Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma (6) **4** (2001), 121-131

LÁSZLÓ TÓTH (*)

On the asymptotic densities of certain subsets of $\boldsymbol{N}^k$ (**)

1 - Introduction

Let $k \geqslant 2$ be a fixed integer. What is the asymptotic density δ_k of the set of ordered k-tuples $(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in \boldsymbol{N}^k$, such that there exists no prime power p^a, $a \geqslant 1$, appearing in the canonical factorization of each n_i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$?

This problem is analogous to the following one: What is the asymptotic density d_k of the set of k-tuples which are relatively prime, i.e. k-tuples $(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in \boldsymbol{N}^k$ such that there exists no prime p, appearing in the canonical factorization of each n_i, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$?

It is known that $d_k = 1/\zeta(k)$, where ζ is the Riemann zeta function, and this value can be considered as the probability that k integers ($k \geqslant 2$) chosen at random are relatively prime. More precisely,

$$N_k(x) := \# \{(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in (\boldsymbol{N} \cap [1, x])^k : gcd(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1\} = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} x^k + R_k(x), \tag{1.1}$$

where $R_k(x) = O(x^{k-1})$ for $k > 2$, $R_2(x) = O(x \log x)$ for $k = 2$, and $d_k = \lim_{x \to \infty} N_k(x)/x^k = 1/\zeta(k)$. This result goes back to the work of J. J. SYLVESTER [**9**] and D. N. LEHMER [**3**], see also J. E. NYMANN [**5**].

There are several generalizations of (1.1) in the literature. For example, let S

(*) Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Univ. of Pécs, 7624, Ifjúság u. 6, Hungary, e-mail: ltoth@math.ttk.pte.hu.
(**) Received May 5, 2001. AMS classification 11 A 25, 11 N 37.

be an arbitrary subset of N. Then

$$(1.2)\qquad N_k(x,S) := \#\{(n_1,\dots,n_k)\in(\boldsymbol{N}\cap[1,x])^k : gcd(n_1,\dots,n_k)\in S\} = \frac{\zeta_S(k)}{\zeta(k)}x^k + T_k(x),$$

where

$$\zeta_S(k) = \sum_{\substack{n=1\\ n\in S}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^k}$$

and $T_k(x) = O(x^{k-1})$ for $k > 2$, $T_2(x) = O(x\log^2 x)$ for $k = 2$, for every $S \subseteq \boldsymbol{N}$, due to E. COHEN [**1**]. Therefore the asymptotic density of the set of ordered k-tuples $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ for which $gcd(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ belongs to S is $\lim_{x\to\infty} N_k(x,S)/x^k = \dfrac{\zeta_S(k)}{\zeta(k)}$.

J. E. NYMANN [**6**] shows that if the characteristic function ϱ_S of $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \boldsymbol{N}$ is completely multiplicative and if $\#\{n : n\in S\cap[1, x]\} = Ax + O(1)$, where A is the asymptotic density of S, then

$$(1.3)\qquad \#\{(n_1,\dots,n_k)\in(S\cap[1,x])^k : gcd(n_1,\dots,n_k) = 1\} = A^k \prod_{p\in S}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^k}\right)x^k + R_k(x),$$

where $R_k(x)$ is the same as above. Therefore, if $P_k^S(n)$ denotes the probability that k integers $(k \geqslant 2)$ chosen at random from $S\cap[1, n]$ are relatively prime, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_k^S(n) = \prod_{p\in S}\left(1-\frac{1}{p^k}\right).$$

This result can be applied for $S = \{n : gcd(n, p_1\dots p_r) = 1\}$, where $\{p_1, \dots, p_r\}$ is a given finite set of distinct primes.

Now return to the problem at the beginning. It is obvious that $\delta_k \geqslant d_k = 1/\zeta(k)$ for every $k \geqslant 2$ and thus $\lim_{k\to\infty} \delta_k = 1$. Which is the exact value of δ_k?

