ON THE EQUATION $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + k$

A. GLIBICHUK, F. LUCA AND F. PAPPALARDI

ABSTRACT. We investigate some properties of the positive integers n that satisfy the equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n)+k$ providing a complete description for the solutions when $k = 0, 1, 2$, and giving some properties of the solutions in the other cases.

1. INTRODUCTION

For every positive integer n, the function $\tau(n)$ counts the number of divisors of n, the function $\omega(n)$ counts the number of distinct prime divisors of n, while the Carmichael function $\lambda(n)$ is the exponent of the multiplicative group of the invertible congruence classes modulo n. The value of the function $\lambda(n)$ can be computed as follows:

$$\lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1; \\ 2^{\alpha-2} & \text{if } n = 2^{\alpha}, \alpha > 2; \\ p^{\alpha-1}(p-1) & \text{if } n = p^{\alpha} \text{ and } \begin{array}{c} p \geq 3 \text{ or} \\ p = 2, \alpha \leq 2; \end{array} \\ [\lambda(p_1^{\alpha_1}), \dots, \lambda(p_s^{\alpha_s})] & \text{if } n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_s^{\alpha_s}. \end{cases}$$

In [?], Erdős, Pomerance and Schmutz proved a number of fundamental properties of λ. In the process of proving the lowerbound $\lambda(n) > (\log n)^{c_0 \log\log\log n}$ for all large n, provided $c_0 < 1/\log 2$, they proved the inequality

$$n \leq (4\lambda(n))^{3\tau(\lambda(n))}.$$

Numerical calculations suggest that the stronger inequality

$$n \leq \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))} \tag{1}$$

holds with the only exceptions of $n = 2, 6, 8, 12, 24, 80, 120, 240$. This will be proved in Corollary **??**. One of the tools for proving (**??**) is the inequality $\tau(\lambda(n)) > \omega(n)$ which holds with the only exceptions

F. L. and F. P. were supported in part by the Italian-Mexican Agreement of Scientific and Technological Cooperation 2003–2005: *Kleinian Groups and Egyptian Fractions.*

$n = 2, 6, 12, 24, 30, 60, 120, 240$ as we will prove in Proposition **??** and Proposition **??**.

This motivates us to compare $\tau(\lambda(n))$ with $\omega(n)$. Since $\tau(\lambda(n)) \geq \omega(n)$ holds for all positive integers n (see Proposition **??**), we can write $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + k$, where k is some nonnegative integer depending on n. We then fix $k \geq 0$ and investigate the positive integers n such that $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + k$.

Throughout this paper, we use x to denote a positive real number. We also use the Landau symbols O and o and the Vinogradov symbols $\gg$ and $\ll$ with their usual meanings. We write $\log x$ for the maximum between 1 and the natural logarithm of x. For a set $\mathcal{A}$ of positive integers we write $\mathcal{A}(x) = \mathcal{A} \cap [1, x]$. We write p and q with or without subscripts for prime numbers.

Let us set

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{n : \tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + k\}.$$

We will show in Theorem **??** that if k is a positive integer and $b_k = 2(k+1)^2 + 3 + \lfloor \log_2(2(k+1)^2 + k + 1) \rfloor$, then the upperbound

$$\#\mathcal{A}_k(x) \ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{b_k}}{(\log x)^2}$$

holds as $x \to \infty$. Furthermore, in Theorem **??**, we will show that if $k > 4$, then the lowerbound

$$\#\mathcal{A}_k(x) \gg_k \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}$$

holds as $x \to \infty$. We will also give complete description on the sets $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ (Proposition **??**, Proposition **??** and Proposition **??**). We will show that $\mathcal{A}_0$ contains 8 integers while the infiniteness of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ would follow if it were known that there exist infinitely many primes of the form $2q + 1$ with q also prime. Finally, in Proposition **??** we deal with the cases $k = 3, 4$ proving that if either $\mathcal{A}_3$ or $\mathcal{A}_4$ are infinite then there exists an even positive integer c such that the set of primes of the form $p = cq^\beta + 1$, with q prime and $\beta \leq 4$ is infinite. This explains the difficulty of proving the infiniteness of $\mathcal{A}_k$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

Acknowledgements. This paper started during very enjoyable visits of A. G. to the Mathematics Department of the University Roma Tre and of F. P. to the Mathematical Institute of the UNAM in Morelia. These authors would like to thank these departments for their hospitality and support. The authors would also like to thank Sergei Konyagin for some useful comments.

2. Determining $\mathcal{A}_k$ for small values of k

Proposition 1. *For any positive integer n, we have that*

$$\tau(\lambda(n)) \geq \omega(n).$$

More precisely,

$$\tau(\lambda(n)) \geq \omega(n/(2^\infty, n)) + \tau(\lambda^o(n')),$$

where n' is the product of the primes dividing n, and $\lambda^o(m)$ denote the the odd part of $\lambda(m)$. That is, $\lambda^o(m) = \lambda(m)/(2^\infty, \lambda(m))$.

Proof. Let us first note that if $n \mid m$, then $\lambda(n) \mid \lambda(m)$, and therefore $\tau(\lambda(n)) \leq \tau(\lambda(m))$. Thus, we can assume that n is square-free (indeed, if n' is the product of the distinct primes dividing n, then $\omega(n) = \omega(n')$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) \geq \tau(\lambda(n'))$).

Suppose that n is odd and $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$, where $p_1 < \cdots < p_r$ are primes. Let $2 < q_2 < \cdots < q_s$ be all the odd prime factors of $\lambda(n)$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 - 1 &= 2^{\alpha_{11}} q_2^{\alpha_{12}} \cdots q_s^{\alpha_{1s}}; \\ p_2 - 1 &= 2^{\alpha_{21}} q_2^{\alpha_{22}} \ldots q_s^{\alpha_{2s}}; \\ &\vdots \\ p_r - 1 &= 2^{\alpha_{r1}} q_2^{\alpha_{r2}} \cdots q_s^{\alpha_{rs}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $A_i = \max\{\alpha_{1i}, \ldots, \alpha_{ri}\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s$, then

$$\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau([p_1 - 1, \ldots, p_r - 1]) = (A_1 + 1)(A_2 + 1) \cdots (A_s + 1).$$

Consider now the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \ldots & \alpha_{1s} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \alpha_{r1} & \ldots & \alpha_{rs} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We know that the entries of the matrix consist of nonnegative integers. The elements in the first column are positive and less than or equal than A_1. For each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, the elements of the i–th column are nonnegative integers less than or equal to A_i.

Furthermore, for each fixed natural number s, we have that the number of rows r is less or equal than the maximum number of distinct s–tuples $(a_1, \ldots, a_s)$ with $a_1 \in [1, A_1]$ and $a_i \in [0, A_i]$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s$. This follows from the fact that $\left(2^{\alpha_{i1}} \prod_{j=2}^s q_j^{\alpha_{ij}}\right)_{i=1,\ldots,s}$ are distinct positive integers. Hence,

$$r \leq A_1(A_2 + 1) \cdots (A_s + 1).$$

From the above discussion, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(\lambda(n)) &= (A_1+1)(A_2+1)\cdots(A_s+1)\\ &\geq r+\tau(\lambda^o(n))=\omega(n)+\tau(\lambda^o(n)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda^o(n)=\lambda(n)/(2^\infty,\lambda(n))$ is largest odd divisor of $\lambda(n)$. So, if n is square-free and odd, then

$$\tau(\lambda(n))\geq\omega(n)+1,$$

while if n is square-free and even, then

$$\tau(\lambda(n))=\tau(\lambda(n/2))\geq\omega(n/2)+1=\omega(n),$$

which concludes the proof. □

Lemma **??** is the main tool to determine the set $\mathcal{A}_k$ for $k\leq 2$.

Proposition 2. $\mathcal{A}_0=\{2,6,12,24,30,60,120,240\}$.

Proof. Let $n\in\mathcal{A}_0$. We apply Lemma **??** and we obtain that if n is odd, then $\tau(\lambda(n))>\omega(n)$, which is impossible.

If n is even, the condition $\tau(\lambda(n))=\omega(n)$, implies by Lemma **??** that

$$\tau(\lambda^o(n'))=1.$$

This is only possible if $\lambda(n')=2^\alpha$ for some $\alpha\in\mathbb{N}$. If $n=2^\gamma$ and $\tau(\lambda(2^\gamma))=1$, then $\gamma=1$ so that $n=2$.

