V(S))$ for a given set S ? It is possible to calculate $|V(S) \cap [1, L]^k|$ for larger and larger values of L . If an L_0 for which $|V(S) \cap [1, L_0]^k| < L_0^k \cdot D(V(S))$ is found, then it is possible in principle to calculate $\text{SD}(V(S))$. To this end, one needs to follow the proof of Theorem 1.1 in an effective way – replace all big oh estimates by estimates with an explicit constant. Let $E = D(V(S)) - |V(S) \cap [1, L_0]^k|/L_0^k$. Once this has been done, we can find an L_1 such that

$$\left| \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k} - D(V(S)) \right| < E, \quad L \geq L_1.$$

Calculating $|V(S) \cap [1, L]^k|$ for all $L < L_1$, we find $\text{SD}(V(S))$. However, as long as an L_0 as above is not found, we cannot apply this method. Moreover, even if we know that $\text{SD}(V(S)) < D(V(S))$, since we do not know how to bound L_0 from above and thus bound E from below, we do not have an algorithmic way to calculate $\text{SD}(V(S))$.

In the case of Propositions 1.5 and 1.6, we know beforehand by Theorem 1.3 that the Schnirelmann density is smaller than the regular density. In their proofs of these propositions, we found L_0 , bounded E from below, and applied the above method to calculate the Schnirelmann density. For other sets S , it might be the case that $\text{SD}(V(S)) = D(V(S))$. In such cases, our methods cannot be used to prove this equality.

A family of finite sets $S \subset \mathbf{Z}^k$, for which we trivially have $\text{SD}(V(S)) = D(V(S))$, is the family of sets for which $s(p) = p^k$ for some prime p ; in this case, $\text{SD}(V(S)) = D(V(S)) = 0$. In view of Theorem 1.3, and Propositions 1.5-1.7 above, Examples 8.1-8.4 and Tables 1, 2, 3 below, we raise

Conjecture 1.8. Let $S \subset \mathbf{Z}^k$ be any finite subset. If $D(V(S)) > 0$, then $\text{SD}(V(S)) < D(V(S))$.

1.4 Organization of the paper

In Section 2 we make some preparations towards the proofs. In Sections 3 and 4 make use of a higher-dimensional Selberg sieve to prove our main result. Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.3. Section 6 is devoted to the proofs of Propositions 1.5-1.7. In Section 7 we discuss the visibility problems from an ergodic theoretical viewpoint. Section 8 contains some numerical results and examples. In Section 9 we consider visibility within discs instead of cubes.

Acknowledgement. The authors express their gratitude to Y.-F. S. Pétermann and W. Takeda for lengthy correspondence regarding their papers [49] and [66]. We also thank the referee for the careful comments, which contributed a lot to the readability and organization of the paper.

2 Preliminaries

Recall that the Möbius function μ is defined on the set of positive integers by

$$\mu(d) = \begin{cases} 1, & d = 1, \\ (-1)^r, & d \text{ is a product of } r \text{ distinct primes,} \\ 0, & d \text{ is not square-free.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

If f is any multiplicative function, then

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) f(d) = \prod_{p|n} (1 - f(p)), \quad n \in \mathbf{N}. \quad (12)$$

In particular, taking $f \equiv 1$,

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 1, \\ 0, & n > 1. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

If two arithmetic functions f and g (not necessarily multiplicative) are related by

$$f(n) = \sum_{d|n} g(d), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

then by the Möbius inversion formula [3]

$$g(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) f(n/d), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let $D \subset \mathbf{N}$ be a divisor closed set (i.e., if $d \in D$ and $d'|d$, then $d' \in D$). If

$$f(n) = \sum_{n|d: d \in D} g(d),$$

then by the dual Möbius inversion formula (cf. [42, Theorem 1.2.3]),

$$g(n) = \sum_{n|d: d \in D} \mu(d/n) f(d)$$

(assuming all series are absolutely convergent).

If $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ are points of \mathbf{Z}^k , and m is a positive integer, we write $\mathbf{x} \equiv \mathbf{y} \pmod{m}$ to indicate that $x_i \equiv y_i \pmod{m}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. The condition that two distinct points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ are mutually visible is equivalent to:

$$\mathbf{x} \not\equiv \mathbf{y} \pmod{p}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

If $\mathbf{x} \equiv \mathbf{y} \pmod{p}$, then \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} are *p-invisible* from each other. (We should exclude the case $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, but this is relevant only to some fixed number of points, and we will ignore it.) Let S be a finite subset of \mathbf{Z}^k . A point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ is *p-invisible* from S if it is *p-invisible* from some point of S . For a square-free integer $d = p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_t}$, with $p_{i_j} \in \mathcal{P}$ for $1 \leq j \leq t$, a point \mathbf{x} is *d-invisible* from S if it is *p_{i_j}-invisible* from S for every $1 \leq j \leq t$. (Note that the points of S from which \mathbf{x} is *p_{i_j}-invisible* may be distinct for distinct *j*-s.) Let B be as in (6). Denote by I_d the set of points $\mathbf{x} \in B$, that are *d-invisible* from S . Then

$$I_d = I_{p_{i_1}} \cap I_{p_{i_2}} \cap \dots \cap I_{p_{i_t}}.$$

The function s in (4) is defined on \mathcal{P} only. We extend it to a multiplicative function on the set of square-free integers by

$$s(d) = \prod_{p|d} s(p), \quad d \in \mathbf{N}, \mu(d) \neq 0, \quad (14)$$

(and $s(1) = 1$).

Lemma 2.1. For square-free d ,

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \left\lfloor \frac{L_i}{d} \right\rfloor s(d) \leq |I_d| \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \left\lceil \frac{L_i}{d} \right\rceil s(d),$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ are the floor and the ceiling functions, respectively.

Proof. For each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, let S_p be a subset of size $s(p)$ of S , consisting of points which are mutually non-congruent modulo p . Let $d = p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_t}$. A point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ is d -invisible from S if

$$\mathbf{x} \equiv \mathbf{x}_j \pmod{p_{i_j}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq t, \quad (15)$$

for some points $\mathbf{x}_j \in S_{p_{i_j}}$, $1 \leq j \leq t$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, for every choice of \mathbf{x}_j -s, the system of congruences (15) has a unique solution modulo d . Therefore, every box of the form $[N_1, N_1 + d) \times \cdots \times [N_k, N_k + d) \subset B$ for some integers N_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, contains exactly one point satisfying (15). Hence for each choice of \mathbf{x}_j -s, the number of points in B satisfying (15) is between $\prod_{i=1}^k \lfloor \frac{L_i}{d} \rfloor$ and $\prod_{i=1}^k \lceil \frac{L_i}{d} \rceil$. Now the number of essentially distinct choices of $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t$ in (15) is $s(p_{i_1})s(p_{i_2}) \cdots s(p_{i_t}) = s(d)$, and the sets of solutions of congruences are pairwise disjoint for distinct $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t$. This proves the lemma. \square

3 Applying Selberg's Sieve Method

The classical Selberg sieve method is usually used to obtain estimates on the size of certain sets of positive integers, defined by some congruence conditions. Here we use this machinery to deal with our sets of visible points. We note that the idea of using the sieve for higher-dimensional sets was mentioned already by Selberg and used for other problems (see, for example, [37, 52, 59, 68]). For the sake of self-containedness, we present the development of the tool in this case, following [18, 42].

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$|I_d| = \frac{L_1 \cdots L_k}{d^k} s(d) + R_d, \quad (16)$$

where

$$R_d = O \left(s(d) \cdot \left(\frac{L_1 \cdots L_{k-1}}{d^{k-1}} + \frac{L_1 \cdots L_{k-2}}{d^{k-2}} + \cdots + \frac{L_1}{d} + 1 \right) \right). \quad (17)$$

For a positive real number z , set

$$P(z) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p < z} p.$$

Denote by

$$V(S, B, z) = |\{\mathbf{x} \in B : (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}, P(z)) = 1, \mathbf{a} \in S\}| \quad (18)$$

the number of points $\mathbf{x} \in B$, such that $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a} \not\equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p}$ for all primes $p < z$ and $\mathbf{a} \in S$. Here, for $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ and $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we denote $(\mathbf{b}, m) = \gcd(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k, m)$.

By inclusion-exclusion

$$V(S, B, z) = \sum_{d|P(z)} \mu(d) |I_d| = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \left(\sum_{d|P(z): \mathbf{x} \in I_d} \mu(d) \right). \quad (19)$$

Let $(\lambda_d)_{d=1}^{\infty}$ be any sequence of real numbers such that $\lambda_1 = 1$. We claim that

$$V(S, B, z) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \left(\sum_{d|P(z): \mathbf{x} \in I_d} \lambda_d \right)^2. \quad (20)$$

Indeed, each $\mathbf{x} \in B$ contributes 1 to the left-hand side if $(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}, P(z)) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in S$ and contributes 0 otherwise. Since $\lambda_1 = 1$, the contribution of \mathbf{x} , with $(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}, P(z)) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in S$, to the right-hand side is also 1. As the contribution of other points \mathbf{x} to the right-hand side is certainly non-negative, this proves (20).

