

# On the Density of naturals $n$ coprime to $\lfloor P(n) \rfloor$ for certain Classes of Polynomials

Aahan Chatterjee

November 20, 2024

## Abstract

We obtain asymptotic bounds on the number of natural numbers less than  $X$  satisfying  $\gcd(n, \lfloor P(n) \rfloor) = 1$ , under some diophantine conditions on the coefficient of  $x$  in  $P$ , and show that the density of such naturals is exactly  $\frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$ .

## 1 Introduction

If  $m$  and  $n$  are two natural numbers chosen at random, the probability that they are coprime is known to be  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$ . This result extends beyond independent integers and can hold when  $m$  and  $n$  are functionally related. For instance, Watson proved in [2] that if  $\alpha$  is irrational, the density of natural numbers  $n$  satisfying  $\gcd(n, \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor) = 1$  is precisely  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$ . Similarly, Lambek and Moser demonstrated in [3] that if  $f(1), f(2), \dots$  is a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative integers that grows slowly to infinity, and if the intervals over which  $f(m) = n$  grow slowly with  $n$ , then the probability that  $f(n)$  is relatively prime to  $n$  is also  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$ .

In this paper, we extend Watson's result to a broader class of functional relationships. Roughly speaking, we show that if  $P$  is a polynomial with real coefficients and the coefficient of  $x$  in  $P$  is not too well-approximable, then the probability that  $n$  and  $\lfloor P(n) \rfloor$  are coprime is exactly  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$ .

### Main Result

More specifically:

**Theorem.** *Let  $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be a polynomial such that the coefficient of  $x$  in  $P$  is **non-Liouville** (we shall define this in **Definition 1**). Then we have that:*

$$S(X) = \frac{X}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(\frac{X}{\log \log X^{1/3}}\right) \quad \text{and hence} \quad \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(X)}{X} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$$

where  $S(X) =: \{x \leq X : \gcd(x, \lfloor P(x) \rfloor) = 1\}$ .

### Heuristic

For a prime  $p$ , the probability that  $p \mid \gcd(n, \lfloor P(n) \rfloor)$  is equal to  $\frac{1}{p}$  times the probability that  $\left\{\frac{P(pn)}{p}\right\} < \frac{1}{p}$ , which is  $\frac{1}{p^2}$ . Therefore, the probability that  $p$  does not divide  $\gcd(n, \lfloor P(n) \rfloor)$  is

$$1 - \frac{1}{p^2}.$$

Heuristically, we expect that the density of natural numbers  $n$  satisfying  $\gcd(n, \lfloor P(n) \rfloor) = 1$  is

$$\prod_{p \text{ prime}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

This product is well-known to evaluate to  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$ , consistent with earlier results for simpler cases. This motivates us to proceed with sieving to establish the result rigorously. However, precise bounds require good control over the error terms, which arise when applying Weyl's equidistribution theorem. To manage these errors effectively, we impose certain Diophantine conditions on the coefficient of  $x$  in  $P$ .

## 2 Diophantine Approximation

**Definition 1.** Let  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $B > 0$ . We say that a number  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  is  $\omega$ -badly-approximable (with constant  $B > 0$ ) if we have

$$\min_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} |q\alpha - p| \geq Bq^{-\omega} \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In particular, a number  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  is said to be **Liouville** if there are no  $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$  for which  $\alpha$  is  $\omega$ -badly-approximable.

## 3 Bounds for Weyl Sums

Now we obtain bounds on the weyl sums of  $\frac{mP(dx)}{d}$ , independent of  $d$  and  $m$ , for  $m$  in a certain range.

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose  $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  with coefficient of  $x$ ,  $\alpha$ , being **non-Liouville**. Then we can find constants  $\tau, \rho, X_0 > 0$  such that

$$s_m(X) =: \sum_{x \leq X} e\left(m \frac{P(dx)}{d}\right) \leq X^{1-\tau} \quad \text{for all } m < X^\rho \quad \text{and } X \geq X_0.$$

