

# LIMIT THEOREMS FOR EMPIRICAL DENSITY OF GREATEST COMMON DIVISORS

BEHZAD MEHRDAD AND LINGJIONG ZHU

**ABSTRACT.** The law of large numbers for the empirical density for the pairs of uniformly distributed integers with a given greatest common divisor is a classic result in number theory. In this paper, we study the large deviations of the empirical density. We will also obtain a sharp rate of convergence to the normal distribution for the central limit theorem. Some generalizations are provided.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be the random variables uniformly distributed on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . It is well known that

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \ell} \rightarrow \frac{6}{\pi^2 \ell^2}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Heuristically, observe that if  $\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \ell$ , then  $X_i, X_j \in C_\ell := \{\ell n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , with probability  $\frac{1}{\ell^2}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\{\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \ell\} = \{X_i, X_j \in C_\ell, \gcd(X_i/\ell, X_j/\ell) = 1\}$ . Therefore, we get the desired result by noticing that  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ell^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$ .

On the other hand, two independent uniformly chosen integers are coprime if and only if they do not have a common prime factor. For any prime number  $p$ , the probability that a uniformly random integer is divisible by  $p$  is  $\frac{1}{p}$ . Hence, we get an alternative formula,

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j) = 1} \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} = \frac{6}{\pi^2},$$

where  $\zeta(\cdot)$  is the Riemann zeta function and throughout this paper  $\mathcal{P}$  denotes the set of all the prime numbers in an increasing order.

The fact that  $\mathbb{P}(\gcd(X_i, X_j)) \rightarrow \frac{6}{\pi^2}$  was first proved by Cesàro [2]. The identity relating the product over primes to  $\zeta(2)$  in (1.2) is an example of an Euler product, and the evaluation of  $\zeta(2)$  as  $\pi^2/6$  is the Basel problem, solved by Leonhard Euler in 1735. For a rigorous proof of (1.2), see e.g. Hardy and Wright [11]. For further details and properties of the distributions, moments and asymptotics for the greatest common divisors, we refer to Cesàro [3], [4], Cohen [5], Diaconis and Erdős [7] and Fernández and Fernández [9], [10].

Since the law of large numbers result is well-known, it is natural to study the fluctuations, i.e. central limit theorem and the probabilities of rare events, i.e.

---

*Date:* 9 November 2013. *Revised:* 9 November 2013.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F10, 60F05, 11A05.

*Key words and phrases.* Greatest common divisors, coprime pairs, central limit theorems, large deviations, rare events.

large deviations. The central limit theorem was recently obtained in Fernández and Fernández [9] and we will provide the sharp rate of convergence to normal distribution. The large deviations result is the main contribution of this paper.

For the readers who are interested in the probabilistic methods in number theory, we refer to the books by Elliott [8] and Tenenbaum [12].

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2, we state the main results, i.e. the central limit theorem and the convergence rate to the Gaussian distribution and the large deviation principle for the emirical density. The proofs for large deviation principle are given in Section 3, and the proofs for the central limit theorem are given in Section 4.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

**2.1. Central Limit Theorem.** In this section, we will show a central limit theorem and obtain the sharp rate of convergence to the normal distribution. The method we will use is based on a result by Baldi et al. [1] for Stein's method for central limit theorems.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $Z$  be a standard normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1.*

$$(2.1) \quad d_{TV} \left( \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} - n^2 \frac{6}{\pi^2}}{2\sigma^2 n^{3/2}}, Z \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}},$$

where  $C > 0$  is a universal constant and

$$(2.2) \quad \sigma^2 := \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3} \right) - \frac{36}{\pi^4}.$$

Similarly, we have the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $Z$  be a standard normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1, and let  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

$$(2.3) \quad d_{TV} \left( \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=\ell} - n^2 \frac{6}{\ell^2 \pi^2}}{2\sigma^2 n^{3/2}}, Z \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}},$$

where  $C > 0$  is a universal constant and

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma^2 := \frac{1}{\ell^3} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3} \right) - \frac{36}{\ell^4 \pi^4}.$$

**2.2. Large Deviation Principle.** In this section, we are interested to study the following probability,

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=\ell} \simeq x \right), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

When  $x \neq \frac{1}{\ell^2} \frac{6}{\pi^2}$ , this probability goes to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, later, we will show that,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=\ell} \simeq x \right) \simeq e^{-nI_\ell(x)+o(n)}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In other words, this probability decays exponenailly fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This pheonomenon is called large devitions in probability and the exponent  $I_\ell(x)$  is the rate function.

Later in this section, we will specify  $I_\ell(x)$  for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . For the moment, let us concentrate on  $I_1(x)$ , the case in which we consider the number of coprime pairs.

Before we proceed, let us introduce the formal definition of large deviations. A sequence  $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of probability measures on a topological space  $X$  satisfies the large deviation principle with rate function  $I : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  if  $I$  is non-negative, lower semicontinuous and for any measurable set  $A$ , we have

$$(2.7) \quad - \inf_{x \in A^\circ} I(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(A) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(A) \leq - \inf_{x \in \bar{A}} I(x).$$

Here,  $A^\circ$  is the interior of  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$  is its closure. We refer to Dembo and Zeitouni [6] or Varadhan [13] for general background of large deviations and the applications.

Let  $X_i = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k} q_1^{\beta_1} \cdots q_m^{\beta_m}$ , where  $p_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k$  are the first  $k$  prime numbers and  $q_h$  are distinct primes other than  $p_j$ , for  $1 \leq h \leq m$ . Define  $X_i^k$  as the restriction of  $X_i$  to its first  $k$  primes, i.e.  $X_i^k := p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ .

As a first step to understand the event that  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  are coprime, it is easier to understand the event that  $X_i^k$  and  $X_j^k$  are coprime. For a given prime  $p \in \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$ , we can ask whether  $X_i^k$  and  $X_j^k$  are divisible by  $p$  or not, for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . This is analogous to selecting two subsets from  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and consider if they have empty intersection. To illustrate, let us consider the following example.

