

Distribution of monomial-prime numbers and Mertens sum evaluations

Lin Feng^a, Huixi Li^a, Biao Wang^{b,*}

^a*School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300071, PR China*

^b*Hua Loo-Keng Center for Mathematical Sciences, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, PR China*

Abstract

In this paper, we mainly study the monomial-prime numbers, which are of the form pn^k for primes p and integers $k \geq 2$. First, we give an asymptotic estimate on the number of numbers of a general form $pf(n)$ for arithmetic functions f satisfying certain growth conditions, which generalizes Bhat's recent result on the Square-Prime Numbers. Then, we prove three Mertens-type theorems related to numbers of a more general form, partially extending the recent work of Qi-Hu, Popa and Tenenbaum on the Mertens sum evaluations. At the end, we evaluate the average and variance of the number of distinct monomial-prime factors of positive integers by applying our Mertens-type theorems.

Keywords: Monomial-Prime Number, Mertens Theorem, Prime Number Theorem, Zeta Function

2020 MSC: 11N25, 11N37, 11N80

1. Introduction and statement of main results

The distribution of integers with certain constraints is a fundamental topic in analytic number theory. Recently, Bhat [3] studied the numbers of the form pn^2 , which are named Square-Prime (SP) Numbers, for integers $n > 1$ and primes p . He showed that the number of SP Numbers up to x is asymptotic to $(\zeta(2) - 1)x/\log x$, where $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/n^s$ ($s > 1$)

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: fenglin@mail.nankai.edu.cn (Lin Feng), lihuixi@nankai.edu.cn (Huixi Li), wangbiao@amss.ac.cn (Biao Wang)

6 is the Riemann zeta function. In this paper, we study the numbers of a general form $pf(n)$
7 for certain primes p and arithmetic functions $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. If $f(n) = n^s$ is a monomial for
8 some positive real number $s > 1$, we call pn^s a *monomial-prime number* of power s . Our
9 first result gives an asymptotic formula for the number of monomial-prime numbers.

Theorem 1.1. *Let S be a set of primes satisfying the following asymptotic estimate*

$$\sum_{p \leq x, p \in S} 1 = \frac{cx^\gamma}{\log^\alpha(x)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log^\beta(x)}\right) \right)$$

for some positive constants c, α, β , and $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ be an increasing
positive sequence satisfying $\sum_{f(n) \geq x} 1/f^\gamma(n) \ll x^{-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then as $x \rightarrow \infty$ we
have

$$\#\{(p, n) : pf(n) \leq x, p \in S\} \sim \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f^\gamma(n)} \right) \cdot \frac{cx^\gamma}{\log^\alpha(x)}.$$

In particular, for any real number $s > 1$ we have

$$\#\{(p, n) : pn^s \leq x, p \text{ prime}\} \sim \zeta(s) \cdot \frac{x}{\log x}. \quad (1)$$

Remark 1. For $s = 1$ in (1), Bănescu and Popa proved in [4, Proposition 5(ii)] that

$$\#\{(p, n) : pn \leq x, p \text{ prime}\} \sim x \log \log x.$$

10 Theorem 1.1 builds a connection between the density of sets of primes and the asymptotic
11 behavior on numbers of the form $pf(n)$. We see that the asymptotic behavior of monomial-
12 prime numbers differs from that of prime numbers by the special value $\zeta(s)$ of the Riemann
13 zeta function as a factor. Several common examples of S will be given in section 2.1 in-
14 cluding primes in arithmetic progressions, in the Chebatorev density theorem, in the Beatty
15 sequences, in the Piatetski-Shapiro sequences, and with preassigned digits. If we take S to
16 be the set of all primes and $f(n) = n^2$, then Bhat's asymptotic formula on the number of SP
17 Numbers is recovered from Theorem 1.1 by the prime number theorem. Moreover, analogous
18 to the SP Numbers, we call pn^3 a Cube-Prime (CP) Number¹ for $n > 1$. Taking $f(n) = n^3$,
19 we get the following asymptotic formula on the number of CP Numbers.

¹Here we require $n > 1$ for CP Numbers to agree with the SP Numbers defined by Bhat. But $n = 1$ is allowed for monomial-prime numbers defined in this paper.

20 **Corollary 1.** *The number of CP Numbers smaller than x is asymptotic to $(\zeta(3) - 1)x/\log x$.*

21 In [3, Theorem 6.1] Bhat also gave an asymptotic estimate on the number of SP Numbers
 22 ending in 1. As another application of Theorem 1.1, we get the following asymptotic estimate
 23 on the number of CP Numbers ending in 1 as well.

Corollary 2. *The number of CP Numbers ending in 1 is asymptotic to*

$$\frac{x}{4000 \log x} \left(\zeta \left(3, \frac{1}{10} \right) + \zeta \left(3, \frac{3}{10} \right) + \zeta \left(3, \frac{7}{10} \right) + \zeta \left(3, \frac{9}{10} \right) - 1000 \right), \quad (2)$$

24 where $\zeta(s, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 1/(n+t)^s$ is the Hurwitz zeta function.

