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# On ultrafriable integers 

Gérald Tenenbaum


#### Abstract

Say that an integer $n$ is $y$-ultrafriable if its canonical decomposition is free of prime powers exceeding $y$. We investigate the asymptotic behaviour of the distribution function $\Upsilon(x, y)$, equal to the number of $y$-ultrafriable integers not exceeding $x$. The study being restricted to the range $\psi(y)>2 \log x$ (where $\psi$ denotes Chebyshev's function) by a symmetry argument, and writing $\Psi(x, y)$ for the number of $y$-friable integers not exceeding $x, \beta=\beta(x, y)$ for the saddle-point associated to the Dirichlet series $Z(s, y):=\prod_{p \leqslant y}\left(1-p^{-\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) s}\right) /\left(1-p^{-s}\right)$ where $\nu_{p}:=\lfloor(\log y) / \log p\rfloor$, we obtain full description via a number of effective estimates, qualitative versions of which may be stated


 as follows:(i) $\Upsilon(x, y) \sim \Psi(x, y) \Leftrightarrow y /(\log x)^{2} \rightarrow \infty \quad(x \rightarrow \infty)$;
(ii) $\Upsilon(x, y)=o(\Psi(x, y)) \Leftrightarrow y /(\log x)^{2} \rightarrow 0 \quad(x \rightarrow \infty)$;
(iii) $\Upsilon(x, y) \sim x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) G\left(\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}\right) \quad\left(x \rightarrow \infty, 2 \log x<\psi(y) \leqslant(\log x)^{3}\right)$.

Here $\sigma_{2}:=\mathrm{d}^{2}\{\log Z(\beta, y)\} / \mathrm{d} s^{2}$ and $G(z):=\mathrm{e}^{z^{2} / 2} \int_{z}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-t^{2} / 2} \mathrm{~d} t / \sqrt{2 \pi}(z>0)$.
Moreover, the phase transition between domains (i) and (ii) is quantitatively described in terms of the Dickman function, the Gaussian behaviour as $\log x$ approaches $\frac{1}{2} \psi(y)$ is made explicit, and a quantitative estimate for the local behaviour with respect to the variable $x$ is derived.
Keywords: Friable integers, integers free of large prime factors, saddle-point method, local behaviour, large deviations in the central limit theorem.

## 1. Introduction and statement of results

A positive integer $n$ is said to be $y$-friable if its largest prime factor $P^{+}(n)$ (with the convention that $P^{+}(1)=1$ ) does not exceed $y$. In the last twenty years, friable integers, and in particular the counting function

$$
\Psi(x, y):=\sum_{\substack{n \leqslant x \\ P^{+}(n) \leqslant y}} 1
$$

received considerable attention in the literature. In this paper, we investigate a related structure.
Let us say that an integer $n$ is $y$-ultrafriable if no prime power dividing $n$ exceeds $y$. Intrinsically a sieve problem but also relevant to other fields such as irreducibility of polynomials [1], graph theory (see, e.g., [9]), or the study of so-called economical integers [4], ${ }^{(1)}$ the distribution of ultrafriable integers raises interesting methodological questions which hopefully can be fairly satisfactorily answered using available techniques previously developed in the context of friable integers.
Denote by $\Upsilon(x, y)$ the number of $y$-ultrafriable integers not exceeding $x$ and put $\nu_{p}=\nu_{p}(y):=\lfloor(\log y) / \log p\rfloor$ for each prime $p \leqslant y$, so that $p^{\nu_{p}}$ is the largest power of $p$ not exceeding $y$. Writing $N_{y}:=\mathrm{e}^{\psi(y)}$ where $\psi(y):=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \nu_{p} \log p$ is Chebyshev's function, we note that all integers counted in $\Upsilon(x, y)$ are divisors of $N_{y}$, and hence

$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\tau\left(N_{y}\right)=\prod_{p \leqslant y}\left(1+\nu_{p}\right)=2^{\pi(y)+O(\sqrt{y} / \log y)} \quad\left(x \geqslant N_{y}\right),
$$

[^0]where $\pi(y)$ denotes the number of primes not exceeding $y$.
Next, we observe that
$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\tau\left(N_{y}\right)-\Upsilon\left(\left(N_{y} / x\right)-, y\right) \quad\left(\sqrt{N_{y}} \leqslant x \leqslant N_{y}\right) .
$$

Therefore, we may restrict the study of $\Upsilon(x, y)$ to the case

$$
x<\sqrt{N_{y}} \text {, i.e. } \psi(y)>2 \log x .
$$

The Dirichlet series associated to the counting function $\Upsilon(x, y)$ is

$$
Z(s, y):=\prod_{p \leqslant y} \frac{1-p^{-\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) s}}{1-p^{-s}} \quad(\Re e s>0) .
$$

While, for large values of $y$, we readily obtain satisfactory estimates for $\Upsilon(x, y)$ from results on the local behaviour of $\Psi(x, y)$ (see [3]), we need to perform a direct evaluation of the Perron integral when $y$ is small. The details are then similar to those appearing in the study of squarefree friable integers provided in [2], with however some significant discrepancies. When it will seem appropriate, we shall skip certain calculations and refer to the corresponding details in [2].
The saddle-point, say $\beta=\beta(x, y)$, relevant to the Perron integral for $\Upsilon(x, y)$ is defined by the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}(\beta, y)=\log x \tag{1•4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}(s, y):=\frac{-Z^{\prime}(s, y)}{Z(s, y)}=\sum_{p \leqslant y}\left\{\frac{\log p}{p^{s}-1}-\frac{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \log p}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) s}-1}\right\} \quad(\text { Res }>0, y \geqslant 2) . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $\varphi_{1}(\sigma, y)$ is a decreasing function of $\sigma$ such that $\varphi_{1}(0+, y)=\frac{1}{2} \psi(y), \varphi_{1}(\infty, y)=0$. Thus, under assumption (1•2), equation (1.4) has a unique solution and $\beta$ is well defined. For convenience, we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta:=0 \quad(\psi(y) \leqslant 2 \log x) . \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{j}(s, y):=(-1)^{j-1} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{j-1} \varphi_{1}}{\mathrm{~d} \sigma^{j-1}}(s, y), \quad \sigma_{j}:=\varphi_{j}(\beta, y) \quad(j \geqslant 1), \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

let

$$
\Phi(z):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \int_{z}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-t^{2} / 2} \mathrm{~d} t \quad(z \in \mathbb{R})
$$

denote the decreasing distribution function of the Gaussian law, and put

$$
G(z):=\mathrm{e}^{z^{2} / 2} \Phi(z) \quad(z \in \mathbb{R})
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(z)=\frac{1}{2}+O(z) \quad(z \rightarrow 0), \quad G(z)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi} z}\left\{1-\frac{1}{z^{2}}+O\left(\frac{1}{z^{4}}\right)\right\} \quad(z \rightarrow+\infty) . \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also define

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\sigma):=\prod_{p \leqslant y}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \sigma}}\right) \quad(\sigma>0)
$$

and make systematic use of the notation

$$
u:=\frac{\log x}{\log y} \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2) .
$$