Interchanging the order of summation in (20), we obtain

$$V(S, B, z) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \left(\sum_{d_1, d_2 | P(z): \mathbf{x} \in I_{[d_1, d_2]}} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} \right) = \sum_{d_1, d_2 | P(z)} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} |I_{[d_1, d_2]}|, \quad (21)$$

where $[d_1, d_2]$ denotes the least common multiple of d_1 and d_2 . By (16) and (21):

$$\begin{aligned} V(S, B, z) &\leq L_1 \cdots L_k \sum_{d_1, d_2 | P(z)} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} \frac{s([d_1, d_2])}{[d_1, d_2]^k} + O \left(\sum_{d_1, d_2 | P(z)} |\lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2}| |R_{[d_1, d_2]}| \right) \\ &= L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot \Sigma_1 + O(\Sigma_2). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Selberg's idea was to choose λ_d for $d \geq 2$ in such a way that the expression on the right-hand side of (22) will become as small as possible. To keep Σ_2 small, we take

$$\lambda_d = 0, \quad d \geq z. \quad (23)$$

The remaining λ_d , for $2 \leq d < z$ with $d | P(z)$, are chosen so as to minimize the quadratic form Σ_1 . Define a multiplicative function g by

$$g(d) = \frac{s(d)}{d^k \prod_{p|d} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right)}, \quad d \in \mathbf{N}, \mu(d) \neq 0. \quad (24)$$

Note that

$$1 + \frac{1}{g(p)} = 1 + \frac{p^k - s(p)}{s(p)} = \frac{p^k}{s(p)}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (25)$$

Since s is multiplicative, for square-free d_1 and d_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s([d_1, d_2])}{[d_1, d_2]^k} &= \frac{s(d_1)}{d_1^k} \cdot \frac{s(d_2)}{d_2^k} \cdot \frac{(d_1, d_2)^k}{s((d_1, d_2))} \\ &= \frac{s(d_1)}{d_1^k} \cdot \frac{s(d_2)}{d_2^k} \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p|(d_1, d_2)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{g(p)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1 &= \sum_{d_1, d_2 < z: d_1, d_2 | P(z)} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} \frac{s(d_1)}{d_1^k} \cdot \frac{s(d_2)}{d_2^k} \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p|(d_1, d_2)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{g(p)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{d_1, d_2 < z: d_1, d_2 | P(z)} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} \frac{s(d_1)}{d_1^k} \cdot \frac{s(d_2)}{d_2^k} \sum_{d|(d_1, d_2)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \\
&= \sum_{d < z: d | P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \sum_{d_1, d_2 < z: d_1, d_2 | P(z), d|(d_1, d_2)} \lambda_{d_1} \lambda_{d_2} \frac{s(d_1)}{d_1^k} \cdot \frac{s(d_2)}{d_2^k} \\
&= \sum_{d < z: d | P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \left(\sum_{l < z: l | P(z), d|l} \lambda_l \frac{s(l)}{l^k} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, under the transformation

$$u_d = \sum_{l < z: l | P(z), d|l} \lambda_l \frac{s(l)}{l^k}, \quad (26)$$

the quadratic form Σ_1 is reduced to a diagonal form:

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{d < z: d | P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} u_d^2. \quad (27)$$

By the dual Möbius inversion formula, (26) yields

$$\lambda_d \frac{s(d)}{d^k} = \sum_{l < z: l | P(z), d|l} \mu(l/d) u_l. \quad (28)$$

Since $\lambda_d = 0$ for $d \geq z$ and $\lambda_1 = 1$, we obtain

$$u_l = 0, \quad l \geq z, \quad (29)$$

and

$$\sum_{l < z: l | P(z)} \mu(l) u_l = \lambda_1 = 1. \quad (30)$$

Put

$$G(z) = \sum_{d < z} \mu^2(d) g(d) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p < z} (1 + g(p)), \quad (31)$$

and

$$G_k(z) = \sum_{d < z: (d, k) = 1} \mu^2(d) g(d) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p < z, (p, k) = 1} (1 + g(p)), \quad k \in \mathbf{N}. \quad (32)$$

By (27), (29) and (30):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \left(u_d - \frac{\mu(d)g(d)}{G(z)} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \left(u_d^2 + \mu^2(d)g^2(d) \frac{1}{G^2(z)} - 2\mu(d)u_d g(d) \frac{1}{G(z)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} u_d^2 + \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \mu^2(d)g(d) \frac{1}{G^2(z)} - 2 \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \mu(d)u_d \frac{1}{G(z)} \\
&= \Sigma_1 + \frac{1}{G(z)} - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{G(z)} \\
&= \Sigma_1 - \frac{1}{G(z)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{d < z: d|P(z)} \frac{1}{g(d)} \left(u_d - \frac{\mu(d)g(d)}{G(z)} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{G(z)}. \quad (33)$$

Since $g(p) > 0$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we infer from (33) that the minimal value of Σ_1 is $\frac{1}{G(z)}$, and is attained for

$$u_d = \frac{\mu(d)g(d)}{G(z)}, \quad d < z, \mu(d) \neq 0. \quad (34)$$

By (25), (28) and (34), for square-free $d < z$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_d &= \frac{d^k}{s(d)} \sum_{l < z: l|P(z), d|l} \mu(l/d) \frac{\mu(l)g(l)}{G(z)} = \frac{d^k}{s(d)} \sum_{t < \frac{z}{d}: t|P(z), (d,t)=1} \mu(t) \mu(dt) \frac{g(dt)}{G(z)} \\
&= \frac{d^k}{s(d)} \sum_{t < \frac{z}{d}: t|P(z), (d,t)=1} \mu^2(t) \mu(d) \frac{g(t)g(d)}{G(z)} = \mu(d)g(d) \frac{d^k}{s(d)} \frac{G_d(z/d)}{G(z)} \\
&= \mu(d)g(d) \prod_{p|d} \left(1 + \frac{1}{g(p)} \right) \frac{\prod_{p < z/d: (p,d)=1} (1 + g(p))}{\prod_{p < z} (1 + g(p))} \\
&= \mu(d) \prod_{p|d} (1 + g(p)) \frac{\prod_{p < z/d: (p,d)=1} (1 + g(p))}{\prod_{p < z} (1 + g(p))} \\
&= \mu(d) \frac{1}{\prod_{z/d \leq p < z: (p,d)=1} (1 + g(p))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $|\lambda_d| \leq |\mu(d)| = 1$ for every square-free $d < z$. It is easy to see that

$$|\{(d_1, d_2) : [d_1, d_2] = d\}| = 3^{\omega(d)}, \quad \mu(d) \neq 0,$$

where $\omega(d)$ is the number of prime divisors of d . Therefore, we arrive at

$$\Sigma_2 \leq \sum_{d_1, d_2 | P(z)} |R_{[d_1, d_2]}| \leq \sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} 3^{\omega(d)} |R_d|. \quad (35)$$

By (17) and (35):

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2 &\leq O\left(\sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} 3^{\omega(d)} s(d) \cdot \left(\frac{L_1 \cdots L_{k-1}}{d^{k-1}} + \frac{L_1 \cdots L_{k-2}}{d^{k-2}} + \cdots + \frac{L_1}{d} + 1\right)\right) \\ &= O\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} L_1 \cdots L_j \cdot \prod_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + \frac{3s(p)}{p^j}\right) + \sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} 3^{\omega(d)} s(d)\right).\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

For $j \geq 2$, the product $\prod_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + \frac{3s(p)}{p^j}\right)$ is bounded. For $j = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + \frac{3s(p)}{p}\right) &\leq \prod_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + \frac{3r}{p}\right) \leq \prod_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} \exp(3r/p) \\ &= \exp\left(3r \sum_{p < z: p \in \mathcal{P}} 1/p\right) = \exp(3r \log \log z + O(1)) \\ &= O(\log^{3r} z),\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

where the second last equality follows from [3, Theorem 4.12]. By [56], the function ω is bounded as follows:

$$\omega(d) \leq \frac{2 \log d}{\log \log d}, \quad d \geq 3.\tag{38}$$

Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large d :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} 3^{\omega(d)} s(d) &\leq \sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} (3r)^{\omega(d)} \leq \sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} (3r)^{\frac{2 \log d}{\log \log d}} \\ &\leq \sum_{d < z^2: d|P(z)} d^\varepsilon \leq z^{2+\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

Hence, by (36), (37), and (39):

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_2 &= O\left(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1} + L_1 \cdots L_{k-2} + \cdots + L_1 L_2 + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= O\left(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1} + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

4 Conclusion of the Proof of Theorem 1.1

Denote:

$$G = \sum_{d \in \mathbf{N}} \mu^2(d) g(d).\tag{41}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}G &= \sum_{d \in \mathbf{N}} \mu^2(d) \frac{s(d)}{d^k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p|d} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right)} \\ &= \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + \frac{s(p)}{p^k - s(p)}\right) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{p^k}{p^k - s(p)},\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{G} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right). \quad (42)$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{G(z)} - \frac{1}{G} &= \frac{1}{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p < z} (1 + g(p))} - \frac{1}{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (1 + g(p))} \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (1 + g(p))} \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p \geq z} (1 + g(p)) - 1 \right) \\ &= O \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p \geq z} (1 + g(p)) \right) = O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \mu^2(d) g(d) \right) = O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} g(d) \right) \\ &= O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \frac{s(d)}{d^k \prod_{p|d} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right)} \right) = O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \frac{s(d)}{d^k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right)} \right) \\ &= O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \frac{s(d)}{d^k} \right) = O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \frac{r^{\omega(d)}}{d^k} \right) \\ &= O \left(\sum_{d \geq z} \frac{d^\varepsilon}{d^k} \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{z^{k-1-\varepsilon}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

By (22), (33), (34), (40), (42), and (43):

$$\begin{aligned} V(S, B, z) &\leq \frac{L_1 \cdots L_k}{G(z)} + O(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1} + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}) \\ &= L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right) + L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot O \left(\frac{1}{z^{k-1-\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &\quad + O(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1} + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}) \\ &= L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right) \\ &\quad + \begin{cases} O(L_1 L_2 \cdot \frac{1}{z^{1-\varepsilon}} + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}), & k = 2, \\ O(L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot \frac{1}{z^{k-1-\varepsilon}} + L_1 \cdots L_{k-1} + L_1 \log^{3r} z + z^{2+\varepsilon}), & k > 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

For $k = 2$, the candidates for the optimal choice of z are those values of z which make two of the three terms $E_{2,1} = \frac{L_1 L_2}{z^{1-\varepsilon}}$, $E_{2,2} = L_1 \log^{3r} z$, and $E_{2,3} = z^{2+\varepsilon}$ equal (up to a big oh factor). The possibility $E_{2,1} = E_{2,2}$ implies $z \simeq L_2^{1+\varepsilon}$, the error in (44) being $O(L_1 \log^{3r} L_2 + L_2^{2+\varepsilon})$. The possibility $E_{2,1} = E_{2,3}$ implies $z \simeq (L_1 L_2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, and the error in (44) is $O(L_1 \log^{3r}(L_1) + (L_1 L_2)^{\frac{2}{3}+\varepsilon})$. The possibility $E_{2,2} = E_{2,3}$ implies $z \simeq L_1^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$, and the error in (44) is $O(L_1^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} L_2 + L_1 \log^{3r} L_1)$. A routine calculation shows that the error is in any case $O(\max\{(L_1 L_2)^{2/3+\varepsilon}, L_1 \log^{3r} L_2\})$.