Choose  $n$  subsets  $A_i^k$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , uniformly from  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Then,  $A_i^k \cap A_j^k = \emptyset$  if and only if  $h \notin A_i^k \cap A_j^k$ , for any  $h \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , which occurs with probability  $1 - \frac{1}{2^2}$ . Therefore, the following law of large numbers holds,

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{A_i^k \cap A_j^k = \emptyset} \rightarrow \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^2}\right)^k = \frac{3^k}{4^k}.$$

Let us denote the  $2^k$  subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  by  $B_1, \dots, B_{2^k}$  and  $\mathcal{P}^k := \{B_1, \dots, B_{2^k}\}$ . Then,

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{A_i^k \cap A_j^k = \emptyset} = \iint_{x \in \mathcal{P}^k, y \in \mathcal{P}^k} f_k(x, y) L_n^A(dx) L_n^A(dy),$$

where  $L_n^A$  is the empirical measure on  $\mathcal{P}^k$ , i.e.

$$(2.10) \quad L_n^A(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{A_i^k}(x),$$

and  $f_k(x, y)$  on  $\mathcal{P}^k \times \mathcal{P}^k$  is defined as

$$(2.11) \quad f_k(x, y) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \cap y \neq \emptyset, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The sets  $A_i^k$  are i.i.d. uniformly distributed on  $\mathcal{P}^k$ . Sanov's theorem tells us that

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(L_n^A \simeq \mu) = e^{-nI(\mu) + o(n)},$$

where  $\mu = (\mu_j)_{1 \leq j \leq 2^k} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}^k)$ , the space of all the probability measures on  $\mathcal{P}^k$ , and the rate function is given by

$$(2.13) \quad I(\mu) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^k} \log \left( \frac{\mu_j}{2^{-k}} \right) \mu_j.$$

By contraction principle,

$$(2.14) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{A_i^k \cap A_j^k = \emptyset} \simeq x \right) \simeq e^{-nI(x)+o(n)},$$

where

$$(2.15) \quad I(x) = \inf_{\int \int_{\mathcal{P}^k \times \mathcal{P}^k} f_k(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = x} \sum_{j=1}^{2^k} \log \left( \frac{\mu_j}{2^{-k}} \right) \mu_j.$$

Now let us go back to our original problem, but for truncated integers. we are interested in,

$$(2.16) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i^k, X_j^k) = 1} \simeq x \right) \simeq e^{-nI_1(x)+o(n)}.$$

Therefore, let us introduce  $\mathcal{P}^k$  again,

$$(2.17) \quad \mathcal{P}^k := \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2^k}) : \alpha_j \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

Similar as before, we take  $A_i^k$  and  $A_j^k$  from  $\mathcal{P}^k$ . Unlike before, now the  $A_i^k$  are not taken uniformly from  $\mathcal{P}^k$ . Indeed, it follows a probability distribution  $\eta^k = (\eta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2^k}$ , where  $\eta_i$  are taken from the set

$$(2.18) \quad \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{p_1} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_1} \right)^{1-\alpha_1} \cdots \left( \frac{1}{p_k} \right)^{\alpha_k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_k} \right)^{1-\alpha_k}, \alpha_j \in \{0, 1\}, j = 1, 2, \dots, k \right\}.$$

Another look at  $f_k$  in 2.11 reveals that,

$$(2.19) \quad f_k(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_i = y_i = 1 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq 2^k. \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence, we have

$$(2.20) \quad I(x) = \inf_{\int \int_{\mathcal{P}^k \times \mathcal{P}^k} f_k(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = x} \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \log \left( \frac{\mu_i}{\eta_i} \right) \mu_i.$$

There are two issues one needs to understand.

- The first problem is how to let  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We need to understand the meaning of  $\mathcal{P}^k$  and the associated probability measure when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Later, we will see that to rigorously tackle this problem, we consider the binary expansions of a real number on  $[0, 1]$  and will define the probability measures accordingly.
- In an “ideal world”, the probability that  $X_i$  is divisible by any prime number  $p$  is precisely  $\frac{1}{p}$ . But in our definition,  $X_i$  is uniformly distributed on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and therefore the probability that it is divisible by  $p$  is  $\frac{[n/p]}{n}$ , where  $[x]$  is the integer part of  $x$ . Later, we will define the probability measure for the “ideal world” as  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  compared with the original probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Let  $S := (s_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of numbers on  $[0, 1]$ . We define the probability measure  $\nu_k^S$  on  $[0, 1]$ , for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , as follows.

$$(2.21) \quad \nu_k^S([0, b]) := \sum_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - s_j)(1 - s_i)^{b_i},$$

where  $b = 0.b_1b_2\dots$  is the binary expansion of  $b$ . In other words, if we draw a random variable  $U$  according to the measure  $\nu_k^S$  and consider the first  $k$  digits in the binary expansion of  $U$ , they are distributed as  $k$  Bernoulli random variables with parameters  $(s_i)_{i=1}^k$ . It is easy to see that a measure  $\nu^S$  exists as a weak limit of  $\nu_k^S$  and let  $\nu^S$  be its weak limit. For example, if  $s_i = \frac{1}{2}$ , for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\nu^S$  is simply the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $(p_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the members of  $\mathcal{P}$  in the increasing order. From now on, we work with  $\nu_k$  and  $\nu$ , for which the  $s_i$  is  $\frac{1}{p_i}$ , or

$$(2.22) \quad \nu = \nu^P, \text{ where } P := \left( \frac{1}{p_i} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \text{ and } p_i \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Let  $U_1, \dots, U_n$  be random variables distributed with probability measure  $\nu$ . Restrict each  $U_i$  to its first  $k$  digits in the binary expansion and define it as  $U_i^k$ . By our construction of  $\nu$  and  $\nu_k$ , we see that  $U_i^k$  are random variables distributed with probability measure  $\nu_k$ .

