Values of Arithmetical Functions
Equal to a Sum of Two Squares

WILLIAM D. BANKS*
Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
bbanks@math.missouri.edu

FLORIAN LUCA
Instituto de Matemáticas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
C.P. 58180, Morelia, Michoacán, México
fluca@matmor.unam.mx

FILIP SAIDAK
Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
filip@math.missouri.edu

IGOR E. SHPARLINSKI
Department of Computing
Macquarie University
Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia
igor@ics.mq.edu.au

---

*Corresponding Author

1

Abstract

Let $\varphi(n)$ denote the Euler function. In this paper, we determine the order of growth for the number of positive integers $n \leq x$ for which $\varphi(n)$ is the sum of two square numbers. We also obtain similar results for the Dedekind function $\psi(n)$ and the sum of divisors function $\sigma(n)$.

1 Introduction

In 1970, Motohashi [6] showed that the number $N(x)$ of primes $p \leq x$ of the form $p = a^2 + b^2 + 1$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies the lower bound $N(x) \gg x/(\ln x)^2$. Based on earlier work of Hooley [2], he conjectured that $N(x) \sim Cx/(\ln x)^{3/2}$ as $x \to \infty$, where

$$C = \frac{3}{2} \prod_{p \equiv 3 \pmod 4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1/2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right).$$

In a subsequent paper [7], he proved the upper bound $N(x) \ll x/(\ln x)^{3/2}$, but he was unable to obtain a lower bound of the same order of magnitude.

The problem of showing $N(x) \asymp x/(\ln x)^{3/2}$ was settled by Iwaniec [4] (see also [5]), who established tight upper and lower bounds for the number $N_{f,m,c}(x)$ of primes $p \leq x$ of the form $mf(a,b) + c$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, where f is a quadratic form with integral coefficients, $m, c \in \mathbb{Z}$, and f, m, c are subject to certain natural hypotheses. He also showed that the constant C originally conjectured by Motohashi cannot be correct, and he suggested that the factor $3/2$ should instead be replaced by $1/\sqrt{2}$. We remark that Motohashi's conjecture remains open at present.

Let $\varphi(n)$ denote the *Euler function*; that is,

$$\varphi(n) = \#\{1 \leq a \leq n : \gcd(a,n) = 1\} = n \prod_{p \mid n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right), \qquad n \geq 1.$$

Since $\varphi(p) = p - 1$ for every prime p, $N(x)$ can be interpreted as the number of primes in the set

$$\{p \leq x : \varphi(p) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Passing from primes to all positive integers, let us consider the function $M(x)$ which counts the number of positive integers in the set

$$\{n \leq x : \varphi(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

As a lower bound, one can use $M(x) \geq N(x) \gg x/(\ln x)^{3/2}$, but it is not immediately clear how to bound $M(x)$ from above. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *For all $x \geq 2$, the following bound holds:*

$$M(x) = \#\{n \leq x : \varphi(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \ll \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}}.$$

In other words,

$$M(x) \asymp N(x) \asymp x/(\ln x)^{3/2}. \tag{1}$$

Theorem 1 is the special case $m = 1$ of Theorem 3, which is proved in Section 3 below; that section also contains several Mertens-type estimates for the classes of primes under consideration, which may be of independent interest.

Let $\psi(n)$ and $\sigma(n)$ denote the *Dedekind function* and the *sum of divisors function*, respectively; that is,

$$\psi(n) = n \prod_{p \mid n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(n) = \sum_{d \mid n} d = \prod_{p^a \parallel n} \frac{p^{a+1} - 1}{p - 1}, \qquad n \geq 1.$$

In Section 4, we show that results analogous to Theorem 1 and thus to (1) hold also for the functions $\psi(n)$ or $\sigma(n)$. More precisely,

3

Theorem 2. *The following bounds hold:*

$$\#\{n \le x : \psi(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \asymp \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}}$$

and

$$\#\{n \le x : \sigma(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \asymp \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}}.$$

We expect that the methods of this paper can be adapted to obtain similar results for other quadratic forms besides $a^2 + b^2$.

2 Notation

Let $\mathbb{Z}$ denote the set of integers, and let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of natural numbers. Throughout, the letter p is always used to denote a *prime number*, while q always denotes a *prime power*.

In what follows, all implied constants in the symbols "O," "$\gg$" and "$\ll$" are *absolute*; in particular, they are uniform with respect to the parameters k and m which often occur in our arguments. For positive functions A and B,

the notations $A = O(B)$, $A \ll B$ and $B \gg A$ are all equivalent to the assertion that $A \le cB$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

For a real number $x > 0$, we define $\log x = \max\{\ln x,\, 2\}$, where $\ln x$ is the natural logarithm, and we put $\log_2 x = \log(\log x)$. Although our notation is highly nonstandard (it is much more common to put $\log x = \max\{\ln x,\, 1\}$ in order to handle various technical difficulties that can occur if x is very small), the function $\log x = \max\{\ln x,\, 2\}$ enjoys a rather convenient property; namely, $\log x$ is *submultiplicative*. Thus, the inequalities

$$\log(xy) \le \log x \, \log y \qquad \text{and} \qquad \log_2(xy) \le \log_2 x \, \log_2 y \qquad (2)$$

hold for *all* $x, y > 0$. The properties (2) enable us to simplify our arguments substantially at several key places, and it is for the benefit of the overall exposition that we have chosen to employ a nonstandard notation; we hope that this will not lead to any confusion for the reader.