In order to solve this problem we use the concept of the unitary divisor. For $d, n \in \boldsymbol{N}$, d is called a unitary divisor (or block divisor) of n if $d \mid n$ and $gcd(d, n/d) = 1$, notation $d \| n$. Various other problems concerning unitary divisors, including properties of arithmetical functions and arithmetical convolutions defined by unitary divisors, have been studied extensively in the literature, see for example [4] and its bibliography. Denote the greatest common unitary divisor of $n_1, \dots, n_k$ by $gcud(n_1, \dots, n_k)$.

Our question can be reformulated in this way: What is the asymptotic density

δ_k of the set of ordered k-tuples $(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ such that $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1$, or more generally, $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in S$?

Furthermore, what is the probability that for k integers $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ chosen at random from $S \cap [1, n]$ one has $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1$?

In this paper we determine the value δ_k and deduce asymptotic formulae with error termes analogous to (1.1)-(1.3), regarding these problems. We give numerical approximations of the constants δ_k and also improve the error term of (1.2) of E. Cohen.

The treatment we use is based on the inversion functions μ_S^* and μ_S attached to the subset S. We point out that this is applicable also in case $k=1$ in order to establish asymptotics regarding the densities of certain subsets S of $\boldsymbol{N}$, generalizing in this way an often cited result of G. J. Rieger [7].

Note that the value δ_2 is given by D. Suryanarayana and M. V. Subbarao [8], Corollary 3.6.3, applying other arguments as those of the present paper.

Using the concept of regular cross-convolution, see [**11**], [**12**], it is possible to deduce more general results, including (1.1) - (1.3) and (2.1) and (2.4) of this paper. We do not go into details.

2 - Results

Let $S \subseteq \boldsymbol{N}$. We say that S is (completely) multiplicative if $1 \in S$ and its characteristic function $\varrho_S(n)$ is (completely) multiplicative. Define the function $\mu_S^*(n)$ by

$$\sum_{d \| n} \mu_S^*(d) = \varrho_S(n), \qquad n \in \boldsymbol{N},$$

that is

$$\mu_S^*(n) = \sum_{d \| n} \varrho_S(d)\, \mu^*(n/d), \qquad n \in \boldsymbol{N},$$

where the sums are extended over the unitary divisors of n and $\mu^*(n) := \mu_{\{1\}}^*(n) = (-1)^{\omega(n)}$, $\omega(n)$ denoting the number of distinct prime factors of n.

Furthermore, let $\phi(n)$ and $\theta(n)$ denote Euler's function and the number of squarefree divisors of n, respectively.

Theorem 2.1. *If $k \geq 2$ and S is an arbitrary subset of $\boldsymbol{N}$, then*

$$\#\{(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in (\boldsymbol{N} \cap [1, x])^k : gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in S\} = \delta_k(S)\, x^k + V_k(x, S), \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\delta_k(S) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_S^*(n)\,\phi^k(n)}{n^{2k}}$$

and the remainder term can be evaluated as follows:

(1) $V_k(x, S) = O(x^{k-1})$ *for* $k > 2$ *and for an arbitrary* S,

(2) $V_2(x, S) = O(x \log^4 x)$ *for an arbitrary* S,

(3) $V_2(x, S) = O(x \log^2 x)$ *for an* S *such that* $\sum_{n \in S} \frac{\theta(n)}{n} < \infty$ (*in particular for every finite* S) *and for every multiplicative* S,

(4) $V_2(x, S) = O(x)$ *for every multiplicative* S *such that* $\sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$ (*in particular if the set* $\{p : p \notin S\}$ *is finite*).

If S *is multiplicative, then*

$$\delta_k(S) = \prod_p \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^k \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ p^a \notin S}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^{ak}}\right).$$

If $S = \{1\}$, *then*

$$\delta_k := \delta_k(\{1\}) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{(p-1)^k}{p^k(p^k - 1)}\right).$$