Let us see the connections amongst  $X_i^k$ ,  $A_i^k$  and  $U_i^k$ . If we view  $U_i^k$  as a 0, 1 sequence of length  $k$ , there exists a bijection  $\psi_k$  to  $\mathcal{P}^k$ . Hence,  $\psi_k(U_i^k)$  has the same distribution as  $A_i^k$  that is  $\eta^k$  as in eq. 2.18. In addition,  $X_i^k$  is  $\phi_k(U_i^k)$ , where the map  $\phi_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , is defined as

$$(2.23) \quad \phi_k(a) := \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{a_i},$$

where  $a = 0.a_1a_2a_3\dots$  is the binary expansion of  $a$  and  $p_i$  is the  $i$ th smallest prime number.

Moreover, if we define  $f : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  (an extension of 2.19) as

$$(2.24) \quad f(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \text{ and } y \text{ share a common 1 in their binary expansions} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

then, it is straightforward to see that

$$(2.25) \quad f(U_i^k, U_j^k) = 1_{\gcd(X_i^k, X_j^k)=1} = 1_{A_i^k \cap A_j^k = \emptyset}.$$

We also extend  $\psi_k$  naturally to  $\psi$ . In that regard, define  $A_i := \psi(U_i)$ . So,

$$(2.26) \quad f(U_i, U_j) = 1_{A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset}.$$

Since  $\phi_k$ ,  $\psi_k$ , and  $\psi$  are continuous maps,  $U_i$ 's,  $A_i$ 's and  $X_i$ 's satisfy large deviations with the same rate if one of them satisfies large deviation. Moreover, the rate function should be an extension of (2.20), and this is the subject of our next and main theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *The probability measures  $\left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} \in \cdot \right)$  satisfy a large deviation principle with rate function*

$$(2.27) \quad I_1(x) = \inf_{\int_{[0,1]^2} f(x,y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = x} \int_{[0,1]} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu,$$

where  $\nu$  and  $f$  are defined in 2.22 and 2.24, respectively.

We can also consider the following large deviation problem,

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \ell} \right) \simeq e^{-nI_\ell(x) + o(n)}.$$

Write

$$(2.29) \quad \ell = q_1^{\beta_1} q_2^{\beta_2} \cdots q_m^{\beta_m},$$

where  $q_i$  are distinct primes and  $\beta_i$  are positive integers for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

For a fixed  $\ell$ , let  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  be the smallest  $k$  primes distinct from  $q_1, \dots, q_m$ . Any positive integer can be written as

$$(2.30) \quad q_1^{\gamma_1} \cdots q_m^{\gamma_m} p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k},$$

where  $\gamma_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  are non-negative integers. Any number on  $[0, 1]$  can be written as

$$(2.31) \quad 0.\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_k \cdots,$$

where  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$  are obtained from ternary expansion and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$  are obtained from binary expansion.

The interpretation is that if an integer is not divisible by  $q_i^{\beta_i}$ , then  $\gamma_i = 0$ . If it is divisible by  $q_i^{\beta_i}$  but not by  $q_i^{\beta_i+1}$ , then  $\gamma_i = 1$ . Finally, if it is divisible by  $q_i^{\beta_i+1}$ , then  $\gamma_i = 2$ . We also have  $\alpha_j = 0$  if an integer is not divisible by  $p_j$  and 1 otherwise.

Restrict to the first  $m + k$  digits and define a probability measure  $\nu_k$  that takes values

$$(2.32) \quad g(q_1) \cdots g(q_m) \left( \frac{1}{p_1} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_1} \right)^{1-\alpha_1} \cdots \left( \frac{1}{p_k} \right)^{\alpha_k} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_k} \right)^{1-\alpha_k},$$

where

$$(2.33) \quad g(q_i) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{q_i^{\beta_i}} & \text{if } \gamma_i = 0 \\ \frac{1}{q_i^{\beta_i}} - \frac{1}{q_i^{\beta_i+1}} & \text{if } \gamma_i = 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \\ \frac{1}{q_i^{\beta_i+1}} & \text{if } \gamma_i = 2 \end{cases}$$

Let  $\nu$  be the weak limit of  $\nu_k$ . Similar to Theorem 3, we get the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *The probability measures  $\left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \ell} \in \cdot \right)$  satisfy a large deviation principle with rate function*

$$(2.34) \quad I_\ell(x) = \inf_{\int \int_{[0,1]^2} f(x,y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = x} \int_{[0,1]} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu,$$

where  $f(x, y) = 1$  if 0 never occurs in the first  $m$  digits in the expansions of  $x$  and  $y$ ; and  $x$  and  $y$  do not share a common 1 or 2 in their expansions. Otherwise,  $f(x, y) = 0$ .

**Remark 5.** *It is interesting to observe that  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$  is also the density of square-free integers. That is because an integer is square-free if and only if it is not divisible by  $p^2$  for any prime number  $p$ . Therefore, we have the law of large numbers, i.e.*

$$(2.35) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{X_i \text{ is square-free}} \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right) = \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

The central limit theorem is standard,

$$(2.36) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{X_i \text{ is square-free}} - \frac{6n}{\pi^2}}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow N\left(0, \frac{6}{\pi^2} - \frac{36}{\pi^4}\right).$$

The large deviation principle also holds with rate function

$$(2.37) \quad I(x) := x \log\left(\frac{x}{6/\pi^2}\right) + (1-x) \log\left(\frac{1-x}{1-6/\pi^2}\right).$$

**Remark 6.** One can also generalize the result to ask what it is the probability that if we uniformly randomly choose  $d$  numbers from  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  their greatest common divisor is 1. It is not hard to see that

$$(2.38) \quad \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_d \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_d})=1} \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(d)}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

There are  $d^2 n(n-1) \cdots (n-(2d-2))$  pairs  $(i_1, \dots, i_d)$  and  $(j_1, \dots, j_d)$  so that  $|\{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \cap \{j_1, \dots, j_d\}| = 1$ . It is also easy to see that

$$(2.39) \quad \mathbb{P}(\gcd(X_1, \dots, X_d) = \gcd(X_d, \dots, X_{2d-1}) = 1) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^d} + \frac{1}{p^{2d-1}}\right).$$

Therefore, we have the central limit theorem.

$$(2.40) \quad \frac{1}{d \cdot n^{\frac{2d-1}{2}}} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_d \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_d})=1} - n^d \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d}\right) \right\} \\ \rightarrow N\left(0, \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^d} + \frac{1}{p^{2d-1}}\right) - \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d}\right)^2\right).$$

We also have the large deviation principle for  $(\frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_d \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_d})=1} \in \cdot)$  with the rate function

$$(2.41) \quad I(x) = \inf_{\int \cdots \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \mu(dx_1) \cdots \mu(dx_d) = x} \int_{[0,1]} \log\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}\right) d\mu,$$

where  $\nu$  is the same as in Theorem 3 and

$$(2.42) \quad f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_1, \dots, x_d \text{ do not share a common 1 in their binary expansions} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

### 3. PROOFS OF LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE

In this section, we will prove a series of lemmas and theorems of superexponential estimates that are needed in the proof of Theorem 3 before going to the proof of Theorem 3. Let us give the definitions of  $Y_p$ ,  $S(k_1, k_2)$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  that will be used repeatedly throughout this section.