3   Sums of Squares and the Euler Function

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of natural numbers that can be expressed as a sum of two square numbers:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{s \in \mathbb{N} : s = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\text{squarefree } m \in \mathbb{N} : p \,|\, m \implies p \equiv 3 \pmod 4\},$$

and for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ we put $m\mathcal{S} = \{ms : s \in \mathcal{S}\}$. From the standard characterization of those integers lying in $\mathcal{S}$, it is clear that $\mathbb{N}$ is the disjoint union of the sets $\{m\mathcal{S} : m \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

As a special case of Theorem 1 of [4], one finds the estimate:

$$\#\{p \leq x : p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}\} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log x)^{3/2}}, \qquad \forall m \ll (\log x)^{3/2}.$$

Our principal tool in this paper is the following extension of this bound for larger values of m.

Lemma 1. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\#\{p \leq x : p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}\} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $x > m$ since the result is trivial otherwise. Throughout the proof, let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} &= \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \,|\, n \implies p \equiv 3 \pmod 4\}, \\
\mathcal{R} &= \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p \,|\, n \implies p \not\equiv 3 \pmod 4\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and that $m\mathcal{S}$ is the disjoint union of the sets $\{md^2\mathcal{R} : d \in \mathcal{N}\}$; it therefore suffices to estimate $\#\{p \leq x : p - 1 \in md^2\mathcal{R}\}$ for each $d \in \mathcal{N}$ and then sum the results.

We apply the arithmetic form of the *large sieve inequality* (see, for example, Corollary 6.1 in §I.4.5 of [8]), which states that for any finite sequence of complex numbers $\{a_n : M < n \leq M + N\}$, the bound

$$\left| \sum_{M < n \leq M+N} a_n \right|^2 \leq \frac{N - 1 + Q^2}{L} \sum_{M < n \leq M+N} |a_n|^2 \tag{3}$$

holds, where

$$Q \geq 1, \qquad L = \sum_{k \leq Q} \left(\mu^2(k) \prod_{p \,|\, k} \frac{w(p)}{p - w(p)} \right),$$

and for every prime p,

$$w(p) = \#\{h : 0 \le h < p, \ n \equiv h \pmod{p} \implies a_n = 0\}.$$

We begin with an estimate for the cardinality of the set

$$\mathcal{P}_b(x) = \{p \le x : p - 1 \in b\mathcal{R}\},$$

where $b \in \mathcal{N}$ and $b \le x$. Put $Q = \lceil (x/b)^{1/2} \rceil$, and let $\{a_n : Q < n \le Q^2\}$ be the finite sequence defined by

$$a_n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } bn + 1 \text{ is prime,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $p = bn + 1$ lies in $\mathcal{P}_b(x)$, then $n \in \mathcal{R}$ and $n < x/b \le Q^2$; thus, either $a_n = 1$ or $n \le Q$. Taking $M = Q$ and $N = Q^2 - Q$ in (3), we see that

$$\#\mathcal{P}_b(x) \le Q + \sum_{Q < n \le Q^2} a_n \le Q + \frac{(Q^2 - Q) - 1 + Q^2}{L} \ll Q + \frac{Q^2}{L}. \quad (4)$$

Now, for the sequence $\{a_n\}$ we are considering, one has for each prime $p \le Q$:

$$w(p) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \text{ and } p \nmid b, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, according to Lemma 4.1 in Chapter 4 of [1], the following lower bound for L holds:

$$L \gg \prod_{p \le Q} \left(1 - \frac{w(p)}{p}\right)^{-1}.$$

The expression on the right is bounded below (see [9]) by

$$\prod_{\substack{p \le Q \\ p \mid b}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \prod_{\substack{p \le Q \\ p \equiv 3 \ (\mathrm{mod}\ 4)}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \prod_{p \le Q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \gg \frac{\varphi(b)}{b} (\log Q)^{3/2}.$$

Substituting this bound into (4) and using the fact that $Q \ll (x/b)^{1/2}$, we derive that

$$\#\mathcal{P}_b(x) \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(b)(\log(x/b))^{3/2}},$$

uniformly for all $b \in \mathcal{N}$ with $b \le x$.

By the remarks at the beginning of the proof,

$$\#\{p \le x : p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}\} = \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{N} \\ d \le (x/m)^{1/2}}} \#\mathcal{P}_{md^2}(x)$$

$$\ll \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{N} \\ d \le (x/m)^{1/2}}} \frac{x}{\varphi(md^2)(\log(x/md^2))^{3/2}}.$$

The contribution for values of $d \le (x/m)^{1/4}$ is at most

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{N} \\ d \le (x/m)^{1/4}}} \frac{x}{\varphi(md^2)(\log(x/md^2))^{3/2}} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{\varphi(d^2)}$$

$$\ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}.$$

For larger values of d, we also have

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{N} \\ (x/m)^{1/4} < d \le (x/m)^{1/2}}} \frac{x}{\varphi(md^2)(\log(x/md^2))^{3/2}} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \sum_{(x/m)^{1/4} < d \le (x/m)^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\varphi(d^2)}$$

$$\ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(x/m)^{1/4}} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}},$$

where we use the well-known fact that the estimate

$$\sum_{d \ge y} \frac{1}{\varphi(d^2)} \ll \frac{1}{y}$$

holds for all positive real numbers y. The result now follows. $\qquad \square$

We need the following analogue of Lemma 1 for prime powers q.

