

# ON THE GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR OF INTEGER PARTS OF POLYNOMIALS

WILLIAM BANKS AND IGOR E. SHPARLINSKI

ABSTRACT. Motivated by a question of V. Bergelson and F. K. Richter (2017), we obtain asymptotic formulas for the number of relatively prime tuples composed of positive integers  $n \leq N$  and integer parts of polynomials evaluated at  $n$ . The error terms in our formulas depend on the Diophantine properties of the leading coefficients of these polynomials.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Motivation.** Let  $[t]$  and  $\{t\}$  denote the integer and fractional parts of a real number  $t$ , respectively; thus,  $t = [t] + \{t\}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Watson [14], answering a question of K. F. Roth, proved that for any given irrational number  $\alpha$ , the set of positive integers  $n$  for which  $\gcd(n, [\alpha n]) = 1$  has a natural density

$$\delta(\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \gcd(n, [\alpha n]) = 1\}) = \frac{6}{\pi^2}. \quad (1.1)$$

In the same paper, Watson showed that a similar result holds for all rational numbers  $\alpha$ , albeit with a natural density that depends on  $\alpha$  and differs from  $6/\pi^2$ . Shortly thereafter, Estermann [5] gave a different proof of a slight generalization of Watson's theorem. Later, Erdős and Lorentz [4] gave sufficient conditions for a differentiable function  $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to satisfy

$$\delta(\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \gcd(n, [f(n)]) = 1\}) = \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

The problem of finding functions  $f$  with this property has been studied by several authors; see [2] for an historical account of these results.

The present paper is inspired by a result of Bergelson and Richter [2] which asserts that the natural density

$$\delta(\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \gcd(n, [f_1(n)], \dots, [f_k(n)]) = 1\}) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k+1)}$$

for any functions  $f_1, \dots, f_k$  belonging to a given Hardy field  $\mathcal{H}$  and satisfying some mild conditions. Here,  $\zeta(s)$  is the Riemann zeta function. At the end of their paper, as a natural extension to Watson's original result (1.1), Bergelson and Richter pose the following question (see [2, Question 1]):

---

*Date:* May 3, 2022.

*Key words and phrases.* Greatest common divisor, polynomials, integer parts, exponential sums.

QUESTION. Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$  be irrational numbers. Is it true that the natural density of the set

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \gcd(n, \lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \alpha_k n^k \rfloor) = 1\} \quad (1.2)$$

exists and is equal to  $1/\zeta(k+1)$ ?

In this paper, we show that (a generalization of) this question has an affirmative answer provided that the numbers  $\{\alpha_j\}$  satisfy some mild Diophantine properties. To do this, we derive estimates for the counting function of the integers in the set (1.2). In the case that the numbers  $\{\alpha_j\}$  are all of *finite type*, we give even stronger estimates. To formulate our results precisely, we need to recall some standard notions from the theory of Diophantine approximations.

**1.2. Types of irrational numbers.** Let  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  denote the distance from a real number  $t$  to the nearest integer:

$$\llbracket t \rrbracket := \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |t - n| \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}). \quad (1.3)$$

For any irrational number  $\alpha$ , we define its *type*  $\tau$  by the relation

$$\tau := \sup \left\{ \vartheta \in \mathbb{R} : \varliminf_{q \in \mathbb{N}} q^\vartheta \llbracket q\alpha \rrbracket = 0 \right\}.$$

We say that  $\alpha$  is of *finite type* when  $\tau < \infty$ . Using Dirichlet's approximation theorem, one sees that  $\tau \geq 1$  for every irrational  $\alpha$ . The celebrated theorems of Khinchin [8] and of Roth [10,11] assert that  $\tau = 1$  for almost all real (in the sense of the Lebesgue measure) and all irrational algebraic numbers  $\alpha$ , respectively.

Similarly, for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  we define its *exponential type*  $\tau_\star$  by

$$\tau_\star := \sup \left\{ \vartheta \in \mathbb{R} : \varliminf_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \exp(q^\vartheta) \llbracket \alpha q \rrbracket = 0 \right\}.$$

We say that  $\alpha$  is of *finite exponential type* whenever  $\tau_\star < \infty$ . Note that if  $\alpha$  is of finite type  $\tau$ , then its exponential type  $\tau_\star$  is also finite, and one has  $\tau_\star \leq \tau$ . The converse is not true in general.

**1.3. Statement of results.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be a fixed integer. Given a sequence

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_j)_{j=1}^k \quad (1.4)$$

of irrational real numbers and a sequence  $\mathbf{m} := (m_j)_{j=1}^k$  of integers such that

$$1 = m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_k,$$

denote by  $N_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{m}}(x)$  the number of positive integers  $n \leq x$  that satisfy

$$\gcd(n, \lfloor \alpha_1 n^{m_1} \rfloor, \lfloor \alpha_2 n^{m_2} \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \alpha_k n^{m_k} \rfloor) = 1. \quad (1.5)$$

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $\alpha$  as in (1.4) be such that every  $\alpha_j$  is an irrational number of finite type not exceeding  $\tau$ . Then the estimate*

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \frac{x}{\zeta(k+1)} + O(x^{1-\gamma+o(1)}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

holds with

$$\gamma := \begin{cases} (3\tau + 2)^{-1} & \text{if } m_k \leq 2, \\ \frac{1}{16} \min\{(m_k \tau)^{-1}, (m_k^2 - m_k)^{-1}\} & \text{if } m_k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

This is proved in §3. As alluded to above, for almost all vectors  $\alpha$  (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) one can use  $\tau := 1$  in applications of Theorem 1.1; thus, for such vectors one can take

$$\gamma := \frac{1}{16}(m_k^2 - m_k)^{-1}$$

in all cases.

We note that although we have optimised the general shape of the dependence on  $m_k$  and  $\tau$  the constant  $1/16$  in the above is certainly not optimal and with a bit of tedious work can be improved.

Our next result tests the limits of our approach as we consider abnormally well-approximable vectors  $\alpha$ . More precisely, in some cases in which the terms of the sequence  $\alpha$  as in (1.4) are all irrational and of finite *exponential type*, we still manage to establish the expected asymptotic relation, albeit with a weaker error term.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $\alpha$  as in (1.4) be such that every  $\alpha_j$  is an irrational number of finite exponential type not exceeding  $\tau_*$ . If  $k = 1$ , then*

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O(x(\log x)^{-1/(2\tau_*)+o(1)}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

If  $k \geq 2$ , then

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \frac{x}{\zeta(k+1)} + O(x(\log x)^{-\gamma_*+o(1)}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

where

$$\gamma_* := \frac{1 - (m_k^2 - m_k + 2)\tau_*}{(m_k^2 + 3)\tau_*}$$

This is proved in §4.