For $k = 3$ we readily verify that, by choosing $z = L_k^{3/(2(k-1))}$, we make all addends in the error term dominated by $L_1 \cdots L_{k-1}$.

Altogether,

$$V(S, B) \leq L_1 \cdots L_k \cdot \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right) + \begin{cases} O\left(\max\{(L_1 L_2)^{2/3+\varepsilon}, L_1 \log^{3r} L_2\}\right), & k = 2, \\ O(L_1 \cdots L_{k-1}), & k > 2, \end{cases}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Recall that, for a positive integer k , the *Jordan totient function* J_k is defined by:

$$J_k(n) = n^k \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}: p|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^k}\right), \quad n \geq 1.$$

An alternative expression for $J_k(n)$ is:

$$J_k(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)^k, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (45)$$

We agree that

$$J_0(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & n = 1, \\ 0, & n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Note that J_1 is Euler's totient function φ . (For more on J_k , we refer, for example, to [13].) For $k \geq 1$ and $m \geq 1$, denote:

$$E_{k,i,m} = V_k \cap \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \mid x_i = m = \max\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \quad (46)$$

A point (x_1, \dots, x_k) with $x_i = m$ is visible if and only if some prime divisor of m divides also $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k$. Let $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_e\}$ be the set of prime divisors of m . For a set $R \subseteq Q$, denote by $I(R)$ the set of points $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, m, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k) \in [1, m]^k$ such that $q \mid x_j$ for every $q \in R$ and every j . Clearly,

$$|I(R)| = m^{k-1} \prod_{q \in R} \frac{1}{q^{k-1}}.$$

By inclusion-exclusion and (46)

$$E_{k,i,m} = \sum_{R \subseteq Q} (-1)^{|R|} |I(R)| = m^{k-1} \sum_{R \subseteq Q} (-1)^{|R|} \prod_{q \in R} \frac{1}{q^{k-1}} = J_{k-1}(m), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, m \geq 1.$$

This clearly implies that

$$\left| \bigcap_{j=1}^r E_{k,i_j,m} \right| = J_{k-r}(m), \quad 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r \leq k.$$

We have

$$V_k \cap [1, L]^k = \bigcup_{m=1}^L \bigcup_{i=1}^k E_{k,i,m},$$

where the external union is disjoint. By the inclusion-exclusion principle

$$\begin{aligned} |V_k \cap [1, L]^k| &= \sum_{m=1}^L \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |E_{k,i,m}| - \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq k} \left| \bigcap_{j=1}^2 E_{k,i_j,m} \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \cdots + (-1)^{k-1} \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^k E_{k,i,m} \right| \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^L \left(k J_{k-1}(m) - \binom{k}{2} J_{k-2}(m) + \cdots + (-1)^{k-1} \binom{k}{k} J_0(m) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Lemma 5.1. For $k \geq 3$,

$$k \sum_{m=1}^L J_{k-1}(m) = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + E_k(L),$$

where

$$E_k(L) = \frac{k}{2} \cdot \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} - k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\} + O(L^{k-2} \log L).$$

Remark 5.2. In [2, Lemma 3.3] and [66, Lemma 4.2], very similar expressions have been obtained, and we could have used their calculations to shorten our proof. However, for self-containedness, we provide a full proof.

Remark 5.3. Erdős and Shapiro's [15] result, mentioned in the introduction, is that the error $E_k(L)$ in the lemma changes sign infinitely often for $k = 2$. However, Adhikari [2, Theorem 3] showed that $E_k(L)$ is eventually positive for $k \geq 3$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. By (45):

$$k \sum_{m=1}^L J_{k-1}(m) = k \sum_{m=1}^L \sum_{d|m} \mu(d) \left(\frac{m}{d} \right)^{k-1} = k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \sum_{q=1}^{\lfloor L/d \rfloor} q^{k-1}. \quad (48)$$

By [63],

$$\sum_{q=1}^{\lfloor L/d \rfloor} q^{k-1} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} B_j \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-j}, \quad (49)$$

where $B_0(=1), B_1(=1/2), B_2, \dots$, are the Bernoulli numbers. From (48) and (49),

$$k \sum_{m=1}^L J_{k-1}(m) = \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} B_j \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-j}.$$

We split the inner sum on the right-hand side into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
k \sum_{m=1}^L J_{k-1}(m) &= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^k + \frac{k}{2} \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} B_j \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-j} \\
&= S_1 + S_2 + S_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

First, we deal with S_3 . Take a constant C_k for which:

$$\left| \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} B_j \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-j} \right| \leq C_k \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-2}, \quad d \leq L.$$

We have:

$$|S_3| \leq \sum_{d=1}^L \left| \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} B_j \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^{k-j} \right| \leq C_k \sum_{d=1}^L \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-2} = O(L^{k-2} \log L). \tag{51}$$

(The logarithmic factor is actually required only for $k = 3$.) Now rewrite S_1 in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left[\frac{L}{d} \right]^k = \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} - \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\} \right)^k \\
&= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-j} \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\}^j \\
&= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^k - k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \sum_{j=2}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-j} \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\}^j \\
&= S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{13}.
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Similarly to (51), we show that

$$S_{13} = O(L^{k-2} \log L). \tag{53}$$

For S_{11} :

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{11} &= \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^k - \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^k \\
&= \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + O \left(L^k \int_L^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^k} dx \right) \\
&= \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + O(L).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

By (52), (53) and (54):

$$S_1 = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} - k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d}\right)^{k-1} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} + O(L^{k-2} \log L) \quad (55)$$

Now S_2 is (except for the additional $k/2$ factor) the same as S_1 , with k replaced by $k-1$. Hence the same calculations yield:

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \frac{k}{2} \cdot \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} - \frac{k(k-1)}{2} \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d}\right)^{k-2} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} + O(L^{k-3} \log L) \\ &= \frac{k}{2} \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} + O(L^{k-2} \log L). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

From (50), (51), (55) and (56) we obtain

$$k \sum_{m=1}^L J_{k-1}(m) = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + \frac{k}{2} \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} - k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d}\right)^{k-1} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} + O(L^{k-2} \log L), \quad (57)$$

as required. \square

Lemma 5.4. [66, Lemma 4.1] *For every $k \geq 3$, there exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(k) > 0$, such that*

$$M(L) = \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} < -\varepsilon$$

for infinitely many positive integers L .

Lemma 5.5. [49, p. 318] *For every $k \geq 3$, there exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(k) > 0$, such that*

$$m(L) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} > \varepsilon \quad (58)$$

for infinitely many positive integers L .

Note that Lemma 5.5 holds also if we take the sum in (58) up to L instead of ∞ , namely replace $m(L)$ by $M(L)$. In fact, this follows readily from:

$$|m(L) - M(L)| = \left| \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \left\{\frac{L}{d}\right\} \right| \leq \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{d^{k-1}} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (59)$$

Therefore

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} m(L) = \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L) \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} m(L) = \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L). \quad (60)$$

It follows from (47) and Lemma 5.1 that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_k \cap [1, L]^k| &= \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + E_k(L) - \binom{k}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{k-1} \left(\frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} + E_{k-1}(L) \right) \\
&\quad + \dots + (-1)^{k-1} \binom{k}{k} \\
&= \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + \frac{k}{2} \cdot \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} - k \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\} \\
&\quad - \binom{k}{2} \frac{1}{k-1} \cdot \frac{L^{k-1}}{\zeta(k-1)} + O(L^{k-2} \log L) \\
&= \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} - kM(L)L^{k-1} + O(L^{k-2} \log L).
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

By Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5,

$$|V_k \cap [1, L]^k| = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + \Omega_{\pm}(L^{k-1}),$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Remark 5.6. We have claimed in Remark 1.4 that

$$|V_k \cap [1, L]^k| = \frac{L^k}{\zeta(k)} + k \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(k)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k-1)} \right) L^{k-1} + \Omega_{+}(L^{k-1}).$$

Indeed, denote

$$h_k(L) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{L}{d} \right\} \right), \quad k \geq 3. \tag{62}$$

By [49, p. 311] (see also [2]),

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_k}{kL^{k-1}} = \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_k(L) - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}. \tag{63}$$

By (60) and (62)

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_k(L) &= \frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} - \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} m(L) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} - \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L),
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

which using (63), implies that

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_k}{kL^{k-1}} = \frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} - \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L) - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}. \tag{65}$$

By Lemma 5.1,

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_k}{kL^{k-1}} = \frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} - \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L). \tag{66}$$

By [49, Theorem 2],

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_k}{kL^{k-1}} = -\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_k}{kL^{k-1}}. \quad (67)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} - \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L) - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} = -\frac{1}{2\zeta(k-1)} + \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L),$$

so that

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k-1)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} - \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} M(L). \quad (68)$$

From Lemma 5.5, (60) and (68), it follows that there exist an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $M(L) < \frac{1}{\zeta(k-1)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} - \varepsilon$ for infinitely many L . Hence our claim follows from (61).