Theorem 1.1. Let $\varepsilon>0$. For $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Upsilon(x, y)=\Psi(x, y)\left\{1+O\left(\frac{u \log 2 u}{\sqrt{y} \log y}\right)\right\} \quad\left(x \geqslant y>(\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}\right), \\
& \Upsilon(x, y)=x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) G\left(\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}\right)\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{u}\right)\right\} \quad\left(2 \log x<\psi(y) \ll(\log x)^{3}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

From this result, a number of more explicit estimates may be easily deduced.
Some further notation is necessary to describe the results. Let $\alpha=\alpha(x, y)$ denote the saddle-point of the Perron integral for $\Psi(x, y)$. So $\alpha$ is defined by the equation

$$
\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\log p}{p^{\alpha}-1}=\log x .
$$

Explicit approximations to $\alpha$ are widely available in the literature. In particular, it is proved in [5] that

$$
\alpha=\frac{1}{\log y} \log \left(1+\frac{y}{\log x}\right)\left\{1+O\left(\frac{\log _{2} 2 y}{\log y}\right)\right\} \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2),
$$

and, more precisely, that, for any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\alpha= \begin{cases}1-\frac{\xi(u)}{\log y}+O\left(\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}+\frac{1}{u(\log y)^{2}}\right) & \left((\log x)^{1+\varepsilon} \leqslant y \leqslant x\right), \\ \frac{\log (1+y / \log x)}{\log y}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log y}\right)\right\} & \left(2 \leqslant y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}\right),\end{cases}
$$

where $\xi(v)$ is defined as the unique solution of the equation $\mathrm{e}^{\xi(v)}=1+v \xi(v)$ for $v>1$ and $\xi(1):=0$. Here and in the sequel, we let $\log _{k}$ denote the $k$-fold iterated logarithm and put

$$
L_{\varepsilon}(y):=\mathrm{e}^{(\log y)^{3 / 5-\varepsilon}} \quad(\varepsilon>0, y \geqslant 2)
$$

Available studies of the local behaviour of the counting function $\Psi(x, y)$-see in particular th. 2.4 of [3]-provide various effective versions of the approximation

$$
\Psi\left(\frac{x}{h}, y\right) \approx \frac{\Psi(x, y)}{h^{\alpha}} \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2,1 \leqslant h \leqslant x) .
$$

For $P^{+}(d) \leqslant y$, put $h_{d}:=\prod_{p \mid d} p^{\nu_{p}+1}$. Then the characteristic function of $y$-ultrafriable integers may be written as

$$
\sum_{\substack{P^{+}(d) \leqslant y \\ h_{d} \mid n}} \mu(d)
$$

and we have the sieve formula

$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\sum_{P^{+}(d) \leqslant y} \mu(d) \Psi\left(\frac{x}{h_{d}}, y\right) \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2) .
$$

Considering (1•16), this leads to the expectation that, in suitable ranges, we should have

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \sim \Psi(x, y) \sum_{P^{+}(d) \leqslant y} \frac{\mu(d)}{h_{d}^{\alpha}}=\Psi(x, y) \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) .
$$

Our first corollary below shows that the right-hand side of (1-17) always constitutes an upper bound for the order of magnitude of $\Upsilon(x, y)$ and that this turns into a lower bound when $\alpha$ is replaced by $\beta$. The second part of the statement provides the exact domain of validity of ( $1 \cdot 17$ ).
We introduce the remainder term

$$
E=E(x, y):= \begin{cases}\frac{u \log 2 u}{\sqrt{y}} & \text { if } y>\frac{(\log x)^{3}}{\log _{2} 2 x} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}+\frac{(\log x)^{3}}{y^{2} \log _{2} 2 x} & \text { if } 2 \leqslant y \leqslant \frac{(\log x)^{3}}{\log _{2} 2 x}\end{cases}
$$

and note that

$$
E \ll \sqrt{\frac{\log _{2} 2 x}{\log x}}+\frac{(\log x)^{3}}{y^{2} \log _{2} 2 x} \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2) .
$$

Corollary 1.2. (i) We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y) \ll \Upsilon(x, y) \ll \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y) \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2) . \tag{1•18}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) As $x \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Upsilon(x, y) \sim \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y) \Leftrightarrow y \sqrt{\log _{2} x} /(\log x)^{3 / 2} \rightarrow \infty \\
& \Upsilon(x, y) \sim \mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y) \Leftrightarrow y \sqrt{\log _{2} x} /(\log x)^{3 / 2} \rightarrow \infty
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\Upsilon(x, y)=\{1+O(E)\} \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y) & \left(y \gg(\log x)^{3 / 2} / \sqrt{\log _{2} x}\right), \\
\Upsilon(x, y)=\{1+O(E)\} \mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y) & \left(y \gg(\log x)^{3 / 2} / \sqrt{\log _{2} x}\right) .
\end{array}
$$

In view of (1-6), the lower bound in (1-18) vanishes when $\psi(y) \leqslant 2 \log x$. However, as observed earlier, we have $\frac{1}{2} \tau\left(N_{y}\right) \leqslant \Upsilon(x, y) \leqslant \tau\left(N_{y}\right)$ in this circumstance.
As is already apparent in the statement of Theorem 1.1, the asymptotic fluctuations of $\Upsilon(x, y)$ present a threshold around $y \approx(\log x)^{2}$. Our next corollary exhibits the behaviours on either side of this threshold and describes the phase transition.
We recall that the Dickman function $\varrho: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow[0,1]$ is defined as the continuous solution to the delay differential equation $v \varrho^{\prime}(v)+\varrho(v-1)=0$ such that $\varrho(v)=1$ for $0 \leqslant v \leqslant 1$. An explicit expression of its Laplace transform is well-known (see, e.g., [11], th. III.5.10):

$$
\widehat{\varrho}(s)=\int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-s v} \varrho(v) \mathrm{d} v=\mathrm{e}^{\gamma+I(-s)}, \quad I(s):=\int_{0}^{s} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{t}-1}{t} \mathrm{~d} t,
$$

where $\gamma$ denotes Euler's constant. ${ }^{(2)}$ On the real axis, $\widehat{\varrho}$ has a simple behaviour:

$$
\widehat{\varrho}(t)=\frac{1+O\left(\mathrm{e}^{-t} / t\right)}{t} \quad(t \rightarrow+\infty), \quad \widehat{\varrho}(t)=\exp \left\{\frac{\mathrm{e}^{|t|}}{|t|}+O\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}^{|t|}}{|t|^{2}}\right)\right\} \quad(t \rightarrow-\infty) .
$$

Corollary 1.3. As $x \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Upsilon(x, y) \sim \Psi(x, y) \Leftrightarrow y /(\log x)^{2} \rightarrow \infty, \\
\Upsilon(x, y)=o(\Psi(x, y)) \Leftrightarrow y /(\log x)^{2} \rightarrow 0 .
\end{gather*}
$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon>0$, and uniformly for $(\log x)^{2} / L_{\varepsilon}(\log x) \leqslant y \leqslant(\log x)^{5 / 2} /\left(\log _{2} x\right)^{3 / 2}$, we have