Next, we obtain an asymptotic formula that holds for any irrational numbers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$  but without an explicit bound on the error term.

**THEOREM 1.3.** *Let  $\alpha$  as in (1.4) be such that every  $\alpha_j$  is an irrational number, then*

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \frac{x}{\zeta(k)} + o(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

This is proved in §5.

REMARK 1.4. Examining our proofs one can immediately notice that without changing anything the statements of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, one can replace  $\alpha_j n^{m_j}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, k$ , in (1.2) with  $\alpha_j n^{m_j} + g_j(n)$  where  $g_j \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ ,  $\deg g_j < m_j$  (however we still have to keep  $\alpha_1 n$  in (1.2)). In fact, in Theorem 1.3 we can replace  $\alpha_j n^{m_j}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, k$ , with  $f_j(n)$  where  $f_j \in \mathbb{R}[X]$  and linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Denominators of Diophantine approximations.** The following simple result give bounds on the denominators of certain rational approximations to an irrational number of finite type.

LEMMA 2.1. *Suppose  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  has finite type  $\tau$ , and  $0 < \varpi < \tau^{-1}$ . If  $Q$  is large enough (depending on  $\alpha$  and  $\varpi$ ), then there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad Q^\varpi < q \leq Q. \quad (2.1)$$

*Proof.* By Dirichlet's approximation theorem, there are coprime integers  $a$  and  $q \leq Q$  such that the first inequality of (2.1) holds. Then

$$\llbracket \alpha q \rrbracket \leq |\alpha q - a| < Q^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, since  $\alpha$  is of type  $\tau < \varpi^{-1}$ , we have

$$q^{1/\varpi} \llbracket \alpha q \rrbracket \geq 1$$

if  $q$  is large enough. Combining these inequalities, the lemma follows.  $\square$

We also use a similar result for irrational numbers of finite exponential type; the proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 2.1.

LEMMA 2.2. *Suppose  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  has finite exponential type  $\tau_*$ , and  $0 < \varpi < \tau_*^{-1}$ . If  $Q$  is sufficiently large (depending on  $\alpha$  and  $\varpi$ ), then there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad (\log Q)^\varpi < q \leq Q.$$

**2.2. Discrepancy and the Koksma-Szűs inequality.** Let us consider the collection  $\mathcal{S}$  consisting of all subsets  $S$  of  $\Omega := [0, 1)^k$  of the form

$$S = \bigotimes_{1 \leq j \leq k} [a_j, b_j)$$

with  $0 \leq a_j < b_j \leq 1$  for each  $j$ . For any given sequence  $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{v}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of vectors  $\mathbf{v}_n \in \Omega$  and a fixed set  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , we denote

$$A(\mathbf{v}, S; N) := |\{n \leq N : \mathbf{v}_n \in S\}|.$$

The (extreme) discrepancy is the quantity defined by

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{v}; N) := \sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \left| \frac{A(\mathbf{v}, S; N)}{N} - m(S) \right| \quad \text{with} \quad m(S) := \prod_{1 \leq j \leq k} (b_j - a_j).$$

Note that if the vectors  $\mathbf{v}_n$  in  $\mathbf{v}$  are chosen uniformly at random from  $\Omega$  and independently for each  $n$ , then  $m(S)$  (the Lebesgue measure of the subset  $S \subset \Omega$ ) represents the proportion of the vectors  $\mathbf{v}_n$  expected to lie in  $S$ .

One of the basic tools used to study uniformity of distribution is the celebrated *Koksma–Szűsz inequality* [9, 13] (see also Drmota and Tichy [3, Theorem 1.21]), which links the discrepancy of a sequence of points to certain exponential sums. To formulate the result, let us recall the standard notation

$$\mathbf{e}(t) := \exp(2\pi it) \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Also, identifying each real sequence  $\mathbf{v} := (v_j)_{j=1}^k$  with the vector  $(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , we denote the inner product of two such sequences  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{w}$  by

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^k v_j w_j.$$

The Koksma–Szűsz inequality can be stated as follows.

**LEMMA 2.3.** *There is an absolute constant  $C > 0$  with the following property. For any integer  $H > 1$  and any sequence of points  $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{v}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  in  $\Omega$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{v}; N) \leq C^k \left( \frac{1}{H} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 < \|\mathbf{h}\| \leq H} \frac{1}{r(\mathbf{h})} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(\langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{v}_n \rangle) \right| \right),$$

where

$$\|\mathbf{h}\| := \max_j |h_j|, \quad r(\mathbf{h}) := \prod_{j=1}^k \max(|h_j|, 1),$$

and the sum is taken over all vectors  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$  with  $0 < \|\mathbf{h}\| \leq H$ .

**2.3. Bounds on Weyl sums.** We use the following result of Shparlinski and Thuswaldner [12, Lemma 3.2].

**LEMMA 2.4.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  be a fixed integer. Suppose that  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  satisfies*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{q^2}$$

with some coprime integers  $a$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Then, for any integer  $h \neq 0$ , any polynomial  $g(X) \in \mathbb{R}[X]$  of degree at most  $m - 1$ , and any integer  $N$ , we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(h\alpha n^m + g(n)) \right| \leq N^{1+o(1)} \Delta^{1/(m^2-m)} \quad (N \rightarrow \infty), \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(h\alpha n^m + g(n)) \ll N(\log N) \Delta^{1/(m^2-m+2)}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\Delta := q^{-1}|h| + N^{-1} + qN^{-m} + \gcd(q, h)N^{-m+1}.$$

At first glance, the statement of Lemma 2.4 may appear to be different from [12, Lemma 3.2], which is formulated for Weyl sums with polynomials of the form  $hf(X)$  with  $f$  a real polynomial of degree  $m \geq 2$ . However, since the bound given in [12] depends only on the leading term of  $f$ , Lemma 2.4 is actually equivalent, for it corresponds to the choice  $f(X) := \alpha X^m + h^{-1}g(X)$ . We also remark (as in [12]) that the bound (2.2) has a smaller exponent of  $\Delta$  than that of (2.3), hence the first bound is typically stronger. For very small  $q$ , however, the factor  $N^{o(1)}$  can make (2.2) trivial, whereas (2.3) is nontrivial in the same situation.

For the case  $m = 2$ , we have a more precise statement, which follows from the Weyl differencing method; see [1, Equation (3.5)].