6 Schnirelmann Densities

Proof of Proposition 1.5. As explained before the statement of the proposition, the main thing we need is an effective lower bound on the difference $\frac{|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} - \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$. One can probably derive such a bound from any of the papers dealing with $D(V_2)$, mentioned in Section 1. Here we show it directly, similarly to the calculations in the proof of Lemma 5.1. For an arbitrary fixed L , denote by θ_d the fractional part of L/d . From (47):

$$\begin{aligned} |V_2 \cap [1, L]^2| &= \sum_{n=1}^L 2J_1(n) - \sum_{n=1}^L J_0(n) = 2 \sum_{n=1}^L \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \cdot \frac{n}{d} - 1 \\ &= 2 \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(1 + 2 + \cdots + \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor \right) - 1 \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor \left(\left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) - 1 \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} - \theta_d \right) \left(\frac{L}{d} + 1 - \theta_d \right) - 1 \\ &= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\left(\frac{L}{d} \right)^2 + (1 - 2\theta_d) \frac{L}{d} - \theta_d(1 - \theta_d) \right) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} &= \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d} (1 - 2\theta_d) - \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \theta_d (1 - \theta_d) - \frac{1}{L^2} \\
&= \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} - \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d} (1 - 2\theta_d) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \theta_d (1 - \theta_d) - \frac{1}{L^2} \\
&\geq \frac{6}{\pi^2} - \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{d(d-1)} + \frac{1}{L} - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{d=2}^L \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{L^2} \\
&= \frac{6}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{d=2}^L \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{4L} - \frac{1}{L^2} \geq \frac{6}{\pi^2} - \frac{\log L}{L}, \quad L \geq 9.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

As mentioned in Section 1, for $L_0 = 820$, the error is actually negative (and L_0 is the smallest number with this property). The error there is:

$$E = \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, 820]^2|}{820^2} - \frac{6}{\pi^2} = -0.000028 \dots$$

The bound $\frac{\log L}{L}$ on the error decreases as L increases. For $L = 5 \cdot 10^5$ we have

$$\frac{\log L}{L} = 0.000026 \dots < |E|.$$

A simple program, run on Mathematica, yields:

$$\text{SD}(V_2) = \min_{820 \leq L \leq 5 \cdot 10^5} \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} = \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, 1276]^2|}{1276^2} = 0.607877 \dots$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1.6. For arbitrary fixed L ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_3 \cap [1, L]^3| &= \sum_{m=1}^L 3J_2(m) - \sum_{m=1}^L 3J_1(m) + \sum_{m=1}^L J_0(m) \\
&= 3 \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor^2 \right) \\
&\quad - 3 \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(1 + 2 + \dots + \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor \left(\left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \left(2 \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 3 \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor \left(\left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \right) + 1 \\
&= \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) \left(\left(\frac{L}{d} - \theta_d \right)^3 - \left(\frac{L}{d} - \theta_d \right) \right) + 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|V_3 \cap [1, L]^3|}{L^3} &= \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d^3} - \frac{3}{L} \cdot \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \theta_d + \frac{1}{L^2} \cdot \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d} (3\theta_d^2 - 1) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{L^3} \cdot \sum_{d=1}^L \mu(d) (\theta_d - \theta_d^3) + \frac{1}{L^3} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\zeta(3)} - \sum_{d=L+1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^3} - \frac{3}{L} \cdot \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \theta_d - \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{d=1}^L \frac{2}{d} - \frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{d=1}^L 1 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\zeta(3)} - \frac{1}{2L^2} - \frac{3\zeta(2)}{L} - \frac{2 \log L + 2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{L^2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\zeta(3)} - \frac{3\zeta(2)}{L} - \frac{2 \log L + 4}{L^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

By computer we find that the smallest L , for which the error is negative, is $L_0 = 122760$. The error there is:

$$E = \frac{|V_3 \cap [1, 122760]^3|}{122760^3} - \frac{1}{\zeta(3)} = -2.95313 \times 10^{-9}.$$

For $L \geq 10^{10}$, the bound on the error in (72) is less than $|E|$. Hence:

$$\text{SD}(V_2) = \min_{122760 \leq L \leq 10^{10}} \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^3} = \frac{|V_2 \cap [1, 169170]^3|}{169170^3} = 0.831907366 \dots$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1.7. Let L be an arbitrary fixed positive integer. For any prime p , denote by $V'_p = [1, L]^2 - I_p$ the set of points of $[1, L]^2$, which are p -visible from both $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. Let s be an arbitrary positive integer, to be determined later. Put $P_s = p_1 \cdots p_s$. We have

$$A \cap [1, L]^2 = \bigcap_{p \in \mathcal{P}} V'_p = \bigcap_{i=1}^s V'_{p_i} - \bigcup_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} I_{p_i},$$

where $\pi(L)$ is the number of primes not exceeding L . Therefore:

$$|A \cap [1, L]^2| \geq \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^s V'_{p_i} \right| - \left| \bigcup_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} I_{p_i} \right| \geq \sum_{d|P_s} \mu(d) |I_d| - \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} |I_{p_i}|. \tag{73}$$

By Lemma 2.1, for appropriate numbers $\theta_d \in [0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{d|P_s} \mu(d)|I_d| &= \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} |I_d| - \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} |I_d| \\
&\geq \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} s(d) \left\lfloor \frac{L}{d} \right\rfloor^2 - \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} s(d) \left\lceil \frac{L}{d} \right\rceil^2 \\
&= \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} s(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} - \theta_d \right)^2 - \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} s(d) \left(\frac{L}{d} + \theta_d \right)^2 \\
&= L^2 \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} s(d) \frac{1}{d^2} - 2L \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} \frac{s(d)}{d} \theta_d + \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=1} s(d) \theta_d^2 \\
&\quad - L^2 \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} s(d) \frac{1}{d^2} - 2L \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} \frac{s(d)}{d} \theta_d - \sum_{d|P_s: \mu(d)=-1} s(d) \theta_d^2 \\
&\geq L^2 \sum_{d|P_s} \mu(d) \frac{s(d)}{d^2} - 2L \sum_{d|P_s} \frac{s(d)}{d} - \sum_{d|P_s} s(d) \\
&= L^2 \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2} \right) - 2L \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{2}{p_i} \right) - 3^s.
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Also:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} |I_{p_i}| &\leq 2 \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \left\lfloor \frac{L}{p_i} \right\rfloor^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \left(\frac{L}{p_i} + 1 \right)^2 \\
&\leq 2L^2 \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i^2} + 4L \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i} + 2\pi(L).
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

By (73), (74) and (75),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|A \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} &\geq \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2} \right) - 2 \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i^2} - \frac{2}{L} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{2}{p_i} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{4}{L} \cdot \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{3^s}{L^2} - \frac{2\pi(L)}{L^2} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2} \right) - f(s, L),
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where for $s, L \in \mathbf{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
f(s, L) &= \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2} \right) - \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2} \right) + 2 \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i^2} + \frac{2}{L} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 + \frac{2}{p_i} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{L} \cdot \sum_{i=s+1}^{\pi(L)} \frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{3^s}{L^2} + \frac{2\pi(L)}{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can easily see that the smallest L , for which the error is negative, is $L_0 = 7$. The error at L_0 is

$$E = \frac{|A \cap [1, 7]^2|}{7^2} - \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p_i^2}\right) = -0.016 \dots$$

As $f(s, L)$ decreases as a function of L , we only need to find s and L_1 such that

$$f(s, L) \leq |E|, \quad L \geq L_1. \quad (77)$$

We easily check that (77) is true for $s = 10$ and $L_1 = 5000$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SD}(A) &= \min_{7 \leq L \leq 5000} \frac{|A \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} = \frac{|A \cap [1, 7]^2|}{7^2} = 0.306 \dots \\ &< 0.322 \dots = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right) = D(A). \end{aligned}$$

□

7 An Ergodic-theoretical Viewpoint

The starting point of the paper, namely Dirichlet's and Lehmer's result about the asymptotic density of the set of lattice points visible from the origin, has been stated also in terms of probability [48] (see also [6, 11, 61]). Now, as there is no translation-invariant probability measure on \mathbf{Z}^k (or even \mathbf{Z}), "probability" is to be understood here as the asymptotic probability of a uniformly random point in the cube $[0, L - 1]^k$ being visible as $L \rightarrow \infty$. In this section, we show how the usage of the term probability may be made rigorous. Moreover, we explain how the basic result may be interpreted as an ergodic theorem. We will keep the required ergodic theory minimal.

Consider the function $f : \mathbf{Z}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, given by

$$f(n_1, \dots, n_k) = \begin{cases} 1, & \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_k) = 1, \\ 0, & \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_k) > 1, \end{cases} \quad (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k. \quad (78)$$

(It makes no difference for us, but we agree that f vanishes at $(0, \dots, 0)$; see [22].) Let R_1, \dots, R_k be the basic translation operators on \mathbf{Z}^k . Namely, we take:

$$R_i(n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots, n_k) = (n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_k), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k.$$

With this notation, the probability that a uniformly random lattice point $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [0, L - 1]^k$ is visible from $(0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbf{Z}^k$ may be written in the form:

$$P((x_1, \dots, x_k) \text{ is visible from } (0, \dots, 0)) = \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} f(R_1^{n_1} \dots R_k^{n_k}(0, \dots, 0)). \quad (79)$$

Now the expression on the right-hand side of (79) looks like an ergodic average, for which it is natural to ask about the limit. However, the underlying space is not a probability

space. Thus, we embed \mathbf{Z}^k in a compact abelian group, and extend the translations R_i in such a way that the right-hand side of (79) will indeed be an ergodic average.