Theorem 2.2. *If* $k \geq 2$ *and* S *is an arbitrary subset of* $\boldsymbol{N}$, *then the asymptotic densities of the sets of ordered* k*-tuples* $(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ *such that* $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in S$ *and* $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1$ *are* $\delta_k(S)$ *and* δ_k, *respectively, given in* Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.3. *Let* p_n *denote the* n*-th prime and for* $r \in \boldsymbol{N}$ *let* $N = 10^r/2$. *Then*

$$\delta_k \approx \prod_{n=1}^{N} \left(1 - \frac{(p_n - 1)^k}{p_n^k(p_n^k - 1)}\right)$$

is an approximation of δ_k *with* r *exact decimals.*

In particular, $\delta_2 \approx 0.8073$, $\delta_3 \approx 0.9637$, $\delta_4 \approx 0.9924$, $\delta_5 \approx 0.9983$, $\delta_6 \approx 0.9996$, $\delta_7 \approx 0.9999$, *with* $r = 4$ *exact decimals.*

Theorem 2.4. *For* $k = 2$ *the error term* $R_2(x)$ *of* (1.2) *can be improved into* $R(x, S)$, *where*

(i) $R(x, S) = O(x \log x)$ *for an* S *such that* $\sum_{n \in S} \frac{1}{n} < \infty$ (*in particular for every finite* S) *and for every multiplicative* S,

(ii) $R(x, S) = O(x)$ *for every multiplicative* S *such that* $\sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p} < \infty$ (*in particular if the set* $\{p : p \notin S\}$ *is finite*).

Remark. It is noted in [**1**] that if $k = 2$ and if the function $\mu_S(n)$ is bounded, cf. proof of Theorem 2.4 of the present paper, then the error term is $R_2(x) = O(x \log x)$.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that* $S \subseteq \boldsymbol{N}$ *is multiplicative and* $\min\{a : p^a \notin S\} \geqslant r \geqslant 2$ *for every prime p. Then*

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} \varrho_S(n) = d(S)x + O(\sqrt[r]{x}), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$d(S) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)\left(1 + \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ p^a \in S}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^a}\right) \tag{2.3}$$

is the asymptotic density of S.

Remark. In the special case $S =$ the set of K-void integers we reobtain from (2.2) the result of G. J. Rieger [**7**]. The K-void integers are defined as follows. Let K be a nonempty subset of $\boldsymbol{N} \setminus \{1\}$. The number n is called K-void if $n = 1$ or $n > 1$ and there is no prime power p^a, with $a \in K$, appearing in the canonical factorization of n.

Does the density exist for an arbitrary multiplicative subset S ? Yes, and it is $d(S)$ given by (2.3), where the infinite product is considered to be 0 when it diverges (if and only if $\sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$). This follows from a well-known result of E. Wirsing [**13**] concerning the mean-values of certain multiplicative functions f. A short direct proof for the case f multiplicative and $0 \leqslant f(n) \leqslant 1$ for $n \geqslant 1$, hence applicable for the characteristic function of an arbitarary multiplicative S, is given in the book of G. Tenenbaum, [**10**], p. 48.

Theorem 2.6. *Let* $k \geqslant 2$ *and suppose that S is a completely multiplicative subset of* $\boldsymbol{N}$ *such that* $\#\{n : n \in S \cap [1, x]\} = Ax + O(1)$. *Then*

$$\#\{(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in (S \cap [1, x])^k : gcud(n_1, \dots, n_k) = 1\} = A^k \beta_k(S) x^k + T_k(x), \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\beta_k(S) = \prod_{p \in S} \left(1 - \frac{(p-1)^k}{p^k(p^k-1)}\right),$$

and $T_k(x) = O(x^{k-1})$ *for* $k > 2$, $T_2(x) = O(x \log^2 x)$ *for* $k = 2$.

If $Q_k^S(n)$ *denotes the probability that for k integers* $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ *chosen at random from* $S \cap [1, n]$ *one has* $gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1$, *then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} Q_k^S(n) = \beta_k(S).$$

3 - Proofs

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Using the definition of μ_S^*, the fact that $d \| gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$ if and only if $d \| n_i$ for every $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$, which can be checked easily, and the well-known estimate