25 *Remark 2.* The asymptotic estimates of CP Numbers ending in 3, 7, and 9 respectively are
 26 the same as that ending in 1. Similarly, one can count the number of CP Numbers ending
 27 in 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8 in the same way as the case ending in 1, but the asymptotic estimates
 28 will be slightly different.

Next, we evaluate some sums and products of Mertens type for monomial-prime numbers. Recall that Mertens' theorems are three results related to the reciprocals of primes (e.g., see [17, Chapter I .1]), which are stated as follows:

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log x + O(1) \quad (\text{Mertens' first theorem}), \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log x + M + O \left(\frac{1}{\log x} \right) \quad (\text{Mertens' second theorem}), \quad (4)$$

$$\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) = \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 + O \left(\frac{1}{\log x} \right) \right) \quad (\text{Mertens' third theorem}), \quad (5)$$

29 where M is the Mertens' constant and γ is the Euler's constant.

Generalizations of Mertens' theorems have been widely studied in many literatures. With respect to the Mertens' first theorem, Qi and Hu [16] evaluated the following sum

$$\sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k \leq x} \frac{\log^s(p_1 \cdots p_k)}{p_1 \cdots p_k}$$

for positive integers k and s . By their result, for $s = 1$ there is a polynomial $F(X)$ of degree $k - 1$ such that

$$\sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k \leq x} \frac{\log(p_1 \cdots p_k)}{p_1 \cdots p_k} = F(\log \log x) \log x + O((\log \log x)^k). \quad (6)$$

30 See Lemma 2.1 in Section 2.2 for the explicit description of $F(X)$. In particular, when $k = 2$,
 31 one may take $F(X) = 2X + 2M - 2$, see [5, Theorem 3.3] as well.

With respect to the Mertens' second theorem, if we let

$$S_k(x) := \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k \leq x} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k},$$

where p_j denotes a prime number, then Mertens' second theorem evaluates $S_1(x)$. In [13, 14], Popa proved asymptotic estimates for $S_2(x)$ and $S_3(x)$ respectively. In 2017, Tenenbaum [18, 19] showed the following asymptotic formula for general $S_k(x)$ using the Selberg-Delange method: for $k \geq 1$, we have

$$S_k(x) = P_k(\log \log x) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^{k-1}}{\log x}\right) \quad (x \geq 3), \quad (7)$$

where $P_k(X) := \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} \lambda_{j,k} X^j$ and

$$\lambda_{j,k} := \sum_{0 \leq m \leq k-j} \binom{k}{m, j, k-m-j} (M - \gamma)^{k-m-j} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma}\right)^{(m)}(1) \quad (0 \leq j \leq k).$$

32 Here M is the Mertens' constant and γ is the Euler's constant as in Mertens' third theorem,
 33 $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma function, and $(1/\Gamma)^{(m)}$ is the m -th derivative of $1/\Gamma$. We remark that
 34 recently Qi and Hu [16] proved another formula for (7) and Bayless et al. [2] showed these
 35 two formulas are equivalent to each other.

36 Our second main result is the following theorem of Mertens type for the numbers of more
 37 general form $p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)$ for some arithmetic functions f_i and integers $k, r \geq 1$,
 38 $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let k and r be two positive integers. Let $F(X)$ and $P_k(X)$ be the same polynomials as in (6) and (7) respectively. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, let $f_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ be an increasing positive function satisfying $\sum_{f_i(n) \geq x} 1/f_i(n) \ll x^{-\delta_i}$ for some $\delta_i > 0$. Then we have*

$$(I) : \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{\log(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \quad (8)$$

$$= \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)} \right) F(\log \log x) \log x + O((\log \log x)^k);$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(II)} : \quad & \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\
& = \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)} \right) P_k(\log \log x) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^k}{\log x}\right);
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(III)} : \quad & \prod_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \right) \\
& = e^{-\left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)}\right) P_k(\log \log x) + c(k, f_1, \dots, f_r)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^{k-1}}{\log x}\right) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

39 Here the constant $c(k, f_1, \dots, f_r)$ in (10) depends on k and the functions f_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$, only.

40 Taking $k = r$ and $f_i(n) = n^{s_i}$ for any positive real number $s_i > 1$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, we get the
41 following result of Mertens type for the products of k monomial-prime numbers.

