

SUMS RELATED TO EULER'S TOTIENT FUNCTION

ARTYOM RADOMSKII

ABSTRACT. We obtain an upper bound for the sum $\sum_{n \leq N} (a_n / \varphi(a_n))^s$, where φ is Euler's totient function, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and a_1, \dots, a_N are positive integers (not necessarily distinct) with some restrictions. As applications, for any $t > 0$, we obtain an upper bound for the number of $n \in [1, N]$ such that $a_n / \varphi(a_n) > t$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let φ denote Euler's totient function. We prove

Theorem 1.1. *Let a_1, \dots, a_N be positive integers (not necessarily distinct), $a_n \leq M$ for all $1 \leq n \leq N$. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we set*

$$\omega(d) = \#\{n \leq N : a_n \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}.$$

Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $y = \max((\ln M)^\alpha, 2)$, and \mathcal{D} be the collection of square-free numbers, all of whose prime divisors lie in $(1, y]$ (we note that $1 \in \mathcal{D}$). Let

$$\omega(n) \leq \frac{K}{g(n)}$$

for any $n \in \mathcal{D}$, where $K > 0$ is a constant (depending on N) and $g(n)$ is a multiplicative function. Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s \leq K \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{(1+p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right)$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold, $K = \gamma N$, $g(p) \geq c_0 > 0$ for any prime p , and*

$$L = \sum_p \frac{1}{pg(p)} < \infty.$$

Then there are positive constants C , c_1 , and c_2 depending only on γ , L , c_0 , and α such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s \leq \exp(s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs)N \tag{1.1}$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\#\left\{n \leq N : \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} > t\right\} \leq c_1 \exp(-\exp(c_2 t))N \tag{1.2}$$

Key words and phrases. Euler's totient function, multiplicative functions, prime numbers.

for any $t > 0$.

From Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 we obtain the following results.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $f(n) = b_d n^d + \dots + b_0$ be a polynomial with integer coefficients such that $b_d > 0$, $(b_d, \dots, b_0) = 1$, and $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist positive constants C , c_1 , and c_2 depending only on f such that for any $x \geq 1$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t > 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{f(n)}{\varphi(f(n))} \right)^s \leq \exp(s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs)x \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$\#\{n \leq x : \frac{f(n)}{\varphi(f(n))} > t\} \leq c_1 \exp(-\exp(c_2 t))x. \quad (1.4)$$

Corollary 1.1 extends Corollary 1.1 in [3] which showed the inequality (1.3) but with an upper bound $\exp(s \ln s + Cs)x$ and without the inequality (1.4).

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ be a set of k distinct linear functions with integer coefficients

$$L_i(n) = a_i n + b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

For $L(n) = an + b$, $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\Delta_L = |a| \prod_{i=1}^k |ab_i - ba_i|.$$

We note that if $a_i = a$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, then

$$\Delta_L = |a|^{k+1} \prod_{i=1}^k |b - b_i|.$$

Modern application of the sieve methods involves the sums

$$\sum_{(a,b) \in \Omega} \frac{\Delta_L}{\varphi(\Delta_L)}$$

(see, for example, [2]). Here (a, b) denotes a vector and Ω is a finite set in \mathbb{Z}^2 . We prove

Corollary 1.2. *Let $s > 0$, $a > 0$, $b_1 < \dots < b_k$ be integers. Let $k \geq 2$, $x \geq 3$, $(\ln x)^{-9/10} \leq \eta \leq 1$, and $|b_i| \leq \ln x$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. We set*

$$f(b) = (b - b_1) \dots (b - b_k).$$

Then the following statements hold.

1) If $k \geq \ln \ln x$ or $s \leq k$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{|b| \leq \eta \ln x \\ b \neq b_1, \dots, b_k}} \left(\frac{a^{k+1} |f(b)|}{\varphi(a^{k+1} |f(b)|)} \right)^s \leq \left(c \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \ln k \right)^s \eta \ln x. \quad (1.5)$$

2) If $2 \leq k < \ln \ln x$ and $s > k$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{|b| \leq \eta \ln x \\ b \neq b_1, \dots, b_k}} \left(\frac{a^{k+1} |f(b)|}{\varphi(a^{k+1} |f(b)|)} \right)^s \leq \left(c \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \ln s \right)^s \eta \ln x. \quad (1.6)$$

Here $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Corollary 1.2 extends a result of Maynard ([2, Lemma 8.1]) which showed the same result but with $s = 1$ and extends Theorem 1.4 in [3] which showed the inequality (1.6) but with an upper bound

$$\left(c \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \ln k \right)^s s! \eta \ln x.$$