Assume now that n is not a power of 2 and write

$$n=2^{\gamma_0}(2^{2^{\alpha_1}}+1)^{\gamma_1}\cdots(2^{2^{\alpha_r}}+1)^{\gamma_r},$$

where $\gamma_j\geq 1$ for $j=0,\dots,r$, $0\leq\alpha_1<\cdots<\alpha_r$, and the numbers $2^{2^{\alpha_i}}+1$ are primes for each $i=1,\dots,r$. Plugging the expression above for n in the identity $\tau(\lambda(n))=\omega(n)$, we obtain

$$\max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})),2^{\alpha_r}+1\}\cdot\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_r=r+1,$$

which is satisfied only for $r=1$ or $r=2$ since from the above we gather that $r+1\geq 2^{\alpha_r}+1\geq 2^{r-1}+1$.

If $r=2$, then necessary $\alpha_2=1$. This forces $\alpha_1=0$, $\gamma_1=\gamma_2=1$, and $1\leq\gamma_0\leq 4$, which correspond to the four values 30, 60, 120 and 240 for n. Finally, if $r=1$, then $\alpha_1=0$, and this forces $\gamma_1=1$ and $1\leq\gamma_0\leq 3$, which correspond to the three values 6, 12 and 24 for n. □

We are now ready to prove the motivating inequality (**??**):

Corollary 1. *Let φ denote the Euler function. With the only exceptions $n = 2, 6, 8, 12, 24, 80, 120, 240$, we have*

$$n \le \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}.$$

Furthermore, $\varphi(n) \le \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}$ with the only exception $n = 24$. Finally, the inequality $\varphi(n) \le \lambda(n)^{\omega(n)}$ holds unless n is a power of 2 times a product of distinct Fermat primes.

Proof. Let $v_p(m)$ be the exponent of the prime p in the factorization of the positive integer m. We know that $\lambda(n)$ divides $\varphi(n)$ and if p odd, then

$$\begin{aligned} v_p(\varphi(n)) &= \sum_{l^\beta \| n} v_p(l^{\beta-1}(l-1)) \\ &\le \omega(n) \left(\max_{l^\beta \| n} \{ v_p(l^{\beta-1}(l-1)) \} \right) \le v_p(\lambda(n)^{\omega(n)}), \end{aligned}$$

while $v_2(\varphi(n)) = v_2(n) - 1 + \sum_{l|n} v_2(l-1) \le 1 + \omega(n) v_2(\lambda(n))$.

So, necessarily $\varphi(n) \mid 2\lambda(n)^{\omega(n)}$. Furthermore, the only circumstances in which $\varphi(n) = 2\lambda(n)^{\omega(n)}$ is when $\varphi(n)$ is a power of 2. If this happens, then n is necessarily a power of 2 times a product of distinct Fermat primes. In all other cases, we have $\varphi(n) \le \lambda(n)^{\omega(n)}$ and this proves the third inequality.

In order to prove the second, it is enough to notice that $\tau(\lambda(n)) \ge \omega(n)$ by Proposition **??**, therefore we only need to show that $\varphi(n) \le \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}$ when $\varphi(n) = 2^a$ and $n \ne 24$. Observe that the latter is certainly true when n is a power of 2 since for $\alpha > 2$, $\varphi(2^\alpha) = 2^{\alpha-1} \le 2^{(\alpha-2)(\alpha-1)} = \lambda(2^\alpha)^{\tau(\lambda(2^\alpha))}$. In the other cases, if we write

$$n = 2^{\alpha_0} \cdot (2^{2^{\alpha_1}} + 1) \cdots (2^{2^{\alpha_r}} + 1),$$

with $\alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(n) &= 2^{2^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + 2^{\alpha_r} + \max\{\alpha_0 - 1, 0\}} \\ &\le 2^{2^{\alpha_r}(1 + 1/2 + \cdots + 1/2^{r-1}) + \max\{\alpha_0 - 1, 0\}} \le 2^{3M+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max\{\log_2(\lambda(2^{\alpha_0}), 2^{\alpha_r}\}$. Here, we use $\log_2$ for the logarithm in base 2. Similarly,

$$\lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))} = 2^{M(M+1)}.$$

Finally $3M+1 \le M(M+1)$ for $M > 2$ while the case when $M \le 2$ leads to $r \le 2$ so that $n \in \{3, 6, 12, 24, 48, 5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 15, 30, 60, 120, 240\}$, and the only value of n from the above set that does not satisfy the inequality $\varphi(n) \le \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}$ is $n = 24$. This completes the proof of the second statement.

As for the first statement, note that if $n \in \mathcal{A}_0$ the statement holds if and only if $n \in \{30, 60\}$. So, we can assume that $n \notin \mathcal{A}_0$ and thus $\tau(\lambda(n)) \geq \omega(n) + 1$. This implies that

$$\lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))} \geq \lambda(n)\varphi(n)$$

unless $\varphi(n)$ is a power of 2. In order to conclude the proof we need to verify that the statement holds when $\varphi(n)$ is a power of 2 and $n \neq 2,\ 8$, and we need to show that

$$\lambda(n)\varphi(n) \geq n.$$

We claim that the inequality above holds unless $n \in \{2, 3, 6, 12, 24\}$ (values for which the statement is verified directly). Indeed, let p be the greatest prime divisor of n. If $p \geq 5$, then

$$\frac{n}{\varphi(n)} = \prod_{l|n} \frac{l}{l-1} \leq \frac{3}{4}p \leq p - 1 \leq \lambda(n).$$

Similarly, if $p = 3$, then $n/\varphi(n) \leq 3 \leq \lambda(n)$ unless $n \in \{3, 6, 12, 24\}$. Finally, if $p = 2$, then $n/\varphi(n) = 2 \leq \lambda(n)$ unless $n = 2$.

If $\varphi(n)$ is a power of 2, then we proceed as in the proof of the second inequality. Observe that if $n = 2^{\alpha_0}$, then $n \leq \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}$ unless $\alpha_0 = 1,\ 3$. If $n = 2^{\alpha_0} \cdot (2^{2^{\alpha_1}} + 1) \cdots (2^{2^{\alpha_r}} + 1)$ with $\alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$ and if $M = \max\{\log_2(\lambda(2^{\alpha_0}), 2^{\alpha_r}\}$ so that $2^{M(M+1)} = \lambda(n)^{\tau(\lambda(n))}$, then

$$n \leq 2^{2(2^{\alpha_1}+\cdots+2^{\alpha_r})+\alpha_0} \leq 2^{5M+2}.$$

Since $5M + 2 \leq M(M + 1)$ for $M > 5$, we are left with checking the statement for integers that divide $2^7 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 17$ and this is done by a short calculation. □

Proposition 3.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1 = \quad & \{1,\ 3,\ 4,\ 8,\ 10,\ 15,\ 20,\ 40,\ 48,\ 80,\ 126,\ 252,\ 480,\ 504,\\ & 510, 1020,\ 2040,\ 2730,\ 4080,\ 5460,\ 8160,\ 8190,\ 10920,\\ & 16320, 16380\ , 21840,\ 32760,\ 65520,\ 6q,\ 12q,\ 24q\},\end{aligned}$$

where $q = 2p + 1$ is prime with $p > 2$ also prime.

Proof. We follow the same method as in the proof of Proposition **??**.

If $n > 1$ is odd, then, from Lemma **??**, we obtain that $\lambda^o(n') = 1$. This implies that $\lambda(n') = 2^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$. Thus,

$$n = (2^{2^{\alpha_1}} + 1)^{\gamma_1} \cdots (2^{2^{\alpha_r}} + 1)^{\gamma_r},$$

where $\gamma_j \geq 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$, $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$, and again $2^{2^{\alpha_i}} + 1$ is prime for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

The equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 1$ is equivalent to

$$(2^{\alpha_r} + 1)\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_r = r + 1.$$

Since $\alpha_r \geq r - 1$, the above is satisfied only if $r = 1$ or $r = 2$. In the first case, we have necessarily $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_1 = 1$, so that $n = 3$. In the second case, we have $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = 1$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$, so that $n = 15$.

Assume now that n is even. If $n = 2^\gamma$, then the equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 2$ is only satisfied for $n = 4$ and for $n = 8$.