Corollary 3. *Let $s_1 > 1, \dots, s_k > 1$ be k positive real numbers. Let $F(X)$ and $P_k(X)$ be as in Theorem 1.2. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(I)'} : \quad & \sum_{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k} \leq x} \frac{\log(p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k})}{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k}} \\
& = \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \zeta(s_i) \right) F(\log \log x) \log x + O((\log \log x)^k);
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\text{(II)'} : \quad \sum_{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k} \leq x} \frac{1}{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k}} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \zeta(s_i) \right) P_k(\log \log x) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^k}{\log x}\right); \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(III)'} : \quad & \prod_{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k} \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_1 n_1^{s_1} \cdots p_k n_k^{s_k}} \right) \\
& = e^{-\left(\prod_{i=1}^k \zeta(s_i)\right) P_k(\log \log x) + c(k, s_1, \dots, s_k)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^k}{\log x}\right) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

42 Here the constant $c(k, s_1, \dots, s_k)$ in (13) depends on the constants k, s_1, \dots, s_k .

Remark 3. On Mertens' first theorem, notice that in the case $k = 1$ the error term in (3) is better than that in (6). Due to this observation, the following result gives a more precise estimate than (11) for $k = 1$: let $s > 1$ be a positive number, then

$$\sum_{pn^s \leq x} \frac{\log(pn^s)}{pn^s} = \zeta(s) \log x - s\zeta'(s) \log \log x + O(1). \tag{14}$$

43 *Remark 4.* There are other generalizations of Mertens type theorems too. For example,
 44 Garcia and Lee [7] recently obtained unconditional and effective number-field analogues
 45 of the three Mertens' theorems. In [12], Lichtman proved an asymptotic formula for the
 46 dissecting sum of reciprocals of numbers with exactly k prime divisors, $k \geq 1$. We leave the
 47 monomial-prime analogues of these results to the interested readers.

48 Finally, we apply (12) in Corollary 3 to compute the average and variance of the number
 49 of distinct monomial-prime factors of integers. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Let $\omega_k(n)$ be the
 50 number of distinct monomial-prime factors of n of power k . That is, $\omega_k(n) = \sum_{pm^k|n} 1$.

Theorem 1.3. *We have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k(n) = \zeta(k)x \log \log x + \zeta(k)Mx + O\left(\frac{x \log \log x}{\log x}\right), \quad (15)$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} (\omega_k(n) - \zeta(k) \log \log x)^2 = \frac{\zeta^3(k) - \zeta^2(k)\zeta(2k)}{\zeta(2k)} x (\log \log x)^2 + O(x \log \log x), \quad (16)$$

51 where M is the Mertens' constant.

Remark 5. Recall $\omega(n)$ is the arithmetic function that counts the number of distinct prime factors of n , then one may view $\omega_k(n)$ as an analogue of $\omega(n)$. Although $\omega_k(n)$ is not a multiplicative function as $\omega(n)$ is, some properties of $\omega(n)$ still hold with respect to $\omega_k(n)$. For example, let $k = 2$, if there are infinitely many natural numbers n such that $\omega(n) = \omega(n+2) = 1$ or $\omega_2(n) = \omega_2(n+2) = 1$, then both of them would imply the famous twin prime conjecture is true, which is still far from reach now. We do have some results on $\omega(n)$ and $\omega(n+2)$, as well as $\omega_2(n)$ and $\omega_2(n+2)$, taking the same values. For example, it follows by [8, Theorem 5] that there are infinitely many integers n such that $\omega(n) = \omega(n+2) = 5$ and $\omega_2(n) = \omega_2(n+2) = 9$. Also, one may think of $\omega(n)$ as the limit of $\omega_k(n)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1.3, we recover the following estimates on $\omega(n)$ (e.g., see [6, Theorems 3.1.1 and 3.1.2]):

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \omega(n) = x \log \log x + Mx + O\left(\frac{x \log \log x}{\log x}\right)$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} (\omega(n) - \log \log x)^2 = O(x \log \log x).$$

52 This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some interesting examples
53 of sets of prime numbers and some technical theorems and lemmas that will be applied later.
54 In Section 3 we first use the key technical tool, Lemma 2.2, to prove Theorem 1.1, and then
55 we apply Theorem 1.1 to prove Corollary 2. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.2 and Equa-
56 tion (14) by Lemma 2.2. In Section 5 we compute the average and variance of $\omega_k(n)$ in
57 Theorem 1.3 by applying (12) in Corollary 3 and Lemma 2.5.

58 **Notation.** The letters p, q, p_1, \dots , and p_k always denote primes. We write $f(x) =$
59 $O(g(x))$ or $f(x) \ll g(x)$ if there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(x)| \leq C|g(x)|$ for
60 all x . The implied constant C may depend on some parameters, say k, m , or ε . We write
61 $f(x) \sim g(x)$ if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)/g(x) = 1$. As usual $[a, b]$ is the least common multiple of a and
62 b , (a, b) is the greatest common divisor of a and b , and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the floor function.

63 2. Nuts and bolts

64 In this section, we list some examples of interesting sets of prime numbers, state a theorem
65 on Mertens sums, and prove some lemmas that will be used in the proofs of main results.
66 In particular, Lemma 2.2 is the key technical tool to be frequently used in the following
67 sections.

68 2.1. Examples of subsets of primes

69 Let \mathcal{P} be the set of all primes. Let S be a subset of primes and let $\pi_S(x) = \{p \in S : p \leq x\}$
70 be the number of primes in S up to x . The following list gives several common interesting
71 examples of S in the literature. The asymptotic estimates on $\pi_S(x)$ satisfy the assumptions
72 in Theorem 1.1.