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leqslant x \\ gcd(n,\, m) = 1}} 1 = \frac{\phi(m)\, x}{m} + O(\theta(m))$$

which holds uniformly for $x \geqslant 1$ and $m \in \boldsymbol{N}$, we obtain

$$\#\{(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in (\boldsymbol{N} \cap [1, x])^k : gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in S\} = \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_k \leqslant x} \varrho_S(gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k)) =$$

$$= \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_k \leqslant x} \sum_{d \| (n_1, \ldots, n_k)} \mu_S^*(d) = \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_k \leqslant x} \sum_{d \| n_1, \ldots, d \| n_k} \mu_S^*(d) =$$

$$= \sum_{d \leqslant x} \mu_S^*(d) \sum_{\substack{a_i \leqslant x/d \\ (a_i, d) = 1 \\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k}} 1 = \sum_{d \leqslant x} \mu_S^*(d) \left(\sum_{\substack{a \leqslant x/d \\ (a, d) = 1}} 1 \right)^k$$

$$= \sum_{d \leqslant x} \mu_S^*(d) \left(\frac{x\phi(d)}{d^2} + O(\theta(d)) \right)^k = \sum_{d \leqslant x} \mu_S^*(d) \left(\frac{x^k \phi^k(d)}{d^{2k}} + O\left(\frac{x^{k-1}\theta(d)}{d^{k-1}} \right) \right)$$

$$= x^k \sum_{d \leqslant x} \frac{\mu_S^*(d)\, \phi^k(d)}{d^{2k}} + O\left(x^{k-1} \sum_{d \leqslant x} \frac{|\mu_S^*(d)|\theta(d)}{d^{k-1}} \right)$$

$$= \delta_k(S)\, x^k + O\left(x^k \sum_{d > x} \frac{|\mu_S^*(d)|}{d^k} \right) + O\left(x^{k-1} \sum_{d \leqslant x} \frac{|\mu_S^*(d)|\theta(d)}{d^{k-1}} \right).$$

The given error term yields now from the next statements:

(a)

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} \frac{\theta(n)}{n^s} = \begin{cases} O(\log^2 x), & s = 1\,, \\ O(1), & s > 1\,. \end{cases}$$

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} \frac{\theta^2(n)}{n^s} = \begin{cases} O(\log^4 x), & s = 1\,, \\ O(1), & s > 1\,, \end{cases}$$

$$\sum_{n > x} \frac{1}{n^s} = O\left(\frac{1}{x^{s-1}}\right), \qquad \sum_{n > x} \frac{\theta(n)}{n^s} = O\left(\frac{\log x}{x^{s-1}}\right), \qquad s > 1\,.$$

(b) For an arbitrary $S \subseteq \boldsymbol{N}$ and for every $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$, $|\mu_S^*(n)| \leqslant \sum_{d \| n} \varrho_S(d) \leqslant \theta(n)$, $|\mu_S^*(n)|\,\theta(n) \leqslant \sum_{d \| n} \varrho_S(d)\,\theta(d)\,\theta(n/d)$ and

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} \frac{|\mu_S^*(n)|\,\theta(n)}{n} \leqslant \sum_{d \leqslant x} \frac{\varrho_S(d)\,\theta(d)}{d} \sum_{e \leqslant x/d} \frac{\theta(e)}{e}$$

$$= O\left(\log^2 x \sum_{d \leqslant x} \frac{\varrho_S(d)\,\theta(d)}{d}\right) = \begin{cases} O(\log^2 x), & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \dfrac{\varrho_S(n)\,\theta(n)}{n} < \infty\,, \\ O(\log^4 x), & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

(c) If S is multiplicative, then μ_S^* is multiplicative too, $\mu_S^*(p^a) = \varrho_S(p^a) - 1$ for every prime power p^a $(a \geqslant 1)$ and $\mu_S^*(n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ for each $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$.

(d) Suppose S is multiplicative. Then

$$\sum_p \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu_S^*(p^a)|\,\theta(p^a)}{p^a} = 2 \sum_p \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \varrho_S(p^a)}{p^a}$$

$$\leqslant 2 \sum_p \left(\frac{1 - \varrho_S(p)}{p} + \sum_{a=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^a}\right) = 2 \sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p(p-1)} + 2 \sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p-1}$$

$$\leqslant 4\left(\sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p^2} + \sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p}\right) < \infty \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{p \notin S} \frac{1}{p} < \infty\,.$$

It follows that in this case the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \dfrac{|\mu_S^*(n)|\,\theta(n)}{n}$ is convergent.