From Theorem 1.2 we obtain

Corollary 1.3. *There are absolute positive constants C , c_1 , and c_2 such that for any $x \geq 2$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t > 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \left(\frac{p-1}{\varphi(p-1)} \right)^s \leq \exp(s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs) \pi(x) \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$\#\{p \leq x : \frac{p-1}{\varphi(p-1)} > t\} \leq c_1 \exp(-\exp(c_2 t)) \pi(x). \quad (1.8)$$

2. NOTATION

We reserve the letter p for primes. In particular, the sum $\sum_{p \leq K}$ should be interpreted as being over all prime numbers not exceeding K . By $\pi(x)$ we denote the number of primes not exceeding x . Let $\#A$ denote the number of elements of a finite set A . By \mathbb{N} we denote the set of all positive integers. Let (a_1, \dots, a_n) be the greatest common divisor of integers a_1, \dots, a_n , and $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ the least common multiple of integers a_1, \dots, a_n . For real numbers x, y we also use (x, y) to denote the open interval, and $[x, y]$ to denote the closed interval. The usage of the notation will be clear from the context.

Let φ denote Euler's totient function, i. e.

$$\varphi(n) = \#\{1 \leq m \leq n : (m, n) = 1\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We write $\nu(n)$ for the number of distinct primes dividing n . By $\mu(n)$ we denote the Möbius mu function, which is defined to be $\mu(n) = (-1)^{\nu(n)}$ if n is square-free, $\mu(n) = 0$ otherwise. Let $P^+(n)$ denote the greatest prime factor of n (by convention $P^+(1) = 1$).

By definition, we put

$$\sum_{\emptyset} = 0, \quad \prod_{\emptyset} = 1.$$

The symbol $b|a$ means that b divides a . For fixed a the sum $\sum_{b|a}$ and the product $\prod_{b|a}$ should be interpreted as being over all positive divisors of a . If x is a real number, then $[x]$ denotes its integral part and $\{x\} = x - [x]$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We need the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *There is an absolute positive constant c such that if $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and n is a positive integer, then*

$$\frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \leq \frac{c}{\alpha} \prod_{p|n: p \leq (\ln n)^\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Proof. This is [3, Lemma 3.3]. □

For $1 \leq n \leq N$, by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} &\leq \frac{c}{\alpha} \prod_{p|a_n: p \leq (\ln a_n)^\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\alpha} \prod_{p|a_n: p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{c}{\alpha} \sum_{\substack{d|a_n: \\ P^+(d) \leq y}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)}\right)^s &\leq \left(\frac{c}{\alpha}\right)^s \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{\substack{d_1, \dots, d_s | a_n: \\ P^+(d_i) \leq y}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1) \dots \mu^2(d_s)}{d_1 \dots d_s} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{c}{\alpha}\right)^s \sum_{d_1, \dots, d_s \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1) \dots \mu^2(d_s)}{d_1 \dots d_s} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq N: \\ d_1 | a_n, \dots, d_s | a_n}} 1 \\ &= \left(\frac{c}{\alpha}\right)^s \sum_{d_1, \dots, d_s \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1) \dots \mu^2(d_s)}{d_1 \dots d_s} \omega([d_1, \dots, d_s]). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)}\right)^s \leq \left(\frac{c}{\alpha}\right)^s \sum_{n \in \mathcal{D}} \omega(n) f(n),$$

where

$$f(n) = \sum_{\substack{d_1, \dots, d_s \in \mathcal{D}: \\ [d_1, \dots, d_s] = n}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1) \dots \mu^2(d_s)}{d_1 \dots d_s}.$$

It is easy to see that $f(n)$ is supported on \mathcal{D} . Suppose that $m, n \in \mathcal{D}$ and $(m, n) = 1$. For any $d_1, \dots, d_s \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $[d_1, \dots, d_s] = mn$ there are unique $d'_i, d''_i \in \mathcal{D}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, such that $d'_i d''_i = d_i$, $(d'_i, d''_i) = 1$, $[d'_1, \dots, d'_s] = n$, and $[d''_1, \dots, d''_s] = m$. Hence

$$f(nm) = \sum_{\substack{d'_1, \dots, d'_s \in \mathcal{D}: \\ [d'_1, \dots, d'_s] = n}} \frac{\mu^2(d'_1) \dots \mu^2(d'_s)}{d'_1 \dots d'_s} \sum_{\substack{d''_1, \dots, d''_s \in \mathcal{D}: \\ [d''_1, \dots, d''_s] = m}} \frac{\mu^2(d''_1) \dots \mu^2(d''_s)}{d''_1 \dots d''_s} = f(n) f(m).$$

Since $f(n) = 0$ for any $n \notin \mathcal{D}$, we obtain that $f(n)$ is a multiplicative function. It is clear that

$$f(p) = \sum_{k=1}^s \binom{s}{k} p^{-k} = (1 + p^{-1})^s - 1$$

for any prime $p \leq y$.