LEMMA 2.5. *For any integer  $h \neq 0$ , any linear polynomial  $g(X) \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ , and any integer  $N$ , we have*

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(han^2 + g(n)) \right|^2 \ll \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2hv\alpha \rrbracket} \right),$$

where  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  is defined by (1.3).

We also need a version of Lemma 2.4 to handle the case  $m = 1$ , i.e., the case of linear sums.

LEMMA 2.6. *Suppose that  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  satisfies*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{q^2}$$

with some coprime integers  $a$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Then, for any integer  $h \neq 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(h\alpha n) \ll N\Delta,$$

where  $\Delta := q^{-1}|h| + qN^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* For  $|h| \geq \frac{1}{2}q$  the bound is trivial, thus we can assume  $|h| < \frac{1}{2}q$ .

Using the well known inequality (see, e.g., [7, Equation (8.6)])

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{e}(h\alpha n) \right| \leq \min \left( N, \frac{1}{2\llbracket h\alpha \rrbracket} \right).$$

Since  $\gcd(a, q) = 1$  and  $0 < |h| < \frac{1}{2}q$ , the ratio  $ah/q$  is a non-integer rational number whose denominator (when it is expressed in reduced form) is at most  $q$ ; therefore,  $\llbracket ah/q \rrbracket \geq q^{-1}$ . Since  $|h/q^2| \leq (2q)^{-1}$ , we conclude that  $\llbracket h\alpha \rrbracket \geq (2q)^{-1}$ , and the lemma follows.  $\square$

**2.4. Bounds on some reciprocal sums.** The following well known result is used in conjunction with Lemma 2.5; see, e.g., [1, Lemma 3.2].

LEMMA 2.7. *Suppose that  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  satisfies*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{q^2}$$

*with some coprime integers  $a$  and  $q \geq 1$ . For any real integer  $K, N \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^K \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket \nu \alpha \rrbracket} \right) \ll (N + q \log q)(K/q + 1).$$

**2.5. Optimization of power sums.** We need the following technical result; see [6, Lemma 2.4].

LEMMA 2.8. *For  $I, J \in \mathbb{N}$  let*

$$F(Z) := \sum_{i=1}^I A_i Z^{a_i} + \sum_{j=1}^J B_j Z^{-b_j},$$

*where  $A_i, B_j, a_i$  and  $b_j$  are positive real numbers for  $1 \leq i \leq I$  and  $1 \leq j \leq J$ . Let  $0 \leq Z_1 \leq Z_2$ . Then for some  $z \in [Z_1, Z_2]$  one has*

$$F(z) \ll \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^J \left( A_i^{b_j} B_j^{a_i} \right)^{1/(a_i+b_j)} + \sum_{i=1}^I A_i Z_1^{a_i} + \sum_{j=1}^J B_j Z_2^{-b_j},$$

*where the implied constant depends only on  $I$  and  $J$ .*

We also need to following elementary statements.

LEMMA 2.9. *For any real numbers  $u > 0$  and  $v \geq 1$ , the sequence*

$$\left( \frac{u}{v^{m-1}} \right)^{1/(m^2-m)} \quad \text{with } m = 2, 3, 4, \dots$$

*is nondecreasing if  $u \leq v$ .*

LEMMA 2.10. *For any real numbers  $u > 0$  and  $v \geq 1$ , the sequence*

$$\left( \frac{v^m}{u} \right)^{1/(m^2-m+2)} \quad \text{with } m = 2, 3, 4, \dots, M$$

*is nondecreasing if  $v \leq u^{1/M}$ .*

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

**3.1. Preliminaries.** Our approach is based the following equivalence, which is easily verified:

$$\lfloor t \rfloor \equiv 0 \pmod{d} \iff \{t/d\} \in [0, d^{-1}) \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}, d \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (3.1)$$

We begin our estimation of  $N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x)$  by applying a familiar inclusion-exclusion argument, using the Möbius function to detect the coprimality condition (1.5):

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d \mid \gcd(n, [\alpha_1 n^{m_1}], \dots, [\alpha_k n^{m_k}])} \mu(d) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x/d \\ [\alpha_j d^{m_j} n^{m_j}] \equiv 0 \pmod{d} \forall j}} 1.$$

Using the criterion (3.1) it follows that

$$N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}|, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\Omega_d$  is used to denote the subset  $[0, d^{-1})^k$  of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_d := (\boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n})_{n \geq 1}$  is the sequence of vectors in  $[0, 1)^k$  given by

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n} := (\{\alpha_1 d^{m_1} n^{m_1}\}, \dots, \{\alpha_k d^{m_k} n^{m_k}\}).$$

The strength of our estimate for  $N_{\alpha, \mathbf{m}}(x)$  via (3.2) depends to a large extent on Diophantine properties of the sequence  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_j)_{j=1}^k$ .

**3.2. Large  $d$ .** First, we consider the ‘‘tail’’ contribution to (3.2) coming from integers  $d > D$ , where  $D$  is a real parameter to be specified later. We follow some ideas of Watson [14].

Throughout the remainder of the section, we fix a real number

$$\varpi \in (0, \tau^{-1}).$$

We have trivially:

$$|\{n \leq x/d : \boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| \leq T(x, d),$$

where

$$T(x, d) := |\{n \leq x/d : [\alpha_1 dn] \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}|.$$

The congruence  $[\alpha_1 dn] \equiv 0 \pmod{d}$  is equivalent to the fact that  $[\alpha_1 dn] = dm$  with some integer  $m$ , and therefore

$$\alpha_1 n = m + \frac{\{\alpha_1 dn\}}{d}.$$

Using (3.11) and the fact that  $n \leq x/d$ , the inequality

$$\left| \frac{an}{q} - m \right| \leq |\alpha_1 n - m| + n \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{d} + \frac{x}{dqQ} \quad (3.3)$$

holds with some coprime integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that  $Q^\varpi < q \leq Q$ .