$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}\right)\right\} \mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y)=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}\right)\right\} \frac{\widehat{\varrho}(h)}{2 \widehat{\varrho}(2 h)} \Psi(x, y),
$$

with $h:=\frac{1}{2} \log y-\xi(u)$.
To clarify expectations, we note that the parameter $h$ appearing in (1.26) satisfies $\mathrm{e}^{h} \sim 2 \sqrt{y} / \log x$ in the critical range $y=(\log x)^{2+o(1)}$. We also observe that when $y>(\log x)^{5 / 2} /\left(\log _{2} x\right)^{3 / 2}$, the estimate (1-10) is more precise than (1.26).
The following result concerns smaller values of $y$, when the saddle-point estimates for $\Upsilon(x, y)$ and $\Psi(x, y)$ assume different shapes. This corresponds essentially to the case $2 \log x<\psi(y)<(2+c) \log x$ for suitable $c \in] 0, \frac{1}{2}[$. We obtain a large deviation result which measures the Gaussian distribution of the divisors of $N_{y}=\mathrm{e}^{\psi(y)}$. The proof will be omitted since it is identical, mutatis mutandis, to that of Corollary 2.2 of [2].
Corollary 1.4. Let $y \geqslant 2, N_{y}=\mathrm{e}^{\psi(y)}, D_{y}^{2}:=\frac{1}{12} \sum_{p \leqslant y} \nu_{p}\left(\nu_{p}+2\right)(\log p)^{2}$. Uniformly for $0 \leqslant z \ll(y / \log y)^{1 / 4}$ and $x=\sqrt{N_{y}} \mathrm{e}^{-z D_{y}}$, we have

$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\tau\left(N_{y}\right) \Phi(z)\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1+z^{4}}{u}\right)\right\} .
$$

According to a remark developed in [2] and still valid in the present context, we note that Petrov's effective theorem on large deviations in the central limit theorem (see [7], th. VIII.2) provides estimates that are similar in nature to, but less precise than (1.27) in its range of validity.
Finally, as a specific by-product of saddle-point asymptotic formulae, we state a result on the local behaviour of $\Upsilon(x, y)$. We also omit the proof, since it is identical to that of corollary 2.4 of $[3],{ }^{(3)}$ and furthermore leave to the reader the possibility of deriving corresponding short interval estimates parallel to theorem 2.5 and corollary 2.6 of [2].
Corollary 1.5. Uniformly under the conditions $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2,1 \leqslant d \leqslant y, \psi(y)>2 \log (d x)$, we have

$$
\Upsilon(d x, y)=d^{\beta} \Upsilon(x, y)\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}\right)\right\} .
$$

2. We shall take the liberty to use the letter $\gamma$ for other purposes later in the paper.
3. Apart from the simplification due to the fact that, in view of $(1 \cdot 10)$, the required result follows directly, for $y>(\log x)^{3}$, from known results on the local behaviour of $\Psi(x, y)$-see [3].

## 2. Lemmas

We start with a useful elementary inequality.
Lemma 2.1. Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^{*}, z>1$. Then

$$
\frac{1}{z+1} \leqslant \frac{1}{z-1}-\frac{\nu+1}{z^{\nu+1}-1} \leqslant \frac{\nu}{z+1}
$$

Moreover, the right-hand inequality is strict when $\nu \geqslant 2$.
Proof. The left-hand inequality is equivalent to

$$
\frac{\nu+1}{z^{\nu+1}-1} \leqslant \frac{1}{z-1}-\frac{1}{z+1}=\frac{2}{z^{2}-1}
$$

This is clear since $\left(z^{v}-1\right) / v$ is an increasing function of $v>0$ when $z>1$.
To prove the right-hand inequality, we may assume $\nu \geqslant 2$ since we trivially have equality when $\nu=1$. Then, the required inequality may be rewritten as

$$
(z+1)\left(z^{\nu+1}-1\right)<(\nu+1)\left(z^{2}-1\right)+\nu(z-1)\left(z^{\nu+1}-1\right)
$$

which, after straightforward transformations, amounts to

$$
f(z):=(\nu-1)\left(z^{\nu}+1\right)-2 \sum_{1 \leqslant j<\nu} z^{j}>0 .
$$

However, we have $f(1)=0$, and $f^{\prime}(z)=\nu(\nu-1) z^{\nu-1}-2 \sum_{1 \leqslant j<\nu} j z^{j-1}>0$ for $z>1$.
Our next lemma provides uniform estimates for the sums

$$
g_{ \pm}(\sigma, y):=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\log p}{p^{\sigma} \pm 1}
$$

as observed in [2], these may be proved by partial summation from a strong form of the prime number theorem along the lines described in [5], lemma 13. We omit the details.
Lemma 2.2. Uniformly for $0<\sigma<2, y \geqslant 2$, we have

$$
g_{ \pm}(\sigma, y)=\frac{y^{1-\sigma}-1}{\left(1 \pm y^{-\sigma}\right)(1-\sigma)}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log y}\right)\right\}+O(1)
$$

Moreover, given any $\sigma_{0}>0, \varepsilon>0$, the remainder term $O(1 / \log y)$ may be replaced by $O\left(1 / L_{\varepsilon}(y)\right)$ when $\sigma \geqslant \sigma_{0}$.
We shall also need an estimate for the order of magnitude of the quantity

$$
V_{y}(\sigma):=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \log p}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \sigma}-1} \quad(\sigma>0)
$$

Lemma 2.3. For $y \geqslant 2,1 / \log y<\sigma \leqslant 2$, we have

$$
V_{y}(\sigma) \asymp \frac{y^{1 / 2-\sigma}\left(1+y^{1 / 2-\sigma}\right) \log y}{1+|1-2 \sigma| \log y}
$$

Proof. We have $V_{y}(\sigma) \asymp(S+T) \log y$, with

$$
S:=\sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{1}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \sigma}}, \quad T:=\sum_{\sqrt{y}<p \leqslant y} \frac{1}{p^{2 \sigma}} .
$$

By the inequality $p^{\nu_{p}+1}>y$ and the prime number theorem, we may write

$$
S \ll \frac{y^{1 / 2-\sigma}}{\log y}, \quad T \asymp \frac{y^{1-2 \sigma}-y^{1 / 2-\sigma}}{(1-2 \sigma) \log y} \asymp \frac{y^{1 / 2-\sigma}\left(1+y^{1 / 2-\sigma}\right)}{1+|1-2 \sigma| \log y}
$$

in view of the uniform estimate

$$
\frac{\mathrm{e}^{t}-1}{t} \asymp \frac{1+\mathrm{e}^{t}}{1+|t|} \quad(t \in \mathbb{R})
$$

Thus $S \ll T$, whence $V_{y}(\sigma) \asymp T \log y$, as required.
The following result provides explicit estimates for $\beta$ in terms of $x$ and $y$. The asymptotic behaviour of the function $\xi$ appearing in $(1-14)$ has been described in [6]. In particular, we have

$$
\xi(v)=\log v+\log _{2} v+\frac{\log _{2} v}{\log v}+O\left(\left(\frac{\log _{2} v}{\log v}\right)^{2}\right) \quad(v \geqslant 3)
$$

Lemma 2.4. Let $\varepsilon>0$.
(i) For $x \geqslant x_{0}(\varepsilon)$, $(\log x)^{1+\varepsilon}<y \leqslant x$, we have

$$
\beta=1-\frac{\xi(u)}{\log y}+O\left(\frac{1}{u(\log y)^{2}}+\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}\right) .
$$