Lemma 2. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\#\{q \leq x : \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}\} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. As before, we may assume $x > m$ since the result is trivial otherwise. To simplify the notation slightly, we put

$$\mathcal{E}(m, x) = \frac{x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}.$$

We have

$$\#\{q \leq x : \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}\} = \#\{p \leq x : p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}\} + \sum_{\alpha \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{q = p^\alpha \leq x \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} 1.$$

By Lemma 1, it suffices to show that the double sum on the right is bounded by $O(\mathcal{E}(m, x))$.

Since $\varphi(2^\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $\alpha \geq 1$, the contribution to the double sum coming from the prime $p = 2$ is at most $O(\log x)$ if $m = 1$, and it is 0 if $m \neq 1$; this is $O(\mathcal{E}(m, x))$ in either case.

For primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, we observe that $\varphi(p^\alpha) = p^{\alpha-1}(p - 1)$ lies in $m\mathcal{S}$ if and only if $p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}$. Thus, by Lemma 1, the contribution to the double sum coming from prime powers of this form is at most

$$\sum_{\alpha=2}^{\lfloor \frac{\ln x}{\ln 2} \rfloor} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x^{1/\alpha} \\ p-1 \in m\mathcal{S} \\ p \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ 4)}} 1 \ll \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\lfloor 2\log x \rfloor} \frac{x^{1/2}}{\varphi(m)} \ll \frac{x^{1/2} \log x}{\varphi(m)} \ll \mathcal{E}(m, x).$$

Similarly, if $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ and $2 \nmid \alpha$, then $p^{\alpha-1}(p - 1)$ lies in $m\mathcal{S}$ if and only if $p - 1 \in m\mathcal{S}$ (since m is squarefree). By Lemma 1, the contribution to

9

the double sum coming from prime powers of this form is at most

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha=3 \\ 2\nmid\alpha}}^{\lfloor\frac{\ln x}{\ln 2}\rfloor} \sum_{\substack{p\le x^{1/\alpha} \\ p-1\in m\mathcal{S} \\ p\equiv 3\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 4)}} 1 \ll \sum_{\alpha=3}^{\lfloor 2\log x\rfloor} \frac{x^{1/3}}{\varphi(m)} \ll \frac{x^{1/3}\log x}{\varphi(m)} \ll \mathcal{E}(m,x).$$

Finally, if $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$, $2\,|\,\alpha$, and $\alpha \ge 2$, then $p^{\alpha-1}(p-1)$ lies in $m\mathcal{S}$ if and only if $p\,|\,m$ and $p - 1 \in (m/p)\mathcal{S}$. Since the last condition implies that $p > m^{1/2}$, there is at most one prime p of this form. Assuming that such a prime exists and using the inequality $\ln p \gg \log m$, we see that the contribution to the double sum coming from the powers of p is at most

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha=2 \\ 2\,|\,\alpha}}^{\lfloor\frac{\ln x}{\ln p}\rfloor} \sum_{\substack{p\le x^{1/\alpha} \\ p\,|\,m,\ p-1\in(m/p)\mathcal{S} \\ p\equiv 3\,(\mathrm{mod}\ 4)}} 1 \ll \frac{\log x}{\log m} \le \log(x/m),$$

where the last estimate follows from (2). Since $(\log(x/m))^{5/2} \ll x/m$ for $x > m$, we see that

$$\log(x/m) \ll \frac{x}{m\log(x/m)^{3/2}} \ll \mathcal{E}(m,x),$$

and this completes the proof. $\qquad\Box$

Lemma 3. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\sum_{\substack{q>x \\ \varphi(q)\in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q} \ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. Since the condition $\varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}$ implies $q > m$, we may assume that $x \ge m$ in what follows. Let X_m denote the characteristic function of the set

10

of prime powers $\{q : \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}\}$, and let z an arbitrary real number such that $z > \max\{x, e^2 m\}$. By partial summation and Lemma 2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{x < q \leq z \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q} = \sum_{x < n \leq z} \frac{X_m(n)}{n} &= \frac{1}{z} \sum_{x < n \leq z} X_m(n) + \int_x^z \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\sum_{x < n \leq t} X_m(n) \right) dt \\
&= \frac{1}{z} \sum_{\substack{x < q \leq z \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} 1 + \int_x^z \frac{1}{t^2} \left(\sum_{\substack{x < q \leq t \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} 1 \right) dt \\
&\ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)} \left(\frac{1}{(\log(z/m))^{3/2}} + \int_x^z \frac{dt}{t(\log(t/m))^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

If $m \leq x < e^2 m$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_x^z \frac{dt}{t(\log(t/m))^{3/2}} &\leq 2^{-3/2} \int_m^{e^2 m} \frac{dt}{t} + \int_{e^2 m}^z \frac{dt}{t(\ln(t/m))^{3/2}} \\
&= 2^{-1/2} + 2^{1/2} - \frac{2}{(\log(z/m))^{1/2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

while for $x \geq e^2 m$, since $\log(t/m) = \ln(t/m)$ for all $t \geq x$, we have

$$
\int_x^z \frac{dt}{t(\log(t/m))^{3/2}} = \frac{2}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}} - \frac{2}{(\log(z/m))^{1/2}}.
$$