**Definition 7.** For any prime number  $p$ , we define

$$(3.1) \quad Y_p := \#\{1 \leq i \leq n : X_i \text{ is divisible by } p\}.$$

**Definition 8.** For any  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , let us define

$$(3.2) \quad S(k_1, k_2) := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : k_1 < p \leq k_2\}.$$

**Definition 9.** We define a probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  under which  $X_i$  are i.i.d. and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(X_i \text{ is divisible by } p) = \frac{1}{p}$  for  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $p \leq n$  and the events  $\{X_i \text{ divisible by } p\}$  and  $\{X_i \text{ divisible by } q\}$  are independent for distinct  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $p, q \leq n$ .

**Lemma 10.** Let  $Y$  be a Binomial random variable distributed as  $B(\alpha, n)$ . For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\lambda_1 := e^\lambda$ . If  $2\alpha\lambda_1^2 < 1$  and  $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ , then, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} Y^2} \right] \leq 4\lambda\alpha^2\lambda_1^4 + \frac{\log 4(n+1)}{n}.$$

*Proof.* By the definition of Binomial distribution,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} Y^2} \right] &= \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \alpha^i (1-\alpha)^{n-i} e^{\frac{\lambda i^2}{n}} \\ &\leq (n+1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \binom{n}{i} \alpha^i (1-\alpha)^{n-i} e^{\frac{\lambda i^2}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Stirling's formula, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(3.5) \quad 1 \leq \frac{n!}{\sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n} \leq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Therefore, we have  $\binom{n}{i} \leq 4e^{nH(i/n)}$ , where  $H(x) := -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ ,  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ . Hence,

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} Y^2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\log 4(n+1)}{n} + \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ H\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) + \frac{i}{n} \log(\alpha) + \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) \log(1-\alpha) + \lambda \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To find the maximum of

$$(3.7) \quad f(x) := H(x) + x \log(\alpha) + (1-x) \log(1-\alpha) + \lambda x^2,$$

it is sufficient to look at

$$(3.8) \quad f'(x) = \log\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right) - \log\left(\frac{x}{1-x}\right) + 2\lambda x.$$

The assumptions  $2\alpha\lambda_1^2 < 1$  and  $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$  implies that

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \lambda_1^2 \leq 2\alpha\lambda_1^2 \leq \frac{2\alpha\lambda_1^2}{1-2\alpha\lambda_1^2}.$$

Since logarithm is an increasing function, (3.8) and (3.9) imply that  $f'(x) < 0$  for any  $x \geq 2\alpha\lambda_1^2$ . Therefore, the maximum of  $f$  is attained at some  $x \leq 2\alpha\lambda_1^2$ .

In addition, since  $\log(\frac{x}{1-x})$  is increasing in  $x$ , the maximum of

$$(3.10) \quad g(x) := H(x) + x \log(\alpha) + (1-x) \log(1-\alpha)$$

is achieved at  $x = \alpha$ , which is  $g(\alpha) = 0$ . Hence,

$$(3.11) \quad \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1} f(x) = \max_{0 \leq x \leq 2\alpha\lambda_1^2} f(x) \leq 0 + \lambda x^2 \leq \lambda(2\alpha\lambda_1^2)^2,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$



**Theorem 11.** For any  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large and  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} Y_p^2 > n^2 \epsilon \right) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{8} \log(k) + 4.$$

Therefore, we have the following superexponential estimate,

$$(3.13) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} Y_p^2 > n^2 \epsilon \right) = -\infty.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $Y_p = \#\{1 \leq i \leq n : \tilde{X}_i \text{ is divisible by } p\}$ . And whether  $\tilde{X}_i$  is divisible by  $p$  is independent from  $\tilde{X}_i$  being divisible by  $q$  for distinct primes  $p$  and  $q$ . In other words,  $Y_p$  are independent for distinct primes  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ . By Chebychev's inequality,

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} Y_p^2 > n^2 \epsilon \right) &\leq -\lambda \epsilon + \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} Y_p^2} \right] \\ &= -\lambda \epsilon + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} Y_p^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We choose  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough so that  $\lambda_1 = e^\lambda < \sqrt{2k}$ . For  $k < p \leq n$ , we have  $\frac{2}{p} \lambda_1^2 < \frac{2}{k} \lambda_1^2 < 1$ . By Lemma 10, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} Y_p^2} \right] \leq \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} \frac{\log(4(n+1))}{n} + 4\lambda \left( \frac{1}{p} \right)^2 \lambda_1^4.$$

Prime number theorem states that

$$(3.16) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(x)}{x / \log(x)} = 1,$$

where  $\pi(x)$  denotes the number of primes less than  $x$ . Therefore,  $|k < p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{2n}{\log n}$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Together with (3.15), for sufficiently large  $n$ , we get

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[ e^{\frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{k < p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} Y_p^2} \right] &\leq \frac{2n}{\log n} \frac{\log 4(n+1)}{n} + 4\lambda \lambda_1^4 \sum_{k < p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p^2} \\ &\leq 3 + 4\lambda \lambda_1^4 \sum_{\ell > k} \frac{1}{\ell^2} \\ &\leq 3 + 4\lambda \lambda_1^4 \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.17) into (3.14), we get