Since $\omega(n) \leq K/g(n)$ for any $n \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s &\leq K \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \sum_{n \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = K \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{f(p)}{g(p)} \right) \\ &= K \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since $g(p) > 0$ for any prime p , from Theorem 1.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s &\leq \gamma N \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \\ &\leq \gamma N \left(\frac{c}{\alpha} \right)^s \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

For any prime $p > s$, by the mean value theorem there is $\xi \in (0, p^{-1})$ such that

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{p} \right)^s - 1 = s(1 + \xi)^{s-1} \frac{1}{p} < s \left(1 + \frac{1}{s} \right)^{s-1} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{es}{p}. \quad (3.2)$$

Since $\ln(1 + x) \leq x$ for any $x \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\prod_{p > s} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \leq \prod_{p > s} \left(1 + \frac{es}{pg(p)} \right) \leq \exp \left(es \sum_{p > s} \frac{1}{pg(p)} \right) \leq \exp(esL). \quad (3.3)$$

If $p \leq s$, then

$$1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} < 1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s}{c_0} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_0} \right) (1 + p^{-1})^s \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_0} \right) \exp \left(\frac{s}{p} \right).$$

By Mertens' theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{p \leq s} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_0} \right)^s \exp \left(\sum_{p \leq s} \frac{s}{p} \right) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_0} \right)^s \exp(s \ln \ln(s + 2) + c_3 s), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $c_3 > 0$ is an absolute constant. From (3.1), (3.3), and (3.4) we obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s \leq \exp(s \ln \ln(s + 2) + Cs) N,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on γ , L , c_0 , and α . The inequality (1.1) is proved.

Now we prove the inequality (1.2). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs)N &\geq \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s \geq \sum_{n \leq N: a_n/\varphi(a_n) > t} \left(\frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} \right)^s \\ &\geq t^s \sum_{n \leq N: a_n/\varphi(a_n) > t} 1. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\#\left\{n \leq N : \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} > t\right\} \leq \exp(s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs - s \ln t)N. \quad (3.5)$$

We take

$$s = \lceil \exp(te^{-(C+1)}) \rceil + 1.$$

Then

$$s+2 = \exp(te^{-(C+1)}) + 3 - \theta, \text{ where } \theta := \{\exp(te^{-(C+1)})\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(s+2) &= te^{-(C+1)} + \ln\left(1 + \frac{3-\theta}{\exp(te^{-(C+1)})}\right) \\ &= te^{-(C+1)} + R_1, \quad 0 < R_1 \leq \frac{3}{\exp(te^{-(C+1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \ln(s+2) &= \ln t - (C+1) + \ln\left(1 + \frac{e^{(C+1)}R_1}{t}\right) \\ &= \ln t - (C+1) + R_2, \quad 0 < R_2 \leq \frac{3e^{C+1}}{t \exp(te^{-(C+1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs - s \ln t = -s + sR_2,$$

where

$$0 < sR_2 \leq \frac{3e^{C+1}(\exp(te^{-(C+1)}) + 1)}{t \exp(te^{-(C+1)})} \leq \frac{6e^{C+1}}{t}.$$

We obtain

$$s \ln \ln(s+2) + Cs - s \ln t \leq -\exp(te^{-(C+1)}) + \frac{6e^{C+1}}{t} \leq -\exp(te^{-(C+1)}/2), \quad (3.6)$$

if $t \geq t_0$ (here $t_0 = t_0(C) = t_0(\gamma, L, c_0, \alpha)$ is a positive constant depending only on γ, L, c_0 , and α).