To Prove this we will use the following Theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.** [1, Theorem 1.6] Let  $\tau$  and  $\delta$  be reals such that  $\tau^{-1} \geq 4k(k-1)$  and  $\delta > k\tau$ . Suppose that  $X$  is sufficiently large in terms of  $k, \delta$  and  $\tau$  and suppose that  $|f_k(\alpha; X)| > X^{1-\tau}$ , then  $\exists q, a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that

$$1 \leq q \leq X^\delta \quad \text{and} \quad |q\alpha_j - a_j| \leq X^{\delta-j} \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

Here  $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$  and  $f_k(\alpha; x) := \sum_{n \leq x} e(\alpha_1 n + \alpha_2 n^2 + \dots + \alpha_k n^k)$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let us consider

$$\delta < \frac{1}{\omega + 1}, \quad \rho = \frac{1 - (\omega + 1)\delta}{2\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau = \frac{\delta}{2k(k-1)}$$

Then it is clear that  $\delta, \tau$  satisfy the hypothesis for **Theorem 3.2**. Suppose  $m < X^\rho$  and assume for sake of contradiction  $|s_m(X)| > X^{1-\tau}$ . Now, since the coefficient of  $x$  in  $m \frac{P(dx)}{d} = m\alpha$ , we have by **Theorem 3.2** that  $\exists q', a' \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$\left| q'm\alpha - a' \right| \leq X^{\delta-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \gcd(a', q') = 1 \text{ and } 1 \leq q' \leq X^\delta. \quad (1)$$

Now let us define:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= 1 + \max\{k, \inf\{\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \text{ is } \omega_0\text{-badly-approximable}\}\} \quad \text{and} \\ B &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sup\{B_0 \in (0, 1) \mid \alpha \text{ is } \omega\text{-badly-approximable with constant } B_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\alpha$  is  $\omega_0$ -badly-approximable with constant  $B$ . Now by **Definition 1**, we know that there is a constant  $X_0 = X_0(\alpha)$  such that for all  $r > X_0$ ,  $|r\alpha - s| \geq Br^{-\omega}$ . Now combining this with (1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} B(X_0qm)^{-\omega} &\leq |X_0qma - pX_0| \leq X_0X^{\delta-1} \\ \implies m &\geq BX_0^{-\omega} X^{(1-(\omega+1)\delta)/\omega} > X^{(1-(\omega+1)\delta)/2\omega} \\ &= X^\rho, \quad \text{contradiction to assumption.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence our assumption that  $|s_m(X)| > X^{1-\tau}$  is wrong. So we have that  $|s_m(X)| \leq X^{1-\tau}$  for all  $m < X^\rho$  as desired.  $\square$

## 4 Sieving

### 4.1 Controlling Error Terms

We will now apply the bounds on Weyl sums derived in the previous section along with the Erdos–Turan Discrepancy Theorem to estimate the error terms in the sieving process.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let us define:*

$$\mathcal{A}_d(X) =: \{x \leq X : d \mid \gcd(x, \lfloor P(x) \rfloor)\}.$$

Then  $\exists$  constants  $\mu, C, C_0 > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mathcal{A}_d(X) - \frac{X}{d^2} \right| \leq C_0 \left( \frac{X}{d} \right)^{1-\mu}$$

*Proof.* By **Theorem 3.1**, we know that  $\exists \rho, \tau > 0$  such that for large enough  $X$  and for all  $m < X^\rho$ , we have that  $s_m(X) \leq X^{1-\tau}$ . Thus we can find a positive constant  $C$  such that whenever  $\frac{X}{d} > C$ , we have that

$$s_m(X/d) \leq \left( \frac{X}{d} \right)^{1-\tau} \quad \text{for all } m < \left( \frac{X}{d} \right)^\rho.$$

Now by Erdos-Turan-Discrepancy Theorem, we know that:

$$\left| |\mathcal{A}_d(X)| - \frac{X}{d^2} \right| \leq C_0 \left( \frac{X}{dT} + \sum_{m \leq T} \frac{|s_m(X/d)|}{m} \right).$$

Finally choosing  $T = \left( \frac{X}{d} \right)^\rho$  and  $\mu := \max\{1 - \rho, 1 - \tau/2\}$ , we obtain the desired bound.  $\square$

## 4.2 Doing The Sieving

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $P \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  be a polynomial such that the coefficient of  $x$  in  $P$  is **non-Liouville**. Then we have that:*

$$S(X) = \frac{X}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(\frac{X}{(\log \log X)^{1/3}}\right) \quad \text{and hence} \quad \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S(X)}{X} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}$$

where  $S(X) =: \#\{x \leq X : \gcd(x, \lfloor P(x) \rfloor) = 1\}$ .