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{k < p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} Y_p^2 > n^2 \epsilon \right) &\leq -\lambda \epsilon + 3 + \frac{4\lambda \lambda_1^4}{k} \\ &= 3 - \lambda \left( \epsilon - \frac{4\lambda_1^4}{k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can choose  $\lambda = \frac{1}{4} \log(\epsilon k) - 3$  so that  $\frac{4\lambda^4}{k} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  and it does not violate with our earlier assumption that  $\lambda_1 < \sqrt{2k}$  for large  $k$ . Hence,

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{k < p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} Y_p^2 > \epsilon n^2 \right) &\leq 3 - \frac{\log(k\epsilon)}{8} \epsilon + 3\epsilon \\ &\leq 4 - \frac{\log(k)}{8} \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 12.** *For  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  sufficiently large,*

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{S(k_1, k_2)} Y_p^2 > \epsilon n^2 \right) \leq 4 \log \log k_2 + 4 - \frac{\log(k_1)}{8} \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* The idea of the proof is to change the measure from  $\mathbb{P}$  to  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  and apply Lemma 10. First, observe that  $F(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{p \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_p^2$  only depends on the events  $\{X_i \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell}\}$ , where  $i, \ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $\{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\} \subset S(k_1, k_2)$  and

$$(3.21) \quad E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell} := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \mid \text{Prime}(i) \cap S(k_1, k_2) = \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}\},$$

where  $\text{Prime}(x) := \{q \in \mathcal{P} : x \text{ is divisible by } q\}$ . We will show that the following uniform upper bound holds,

$$(3.22) \quad \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell})}{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(X_1 \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell})} \leq e^{4 \log \log k_2}.$$

Before we proceed, let us show that (3.22) and Theorem 11 implies (3.20). Since  $X_i$ 's are independent and  $\tilde{X}_i$ 's are independent,

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{\mathbb{P} \left( X_i \in E_{p_1^i, \dots, p_\ell^i}, 1 \leq i \leq n \right)}{\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( X_i \in E_{p_1^i, \dots, p_\ell^i}, 1 \leq i \leq n \right)} \leq [e^{4 \log \log k_2}]^n,$$

where  $\{p_1^i, \dots, p_\ell^i\} \subset S(k_1, k_2)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Recall that  $F$  only depends on events  $\{X_i \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell}\}$ , therefore,

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(F > n^2 \epsilon) &\leq 4 \log \log k_2 + \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(F > n^2 \epsilon) \\ &\leq 4 \log \log k_2 + 4 - \frac{\log(k_1)}{8} \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 11 at the last step. Now, let us prove (3.22). First, let us give an upper bound for the numerator, that is,

$$(3.25) \quad \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell}) = \frac{1}{n} \#|E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell}| \leq \frac{\left\lceil \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_\ell} \right\rceil}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_\ell},$$

where  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the largest integer less or equal to  $x$  and we used the simple fact that  $\frac{\lceil x \rceil}{x} \leq 1$  for any positive  $x$ .

As for the lower bound for the denominator, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.26) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(X_1 \in E_{p_1, \dots, p_\ell}) &= \prod_{q \in \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}} \frac{1}{q} \prod_{q \in S(k_1, k_2) \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \\
 &\geq \prod_{q \in \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}} \frac{1}{q} \prod_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \\
 &\geq \prod_{q \in \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}} \frac{1}{q} e^{-2 \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} \frac{1}{q}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the inequality that  $1 - x \geq e^{-2x}$  for  $x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Notice that

$$(3.27) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ - \sum_{q \in S(1, n)} \frac{1}{q} + \log \log n \right\} = M,$$

where  $M = 0.261497 \dots$  is the Meissel-Mertens constant. Therefore, for sufficiently large  $k_2$ ,

$$(3.28) \quad \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} \frac{1}{q} \leq \sum_{q \in S(1, k_2)} \frac{1}{q} \leq 2 \log \log k_2.$$

Combining (3.25), (3.26) and (3.28), we have proved the upper bound in (3.22).  $\square$

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $p_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  be the primes such that  $S(k_1, k_2) = \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\}$  and*

$$(3.29) \quad m \prod_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} p_j \leq n < (m+1) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} p_j,$$

where  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, there exists a coupling of vectors of random variables  $X_i$  and  $\tilde{X}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , i.e. a measure  $\mu$  with marginal distributions the same as  $X_i$  and  $\tilde{X}_i$  such that

$$(3.30) \quad \mu \left( \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_q^2 - \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} \tilde{Y}_q^2 \geq n^2 \epsilon \right) \leq 2^n \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{n \epsilon}{2k_2}}.$$

*Proof.* The main ingredient of the proof is the Chinese Remainder Theorem which states that the set of equations

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{cases} x \equiv a_1 \pmod{p_1} \\ \vdots \\ x \equiv a_\ell \pmod{p_\ell} \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution  $1 \leq x \leq p_1 \cdots p_\ell$ , where  $0 \leq a_i < p_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ . Hence, for each sequence of  $a_i$ 's, the set of equations in (3.31) has exactly  $m$  solutions for  $1 \leq x \leq mp_1 \cdots p_\ell$ . We denote these solutions by  $R_i(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . Given  $X_i$  uniformly distributed on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we define  $\tilde{X}_i$  as follows. We generate Bernoulli random variables  $c_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , with parameters  $\frac{1}{p_j}$  and independent of each other. Now, define

$$(3.32) \quad \tilde{X}_i = \begin{cases} p_1^{c_1} \cdots p_\ell^{c_\ell} & \text{if } X_i > mp_1 \cdots p_\ell, \\ p_1^{b_1} \cdots p_\ell^{b_\ell} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where  $b_j$  is 1 if  $X_i$  is divisible by  $p_j$  and 0 otherwise for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ . By the definition, if we condition on  $X_i > mp_1 \cdots p_\ell$ ,  $\tilde{X}_i$  is the multiplication of  $p_j^{c_j}$  and  $c_j$ 's are independent. Now, conditional on  $X_i \leq mp_1 \cdots p_\ell$  and let  $\text{Prime}(X_i) = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : X_i \text{ is divisible by } p\}$ . Thus, for a vector  $\vec{b} = (b_j)_{j=1}^\ell \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ , we have