The group we take is G^k , where $G = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$ is the direct product of all cyclic groups of prime order. G is a compact abelian group under the product topology. We describe the Haar measure μ on G , namely the (unique) probability measure on G , invariant under all translations of the group. (We refer to [23] for more details on the Haar measure.) The measure of a cylindrical set $C = A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_n \times \prod_{i \geq n+1} \mathbf{Z}/p_i\mathbf{Z}$, where p_i is the i th prime and $A_j \subseteq \mathbf{Z}/p_j\mathbf{Z}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, is:

$$\mu(C) = \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|A_j|}{p_j}. \quad (80)$$

We mention that (80) uniquely determines μ on the whole Borel field $\mathcal{B}(G)$ of G (see [29]). Moreover, μ is the Haar measure on G . The Haar measure on G^k is the k -fold product $\mu^k = \mu \times \cdots \times \mu$, determined by (see [14, Sec. 5.3])

$$\mu^k(B_1 \times \cdots \times B_k) = \mu(B_1) \cdots \mu(B_k), \quad B_1, \dots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(G).$$

Define a monomorphism $i_{\mathbf{Z}} : \mathbf{Z} \hookrightarrow G$ by

$$i_{\mathbf{Z}} : n \rightarrow (n \bmod p_1, n \bmod p_2, \dots), \quad n \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

The transformation $R_{\mathbf{Z}} : \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$, given by $R_{\mathbf{Z}}(n) = n + 1$ for $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, may be extended to a transformation $R_G : G \rightarrow G$ by

$$R_G : (x_1, x_2, \dots) = (x_1 + 1, x_2 + 1, \dots),$$

and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Z} & \xrightarrow{i_{\mathbf{Z}}} & G \\ R_{\mathbf{Z}} \downarrow & & \downarrow R_G \\ \mathbf{Z} & \xrightarrow{i_{\mathbf{Z}}} & G \end{array} \quad (81)$$

is commutative.

Now we generalize the concept of visibility to G and G^k . Two points $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ in G are *mutually visible* if $x_i \neq y_i$ for each i ; otherwise, they are *mutually invisible*. The probability that a μ -random point $\mathbf{x} \in G$ is visible from $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots) \in G$ is the measure of the set $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z})^*$,

$$P(\mathbf{x} \text{ is visible from } \mathbf{0}) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = 0.$$

Two points $\vec{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ and $\vec{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k)$ in G^k , where $\mathbf{x}_j = (x_{j1}, x_{j2}, \dots)$ and $\mathbf{y}_j = (y_{j1}, y_{j2}, \dots)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, are *mutually invisible* if $x_{ji} = y_{ji}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$ and for some $i \in \mathbf{N}$; otherwise, they are *mutually visible*. The probability that a μ^k -random point $\vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k$ is visible from $\vec{\mathbf{0}} = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0})$ is $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i^k}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}$ for $k \geq 2$. Let us denote

$$\mathbf{e}_j = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}), \quad 1 \leq j \leq k,$$

\uparrow
 $j^{\text{th}}\text{-entry}$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots)$. Define the rotations $R_{\mathbf{e}_j} : G^k \rightarrow G^k$ (extending the translations R_1, \dots, R_k to G^k) by

$$R_{\mathbf{e}_j}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = \vec{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{e}_j, \quad \vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k, 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Analogously to (79), we may be interested in the behavior of the averages

$$\frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} f_{G^k}(R_{\mathbf{e}_1}^{n_1} \cdots R_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{n_k} \vec{\mathbf{x}}) \quad (82)$$

as $L \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \vec{\mathbf{x}} \text{ is visible from } \vec{\mathbf{0}}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We recall several other basic definitions and results. (See [34] for more details.) Let X be a compact metric space, \mathcal{A} its Borel σ -field, and ν a probability measure on (X, \mathcal{A}) . Given commuting homeomorphisms T_1, \dots, T_k of X , we consider the \mathbf{Z}^k -action T on X defined by:

$$T^{\bar{n}}(x) = T_1^{n_1} \cdots T_k^{n_k}(x), \quad x \in X, \bar{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k.$$

The measure ν is T -invariant if

$$\nu(T^{\bar{n}}(E)) = \nu(E), \quad E \in \mathcal{A}, \bar{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k.$$

A set $E \in \mathcal{A}$ is T -invariant if $T^{\bar{n}}(E) = E$ for all $\bar{n} \in \mathbf{Z}^k$.

Definition 7.1. 1. A T -measure-preserving system is a quadruple (X, \mathcal{A}, ν, T) , where ν is T -invariant probability measure.

2. The system is *ergodic* if, for every T -invariant set $E \in \mathcal{A}$, either $\nu(E) = 0$ or $\nu(E) = 1$.

Definition 7.2. An action T is *uniquely ergodic* if it admits a unique invariant measure on X .

Define a \mathbf{Z}^k -action R on G^k by:

$$R^{\bar{n}} \vec{\mathbf{x}} = R_{\mathbf{e}_1}^{n_1} \cdots R_{\mathbf{e}_k}^{n_k} \vec{\mathbf{x}}, \quad \bar{n} \in \mathbf{Z}^k, \vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k.$$

Since the $R_{\mathbf{e}_j}$ -s are rotations of G^k , the action preserves μ^k . Note that the subgroup of G^k generated by \mathbf{e}_j , $1 \leq j \leq k$, which is just the image of \mathbf{Z}^k under the monomorphism $i_{\mathbf{Z}}^k : \mathbf{Z}^k \rightarrow G^k$, is dense in G^k . Therefore, R is invariant under all rotations of G^k , and hence is uniquely ergodic by the uniqueness of the Haar measure. Now the ergodicity of the action R implies that (see [34]):

$$\frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} g(R^{\bar{n}} \vec{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow[L \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.e.}} \int_{G^k} g d\mu^k, \quad g \in L^1(G^k, \mathcal{B}^k(G), \mu^k). \quad (83)$$

For continuous functions g , the convergence holds everywhere and is uniform [34, Proposition 2.8].

However, our function f_{G^k} is not continuous. Indeed, take, for example, $\vec{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$, $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n = (\mathbf{y}_1^n, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k^n)$, with $\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$, and

$$y_{ji}^n = \begin{cases} 1, & 1 \leq j \leq k, i \neq n \\ 0, & 1 \leq j \leq k, i = n. \end{cases}$$

Then $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \vec{\mathbf{x}}$, yet $f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n) = 0$ for each n , while $f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 1$. Thus, whereas the convergence in (83) is guaranteed almost everywhere, it may not hold everywhere. It does hold for the point $\vec{\mathbf{0}}$; this is just Dirichlet-Lehmer's result. However, there exist points for which the convergence in (83) does not hold. The following example presents an "extreme" such point.

Example 7.1. Let M be any bijection from \mathcal{P} to $(\mathbf{N} \cup \{0\})^k$, and let $\vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k$ be given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{1i} \\ \vdots \\ x_{ki} \end{pmatrix} = -M(p_i) \bmod p_i, \quad i \in \mathbf{N}.$$

We claim that $f_{G^k}(R^{\bar{n}}\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ for every $\bar{n} \in (\mathbf{N} \cup \{0\})^k$. In fact, given any \bar{n} , take the i for which $M(p_i) = \bar{n}$. Then the i -th coordinate of $R^{\bar{n}}(\vec{\mathbf{x}})$ is:

$$(-M(p_i) + \bar{n}) \bmod p_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that the left-hand side of (83) is 0 for every L , while the right-hand side is $1/\zeta(k)$. Hence (83) fails for f_{G^k} and $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$.

We mention that, while in general there is no necessary relation between the ergodic averages and the almost everywhere limit at points where (83) fails, in our case we have:

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} f_{G^k}(R^{\bar{n}}\vec{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}, \quad \vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k. \quad (84)$$

In fact, define a sequence $\{f_{n, G^k}\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ of continuous functions $f_{n, G^k} : G^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by:

$$f_{n, G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, \text{ we have } x_{ji} \neq 0 \text{ for some } j = j(i), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) \leq f_{n, G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}})$ for every n and $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$. Hence, for all $\vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} f_{G^k}(R^{\bar{n}}\vec{\mathbf{x}}) &\leq \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} f_{n, G^k}(R^{\bar{n}}\vec{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - 1/p_i^k), \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where the equality follows from the fact that R is uniquely ergodic and the functions f_{n,G^k} are continuous. (In fact, the equality is trivial by periodicity.) Since the left-hand side of (85) is independent of n , this proves (84).

We have seen that our action R is uniquely ergodic, but f_{G^k} is discontinuous. This explains why we have arbitrarily large cubes in \mathbf{Z}^k , for which the proportion of points visible from $\vec{\mathbf{0}}$ is very far from the limit. In fact, as we have seen in Section 1, the proportion may well be 0. The discontinuity of f_{G^k} is due to its being sensitive to arbitrarily large primes. Consider a point $\vec{\mathbf{x}} \in G^k$ that passes many ‘‘invisibility tests’’, namely satisfies $x_{ji} \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and some $j = j(i)$. If it satisfies this property for all primes, then $f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 1$; if it fails for but one prime, then $f_{G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$.