(ii) For $x \geqslant 2,2 \log x<\psi(y) \ll(\log x)^{3}$, we have

$$
\beta=\frac{1+O(1 / \log y)}{\log y} \log \left(\frac{\psi(y)}{\log x}-1\right)
$$

(iii) For $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2, \psi(y)>2 \log x, r:=y /(\log x)^{2}$, we have,

$$
\alpha-\beta \asymp \frac{(\log 2 u)(\sqrt{y}+u \log 2 u)}{y(\log y)(1+|\log r|)}
$$

Proof. We note that, in its range of validity, $(2 \cdot 9)$ follows from (2.11) in view of $(1 \cdot 14)$. However, it will be convenient to derive $(2 \cdot 9)$ as a preliminary step. By $(2 \cdot 1)$, we have, for all $\sigma>0$,

$$
g_{+}(\sigma, y) \leqslant \varphi_{1}(\sigma, y) \leqslant g_{+}(\sigma, y)+r(\sigma, y)
$$

say, with

$$
r(\sigma, y):=\sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{\left(\nu_{p}-1\right) \log p}{p^{\sigma}+1}
$$

Let us first assume $y>(\log x)^{3}$. Then we deduce from $(2 \cdot 4)$ and the left-hand inequality above that $\beta>3 / 5$ provided $x$ is sufficiently large. Inserting this back into (1.5) and taking (2.6) into account, we obtain

$$
\varphi_{1}(\beta, y)=g_{-}(\beta, y)+O\left(y^{-1 / 10}\right)
$$

This is sufficient to deduce $(2 \cdot 9)$ by computations identical to those leading to estimate (7.8) of [5].

Next, we consider the case $(\log x)^{1+\varepsilon}<y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$. Then it follows from (2.8) and (2.9) that $\beta \leqslant \beta\left(x, 2(\log x)^{3}\right) \leqslant \frac{2}{3}+O(1 / \log y)$. Therefore

$$
r(\beta, y) \ll(\log y) \sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{1}{p^{\beta}} \ll y^{(1-\beta) / 2}
$$

where the last bound readily follows by partial summation - see lemma 3.6 of [3] for a general estimate. We hence deduce from (2•4) that

$$
r(\beta, y) \ll g_{+}(\beta, y) y^{-1 / 6} .
$$

Thus we obtain that the estimate $(2 \cdot 4)$ for $g_{+}(\beta, y)$ equally holds for $\varphi_{1}(\beta, y)$. We may now again deduce (2.9) by computations parallel to those leading to estimate (7.8) of [5]. We refer the reader to [5] for the details.
Let us next evaluate $\beta$ when $2 \log x<\psi(y) \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$. In this range, it follows from (2.14) that

$$
g_{+}(\beta, y)=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{y^{1 / 6}}\right)\right\} \log x .
$$

By (2.4), and since we have $\beta<3 / 4$, this plainly implies

$$
y^{1-\beta} \asymp \log x .
$$

Now, by (2•1) with $z=p^{\beta}$ and $\nu=\nu_{p}=\nu_{p}(y)$,

$$
-\sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{\left(\nu_{p}-1\right) \log p}{1+p^{\beta}} \leqslant \varphi_{1}(\beta, y)-\frac{\psi(y)}{1+y^{\beta}} \leqslant \sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\nu_{p}(y)\left(y^{\beta}-p^{\beta}\right) \log p}{\left(1+p^{\beta}\right)\left(1+y^{\beta}\right)} .
$$

By partial summation, we obtain that the above upper bound is $\ll \beta y^{1-\beta} \ll \beta \log x$. Moreover, by (2•14) and (2•15), the lower bound is

$$
-r(\beta, y) \ll \frac{\log x}{y^{1 / 6}} .
$$

Let $\gamma$ denote the solution to the equation $\psi(y) /\left(1+y^{\gamma}\right)=\log x$. We deduce from the above that

$$
|\beta-\gamma|(\log x) \log y \ll \frac{\psi(y)\left|y^{\beta}-y^{\gamma}\right|}{\left(1+y^{\beta}\right)\left(1+y^{\gamma}\right)} \ll\left(\beta+\frac{1}{y^{1 / 6}}\right) \log x .
$$

This yields $(2 \cdot 10)$ if, say, $\psi(y)>\left(2+y^{-1 / 7}\right) \log x$. In the complementary case, we appeal to the estimate

$$
\varphi_{1}(\sigma, y)=\frac{1}{2} \psi(y)-\sigma D_{y}^{2}+O\left(\sigma^{2} y(\log y)^{2}\right) \quad\left(0 \leqslant \sigma \log y<\frac{1}{2}\right)
$$

where $D_{y}^{2}$ is defined in Corollary 1.4 and satisfies $D_{y}^{2}=\frac{1}{4} y \log y+O(y)$. This readily follows from the classical expansion of $z /\left\{\mathrm{e}^{z}-1\right\}$ involving Bernoulli numbers, up to the third order. Substituting $\sigma=\beta$ yields (2•10).

We are now in a position to prove the more precise estimate $(2 \cdot 11)$. From $(1 \cdot 14),(2 \cdot 9)$ and $(2 \cdot 10)$, we see that, for any $\vartheta \in[0,1]$ and $\gamma=\alpha+\vartheta(\beta-\alpha)$, we have in the considered range

$$
g_{-}^{\prime}(\gamma, y)=\mathrm{e}^{O(R)} \frac{\left(y^{1-\gamma}-1\right) \log y}{\left(1-y^{-\gamma}\right)^{2}(1-\gamma)} \asymp u(\log y)^{2}
$$

with $R:=1 / \log 2 u+1 / \log y$, where the first estimate is proved in lemmas 4 and 13 of [5], using a strong form of the prime number theorem. Moreover, recalling the notations (2.5) and $r:=y /(\log x)^{2}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
g_{-}(\beta, y)-g_{-}(\alpha, y) & =g_{-}(\beta, y)-\varphi_{1}(\beta, y)=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \log p}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \beta}-1} \\
& =V_{y}(\beta) \asymp \frac{u(\log 2 u)(\sqrt{y}+u \log 2 u) \log y}{y(1+|\log r|)}
\end{align*}
$$

where the last estimate follows from $(2 \cdot 6),(2 \cdot 9)$ and $(2 \cdot 10)$, since

$$
y^{1 / 2-\beta} \asymp \frac{u \log 2 u}{\sqrt{y}} \quad(\psi(y)>2 \log x) .
$$