1. Arithmetic progressions. Let $q \geq 2$ and $1 \leq a < q$ be two integers with $(a, q) = 1$.
Let $S = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \equiv a \pmod{q}\}$, then by the prime number theorem in arithmetic

progressions (e.g., see [17, Theorem II .4.1]), we have

$$\pi_S(x) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \frac{x}{\log x} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right) \right).$$

2. Chebotarev density theorem. Let K/\mathbb{Q} be a finite Galois extension with Galois group $G = \text{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$. For any conjugacy class $C \subset G$, let

$$S_C = \left\{ p \in \mathcal{P} : p \text{ unramified, } \left[\frac{K/\mathbb{Q}}{p} \right] = C \right\},$$

where $\left[\frac{K/\mathbb{Q}}{p} \right]$ is the conjugacy class of Artin symbols with respect to an unramified prime p . Then by effective versions of the Chebotarev density theorem from Lagarias and Odlyzko [11, Theorems 1.3 and 1.4], we have

$$\pi_{S_C}(x) = \frac{|C|}{|G|} \frac{x}{\log x} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right) \right).$$

3. Beatty sequences. Let α be positive and irrational of finite type. Let

$$S_\alpha = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then by the prime number theorem for Beatty sequences [1, Corollary 5.5], we have

$$\pi_{S_\alpha}(x) = \frac{x}{\alpha \log x} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right) \right).$$

4. Piatetski-Shapiro primes. Let $c \geq 1$ be positive and set

$$S_c := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p = \lfloor n^c \rfloor \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Then by Piatetski-Shapiro's work [15], we have

$$\pi_{S_c}(x) = \frac{x^{1/c}}{\log x} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right) \right)$$

73 for $c \in [1, 12/11)$.

5. Primes with preassigned digits. Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer and $A_q = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$. For integers $n \geq 0$ and $j \geq 0$, let $a_j(n) \in A_q$ be defined by $n = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(n)q^j$. Let

$b \geq 1$ be an integer with q -ary expansion $b = \sum_{j=0}^r b_j q^j$ with $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_r \in A_q$ and $(b_0, q) = 1$. For a sequence of indexes $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_r$, we take

$$S_b := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : a_0(p) = b_0, a_{l_j}(p) = b_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq r\}.$$

Then by [10, Theorem 1], for $q^N < x < q^{N+1}$, $N \geq 1$, $0 \leq r < \sqrt{N}$, $1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_r \leq N$, we have

$$\pi_{S_b}(x) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)q^r} \frac{x}{\log x} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right) \right).$$

74 2.2. Multiple Mertens evaluations

Suppose $\{a_n\}$ is a sequence related to the Riemann zeta function, that is,

$$a_2 = -\zeta(2), a_3 = 2\zeta(3), a_4 = 3\zeta(2)^2 - 6\zeta(4),$$

$$a_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-3} (-1)^i C_{k-1}^i i! \zeta(i+1) a_{k-1-i} + (-1)^{k-1} (k-1)! \zeta(k) \quad (k > 4),$$

and $C_k^l = \binom{k}{l}$. Then we set a series of polynomials $\{Q_i(y) : i \geq 0\}$:

$$Q_0(y) = 1, Q_1(y) = y + M,$$

$$Q_k(y) = (y + M)^k + \sum_{m=2}^k C_k^m a_m (y + M)^{k-m} \quad (k \geq 2),$$

75 where M is Mertens' constant.

76 Now, we state a theorem about multiple Mertens evaluations by Qi and Hu.

Lemma 2.1 ([16, Theorem 1.1]). *For any positive integers k and s , the following evaluation holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k \leq x} \frac{\log^s(p_1 \cdots p_k)}{p_1 \cdots p_k} &= \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^l \frac{A_k^{l+1}}{s^{l+1}} Q_{k-1-l}(\log \log x) \cdot \log^s(x) + f(2) \log^{s-1}(2) \\ &\quad + O(\log^{s-1}(x) \cdot (\log \log x)^k), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^l A_k^{l+1} Q_{k-1-l}(\log \log x) \cdot \log x,$$

77 and the combinatorial number $A_k^l = \binom{k}{l} \cdot l!$.

78 In (6), one may take $F(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (-1)^i A_k^{i+1} Q_{k-1-i}(X)$.

79 2.3. Some lemmas

80 Now we establish some lemmas that will be used in the proofs of our main results. In
 81 particular, in Lemma 2.2, A and B are two expressions on some variables. For example, we
 82 may take $A = p_1 \cdots p_k$, then p_1, \dots, p_k are variables in this expression. If we take $B = [a^k, b^k]$
 83 or $f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)$, then a and b or n_1, \dots, n_r are variables in B . In our applications, the
 84 variables of A and B are easy to see from their explicit expressions related to the summations.