Interestingly, if we replaced the binary visible-invisible ladder by a more refined measure of visibility, we would be able to enjoy the unique ergodicity property. Suppose, intuitively, that $f : G^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ still satisfies $f(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 1$ for a visible point $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$, but assumes a relatively large (small, respectively) value if $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$ violates the visibility condition for few (many, respectively) primes. Specifically, consider the functions $\Phi_{s,G^k} : G^k \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for real $s > 0$:

$$\Phi_{s,G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = \prod_{i: x_{1i}=\dots=x_{ki}=0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i^s}\right), \quad \vec{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in G^k.$$

By (83):

$$\frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{s,G^k}(R^{\vec{n}} \vec{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow[L \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.e.}} \int_{G^k} \Phi_{s,G^k} d\mu^k. \quad (86)$$

G^k is the product of the finite groups $(\mathbf{Z}/p_i\mathbf{Z})^k$, and the measure μ^k is the product of the Haar measures μ_i^k on these groups. The function Φ_{s,G^k} may be written as a product of simple functions $\Phi_{s,(\mathbf{Z}/p_i\mathbf{Z})^k}$ on these groups. Hence we can calculate the integral explicitly to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L^k} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{s,G^k}(R^{\vec{n}} \vec{\mathbf{x}}) &\xrightarrow[L \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.e.}} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{(\mathbf{Z}/p_i\mathbf{Z})^k} \Phi_{s,(\mathbf{Z}/p_i\mathbf{Z})^k} d\mu_i^k \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i^k}\right) \cdot 1 + \frac{1}{p_i^k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i^s}\right) \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i^{s+k}}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(s+k)}. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

One checks easily that Φ_{s,G^k} is continuous for $s > 1$. Hence, for such s , the convergence in (86) is everywhere and holds uniformly. Note that, for $0 < s \leq 1$, the function Φ_{s,G^k} is discontinuous. Indeed, take, say, $\vec{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ with $\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{1}$ and $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n = (\mathbf{y}_1^n, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k^n)$, defined by:

$$y_{ji}^n = \begin{cases} 1, & 1 \leq j \leq k, 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ 0, & 1 \leq j \leq k, i > n. \end{cases}$$

Then $\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \vec{\mathbf{x}}$, yet $\Phi_{s,G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{y}}^n) = 0$ for each n , while $\Phi_{s,G^k}(\vec{\mathbf{x}}) = 1$. In the case $k = 1$, the limit in (86) has been calculated in [13] and it was shown that the ergodic sum

behaves like:

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{n=0}^{L-1} \Phi_{s,G}(R_G^n \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\zeta(s+1)} + O\left(\frac{1}{L}\right), \quad s > 1. \quad (88)$$

The discussion above implies a multi-dimensional version of this formula. Moreover, due to the unique ergodicity, the averaging may start anywhere. Note, though, that our method does not yield an explicit error term as in (88).

Proposition 7.2. *Let $s > 1$ and*

$$B_i = [M_{1,i}, M_{1,i} + L_{1,i}) \times \cdots \times [M_{k,i}, M_{k,i} + L_{k,i}), \quad i \in \mathbf{N},$$

where $M_{1,i} \dots M_{k,i} \in \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $L_{j,i} \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then

$$\frac{1}{|B_i|} \sum_{\bar{n} \in B_i} \Phi_{s,G^k}(R^{\bar{n}} \vec{\mathbf{x}}) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{G^k} \Phi_{s,G^k} d\mu = \frac{1}{\zeta(s+k)}$$

uniformly everywhere.

8 “Statistical” Insights

In this section, we provide the results of several relevant computations performed using Mathematica. The first question we studied concerns the sign of the error $\frac{|V_k \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)}$. As mentioned in the Section 1, the smallest integer, for which the error is negative for dimension $k = 2$, is $L_0 = 820$. Thus, let L be an *exceptional* integer (for dimension k) if $\frac{|V_k \cap [1, L]^k|}{L^k} - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} < 0$. It turns out that, in the range $[1, 10^4]$, there are but 18 exceptional integer:

$$820, 1276, 1422, 1926, 2080, 2640, 3186, 3250, 4446, \\ 4720, 4930, 5370, 6006, 6546, 7386, 7476, 9066, 9276.$$

The frequency of exceptional integers seems to be pretty fixed as we continue. There are 18237167 exceptional integers in the range $[1, 10^{10}]$. Counting them in each of the 10 sub-intervals $(j \cdot 10^9, (j+1) \cdot 10^9]$, $0 \leq j \leq 9$, we see that in each sub-interval, there are about one-tenth of them. In fact, the minimum is 1822954, attained at $(6 \cdot 10^9, 7 \cdot 10^9]$ and the maximum is 1824549, attained at $(9 \cdot 10^9, 10^{10}]$.

Another (hardly surprising) thing one may observe is that exceptional integers tend to have small remainders modulo small primes. In fact, all exceptional integers up to $5 \cdot 10^5$ are (i) $0 \pmod{2}$, (ii) $0, 1 \pmod{3}$, (iii) $0, 1, 2 \pmod{5}$, and (iv) $0, 1, 2, 3, 5 \pmod{7}$.

For $k = 3$, there are even (much) less exceptional integers. In the range $[1, 10^6]$, there are six of them:

$$122760, 169170, 446370, 689130, 8134450, 912990.$$

Similarly to the case $k = 2$, the frequency of exceptional integers seems to be pretty fixed (but much lower) as we continue. There are 40815 exceptional integers in the range $[1, 10^{10}]$. Counting them in each of the 10 sub-intervals $(j \cdot 10^9, (j+1) \cdot 10^9]$, $0 \leq j \leq 9$, we see that the minimum is 4033, attained at $(4 \cdot 10^9, 5 \cdot 10^9]$, and the maximum is 4123,

attained at $(9 \cdot 10^9, 10^{10}]$. We mention that the fact that for $k \geq 3$, the lower density (cf. [16, p. 72]) of the set of exceptional integers is not 0 follows by getting into the proof of Petermann's results [49, p. 318], on which we have relied, in the proof of Theorem 1.3. In fact, the set of exceptional integers contains an infinite arithmetic progression.

We have also looked at the error term for some sets S of cardinality greater than 1. Interestingly, at least in the cases, we have checked, there is no strong tendency for the error to be positive (or negative either). We have considered the following examples.

Example 8.1. Let $S = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}^2$ (as in Proposition 1.7). In the range $[1, 10^3]$ there are about 311 integers L for which

$$\frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} < \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right) = D(V(S)).$$

(The “about” in the last sentence is due to the fact that we have not bothered to check the status of integers L for which $\frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2}$ and the density $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right)$ are very close.)

Example 8.2. Let $S = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}^2$. Then the Schnirelmann density of $V(S)$ is strictly smaller than its regular density. In fact, in the range $[1, 10^3]$ there are about 916 integers L for which

$$\frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} < \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{p^2}\right) = D(V(S)).$$

The Schnirelmann density of $V(S)$ seems to be

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq L \leq 10^3} \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^2|}{L^2} &= \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, 4]^2|}{4^2} = \frac{1}{16} = 0.0625 \\ &< 0.1254\dots = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{p^2}\right) = D(V(S)), \end{aligned}$$

but we have not verified it.

Example 8.3. Let $S = \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}^3$. Again, the Schnirelmann density of $V(S)$ is strictly smaller than its regular density. In the range $[1, 10^3]$ there are about 227 integers L for which

$$\frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^3|}{L^3} < \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{p^3}\right) = D(V(S)).$$

The Schnirelmann density of $V(S)$ seems to be

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq L \leq 10^3} \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^3|}{L^3} &= \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, 16]^3|}{16^3} = \frac{2146}{4096} = 0.5239\dots \\ &< 0.5345\dots = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{3}{p^3}\right) = D(V(S)). \end{aligned}$$

Example 8.4. Let $S = \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}^3$. In the range $[1, 10^3]$ there are about 279 integers L for which

$$\frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^3|}{L^3} < \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{4}{p^3}\right) = D(V(S)).$$

The Schnirelmann density of $V(S)$ seems to be

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq L \leq 10^3} \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, L]^3|}{L^3} &= \frac{|V(S) \cap [1, 10^3]|}{10^3} = \frac{350}{1000} = 0.35 \\ &< 0.404\dots = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{4}{p^3}\right) = D(V(S)). \end{aligned}$$

One readily observes in all four examples that we have a much higher frequency of L -s, for which the proportion of visible points in $[1, L]^k$ is below $D(V(S))$, than was the case for visibility from the origin. Also, the Schnirelmann density is smaller than the regular density in each of these cases, and the difference $D(V(S)) - \text{SD}(V(S))$ is much larger than for $S = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

We have checked a bunch of additional “random” sets S in dimensions $k = 2, 3, 4$. In all examples, we calculated the proportion of points visible from S in the boxes $[1, L]^k$ for $1 \leq L \leq 1000$ in dimensions $k = 2, 3$, and for $1 \leq L \leq 200$ for $k = 4$. Similarly to Examples 8.1-8.4, it turns out that the proportions are smaller than the limiting value $D(V(S))$ for many values of L . We will refer to such L -s as having *bad visibility*. Denote by L_{\min} the value of L for which the proportion is minimal, namely at which the Schnirelmann density $\text{SD}(V(S))$ is attained. (In principle, there may be more than one such L . We only found the smallest of these.)

Remark 8.5. We emphasize that our results may be **not completely accurate** due to the following reasons:

- (a) The infinite product $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{s(p)}{p^k}\right)$, giving $D(V(S))$, was calculated numerically, and so contains some error. Thus, values of L , for which $|V(S) \cap [1, L]^k|/L^k$ is very close to $D(V(S))$, may have been classified erroneously as having bad visibility or not.
- (b) We have not gone in our tests far enough to make sure that there is no value of L beyond the checked range, for which the proportion of visible points in $[1, L]^k$ is below the minimum we found. However, since the L_{\min} we record is usually much smaller than the maximal value checked, we believe the results are mostly accurate.

The full results are shown in Tables 1, 2, 3.

In view of our observations in the beginning of this section and the discussion in Section 7 we pose our final

Question 8.6. Is it true that, for every k and finite $S \subset \mathbf{Z}^k$, the set of integers L with bad visibility has an asymptotic density? Is it true, moreover, that this set has a Banach density? (For the notion of Banach density, see, for example, [16, p. 72].)