Estimate $(2 \cdot 11)$ readily follows from this and $(2 \cdot 17)$, by the mean-value theorem.
We next evaluate the derivatives $\sigma_{j}(j \geqslant 1)$ defined in $(1 \cdot 7)$ for comparatively small values of $y$.
Lemma 2.5. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ be fixed. Uniformly for $2 \log x<\psi(y) \ll(\log x)^{3}$, we have

$$
\sigma_{j} \ll u(\log y)^{j}
$$

For $j=3$, the right-hand side may be multiplied by $\min (1, \beta \log y)+1 / \sqrt{u}$. Moreover, when $j=2$, we may replace the $\ll-\operatorname{sign}$ by $\asymp$. More precisely,

$$
\sigma_{2}=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log y}\right)\right\} \frac{w-1}{w} u(\log y)^{2}
$$

with $w:=\psi(y) / \log x$.
Proof. Put $R_{p}(z):=\sum_{0 \leqslant h \leqslant \nu_{p}} z^{h}$. A simple induction provides the formula

$$
\sigma_{j}=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{Q_{j, p}\left(p^{\beta}\right)(\log p)^{j}}{R_{p}\left(p^{\beta}\right)^{j}}
$$

where $Q_{j, p}$ is a polynomial of degree $\nu_{p} j-1$ with coefficients $\ll \nu_{p}^{j}$. This immediately implies $(2 \cdot 20)$ in view of the first inequality in $(2 \cdot 12)$.
Recall that our hypotheses imply $\beta \leqslant \frac{2}{3}+O(1 / \log y)$. To prove the complementary assertions, we observe that, for any fixed $j \geqslant 1$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{j}-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{j-1} g_{+}}{\mathrm{d} \sigma^{j-1}}(\beta, y) & =-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{j-1} g_{+}}{\mathrm{d} \sigma^{j-1}}(\beta, \sqrt{y})+\sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{Q_{j, p}\left(p^{\beta}\right)(\log p)^{j}}{R_{p}\left(p^{\beta}\right)^{j}} \\
& \ll(\log y)^{j} \sum_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}} \frac{1}{p^{\beta}} \ll(\log y)^{j-1} y^{(1-\beta) / 2} \ll \sqrt{u}(\log y)^{j}
\end{align*}
$$

Since

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} g_{+}}{\mathrm{d} \sigma^{2}}(\beta, y)=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{(\log p)^{3} p^{\beta}\left(p^{\beta}-1\right)}{\left(1+p^{\beta}\right)^{3}} \ll \min (1, \beta \log y) u(\log y)^{3}
$$

we obtain the statement regarding the case $j=3$.

As for the case $j=2$, we first note, on applying the prime number theorem as for the proof of $(2 \cdot 4)$, that the estimate

$$
g_{+}^{\prime}(\sigma, y)=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log y}\right)\right\} \frac{1}{\left(1+y^{-\sigma}\right)^{2}} \int_{1}^{y} \frac{\log t}{t^{\sigma}} \mathrm{d} t
$$

holds uniformly for $\sigma>0$. Taking $(2 \cdot 4)$ and $(2 \cdot 15)$ into account and evaluating $1+y^{-\beta}$ by $(2 \cdot 10)$, we get

$$
g_{+}^{\prime}(\beta, y)=\mathrm{e}^{O(R)} \frac{w-1}{w} u(\log y)^{2}
$$

with $R:=1 / \log 2 u+1 / \log y \ll 1 / \log y$. By $(2 \cdot 22)$, this estimate is equally valid for $\sigma_{2}$ : indeed $\sqrt{u}>y^{1 / 7}$ in the range under study.

We shall need the following estimate to control the decay of $|Z(s, y)|$ along the line $\sigma=\beta$. We write $s=\beta+i \tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and set

$$
Y_{\varepsilon}:=\mathrm{e}^{(\log y)^{3 / 2-\varepsilon}} \quad(y \geqslant 2)
$$

Lemma 2.6. Let $\varepsilon>0$. For a suitable absolute constant $c>0$, we have

$$
\left|\frac{Z(\beta+i \tau, y)}{Z(\beta, y)}\right| \leqslant \begin{cases}\mathrm{e}^{-c u(\tau \log y)^{4}} & \text { if }|\tau| \leqslant 1 / \log y \\ \mathrm{e}^{-c u \tau^{4} /\left(1+\tau^{4}\right)} & \text { if } 1 / \log y<|\tau| \leqslant Y_{\varepsilon}\end{cases}
$$

Proof. For $s=\beta+i \tau(\tau \in \mathbb{R})$, a standard computation yields

$$
\left|\frac{Z(s, y)}{Z(\beta, y)}\right|^{2}=\prod_{p \leqslant y} \frac{1+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \tau\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \log p\right) /\left\{p^{\beta\left(\nu_{p}+1\right)}\left(1-p^{-\beta\left(\nu_{p}+1\right)}\right)^{2}\right\}}{1+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \tau \log p\right) /\left\{p^{\beta}\left(1-p^{-\beta}\right)^{2}\right\}} .
$$

Now, observe that

$$
\nu^{2} \leqslant\left(\sum_{0 \leqslant j<\nu} p^{j \beta}\right)\left(\sum_{0 \leqslant j<\nu} p^{-j \beta}\right)=p^{(\nu-1) \beta}\left(\frac{1-p^{-\nu \beta}}{1-p^{-\beta}}\right)^{2} \quad(\nu \geqslant 1)
$$

and, by lemma 1 of [10],

$$
\left|\frac{\sin \nu \vartheta}{\nu \sin \vartheta}\right| \leqslant 1-\frac{2}{3} \min \left(1, \nu^{2}\|\vartheta / \pi\|^{2}\right) \leqslant 1-\frac{2}{3}\|\vartheta / \pi\|^{2} \quad(\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}, \nu \geqslant 1)
$$

where $\|z\|$ denotes the distance from the real number $z$ to the set of integers. Therefore, writing $\vartheta_{p}:=\|(\tau / 2 \pi) \log p\|$ and $B_{p}:=p^{\beta}\left(1-p^{-\beta}\right)^{2}$, we obtain that the generic factor in $(2 \cdot 25)$ does not exceed

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{1+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \tau\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \log p\right) /\left\{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right)^{2} B_{p}\right\}}{1+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right) / B_{p}} \leqslant \frac{B_{p}+4\left(1-2 \vartheta_{p}^{2} / 3\right)^{2} \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)}{B_{p}+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)} \\
\leqslant \frac{B_{p}+4\left(1-2 \vartheta_{p}^{2} / 3\right) \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)}{B_{p}+4 \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)}=1-\frac{8 \vartheta_{p}^{2} \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)}{3 B_{p}+12 \sin ^{2}\left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)}
\end{gathered}
$$

and so, appealing to the lower bound $\left|\sin \left(\pi \vartheta_{p}\right)\right| \geqslant 2 \vartheta_{p}$, we arrive at

$$
\left|\frac{Z(s, y)}{Z(\beta, y)}\right|^{2} \leqslant \mathrm{e}^{-W}
$$

say, with

$$
W:=\frac{8}{3} \sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{4 \vartheta_{p}^{4}}{16 \vartheta_{p}^{2}+p^{\beta}\left(1-p^{-\beta}\right)^{2}} \gg \sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{\|(\tau / 2 \pi) \log p\|^{4}}{p^{\beta}}
$$

If $|\tau| \leqslant 1 / \log y$, we have

$$
W \gg \tau^{4} \sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{(\log p)^{4}}{p^{\beta}} \gg \frac{\tau^{4}(\log y)^{3}\left(y^{1-\beta}-1\right)}{1-\beta} \gg(\tau \log y)^{4} u
$$

where, for the last estimate, we used (2.9) if $y>(\log x)^{3}$ and (2•16) in the complementary case.