If both inequalities

$$d \geq 2q \quad \text{and} \quad d \geq \frac{2x}{Q} \quad (3.4)$$

hold, then (3.3) implies that  $an/q = m \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence  $q \mid n$ . In this case, there are at most  $x/(dq)$  such positive integers  $n \leq x/d$ , and so

$$T(x, d) \ll \frac{x}{dq} < \frac{x}{dQ^\varpi}. \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, if either inequality in (3.4) fails, then

$$d \ll q + \frac{x}{Q}.$$



In this case, (3.3) implies

$$an = mq + O(q/d + x/(dQ)).$$

Since  $\gcd(a, q) = 1$ , it follows that  $n$  belongs to one of  $O(q/d + x/(dQ))$  distinct residue classes modulo  $q$ . Since each residue class modulo  $q$  contains no more than  $O(x/(dq) + 1)$  positive integers  $n \leq x/d$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, d) &\ll (q/d + x/(dQ)) (x/(dq) + 1) \\ &\ll x/d^2 + x^2/(d^2qQ) + q/d + x/(dQ) \\ &\ll x/d^2 + x^2/(d^2Q^{1+\varpi}) + Q/d + x/(dQ), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.11) in the last step. This implies the slightly weaker bound

$$T(x, d) \ll x/d^2 + x^2/(d^2Q^{1+\varpi}) + Q/d + x/(dQ^\varpi), \quad (3.6)$$

which we also use to replace (3.5) in the previous case. By Lemma 2.8, the value of  $Q$  can be adjusted to balance the terms involving  $Q$  in (3.6), leading to

$$T(x, d) \ll xd^{-2} + x^{c_1}d^{-1} + x^{2c_2}d^{-1-c_2},$$

where  $c_1 := (1 + \varpi)^{-1}$  and  $c_2 := (2 + \varpi)^{-1}$ . Summing over  $d > D$ , we find that

$$\sum_{D < d \leq x} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| \ll \sum_{D < d \leq x} T(x, d) \ll E_0,$$

where

$$E_0 := xD^{-1} + x^{c_1} \log x + x^{2c_2} D^{-c_2}. \quad (3.7)$$

**3.3. Small  $d$ .** Next, we consider the contribution to (3.2) from integers  $d \leq D$ . Using the definitions of §2.2 and the fact that  $m(\Omega_d) = d^{-k}$ , we have

$$|\{n \leq x/d : \boldsymbol{\nu}_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = A(\boldsymbol{\nu}_d, \Omega_d; x/d) = xd^{-k-1} + O(xd^{-1}\mathcal{D}_d), \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_d$  is shorthand for the discrepancy  $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\nu}_d; x/d)$ . By Lemma 2.3, for any positive real parameter  $H \leq x$  we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll \frac{1}{H} + \frac{d}{x} \sum_{0 < \|\mathbf{h}\| \leq H} \frac{1}{r(\mathbf{h})} \left| \sum_{n \leq x/d} \mathbf{e}(h_k d^{m_k} \alpha_k n^{m_k} + \cdots + h_1 d^{m_1} \alpha_1 n^{m_1}) \right|,$$

where the outer sum runs over all  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$  with  $0 < \|\mathbf{h}\| \leq H$ . For each  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_j$  be the set of such vectors  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  with  $h_j \neq 0$  and  $h_{j+1} = \cdots = h_k = 0$ . Then

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll \frac{1}{H} + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{D}_{d,j}, \quad (3.9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,j} := (x/d)^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_j} \frac{1}{r(\mathbf{h})} |S_j(d, \mathbf{h})| \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$S_j(d, \mathbf{h}) := \sum_{n \leq x/d} \mathbf{e}(h_j d^{m_j} \alpha_j n^{m_j} + \cdots + h_1 d^{m_1} \alpha_1 n^{m_1}).$$

As in §3.2 we fix  $\varpi \in (0, \tau^{-1})$ . For each  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , Lemma 2.1 shows that for all large  $Q$  (depending on  $\alpha_j$  and  $\varpi$ ) there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that

$$\left| \alpha_j - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad Q^\varpi < q \leq Q. \quad (3.11)$$

It is convenient to assume that  $Q \leq x^{O(1)}$ . This condition is not restrictive as it holds for our choice of parameters at the optimization stage.

We now turn to the problem of bounding  $\mathcal{D}_{d,j}$  for any given  $j$ . Because the different bounds on Weyl sums given in §2.3 vary in strength, we examine several cases according to whether  $m_j = 1$ ,  $m_j = 2$ , or  $m_j \geq 3$ .

LEMMA 3.1. *With the notation as above, we have for each  $j$ :*

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,j} \ll \begin{cases} x^{c_1-1} d H^{c_1} (\log H)^{1-c_1} & \text{if } m_j = 1, \\ x^{o(1)} (x^{c_1-1} d + x^{-1/2} d^{3/2}) & \text{if } m_j = 2, \\ x^{o(1)} \left( \left( \frac{H^{c_1} d^{m_j-1+c_1}}{x^{(m_j-1)(1-c_1)}} \right)^{\lambda_j} + \left( \frac{d}{x} \right)^{\lambda_j} \right) & \text{if } m_j \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c_1 := (1 + \varpi)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j := (m_j^2 - m_j)^{-1}. \quad (3.12)$$

*Proof.* First, suppose that  $m_j = 1$ . For each vector  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{H}_1$  we apply Lemma 2.6 with

$$N := \lfloor x/d \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad h := h_1 d,$$

deriving the bound

$$S_1(d, \mathbf{h}) = \sum_{n \leq x/d} \mathbf{e}(h_1 d \alpha_1 n) \ll \frac{x|h_1 d|}{dq} + q < \frac{x|h_1|}{Q^\varpi} + Q,$$

where we used (3.11) in the second step. By (3.10) we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,1} = \frac{d}{x} \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_1} \frac{1}{|h_1|} \left( \frac{x|h_1|}{Q^\varpi} + Q \right) \ll \frac{dH}{Q^\varpi} + \frac{dQ \log H}{x}.$$

Taking  $Q := (xH/\log H)^{c_1}$  we obtain the bound for  $\mathcal{D}_{d,1}$  stated in the lemma.

Next, suppose that  $m_j = 2$ . For any vector  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, h_2, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{H}_2$  we apply Lemma 2.5 with  $N := \lfloor x/d \rfloor$  and  $h := h_2 d^2$ , deriving the bound

$$S_2(d, \mathbf{h}) \ll \left( \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2h_2 d^2 v \alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right) \right)^{1/2},$$

hence by (3.10) (and symmetry) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{d,2} &\ll \frac{d}{x} \sum_{h_1 \leq H} \sum_{0 < h_2 \leq H} \frac{1}{\max(h_1, 1) h_2} \left( \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2h_2 d^2 v \alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\ll \frac{d \log H}{x} \sum_{0 < h \leq H} \frac{1}{h} \left( \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2h d^2 v \alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Splitting the summation range over  $h$  into  $O(\log H)$  dyadic intervals of the form  $R < h \leq 2R$  with  $\frac{1}{2} \leq R \ll H$ , it suffices to bound each term

$$\Sigma_R := \frac{d \log H}{xR} \sum_{R < h \leq 2R} \left( \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2hd^2v\alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.13)$$