If n is not a power of 2, then, from Lemma **??**, we get $\tau(\lambda^o(n')) \leq 2$. This can only happen if either $\lambda(n') = 2^a$, or $\lambda(n') = 2^a p$, with p an odd prime. In the first case, we have that

$$n = 2^{\gamma_0} \cdot (2^{2^{\alpha_1}} + 1)^{\gamma_1} \cdots (2^{2^{\alpha_r}} + 1)^{\gamma_r},$$

where $\gamma_j \geq 1$ for $j = 0, \ldots, r$, $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$, and again $2^{2^{\alpha_i}} + 1$ is prime for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

If we plug the above expression for n in the identity $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 1$, we obtain

$$\max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})), 2^{\alpha_r} + 1\} \cdot \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_r = r + 2,$$

which can only be satisfied for $r \leq 3$ since $r + 2 \geq 2^{\alpha_r} + 1 \geq 2^{r-1} + 1$. A quick computation shows that $\gamma_j = 1$ for all $j \geq 1$ and we have only the following possibilities:

r	$(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r)$	n
1	(0)	48
	(1)	10, 20, 40, 80
2	–	–
3	(0, 1, 2)	510, 1020, 2040, 4080, 8160, 16320

The next case to consider is when $\lambda(n') = 2^a p$ so that each odd prime dividing n is either of the form $2^{2^\alpha} + 1$, or of the form $2^\beta p + 1$. Hence,

$$n = 2^{\gamma_0} \cdot (2^{2^{\alpha_1}} + 1)^{\gamma_1} \cdots (2^{2^{\alpha_r}} + 1)^{\gamma_r} \cdot (2^{\beta_1} p + 1)^{\gamma_{r+1}} \cdots (2^{\beta_s} p + 1)^{\gamma_{r+s}},$$

where $\gamma_j \geq 1$ for $j = 0, \ldots, r + s$, $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$, $2^{2^{\alpha_i}} + 1$ is prime for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $1 < \beta_1 < \cdots < \beta_s$, and $2^{\beta_k} p + 1$ is prime for $k = 1, \ldots, s$.

We distinguish two more sub-cases: $p^2 \mid n$ and $p^2 \nmid n$.

If $p^2 \mid n$, then the equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 1$ translates into

$$\max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})), 2^{\alpha_r} + 1, \beta_s + 1\} \cdot \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{r+s} = r + s + 2. \tag{2}$$

In this case, there exists $j \leq r$ such that $\gamma_j \geq 2$ and since $\max\{a, b\} \geq (a + b)/2$, we have that the left hand side (**??**) is greater or equal than $2^{\alpha_r} + 1 + \beta_s + 1$. Using the fact that $\alpha_r \geq r - 1$ and that $\beta_s \geq s$, we obtain once again that $2^{r-1}+1 \le r+1$, which implies that $r=1$ or $r=2$.

If $r=1$, then necessarily $\alpha_1=0$, $\gamma_1=2$, $s=1$ and $\beta_1=\gamma_2=1$. This implies $n=2^{\gamma_0}\cdot 3^2\cdot 7$ and $\gamma_0=1,2,3$.

If $r=2$, then necessarily $\alpha_1=0$, $\alpha_2=1$ and $s\le 2$ since the left hand side of (**??**) is greater or equal of $2s+2$. Checking all possibilities, we find that $n=2^{\gamma_0}\cdot 3^2\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdot 13$ and $\gamma_0=1,2,3,4$.

If $p^2\nmid n$, then the equation $\tau(\lambda(n))=\omega(n)+1$ translates into

$$2\cdot\max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})),2^{\alpha_r}+1,\beta_s+1\}\cdot\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_{r+s}=r+s+2. \tag{3}$$

For the same reason as above, we have $r=1$ or $r=2$ and $s=1$ or $s=2$.

If $r=s=1$, then we have the family of solutions $n=2^{\gamma_0}\cdot 3\cdot(2p+1)$, where $\gamma_0=1,2,3$ and $2p+1$ is prime with $p\ge 3$.

If $r=s=2$, then we have the solutions $n=2^{\gamma_0}\cdot 3\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdot 13$, where $\gamma_0=1,2,3,4$. The remaining cases $r=1$, $s=2$ and $r=2$, $s=1$ produce a value of the right hand side of (**??**) equal to 5 and therefore do not lead to any more solutions. □

Proposition 4. *We have that $\mathcal{A}_2=\mathcal{F}_1\cup\mathcal{F}_2\cup\mathcal{F}_3\cup\mathcal{F}_4\cup\mathcal{I}_1\cup\mathcal{I}_2\cup\mathcal{I}_3$, where*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_1 &= \left\{\begin{array}{l|l} 5,\ 2^4,\ 2^5\cdot 3,\ 2^5\cdot 5,\ 2^\beta\cdot 3^2,\ 2^6\cdot 3\cdot 5, & 1\le\alpha\le 6,\\ 2^\alpha\cdot 3\cdot 17,\ 2^\alpha\cdot 5\cdot 17,\ 3\cdot 5\cdot 17, & 1\le\beta\le 3\\ 2^7\cdot 3\cdot 5\cdot 17 & \end{array}\right\};\\
\mathcal{F}_2 &= \left\{\begin{array}{l|l} 2^\alpha\cdot 3^\beta\cdot 5\cdot 7,\ 3^\beta\cdot 7, 3^\beta\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdot 13 & 1\le\alpha\le 4,\\ 2^\alpha\cdot 3^\beta\cdot 5\cdot 13,\ 2^\alpha\cdot 3^\beta\cdot 7\cdot 13, & \beta=1,2\\ 2^\alpha\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdot 13 & \end{array}\right\};\\
\mathcal{F}_3 &= \left\{2^\alpha\cdot 3\cdot 5^2\cdot 11 \;\middle|\; 1\le\alpha\le 4\right\};\\
\mathcal{F}_4 &= \left\{\begin{array}{l|l} 2^\delta\cdot 3^\beta\cdot 7\cdot 19, & 1\le\alpha\le 4,\\ 2^\alpha\cdot 3^\beta\cdot 5\cdot 7\cdot 13\cdot 19\cdot 37 & 1\le\beta,\delta\le 3\end{array}\right\};\\
\mathcal{I}_1 &= \{2^\alpha\cdot(2p+1)\mid 2p+1,\ p\ge 3 \textit{ primes},\ 1\le\alpha\le 3\};\\
\mathcal{I}_2 &= \{3\cdot(2p+1)\mid 2p+1,\ p\ge 3 \textit{ primes}\};\\
\mathcal{I}_3 &= \left\{2^\alpha\cdot 3\cdot 5\cdot(2^\beta p+1) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} 2^\beta p+1,\ p\ge 3 \textit{ primes},\\ 1\le\alpha\le 4,\ \beta=1,2\end{array}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Following the same approach as in the previous results, we obtain that in order for n to satisfy $\tau(\lambda(n))=\omega(n)+2$, we need to have $\lambda(n')=2^\alpha p^\beta$, where $\alpha\ge 0$ and $\beta=0,1,2$. This implies that n should be of the form

$$n=2^{\gamma_0}\cdot A\cdot B\cdot C,$$

where A, B and C are either 1 or of the respective forms:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= (2^{2^{\alpha_1}}+1)^{\gamma_1}\cdots(2^{2^{\alpha_r}}+1)^{\gamma_r}, \\ B &= (2^{\beta_1}p+1)^{\gamma_{r+1}}\cdots(2^{\beta_s}p+1)^{\gamma_{r+s}}, \\ C &= (2^{\delta_1}p^2+1)^{\gamma_{r+s+1}}\cdots(2^{\delta_t}p^2+1)^{\gamma_{r+s+t}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we assume the following conditions: $\gamma_j \geq 1$ for $j = 0, \ldots, r+s+t$, $0 \leq \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_r$, $2^{2^{\alpha_i}}+1$ is prime for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $1 < \beta_1 < \cdots < \beta_s$, $2^{\beta_k}p+1$ is prime for $k = 1, \ldots, s$, $1 < \delta_1 < \cdots < \delta_t$, and $2^{\delta_l}p^2+1$ is prime for $l = 1, \ldots, t$. Here, we allow either one of r, s, t, γ_0 to be zero with the obvious meaning.

The equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 2$ is equivalent to

$$\Theta \cdot \Lambda \cdot \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{r+s+t} = r + s + t + \min\{1, \gamma_0\} + 2, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\Theta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if either } (s+t>0 \text{ and } p^3 \mid n) \text{ or } (s+t=0) \\ & \ \text{or } (t=0, s>0 \text{ and } p^2 \| n); \\ 3/2 & \text{if } t>0 \text{ and } p^2 \| n; \\ 2 & \text{if } t=0, s>0 \text{ and } p^2 \nmid n; \\ 3 & \text{if } t>0 \text{ and } p^2 \nmid n; \end{cases}$$

and $\Lambda = \max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})), 2^{\alpha_r}+1, \beta_s+1, \delta_t+1\}$. Here, the terms β_s+1 (resp. δ_t+1) are to be omitted if $s=0$ (resp. $t=0$).

If $s = t = 0$, the above implies that $r \leq 3$ and

$$n = 2^{\delta_0} \cdot 3^{\delta_1} \cdot 5^{\delta_2} \cdot 17^{\delta_3}.$$

In this case, all possible solutions of $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 2$ are:

r	$(\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$	n
0	(4,0,0,0)	2^4
1	(0,0,1,0)	5
	$(\delta, 2, 0, 0)$, $\delta = 1, 2, 3$	$2 \cdot 3^2, 2^2 \cdot 3^2, 2^3 \cdot 3^2$
	$(5, 1, 0, 0)$	$2^5 \cdot 3$
	$(5, 0, 1, 0)$	$2^5 \cdot 5$
2	$(6, 1, 1, 0)$	$2^6 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$
	$(\delta, 1, 0, 1)$, $1 \leq \delta \leq 6$	$2^\delta \cdot 3 \cdot 17, 1 \leq \delta \leq 6$
	$(\delta, 0, 1, 1)$, $1 \leq \delta \leq 6$	$2^\delta \cdot 5 \cdot 17, 1 \leq \delta \leq 6$
3	$(0, 1, 1, 1)$	$3 \cdot 5 \cdot 17$
	$(7, 1, 1, 1)$	$2^7 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 17$

which are exactly the 22 elements of $\mathcal{F}_1$.

When $t = 0$, $s \neq 0$, the equation (**??**) simplifies to

$$\Theta \cdot \Lambda \cdot \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{r+s} = r + s + \min\{1, \gamma_0\} + 2, \tag{5}$$

where

$$\Theta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p^2 | n; \\ 2 & \text{if } p^2 \nmid n; \end{cases} \qquad \Lambda = \max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})), 2^{\alpha_r} + 1, \beta_s + 1\},$$

and the middle term is omitted if $r = 0$. In such a case, we have that $p \nmid n$ and $s \le \beta_s \le (s + \min\{1, \gamma_0\})/2$. This is only possible for n even and $s = \beta_s = 1$. This implies that $n = 2^{\gamma_0}(2p + 1)$ with $\gamma_0 = 1, 2, 3$, which are exactly the elements of $\mathcal{I}_1$.

Assuming $r > 0$, the left hand side of (**??**) is greater than or equal to $2^{\alpha_r} + \beta_s + 2$, which implies that $2^{\alpha_r} \le r + \min\{1, \gamma_0\}$. From the last inequality, it follows that $r \le 2 + \min\{1, \gamma_0\}$.

We distinguish the two sub-cases $p = 3$ and $p > 3$. In the first sub-case, $s \le r + \min\{1, \gamma_0\}$ and $\beta_s \le (r + s + \min\{1, \gamma_0\})/2$. This implies that

$$n = 2^{\delta_0} \cdot 3^{\delta_1} \cdot 5^{\delta_2} \cdot 7^{\delta_3} \cdot 13^{\delta_4}.$$

In this sub-case, all possible solutions of $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 2$ are:

(r, s)	$(\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4)$	n
$(1, 1)$	$(0, \delta, 0, 1, 0), \delta = 1, 2$	$3 \cdot 7, 3^2 \cdot 7$
$(1, 2)$	$(\delta, 1, 0, 1, 1)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3 \cdot 7 \cdot 13$
	$(\delta, 2, 0, 1, 1)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3^2 \cdot 7 \cdot 13$
	$(\delta, 0, 1, 1, 1)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 13$
$(2, 2)$	$(0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	$3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 13$
	$(0, 2, 1, 1, 1)$	$3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 13$
$(2, 1)$	$(\delta, 1, 1, 1, 0)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$
	$(\delta, 2, 1, 1, 0)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$
	$(\delta, 1, 1, 0, 1)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 13$
	$(\delta, 2, 1, 0, 1)$, $1 \le \delta \le 4$	$2^\delta \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 13$

which are exactly the 32 elements of $\mathcal{F}_2$.

In the sub-case $r > 0$, $s > 0$, $t = 0$, $p > 3$, we have $\beta_s \ge 2s - 1$. Thus,

$$2^{\alpha_r} + 2s + 1 \le 2^{\alpha_r} + \beta_s + 2 \le r + s + \min\{\gamma_0, 1\} + 2,$$

and $s \le r + 1 + \min\{\gamma_0, 1\} - 2^{\alpha_r} \le 1$, which implies that $s = 1$ and $\beta_1 \le 2$.

Note also that $\alpha_r \le 1$ and r cannot be 3 since this would imply $s = 1$, $2^{\alpha_r} + 1 \ge 5$, $\tau(\lambda(n)) \ge 10$, and $\omega(n) \ge 8$, which is impossible because $\omega(n) \le r + s + 3 \le 7$.

Therefore,

$$n = 2^{\delta_0} \cdot 3^{\delta_1} \cdot 5^{\delta_2} \cdot (2^{\beta_1} p + 1)^{\delta_3},$$

with $p > 3$. If $5^2 \mid n$, then we have the solutions $n = 2^\alpha \cdot 3 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 11$, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$, which are exactly the elements of $\mathcal{F}_3$, while if $5^2 \nmid n$, then we have the solutions $n = 3 \cdot (2p + 1)$, which are elements of $\mathcal{I}_2$, and $n = 2^\alpha \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot (2^\beta + 1)$, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and $\beta = 1, 2$, which are elements of $\mathcal{I}_3$.

The last case to consider is when $t > 0$, so that there is a prime dividing n of the form $2^\beta \cdot p^2 + 1$. Now equation $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + 2$ is equivalent to

$$\Theta \cdot \Lambda \cdot \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{r+s+t} = r + s + t + \min\{1, \gamma_0\} + 2, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\Theta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p^3 \mid n; \\ 3/2 & \text{if } p^2 \| n; \\ 3 & \text{if } p^2 \nmid n; \end{cases}$$

and $\Lambda = \max\{\tau(\lambda(2^{\gamma_0})), 2^{\alpha_r} + 1, \beta_s + 1, \delta_t + 1\}$. Here, the terms $2^{\alpha_r} + 1$ (resp. $\beta_s + 1$) are to be omitted if $r = 0$ (resp. $s = 0$).

We claim that $r, s \neq 0$, and we will show this later. Therefore, from (**??**), we deduce that

$$2^{\alpha_r} + \beta_s + \delta_t + 3 \le r + s + t + \min\{1, \gamma_0\} + 2.$$

On one side, the above implies that $2^{\alpha_r} \le r - 1 + \min\{1, \gamma_0\}$, so that $\gamma_0 \ge 1$ and either $r = 1, \alpha_1 = 0$ or $r = 2, \alpha_2 = 1, \alpha_1 = 0$. On another side, the above implies that $s + t \le \beta_s + \delta_t \le 2r$.

If $r = 1$, then $s = t = \beta_s = \delta_t = 1$, and since $2p^2 + 1$ is prime, we necessarily have $p = 3$. Hence,

$$n = 2^{\gamma_0} \cdot 3^{\gamma_1} \cdot 7^{\gamma_2} \cdot 19^{\gamma_3},$$

and the only solutions of $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 6$ of the above form are the first 9 elements of $\mathcal{F}_4$.

If $r = 2$, then $4 \le s + t \le \beta_s + \delta_t \le 4$. This implies that $s = t = 2$ and $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \delta_1, \delta_2) = (1, 2, 1, 2)$, so that again $p = 3$,

$$n = 2^{\gamma_0} \cdot 3^{\gamma_1} \cdot 5^{\gamma_2} \cdot 7^{\gamma_3} \cdot 13^{\gamma_3} \cdot 19^{\gamma_4} \cdot 37^{\gamma_5},$$

and the only solutions of $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 9$ of the above form are the last 12 elements of $\mathcal{F}_4$.