We set

$$c_2 = e^{-(C+1)}/2, \quad c_1 = \max(\exp(\exp(c_2 t_0)), 1).$$

Then c_1 and c_2 are positive constants depending only on γ, L, c_0 , and α . From (3.5) and (3.6) we obtain

$$\#\left\{n \leq N : \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} > t\right\} \leq \exp(-\exp(c_2 t))N,$$

if $t > t_0$. If $0 < t \leq t_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \#\left\{n \leq N : \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} > t\right\} &\leq N \leq N \frac{\exp(\exp(c_2 t_0))}{\exp(\exp(c_2 t))} \\ &\leq c_1 \exp(-\exp(c_2 t))N. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain

$$\#\left\{n \leq N : \frac{a_n}{\varphi(a_n)} > t\right\} \leq c_1 \exp(-\exp(c_2 t))N$$

for any $t > 0$, and the inequality (1.2) is proved. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

4. PROOF OF COROLLARIES 1.1 - 1.3

Proof of Corollary 1.1. We set $a_n = f(n)$. It is clear that $N = [x]$. There exists a positive constant τ depending only on f such that $f(n) \leq \tau n^d$ for any positive integer n . We take $M = \tau x^d$ and $\alpha = 1/2$. We can assume that $x \geq x_0$, where $x_0 > 0$ is a large constant depending only on f . We have

$$y = (\ln M)^\alpha = (d \ln x + \ln \tau)^{1/2} \leq (\ln x)^{3/4},$$

if x_0 is large enough. If $n \in \mathcal{D}$, then

$$n \leq \prod_{p \leq y} p \leq \exp(2y) \leq \exp(2(\ln x)^{3/4}) \leq \sqrt{x} < [x] = N.$$

We need the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *Let d and m be positive integers. Let*

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d b_i x^i,$$

where b_0, \dots, b_d are integers with $(b_0, \dots, b_d, m) = 1$. Let $\rho(f, m)$ denote the number of solutions of the congruence $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Then

$$\rho(f, m) \leq c d m^{1-1/d},$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. This is [1, Theorem 2]. \square

By Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(n) = \#\{k \leq N : f(k) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}\} &\leq \rho(f, n) \left(\frac{N}{n} + 1 \right) \leq 2\rho(f, n) \frac{N}{n} \\ &\leq (2c) d n^{1-1/d} \frac{N}{n} = \frac{\gamma N}{n^{1/d}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = 2cd$. The function $g(n) = n^{1/d}$ is multiplicative. Also, $g(p) = p^{1/d} \geq 1$ for any prime p (hence, we can take $c_0 = 1$) and

$$L = \sum_p \frac{1}{p g(p)} = \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{1+1/d}} < \infty.$$

By Theorem 1.2 there exist positive constants C , c_1 , and c_2 (depending only on d) such that (1.3) and (1.4) hold. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.2. We can assume that $x \geq x_0$, where x_0 is a large absolute constant. We set

$$\Omega = \{b \in \mathbb{Z} : |b| \leq \eta \ln x, b \neq b_1, \dots, b_k\}.$$

Since $\varphi(mn) \geq \varphi(m)\varphi(n)$ for all positive integers m and n , and $a^{k+1}/\varphi(a^{k+1}) = a/\varphi(a)$, we obtain

$$S = \sum_{b \in \Omega} \left(\frac{a^{k+1}|f(b)|}{\varphi(a^{k+1}|f(b)|)} \right)^s \leq \left(\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \right)^s \sum_{b \in \Omega} \left(\frac{|f(b)|}{\varphi(|f(b)|)} \right)^s = \left(\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \right)^s S_0. \quad (4.1)$$

Let $b \in \Omega$. Hence, $|b - b_i| \leq 2 \ln x$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $|f(b)| \leq (2 \ln x)^k$. Suppose that $k \geq \ln \ln x$. Since $n/\varphi(n) \leq c \ln \ln(n+2)$ for any positive integer n , where c is an absolute positive constant, we obtain

$$\frac{|f(b)|}{\varphi(|f(b)|)} \leq c(\ln k + \ln \ln(4 \ln x)) \leq c_1 \ln k.$$

Hence,

$$S \leq \left(\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} c_1 \ln k \right)^s \#\Omega \leq \left(c_2 \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \ln k \right)^s \eta \ln x,$$

where c_2 is an absolute positive constant.

Suppose that $2 \leq k < \ln \ln x$. We take $\alpha = 1/4$, $M = (2 \ln x)^k$. Then

$$y = (\ln M)^\alpha \leq 2(\ln \ln x)^{1/2}.$$

If $n \in \mathcal{D}$, then

$$n \leq \prod_{p \leq y} p \leq \exp(2y) \leq \exp(4(\ln \ln x)^{1/2}) \leq \eta \ln x.$$

For $n \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(n) = \#\{b \in \Omega : f(b) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}\} &\leq \left(\frac{2\eta \ln x}{n} + 1 \right) \prod_{p|n} \min(p, k) \\ &\leq \frac{3\eta \ln x}{n} \prod_{p|n} \min(p, k). \end{aligned}$$