S	Number of L -s with bad visibility in $[1, 10^3]$	L_{\min}	$SD(V(S))$	$D(V(S))$
$(0,0),(1,0)$	307	10	0.29000...	0.32263...
$(0,0),(2,2)$	27	192	0.48348...	0.48396...
$(0,0),(6,0)$	36	156	0.55227...	0.55309...
$(0,0),(1,0),(2,3)$	415	16	0.10938...	0.12549...
$(0,0),(2,2),(3,4)$	19	810	0.25073...	0.25097...
$(1,2),(4,5),(8,3)$	990	18	0.27160...	0.29280...
$(0,1),(2,2),(3,4)$	486	18	0.13889...	0.14640...
$(1,0),(2,2),(3,4),(4,3)$	728	10	0.10000...	0.11358...
$(0,0),(1,0),(0,1),(2,2)$	723	4	0.06250...	0.09465...
$(1,0),(0,1),(2,2),(3,4)$	939	10	0.09000...	0.11358...
$(0,0),(1,0),(0,1),(4,2)$	920	16	0.05469...	0.09465...
$(0,0),(1,0),(2,2),(4,2)$	543	8	0.07812...	0.09465...
$(0,0),(1,0),(0,1)(2,2),(3,4)$	762	4	0.06250...	0.08542...
$(1,0),(0,1)(2,2),(3,4),(4,3)$	992	10	0.08000...	0.10250...
$(0,0),(2,2)(3,2),(3,4),(4,3)$	8	4	0.06250...	0.06834...
$(0,0),(1,2)(2,1),(3,2),(4,3)$	993	14	0.04592...	0.06834...
$(0,1),(1,2)(2,1),(3,2),(2,3)$	988	17	0.11419...	0.13668...

Table 1: Statistics of sets of visible points for some 2-dimensional sets S (see Remark 8.5).

S	Number of L -s with bad visibility in $[1, 200]$	L_{\min}	$SD(V(S))$	$D(V(S))$
$(0,0,0),(1,0,0)$	91	36	0.67554...	0.67689...
$(1,0,0),(0,1,0)$	170	16	0.67188...	0.67689...
$(0,0,0),(2,2,2)$	28	72	0.78937...	0.78971...
$(0,0,0),(6,6,0)$	11	6	0.81944...	0.82130...
$(6,6,0),(0,6,6)$	86	6	0.80555...	0.82130...
$(1,1,0),(0,1,0),(0,0,1)$	266	16	0.52343...	0.53457...
$(0,0,0),(2,2,2),(3,3,0)$	33	60	0.66794...	0.66820...
$(2,0,0),(2,2,2),(0,2,2)$	70	72	0.74711...	0.74840...
$(0,0,0),(4,0,4),(6,0,6)$	34	70	0.77897...	0.77958...

Table 2: Statistics of sets of visible points for some 3-dimensional sets S (see Remark 8.5).

S	Number of L -s with bad visibility in [1, 200]	L_{\min}	$\text{SD}(V(S))$	$D(V(S))$
$(1,1,0,0),(0,1,1,1)$	161	12	0.82424...	0.84973...
$(0,0,0,0),(2,2,2,2)$	9	12	0.90987...	0.91043...
$(1,1,0,0),(0,0,1,1)$	90	16	0.84634...	0.84974...
$(0,0,1,0),(1,1,0,0),(1,0,0,1)$	46	4	0.77344...	0.77738...
$(0,0,0,0),(1,1,0,0),(0,0,1,1)$	33	16	0.77556...	0.77738...

Table 3: Statistics of sets of visible points for some 4-dimensional sets S (see Remark 8.5).

9 Visible Lattice Points in Discs

Denote by

$$A_k(x) = |\{(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k : n_1^2 + \dots + n_k^2 \leq x\}|, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, \quad x \geq 0,$$

the number of lattice points in the k -dimensional disc $D_k(0, \sqrt{x})$ of radius \sqrt{x} , centered at the origin. $A_k(x)$ is very close to the volume of $D_k(0, \sqrt{x})$ for large x . More precisely, put

$$P_k(x) = A_k(x) - \text{Vol}(D_k(0, \sqrt{x})), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, \quad x \geq 0.$$

The well-known Gauss circle problem (cf. [28]) is to estimate $P_2(x)$. For general $k \geq 2$, the estimation of $P_k(x)$ is known as the generalized Gauss circle problem (see [24]). Gauss showed, using a simple observation, that $P_2(x) = O(\sqrt{x})$. The error was improved by several authors (cf. [26, 31, 60]), and the best estimate currently seems to be due to Bourgain and Watt [8, Theorem 2]:

$$P_2(x) = O(x^{517/1648+\varepsilon}), \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

In the other direction, Hardy [19] showed that

$$P_2(x) = \Omega_+(x^{1/4}), \quad P_2(x) = \Omega_-(x^{1/4}(\log x)^{1/4}).$$

The Ω -results were improved by Corrádi-Kátai [12], Hafner [17], and Soundararajann [62, Theorem 1]. Similar results to those on $D_2(0, \sqrt{x})$ have been obtained for compact convex regions $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^2$ containing the origin, whose boundary satisfies some smoothness conditions (see, for example, [25, 44, 45]). Huxley [25, Theorem 5] showed that the estimation from above of the analog of $P_2(x)$ for such \mathcal{D} is not more difficult than that of $P_2(x)$ (see also [27]).

For the estimation of $P_k(x)$ in dimensions 3 and 4, we refer to [1, 20, 32, 67, 69]. For dimension $k \geq 5$, the situation becomes simpler (cf. [30]):

$$P_k(x) = O(x^{k/2-1}), \quad P_k(x) = \Omega(x^{k/2-1}), \quad k \geq 5.$$

Denote by

$$V'_k(x) = |\{(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbf{Z}^k : n_1^2 + \dots + n_k^2 \leq x, (n_1, \dots, n_k) = 1\}|, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, x \geq 0,$$

the number of lattice points visible from the origin in $D_k(0, \sqrt{x})$. $V'_k(x)$ is very close to $1/\zeta(k) \cdot \text{Vol}(D_k(0, \sqrt{x}))$ for large x . Put

$$E'_k(x) = V'_k(x) - \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} \cdot \text{Vol}(D_k(0, \sqrt{x})), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots, \quad x \geq 0.$$

Huxley and Nowak [27] show that

$$E'_2(x) = O(x^{1/2} \exp(-c(\log x)^{3/5}(\log \log x)^{-1/5})),$$

for some constant $c > 0$, and under the Riemann Hypothesis $E'_2(x) = O(x^{5/12+\varepsilon})$ for arbitrary fixed $\varepsilon > 0$. Currently, the best-known bound is due to Wu [71]:

$$E'_2(x) = O(x^{221/608+\varepsilon}), \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

Ω -results for E'_2 and E'_3 have also been obtained [10, 47]. (For more details on visible lattice points in planar domains, see [4, 5, 21, 40, 46, 72, 73].)

In the spirit of this paper, it seems more appropriate to compare $V'_k(x)$ not with $1/\zeta(k) \cdot \text{Vol}(D(0, \sqrt{x}))$ but rather with $1/\zeta(k) \cdot A_k(x)$. We wanted to check computationally whether, for visibility from the origin, we again have the phenomenon whereby, for most discs, the relative density of visible points within the disc exceeds the asymptotic density. The short answer is negative. Similarly to the terminology from Section 8, let a positive integer n be “exceptional” in this section (for dimension k) if

$$V'_k(n) < A_k(n)/\zeta(k).$$

It turns out that, unlike the case of visible points in cubes $[1, L]^k$, exceptional integers for discs are not exceptional at all. In fact, for $k = 2$, in the range $[1, 10^9]$, there are 474072530 exceptional integers. Counting them in each of the ten sub-intervals $(j \cdot 10^8, (j+1) \cdot 10^8]$, $0 \leq j \leq 9$, we find that the minimum is 20862314, attained at $(7 \cdot 10^8, 8 \cdot 10^8]$, and the maximum is 63524202, attained at $(5 \cdot 10^8, 6 \cdot 10^8]$. For $k = 3$, in the range $[1, 10^6]$, there are 500724 exceptional integers. Counting them in each of the ten sub-intervals $(j \cdot 10^5, (j+1) \cdot 10^5]$, $0 \leq j \leq 9$, we find that the minimum is 46484, attained at $(6 \cdot 10^5, 7 \cdot 10^5]$, and the maximum is 51656, attained at $(7 \cdot 10^5, 8 \cdot 10^5]$. For $k = 4$, in the range $[1, 10^6]$, there are 500220 exceptional integers. Counting them in each of the ten sub-intervals $(j \cdot 10^5, (j+1) \cdot 10^5]$, $0 \leq j \leq 9$, we find that the minimum is 49982, attained at $(9 \cdot 10^5, 10^6]$, and the maximum is 50092, attained at $(8 \cdot 10^5, 9 \cdot 10^5]$.