Taking $z \to \infty$, we obtain the stated result. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 4. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$
\sum_{\substack{q \leq x \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q \, (\log(x/qn))^{1/2}} \ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/mn))^{1/2}}.
$$

Proof. Since $\varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}$ implies $q > m$, we may assume that $x \geq m$. Let $y = (mx/n)^{1/2}$, and note that $x/yn = y/m = (x/mn)^{1/2}$. By Lemma 3, we

11

have for the sum over $q > y$:

$$\sum_{\substack{y < q \leq x \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q \left(\log(x/qn)\right)^{1/2}} \ll \sum_{\substack{q > y \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q} \ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)(\log(y/m))^{1/2}}$$

$$\ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/mn))^{1/2}}.$$

Again by Lemma 3, we have for the sum over $q \leq y$:

$$\sum_{\substack{q \leq y \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q \left(\log(x/qn)\right)^{1/2}} \ll \frac{1}{(\log(x/yn))^{1/2}} \sum_{\substack{q > 1 \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{q} \ll \frac{1}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/mn))^{1/2}}.$$

Combining the preceding estimates, we finish the proof. $\qquad\square$

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ denote the set of prime powers.

Lemma 5. *For some absolute constant $C > 0$, the estimate*

$$\sum_{\substack{(q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathcal{Q}^k \\ q_1 \cdots q_k \leq x \\ \varphi(q_j) \in m_j\mathcal{S} \ \forall j}} \log(q_1 \cdots q_k) \leq kC^k \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\varphi(m_j)} \right) \frac{x \log \mu}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}$$

holds for all $k \geq 1$, $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathcal{M}$, and $x > 0$, where $m = m_1 \cdots m_k$ and $\mu = \max\{m_1, \ldots, m_k\}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k.

The case $k = 1$ is straightforward. Indeed, if $m \in \mathcal{M}$, using Lemma 2 together with (2), we see that the estimate

$$\sum_{\substack{q \leq x \\ \varphi(q) \in m\mathcal{S}}} \log q \leq C \frac{x \log x}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{3/2}} \leq C \frac{x \log m}{\varphi(m)(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}$$

holds for some absolute constant $C > 0$, since $\log q \leq \log x$ for each term in the sum. This establishes the result for $k = 1$.

12

Taking C larger if necessary, let us assume that C is at least as large as the implied constant of Lemma 4.

Let us now suppose that the result has been established for some integer $k \geq 1$. Starting with the bound

$$k \log(q_1 \cdots q_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \log(q_1 \cdots \widehat{q}_j \cdots q_{k+1}),$$

where $\widehat{q}_j$ indicates that the factor q_j has been omitted (in fact, the inequality would be an identity were it not for our slightly modified definition of the function log; see Section 2), we derive that

$$\sum_{\substack{(q_1,\ldots,q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}^{k+1} \\ q_1 \cdots q_{k+1} \leq x \\ \varphi(q_j) \in m_j \mathcal{S} \; \forall j}} k \log(q_1 \cdots q_{k+1})$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{(q_1,\ldots,q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}^{k+1} \\ q_1 \cdots q_{k+1} \leq x \\ \varphi(q_j) \in m_j \mathcal{S} \; \forall j}} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \log(q_1 \cdots \widehat{q}_j \cdots q_{k+1})$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{q_j \leq x \\ \varphi(q_j) \in m_j \mathcal{S}}} \sum_{\substack{(q_1,\ldots,\widehat{q}_j,\ldots,q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{Q}^k \\ q_1 \cdots \widehat{q}_j \cdots q_{k+1} \leq x/q_j \\ \varphi(q_i) \in m_i \mathcal{S} \; \forall i \neq j}} \log(q_1 \cdots \widehat{q}_j \cdots q_{k+1})$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} k C^k \left(\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k+1 \\ i \neq j}} \frac{1}{\varphi(m_i)} \right) \sum_{\substack{q_j \leq x \\ \varphi(q_j) \in m_j \mathcal{S}}} \frac{x \log \mu}{q_j \left(\log \left(\frac{x}{q_j \, m_1 \cdots \widehat{m}_j \cdots m_k} \right) \right)^{1/2}}.$$

Dividing both sides by k and using Lemma 4 to estimate the last sum, it

follows that

$$
\sum_{\substack{(q_1,\dots,q_{k+1})\in\mathcal{Q}^{k+1} \\ q_1\cdots q_{k+1}\le x \\ q_j-1\in m_j\mathcal{S}\ \forall j}} \log(q_1\cdots q_{k+1}) \ \le\ C^k \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\left(\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le k+1 \\ i\ne j}}\frac{1}{\varphi(m_i)}\right)\frac{Cx\log\mu}{\varphi(m_j)(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}
$$

$$
=\ (k+1)C^{k+1}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k+1}\frac{1}{\varphi(m_i)}\right)\frac{x\log\mu}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}.
$$

This completes the induction and finishes the proof. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 3. *For all $m\in\mathcal{M}$ and $x>0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$
\#\{n\le x : \varphi(n)=m(a^2+b^2)\ \text{for some } a,b\in\mathbb{Z}\}\ \ll\ \frac{c(m)x}{(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}
$$

for some positive function $c(m)$ that depends only on m. Moreover, $c(m)\to 0$ as $m\to\infty$.