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta &:= \mu \left( \tilde{X}_i = \prod_{j=1}^\ell p_j^{b_j} \mid X_i \leq mp_1 \cdots p_\ell \right) \\ &= \mu \left( \text{Prime}(X_i) \cap \{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\} = S(\vec{b}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $S(\vec{b}) := \{p_j \mid b_j = 1, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}$ . But that is equivalent to

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{\#\{R_i(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \mid a_j = 0 \text{ if and only if } b_j = 0, 1 \leq i \leq m\}}{mp_1 \cdots p_\ell} \\ &= \frac{m \prod_{b_j \neq 0} (p_j - 1)}{mp_1 \cdots p_\ell} \\ &= \prod_{j: b_j = 0} \frac{1}{p_j} \prod_{j: b_j \neq 0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_j}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$(3.35) \quad \mu \left( X_i = \prod_{j=1}^\ell p_j^{b_j} \right) = \prod_{j: b_j = 0} \frac{1}{p_j} \prod_{j: b_j \neq 0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_j}\right).$$

Let us define

$$(3.36) \quad g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\text{Prime}(X_i) \cap S(k_1, k_2)\} \neq \{\text{Prime}(\tilde{X}_i) \cap S(k_1, k_2)\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

By the definition of the coupling of  $\vec{X}$  and  $\vec{\tilde{X}}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1) \leq \frac{1}{m}$  since the event  $g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1$  implies that  $X_i > mp_1 \cdots p_\ell$  which occurs with probability

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{n - mp_1 p_2 \cdots p_\ell}{n} \leq 1 - \frac{mp_1 p_2 \cdots p_\ell}{(m+1)p_1 \cdots p_\ell} = \frac{1}{m+1} < \frac{1}{m}.$$

Now, let us go back to prove the superexponential bound in (3.30). Observe that

$$(3.38) \quad f(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_q^2 = \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_q + \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} \sum_{i \neq j} 1_{q \mid \gcd(X_i, X_j)}.$$

Hence,

$$(3.39) \quad \left| \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_q^2 - \tilde{Y}_q^2 \right| \leq \#\{i \mid g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1\} 2k_2 n.$$

That is because if we change one of  $X_i$ 's, the function  $f(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  changes by at most  $k_2(n+1) \leq 2k_2n$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.40) \quad & \mu \left( \sum_{q \in S(k_1, k_2)} Y_q^2 - \tilde{Y}_q^2 \geq n^2 \epsilon \right) \\
 & \leq \mu \left( 2k_2n \# \{i | g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1\} \geq n^2 \epsilon \right) \\
 & = \mu \left( \# \{i | g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1\} \geq n \frac{\epsilon}{2k_2} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\# \{i | g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1\} = \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i)=1}$  is the sum of i.i.d. indicator functions and  $\mu(g(X_1, \tilde{X}_1) = 1) \leq \frac{1}{m}$ . Hence, by Chebychev's inequality, by choosing  $\theta = \log m > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.41) \quad & \mu \left( \# \{i | g(X_i, \tilde{X}_i) = 1\} \geq n \frac{\epsilon}{2k_2} \right) \\
 & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\theta 1_{g(X_1, \tilde{X}_1)=1}} \right]^n e^{-\theta n \frac{\epsilon}{2k_2}} \\
 & \leq \left( \frac{e^\theta}{m} + 1 \right)^n e^{-\theta n \frac{\epsilon}{2k_2}} \\
 & \leq 2^n e^{-(\log m)n \frac{\epsilon}{2k_2}}
 \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Theorem 14.** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have the following superexponential estimates,*

$$(3.42) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{q \in S(k, n)} Y_q^2 > n^2 \epsilon \right) = -\infty.$$

*Proof.* Let us write

$$(3.43) \quad \sum_{q \in S(k, n)} Y_q^2 = \sum_{q \in S(k, M_1)} Y_q^2 + \sum_{q \in S(M_1, M_2)} Y_q^2 + \sum_{q \in S(M_2, n)} Y_q^2,$$

where  $M_1 := \lceil \log \log n \rceil^{\frac{120}{\epsilon}}$  and  $M_2 := \lceil \log n \rceil^{\frac{120}{\epsilon}}$ . By Lemma 12, for the second and third terms in (3.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.44) \quad & \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{q \in S(M_1, M_2)} Y_q^2 > \frac{n^2 \epsilon}{3} \right) \\
 & \leq 4 \log \log M_2 + 4 - \frac{\log M_1}{8} \frac{\epsilon}{3} \\
 & = 4 \log(\log(\lceil \log n \rceil^{\frac{120}{\epsilon}})) + 4 - \frac{\epsilon}{24} \log(\lceil \log(\log(n)) \rceil^{\frac{120}{\epsilon}}) \\
 & = 4 \log \left( \log \left( \frac{120}{\epsilon} \right) + \log \log n \right) + 4 - 5 \log \log \log n \\
 & = 4 \log \log \left( \frac{120}{\epsilon} \right) + 4 - \log \log \log n,
 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$(3.45) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{q \in S(M_2, n)} Y_q^2 > \frac{n^2 \epsilon}{3} \right) \leq -\log(\log n) + 4.$$

In addition, for the first term in (3.43), by Lemma 13, we get

$$(3.46) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \mu \left( \left| \sum_{q \in S(k, M_1)} Y_q^2 - \sum_{q \in S(k, M_1)} \tilde{Y}_q^2 \right| > \frac{n^2 \epsilon}{6} \right) \leq \log 2 - \frac{\epsilon}{12M_1} \log M_0,$$

where

$$(3.47) \quad \begin{aligned} M_0 &:= \frac{n}{\prod_{q \in S(k, M_1)} q} \\ &\geq \frac{n}{M_1^{M_1}} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \log(n) - \frac{120}{\epsilon} (\log \log n)^{\frac{120}{\epsilon}} \log \log \log n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 11,

$$(3.48) \quad \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \sum_{p \in S(k, M_1)} Y_p^2 \geq \frac{n^2 \epsilon}{6} \right) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{48} \log(k) + 4.$$

Combining (3.44), (3.45), (3.46), (3.47) and (3.48), we get the desired result.  $\square$

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 3.

