

LARGE PRIME FACTORS OF WELL-DISTRIBUTED SEQUENCES

ABHISHEK BHARADWAJ, BRAD RODGERS

ABSTRACT. We study the distribution of large prime factors of a random element u of arithmetic sequences satisfying simple regularity and equidistribution properties. We show that if such an arithmetic sequence has level of distribution 1 the large prime factors of u tend to a Poisson-Dirichlet process, while if the sequence has any positive level of distribution the correlation functions of large prime factors tend to a Poisson-Dirichlet process against test functions of restricted support. For sequences with positive level of distribution, we also estimate the probability the largest prime factor of u is greater than $u^{1-\epsilon}$, showing that this probability is $O(\epsilon)$.

Examples of sequences described include shifted primes and values of single-variable irreducible polynomials.

The proofs involve (i) a characterization of the Poisson-Dirichlet process due to Arratia-Kochman-Miller and (ii) an upper bound sieve.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. The purpose of this note is to study the distribution of large prime factors of elements in sequences which satisfy only a few minimal conditions.

Let us recall the classical theory and notation: let $P^+(u)$ be the largest prime factor of a positive integer u . It is a consequence of a result of Dickman [10] that for any fixed $c \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\frac{1}{x} |\{u \leq x : P^+(u) \leq u^c\}| \sim \rho(1/c),$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is a continuous function called the Dickman function. (See e.g. [28, Ch. 7.1] for a modern account.)

This result was generalized and given a probabilistic interpretation by Billingsley [4] (and independently Knuth and Trabb Pardo [25] and Vershik [35]). Let u be chosen randomly and uniformly from the integers from 1 to x . Then the above result says that $\log P^+(u)/\log u$ tends in distribution to a nonnegative random variable L_1 with cumulative distribution function $\mathbb{P}(L_1 \leq c) = \rho(1/c)$. Moreover, let $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots$ be the prime factors of u listed with multiplicity, with the convention that $p_j = 1$ if n has fewer than j prime factors (so that $p_1 = P^+(n)$ and $n = p_1 p_2 \dots$). Billingsley showed that there is a sequence of (dependent) random variables L_1, L_2, \dots such that for any $k \geq 1$, and any fixed constants $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\log p_1}{\log u} \leq c_1, \dots, \frac{\log p_k}{\log u} \leq c_k\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(L_1 \leq c_1, \dots, L_k \leq c_k),$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. That is, the process $\frac{\log p_1}{\log u}, \frac{\log p_2}{\log u}, \dots$ tends in distribution to L_1, L_2, \dots (See e.g. [5] for a modern probabilistic account. Here and in what follows we discard with the case $u = 1$ by adopting the formal convention $\log 1/\log 1 = 1$.)

For each k an explicit formula for $\mathbb{P}(L_1 \leq c_1, \dots, L_k \leq c_k)$ can be written down (see [5, Thm. 4.4] for a density formula), but the formula is somewhat complicated. The following characterization is simpler: let U_1, U_2, \dots be independent and identically distributed uniform random variables on the interval $(0, 1)$, and define random variables $G_1 = 1 - U_1$, $G_2 = U_1(1 - U_2)$, $G_3 = U_1U_2(1 - U_3)$, \dots . Then $L_1 \geq L_2 \geq \dots$ may be defined as the outcome of sorting G_1, G_2, \dots into nonincreasing order.

The sequence of random variables L_1, L_2, \dots is known as the *Poisson-Dirichlet process with parameter $\theta = 1$* . As the name suggests there are Poisson-Dirichlet processes with $\theta \neq 1$, but in this paper we will only deal with $\theta = 1$, and so if there is no risk of confusion sometimes refer to L_1, L_2, \dots as simply the Poisson-Dirichlet process. (See [5, 24] for an account of general θ , along with a more detailed introduction to the case $\theta = 1$.)

We note that $\frac{\log p_1}{\log u} + \frac{\log p_2}{\log u} + \dots = 1$, and likewise $L_1 + L_2 + \dots = 1$ almost surely.

1.2. Some well-distributed arithmetic sequences. It is natural to wonder whether this statistical pattern governing the distribution of large prime factors of random integers extends to other arithmetic sequences. Some cases which have been studied extensively include shifted primes [2, 13, 15, 18, 21] – that is the sequence $\{p - a\}$ for a constant a where p ranges over the primes – and the values of irreducible polynomials [8, 7, 9, 20, 27] – that is the sequence $\{F(n)\}$, where F is an irreducible polynomial with integer coefficients and a positive leading coefficient and n ranges over the integers.