Proof. Let

$$
\mathcal{T}(m;x)=\{n\le x : \varphi(n)\in m\mathcal{S}\}.
$$

We begin by estimating

$$
\sum_{\substack{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ \omega(n)=k}}\log n = \sum_{\substack{(p_1^{\alpha_1},\dots,p_k^{\alpha_k})\in\mathcal{Q}^k \\ p_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}\in\mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ p_1<\dots<p_k}}\log(p_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}) = \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\substack{(q_1,\dots,q_k)\in\mathcal{Q}^k \\ q_1\cdots q_k\in\mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ \gcd(q_i,q_j)=1\ \forall i\ne j}}\log(q_1\cdots q_k).
$$

If $q_1\cdots q_k\in\mathcal{T}(m;x)$ and $\gcd(q_i,q_j)=1$ for all $i\ne j$, it is easy to see that the integers $m_1,\dots,m_k\in\mathcal{M}$ defined by $\varphi(q_j)\in m_j\mathcal{S}$, $j=1,\dots,k$, satisfy the relation $m_1\cdots m_k=mt^2$ for some *odd* integer $t\le(x/m)^{1/2}$. Moreover, since each m_j is *squarefree*, it follows that $m_j\le mt$. Using Lemma 5, we

14

derive that

$$\sum_{\substack{(q_1,\ldots,q_k)\in\mathcal{Q}^k \\ q_1\cdots q_k\in\mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ \gcd(q_i,q_j)=1 \ \forall i\neq j}} \log(q_1\cdots q_k) \leq \sum_{\substack{t\leq(x/m)^{1/2} \\ t \text{ odd}}} \sum_{\substack{(m_1,\ldots,m_k)\in\mathcal{M}^k \\ m_1\cdots m_k=mt^2}} \sum_{\substack{(q_1,\ldots,q_k)\in\mathcal{Q}^k \\ q_1\cdots q_k\leq x \\ \varphi(q_j)\in m_j\mathcal{S} \ \forall j}} \log(q_1\cdots q_k)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\substack{t\leq(x/m)^{1/2} \\ t \text{ odd}}} \sum_{\substack{(m_1,\ldots,m_k)\in\mathcal{M}^k \\ m_1\cdots m_k=mt^2}} kC^k \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{1}{\varphi(m_j)}\right) \frac{x\log(mt)}{(\log(x/mt^2))^{1/2}}.$$

For each term in the double summation, we use the bound

$$\prod_{j=1}^{k}\varphi(m_j) = \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(m_j\prod_{p\,|\,m_j}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) = mt^2\prod_{j=1}^{k}\prod_{p\,|\,m_j}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)$$

$$= mt^2\prod_{p\,|\,mt}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\#\{1\leq j\leq k:p\,|\,m_j\}}$$

$$\geq mt^2\left(\frac{\varphi(m)}{m}\right)^k\prod_{p^\alpha\,\|\,t}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{2\alpha} = m\left(\frac{\varphi(m)}{m}\right)^k\prod_{p^\alpha\,\|\,t}(p-1)^{2\alpha}.$$

By (2), we also have

$$\frac{\log(mt)}{(\log(x/mt^2))^{1/2}} \leq \frac{\log m}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}(\log t)^2.$$

Putting everything together, we obtain that

$$\sum_{\substack{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ \omega(n)=k}} \log n \leq \frac{kC^k m^{k-1}\log m}{\varphi(m)^k\cdot k!}\frac{x}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}\sum_{\substack{t\leq(x/m)^{1/2} \\ t \text{ odd}}}\frac{\tau_k^*(mt^2)(\log t)^2}{\prod_{p^\alpha\,\|\,t}(p-1)^{2\alpha}},$$

where $\tau_k^*(n)$ denotes the number of k-tuples $(n_1,\ldots,n_k)$ of squarefree natural numbers such that $n_1\cdots n_k=n$. From the identity

$$\tau_k^*(n) = \prod_{p^\alpha\,\|\,n}\binom{k}{\alpha}, \tag{5}$$

15

it follows that (since $\Omega(m) = \omega(m)$)

$$\tau_k^*(mt^2) \leq \tau_k^*(m)\tau_k^*(t^2) \leq \tau_k(m)\tau_k^*(t^2) \leq k^{\omega(m)}\tau_k^*(t^2)$$

for each term in the preceding sum, where $\tau_k(n)$ is the number of k-tuples $(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ in $\mathbb{N}^k$ such that $n_1 \cdots n_k = n$. Consequently, we derive that

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in \mathcal{T}(m;x) \\ \omega(n)=k}} \log n \leq T_k \frac{k^{\omega(m)+1}C^k m^{k-1}\log m}{\varphi(m)^k \cdot k!} \frac{x}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$T_k = \sum_{\substack{t \geq 1 \\ t \text{ odd}}} \tau_k^*(t^2)(\log t)^2 \prod_{p^\alpha \| t} (p-1)^{-2\alpha}.$$

We turn now to the estimation of T_k. By the multiplicativity of $\tau_k^*(n)$, the sub-multiplicativity of $\log n$, and the identity (5), we see that

$$T_k \leq 3 + \prod_{p \neq 2} \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}}\right).$$