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Let  $L_n, L_n^k$  be the empirical measures of  $U_i, U_i^k$ , i.e.

$$(3.49) \quad L_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{U_i}(x),$$

and

$$(3.50) \quad L_n^k(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{U_i^k}(x).$$

By Sanov's theorem, see Dembo and Zeitouni [6],  $L_n$  satisfies a large deviation principle on  $\mathcal{M}[0, 1]$ , the space of probability measures on  $[0, 1]$ , equipped with the weak topology and the rate function

$$(3.51) \quad I(\mu) = \begin{cases} \int_{[0,1]} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu & \text{if } \mu \ll \nu \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For  $a \in [0, 1]$  and  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$(3.52) \quad \chi_i(a) = \text{the } i\text{th digit in the binary expansion of } a.$$

We also redefine  $f_k, f : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  from 2.19 and 2.24, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , as follows

$$(3.53) \quad f_k(x, y) = 1 - \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \chi_i(x) \chi_i(y), \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, y) := 1 - \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \chi_i(x) \chi_i(y).$$

In other words,  $f$  is 1 if  $x$  and  $y$  do not share a common 1 at the same place in their binary expansions and  $f$  is 0 otherwise. Similar interpretation holds for  $f_k$ . Clearly,  $f_k \geq f$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k(x, y) = f(x, y)$ . Again, let  $\nu$  be the probability

measure on  $[0, 1]$  such that for a random variable  $x$  with measure  $\nu$ ,  $\chi_i(x)$  are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with parameters  $\frac{1}{p_i}$ , where  $p_i$  is the  $i$ th smallest prime number.

Let  $\alpha^k := \{\alpha \in [0, 1] \mid \chi_i(\alpha) = 0 \text{ for } i > k\}$  be the set of numbers on  $[0, 1]$  with  $k$ -digit binary expansion. We define

$$(3.54) \quad A_\alpha := \{x \in [0, 1] \mid \chi_i(\alpha) = \chi_i(x), 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

Let  $F_k(\mu) := \iint_{[0,1]^2} f_k(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$  and  $F(\mu) := \iint_{[0,1]^2} f(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$ . We have

$$(3.55) \quad F_k(\mu) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in A^k} f_k(\alpha, \beta) \mu(A_\alpha) \mu(A_\beta).$$

Hence the map  $\mu \mapsto F_k(\mu)$  is continuous, i.e. for  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  in the weak topology,  $F_k(\mu_n) \rightarrow F_k(\mu)$ . By contraction principle,  $L_n \circ F_k^{-1}$  satisfies a large deviation principle with good rate function

$$(3.56) \quad I^{(k)}(x) = \inf_{\iint_{[0,1]^2} f_k(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = x} \int_{[0,1]} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu.$$

Moreover, in Theorem 11, we proved that

$$(3.57) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \iint_{[0,1]^2} (f_k - f) dL_n(x) dL_n(y) \geq \delta \right) = -\infty,$$

for any  $\delta > 0$ . Thus the family  $\{L_n \circ F_k^{-1}\}$  are exponentially good approximation of  $\{L_n \circ F^{-1}\}$ . Now, by Theorem 4.2.16 in Dembo and Zeitouni [6],  $L_n \circ F^{-1}$  satisfies a weak large deviation principle with the rate function

$$(3.58) \quad I_1(x) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|w-x| < \delta} I^{(k)}(w).$$

Since the interval  $[0, 1]$  is compact,  $L_n \circ F^{-1}$  satisfies the full large deviation principle with good rate function  $I_1(x)$  as above and it is easy to check that

$$(3.59) \quad I_1(x) = \inf_{\iint_{[0,1]^2} f(x, y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = x} \int_{[0,1]} \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu.$$

For any  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , let us recall that  $Y_p = \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{p|X_i}$  and for any  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $S(k_1, k_2) = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : k_1 < p \leq k_2\}$ .

By Theorem 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.60) \quad & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i^k, X_j^k)=1} - 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} \geq \epsilon \right) \\ &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} 1_{p|X_i, p|X_j} \geq \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{p \in S(k, n)} Y_p^2 \geq \epsilon \right) \\ &= -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Next, notice that the difference between  $(\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i^k, X_j^k)=1} \in \cdot)$  under  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  is superexponentially small by Lemma 13. Finally, by Theorem 14,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i^k, X_j^k)=1} - 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} \geq \epsilon \right) = -\infty. \quad (3.61)$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} - \inf_{x \in A^o} I_1(x) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} \in A \right) \\ (3.62) \quad &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} \in A \right) \leq - \inf_{x \in A} I_1(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.63)$$

□

#### 4. PROOFS OF CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Instead of summing over  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ , we only need to consider  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ . The reason is because if  $i = j$ , then  $\gcd(X_i, X_i) = 1$  if and only if  $X_i = 1$  which occurs with probability  $\frac{1}{n}$  and therefore  $\frac{1}{2n^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_i)=1}$  is negligible in the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1} = 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1}$$

and we can therefore concentrate on  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ .

Let us define  $a_{ij} = 1_{\gcd(X_i, X_j)=1}$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ .  $a_{ij}$  have the same distribution and let  $\alpha_n$  be the mean of  $a_{12}$ . Then, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \alpha_n = \mathbb{E}[a_{12}] = \mathbb{P}(\gcd(X_1, X_2) = 1) \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right),$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Define  $\tilde{a}_{ij} := a_{ij} - \alpha_n$  and  $W = \sum_{(i,j) \in I} \tilde{a}_{ij}$ , where the sum is taken over the set  $I$  that is all the pairs of  $i, j \in [n]$  and  $i < j$ . Therefore,

$$(4.2) \quad \sigma_n^2 := \text{Var}(W) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in I} \tilde{a}_{ij} \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{(i,j)} \sum_{(\ell,k)} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{ij} \tilde{a}_{\ell k}].$$