In this paper we study a quite general class of arithmetic sequences. Let (a_n) be a sequence of nonnegative numbers. Define the quantities

$$N(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} a_n, \quad N_d(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0 \pmod{d}}} a_n. \quad (1)$$

We say that the sequence (a_n) is:

(A) *Regular* if for any fixed $c < 1$,

$$N(x^c) = o(N(x)).$$

(B) *Has a level of distribution ϑ* if for any $0 < c < \vartheta$ and any $A > 0$,

$$\sum_{d \leq x^c} |N_d(x) - g(d)N(x)| \ll_{c,A} \frac{1}{(\log x)^A} N(x), \quad (2)$$

where $g(d)$ is a multiplicative function with $g(d) \in [0, 1]$ for all $d \geq 1$, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} g(p) \log p = \log x + O(1), \quad g(d) = O(C^{\Omega(d)}/d), \quad (3)$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$.

(C) *Locally uniform* if there are constants $\delta > 0$, $B \geq 0$, $C \geq 1$ such that

$$N_d(x) \ll \frac{(\log x)^B C^{\Omega(d)}}{d} N(x), \quad \text{for } d \leq x^\delta.$$

Here as usual $\Omega(d)$ is the number of prime factors of d counted with multiplicity. Note that (3) implies that $g(p^k) < 1$ except for finitely many primes p .

Likewise note that we trivially have $N_d(x) \leq N(x)$, so that the condition for local uniformity is only meaningful for those integers d with prime factors $p > C$.

It will typically be the case that a_n is the indicator function of n belonging to some subset of the integers, and in that case we will also describe that subset by the above terminology as long as there is no chance for confusion. Let us make the following brief remarks: (A) regularity entails that the subset being described is not lacunary; in (B) one may keep in mind the examples $g(d) = 1/d$ or $g(d) = 1/\phi(d)$; and (C) may be thought of as a more technical condition – the reader may check it is trivially satisfied if the sequence (a_n) is bounded and $N(x) \gg x/(\log x)^B$ for some B .

Examples of sequences satisfying these conditions are described by the following propositions. Throughout the paper, for a proposition \mathfrak{A} , we use the notation $\mathbf{1}[\mathfrak{A}]$ to be 1 if \mathfrak{A} is true and 0 otherwise.

Proposition 1. *Shifted primes are regular, have positive level of distribution, and are locally uniform. That is: for a fixed integer a , consider the set $\mathcal{B} = \{p - a : p \text{ is prime}\}$ and let $a_n = \mathbf{1}[n \in \mathcal{B}]$. Then (a_n) is regular, has level of distribution $\vartheta = 1/2$, and is locally uniform.*

Proof. Regularity and local uniformity (with parameters $\delta = 1$, $B = 1$, $C = 1$) follow from the prime number theorem (or indeed Chebyshev's bounds), while level of distribution $1/2$ follows from the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem [6, Thm. 9.2.1], with $g(d) = 1/\phi(d)$. \square

Proposition 2. *The values of irreducible polynomials are regular, have positive level of distribution, and are locally uniform. That is: for a polynomial $F(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of degree $D \geq 1$ which is irreducible with positive leading coefficient, consider the set $\mathcal{C} = \{F(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}\} \cap \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and let $a_n = \mathbf{1}[n \in \mathcal{C}]$. Then (a_n) is regular, has level of distribution $\vartheta = 1/D$, and is locally uniform.*

Proof. Regularity follows from the fact that $N(x) \asymp x^{1/D}$.

We see that the level of distribution is $1/D$ in the following way. For a natural number d , let $h(d)$ be the number of distinct roots of F modulo d . By the Chinese Remainder Theorem we note that h is multiplicative. Set $g(d) = h(d)/d$ and note g is multiplicative also.

Obviously $g(d) \in [0, 1]$. Let us now show (3) holds for g . That $\sum_{p \leq x} g(p) \log p = \log x + O(1)$ follows immediately from partial summation and the Frobenius density theorem (see [32, pg. 236]). The second claim in (3) is just the claim that $h(d) \ll C^{\Omega(d)}$ for some constant $C > 1$. By multiplicativity this will be verified if we show it for d any prime power. If $p \nmid \text{disc } F$ we have $h(p^k) \leq D$ for any k by Hensel's lemma (see [30, Thm. 2.23]). If $p \mid \text{disc } F$, we have trivially $h(p^k) \leq p^k$ for any k . Hence the claim is true where C is any number larger than $\max(D, p_1, \dots, p_\ell)$ where p_1, \dots, p_ℓ are the prime divisors of $\text{disc } F$.

Let us now prove (2). Let n_0 be sufficiently large that $F(n)$ is increasing for $n \geq n_0$. (n_0 will depend on F .) Note if $x = F(dm)$ for some m with $dm \geq n_0$, then $N_d(x) = m \cdot h(d)$. Yet $N(x) = dm$, so for such y ,

$$N_d(x) - \frac{h(d)}{d}N(x) = 0.$$

And for $x \in (F(dm), F(d(m+1))]$ with dm sufficiently large as above, we have $md \leq N(x) \leq md + d$ and $mh(d) \leq N_d(x) \leq h(d) + mh(d)$ as F can have at