If S is multiplicative, then the series giving $\delta_k(S)$ can be expanded into an infinite product of Euler-type.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Consider the series of positive terms

$$\sum_p \log\left(1 - \frac{(p-1)^k}{p^k(p^k-1)}\right)^{-1}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log\left(1 + \frac{(p_n-1)^k}{p_n^k(p_n^k-1)-(p_n-1)^k}\right) = -\log \delta_k,$$

where p_n denotes the n-th prime.

The N-th order error R_N of this series can be evaluated as follows:

$$R_N := \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \log\left(1 + \frac{(p_n-1)^k}{p_n^k(p_n^k-1)-(p_n-1)^k}\right) < \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{(p_n-1)^k}{p_n^k(p_n^k-1)-(p_n-1)^k}$$

$$< \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_n^k-1} \leqslant \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_n^2-1}.$$

Now using that $p_n > 2n$, valid for $n \geqslant 5$, we have

$$R_N < \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4n^2-1} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{2n-1} - \frac{1}{2n+1}\right) = \frac{1}{2(2N+1)}.$$

In order to obtain an approximation with r exact decimals we use the condition

$$\frac{1}{2(2N+1)} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\cdot 10^{-r}$$

and obtain $N \geqslant \frac{1}{2}(10^r - 1)$.

The numerical values were obtained using the software package MAPLE.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Define the function $\mu_S(n)$ by

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu_S(d) = \varrho_S(n), \qquad n \in \boldsymbol{N},$$

that is

$$\mu_S(n) = \sum_{d|n} \varrho_S(d)\,\mu(n/d), \qquad n \in \boldsymbol{N},$$

where $\mu(n) := \mu_{\{1\}}(n)$ is the Möbius function, see [**1**]. We have

$$N_k(x, S) := \#\{(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in (\boldsymbol{N} \cap [1, x])^k : gcd(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in S\}$$

$$= \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq x} \varrho_S(gcd(n_1, \ldots, n_k)) = \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_k \leq x} \sum_{d \mid (n_1, \ldots, n_k)} \mu_S(d)$$

and the proof runs parallel to the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.5

$$N_1(x, S) = \sum_{n \leq x} \varrho_S(n) = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d \mid n} \mu_S(d) = x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu_S(d)}{d} + O\Big(\sum_{d \leq x} |\mu_S(d)|\Big).$$

Here μ_S is multiplicative, $\mu_S(p^a) = \varrho_S(p^a) - \varrho_S(p^{a-1})$, $a \geq 1$ and since $p, p^2, \ldots, p^{r-1} \in S$ we have $\mu_S(p) = \mu_S(p^2) = \ldots = \mu_S(p^{r-1}) = 0$ for every prime p. Hence for each $n \in \boldsymbol{N}$, $|\mu_S(n)| \leq \varrho_{L_r}(n)$, where L_r is the set of r-full numbers, i. e. $L_r = \{1\} \cup \{n > 1 : p \mid n \Rightarrow p^r \mid n\}$. We get

$$N_1(x, S) = d(S)\, x + O\left(x \sum_{d > x} \frac{\varrho_{L_r}(d)}{d}\right) + O\Big(\sum_{d \leq x} \varrho_{L_r}(d)\Big),$$

and using the elementary estimate

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \varrho_{L_r}(n) = C\sqrt[r]{x} + O(\sqrt[r+1]{x}),$$

where C is a positive constant, due to P. ERDÖS and G. SZEKERES [**2**], obtain the given result.