Let us suppose that $k \geq 32$. For an odd prime $p \leq k^2$ and an integer $\alpha \geq 1$, we have $\log p^\alpha \leq 2\alpha \log k$, hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}} &\leq 1 + 4(\log k)^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{\alpha^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}} \\
&\leq 1 + (\log k)^2 \sum_{\beta=0}^{k} \binom{k}{\beta} \frac{\beta^2}{(p-1)^\beta} \\
&\leq 1 + k^2(\log k)^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right)^k \\
&\leq 2k^2(\log k)^2 \exp\left(\frac{k}{p-1}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

16

For the product over odd primes $p < 32k$, we therefore have by the Prime Number Theorem and Mertens' Theorem:

$$\prod_{\substack{p<32k \\ p\neq2}} \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}}\right) \leq \prod_{\substack{p<32k \\ p\neq2}} \exp\left(\frac{k}{p-1} + O(\log k)\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\sum_{p<32k} \frac{k}{p-1} + O(k)\right) = \exp(O(k \log_2 k)).$$

(7)

Now suppose that $p > 32k$. Defining

$$f(p, \alpha) = \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}}, \qquad 1 \leq \alpha \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor,$$

we have

$$\frac{f(p, \alpha+1)}{f(p, \alpha)} = \frac{(\alpha+1)^2(k-2\alpha)(k-2\alpha-1)}{\alpha^2(2\alpha+2)(2\alpha+1)(p-1)^2} < \frac{(\alpha+1)^2}{\alpha^2(2\alpha+1)^2} \frac{(k-2\alpha)^2}{(32k)^2} < \frac{1}{2},$$

and therefore

$$1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}} = 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} f(p, \alpha) \leq 1 + f(p, 1)\left(1 + \tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{4} + \dots\right)$$

$$= 1 + 2f(p, 1) \leq 1 + k^2 \frac{(\log p)^2}{(p-1)^2} \leq \exp\left(k^2 \frac{(\log p)^2}{(p-1)^2}\right).$$

Now for the product over odd primes $p > 32k$, we have:

$$\prod_{p>32k} \left(1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \binom{k}{2\alpha} \frac{(\log p^\alpha)^2}{(p-1)^{2\alpha}}\right) \leq \prod_{p>32k} \exp\left(k^2 \frac{(\log p)^2}{(p-1)^2}\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(2k^2 \sum_{p>32k} \frac{(\ln p)^2}{p^2}\right)$$

(8)

if k is larger than some absolute constant. To estimate the sum, let us suppose that k is also sufficiently large so that the inequality $\pi(x) \leq 2x/\ln x$

17

holds for all $x \geq k$. Then

$$\sum_{p>32k} \frac{(\ln p)^2}{p^2} = \sum_{j=6}^{\infty} \sum_{k2^{j-1}<p\leq k2^j} \frac{(\ln p)^2}{p^2} \leq 4 \sum_{j=6}^{\infty} \frac{(\ln(k2^j))^2}{k^2 4^j} \pi(k2^j)$$

$$\leq 8 \sum_{j=6}^{\infty} \frac{(\ln(k2^j))^2}{k^2 4^j} \frac{k2^j}{\ln(k2^j)} = \frac{8}{k} \sum_{j=6}^{\infty} \frac{\ln k + j \ln 2}{2^j} = \frac{\ln k}{4k} + \frac{7 \ln 2}{k}.$$

Substituting this estimate into (8) and taking into account (7), we deduce that

$$T_k \leq \exp(0.5k \log k + O(k \log_2 k)). \tag{9}$$

Using this estimate in (6) together with Stirling's formula for $k!$, and then summing over all values of $k \geq 1$, it is now clear that for some constant $c(m)$ (which we estimate below),

$$\sum_{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;x)} \ln n \leq \sum_{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;x)} \log n \leq \frac{c(m)\,x}{(\log(x/m))^{1/2}}. \tag{10}$$

If $x \geq e^2 m$, which we may assume otherwise the statement of the theorem is trivial, we have by partial summation:

$$\sum_{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;x)} \ln n = \#\mathcal{T}(m,x) \ln x - \int_m^x \frac{1}{t} \left(\sum_{n\in\mathcal{T}(m;t)} \ln n \right) dt,$$

thus, by (10), it follows that

$$\#\mathcal{T}(m,x) \ln x \leq \frac{c(m)\,x}{(\ln(x/m))^{1/2}} + \int_m^x \frac{c(m)}{(\log(t/m))^{1/2}}\, dt.$$

Since

$$\int_m^x \frac{1}{(\log(t/m))^{1/2}}\, dt = 2^{-1/2}(e^2 m - m) + \int_{e^2 m}^x \frac{1}{(\ln(t/m))^{1/2}}\, dt$$

$$\leq 2^{-1/2}(e^2 m - m) + \int_{e^2 m}^x \left(\frac{2}{(\ln(t/m))^{1/2}} - \frac{1}{(\ln(t/m))^{3/2}} \right) dt$$

$$= 2^{-1/2}(e^2 m - m) - 2^{1/2} e^2 m + \frac{2x}{(\ln(x/m))^{1/2}} < \frac{2x}{(\ln(x/m))^{1/2}},$$