most d values and at most $h(d)$ solutions congruent to 0 mod d in this interval. Therefore for $x \in (md, (m+1)d]$, we have $|N_d(x) - \frac{h(d)}{d}N(x)| \leq h(d)$. Hence we have shown this bound for all $x \geq n_0$. On the other hand for $x < n_0$, if $h(d) \geq 1$, we have $|N_d(x) - g(d)N(x)| \ll h(d)$ trivially. On the other hand, if $h(d) = 0$ then $N_d(x) = 0$ and $g(d)N(x) = 0$, so this bound holds also in this case. We thus obtain $|N_d(x) - g(d)N(x)| \ll h(d)$ for all x and hence there is a constant $A > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{d \leq x^c} |N_d(x) - g(d)N(x)| \ll \sum_{d \leq x^c} h(d) \ll_c x^c (\log x)^A,$$

where we use Lemma 3, proved below, in the last estimate. As $N(x) \asymp x^{1/D}$, we see (2) is satisfied as long as $c < 1/D$.

To prove local uniformity, we use the bound $N_d(x) \leq g(d)N(x) + h(d) \ll \frac{C^{\Omega(d)}}{d}N(x) + C^{\Omega(d)}$, and see this condition is satisfied for C as above, and $\delta = 1/D$, $B = 0$. This is because if $d \leq x^{1/D}$ then $d \ll N(x)$ and we have $C^{\Omega(d)} \ll C^{\Omega(d)}N(x)/d$. \square

We have used one the following results above and we will need them later as well.

Lemma 3. *Suppose $h(d)$ is a multiplicative function and $g(d) = h(d)/d$ satisfies $g(d) \in [0, 1]$ for all d and $g(d) = O(C^{\Omega(d)}/d)$ for some constant $C \geq 1$. Then for some constant $A > 0$,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} g(n) \ll (\log x)^A$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} h(n) \ll x (\log x)^A.$$

Proof. Let p_1, \dots, p_ℓ be the finite set of primes less than $2C$, and set $P = p_1 \cdots p_\ell$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n, P) = 1}} g(n) &\ll \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n, P) = 1}} C^{\Omega(n)}/n \leq \prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ (p, P) = 1}} \left(1 + \frac{C}{p} + \frac{C^2}{p^2} + \cdots\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{C}{p} + O(1)\right) \ll (\log x)^C, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that C/p in the product above is no more than $1/2$ in order to sum the series. Using multiplicativity and $g(p_i^{e_i}) \in [0, 1]$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we have from a crude bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} g(n) &= \sum_{p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_\ell^{e_\ell} \leq x} \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_\ell^{e_\ell} \\ (m, P) = 1}} g(m) \\ &\ll (\log x)^C \left(\sum_{e_1: p_1^{e_1} \leq x} 1\right) \cdots \left(\sum_{e_\ell: p_\ell^{e_\ell} \leq x} 1\right) \ll (\log x)^{C+\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first estimate. For the second, we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} h(n) \leq x \sum_{n \leq x} g(n)/n,$$

which implies the claim. \square

Regarding the level of distribution of shifted primes, one expects more can be said:

Conjecture 4. *The shifted primes have level of distribution $\vartheta = 1$.*

Indeed this is a slightly weaker version of the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture [6, Ch. 9.2].

On the other hand one it does not seem that the values of irreducible polynomials of degree 2 or greater have level of distribution 1.

Some interesting arithmetic sequences are known to have level of distribution 1 however, for instance those positive integers \mathcal{S} which indicate a 0 in the Thue-Morse sequence [33]. \mathcal{S} may be characterized in the following way: it is the collection of positive integers n , where n has an even number of 1s in its binary expansion.

Proposition 5. *The values of the Thue-Morse sequence are regular, have level of distribution 1, and are locally uniform. That is, let $a_n = \mathbf{1}[n \in \mathcal{S}]$. Then (a_n) is regular, has level of distribution $\vartheta = 1$, and is locally uniform.*

Proof. Regularity and local uniformity follow from classical results of Gelfond [17] – see Theorem A in [33]. While the level of distribution $\vartheta = 1$ is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 of [33]. \square

1.3. Main results. Our main results depend on the following setup. As above we let (a_n) be a sequence of nonnegative numbers, and for a parameter x we let u be a random integer such that

$$\mathbb{P}(u = m) = \frac{a_m}{N(x)} \mathbf{1}[1 \leq m \leq x].$$

In the case that a_n is the indicator function of a subset of natural numbers, u is uniformly distributed on elements of the set no more than x . As before, we let $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots$ be the prime factors of u listed with multiplicity, with the convention that $p_j = 1$ if n has fewer than j prime factors.

We will prove results comparing the distribution of p_1, p_2, \dots to a Poisson-Dirichlet process (Theorem 6 and Lemma 7) and also an upper bound for the likelihood that $p_1 = P^+(u)$ is exceptionally large (Theorem 9). These results are related in that they use almost the same information, but because they may be of independent interest we have written this note so that their proofs may be read independently.