Lemma 2.2. *Let A and B be two expressions. Let $g(A)$ be a nonnegative function on A and $h(B)$ a nonnegative function on B . Suppose that $g(A)$ has the following asymptotic estimate:*

$$\sum_{A \leq x} g(A) = x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x)}\right) \right)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\gamma \geq 0$. Here $P(x, y) = \sum_{u, v \in \mathbb{R}} c_{u, v} x^u y^v$ is a finite sum of some monomials of two variables. If $h(B)$ satisfies $\sum_B h(B)/B^\gamma < \infty$ with the following decaying rate

$$\sum_{B \geq x} \frac{h(B)}{B^\gamma} \ll x^{-\delta}$$

for some $\delta > 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{AB \leq x} g(A)h(B) = \left(\sum_B \frac{h(B)}{B^\gamma} \right) x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x)}\right) \right). \quad (17)$$

85 If $P(\log \log x, \log x)$ has no $\log x$ term, then the error term $O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right)$ in (17) can be replaced
 86 by $O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right)$.

Proof. Let $\ell \geq \max\{\delta^{-1}, \delta^{-1}\alpha\}$. We break the double summations up into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{AB \leq x} g(A)h(B) &= \sum_{B \leq \log^\ell(x)} h(B) \sum_{A \leq x/B} g(A) + \sum_{B > \log^\ell(x)} h(B) \sum_{A \leq x/B} g(A) \\ &:= S_1 + S_2. \end{aligned}$$

In S_1 , we have $B \leq \log^\ell(x)$, which implies $\log(x/B) = \log x (1 + O(\log \log x / \log x))$ and $\log \log(x/B) = \log \log x (1 + O(1/\log x))$. Since $\log^v(x/B) = \log^v(x) (1 + O_{v, \ell}(\log \log x / \log x))$

and $(\log \log(x/B))^u = (\log \log x)^u (1 + O_{u,\ell}(1/\log x))$ for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows that

$$P(\log \log(x/B), \log(x/B)) = P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right)\right). \quad (18)$$

By (18) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{B \leq \log^\ell(x)} h(B)(x/B)^\gamma P(\log \log(x/B), \log(x/B)) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log(x/B))^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x/B)}\right)\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{B \leq \log^\ell(x)} \frac{h(B)}{B^\gamma}\right) x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right)\right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x)}\right)\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_B \frac{h(B)}{B^\gamma} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log^{\delta\ell}(x)}\right)\right) x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x)}\right)\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_B \frac{h(B)}{B^\gamma}\right) x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^\beta}{\log^\alpha(x)}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

For S_2 , we have

$$S_2 \leq \sum_{B > \log^\ell(x)} h(B) \sum_{A \leq x} g(A) \ll \frac{x^\gamma P(\log \log x, \log x)}{\log^{\delta\ell}(x)}.$$

87 Combining the estimates above for S_1 and S_2 completes the proof. □

88 Next we prove two lemmas on Mertens-type sums.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $r \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $f : \mathbb{N}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be a function satisfying $\#\{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r : f(n_1, \dots, n_r) \leq a\}$ is finite for any $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and*

$$\sum_{f(n_1, \dots, n_r) \geq x} \frac{1}{f(n_1, \dots, n_r)} \ll x^{-\delta}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Then we have

$$\sum_{n_1=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{n_r=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log^s(f(n_1, \dots, n_r))}{f(n_1, \dots, n_r)^{1-\eta}} < +\infty$$

for any $0 \leq \eta < \delta$ and $s \geq 0$. Furthermore, for any $0 \leq \eta < \delta$ and $s \geq 0$, we have

$$\sum_{f(n_1, \dots, n_r) \geq x} \frac{\log^s(f(n_1, \dots, n_r))}{f(n_1, \dots, n_r)^{1-\eta}} \ll x^{\eta-\delta} \log^s(x). \quad (19)$$

Proof. By our assumptions on f , it suffices to prove (19). We write $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$. Since $\sum_{f(\mathbf{n}) \geq x} 1/f(\mathbf{n}) = O(x^{-\delta})$, we have

$$\sum_{x \leq f(\mathbf{n}) < 2x} \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{n})} = O(x^{-\delta}).$$

This implies that $\#\{\mathbf{n} : x \leq f(\mathbf{n}) < 2x\} = O(x^{1-\delta})$ and $\delta \leq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f(n_1, \dots, n_r) \geq x} \frac{\log^s(f(n_1, \dots, n_r))}{f(n_1, \dots, n_r)^{1-\eta}} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{2^k x \leq f(\mathbf{n}) < 2^{k+1} x} \frac{\log^s(f(\mathbf{n}))}{f(\mathbf{n})^{1-\eta}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\log^s(2^{k+1}x)}{(2^k x)^{1-\eta}} \sum_{2^k x \leq f(\mathbf{n}) < 2^{k+1} x} 1 \\ &\ll \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\log^s(2^{k+1}x)}{(2^k x)^{1-\eta}} \cdot (2^k x)^{1-\delta} \\ &= x^{\eta-\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\log^s(2^{k+1}x)}{2^{k(\delta-\eta)}} \\ &\ll x^{\eta-\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\log(2^{k+1}) \log x)^s}{2^{k(\delta-\eta)}} \\ &\ll x^{\eta-\delta} \log^s(x), \end{aligned}$$

89 which completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $f_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ be an increasing positive sequence satisfying $\sum_{f_i(n) \geq x} 1/f_i(n) \ll x^{-\delta_i}$ for some $\delta_i > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \geq x} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \ll x^{-\delta} \tag{20}$$

90 for some $\delta > 0$.