*Proof.* Let us define

$$S(X, z) := \#\{x \leq X : \gcd(\gcd(x, \lfloor P(x) \rfloor), P_z) = 1\}.$$

Let  $\epsilon, A > 0$  be arbitrary. Then we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} S(X) - S(X, z) &\leq \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \leq X} |\mathcal{A}_d| \\ &= \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \leq X/\log^\epsilon z} |\mathcal{A}_d| + \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \geq X/\log^\epsilon z} |\mathcal{A}_d| \end{aligned}$$

Now we shall estimate the the sums on the RHS seperately.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \leq X/\log^\epsilon z} |\mathcal{A}_d| &\leq \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \leq X/\log^\epsilon z} \frac{X}{d^2} + O\left(\left(\frac{X}{d}\right)^{1-\mu}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{d > z} \frac{X}{d^2} + O\left(\frac{X}{\log^{\epsilon\mu} z}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{X}{\log^{\epsilon\mu} z}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \geq X/\log^\epsilon z} |\mathcal{A}_d| &\leq \log^\epsilon z \sum_{(d, P_z)=1; d \geq X/\log^\epsilon z} 1 \\ &= \log^\epsilon z \left( X \left( \prod_{p < z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\log^A X}\right) \right) \right) \\ &\quad \text{(for } z := X^{c/\log \log X} \text{ where } c = 1/(2(A+1))) \\ &\leq \frac{X}{\log^{1-\epsilon} z} + O\left(\frac{X}{\log^A X}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus in conclusion, we have that

$$S(X) - S(X, z) = O\left(\frac{X}{\log^{1-\epsilon} z}\right) + O\left(\frac{X}{\log^{\epsilon\mu} z}\right) + O\left(\frac{X}{\log^A X}\right)$$

where  $z = X^{c/\log \log X}$ .

So now it just remains for us to estimate  $S(X, z)$ . For this, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
S(X, z) &= \sum_{d|P_z; d < X} \mu(d) |\mathcal{A}_d| \\
&= X \left( \prod_{p < z} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{X}\right) \right) + O\left( \sum_{d < X/\log^\epsilon z} \left(\frac{X}{d}\right)^{1-\mu} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{d|P_z; X/\log^\epsilon z < d \leq X} |\mathcal{A}_d|
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Now if  $d | P_z$  with  $w(d) < \log \log d + (\log \log d)^{2/3}$  and  $d > \frac{X}{\log z}$ , then we can find a prime factor of  $d$  of size atleast  $M = d^{1/2 \log \log d}$ . We claim  $M > z$ . To see this, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log M &= \frac{\log d}{2 \log \log d} \\
&\geq \frac{\log X}{\log \log X} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{c}{2 \log \log X} \right) \\
&> \frac{\log X}{2(A+1) \log \log X} > \log z \quad (\text{for large enough } X)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $M > z$ . But then this means that  $d$  has a prime factor  $> z$  and thus  $d \nmid P_z$ , a contradiction. Therefore the contribution of the last sum in (2) is atleast

$$\#\{n < X : |\omega(n) - \log \log n| > (\log \log n)^{2/3}\} < \frac{X}{(\log \log X)^{1/3}}$$

(Hardy-Ramanujan Theorem)

So in conclusion we have that

$$S(X, z) = \frac{X}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(\frac{X}{\log^{\epsilon\mu} z}\right) + O\left(\frac{X}{(\log \log X)^{1/3}}\right)$$

Combining this with the estimate for  $S(X) - S(X, z)$  we obtained earlier gives us

$$S(X) = \frac{X}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(\frac{X}{(\log \log X)^{1/3}}\right) \quad \text{as desired.}$$

□

## References

- [1] Trevor Wooley, *Vinogradov's mean value theorem via efficient congruencing*
- [2] G.L. Watson, *On Integers  $n$  relatively prime to  $[\alpha n]$*
- [3] Joachim Lambek and Leo Moser, *On Integers  $n$  relatively Prime to  $f(n)$*