Theorem 6. *If (a_n) is regular and has level of distribution 1, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\log p_1}{\log u} \leq c_1, \dots, \frac{\log p_k}{\log u} \leq c_k\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(L_1 \leq c_1, \dots, L_k \leq c_k),$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. *That is, the process $\frac{\log p_1}{\log u}, \frac{\log p_2}{\log u}, \dots$ tends in distribution to the Poisson-Dirichlet process L_1, L_2, \dots*

This generalizes to multiple prime factors a result noted by Granville [19] (with details of the proof provided by Wang [36]) that for shifted primes the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture implies the distribution of the largest prime divisor is governed by the Dickman function (a phenomenon first conjectured by Pomerance [31]). And this result proves unconditionally that large prime factors of the Thue-Morse tend a Poisson-Dirichlet distribution.

On the other hand, while the values of irreducible polynomials do not appear to have level of distribution 1, it is reasonable to believe that their prime factors tend to a Poisson-Dirichlet distribution. That the distribution of the largest prime factor is governed by the Dickman function was given a conditional proof by Martin [26] on the assumption of a prime number theorem for polynomial sequences. It may be possible to formulate a relaxed version of level of distribution 1 which applies to the values of irreducible polynomials and which also implies a Poisson-Dirichlet distribution for large prime factors, but we do not pursue this further here. (Indeed the condition (D_θ) in the very recent preprint [29] might be a correct starting point.)

Even for a sequence with level of distribution less than 1, one may still compare the *correlation functions* of its large prime factors to those of the Poisson-Dirichlet process, at least against test functions with restricted support.

Lemma 7. *If (a_n) is regular and has level of distribution $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$, then for any $k \geq 0$ and any continuous $\eta : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\text{supp } \eta \subset \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : y_1 + \cdots + y_k < \vartheta\}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta\left(\frac{\log p_{j_1}}{\log u}, \dots, \frac{\log p_{j_k}}{\log u}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(L_{j_1}, \dots, L_{j_k}), \quad (4)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Here and throughout the paper we adopt the convention that $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, \infty)$. So η being supported in \mathbb{R}_+^k means that $\eta(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ will vanish when any y_i is sufficiently close to 0. (Recall that the support of a function is the *closure* of the set on which it does not vanish.)

Remark 8. In fact in Theorem 6 and Lemma 7 and in other places in this paper it should be possible to adopt a weaker definition of level of distribution ϑ , in which the bound (2) need only hold for a sums over d in which $\Omega(d) \leq k$ and all prime factors of d are larger than x^ϵ , with implicit constants depending on k and ϵ , for all $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, but we do not pursue this generalization here.

In fact, the right hand side in (4) has a simple evaluation in general: for any continuous η ,

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(L_{j_1}, \dots, L_{j_k}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} \frac{\mathbf{1}[t_1 + \cdots + t_k \leq 1]}{t_1 \cdots t_k} \eta(t) d^k t. \quad (5)$$

This is [34, (4)] (see also the closely related [1, (14)]).

Theorem 6 will be seen to follow from Lemma 7 and a characterization of the Poisson-Dirichlet process due to Arratia-Kochman-Miller [1].

Lemma 7 has a surface-level resemblance to results that can be proven about zeros of L -functions. The reader unfamiliar with correlation sums as occur in the Lemma may consult [22, Ch.1] for a general introduction and further information.

Lemma 7 gives information about prime divisors of intermediate size, but because of restrictions on the support of η it does not entail an asymptotic formula for the distribution of the largest prime factor of u . Our last result shows that even this partial information about the level of distribution entails an upper bound for how often the largest prime factor can be especially large.

Theorem 9. *If (a_n) is regular, has a positive level of distribution, and is locally uniform, then for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(P^+(u) \geq u^{1-\epsilon}) \ll \epsilon,$$

where the implicit constant depends on the sequence (a_n) .

We note that this is an essentially optimal result, since for sequences with level of distribution 1 by Theorem 6 we have $\mathbb{P}(P^+(u) \geq u^{1-\epsilon}) \sim 1 - \rho(1/(1-\epsilon))$, and for ϵ small enough that $1 \leq 1/(1-\epsilon) \leq 2$ we have $1 - \rho(1/(1-\epsilon)) = \log(1/(1-\epsilon)) \approx \epsilon$ (see [28, (7.10)] for the evaluation of ρ in this range).

In the case of sampling shifted primes $p-1 \leq x$, Theorem 9 recovers the following corollary,

Corollary 10 (Erdős). *For any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi(x)} |\{p \leq x : P^+(p-1) \geq p^{1-\epsilon}\}| \ll \epsilon.$$

This result appears implicitly, though somewhat obscurely, in a paper of Erdős (see the line beginning with “the sum in a is less than” in [14, p. 213]). A recent paper of Ding [12] gives a proof with explicit constants, and explains some of the history around this estimate.

As in these other proofs of Corollary 10, the proof of Theorem 9 relies on an upper bound sieve.