18

we have therefore shown that

$$\# \mathcal{T}(m, x) \ll \frac{c(m)x}{\log(x/m)^{3/2}}.$$

To complete the proof, it remains only to show that $c(m) = o(1)$. In what follows, let us suppose that m is large enough to guarantee that the stated estimates hold. By (9), Stirling's formula for $k!$, and the estimate $\varphi(m) \gg m/\log_2 m$, we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
c(m) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} T_k \frac{k^{\omega(m)+1} C^k m^{k-1} \log m}{\varphi(m)^k \cdot k!} \\
&\ll \frac{\log m}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\tfrac{1}{2}k \log k + \omega(m) \log k + k \log_3 m + O(k \log_2 k)\right) \\
&\ll \frac{\log m}{m} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k(m),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$a_k(m) = \exp\left(-\tfrac{1}{3}k \log k + \omega(m) \log k + k \log_3 m\right).$$

Now let S_1 be the set of integers $k \geq 1$ that satisfy both inequalities $k \geq 4\omega(m)$ and $k \geq (\log_2 m)^{24}$. If k lies in S_1, then $\omega(m) \leq k/4$ and $\log_3 m \leq (\log k)/24$; therefore,

$$-\tfrac{1}{3}k \log k + \omega(m) \log k + k \log_3 m \leq -\tfrac{1}{3}k \log k + \tfrac{1}{4}k \log k + \tfrac{1}{24}k \log k = -\tfrac{1}{24}k \log k.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\sum_{k \in S_1} a_k(m) \ll \sum_{k \geq 1} \exp(-\tfrac{1}{24}k \log k) \ll 1. \tag{11}$$

Let S_2 be the set of integers $k \geq 1$ for which $k \leq (\log_2 m)^{24}$. In this case,

19

we have

$$a_k(m) \leq \exp\left(\omega(m)\log k + k\log_3 m\right)$$
$$\leq \exp\left(O\left(\frac{\log m \log_3 m}{\log_2 m}\right)\right) \ll m^{o(1)},$$

where we used the fact that $\omega(m) \ll \log m / \log_2 m$. Since the cardinality of S_2 is at most $(\log_2 m)^{24} = m^{o(1)}$, we find that

$$\sum_{k \in S_2} a_k(m) \leq m^{o(1)}. \tag{12}$$

Finally, let S_3 denote the set of integers $k \geq 1$ such that the inequalities $(\log_2 m)^{24} < k \leq 4\omega(m)$ hold. For any $k \in S_3$, we have $k\log_3 m \leq \frac{1}{6}k\log k$ (otherwise, $k < (\log_2 m)^6$); hence, it follows that

$$a_k(m) \ll \exp\left(-\tfrac{1}{6}k\log k + \omega(m)\log k\right).$$

Defining

$$f_m(z) = -\tfrac{1}{6}z\log z + \omega(m)\log z,$$

we have

$$\frac{df_m(z)}{dz} = -\frac{1}{6} + \frac{\omega(m)}{z} - \frac{\log z}{6}, \qquad \frac{d^2 f_m(z)}{dz^2} = -\frac{1}{6z} - \frac{\omega(m)}{z^2},$$

which shows that $f_m(z)$ has a (unique) maximum for a value of z_0 satisfying $z_0 \log z_0 = (6 + o(1))\omega(m)$. From this we deduce that

$$f_m(z_0) = \omega(m)(\log\omega(m) - \log_2\omega(m)) + O(\omega(m)).$$

From the trivial inequality $\omega(m)! \leq m$ and Stirling's formula, we obtain

$$\omega(m)\left(\log\omega(m) + O(1)\right) \leq \log m.$$

20

Therefore,

$$f_m(z_0) \ll \log m - \omega(m) \log_2 \omega(m) + O(\omega(m)).$$

If S_3 is not empty, then $\omega(m) > \frac{1}{4}(\log_2 m)^{24}$; hence,

$$a_k(m) \ll \exp(f_m(z_0)) \ll \exp\left(\log m - \frac{1}{8}(\log_2 m)^{25}\right)$$

for all $k \in S_3$. Since S_3 has at most $4\omega(m) \ll \log m$ elements, it follows that

$$\sum_{k \in S_3} a_k(m) = o\left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right). \tag{13}$$

From our original bound,

$$c(m) \leq \frac{\log m}{m} \sum_{k \geq 1} a_k(m),$$

we now deduce that $c(m) = o(1)$ from the estimates (11), (12) and (13), and this completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

From the proof of Theorem 3, it is clear that the function $c(m)$ can be chosen to satisfy the bound

$$c(m) \ll \exp\left(-c(\log_2 m)^{25}\right)$$

for any fixed constant $0 < c < \frac{1}{8}$; in particular, $c(m) \ll (\log m)^{-A}$ for any fixed constant $A > 0$. Though we have not attempted to do so, it would be interesting to understand the extent to which this upper bound can be strengthened.

4   Proof of Theorem 2

The upper bound for the first part of Theorem 2 is the special case $m = 1$ of the following theorem, whose proof is virtually identical to that of Theorem 3 (one simply replaces $p - 1$ by $p + 1$ in the various statements of Section 3).

Theorem 4. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\#\{n \le x : \psi(n) \in m\mathcal{S}\} \ll \frac{c(m)x}{(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}$$

for some positive function $c(m)$ that depends only on m. Moreover, $c(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

The analogue of Lemma 1 with $p - 1$ replaced by $p + 1$ clearly gives the desired lower bounds for both parts of Theorem 2. To complete the proof, it remains only to establish the upper bound:

$$\#\{n \le x : \sigma(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \ll \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}}. \tag{14}$$

Noting that $\sigma(n) = \psi(n)$ for squarefree integers n, we have the following corollary of Theorem 4.