We set $g(1) = 1$,

$$g(p^\beta) = \begin{cases} p/\min(p, k), & \text{if } \beta = 1; \\ 1, & \text{if } \beta \geq 2; \end{cases}$$

and $g(p_1^{\beta_1} \dots p_r^{\beta_r}) = g(p_1^{\beta_1}) \dots g(p_r^{\beta_r})$, where p_1, \dots, p_r are pairwise distinct prime numbers. Then $g(n)$ is a multiplicative function and

$$\omega(n) \leq \frac{3\eta \ln x}{g(n)}$$

for any $n \in \mathcal{D}$. Since $g(p) > 0$ for any prime p , from Theorem 1.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b \in \Omega} \left(\frac{|f(b)|}{\varphi(|f(b)|)} \right)^s &\leq c^s (\eta \ln x) \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \\ &\leq c^s (\eta \ln x) \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

(here $c > 0$ is an absolute constant). By (4.1) and (4.2) we have

$$S \leq \left(c \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} \right)^s \eta \ln x \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right).$$

Suppose that $s \leq k$ (we recall that $2 \leq k < \ln \ln x$). If $p > k$, then $p > s$ and (3.2) holds. Since $g(p) = p/k$, we obtain

$$\prod_{p > k} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \leq \prod_{p > k} \left(1 + \frac{e k s}{p^2} \right) \leq c_1^s,$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is an absolute constant. If $p \leq k$, then $g(p) = 1$ and we have

$$1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} = (1 + p^{-1})^s \leq \exp\left(\frac{s}{p}\right).$$

Hence

$$\prod_{p \leq k} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \leq \exp\left(\sum_{p \leq k} \frac{s}{p}\right) \leq (c_2 \ln k)^s,$$

where $c_2 > 0$ is an absolute constant. The inequality (1.5) is proved.

Suppose that $s > k$ and $2 \leq k < \ln \ln x$. Since $g(p) \geq p/k > p/s$ for any prime p , we obtain

$$\prod_{p > s} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \leq \prod_{p > s} \left(1 + \frac{e s^2}{p^2} \right) \leq c_3^s.$$

Since $g(p) \geq 1$ for any prime p , we have

$$\prod_{p \leq s} \left(1 + \frac{(1 + p^{-1})^s - 1}{g(p)} \right) \leq \exp\left(\sum_{p \leq s} \frac{s}{p}\right) \leq (c_4 \ln s)^s.$$

The inequality (1.6) is proved. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.2. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3. We set $a_n = p_n - 1$, where p_n is the n th prime. It is clear that $N = \pi(x)$. We take $\alpha = 1/2$, $M = x$. We can assume that $x \geq x_0$, where x_0 is a large absolute constant. Then $y = (\ln x)^{1/2}$. If $n \in \mathcal{D}$, then

$$n \leq \prod_{p \leq y} p = \exp((1 + o(1))y) \leq \exp(2(\ln x)^{1/2}) \leq \sqrt{x}.$$

By the Brun - Titchmarsh inequality (see, for example, [4, Exercise 9.3.13]) we have

$$\omega(n) = \#\{p \leq x : p \equiv 1 \pmod{n}\} \leq \frac{3x}{\varphi(n) \ln(2x/n)} \leq \gamma \frac{\pi(x)}{\varphi(n)},$$

where γ is an absolute positive constant. Since $\varphi(n)$ is a multiplicative function, $\varphi(p) = p - 1 \geq 1$ for any prime p (hence, we can take $c_0 = 1$), and

$$L = \sum_p \frac{1}{p\varphi(p)} = \sum_p \frac{1}{p(p-1)} < \infty,$$

we can apply Theorem 1.2. Since γ , L , c_0 , and α are absolute positive constants, the constants C , c_1 , and c_2 in (1.7) and (1.8) are absolute and positive. Corollary 1.3 is proved. \square

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Mikhail R. Gabdullin for useful comments.

This research was supported by Russian Science Foundation, grant 20-11-20203, <https://rscf.ru/en/project/20-11-20203/>.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. V. Konyagin, On the number of solutions of an n th degree congruence with one unknown, *Sb. Math.*, **37** (1980), no. 2, 151–166.
- [2] J. Maynard, Dense clusters of primes in subsets, *Compos. Math.*, **152** (2016), no. 7, 1517–1554.
- [3] A. O. Radomskii, On Romanoff’s theorem, *Izv. Math.*, **87** (2023), no. 1, 113–153.
- [4] M. Ram Murty, *Problems in analytic number theory*, 2nd ed., Grad. Texts in Math., **206**, Readings in Math., Springer, New York, 2008, xxii+502 pp.

HSE UNIVERSITY, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Email address: `artyom.radomskii@mail.ru`