1.4. Acknowledgements. We thank Ofir Gorodestky for comments and suggestions and for pointing out a correction to an earlier version of this manuscript. We also thank Yuchen Ding and Ram Murty for comments and suggestions. B.R. is supported by an NSERC grant. A.B. is supported by a Coleman Postdoctoral Fellowship.

2. RESEMBLANCE TO POISSON-DIRICHLET: A PROOF OF THEOREM 6 AND LEMMA 7

Proof of Lemma 7. Note that in the sum on the left hand side of (4), there is a one-to-one correspondence between tuples $(p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_k})$ with j_1, \dots, j_k distinct and tuples (q_1, \dots, q_k) of primes (which need not be distinct) in which $q_1 \cdots q_k | u$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta\left(\frac{\log p_{j_1}}{\log u}, \dots, \frac{\log p_{j_k}}{\log u}\right) \\ = \frac{1}{N(x)} \sum_{n \leq x} a_n \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} \mathbf{1}[q_1 \cdots q_k | n] \eta\left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log n}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We will show using regularity the right hand side is

$$= \frac{1}{N(x)} \sum_{n \leq x} a_n \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} \mathbf{1}[q_1 \cdots q_k | n] \eta\left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x}\right) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1). \quad (7)$$

To make this reduction, we begin by noting there is a constant α such that $\eta(y_1, \dots, y_k)$ vanishes whenever $y_i \leq \alpha$; this is because of the restricted support of

η . Thus in the sum above, each q_i is greater than n^α . But n has no more than $1/\alpha$ prime factors greater than n^α . Thus we have the following crude bound: for any n ,

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} \mathbf{1}[q_1 \cdots q_k | n] \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log n}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log n} \right) \right| \leq \max(|\eta|) \cdot (1/\alpha)^k = O(1),$$

where the implicit constant depends on k and η , but the bound is otherwise uniform.

Hence for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, the left hand side of (6) is

$$= \frac{1}{N(x)} \sum_{x^{1-\epsilon} < n \leq x} a_n \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} \mathbf{1}[q_1 \cdots q_k | n] \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log n}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log n} \right) + O\left(\frac{N(x^{1-\epsilon})}{N(x)}\right). \quad (8)$$

By continuity and compact support of η , for any q_1, \dots, q_k in the sum above,

$$\eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log n}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log n} \right) = \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x} \right) + O(\epsilon), \quad \text{for } x^{1-\epsilon} < n \leq x.$$

Thus one has (8) is

$$= \frac{1}{N(x)} \sum_{x^{1-\epsilon} < n \leq x} a_n \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} \mathbf{1}[q_1 \cdots q_k | n] \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x} \right) + O\left(\epsilon \cdot \frac{N(x) - N(x^{1-\epsilon})}{N(x)}\right) + O\left(\frac{N(x^{1-\epsilon})}{N(x)}\right). \quad (9)$$

This is because in both (8) and (9), only a bounded number of terms in the sums over q_1, \dots, q_k will be nonzero (with a bound uniform in n), and in the case these terms are nonzero, they differ by $O(\epsilon)$ for all summands q_1, \dots, q_k and n .

Regularity implies the error terms in (9) are $O(\epsilon) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1)$, and because ϵ was arbitrary this implies (7).

We now use the level of distribution ϑ to simplify (7). Note that (7) is

$$\frac{1}{N(x)} \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} N_{q_1 \cdots q_k}(x) \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x} \right) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1).$$

As there $O_k(1)$ ways to write any integer $d = q_1 \cdots q_k$, and as the support of η above ensures such d satisfy $d \leq x^\vartheta$, our hypothesis on level of distribution implies the above simplifies to

$$= \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} g(q_1 \cdots q_k) \eta \left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x} \right) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1). \quad (10)$$

But note if $j \geq 2$ the upper bound in (3) implies

$$\sum_{\substack{q \geq x^\alpha \\ \text{prime}}} g(q^j) = o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1), \quad (11)$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{q \geq x^\alpha \\ \text{prime}}} g(q)^j = o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1), \quad (12)$$

for any $\alpha > 0$. The bound (11) implies that we can replace the sum in (10) with a sum over distinct primes. We may then use the multiplicativity of g followed by (12) to write (10) as

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime, distinct}}} g(q_1) \cdots g(q_k) \eta\left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x}\right) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{q_1, \dots, q_k \\ \text{prime}}} g(q_1) \cdots g(q_k) \eta\left(\frac{\log q_1}{\log x}, \dots, \frac{\log q_k}{\log x}\right) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

But finally the asymptotic formula in (3) and partial summation implies that if ν is the indicator function of an interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$,

$$\sum_{q \text{ prime}} g(q) \nu\left(\frac{\log q}{\log x}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{\nu(t)}{t} dt + o(1).$$

This implies that if η is the indicator function of a rectangle $[\alpha_1, \beta_1] \times \cdots \times [\alpha_k, \beta_k] \subset (0, \infty)^k$, the left hand side of (13) is

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} \frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_k} \eta(t) d^k t + o(1). \quad (14)$$

But because linear combinations of such functions are dense in the space of continuous functions with compact support in \mathbb{R}_+^k , a standard approximation argument implies (14) is true for this class of functions as well.