Finally, we need to prove the claim $r, s \neq 0$. If $r = 0, s \neq 0$, then from (**??**) we deduce that

$$3(s + t + 2)/2 \le 3(\beta_s + \delta_t + 2)/2 \le s + t + 3,$$

which implies $s + t \le 0$, which is a contradiction. A similar argument rules out the possibility $r = 0$ and $s = 0$. Lastly, if $r \neq 0$ and $s = 0$, then from (??) and from $\delta_t \geq t$ we deduce that

$$3(2^{\alpha_r} + t + 2)/2 \leq r + t + 3,$$

which is again a contradiction and ends the proof of the proposition. □

3. Lower bounds on the counting functions of $\mathcal{A}_k$

Theorem 1. *$\mathcal{A}_k$ is nonempty for all nonnegative integers k.*

Proof. Let $p_1 = 3,\ p_2 = 5,\ p_3 = 13$ and $p_4 = 31$. Then, for each $m \geq 3$ and for each $t \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ the number $n = 2^{m+1} \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot p_1 \cdots p_{t-3}$ verifies $\omega(n) = t$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau(2^{m-1} \cdot 3 \cdot 5) = 4m$.

Hence, $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 4(m-1) - (t-4)$ can assume all possible values greater than or equal to 8.

Finally, $3 \in \mathcal{A}_0,\ 4 \in \mathcal{A}_1,\ 5 \in \mathcal{A}_2,\ 7 \in \mathcal{A}_3,\ 17 \in \mathcal{A}_4,\ 13 \in \mathcal{A}_5,$ $62 \in \mathcal{A}_6$, and $31 \in \mathcal{A}_7$, which completes the proof. □

In what follows, we show that if k is sufficiently large, then $\mathcal{A}_k$ contains "many" elements.

Theorem 2. *For all $k \neq 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, we have the lowerbound*

$$\#\mathcal{A}_k(x) \gg_k \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} \qquad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Proof. The proof uses the famous Theorem of Chen that we state in the following form (see [?], or Lemma 1.2 in [?], or Chapter 11 in [?]).

Lemma 1. *Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$ be an even number. There exists a constant $c = c(a)$ such that if $x > x_0(a)$, then the number of primes $p \in [x/2, x]$ such that $p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ and $(p-1)/a$ has at most two prime factors each of which exceeds $x^{1/10}$ is at least $c_a x/(\log x)^2$.*

We write $k = 4s + r$, with $s \geq 1$, $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and distinguish the two cases:

- Case 1. $r \neq 3$;
- Case 2. $r = 3$.

In Case 1, we apply Chen's Theorem with the choice $a = 2^s$ and obtain that there are either at least $M_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/42$ with $p - 1 = 2^{s+2}q$ and q prime, or at least $N_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/42$ with $p - 1 = 2^s q_1 q_2$, where q_1 and q_2 are distinct primes which exceed $x^{1/10}$.

Assume that we are in the first instance. Then consider the M_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = 7pT$, where

$$T = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 2; \\ 2 & \text{if } r = 1; \\ 6 & \text{if } r = 0. \end{cases}$$

With these choices, we have that $\omega(n) = 4 - r$, $\lambda(n) = 2^s \cdot 3 \cdot q$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 4(s+1)$, therefore $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 4s + r = k$.

Assume now that we are in the second instance. Then consider the N_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = 2pT$ where

$$T = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 2; \\ 3 & \text{if } r = 1; \\ 15 & \text{if } r = 0. \end{cases}$$

For $s \geq 2$ and for ($s = 1$ and $r \neq 0$), we have that $\omega(n) = 4 - r$, $\lambda(n) = 2^s \cdot q_1 \cdot q_2$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 4(s+1)$, so that again $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = k$.

In Case 2, we apply Chen's Theorem with the choice $a = 2^{s+1}$ and obtain that either there are at least $M_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/510$ with $p - 1 = 2^{s+1}q$ and q prime, or at least $N_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/510$ with $p - 1 = 2^{s+1}q_1q_2$, and q_1 and q_2 distinct primes which exceed $x^{1/10}$.

Assume that we are in the first instance. Then consider the M_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = 210p$. For $s \geq 1$, we have that $\omega(n) = 5$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 4(s+2)$, so that $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 4s + 3 = k$.

Assume that we are in the second instance. Then consider the N_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = 510p$. For $s \geq 3$, we have that $\omega(n) = 5$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 4(s+2)$, so that again $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 4s + 3 = k$.

Next assume that $k = 7$. Then we apply Chen's Theorem with the choice $a = 2$ and obtain that either there are at least $M_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/192$ with $p - 1 = 2q$ and q prime, or at least $N_a \gg_a x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/192$ with $p - 1 = 2q_1q_2$, and q_1 and q_2 distinct primes which exceed $x^{1/10}$.

Assume that we are in the first instance. Then consider the M_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = 2^6 3p$. We have that $\omega(n) = 3$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau(2^4 p)$, so that $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 10 - 3 = 7$.

Assume that we are in the second instance. Then consider the N_a integers $n \leq x$ of the form $n = p = (2q_1q_2 + 1)$. We have that $\omega(n) = 1$ and $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 8$, so that again $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) = 8 - 1 = 7$.

Finally, we treat the case $k = 11$. Here, we apply Chen's Theorem with the choice $a = 4$ and deduce that either there exist $M \gg x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \leq x/4510$, such that $p - 1 = 4q$, with q prime, or there exist $N \gg x/(\log x)^2$ primes $p \le x/4510$, such that $p-1 = 4q_1q_2$, where q_1 and q_2 are distinct primes which exceed $x^{1/10}$.

If we are in the instance when $M \gg x/(\log x)^2$, then we note that for large x the M positive integers $n = 2 \cdot 5 \cdot 11 \cdot 41 \cdot p = 4510p$, where $p \le x$ is of the form $4q+1$, are all $\le x$, have $\omega(n) = 5$ and $\lambda(n) = 2^3 \cdot 5 \cdot q$, therefore $\tau(\lambda(n)) = 16 = \omega(n) + 11$. If we are in the instance when $N \gg x/(\log x)^2$, then for large x the N positive integers $n = p$, where $p \le x$ is such that $p - 1 = 4q_1q_2$, with distinct primes q_1 and q_2 which exceed $x^{1/10}$, have the property that $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau(4q_1q_2) = 12 = \omega(n) + 11$. Thus, $\#\mathcal{A}_{11}(x) \ge \max\{M, N\} \gg x/(\log x)^2$, which completes the proof of this theorem. □

The remaining cases are $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$, need to be treated separately. Propositions **??**, **??** and **??** address the first three cases and certainly there is no hope even to show that $\mathcal{A}_k$ is infinite for $k = 0, 1, 2$. While the next result is not such a precise characterization of $\mathcal{A}_k$ for $k = 3,\ 4$ as Propositions **??**, **??** and **??** for the smaller values of k, its aim is to show that it is beyond our reach to show that either one of these two sets is infinite.

Proposition 5. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_4$ is infinite. Then there exists an even positive integer c such that the set of primes of the form $p = cq^\beta + 1$, with q prime and $\beta \le 4$ is infinite.*

Proof. Assume that $n \in \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_4$. Then $\tau(\lambda(n)) \le \omega(n) + 4$. Write $m = \lambda(n)$ and note that $\omega(n)$ is at most the number of divisors of m of the form $p - 1$ for some prime p. Hence, m can have at most four divisors d such that $d+1$ is composite. Write $m = 2^\alpha \ell$, where ℓ is odd. If $\alpha \ge 9$, then $2^3,\ 2^5,\ 2^6,\ 2^7$ and 2^9 are five divisors of m none of the form $p - 1$ for some prime p. Thus, $\alpha \le 8$. If $\tau(\ell) \ge 6$, then ℓ (hence, m) has at least five odd divisors > 1, and certainly none of them is of the form $p - 1$ for some prime p. Thus, $\tau(\ell) \le 5$, which shows that either $\ell = q^\beta$ for some prime q and some $\beta \le 4$, or $\ell = q_1q_2$, where q_1 and q_2 are distinct primes.