Proof. Indeed, notice that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/f_i(n) < \infty$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \geq x^r} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \geq x^r \\ f_1(n_1) \cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1}) \geq x^{r-1}}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} + \sum_{\substack{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \geq x^r \\ f_1(n_1) \cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1}) < x^{r-1}}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})\geq x^{r-1}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_r(n_r)} + \sum_{f_r(n_r)\geq x} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_r(n_r)} \\
&= \left(\sum_{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})\geq x^{r-1}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})} \right) \left(\sum_{n_r} \frac{1}{f_r(n_r)} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{n_1, \dots, n_{r-1}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})} \right) \left(\sum_{f_r(n_r)\geq x} \frac{1}{f_r(n_r)} \right) \\
&\ll \sum_{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})\geq x^{r-1}} \frac{1}{f_1(n_1)\cdots f_{r-1}(n_{r-1})} + x^{-\delta_r} \\
&\ll x^{-\delta_1} + \cdots + x^{-\delta_r},
\end{aligned}$$

91 where the last line above holds by induction on r . Thus, we may take $\delta = r^{-1} \min \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_r\}$
92 for (20). This completes the proof. \square

93 The following two lemmas will be applied in the study of the average and variance of
94 $\omega_k(x)$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Then we have*

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} = \frac{\zeta^3(k)}{\zeta(2k)}. \tag{21}$$

Proof. Set $d = (a, b)$, $a = da'$, $b = db'$, then we get $[a^k, b^k] = d^k a'^k b'^k$. It follows that

$$\sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{a'=1 \\ (a', b')=1}}^{\infty} \sum_{b'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{d^k a'^k b'^k} = \zeta(k) \sum_{\substack{a'=1 \\ (a', b')=1}}^{\infty} \sum_{b'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a'^k b'^k}. \tag{22}$$

Now, we compute the square of $\zeta(k)$ as follows:

$$\zeta^2(k) = \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a^k b^k} = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{a'=1 \\ (a', b')=1}}^{\infty} \sum_{b'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{d^{2k} a'^k b'^k} = \zeta(2k) \sum_{\substack{a'=1 \\ (a', b')=1}}^{\infty} \sum_{b'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a'^k b'^k}.$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{a'=1 \\ (a', b')=1}}^{\infty} \sum_{b'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a'^k b'^k} = \frac{\zeta^2(k)}{\zeta(2k)}. \tag{23}$$

95 Then (21) follows by plugging (23) into (22). \square

96

For the tail of the double series in (21) we have the following bound.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{[a^k, b^k] \geq x} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} = O\left(x^{-1+\frac{1}{k}+\varepsilon}\right).$$

Proof. By [9, (1.81)], we have $\tau_3(n) \ll n^\varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\sum_{[a^k, b^k] \geq x} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} = \sum_{l^k \geq x, [a^k, b^k] = l^k} \frac{1}{l^k} \ll \sum_{l^k \geq x} \frac{\tau_3(l)}{l^k} \ll \sum_{l \geq x^{1/k}} \frac{l^\varepsilon}{l^k} \ll x^{-1+\frac{1}{k}+\varepsilon}.$$

97

□

98 3. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 2

99

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 2. Indeed, if we take $A = p$, $B = f(n)$,

100

$g(A) = 1_S(p)$, and $h(B) = 1$ in Lemma 2.2, where 1_S is the indicator function on S , then

101

Theorem 1.1 follows immediately. Therefore, it suffices to prove Corollary 2, in which we

102

apply Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Corollary 2. Using the fact that primes are asymptotically equi-distributed in the reduced residues mod 10, we calculate the asymptotic estimates for CP Numbers ending in 1 as follows. We have the following four cases: when $p \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$, we require a^3 to end in 1, thus a is congruent to 1 modulo 10; when $p \equiv 3 \pmod{10}$, we require a^3 to end in 7, thus a is congruent to 3 modulo 10; when $p \equiv 7 \pmod{10}$, we require a^3 to end in 3, thus a is congruent to 7 modulo 10; and finally when $p \equiv 9 \pmod{10}$, we require a^3 to end in 9, thus a is congruent to 9 modulo 10. From the definition of CP Numbers, we know that $a > 1$. Therefore, the number of pairs (p, a) such that $pa^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$ with $pa^3 \leq x$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 1 \pmod{10}, p(10k+1)^3 \leq x, k \geq 1\} \\ & + \# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 3 \pmod{10}, p(10k+3)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\} \\ & + \# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 7 \pmod{10}, p(10k+7)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\} \\ & + \# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 9 \pmod{10}, p(10k+9)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then from Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 1 \pmod{10}, p(10k+1)^3 \leq x, k \geq 1\} \\ & \sim \frac{x}{4 \log x} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(10k+1)^3} = \frac{x}{4000 \log x} \left(\zeta \left(3, \frac{1}{10} \right) - 1000 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 3 \pmod{10}, p(10k+3)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\} \sim \frac{x}{4000 \log x} \zeta \left(3, \frac{3}{10} \right),$$