Due to the restricted support of η , the indicator function in the expression (5) for Poisson-Dirichlet plays no role here, and we have therefore verified the lemma. \square

We will verify Theorem 6 using the above lemma and the following criterion, from [1, Lemma 2]:

Lemma 11 (Arratia-Kochman-Miller). *If for each x , $(L_1(x), L_2(x), \dots)$ is a random process with $L_1(x) \geq L_2(x) \geq \cdots \geq 0$ satisfying $\sum L_i(x) = 1$, and if for any collection of disjoint intervals $I_i = [a_i, b_i] \subset (0, 1]$ with $b_1 + \cdots + b_k < 1$ we have*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^k |\{j : L_j(x) \in I_i\}| \geq \prod_{i=1}^k \log(b_i/a_i) = \int_{I_1 \times \cdots \times I_k} \frac{d^k t}{t_1 \cdots t_k}, \quad (15)$$

then the process $L_1(x), L_2(x), \dots$ tends in distribution to the Poisson-Dirichlet process L_1, L_2, \dots as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 6. Let $L_i(x) = \log p_i / \log u$. If $\eta^* = \mathbf{1}_{I_1 \times \cdots \times I_k}$ were continuous this would be implied by Lemma 7, as

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |\{j : L_j(x) \in I_i\}| = \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta^*\left(\frac{\log p_{j_1}}{\log u}, \dots, \frac{\log p_{j_k}}{\log u}\right).$$

But for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a continuous function η^- with support in $\{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : y_1 + \cdots + y_k < 1\}$ such that

$$\eta^* \geq \eta^-$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} (\eta^* - \eta^-) \frac{d^k t}{t_1 \cdots t_k} \leq \epsilon.$$

Thus lower-bounding η^* by η^- and applying Lemma 7 for η^- , we have

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta^* \left(\frac{\log p_{j_1}}{\log u}, \dots, \frac{\log p_{j_k}}{\log u} \right) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} \eta^- \frac{d^k t}{t_1 \cdots t_k}.$$

But the right hand side is within ϵ of

$$\int \eta^* \frac{d^k t}{t_1 \cdots t_k} = \int_{I_1 \times \dots \times I_k} \frac{d^k t}{t_1 \cdots t_k},$$

and because ϵ is arbitrary this verifies (15) is true in this case, and the result follows. \square

Remark 12. In effect, what Lemma 11 of Arratia-Kochman-Miller shows is that if the result of Lemma 7 holds for $\vartheta = 1$ for some ordered process, then that process tends in distribution to the Poisson-Dirichlet process. That is, the convergence of correlation functions implies convergence in distribution in this context.

3. UPPER BOUNDS ON LARGEST PRIMES: A PROOF OF THEOREM 9

In proving Theorem 9 we will use the Selberg upper bound sieve. We recall the setup from [16].

Let \mathcal{P} be a finite set of primes, and define $P = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p$. Let $g(d) \in [0, 1)$ be defined for $d|P$ and be a multiplicative function for this set of d . In the notation (1) as before, define

$$r_d = N_d(x) - g(d)N(x),$$

and suppose there are constants $\kappa, K > 0$ such that

$$\prod_{\substack{w \leq p < z \\ p \in \mathcal{P}}} \frac{1}{1 - g(p)} \leq K \left(\frac{\log z}{\log w} \right)^\kappa, \quad (16)$$

for all $z > w \geq 2$.

Theorem 13 (An explicit upper bound sieve). *For \mathcal{P} , P , $g(d)$, and r_d as just described, with g satisfying (16), define $k = \kappa + \log K$. If a parameter D is chosen such that all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfy $p < D^{1/4k}$, then*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n, P) = 1}} a_n \leq C \cdot V \cdot N(x) + \sum_{\substack{d|P \\ d < D}} \tau_3(d) |r_d|,$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant which depends only on k , we have defined

$$V = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (1 - g(p)),$$

and $\tau_3(d) = \sum_{d_1 d_2 d_3 = d} 1$ is the threefold divisor function.

Proof. This is Theorem 7.4 in [16], where in their notation we have taken $s = 4k$ and $X = N(x)$. (Note that the hypothesis of their theorem requires $g(d) \in (0, 1)$ for $d|P$, but one may check the proof works with no modification if $g(d) \in [0, 1)$ for $d|P$.) \square

We now apply this result to get an upper bound on the frequency with which a number n has a prime factor larger than $n^{1-\epsilon}$. The idea behind the proof is easy to state: if n has a prime factor larger than $n^{1-\epsilon}$, it will have no prime factors in between n^ϵ and $n^{1-\epsilon}$. The upper bound is obtained by sieving by (a subset of) such primes.