Assume that $\ell = q^\beta$ holds for infinitely many n. Then there exist infinitely many primes p of the form $p - 1 = 2^{\alpha_0}q^\beta$ for some $\alpha_0 \in \{1, \ldots, 9\}$, and $\beta \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$, which implies the conclusion of the proposition.

Assume now that $\ell = q_1q_2$ holds for infinitely many n. Suppose further that $q_1 < q_2$. We then distinguish two cases. The first case is when q_1 remains bounded for infinitely many such n. Then $2^\alpha q_1$ can take only finitely many values. Since we have infinitely many values for n, there must exist some fixed even positive integer c (an even divisor of a number of the form $2^9 q_1$ over all the finitely many possibilities for q_1), such that $p - 1 = cq_2$ holds for infinitely many primes p, which implies the conclusion of the proposition. The second case is when q_1 tends to infinity as n tends to infinity in $\mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_4$. If for infinitely many such n we have that either $2q_1 + 1$ or $2q_2 + 1$ is prime, then we get the conclusion of the proposition with $c = 2$. Assuming that this is not the case, we show that we get a contradiction. Note first that $\alpha \le 3$, for if not $2^3,\ q_1,\ q_2,\ 2q_1$ and $2q_2$ are five divisors of n none of which is of the form $p - 1$ for some odd prime p. Assume now that $\alpha = 1$. Then $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau(2q_1q_2) = 8$, therefore $\omega(n) \ge 4$. Since the only prime factors of n are in $\{2,\ 3,\ 2q_1{+}1,\ 2q_2{+}1,\ 2q_1q_2{+}1\}$, we deduct that one of $2q_1 + 1$ and $2q_2 + 1$ must be prime, which is a contradiction. Finally, if $\alpha = 2$, then $\tau(\lambda(n)) = \tau(4q_1q_2) = 12$, therefore $\omega(n) \ge 8$. Since all the prime factors of n belong to $\{2, 3, 5, 2q_1 + 1, 2q_2 + 1, 4q_1 + 1, 4q_2 + 1, 2q_1q_2 + 1, 4q_1q_2 + 1\}$, we get again that one of $2q_1 + 1$ or $2q_2 + 1$ must be a prime, which is the final contradiction. □

4. Upper bounds on the counting functions of $\mathcal{A}_k$

Our first result here shows that numbers $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$ have $\omega(n)$ bounded in terms of k.

Proposition 6. *If $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$, then $\omega(n) \le 2(k + 1)^2 + 1$.*

Proof. We use the same idea and notations as in the proof of Proposition **??**. Let $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$, and put $m = \lambda(n) = 2^\alpha \ell$, where α is a nonnegative integer and ℓ is odd. If $\alpha \ge 2k + 3$, then $2^3,\ 2^5,\ \ldots,\ 2^{2k+3}$ are $k + 1$ divisors of m none of which is of the form $p - 1$ for some prime p, which is a contradiction. If $\tau(\ell) \ge k + 2$, then ℓ (hence, m) has $k + 1$ odd divisors > 1, and obviously none of them is of the form $p - 1$ for some prime p, which is again a contradiction. Hence, $\alpha \le 2k + 2$ and $\tau(\ell) \le k + 1$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(n) &= \tau(\lambda(n)) - k = \tau(2^\alpha \ell) - k = (\alpha + 1)\tau(\ell) - k \\ &\le (2k + 3)(k + 1) - k = 2(k + 1)^2 + 1.\end{aligned}$$

□

An upperbound for the counting function $\#\mathcal{A}_k(x)$ of $\mathcal{A}_k$ follows from Proposition **??** with a little extra work. Let us set

$$b_k = 2(k + 1)^2 + 3 + \lfloor \log_2(2(k + 1)^2 + k + 1) \rfloor.$$

We then have the following result.

Theorem 3. *For all nonnegative integers k we have the upper bound*

$$\#\mathcal{A}_k(x) \ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{b_k}}{(\log x)^2} \qquad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Proof. Let $K \geq 2$ be any fixed positive integer. Let $\pi_K(x)$ be the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that $\omega(p-1) \leq K$. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *There exists an absolute constant c_0 such that the following estimate holds*

$$\pi_K(x) \ll \frac{x(\log\log x + c_0)^{K+1}}{(K-1)!(\log x)^2} \qquad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}(x) = \{p \leq x : \omega(p-1) \leq K\}$. Put $y = x^{1/\log\log x}$ and $u = \log x/\log y = \log\log x$. For a positive integer n we write $P(n)$ for the largest prime factor of n. Let

$$\Psi(x, y) = \{n \leq x : P(n) \leq y\}.$$

By a result of de Bruijn (see [?], as well as Corollary 1.3 of [?], [?] and Chapter III.5 of [?]), the bound

$$\#\Psi(x, y) \leq x \exp(-(1 + o(1))u \log u) < \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} \tag{7}$$

holds as $u \to \infty$, where $u = \log x/\log y$, provided that $u \leq y^{1/2}$, which is satisfied for the above choice of y.

Therefore, if $\mathcal{P}_1(x) = \mathcal{P}(x) \cap \Psi(x, y)$, then we have that

$$\#\mathcal{P}_1(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}.$$

Now let $\mathcal{P}_2(x) = \{p \leq x : q^2 \mid p-1 \text{ for some } q \geq y\}$. For a fixed $q \geq y$, the number of $1 < n \leq x$ such that $q^2 \mid n-1$ and is $\leq x/q^2$. Thus,

$$\#\mathcal{P}_2(x) \leq \sum_{q \geq y} \frac{x}{q^2} \ll x \int_y^\infty \frac{dt}{t^2} \ll \frac{x}{y} = o\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^2}\right).$$

Put $\mathcal{P}_3(x) = \mathcal{P}(x) \backslash (\mathcal{P}_1(x) \cup \mathcal{P}_2(x))$. Write $p - 1 = Pm$, where $P = P(p-1)$. Since $P > y$ and $p \notin \mathcal{P}_2(x)$, we deduce that $P(m) < P$. Thus, $\omega(m) \leq K-1$. Fix m. By Brun's sieve (see, for example, Theorem 2.3 in [?]), we have that the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that $p-1 = mP$ for some prime P is

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

Summing up over all the acceptable values of m, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\mathcal{P}_3(x) &\ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^2}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{\substack{m\le x\\ \omega(m)\le K-1}} \frac{1}{\varphi(m)}\\
&\le \frac{x(\log\log x)^2}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{\substack{m\le x\\ \omega(m)=k}} \frac{1}{\varphi(m)}\\
&\le \frac{x(\log\log x)^2}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k!}\left(\sum_{p^\alpha\le x} \frac{1}{p^{\alpha-1}(p-1)}\right)^k\\
&\ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^2}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k!}\left(\sum_{p\le x} \frac{1}{p-1} + O(1)\right)^k\\
&\ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^2}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{1}{k!}(\log\log x + c_0)^{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to note that in the above sum the last term dominates as x tends to infinity. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem **??**. Assume that $k \ge 3$, since otherwise the result follows immediately from Propositions **??**, **??**, **??** and Brun's sieve even with a smaller b_k (i.e., $b_0 = 0$, $b_1 = 1$ and $b_2 = 1$).