$$\# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 7 \pmod{10}, p(10k+7)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\} \sim \frac{x}{4000 \log x} \zeta \left(3, \frac{7}{10} \right),$$

and

$$\# \{(p, k) : p \equiv 9 \pmod{10}, p(10k+9)^3 \leq x, k \geq 0\} \sim \frac{x}{4000 \log x} \zeta \left(3, \frac{9}{10} \right).$$

103 Hence the asymptotic formula (2) holds by adding these four asymptotic estimates up. \square

104 4. Proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Equation (14)

105 In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 and Equation (14), in which we frequently apply
106 Lemma 2.2.

107 4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2

First, we prove (8). We write the partial sum in (8) as two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{\log(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\ & = \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{\log(p_1 \cdots p_k)}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\ & \quad + \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{\log(f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\ & := S_3 + S_4. \end{aligned}$$

For S_3 , we take $A = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$, $B = f_1(n_1) f_2(n_2) \cdots f_r(n_r)$, $g(A) = (\log A)/A$, and $h(B) = 1/B$ in Lemma 2.2. Combining with (6) and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$S_3 = \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)} \right) \cdot F(\log \log x) \cdot \log x + O\left((\log \log x)^k\right). \quad (24)$$

For S_4 , we take $A = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$, $B = f_1(n_1) f_2(n_2) \cdots f_r(n_r)$, $g(A) = 1/A$, and $h(B) = (\log B)/B$ in Lemma 2.2. Combining with 7, Lemma 2.3, and Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_4 &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{n_i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log(f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))}{f_1(n_1) f_2(n_2) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \cdot P_k(\log \log x) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log \log x \cdot \log x}\right) \right) \\ &= O\left((\log \log x)^k\right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

108 Combining (24) and (25) together gives the desired formula (8).

109 Similarly, if we take $A = p_1 \cdots p_k$, $B = f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)$, $g(A) = 1/A$, and $h(B) = 1/B$
110 in Lemma 2.2, then by Lemma 2.4 we immediately obtain (9).

Finally, we use (9) to prove (10). Let

$$V_{k,r}(x) := \prod_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \right).$$

After taking logarithm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log V_{k,r}(x) &= \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} -\log \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \sum_{t \geq 1} \frac{1}{t(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))^t} \\ &= \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) \leq x} \sum_{t \geq 2} \frac{1}{t(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))^t}. \end{aligned}$$

By our assumptions on the functions f_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$, the tail in the second sum satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) > x} \sum_{t \geq 2} \frac{1}{t(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))^t} \\ &\ll \sum_{p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r) > x} \frac{1}{(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r))^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll \sum_{p_1 \geq x^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{p_1^2} + \sum_{p_2 \cdots p_k f_1(n_1) \cdots f_r(n_r)^2 \geq x^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{(p_1 \cdots p_k f_1(n) \cdots f_r(n_r))^2} \\
&\ll \dots \dots \\
&\ll \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{p_i \geq x^{\frac{1}{2^i}}} \frac{1}{p_i^2} + \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{f_j(n_j) \geq x^{\frac{1}{2^{k+j}}}} \frac{1}{(f_j(n_j))^2} \\
&\ll x^{-\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, by (9) we obtain

$$-\log V_{k,r}(x) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)} \right) P_k(\log \log x) - c(k, f_1, \dots, f_r) + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^k}{\log x}\right)$$

for some constant $c(k, f_1, \dots, f_r)$ that depends on k and the functions f_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Therefore, we know

$$V_{k,r}(x) = e^{-\left(\prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f_i(n)}\right) P_k(\log \log x) + c(k, f_1, \dots, f_r)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^k}{\log x}\right)\right).$$

111 We have finished the proof of Theorem 1.2.

112 4.2. Proof of Equation (14)

The proof of Equation (14) is similar to that of (8). We write

$$\sum_{pn^s \leq x} \frac{\log(pn^s)}{pn^s} = \sum_{pn^s \leq x} \frac{\log p}{pn^s} + \sum_{pn^s \leq x} \frac{\log(n^s)}{pn^s} := S_5 + S_6.$$

For S_5 , we take $A = p$, $B = n^s$, $g(A) = (\log A)/A$, and $h(B) = 1/B$ in Lemma 2.2.