Corollary 1. *For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x > 0$, the following estimate holds:*

$$\#\{n \le x : \sigma(n) \in m\mathcal{S} \text{ and } n \text{ is squarefree}\} \ll \frac{c(m)x}{(\log(x/m))^{3/2}}$$

for some positive function $c(m)$ that depends only on m. Moreover, $c(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

Recall that an integer $k \ge 1$ is said to be *powerful* if $p^2 \mid k$ whenever $p \mid k$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of positive integers $n \le x$ such that $k \mid n$ for some powerful integer $k > (\ln x)^4$. Then

$$\#\mathcal{T} \le \sum_{\substack{k > (\ln x)^4 \\ k \text{ powerful}}} \sum_{\substack{n \le x \\ k \mid n}} 1 \le x \sum_{\substack{k > (\ln x)^4 \\ k \text{ powerful}}} \frac{1}{k} \ll \frac{x}{(\ln x)^2},$$

where for the above estimate we have used the known fact that

$$\#\{k \le y \mid k \text{ powerful}\} \ll \sqrt{y}$$

22

for all real numbers y (for a more precise statement, see Theorem 14.4 in [3]), together with partial summation. Thus, to establish the estimate (14), it suffices to prove the same upper bound for the number of integers $n \leq x$ with $\sigma(n) \in \mathcal{S}$ and $n \notin \mathcal{T}$. Let n be one such integer. Write $n = k\ell$, where k is *powerful*, ℓ is squarefree, and $\gcd(k, \ell) = 1$; then k and ℓ are uniquely determined by n. Let us write

$$f(k) = \prod_{\substack{p^a \,\|\, \sigma(k) \\ p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 \\ a \equiv 1 \pmod 2}} p.$$

Clearly,

$$f(k) \leq \sigma(k) \ll k \log_2 k \ll (\ln x)^5.$$

Since $\sigma(n) = \sigma(k)\sigma(\ell) \in \mathcal{S}$, it follows that $\sigma(\ell) \in f(k)\mathcal{S}$. By Corollary 1, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\#\{n \leq x : \sigma(n) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } n \notin \mathcal{T}\} \;\leq\;& \sum_{\substack{k \leq (\ln x)^4 \\ k \text{ powerful}}} \sum_{\substack{\ell \leq x/k \\ \ell \text{ sqfree} \\ \sigma(\ell) \in f(k)\mathcal{S}}} 1 \\
\ll\;& \sum_{\substack{k \leq x \\ k \text{ powerful}}} \frac{x}{k(\log(x/kf(k)))^{3/2}} \\
\ll\;& \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}} \sum_{\substack{k \leq x \\ k \text{ powerful}}} \frac{1}{k} \ll \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the fact that $kf(k) \ll (\ln x)^9$ in the third step. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

23

5 Remarks

A well-known asymptotic formula of Landau asserts that

$$\#\{n \le x : n = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \sim C_0 \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{1/2}},$$

where

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \prod_{p \equiv 3 \pmod 4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1/2} = 0.7642 \cdots.$$

In view of Theorem 1, it seems reasonable to expect the asymptotic formula

$$\#\{n \le x : \varphi(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \sim C_1 \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{3/2}} \qquad (15)$$

to hold for some constant $C_1 > 0$. More generally, we can ask whether it is true that for any integer $k \ge 1$, there is a constant $C_k > 0$ for which the asymptotic formula

$$\#\{n \le x : \varphi^{(k)}(n) = a^2 + b^2 \text{ for some } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\} \sim C_k \frac{x}{(\ln x)^{k+1/2}} \qquad (16)$$

holds, where $\varphi^{(k)}(n)$ denotes the k-th iterate of the Euler function. It is likely that any proof of (16) (or even (15)) will require an asymptotic formula for the number primes $p \le x$ with $p - 1 = a^2 + b^2$ (that is, a proof of Motohashi's conjecture). On the other hand, it might be possible to establish the precise rate of growth of the function on the left side of (16) when $k \ge 2$, perhaps by extending the ideas of this paper. It would also be interesting to have heuristic formulas for the constants $\{C_k : k \ge 1\}$.

Of course, similar questions can be posed for the Dedekind function and for the sum of divisors function as well.

References

[1] H. Halberstam and H.-E. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 4, Academic Press, London-New York, 1974.

[2] C. Hooley, 'On the representation of a number as the sum of two squares and a prime', *Acta Math.*, **97** (1957), 189–210.

[3] A. Ivić, *The Riemann Zeta-Function. Theory and Applications*, Dover, Mineola, NY, 2003.

[4] H. Iwaniec, 'Primes of the type $\varphi(x, y) + A$ where φ is a quadratic form', *Acta Arith.*, **21** (1972), 203–234.

[5] H. Iwaniec, 'Primes represented by quadratic polynomials in two variables', *Acta Arith.*, **24** (1974), 435–459.

[6] Y. Motohashi, 'On the distribution of prime numbers which are of the form $x^2 + y^2 + 1$', *Acta Arith.*, **16** (1970), 351–363.

[7] Y. Motohashi, 'On the distribution of prime numbers which are of the form $x^2 + y^2 + 1$, II', *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.*, **22** (1971), 207–210.

[8] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995.

[9] K. Williams, 'Mertens' theorem for arithmetical progressions', *J. Number Theory*, **6** (1974), 353–359.