Now note that if $p \mid n$ and $n \in \mathcal{A}_k$, then

$$2^{\omega(p-1)} \le \tau(p-1) \le \tau(\lambda(n)) = \omega(n) + k \le 2(k+1)^2 + k + 1,$$

(by Proposition **??**), therefore $\omega(p-1) \le K = \lfloor \log_2(2(k+1)^2+k+1)\rfloor$. Lemma **??** shows that

$$\#\{p \le x : \omega(p-1) \le K\} \ll_K \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+1}}{(\log x)^2}. \tag{8}$$

We put $\mathcal{A}_{k,1}(x)$ for the set of $n \in \mathcal{A}_k(x)$ such that either $P \le y = x^{1/\log\log x}$, or P^2 divides n. As in the proof of Lemma **??**,

$$\#\mathcal{A}_{k,1} \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}. \tag{9}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_{k,2}(x)$ stand for the complement of $\mathcal{A}_{k,1}(x)$ in $\mathcal{A}_k(x)$. Now write $n \in \mathcal{A}_{k,1}(x)$ as $n = Pm$, where $P = P(n)$. So, $P > y = x^{1/\log\log x}$, P^2 does not divide n, and $\omega(m) = \omega(n) - 1 \le 2(k+1)^2$. Fixing m, the number of values for $P \le x/m$ such that $\omega(P-1) \le K$ is, by estimate

(**??**),

$$\pi_K(x/m) \ll_k \frac{x(\log\log(x/m))^{K+1}}{m(\log(x/m))^2} \ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+1}}{m(\log y)^2} \ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+3}}{m(\log x)^2}.$$

Summing up the above inequality over all the values of $m \le x$ with $\omega(m) \le 2(k+1)^2$, we get that the number of possibilities is

$$\begin{aligned}\#\mathcal{A}_{k,2}(x) &\ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+3}}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{\substack{m\le x\\ \omega(m)\le 2(k+1)^2}} \frac{1}{m} \\ &\ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+3}}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{\ell=0}^{2(k+1)^2} \frac{1}{\ell!}\left(\sum_{p^\alpha\le x}\frac{1}{p^\alpha}\right)^\ell \\ &\ll_k \frac{x(\log\log x)^{K+3+2(k+1)^2}}{(\log x)^2},\end{aligned}$$

which together with (**??**) completes the proof of this theorem. □

A more careful analysis (along the lines of the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [**?**]) shows that Theorem **??** holds with a somewhat smaller b_k. Furthermore, it is clear that one can write down a formula for the implied constant in terms of k. We do not enter into such details.

5. A more general Statement

Let $f(x) \ge 1$ be any function which tends to infinity with n and which is monotonically decreasing for $x > x_0$. Let

$$\mathcal{B}_f = \{n : \tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n) < \exp((\log\log n)/f(n))\}. \tag{10}$$

We then show the following result.

Theorem 4. *If $\mathcal{B}_f$ is the set appearing at (**??**), then the following estimate holds*

$$\#\mathcal{B}_f(x) \le \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}} \qquad \textit{as } x \to \infty.$$

We start by proving the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{P}_f = \{p : \omega(p) < 2(\log\log p)/\sqrt{f(p)}\}$. Then the following estimate holds*

$$\#\mathcal{P}_f(x) \le \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}} \qquad \textit{as } x \to \infty. \tag{11}$$

Proof. Let x be large, put $y = x^{1/\log\log x}$ and let

$$\mathcal{P}_2(x) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(x) : p - 1 \notin \Psi(x, y)\}.$$

If $p \in \mathcal{P}_2(x)$, then $p - 1 = Qm$, where $Q = P(p-1) > y$ and $m \le x/y$. Fix m. By Brun's method, the number of primes $Q \le x/m$ such that $p = Qm + 1$ is also prime is

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

Using the minimal order $\varphi(m)/m \gg 1/\log\log x$ of the Euler function in the interval $[1, x]$, we get that if m is fixed, then the number of acceptable primes $p \in \mathcal{P}_2(x)$ with $(p-1)/P(p-1) = m$ is

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

Let $\mathcal{M}(x)$ be the set of acceptable values for m. Since $\omega(p-1) \le 2(\log\log p)/\sqrt{f(p)}$, f is increasing for large x and $p > y$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_2(x)$, it follows that

$$z = \max\{2(\log\log p)/\sqrt{f(p)} : p \in \mathcal{P}_2(x)\} \le \frac{2\log\log x}{\sqrt{f(y)}} = o(\log\log x)$$

as $x \to \infty$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{M}(x) \subseteq \{m \le x : \omega(m) \le z\}$. We then get

$$\#\mathcal{P}_2(x) \ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^3}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^3}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{k \le z} \sum_{\substack{m \le x \\ \omega(m) = k}} \frac{1}{m}. \tag{12}$$

Put

$$\mathcal{S}_k(x) = \sum_{\substack{m \le x \\ \omega(m) = k}} \frac{1}{m}.$$

Clearly, by unique factorization, the multinomial formula and Stirling's formula,

$$\mathcal{S}_k(x) \le \frac{1}{k!}\left(\sum_{p \le x}\sum_{\alpha \ge 1} \frac{1}{p^\alpha}\right)^k \le \left(\frac{e\log\log x + O(1)}{k}\right)^k, \tag{13}$$

where we also used the obvious fact that

$$\sum_{p \ge 2}\sum_{\alpha \ge 2} \frac{1}{p^\alpha} = O(1),$$

together with Mertens's formula

$$\sum_{p \le x} \frac{1}{p} = \log\log x + O(1).$$

Since for every fixed value of $A > 1$ the function $(eA/t)^t$ is increasing for $t < A$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_k(x) &\le \left(\frac{e\log\log x + O(1)}{z}\right)^z = \exp\left(z\log(e(\log\log x + O(1))/z)\right) \\ &\le \exp\left(\frac{2\log\log x}{\sqrt{f(y)}}\log(O(\sqrt{f(y)}))\right) = \exp(o(\log\log x)) \\ &= (\log x)^{o(1)}, \qquad \text{for } k \le z. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Hence, by inequalities (??) and (??) and estimate (??), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{P}_2(x) &\ll \frac{x(\log\log x)^3}{(\log x)^2}\sum_{k\le z}\mathcal{S}_k(x) \\ &\le \frac{x(\log\log x)^4}{(\log x)^2}\max\{\mathcal{S}_k(x) : k \le z\} = \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with estimate (??) implies inequality (??) and completes the proof of the lemma. □

By partial summation, we immediately get

Corollary 2. *If $\mathcal{P}_f$ is the set of primes appearing in Lemma ??, then*

$$\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}_f}\frac{1}{p} = O(1).$$

Proof of Theorem ??. Let again $y = x^{1/\log\log x}$, $w = x/(\log x)^2$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_1(x) = \{n \le w\} \cup \Psi(x,y).$$

It follows by inequality (??) that

$$\#\mathcal{B}_1(x) \le \frac{2x}{(\log x)^2} \tag{15}$$

once x is large. Let $\mathcal{B}_2(x) = \{n \le x : \omega(n) > 10\log\log x\}$. It follows from results of Norton [?] that

$$\#\mathcal{B}_2(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{\lambda}},$$

where $\lambda = 1 + 10\log(10/e) > 2$, therefore

$$\#\mathcal{B}_2(x) < \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}. \tag{16}$$

Now put

$$\mathcal{B}_3(x) = \mathcal{B}_f(x)\backslash(\mathcal{B}_1(x) \cup \mathcal{B}_2(x)),$$

and assume that $n \in \mathcal{B}_3(x)$. Replacing $f(x)$ by $\min\{f(x), \log\log\log x\}$, we may assume that $f(x) \le \log\log\log x$. Then $p-1 \mid \lambda(n)$ for all prime factors p of n, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\omega(p-1)} &\le \tau(\lambda(n)) \le \omega(n) + \exp((\log\log n)/f(n)) \\ &< 10\log\log x + \exp((\log\log x)/f(w)) \\ &< \exp\left(\frac{1.1(\log\log x)}{f(w)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\omega(p-1) < \frac{1.6(\log\log x)}{\sqrt{f(w)}}, \tag{17}$$

where we used the fact that $1.1/\log 2 < 1.6$. Let $\mathcal{B}_4(x) = \{n \in \mathcal{B}_3(x) : P(n) > w\}$. Since $w \ge p/(\log p)^2$ holds for all $p \in [w, x]$ once x is large, it follows that if $p = P(n)$ for $n \in \mathcal{B}_4(x)$, then the inequality

$$\omega(p-1) < \frac{1.6(\log\log x)}{f(p/(\log p)^2)} < \frac{2(\log\log p)}{\sqrt{g(p)}},$$

holds for large x, where g is the function $g(t) = (f(t/(\log t)^2))^2$, which is increasing for large t. Thus, $p \in \mathcal{P}_g$. Let us now write $n = Pm$, where $m < x/p < (\log x)^2$, and let us fix m. Then $p \in \mathcal{P}_g(x/m)$ and, by Lemma **??**, the number of such choices for p is

$$\#\mathcal{P}_g(x/m) \le \frac{x}{m(\log x/m)^{2+o(1)}} = \frac{x}{m(\log x)^{2+o(1)}}.$$