By the Cauchy inequality,

$$\sum_{R < h \leq 2R} \left( \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2hd^2v\alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right) \right)^{1/2} \leq R^{1/2} \Xi_R^{1/2}, \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\Xi_R := \sum_{R < h \leq 2R} \sum_{v=1}^N \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket 2hd^2v\alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right).$$

Collecting together products  $2hd^2v$  with the same value  $\nu = 2hd^2v$ , and using a well-known bound on the divisor function (see, e.g., [7, Equation (1.81)]), we have

$$\Xi_R \leq (dNR)^{o(1)} \sum_{1 \leq \nu \leq 4d^2NR} \min \left( N, \frac{1}{\llbracket \nu\alpha_2 \rrbracket} \right).$$

Finally, using Lemma 2.7 and (3.11), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_R &\leq x^{o(1)} (N + q \log q) (d^2NR/q + 1) \\ &\leq x^{o(1)} (d^2N^2R/q + d^2NR + q) \\ &\leq x^{o(1)} \left( \frac{d^2N^2R}{Q^\varpi} + d^2NR + Q \right), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.13) and (3.14) implies

$$\Sigma_R \leq x^{-1+o(1)} d \left( \frac{d^2N^2}{Q^\varpi} + d^2N + QR^{-1} \right)^{1/2} \leq x^{-1+o(1)} d \left( \frac{x^2}{Q^\varpi} + xd + Q \right)^{1/2}.$$

The bound is optimized with the choice  $Q := x^{2c_1}$ , and we get that

$$\Sigma_R \leq x^{o(1)} (x^{c_1-1}d + x^{-1/2}d^{3/2}).$$

Summing over all possibilities for  $R$ , we finish the proof in this case.

Finally, suppose that  $m_j \geq 3$ . For each vector  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_j$  we use the bound (2.2) from Lemma 2.4 with  $N := \lfloor x/d \rfloor$  and  $h := h_j d^{m_j}$ ; taking into account (3.11), we find that the bound

$$S_j(d, \mathbf{h}) \ll N^{1+o(1)} \left( \frac{|h_j| d^{m_j}}{Q^\varpi} + \frac{1}{N} + \frac{Q}{N^{m_j-1}} \right)^{\lambda_j}$$

holds with  $\lambda_j := (m_j^2 - m_j)^{-1}$  as in (3.12). To optimize the bound, we choose  $Q := (|h_j| d^{m_j} N^{m_j-1})^{c_1}$ , which leads to

$$S_j(d, \mathbf{h}) \ll N^{1+o(1)} \left( \frac{|h_j|^{c_1} d^{m_j c_1}}{N^{(m_j-1)(1-c_1)}} + \frac{1}{N} \right)^{\lambda_j}.$$

Recalling (3.10) and noting that (with any fixed  $C > 0$ )

$$\sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_j} \frac{1}{r(\mathbf{h})} \ll (\log H)^j \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_j} \frac{|h_j|^C}{r(\mathbf{h})} \ll H^C (\log H)^{j-1}, \quad (3.15)$$

we derive the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{d,j} &\leq x^{o(1)} \left( \frac{H^{c_1} d^{m_j c_1}}{N^{(m_j-1)(1-c_1)}} + \frac{1}{N} \right)^{\lambda_j} \\ &= x^{o(1)} \left( \left( \frac{H^{c_1} d^{m_j-1+c_1}}{x^{(m_j-1)(1-c_1)}} \right)^{\lambda_j} + \left( \frac{d}{x} \right)^{\lambda_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that  $N \asymp x/d$ , we finish the proof.  $\square$

We are now in a position to bound  $\mathcal{D}_d$  and to estimate the overall contribution to (3.2) from integers  $d \leq D$ .

CASE 1: ( $m_k = 1$ ). In this case,  $k = 1$ . By (3.9) and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll H^{-1} + x^{c_1-1} d H^{c_1} (\log H)^{1-c_1}.$$

The bound is optimized with the choice  $H := (x/\log x)^{1-2c_2} d^{c_2-1}$ , where

$$c_2 := (2 + \varpi)^{-1},$$

and with this choice we get that

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll (x/\log x)^{2c_2-1} d^{1-c_2}.$$

Using this result in (3.8) and summing over all  $d \leq D$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O(E_1),$$

where

$$E_1 := xD^{-1} + (x/\log x)^{2c_2} D^{1-c_2}. \quad (3.16)$$

CASE 2: ( $m_k = 2$ ). In this case,  $k = 2$ . We have by (3.9) and Lemma 3.1:

$$\mathcal{D}_d \leq x^{o(1)} \left( H^{-1} + x^{c_1-1} d H^{c_1} + x^{-1/2} d^{3/2} \right).$$

Taking  $H := x^{1-2c_2} d^{c_2-1}$  we see that

$$\mathcal{D}_d \leq x^{o(1)} \left( x^{2c_2-1} d^{1-c_2} + x^{-1/2} d^{3/2} \right).$$

Using this result in (3.8) and summing over all  $d \leq D$ , we have

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(3)} + O(E_2),$$

where

$$E_2 := xD^{-2} + x^{o(1)} \left( x^{2c_2} D^{1-c_2} + x^{1/2} D^{3/2} \right). \quad (3.17)$$

CASE 3: ( $m_k \geq 3$ ). In this case,  $k \geq 2$ . By (3.9) and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll H^{-1} + x^{c_1-1} d H^{c_1} (\log H)^{1-c_1} + \sum_{j=2}^k \mathcal{D}_{d,j},$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,j} \ll x^{o(1)} \left( \left( \frac{H^{c_1} d^{m_j-1+c_1}}{x^{(m_j-1)(1-c_1)}} \right)^{\lambda_j} + \left( \frac{d}{x} \right)^{\lambda_j} \right) \quad (2 \leq j \leq k).$$

Clearly, the second term  $(d/x)^{\lambda_j}$  in this bound increases with  $j$ . On the other hand, applying Lemma 2.9 with  $u := H^{c_1} d^{c_1}$  and  $v := x^{1-c_1} d^{-1}$ , we see that the first term also increases  $j$  provided that  $u \leq v$ , or equivalently, when

$$H \leq \left( \frac{x}{d} \right)^{(1-c_1)/c_1} = \left( \frac{x}{d} \right)^\varpi.$$