If $1 / \log y<|\tau| \leqslant \sqrt{y}$, we appeal to upper bounds on primes in short intervals and argue as in lemma 5.12 of [8] to show that

$$
\sum_{z / 2<p \leqslant z}\|(\tau / 2 \pi) \log p\|^{4} \gg \frac{\tau^{4}}{1+\tau^{4}} \frac{z}{\log z} \quad\left(y^{3 / 4}<z \leqslant y\right)
$$

from which we infer by partial summation that $W \gg \tau^{4} u /\left(1+\tau^{4}\right)$, as required.
When $\sqrt{y}<|\tau| \leqslant Y_{\varepsilon}$, we note that the left-hand side of $(2 \cdot 28)$ is

$$
\gg \sum_{z / 2<p \leqslant z} \sin ^{4}\left(\frac{1}{2} \tau \log p\right)=\frac{3}{8} \sum_{z / 2<p \leqslant z} 1-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{z / 2<p \leqslant z}\left\{\cos (\tau \log p)-\frac{1}{4} \cos (2 \tau \log p)\right\} .
$$

However, classical bounds on exponential sums over primes ${ }^{(4)}$ yield that the last sum is $o(z / \log z)$ for $y^{3 / 4}<z \leqslant y$. We may then conclude by partial summation as before.

By a standard procedure, we deduce from the previous lemma an upper estimate for the number of ultrafriable integers in short intervals.
Lemma 2.7. Let $\varepsilon>0$. For a suitable absolute constant $c_{0}>0$, and uniformly for $x \geqslant y \geqslant 2,1 \leqslant z \leqslant \min \left(Y_{\varepsilon}, \mathrm{e}^{c_{0} u}\right)$, we have

$$
\Upsilon(x+x / z, y)-\Upsilon(x, y) \ll x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) / z
$$

Proof. From (2-24) and a classical bound for short sums of coefficients of Dirichlet series (see e.g. [11], Exercise 171) we infer that the left-hand side of $(2 \cdot 29)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ll \frac{x^{\beta}}{z} \int_{0}^{z}|Z(\beta+i \tau, y)| \mathrm{d} \tau \\
& \ll \frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{z}\left\{\int_{0}^{1 / \log y} \mathrm{e}^{-c u(\tau \log y)^{4}} \mathrm{~d} \tau+\int_{1 / \log y}^{z} \mathrm{e}^{-c \tau^{4} u /\left(1+\tau^{4}\right)} \mathrm{d} \tau\right\} \\
& \ll \frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{z}\left\{\frac{1}{u^{1 / 4}}+z \mathrm{e}^{-c u / 2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

[^1]
## 3. Proofs

### 3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Recall the definition (1-12) for the saddle-point $\alpha=\alpha(x, y)$ related to the distribution of friable integers.
First, let us assume $y>(\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}$ with, say, $\left.\varepsilon \in\right] 0, \frac{1}{3}[$. Then, for large $x$, we have $\alpha>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{5} \varepsilon$ by (1-13). By theorem 2.4(i) of [3] the number of integers $n \leqslant x$ which are $y$-friable but not $y$-ultrafriable does not exceed

$$
\sum_{p \leqslant y} \Psi\left(\frac{x}{p^{\nu_{p}+1}}, y\right) \ll \Psi(x, y) S
$$

with

$$
S:=\sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{1}{p^{\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \alpha}} \ll \frac{y^{1 / 2-\alpha}}{\log y} \ll \frac{u \log 2 u}{\sqrt{y} \log y}
$$

where the first estimate follows from (2•6) and the last from (1-14). This proves (1-10).
Thus, it remains to prove the estimate ( $1 \cdot 11$ ) when

$$
2 \log x<\psi(y) \ll(\log x)^{3} .
$$

In this range, we apply the saddle-point method in a very similar fashion to that of [5]. For purposes of convenience, we note at the outset that the expected main term has order of magnitude

$$
\frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{1+\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}} \gg \frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{\sqrt{u} \log u} .
$$

This follows from (1•9), (2•10) and (2•21).
First, we apply Perron's formula with remainder (see [11], th. II.2.3) to get

$$
\Upsilon(x, y)=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\beta-i T}^{\beta+i T} \frac{x^{s} Z(s, y)}{s} \mathrm{~d} s+O\left(\frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) \log T}{T}\right)
$$

with $T:=\mathrm{e}^{2 c_{1}(\log u)^{4 / 3}}<\min \left(\mathrm{e}^{c_{0} u}, Y_{1 / 20}\right)$ where $c_{1}$ is absolute, sufficiently small, and $c_{0}$ is the constant appearing in the statement of Lemma 2.7. This is proved in a standard way using (2.29) and we omit the details.
Set $T_{0}:=u^{-1 / 5} / \log y$. The contribution of the range $T_{0} \leqslant|\tau| \leqslant T$ to the last integral may be bounded above using ( $2 \cdot 24$ ). We obtain that it is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ll x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)\left\{\int_{T_{0}}^{1 / \log y} \mathrm{e}^{-c u(\tau \log y)^{4}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \tau}{\beta+\tau}+\int_{1 / \log y}^{T} \mathrm{e}^{-c u \tau^{4} /\left(1+\tau^{4}\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d} \tau}{\tau}\right. \\
& \ll x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)\left\{\mathrm{e}^{-c u\left(T_{0} \log y\right)^{4}} \log u+\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2} c u /(\log y)^{4}} \log _{2} y+\mathrm{e}^{-u / 2} \log T\right\} \\
& <x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) \mathrm{e}^{-c_{2} u^{1 / 5}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, under assumption (3•2), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Upsilon(x, y)=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\beta-i T_{0}}^{\beta+i T_{0}} \frac{x^{s} Z(s, y)}{s} \mathrm{~d} s+O\left(x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) \mathrm{e}^{-c_{1}(\log u)^{4 / 3}}\right) . \tag{3•5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last integral is classically evaluated by expanding the integrand around $s=\beta$. Let $T_{1}:=u^{-1 / 3} / \log y$. When $T_{1}<|\tau| \leqslant T_{0}$, we have

$$
Z(s, y) x^{s}=Z(\beta, y) x^{\beta} \mathrm{e}^{-\tau^{2} \sigma_{2} / 2+i \tau^{3} \sigma_{3} / 6+\sigma_{4} \tau^{4} / 24+O(1)} \ll Z(\beta, y) x^{\beta} \mathrm{e}^{-u^{1 / 3} / 5}
$$

by $(2 \cdot 20)$ and $(2 \cdot 21)$, since $\tau^{5} \varphi_{5}(\beta+i \tau, y) \ll T_{0}^{5} \sigma_{5} \ll 1$ for $|\tau| \leqslant T_{0}$. Therefore, we may replace $T_{0}$ by $T_{1}$ in (3.5) without altering the error term.
We now evaluate the new main term.
Since $T_{1}^{j} \sigma_{j} \ll 1$ for $j=3,4$ and $\varphi_{4}(\beta+i \tau, y) \ll \sigma_{4}^{*}:=u(\log y)^{4}$ for $|\tau| \leqslant 1 / \log y$, we may write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\beta-i T_{1}}^{\beta+i T_{1}} \frac{x^{s} Z(s, y)}{s} \mathrm{~d} s & =\frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{2 \pi} \int_{-T_{1}}^{T_{1}} \mathrm{e}^{-\tau^{2} \sigma_{2} / 2+i \tau^{3} \sigma_{3} / 6+O\left(\tau^{4} \sigma_{4}^{*}\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d} \tau}{\beta+i \tau} \\
& =\frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{2 \pi}\left\{J_{2}+\frac{1}{6} i J_{3}+O(K)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{2} & :=\int_{-T_{1}}^{T_{1}} \mathrm{e}^{-\tau^{2} \sigma_{2} / 2} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \tau}{\beta+i \tau}, \quad J_{3}:=\sigma_{3} \int_{-T_{1}}^{T_{1}} \tau^{3} \mathrm{e}^{-\tau^{2} \sigma_{2} / 2} \frac{\mathrm{~d} \tau}{\beta+i \tau} \\
K & :=\int_{-T_{1}}^{T_{1}} \mathrm{e}^{-\tau^{2} \sigma_{2} / 2}\left\{\tau^{4} \sigma_{4}^{*}+\tau^{6} \sigma_{3}^{2}\right\} \frac{\mathrm{d} \tau}{|\beta|+|\tau|}
\end{aligned}
$$

The required formula now follows from computations identical to those appearing in the end of the proof of proposition 2.13 of [2], so we do not repeat the details here.