Recall that V_k is the set of lattice points visible from the origin. The Schnirelmann density of V_k was defined as the minimum over L of the relative density $|V_k \cap [1, L]^k|/L^k$ of the set of visible points within cubes $[1, L]^k$. We may consider the analogous ratio when we go over discs $D_k(0, \sqrt{x})$. Namely, let

$$\text{SD}'(V_k) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{V'_k(n)}{A_k(n)}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots).$$

(As mentioned above, the origin is considered as invisible.) Our calculations hint that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SD}'(V_2) &= \frac{V'_2(9)}{A_2(9)} = \frac{16}{29} = 0.552 < 0.608 = 1/\zeta(2), \\ \text{SD}'(V_3) &= \frac{V'_3(4)}{A_3(4)} = \frac{26}{33} = 0.788 < 0.832 = 1/\zeta(3), \\ \text{SD}'(V_4) &= \frac{V'_4(1)}{A_4(1)} = \frac{8}{9} = 0.889 < 0.924 = 1/\zeta(4). \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] S. Adhikari and Y.-F. S. Pétermann, Lattice points in ellipsoids, *Acta Arithmetica* **59** (1991), 329–338.
- [2] S. Adhikari and A. Sankaranarayanan, On an error term related to the Jordan totient function $J_k(n)$, *Journal of Number Theory* **34(2)** (1990), 178–188.
- [3] T. M. Apostol, *Analytic Number Theory*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1976.
- [4] R. C. Baker, Primitive lattice points in planar domains, *Acta Arithmetica* **142(3)** (2010), 267–302.
- [5] I. Bárány, G. Martin, E. Naslund, and S. Robins, Primitive points in rational polygons, *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* **63(4)** (2020), 850–870.
- [6] S. Benkoski, The probability that k positive integers are relatively r -prime, *Journal of Number Theory* **8(2)** (1976), 218–223.
- [7] P. Brass, W. Moser, and J. Pach, *Research Problems in Discrete Geometry*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [8] J. Bourgain and N. Watt, Mean square of zeta function, circle problem and divisor problem revisited, arXiv preprint, arXiv:1709.04340v1, 2017.
- [9] S. Chaubey, A. Tamazyan, and A. Zaharescu, Lattice point problems involving index and joint visibility, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **147(8)** (2019), 3273–3288.
- [10] F. Chamizo, E. Cristóbal, and A. Ubis, Visible lattice points in the sphere, *Journal of Number Theory* **126(2)** (2007), 200–211.
- [11] G. Collins and J. Johnson, The probability of relative primality of Gaussian integers, in *Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 358)* (1988), New York: Springer-Verlag, 252–258.
- [12] K. Corrádi and I. Kátai, A comment on KS Gangadharan’s paper entitled “Two classical lattice point problems”, *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Fiz. Oszt. Közl.* **17** (1967), 89–97.
- [13] C. Eckford, Series representations of certain types of arithmetical functions, *Osaka Mathematical Journal* **13(1)** (1961), 209–216.
- [14] T. Eisner, B. Farkas, M. Haas, and R. Nagel, *Operator Theoretic Aspects of Ergodic Theory*, Springer, New York, 2015.
- [15] P. Erdős and P. Shapiro, On the changes of sign of a certain error function, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **3** (1951), 375–385.
- [16] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1981.

- [17] J. L. Hafner, New omega theorems for two classical lattice points problems, *Inventiones mathematicae* **63** (1981), 181–186.
- [18] H. Halberstam and H. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press, London-New York, 1974.
- [19] G. H. Hardy, On Dirichlet’s divisor problem, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **2(15)** (1916), 1–25.
- [20] D. R. Heath-Brown, Lattice points in the sphere, *In: Number Theory in Progress, Proc. Number Theory Conf. Zakopane 1997, eds. K. Györy et al.* **2** (1999), 883–892.
- [21] D. Hensley, The number of lattice points within a contour and visible from the origin, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **166(2)** (1994), 295–304.
- [22] F. Herzog and B. M. Stewart, Patterns of visible and nonvisible lattice points, *American Mathematical Monthly* **78(5)** (1971), 487–496.
- [23] P. Higgins and N. Hitchin, *An Introduction to Topological Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- [24] T. A. Hulse, C. I. Kuan, D. Lowry-Duda, and A. Walker, Second moments in the generalized Gauss circle problem, *In Forum of Mathematics, Sigma* **6** (2018), 1–49.
- [25] M. N. Huxley, Exponential sums and lattice points II, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **66** (1993), 279–301.
- [26] M. N. Huxley, Exponential sums and lattice points III, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **87(3)** (2003), 591–609.
- [27] M. N. Huxley and W. G. Nowak, Primitive lattice points in convex planar domains, *Acta Arithmetica* **76(3)** (1996), 271–283.
- [28] A. Ivić, E. Krätzel, M. Kühleitner, and W. G. Nowak, Lattice points in large regions and related arithmetic functions: Recent developments in a very classic topic, in *Elementare und analytische Zahlentheorie*, Publications of the Scientific Society at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main. Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, Postfach 10 10 61, 70009 Stuttgart, Germany, 20 (Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, Stuttgart, 2006), 89–128.
- [29] S. Kakutani, Notes on infinite product measure spaces, I, *Proceedings of the Imperial Academy* **19(3)** (1943), 148–151.
- [30] E. Krätzel, *Analytische Funktionen in der Zahlentheorie*, Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik **139**, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 2000.
- [31] G. Kolesnik, On the method of exponent pairs, *Acta Arithmetica* **45(2)** (1985), 115–143.
- [32] E. Landau, Über die Anzahl der Gitterpunkte in gewissen Bereichen, *Göttingen Nachr.* **18** (1912), 687–770.

- [33] D. N. Lehmer, Asymptotic evaluation of certain totient sums, *Amer. J. Math* **22(4)** (1900), 293–335.
- [34] Y. Lima, \mathbf{Z}^d -actions with prescribed topological and ergodic properties, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **32(1)** (2012), 191–209.
- [35] H. Q. Liu, On Euler’s function, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Section A: Mathematics* **146(4)** (2016), 769–775.
- [36] K. Liu, M. Lu, and X. Meng, Generalized visibility of lattice points in higher dimensions, *Journal of Number Theory* **241** (2022), 314–329
- [37] J. Maynard, Small gaps between primes, *Annals of Mathematics* **18(2)** (2015), 383–413.
- [38] F. Mertens, Ueber einige asymptotische Gesetze der Zahlentheorie, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **1874(77)** (1874), 289–338.
- [39] H. L. Montgomery, Fluctuations in the mean of Euler’s phi function, *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences-Mathematical Sciences* **97(1)** (1987), 239–245.
- [40] B. Z. Moroz, On the number of primitive lattice points in plane domains, *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **99** (1985), 37–42.
- [41] W. Moser, J. Pach, *Research Problems in Discrete Geometry*, Unpublished, 1985.
- [42] M. Murty and A. Cojocaru, *An Introduction to Sieve Methods and Their Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [43] I. Niven, H. Zuckerman, and L. Montgomery, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [44] W. G. Nowak, An Ω -estimate for the lattice rest of a convex planar domain, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* **100(3-4)** (1985), 295–299.
- [45] W. G. Nowak, On the average order of the lattice rest of a convex planar domain, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **98(1)** (1985), 1–4.
- [46] W. G. Nowak, Primitive lattice points in starlike planar sets, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **179(1)** (1997), 163–178.
- [47] W. G. Nowak, Primitive lattice points inside an ellipse, *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal* **55** (2005), 519–530.
- [48] J. Nymann, On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime, *Journal of Number Theory*. **4(5)** (1972), 469–473.
- [49] Y.-F. S. Pétermann, Oscillations d’un terme d’erreur lié à la fonction totient de Jordan, *Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux* **3(2)** 1991, 311–335.
- [50] Y.-F. S. Pétermann, Personal communication.

- [51] S. S. Pillai and S. D. Chowla, On the error terms in some asymptotic formulae in the theory of numbers (1), *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **1(2)** (1930), 95–101.
- [52] P. Pollack, Bounded gaps between primes with a given primitive root, *Algebra & Number Theory* **8(7)** (2014), 1769–1786.
- [53] D. F. Rearick, *Some Visibility Problems in the Point Lattices* (Doctoral dissertation, California Institute of Technology), 1960.
- [54] D. Rearick, Mutually visible lattice points, *Norske Vid. Selsk. Forh.* **39(6)** (1966), 41–45.
- [55] H. Rumsey, Sets of visible points, *Duke Mathematical Journal* **33(2)** (1966), 263–274.
- [56] G. Robin, Estimation de la fonction de Tchebychef θ sur le k -ième nombre premier et grandes valeurs de la fonction $\omega(n)$ nombre de diviseurs premiers de n , *Acta Arithmetica* **42(4)** (1983), 367–389.
- [57] M. L. N. Sarma, On the error term in a certain sum, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. A* **3** (1931), 338.
- [58] L. Schnirelmann, Über additive Eigenschaften von Zahlen, *Mathematische Annalen* **107(1)** (1933), 649–690.
- [59] A. Selberg, Sieve methods, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math* **20** (1971), 311–351.
- [60] W. Sierpiński, O pewnym zagadnieniu z rachunku funkcji asymptotycznych, *Prace matematyczno-fizyczne* (**17**) (1906), 77–118.
- [61] B. D. Sittinger, The probability that random algebraic integers are relatively r -prime, *Journal of Number Theory* **130(1)** (2010), 164–171.
- [62] K. Soundararajan, Omega results for the divisor and circle problems, *Intern. Math. Research Notes* **36** (2003), 1987–1998.
- [63] B. Sury, Bernoulli numbers and the Riemann zeta function, *Resonance* **8(7)** (2003), 54–61.
- [64] J. J. Sylvester, Sur le nombre de fractions ordinaires inégales qu'on peut exprimer en se servant de chiffres qui n'excèdent pas un nombre donné, *CR Acad. Sci. Paris* **96** (1883), 409–413.
- [65] J. J. Sylvester, On the number of fractions contained in any “Farey series” of which the limiting number is given, *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* **15(94)** (1883), 251–257.
- [66] W. Takeda, The exact order of the number of lattice points visible from the origin, arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.02703, 2016.
- [67] K. M. Tsang, Counting lattice points in the sphere, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **32(6)** (2000), 679–688.

- [68] A. Vatwani, *Higher Rank Sieves and Applications* (Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University), 2016.
- [69] A. Walfisz, Über gitterpunkte in vierdimensionalen ellipsoiden, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **72(1)** (1959), 259–278.
- [70] A. Walfisz, Weylsche Exponentialsummen in der neueren Zahlentheorie, *Mathematische Forschungsberichte* **15** (1963), 231–241.
- [71] J. Wu, On the primitive circle problem, *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **135** (2002), 69–81.
- [72] W. Zhai, On primitive lattice points in planar domains, *Acta Arithmetica* **109** (2003), 1–26.
- [73] W. Zhai and X. Cao, On the number of coprime integer pairs within a circle, *Acta Arithmetica* **90(1)** (1999), 1–16.