Assuming this condition is met, we derive the bound

$$\mathcal{D}_d \leq x^{o(1)} \left( \frac{1}{H} + \frac{dH^{c_1}}{x^{1-c_1}} + \frac{d^{3/2}}{x^{1/2}} + \frac{H^{c_3} d^{c_4}}{x^{c_5}} + \frac{d^\lambda}{x^\lambda} \right),$$

where

$$m := m_k, \quad \lambda := (m^2 - m)^{-1}, \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$c_3 := \lambda c_1, \quad c_4 := \lambda(m-1+c_1), \quad c_5 := \lambda(m-1)(1-c_1). \quad (3.19)$$

By Lemma 2.8, there exists a choice of the parameter  $H \in [1, (x/d)^\varpi]$  for which

$$\mathcal{D}_d \leq x^{o(1)} \left( \frac{d^\varpi}{x^\varpi} + \frac{d^{3/2}}{x^{1/2}} + \frac{d^\lambda}{x^\lambda} + \frac{d^{1/(c_1+1)}}{x^{(1-c_1)/(c_1+1)}} + \frac{d^{c_4/(c_3+1)}}{x^{c_5/(c_3+1)}} \right).$$

Using this result in (3.8) and summing over all  $d \leq D$ , we have

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(k+1)} + O(E_3),$$

where

$$E_3 := xD^{-k} + x^{1+o(1)} \left( \frac{D^\varpi}{x^\varpi} + \frac{D^{3/2}}{x^{1/2}} + \frac{D^\lambda}{x^\lambda} + \frac{D^{1/(c_1+1)}}{x^{(1-c_1)/(c_1+1)}} + \frac{D^{c_4/(c_3+1)}}{x^{c_5/(c_3+1)}} \right). \quad (3.20)$$

**3.4. Final optimizations.** In CASE 1 we combine (3.7) and (3.16), obtaining an overall error

$$E := E_0 + E_1 \ll x^{o(1)} (xD^{-1} + x^{c_1} + x^{2c_2} D^{1-c_2}).$$

Recalling the definitions of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , and taking  $D := x^{\varpi/(3+2\varpi)}$ , one has

$$E \ll x^{o(1)} (x^{(3+\varpi)/(3+2\varpi)} + x^{1/(1+\varpi)}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Since

$$\frac{3+\varpi}{3+2\varpi} > \frac{1}{1+\varpi} \quad (0 < \varpi < 1),$$

the second term can be dropped, and thus

$$E \ll x^{(3+\varpi)/(3+2\varpi)+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty). \quad (3.21)$$

Letting  $\varpi$  approach  $\tau^{-1}$ , Theorem 1.1 follows in this case.

In CASE 2 we use (3.7) and (3.17) for an overall error

$$E := E_0 + E_2 \ll x^{o(1)} (xD^{-1} + x^{c_1} + x^{2c_2} D^{1-c_2} + x^{1/2} D^{3/2}).$$

Applying Lemma 2.8, we see that for some choice of  $D \in [1, x]$  we have

$$E \ll x^{o(1)} \left( x^{(3+\varpi)/(3+2\varpi)} + x^{1/(1+\varpi)} + x^{4/5} \right) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Since

$$\frac{3+\varpi}{3+2\varpi} > \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1+\varpi}, \frac{4}{5} \right\} \quad (0 < \varpi < 1),$$

we again have (3.21), and we finish the proof as in CASE 1.

In CASE 3 we choose

$$D := x^{\varpi/4}.$$

By (3.7) we have

$$E_0 := x^{o(1)} \left( x^{1-\varpi/4} + x^{1/(1+\varpi)} + x^{(8-\varpi)/(8+4\varpi)} \right) \ll x^{1-\varpi/4+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Turning to the error term  $E_3$  given by (3.20), we begin by noting that

$$xD^{-k} \leq xD^{-1} \leq x^{1-\varpi/4}. \quad (3.22)$$

Since  $D < x^{1/4}$  we also have

$$\frac{D^\varpi}{x^\varpi} + \frac{D^{3/2}}{x^{1/2}} + \frac{D^\lambda}{x^\lambda} \leq x^{-3\varpi/4} + x^{-1/8} + x^{-3\lambda/4}. \quad (3.23)$$

Next, as  $1 - c_1 \in (\frac{1}{2}\varpi, \varpi)$  and  $1 + c_1 \in (1, 2)$ , we also have

$$\frac{D^{1/(c_1+1)}}{x^{(1-c_1)/(c_1+1)}} \leq \left( \frac{D}{x^{1-c_1}} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left( \frac{D}{x^{\varpi/2}} \right)^{1/2} \leq x^{-\varpi/8}. \quad (3.24)$$

Finally, recalling (3.18) and (3.19), we see that

$$c_3 < 1, \quad c_4 \leq \lambda m = \frac{1}{m-1} \leq \frac{3}{2m}, \quad c_5 = \frac{1-c_1}{m} = \frac{\varpi}{m(1+\varpi)} \geq \frac{\varpi}{2m},$$

and therefore

$$\frac{D^{c_4/(c_3+1)}}{x^{c_5/(c_3+1)}} \leq \left( \frac{D^{c_4}}{x^{c_5}} \right)^{1/2} \leq \left( \frac{D^{3/(2m)}}{x^{\varpi/(2m)}} \right)^{1/2} = x^{-\varpi/(16m)}. \quad (3.25)$$

Collecting the bounds (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), and (3.25), and substituting into (3.20), we find that

$$E_3 \ll x^{1-\frac{1}{16} \min\{\varpi/m, \lambda\} + o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Taking into account the above bound on  $E_0$ , we see that the overall error is

$$E := E_0 + E_3 \ll x^{1-\frac{1}{16} \min\{\varpi/m, \lambda\} + o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Letting  $\varpi$  approach  $\tau^{-1}$ , Theorem 1.1 follows in this case, and we are done.

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

**4.1. Outline.** We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, however we now use Lemma 2.2 instead of Lemma 2.1 and the bound (2.3) instead of (2.2). We continue to use the notation introduced earlier, and since our arguments are essentially the same, we focus only the needed adjustments.

Note that we can assume  $\tau_\star < (m_k^2 - m_k + 2)^{-1}$  since the statement of the theorem is trivial otherwise.