This completes the proof of $(1 \cdot 11)$.

### 3.2. Proof of Corollary 1.2

We start with establishing (1-18). When $y>(\log x)^{3}$, we have, for $\gamma=\alpha$ or $\gamma=\beta$,

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\gamma)=1+O\left(\frac{V_{y}(\gamma)}{\log y}\right)=1+O\left(\frac{u \log 2 u}{\sqrt{y} \log y}\right)
$$

by $(2 \cdot 6),(1 \cdot 14)$, and $(2 \cdot 9)$. Thus (1-18) holds in this case - and actually so do (1.21) and (1-22).

We may therefore assume $y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$ henceforth.
By $(1 \cdot 11),(1 \cdot 14),(2 \cdot 10),(2 \cdot 4),(2 \cdot 21)$, and the definition of $\alpha$, we have for $2 \log x<$ $\psi(y) \ll(\log x)^{3}$,

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \asymp \frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{1+\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}} \gg \frac{\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) x^{\alpha} \zeta(\alpha, y)}{\alpha \sqrt{u} \log y} \asymp \mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y)
$$

where the last estimate readily follows from the saddle-point asymptotic formula for $\Psi(x, y)-$ see $[5]$, th. $1-$, viz.

$$
\Psi(x, y)=\frac{x^{\alpha} \zeta(\alpha, y)}{\alpha \sqrt{2 \pi g_{-}^{\prime}(\alpha, y)}}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{u}+\frac{\log y}{y}\right)\right\} \quad(x \geqslant y \geqslant 2)
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta(s, y):=\prod_{p \leqslant y}\left(\frac{1}{1-p^{-s}}\right) \quad(\Re e s>0) \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This completes the proof of the lower bound in (1-18).

To prove the upper bound, we let $\varepsilon$ be a small positive constant and note that, if $\psi(y)>(2+\varepsilon) \log x$, we have $\alpha \asymp \beta$ by (1•13) and (2•10). We hence deduce from (1•11), (1.9), (2.4) and (2.21) that

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \asymp \frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{1+\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}} \ll \frac{x^{\alpha} Z(\alpha, y)}{\alpha \sqrt{u} \log y} \asymp \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y),
$$

where the first upper bound is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\beta$ and the latter follows again from (3.8).
When $\psi(y) \leqslant(2+\varepsilon) \log x$, the above argument is not sufficient since $\beta \log y$ may approach 0 while we always have $\alpha \gg 1 / \log y$. However, by Taylor's formula to the second order and the definition of $\beta$, we have

$$
x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) \leqslant x^{\alpha} Z(\alpha, y) \mathrm{e}^{-v(\alpha-\beta)^{2}}
$$

where $v:=\frac{1}{2} \varphi_{2}(\gamma, y)$ for some $\left.\gamma \in\right] \beta, \alpha[$-it indeed follows from (1-14) and (2.10) that $\beta<\alpha$ if $\varepsilon$ is chosen sufficiently small. Now, we observe that, from lemma 13 of [5] and (1•13), we have $g_{+}^{\prime}(\alpha, y) \asymp u(\log y)^{2}$. Since $g_{+}^{\prime}(\sigma, y)$ is a non-increasing function of $\sigma$, we infer, taking $(2 \cdot 22)$ with $j=2$ and (2•23) into account, that $\varphi_{2}(\gamma, y) \asymp u(\log y)^{2}$. It remains to use the fact that $\alpha-\beta \asymp \alpha$ in the range under consideration to obtain, for some suitable absolute constant $c>0$,

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \ll x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y) \ll x^{\alpha} Z(\alpha, y) \mathrm{e}^{-c u} \ll \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y) \mathrm{e}^{-c u / 2} .
$$

This completes the proof of ( $1 \cdot 18$ ).
We next turn our attention to (1-21) and (1-22), which contain the sufficiency part of assertions ( $1 \cdot 19$ ) and ( $1 \cdot 20$ ) respectively.
In view of (3.6), we may assume that $(\log x)^{3 / 2} / \sqrt{\log _{2} x}<y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$, and note that this is equivalent to $y \gg u^{3 / 2} \log 2 u$ and implies $\log y \asymp \log u \asymp \log _{2} x$. Since $\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}} \asymp \sqrt{u} \log y$ in the range under consideration, it follows from (1.9) that

$$
G\left(\beta \sqrt{\sigma_{2}}\right)=\frac{1+O(1 / u)}{\beta \sqrt{2 \pi \sigma_{2}}} .
$$

From (2.22), we see that, in this last expression, we can replace $\sigma_{2}$ by $g_{+}^{\prime}(\beta, y)$ at the cost of increasing the error to $\ll 1 / \sqrt{u}$. Furthermore, we observe that, in view of (3•13), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{-}^{\prime}(\beta, y)-g_{+}^{\prime}(\beta, y) & \ll \sum_{p \leqslant y} \frac{(\log p)^{2}}{p^{2 \beta}} \\
& \ll \frac{\left(y^{1-2 \beta}-1\right) \log y}{1-2 \beta} \asymp \frac{\left\{y+(\log x)^{2}\right\}(\log y)^{2}}{y(1+|\log r|)} \\
& \ll g_{-}^{\prime}(\beta, y) \frac{y+(\log x)^{2}}{u y(1+|\log r|)} \ll \frac{g_{-}^{\prime}(\beta, y)}{\sqrt{u}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (2•19), (2•7) and (2•17). It follows that

$$
\frac{x^{\beta} Z(\beta, y)}{\beta \sqrt{2 \pi \sigma_{2}}}=\frac{\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) x^{\beta} \zeta(\beta, y)}{\beta \sqrt{2 \pi g_{-}^{\prime}(\beta, y)}}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}\right)\right\} .
$$

Replacing $\beta$ by $\alpha$ in all terms except $\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta)$ on the right-hand side yields an extra factor

$$
F:=\exp \left\{O\left(|\beta-\alpha| D+(\beta-\alpha)^{2} u(\log y)^{2}\right)\right\}
$$

with $D:=1 / \beta+g_{-}^{\prime \prime}(\beta, y) / g_{-}^{\prime}(\beta, y) \ll \log y$. In view of $(2 \cdot 11)$, we obtain, writing $L:=1+|\log r|$, that

$$
F-1 \ll \frac{\log 2 u}{\sqrt{y} L}+\frac{u(\log u)^{2}}{y L}+\frac{u^{3}(\log u)^{4}}{y^{2} L^{2}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}+\frac{u^{3}(\log u)^{2}}{y^{2}} \asymp E .
$$