Proof of Theorem 2.6

$$\#\{(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in (S \cap [1, x])^k : gcud(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = 1\}$$

$$= \sum_{n_1 \leq x} \varrho_S(n_1) \ldots \sum_{n_k \leq x} \varrho_S(n_k) \sum_{d \| (n_1, \ldots, n_k)} \mu^*(d) = \sum_{n_1 \leq x} \varrho_S(n_1) \ldots \sum_{n_k \leq x} \varrho_S(n_k) \sum_{d \| n_1, \ldots, d \| n_k} \mu^*(d)$$

$$= \sum_{d \leq x} \mu^*(d) \sum_{\substack{a_1 \leq x/d \\ (a_1, d) = 1}} \varrho_S(da_1) \ldots \sum_{\substack{a_k \leq x/d \\ (a_k, d) = 1}} \varrho_S(da_k)$$

$$= \sum_{d \leq x} \varrho_S(d)\, \mu^*(d) \left(\sum_{\substack{a \leq x/d \\ (a, d) = 1}} \varrho_S(a) \right)^k .$$

Here we use the estimate, valid for every $l \in \boldsymbol{N}$,

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leqslant x \\ gcd(n,\, l)=1}} \varrho_S(n) = \sum_{n \leqslant x} \varrho_S(n) \sum_{d \mid gcd(n,\, l)} \mu(d)$$

$$= \sum_{d \mid l} \mu(d)\, \varrho_S(d) \sum_{e \leqslant x/d} \varrho_S(e) = \sum_{d \mid l} \mu(d)\, \varrho_S(d) \left(A \frac{x}{d} + O(1) \right)$$

$$= Ax \prod_{\substack{p \mid l \\ p \in S}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) + O(\theta(l))$$

and obtain the desired result, see the proof of Theorem 2.1.

References

[1] E. COHEN, *Arithmetical functions associated with arbitrary sets of integers*, Acta Arith. **5** (1959), 407-415.

[2] P. ERDÖS and G. SZEKERES, *Über die Anzahl der Abelschen Gruppen gegebener Ordnung und über ein verwandtes zahlentheoretisches Problem*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **7** (1935), 95-102.

[3] D. N. LEHMER, *An asymptotic evaluation of certain totient sums*, Amer. J. Math. **22** (1900), 293-355.

[4] P. J. MCCARTHY, *Introduction to arithmetical functions*, Springer Verlag, New York - Berlin - Heidelberg - Tokyo 1986.

[5] J. E. NYMANN, *On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime*, J. Number Theory **4** (1972), 469-473.

[6] J. E. NYMANN, *On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime, II.*, J. Number Theory **7** (1975), 406-412.

[7] G. J. RIEGER, *Einige Verteilungsfragen mit K-leeren Zahlen, r-Zahlen und Primzahlen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **262/263** (1973), 189-193.

[8] D. SURYANARAYANA and M. V. SUBBARAO, *Arithmetical functions associated with the bi-unitary k-ary divisors of an integer*, Indian J. Math. **22** (1980), 281-298.

[9] J. J. SYLVESTER, *The collected mathematical papers of James Joseph Sylvester, vol. III.*, Cambridge Univ. Press, London - New York 1909.

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

[11] L. TÓTH, *Asymptotic formulae concerning arithmetical functions defined by cross-convolutions, I. Divisor-sum functions and Euler-type functions*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **50** (1997), 159-176.

[12] L. TÓTH, *Asymptotic formulae concerning arithmetical functions defined by cross-convolutions, VIII. On the product and the quotient of* $\sigma_{A,s}$ *and* $\phi_{A,s}$, Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma (6) **2** (1999), 199-206.

[13] E. WIRSING, *Das aymptotische Verhalten von Summen über multiplikative Funktionen, II.*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **18** (1967), 411-467.

Abstract

We determine the asymptotic density δ_k *of the set of ordered k-tuples* $(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in \boldsymbol{N}^k$, $k \geq 2$, *such that there exists no prime power* p^a, $a \geq 1$, *appearing in the canonical factorization of each* n_i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, *and deduce asymptotic formulae with error terms regarding this problem and analogous ones. We give numerical approximations of the constants* δ_k *and improve the error term of formula* (1.2) *due to E. Cohen. We point out that our treatment, based on certain inversion functions, is applicable also in case* $k = 1$ *in order to establish asymptotic formulae with error terms regarding the densities of subsets of* $\boldsymbol{N}$ *with additional multiplicative properties. These generalize an often cited result of G. J. Rieger.*

* * *