Note that if the intersection of  $\{i, j\}$  and  $\{k, \ell\}$  is empty, then  $\tilde{a}_{ij}$  and  $\tilde{a}_{\ell k}$  are independent and  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{ij} \tilde{a}_{\ell k}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{ij}] \mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{\ell k}] = 0$ . The remaining two cases are either  $\{i, j\} = \{k, \ell\}$  or  $|\{i, j\} \cap \{k, \ell\}| = 1$ . For the former, we have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{ij} \tilde{a}_{ij}] = \mathbb{E}[a_{ij}^2] - \alpha_n^2 = \mathbb{E}[a_{ij}] - \alpha_n^2 = \alpha_n - \alpha_n^2.$$

For the latter, assuming without loss of generality that  $i = k$  and  $j \neq \ell$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (4.4) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{a}_{ij} \tilde{a}_{\ell k}] &= \mathbb{E}[a_{ij} a_{\ell k}] - \alpha_n^2 \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \gcd(X_i, X_\ell) = 1) - \alpha_n^2 \\ &= \beta_n - \alpha_n^2, \end{aligned}$$



where  $\beta_n := \mathbb{P}(\gcd(X_i, X_j) = \gcd(X_i, X_\ell) = 1)$ .

Let  $p$  be a prime number and  $\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{X}_3$  be three i.i.d. integer valued random variables so that  $\tilde{X}_1$  is divisible by  $p$  with probability  $\frac{1}{p}$ . Then, by inclusion-exclusion principle,

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{P}(\gcd(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2) = \gcd(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_3) = 1) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3}\right).$$

It is easy to see that

$$(4.6) \quad \beta_n \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3}\right),$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We have  $\binom{n}{2}$  pairs that  $\{i, j\} = \{k, \ell\}$  and  $3 \times 2 \times \binom{n}{3}$  pairs that  $|\{i, j\} \cap \{k, \ell\}| = 1$ . (We pick three numbers from 1 to  $n$ . Then we pick one of them to be duplicated, say  $i$ . Finally, we have two pairs as  $(i, j)(i, k)$  and  $(i, k)(i, j)$ ). Thus

$$(4.7) \quad \sigma_n^2 = \binom{n}{2}(\alpha_n - \alpha_n^2) + 3 \cdot 2 \cdot \binom{n}{3}(\beta_n - \alpha_n^2),$$

and we have

$$(4.8) \quad \sigma_n^2 \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3}\right) - \frac{36}{\pi^4},$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now, our goal is to use the general theorem for random dependency graphs to prove that  $W = \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \sum_{(i,j) \in I} \tilde{a}_{ij}$  converges to a standard normal random variable.

We have a collection of dependent random variables  $(\tilde{a}_{ij})_{(i,j) \in I}$ . We say  $\tilde{a}_{ij}$  and  $\tilde{a}_{k\ell}$  are neighbors if they are dependent, i.e.  $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, \ell\} \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $N(i, j) = \{\text{neighbors of } (i, j)\} \cup \{(i, j)\}$ . Hence,  $N(i, j)$  has  $D = 2n - 5$  elements. In addition, let  $Z$  be a standard normal random variable.

By a result of Baldi et al. [1], we have

$$(4.9) \quad d_{TV}(W, Z) = \sup_t |\mathbb{P}(W \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(Z \leq t)| \\ \leq \frac{D^2}{\sigma_n^3} \sum_{(i,j) \in I} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{a}_{ij}|^3 + \frac{\sqrt{2\sigma_n} D^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\pi} \sigma_n^2} \sqrt{\sum_{(i,j) \in I} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{a}_{ij}|^4}.$$

Note that  $\tilde{a}_{ij}$  is bounded by 1. Thus, using (4.7), we have

$$(4.10) \quad d_{TV}(W, Z) \leq \frac{D^2}{\sigma_n^3} \binom{n}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{2\sigma_n} D^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\pi} \sigma_n^2} \sqrt{\binom{n}{2}} \\ \leq \frac{(2n)^2 \cdot n^2}{\sigma_n^3} + 5 \frac{(2n)^{3/2} n}{\sigma_n^2} \\ \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}.$$

where  $C$  is a universal constant.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are very grateful to Professor S. R. S. Varadhan for helpful discussions and generous suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Baldi, P., Rinott, Y. and C. Stein. (1989). A normal approximation for the number of local maxima of a random function on a graph. In *Probability, Statistics, and Mathematics. Papers in Honor of Samuel Karlin* (T. W. Anderson, K. B. Athreya and D. L. Iglehart, eds.) 59-81. Academic Press, Boston.
- [2] Cesàro, E. (1881). Démonstration élémentaire et généralisation de quelques théorèmes de M. Berger. *Mathesis*. **1**, 99-102.
- [3] Cesàro, E. (1885). Étude moyenne du plus grand commun diviseur de deux nombres. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*. **13**, 235-250.
- [4] Cesàro, E. (1885). Sur le plus grand commun diviseur de plusieurs nombres. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*. **13**, 291-294.
- [5] Cohen, E. (1960). Arithmetical functions of a greatest common divisor. I. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **11**, 164-171.
- [6] Dembo, A. and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, 2nd Edition, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [7] Diaconis, P. and P. Erdős. On the distribution of the greatest common divisor. Technical Report No. 12. Stanford University, 1977. Reprinted in *A Festschrift for Herman Rubin*, 56-61. Lecture Notes, Monograph Series, Vol. 45, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2004.
- [8] Elliott, P. D. T. A. *Probabilistic Number Theory*, Volume I and II, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
- [9] Fernández, J. L. and P. Fernández. Asymptotic normality and greatest common divisors. Preprint, 2013.
- [10] Fernández, J. L. and P. Fernández. On the probability distribution of gcd and lcm of  $r$ -tuples of integers. Preprint, 2013.
- [11] Hardy, G. H. and E. M. Wright. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 6th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [12] Tenenbaum, G. *Introduction to Analytic and Probabilistic Number Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [13] S. R. S. Varadhan. *Large Deviations and Applications*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1984.

COURANT INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES  
 NEW YORK UNIVERSITY  
 251 MERCER STREET  
 NEW YORK, NY-10012  
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
*E-mail address:* mehrdad@cims.nyu.edu, ling@cims.nyu.edu