4.2. **Large  $d$ .** Let  $\varpi \in (0, \tau_\star^{-1})$  be fixed. As before, we start by considering the contribution to (3.2) coming from integers  $d \leq D$ , where  $D$  is a real parameter to be specified below. For now, we assume only that

$$D \leq (\log x)^{\varpi/m_k}. \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 2.2 shows that for all large  $Q$  (depending on  $\alpha_1$  and  $\varpi$ ) there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that

$$\left| \alpha_1 - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad (\log Q)^\varpi < q \leq Q.$$

Using this result in place of (3.11), the argument of §3.2 yields the bound

$$T(x, d) \ll x/d^2 + x^2/(d^2 Q (\log Q)^\varpi) + Q/d + x/(d (\log Q)^\varpi)$$

instead of (3.6). Choosing

$$Q := \frac{x}{d^{1/2} (\log x)^{\varpi/2}}$$

and taking into account that  $d \leq (\log x)^\varpi$  by (4.1), it follows that

$$T(x, d) \ll x/d^2,$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{D < d \leq x} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| \ll E_0 := xD^{-1}. \tag{4.2}$$

4.3. **Small  $d$  and final optimizations.** Next, we consider the contribution to (3.2) from integers  $d \leq D$ . From now on, we assume that

$$D \leq (\log x)^{(\varpi \lambda_k - 1)/(m_k \lambda_k)}, \tag{4.3}$$

where  $\lambda_k := (m_k^2 - m_k + 2)^{-1}$ ; this assumption is only slightly stronger than (4.1). As above, Lemma 2.2 shows that for all large  $Q$  (depending only on  $\alpha$  and  $\varpi$ ) and every  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  such that

$$\left| \alpha_j - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad (\log Q)^\varpi < q \leq Q. \tag{4.4}$$

LEMMA 4.1. *In the notation of §3.3, we have for each  $j$ :*

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,j} \ll \begin{cases} H(\log x)^{-\varpi} & \text{if } m_j = 1, \\ H^{\lambda_j} (\log H)^{j-1} d^{m_j \lambda_j} (\log x)^{1-\varpi \lambda_j} & \text{if } m_j \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\lambda_j := (m_j^2 - m_j + 2)^{-1}. \tag{4.5}$$

*Proof.* First, suppose that  $m_j = 1$ . For each vector  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{H}_1$  we apply Lemma 2.6 with  $N := \lfloor x/d \rfloor$  and  $h := h_1 d$ , deriving the bound

$$S_1(d, \mathbf{h}) = \sum_{n \leq x/d} \mathbf{e}(h_1 d \alpha_1 n) \ll \frac{x|h_1 d|}{dq} + q < \frac{x|h_1|}{(\log Q)^\varpi} + Q,$$

where we used (4.4) in the second step. By (3.10) we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{d,1} = \frac{d}{x} \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_1} \frac{1}{|h_1|} \left( \frac{x|h_1|}{(\log Q)^\varpi} + Q \right) \ll \frac{dH}{(\log Q)^\varpi} + \frac{dQ \log H}{x}.$$

Taking  $Q := xH(\log x)^{-1-\varpi}$  we obtain the bound for  $\mathcal{D}_{d,1}$  stated in the lemma.

Next, suppose that  $m_j \geq 2$ . For each vector  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_j$  we use the bound (2.3) of Lemma 2.4 with  $N := \lfloor x/d \rfloor$  and  $h := h_j d^{m_j}$ ; taking into account (4.4), we find that the bound

$$S_j(d, \mathbf{h}) \ll \frac{x \log x}{d} \left( \frac{|h_j| d^{m_j}}{(\log Q)^\varpi} + \frac{d}{x} + \frac{Q d_j^{m_j-1}}{x^{m_j-1}} \right)^{\lambda_j}$$

holds with  $\lambda_j$  as in (4.5). To optimize, we choose

$$Q := \frac{|h_j| d_j x^{m_j-1}}{(\log x)^\varpi},$$

which leads to the bound

$$S_j(d, \mathbf{h}) \ll \frac{x \log x}{d} \left( \frac{|h_j| d^{m_j}}{(\log x)^\varpi} \right)^{\lambda_j} = \frac{x |h_j|^{\lambda_j} d^{m_j \lambda_j - 1}}{(\log x)^{\varpi \lambda_j - 1}}.$$

Using (3.10) and (3.15), we derive the bound for  $\mathcal{D}_{d,j}$  stated in the lemma.  $\square$

We can now bound  $\mathcal{D}_d$  and estimate the overall contribution to (3.2) coming from integers  $d \leq D$ .

CASE 1: ( $k = 1$ ). By (3.9) and Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll H^{-1} + H(\log x)^{-\varpi}.$$

The bound is optimized with the choice  $H := (\log x)^{\varpi/2}$ , which gives

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll (\log x)^{-\varpi/2}.$$

Using this result in (3.8) and summing over all  $d \leq D$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O(E_1),$$

where

$$E_1 := xD^{-1} + x(\log x)^{-\varpi/2} \log D. \quad (4.6)$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.6) we obtain an overall error

$$E := E_0 + E_1 \ll xD^{-1} + (\log x)^{-\varpi/2} \log D.$$

Choosing  $D := (\log x)^{\varpi/2}$  in this case, we have

$$E \ll x(\log x)^{-\varpi/2+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Letting  $\varpi$  approach  $\tau_\star^{-1}$ , we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

CASE 2: ( $k \geq 2$ ). By (3.9) and Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll \frac{1}{H} + \frac{H}{(\log x)^\varpi} + (\log x)(\log H)^{k-1} \sum_{j=2}^k \left( \frac{H d^{m_j}}{(\log x)^\varpi} \right)^{\lambda_j},$$



where  $\lambda_j := (m_j^2 - m_j + 2)^{-1}$ . Using Lemma 2.10, we see that the terms in the preceding sum are nondecreasing as  $j$  increases provided that

$$d \leq \frac{(\log x)^{\varpi/m_k}}{H^{1/m_k}}. \quad (4.7)$$

Assuming this for the moment, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll H^{-1} + H(\log x)^{-\varpi} + \frac{H^\lambda (\log H)^{k-1} d^{m\lambda}}{(\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1}}, \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$m := m_k \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda := (m^2 - m + 2)^{-1}.$$

Note that the inequality

$$\frac{\varpi\lambda - 1}{\lambda + 1} \leq \frac{\varpi}{2}$$

implies that  $H \leq (\log x)^{\varpi/2}$ , so we can drop the second term in the bound (4.8). We set

$$H := \left( \frac{(\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1}}{d^{m\lambda}} \right)^{1/(\lambda+1)}$$

to balance the remaining terms in (4.8). Combining our assumption (4.3) with another easily verified inequality:

$$\frac{\varpi\lambda - 1}{\lambda} \leq \varpi + 1,$$

we have  $D^m \leq (\log x)^{\varpi+1}$ , and therefore

$$d^m H = (d^m (\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1})^{1/(\lambda+1)} \leq (D^m (\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1})^{1/(\lambda+1)} \leq (\log x)^\varpi;$$

this shows that the condition (4.7) is met. Putting everything together, we get that

$$\mathcal{D}_d \ll (\log x)^{o(1)} \left( \frac{d^{m\lambda}}{(\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1}} \right)^{1/(\lambda+1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Inserting this bound into (3.8) and summing over  $d \leq D$ , we find that