By $(3 \cdot 8)$, we hence infer that $(1 \cdot 22)$ holds.
To prove $(1 \cdot 21)$, we assume $y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$ and note that, for some $\vartheta \in[0,1]$ and $\gamma=\beta+\vartheta(\alpha-\beta)$, we have

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha)=\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \mathrm{e}^{(\alpha-\beta) V_{y}(\gamma)}
$$

By (2-11) and (2•18), which is equally valid for $\gamma$, we obtain, still using the notation $L:=1+|\log r|$,

$$
\log \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha)}{\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta)}\right) \asymp \frac{u(\log y)^{2}}{y L^{2}}+\frac{u^{3}(\log y)^{4}}{y^{2} L^{2}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{u}}+\frac{(\log x)^{3}}{y^{2} \log _{2} x} \asymp E
$$

Thus, we have established (1-21).
It remains to prove that the asymptotic formulae in $(1 \cdot 19)$ and $(1 \cdot 20)$ do not hold when $y \ll(\log x)^{3 / 2} / \sqrt{\log _{2} x}$. From (3.7), we have in this range

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \gg \mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta) \Psi(x, y) \mathrm{e}^{(\alpha-\beta)^{2} g_{-}^{\prime}(\gamma, y) / 2}
$$

for some $\gamma:=\alpha+\vartheta(\beta-\alpha)$ with $0 \leqslant \vartheta \leqslant 1$. However, estimates (2•17) and (2•11) yield in this case

$$
(\alpha-\beta)^{2} g_{-}^{\prime}(\gamma, y) \asymp \frac{(\log x)^{3}}{y^{2} \log _{2} x} \gg 1
$$

Hence the asymptotic formula in $(1 \cdot 20)$ cannot hold.
We have already seen in $(3 \cdot 10)$ that $(1 \cdot 19)$ fails when $\psi(y) \leqslant(2+\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon$ sufficiently small. In the complementary range, the asymptotic formula (1-11) yields

$$
\Upsilon(x, y) \asymp \frac{x^{\alpha} Z(\alpha, y)}{\alpha \sqrt{u} \log y} \mathrm{e}^{-(\alpha-\beta)^{2} \varphi_{2}(\gamma, y) / 2} \asymp \mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \Psi(x, y) \mathrm{e}^{-(\alpha-\beta)^{2} \varphi_{2}(\gamma, y) / 2}
$$

for some $\gamma$ between $\alpha$ and $\beta$. But $(2 \cdot 17)$ and the last estimate of $(2 \cdot 18)$, which also holds for $\gamma$ in place of $\beta$, yield $\varphi_{2}(\gamma, y) \asymp u(\log y)^{2}$. Hence we get as before

$$
(\alpha-\beta)^{2} \varphi_{2}(\gamma, y) \asymp \frac{(\log x)^{3}}{y^{2} \log _{2} x} \gg 1
$$

This completes the proof of assertion (1-19).

### 3.3. Proof of Corollary 1.3

We observe at the outset that the asymptotic formulae $(1 \cdot 24)$ and $(1.25)$ readily follow, respectively, from $(1 \cdot 10)$ when $y>(\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}$, and from (1-18) when

$$
\log x \ll y \leqslant(\log x)^{2} / L_{\varepsilon}(\log x)
$$

with, say $0<\varepsilon<\frac{1}{10}$. Indeed, for large $x$, we then have $\alpha \leqslant \frac{1}{2}-1 /\left(\log _{2} x\right)^{2 / 5+2 \varepsilon}$, and so

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\alpha) \ll \exp \left\{-\sum_{\sqrt{y} \leqslant p \leqslant y} 1 / p^{2 \alpha}\right\} \ll \frac{1}{L_{3 \varepsilon}(\log x)}=o(1)
$$

Moreover, in view of $(1 \cdot 23)$, it is clear that, in the stated range of validity, ( $1 \cdot 26$ ) implies (1-24) and (1.25) since it may be easily checked that $h$ and $\log \left\{y /(\log x)^{2}\right\}$ tend simultaneously to $\pm \infty$.
Thus it only remains to establish (1-26).

We note that the first formula in (1-26) readily follows from (1.22) since, in the considered range, we have $E \ll 1 / \sqrt{u}$.
We next need an estimate for $\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta)$. We plainly have $y \leqslant(\log x)^{3}$. We may hence deduce from $(2 \cdot 10)$ that, for a suitable constant $c>0$, we have

$$
\beta \geqslant \frac{1}{2}-\frac{c}{(\log y)^{2 / 5+\varepsilon}}
$$

It follows from (3•13) that

$$
\prod_{p \leqslant \sqrt{y}}\left(1-p^{-\left(\nu_{p}+1\right) \beta}\right)=\exp \left\{O\left(\frac{y^{(1-3 \beta) / 2}-y^{(1-3 \beta) / 3}}{(1-3 \beta) \log y}\right)\right\}=1+O\left(\frac{u \log u}{y^{2 / 3} \log y}\right)
$$

Since $\log u \asymp \log y$, we get

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta)=\left\{1+O\left(\frac{u}{y^{2 / 3}}\right)\right\} \prod_{\sqrt{y}<p \leqslant y}\left(1-p^{-2 \beta}\right)
$$

We now apply (2.9) with $\varepsilon / 2$ instead of $\varepsilon$ and consequently replace $\beta$ by $1-\xi(u) / \log y=$ $\frac{1}{2}+h / \log y$ in the latter product. This involves an extra factor

$$
\exp \left\{O\left(\sum_{\sqrt{y}<p \leqslant y} \frac{\log p}{p^{2 \beta} L_{\varepsilon / 2}(y)}\right)\right\}=1+O\left(\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}\right)
$$

Now, we have by lemma III.5.16 of [11]

$$
\prod_{\sqrt{y}<p \leqslant y}\left(1-p^{-1-2 h / \log y}\right)=\frac{\widehat{\varrho}(h)}{2 \widehat{\varrho}(2 h)}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}\right)\right\} \quad(y \geqslant 2)
$$

Gathering our estimates so far, we obtain

$$
\mathcal{H}_{y}(\beta)=\frac{\widehat{\varrho}(h)}{2 \widehat{\varrho}(2 h)}\left\{1+O\left(\frac{1}{L_{\varepsilon}(y)}\right)\right\} \quad(y \geqslant 2)
$$

Inserting this into $(1 \cdot 22)$, we obtain the second formula in $(1 \cdot 26)$, as required.
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[^0]:    2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: primary 11N25; secondary 11N35, 11N37, 11N60.

    1. An integer $n$ is said to be economical in base $q$ if its prime factorisation can be written with no more digits that $n$ itself in base $q$. Thus $14=2 \cdot 7,15=3 \cdot 5$ and $16=2^{4}$ are economical in base 10 but $18=2 \cdot 3^{2}$ is not.
[^1]:    4. See, e.g., [11], equation (III.5.72).