Proof of Theorem 9. Note that by (3) there is a constant z_0 such that $g(p) \leq 1/2$ for all $p \geq z_0$. Further by (3) we have,

$$\prod_{z_0 \leq p < z} (1 - g(p)) = \exp[-\log \log z + O(1)],$$

so that under the hypothesis of Theorem 9, we have (16) is satisfied for any subset \mathcal{P} of primes larger than z_0 , for $\kappa = 1$ and some constant K . As in Theorem 13 define $k = \kappa + \log K$.

Now, using regularity,

$$\sum_{n \leq x} a_n \mathbf{1}[P^+(n) \geq n^{1-\epsilon}] = \sum_{x^{1/2} < n \leq x} a_n \mathbf{1}[P^+(n) \geq n^{1-\epsilon}] + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(N(x)). \quad (17)$$

But if $P^+(n) \geq n^{1-\epsilon}$ then n is not divisible by any primes strictly in between n^ϵ and $n^{1-\epsilon}$. If $x^{1/2} < n \leq x$, that means n is not divisible by any primes strictly in between x^ϵ and $x^{(1-\epsilon)/2}$.

We will sieve out by a sparser set of primes even than these. Let δ be sufficiently small that (a_n) has level of distribution larger than δ and such that δ can be used as a parameter in local uniformity.

Let $D = x^\delta$ and then set $\delta_0 = \min((1-\epsilon)/2, \delta/4k)$. Now define \mathcal{P} to be the primes larger than z_0 and strictly in between x^ϵ and x^{δ_0} . (Let \mathcal{P} be empty if there are no such primes.) We have \mathcal{P} is a subset of the primes in between x^ϵ and $x^{(1-\epsilon)/2}$, and also all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfy $p < D^{1/4k}$.

Thus, if we set $P = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p$, the right hand side of (17) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n, P)=1}} a_n + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(N(x)) \\ &\leq C' \cdot V \cdot N(x) + \sum_{\substack{d < D \\ d|P}} \tau_3(d) |r_d| + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(N(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where C' is a constant which depends only on the sequence (a_n) .

Now note that for sufficiently small ϵ , once x is sufficiently large, the set \mathcal{P} will not be empty. With no loss of generality we may assume ϵ is this small and x is at least this large in the remainder of the proof.

We have

$$V = \prod_{x^\epsilon < p < x^{\delta_0}} (1 - g(p)) = \exp[-\log \log(x^{\delta_0}) + \log \log(x^\epsilon) + O(1)] \ll \epsilon,$$

Moreover by local uniformity, there are constants B and C such that

$$|r_d| \ll \frac{(\log x)^B C^{\Omega(d)}}{d} N(x), \quad (18)$$

for $d \leq D$. Taking such a constant C , we note

$$\sum_{\substack{d \leq D \\ d|P}} \tau_3(d)|r_d| \leq \left(\sum_{\substack{d \leq x^\delta \\ d|P}} \frac{C^{\Omega(d)} \tau_3(d)^2}{d} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{\substack{d \leq x^\delta \\ d|P}} \frac{d}{C^{\Omega(d)}} |r_d|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note $\tau_3(n) \leq 3^{\Omega(n)}$ and for sufficiently large x we have $(9C)^{\Omega(d)}/d \leq 1$ for all $d|P$. So using Lemma 3 to estimate the first parentheses and (18) to estimate the second, for sufficiently large x the above is

$$\ll (\log x)^A \left((\log x)^B N(x) \sum_{d \leq x^\delta} |r_d| \right)^{1/2}$$

for some constant $A > 0$.

Using that (a_n) has level of distribution greater than δ , the above is

$$\ll N(x)/(\log x)^{A'} = o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(N(x)),$$

for any constant $A' > 0$.

Putting matters together we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} a_n \mathbf{1}[P^+(n) \geq n^{1-\epsilon}] \ll \epsilon N(x) + o_{x \rightarrow \infty}(N(x)),$$

where the implicit constant depends only on the sequence (a_n) , which implies the Theorem. \square

Remark 14. Theorem 9 says that the likelihood that $\log P^+(u)/\log u \geq 1 - \epsilon$ is $O(\epsilon)$. Although in its proof we have imported Theorem 13 directly from sieve theory, it is likely possible and would be interesting to abstract the combinatorial content of this sieve bound to prove a version of Theorem 9 for general point processes on the simplex with correlation functions known to agree with those of a Poisson-Dirichlet process against test functions with restricted support, in the sense of Lemma 7. We do not pursue this here however.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Arratia, F. Kochman, and V.S. Miller. Extensions of Billingsley’s Theorem via Multi-Intensities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.1555*.
- [2] R. Baker and G. Harman. The Brun-Titchmarsh theorem on average. *Analytic number theory, Vol. 1 (Allerton Park, IL, 1995)*, 39–103, Progr. Math., 138, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1996.
- [3] W.D. Banks and I.E. Shparlinski. On values taken by the largest prime factor of shifted primes. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 82 (2007), no. 1, 133–147.
- [4] P. Billingsley. On the distribution of large prime divisors. *Period. Math. Hungar.* 2 (1972), 283–289.
- [5] P. Billingsley. Convergence of probability measures. Second edition. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. *John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York*, 1999. x+277 pp.
- [6] A.C. Cojocaru and M.R. Murty. An introduction to sieve methods and their applications. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 66. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2006. xii+224 pp.
- [7] C. Dartyge, G. Martin, and G. Tenenbaum. Polynomial values free of large prime factors. *Period. Math. Hungar.* 43 (2001), no. 1-2, 111–119.
- [8] R. de la Bretèche and S. Drappeau. Niveau de répartition des polynômes quadratiques et crible majorant pour les entiers friables. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 22 (2020), no. 5, 1577–1624.