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(k+1)} + O(E_2),$$

where

$$E_2 = xD^{-k} + x(\log x)^{o(1)} \left( \frac{D^{m\lambda}}{(\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1}} \right)^{1/(\lambda+1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty). \quad (4.9)$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.9) yields an overall error

$$E := E_0 + E_2 \ll xD^{-1} + x(\log x)^{o(1)} \left( \frac{D^{m\lambda}}{(\log x)^{\varpi\lambda-1}} \right)^{1/(\lambda+1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

We balance this bound by taking

$$D := (\log x)^\theta, \quad \theta := \frac{\varpi\lambda - 1}{(m+1)\lambda + 1},$$

noting that our assumption holds with this choice. Letting  $\varpi$  approach  $\tau_\star^{-1}$ , we finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

5.1. **Preliminaries.** Again, we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, but rather than applying Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we simply observe that the irrationality of the components of  $\alpha$  implies that there exists a function  $\psi$ , with  $\psi(x) \leq x$  and  $\psi(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , such that for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  and  $Q > 1$  there are integers  $a$  and  $q$  for which

$$\left| \alpha_j - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{qQ}, \quad \gcd(a, q) = 1, \quad \psi(Q) < q \leq Q. \quad (5.1)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\psi(x)$  is monotonically increasing.

5.2. **Small  $d$ .** Let us fix  $D > 1$  and take  $Q = x/\psi(x)^{1/2}$ . Since  $\psi(x) \leq x$  we have  $Q \geq x^{1/2}$  and hence the monotonicity of  $\psi$  implies

$$\psi(Q) \geq \psi(x^{1/2}).$$

Then, using (5.1), instead of (3.5) we obtain that

$$T(x, d) \ll \frac{x}{d\psi(x)},$$

and instead of (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, d) &\ll x/d^2 + x^2/(d^2 Q \psi(Q)) + Q/d + x/(d\psi(Q)) \\ &\ll x/d^2 + x/(d^2 \psi(x^{1/2})) + x/(d\psi(x)^{1/2}) + x/(d\psi(x^{1/2})) \\ &\ll x/d^2 + x/(d\psi(x)^{1/2}) + x/(d\psi(x^{1/2})). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the bound

$$\sum_{D < d \leq x} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| \ll \sum_{D < d \leq x} T(x, d) \ll E_0,$$

where instead of (3.7) we can take

$$E_0 := xD^{-1} + x\psi(x)^{-1/2} \log D + x\psi(x^{1/2})^{-1} \log D.$$

5.3. **Large  $d$ .** By a well known result of Weyl on the uniformity of distribution of fractional parts of polynomials that have at least one irrational non-constant coefficient (see, for example, [7, Proposition 21.1]) for any fixed  $D$  we have

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \mu(d) \cdot |\{n \leq x/d : \nu_{d,n} \in \Omega_d\}| = \frac{x}{\zeta(k)} + O(E_*),$$

where instead of (3.16), (3.17) and (3.20), we have

$$E_* := C(D)x/\Psi(x)$$

with some constant  $C(D)$  that depends only on  $D$ , and a function  $\Psi(x)$  (depending on  $\alpha$ ) such that  $\Psi(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Taking  $D$  to be the largest integer with

$$\log D \leq \psi(x)^{1/4}, \quad \log D \leq \psi(x^{1/2})^{1/2}, \quad A(D) \leq \Psi(x)^{1/2},$$

it is clear that  $D \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and so the result follows.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the organizers of the *Number Theory Web Seminar*, <https://www.ntwebseminar.org>, whose vision, hard work, and dedication has helped to keep the spirit of mathematical exchange alive and vibrant during the midst of a pandemic. It was an enticing talk given by Robert Tichy at this seminar which motivated the present work.

We also thank Vitaly Bergelson and Florian Richter for their comments.

During the preparation of this paper, I. E. Shparlinski was supported in part by the Australian Research Council Grant DP170100786

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. C. Baker, *Diophantine inequalities*, Oxford University Press Press, Oxford, 1986.
- [2] V. Bergelson and F. K. Richter, On the density of coprime tuples of the form  $(n, \lfloor f_1(n) \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor f_k(n) \rfloor)$ , where  $f_1, \dots, f_k$  are functions from a Hardy field. *Number Theory – Diophantine Problems, Uniform Distribution and Applications*, 109–135, Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [3] M. Drmota and R. F. Tichy, *Sequences, discrepancies and applications*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1651. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [4] P. Erdős and G. G. Lorentz, On the probability that  $n$  and  $g(n)$  are relatively prime. *Acta Arith.* 5 (1959), 35–44.
- [5] T. Estermann, On the number of primitive lattice points in a parallelogram. *Canad. J. Math.* 5 (1953), 456–459.
- [6] S. W. Graham and G. Kolesnik, *van der Corput’s method of exponential sums*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [7] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [8] A. Y. Khinchin, Zur metrischen Theorie der diophantischen Approximationen. *Math. Z.* 24 (1926), no. 4, 706–714.
- [9] J. F. Koksma, Some theorems on Diophantine inequalities. *Math. Centrum Scriptum no. 5*, Amsterdam, 1950.
- [10] K. F. Roth, Rational approximations to algebraic numbers. *Mathematika* 2 (1955), 1–20.
- [11] K. F. Roth, Corrigendum to “Rational approximations to algebraic numbers”. *Mathematika* 2 (1955), 168.
- [12] I. E. Shparlinski and J. M. Thuswaldner, Weyl sums over integers with digital restrictions. *Preprint*, 2021 (available from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.04835>).
- [13] P. Szűsz, Über ein Problem der Gleichverteilung. *Comptes Rendus Premier Congrès des Mathématiciens Hongrois, 27 Août–2 Septembre 1950*, 461–472. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1952.
- [14] G. L. Watson, On integers  $n$  relatively prime to  $\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$ . *Canad. J. Math.* 5 (1953), 451–455.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA MO 65211, USA

*Email address:* [bankswd@missouri.edu](mailto:bankswd@missouri.edu)

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES, SYDNEY, NSW 2052, AUSTRALIA

*Email address:* [igor.shparlinski@unsw.edu.au](mailto:igor.shparlinski@unsw.edu.au)