Summing up the above inequality for $m \le (\log x)^2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{B}_4(x) &\le \sum_{m \le (\log x)^2} \#\mathcal{P}_g(x/m) \\ &\le \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}} \sum_{m \le (\log x)^2} \frac{1}{m} \\ &= \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

because

$$\sum_{m \le (\log x)^2} \frac{1}{m} \ll \log\log x = (\log x)^{o(1)}.$$

From now on, we are assuming that $n \in \mathcal{B}_5(x) = \mathcal{B}_3(x) \backslash \mathcal{B}_4(x)$. Let $n = Pm$, where $P = P(n) \in [y, w]$. Since $1.6\log\log x < 2\log\log y \le 2\log\log P$ for large x, and $f(w) \ge f(P)$, we get that

$$\omega(P-1) < \frac{1.6(\log\log x)}{f(w)} < \frac{2(\log\log P)}{f(P)}.$$

In particular, $P \in \mathcal{P}_{f^2}$. By Lemma **??**, we get that if $m \le x/y$ is fixed, then the number of choices for P is at most

$$\#\mathcal{P}_{f^2}(x/m) \le \frac{x}{m(\log(x/m))^{2+o(1)}} \le \frac{x}{m(\log y)^{2+o(1)}} \le \frac{x}{m(\log x)^{2+o(1)}},$$

where we used the facts that $x/m \ge y$ and $\log y = \log x/\log\log x = (\log x)^{1+o(1)}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(x)$ be the set of acceptable values of m. Then

$$\#\mathcal{B}_5(x) \le \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}(x)} \frac{x}{m(\log x)^{2+o(1)}} \le \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}(x)} \frac{1}{m}. \tag{19}$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}(x)$ be the set of primes dividing some $m \in \mathcal{M}(x)$. Note that $\mathcal{Q}(x)$ consists primes $q \le x$ satisfying the inequality (**??**). We put $v = \exp(\exp((\log\log x)/f(w)))$ and split the primes in $\mathcal{Q}$ into two subsets as follows:

- $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \{q \le v\} \cap \mathcal{Q}$.
- $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \mathcal{Q} \cap [v, w]$.

Note that if $q \in \mathcal{Q}_2$, then

$$\frac{2\log\log q}{\sqrt{f(q)}} \ge \frac{2\log\log x}{\sqrt{f(q)f(w)}} \ge \frac{2\log\log x}{f(w)} > \omega(q-1),$$

therefore $\mathcal{Q}_2 \subset \mathcal{P}_f$. This argument shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}(x)} \frac{1}{m} &\le \prod_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_1\cup\mathcal{Q}_2} \left(\sum_{\alpha\ge 0} \frac{1}{q^\alpha}\right)\\ &\le \exp\left(\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_1} \frac{1}{q} + \sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_2} \frac{1}{q} + O\left(\sum_{q\ge 2}\sum_{\alpha\ge 2} \frac{1}{q^\alpha}\right)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Since

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_1} \frac{1}{q} \le \sum_{q\le v} \frac{1}{v} = \log\log v + O(1) = o(\log\log x)$$

(by Mertens's formula),

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_2} \frac{1}{q} \le \sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}_f} \frac{1}{q} = O(1)$$

(by Corollary **??**), and

$$\sum_{q\ge 2}\sum_{\alpha\ge 2} \frac{1}{q^\alpha} = O(1),$$

we get from estimate (**??**) that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(x)} \frac{1}{m} \le \exp(o(\log\log x)) = (\log x)^{o(1)},$$

which together with (**??**) gives

$$\#\mathcal{B}_5(x) \le \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}}. \tag{21}$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_3(x) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_4(x) \cup \mathcal{B}_5(x)$, we get, by estimates (**??**) and (**??**), that

$$\#\mathcal{B}_3(x) < \frac{x}{(\log x)^{2+o(1)}}, \tag{22}$$

which together with estimates (**??**) and (**??**) completes the proof of this theorem. □

6. Average and normal orders of $\tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n)$

Our last result addresses average and normal orders of the function

$$h(n) = \tau(\lambda(n)) - \omega(n).$$

Theorem 5. (i) *There exist positive constants c_0, c_1 such that the inequalities*

$$\exp\left(c_0\sqrt{\frac{\log x}{\log\log x}}\right) \le \frac{1}{x}\sum_{n\le x} h(n) \le \exp\left(c_1\sqrt{\frac{\log x}{\log\log x}}\right) \tag{23}$$

hold for all $x \ge 1$.

(ii) *The inequality*

$$h(n) = 2^{0.5(1+o(1))(\log\log n)^2}$$

holds for almost all positive integers n.

Proof. (i) In [**?**], it is shown that inequalities (**??**) hold with some constants c_0 and c_1 for the function $\tau(\lambda(n)) = h(n) + \omega(n)$. Since the average value of $\omega(n)$ is $\log\log x = \exp(o(\sqrt{\log x/\log\log x}))$, the required inequality follows.

(ii) In [**?**], it is shown that the normal order of both $\omega(\varphi(n))$ and $\Omega(\varphi(n))$ is $0.5(\log\log n)^2$. Since $\omega(\lambda(n)) = \omega(\varphi(n))$, while $\Omega(\lambda(n)) \le \Omega(\varphi(n))$, it follows that the normal order of both $\omega(\lambda(n))$ and $\Omega(\lambda(n))$ is also $0.5(\log\log n)^2$. Finally, since

$$2^{\omega(\lambda(n))} \le \tau(\lambda(n)) \le 2^{\Omega(\lambda(n))},$$

and since the normal order of $\omega(n)$ is $\log\log n = 2^{o((\log\log n)^2)}$, the desired inequalities follow. □

7. Comments and Remarks

We suspect that for every $k \geq 1$ there exist constants $a_k > 0$ and $c_k \geq 0$ such that

$$\#\mathcal{A}_k(x) = a_k(1+o(1))\frac{x(\log\log x)^{c_k}}{(\log x)^2} \qquad \text{as } x \to \infty. \tag{24}$$

Widely believed conjectures concerning the distribution of Sophie Germain primes p together with Proposition **??** seem to support the above conjecture (**??**) at $k=1$ (with $c_1 = 0$ and some $a_1 > 0$). Note that an upper bound of the above shape is given in Theorem **??**.

We would like to leave this conjecture as an open problem.

References

[1] W. D. Banks, K. Ford, F. Luca, F. Pappalardi, I. E. Shparlinski, 'Values of the Euler function in various sequences', *Monatsh. Math.* **146** (2005), no. 1, 1–19.

[2] N. G. de Bruijn, 'On the number of positive integers $\leq x$ and free of primes $> y$, II', *Indag. Math.*, **28** (1966), 239–247.

[3] E. R. Canfield, P. Erdős and C. Pomerance, 'On a problem of Oppenheim concerning "Factorisatio Numerorum"', *J. Number Theory*, **17** (1983), 1–28.

[4] J. R. Chen, 'On the representation of a large even integer as the sum of a prime and a product of at most two primes', *Sci. Sinica* **16** (1973), 157–176.

[5] P. Erdős and C. Pomerance, 'On the normal number of prime factors of $\varphi(n)$', *Rocky Mtn. J. of Math.* **15** (1985), 343–352.

[6] P. Erdős, C. Pomerance and E. Schmutz, 'Carmichael's lambda function', *Acta Arith.* **58** (1991), no. 4, 363–385.

[7] K. Ford, 'The number of solutions of $\varphi(x) = m$', *Ann. Math.* **150** (1999), 283–311.

[8] H. Halberstam and H.-E. Rickert, *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press, London, 1974.

[9] A. Hildebrand and G. Tenenbaum, 'Integers without large prime factors', *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux*, **5** (1993), 411–484.

[10] F. Luca and C. Pomerance, 'On the average number of divisors of the Euler function', *Publ. Math. (Debrecen)*, to appear.

[11] K. K. Norton, 'The number of restricted prime factors of an integer. I', *Illinois J. Math.* **20** (1976), 681–705; II, *Acta Math.* **143** (1979), 9–38.

[12] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.

(Glibichuk) Department of Mechanics and Mathematics, Moskow State University, Vorobevy gory, 1, MSU Main Building, Moskow, 119992, Russia

E-mail address: aanatol@mail.ru

(Luca) Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, C.P. 58089, Morelia, Michoacán, México
E-mail address: fluca@matmor.unam.mx

(Pappalardi) Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi Roma Tre, Largo S. L. Murialdo, 1, Roma, I–00146, Italy
E-mail address: pappa@mat.uniroma3.it