- [9] J.-M. Deshouillers and H. Iwaniec. On the greatest prime factor of $n^2 + 1$. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 32 (1982), no. 4, 1–11 (1983).
- [10] K. Dickman. On the frequency of numbers containing prime factors of a certain relative magnitude. *Arkiv för Matematik, Astronomi och Fysik.* (1930) 22A (10): 1–14.
- [11] Y. Ding. On a conjecture on shifted primes with large prime factors. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 120 (2023), no. 3, 245–252.
- [12] Y. Ding. On a conjecture on shifted primes with large prime factors, II. *arXiv preprint 2402.09829* (2024)
- [13] B. Feng and J. Wu. On the density of shifted primes with large prime factors. *Sci. China Math.* 61 (2018), no. 1, 83–94.
- [14] P. Erdős. On the normal number of prime factors of $p - 1$ and some related problems concerning Euler’s ϕ -function. *Q. J. Math.* os-6 (1935) no. 1, 205–213.
- [15] É. Fouvry. Théorème de Brun-Titchmarsh: application au théorème de Fermat. *Invent. Math.* 79 (1985), no. 2, 383–407.
- [16] J. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec. Opera de cribro. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 57. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2010. xx+527 pp.
- [17] A.O. Gelfond. Sur les nombres qui ont des propriétés additives et multiplicatives données. (French) *Acta Arith.* 13 (1967/68), 259–265.
- [18] M. Goldfeld. On the number of primes p for which $p+a$ has a large prime factor. *Mathematika* 16 (1969), 23–27.
- [19] A. Granville. Smooth numbers: computational number theory and beyond. *Algorithmic number theory: lattices, number fields, curves and cryptography*, 267–323, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., 44, *Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge*, 2008.
- [20] C. Hooley. On the greatest prime factor of a quadratic polynomial. *Acta Math.* 117 (1967), 281–299.
- [21] C. Hooley. On the largest prime factor of $p + a$. *Mathematika* 20 (1973), 135–143.
- [22] J.B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, B. Virág. Zeros of Gaussian analytic functions and determinantal point processes. University Lecture Series, 51. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2009. x+154 pp.
- [23] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. Analytic number theory. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2004. xii+615 pp.
- [24] J.F.C. Kingman. Random discrete distributions. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* 37 (1975), 1–22.
- [25] D.E. Knuth and L. Trabb Pardo. Analysis of a simple factorization algorithm. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 3 (1976/77), no. 3, 321–348.
- [26] G. Martin. An asymptotic formula for the number of smooth values of a polynomial. *J. Number Theory* 93 (2002), no. 2, 108–182.
- [27] J. Merikoski. On the largest prime factor of $n^2 + 1$. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 25 (2023), no. 4, 1253–1284.
- [28] H. L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan. Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 97. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2007. xviii+552 pp.
- [29] A. Mounier. Un crible minorant effectif pour les entiers friables. *arXiv preprint 2402.13198* (2024).
- [30] I. Niven, H. Zuckerman, H.L. Montgomery. An introduction to the theory of numbers. Fifth edition. *John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York*, 1991. xiv+529 pp.
- [31] C. Pomerance. Popular values of Euler’s function. *Mathematika* 27 (1980), no. 1, 84–89.
- [32] Serre, Jean-Pierre *On a theorem of Jordan*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.),40,2003,4,429–440,
- [33] Spiegelhofer, Lukas. The level of distribution of the Thue-Morse sequence. *Compos. Math.* 156 (2020), no. 12, 2560–2587.
- [34] T. Tao. The Poisson-Dirichlet process, and large prime factors of a random number. <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2013/09/21/the-Poisson-Dirichlet-process-and-large-prime-factors-of-a-random-number/>
- [35] A.M. Vershik. Asymptotic distribution of decompositions of natural numbers into prime divisors. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 289 (1986), no. 2, 269–272.
- [36] Z. Wang. Autour des plus grands facteurs premiers d’entiers consécutifs voisins d’un entier criblé. *Q. J. Math.* 69 (2018), no. 3, 995–1013.

- [37] J. Wu. On shifted primes with large prime factors and their products. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 112 (2019), no. 4, 387–393.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, ONTARIO,
K7L 3N6, CANADA

E-mail addresses: `atb4@queensu.ca`, `brad.rodgers@queensu.ca`