Combining with Mertens' first theorem, we obtain

$$S_5 = \zeta(s) \log x + O(1). \tag{26}$$

For S_6 , we take $A = p$, $B = n^s$, $g(A) = 1/A$, and $h(B) = (\log B)/B$. Notice that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log(n^s)}{n^s} = -s\zeta'(s).$$

From Mertens' second theorem, similar to the argument of Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$S_6 = -s\zeta'(s) \log \log x + O(1). \tag{27}$$

Combining (26) and (27), we obtain

$$\sum_{pn^s \leq x} \frac{\log(pn^s)}{pn^s} = \zeta(s) \log x - s\zeta'(s) \log \log x + O(1),$$

113 which completes the proof of Equation (14).

114 5. Proof of Theorem 1.3

115 In this section we prove Theorem 1.3 by applying (12) in Corollary 3.

116 5.1. Proof of Equation (15)

By definition, we have $\omega_k(n) = \sum_{pm^k|n} 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k(n) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{pm^k|n} 1 \\ &= \sum_{pm^k \leq x} \sum_{n \leq x/pm^k} 1 \\ &= \sum_{pm^k \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{pm^k} \right\rfloor \\ &= x \sum_{pm^k \leq x} \frac{1}{pm^k} + O\left(\sum_{pm^k \leq x} 1\right) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

On the one hand, from (12) we know

$$\sum_{pm^k \leq x} \frac{1}{pm^k} = \zeta(k) (\log \log x + M) + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right). \tag{29}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 1.1 we have

$$\sum_{pm^k \leq x} 1 \sim \zeta(k) \frac{x}{\log x}. \tag{30}$$

Combining (28), (29), and (30), we get

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k(n) = \zeta(k) \log \log x + \zeta(k) Mx + O\left(\frac{x \log \log x}{\log x}\right),$$

117 which completes the proof of Equation (15).

We first compute the second moment of $\omega_k(n)$. It is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k^2(n) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{pa^k | n} \sum_{qb^k | n} 1 \\
 &= \sum_{pa^k \leq x} \sum_{qb^k \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ pa^k | n, qb^k | n}} 1 \\
 &= \sum_{pa^k \leq x} \sum_{qb^k \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{[pa^k, qb^k]} \right\rfloor \\
 &= x \sum_{[pa^k, qb^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]} + O \left(\sum_{[pa^k, qb^k] \leq x} 1 \right) \\
 &:= x \cdot S_7 + S_8.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the sum S_7 , we will prove

$$S_7 = \frac{\zeta^3(k)}{\zeta(2k)} (\log \log x)^2 + O(\log \log x). \quad (31)$$

Lemma 2.5 and Mertens' second theorem imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{p=q, [pa^k, qb^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]} &= \sum_{p[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{p[a^k, b^k]} \\
 &\leq \sum_{[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \\
 &\ll \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \\
 &\ll \log \log x.
 \end{aligned}$$

So we only need to consider the terms with $p \neq q$. In the sum

$$S'_7 = \sum_{p \neq q, [pa^k, qb^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]},$$

we let $a = p^{e_1} q^{e_2} a_1$ and $b = p^{f_1} q^{f_2} b_1$, where $(a_1, pq) = (b_1, pq) = 1$. Then $[pa^k, qb^k] = p^g q^h [a_1^k, b_1^k]$, where $g = \max\{ke_1 + 1, kf_1\} \geq 1$ and $h = \max\{ke_2, kf_2 + 1\} \geq 1$. Next we

discuss the contributions of the terms according to their e_1 , e_2 , f_1 , and f_2 values. If $e_1 \geq 1$, then $[pa^k, qb^k] \geq p^3q[a_1^k, b_1^k]$, and thus

$$\sum_{p \neq q, [pa^k, qb^k] \leq x, e_1 \geq 1} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]} \ll \sum_{q \leq x} \frac{1}{q} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^3} \sum_{a_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[a_1^k, b_1^k]} \ll \log \log x. \quad (32)$$

If $f_1 \geq 1$, then $[pa^k, qb^k] \geq p^2q[a_1^k, b_1^k]$, which implies

$$\sum_{p \neq q, [pa^k, qb^k] \leq x, f_1 \geq 1} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]} \ll \sum_{q \leq x} \frac{1}{q} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{a_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{b_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[a_1^k, b_1^k]} \ll \log \log x. \quad (33)$$

Similarly, for the terms with $e_2 \geq 1$ or $f_2 \geq 1$, we also have

$$\sum_{\substack{[pa^k, qb^k] \leq x \\ p \neq q, e_2 \geq 1 \text{ or } f_2 \geq 1}} \frac{1}{[pa^k, qb^k]} = O(\log \log x) \quad (34)$$

Noting that $e_1 = e_2 = f_1 = f_2 = 0$ implies $[pa^k, qb^k] = pq[a_1^k, b_1^k]$, we can combine the estimates (32), (33), and (34) to obtain

$$S'_7 = \sum_{\substack{pq[a^k, b^k] \leq x \\ p \neq q, (a, pq) = (b, pq) = 1}} \frac{1}{pq[a^k, b^k]} + O(\log \log x).$$

In fact, we can remove the constrains $p \neq q$ and $(a, pq) = (b, pq) = 1$ in S'_7 since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{pq[a^k, b^k] \leq x, p=q} \frac{1}{pq[a^k, b^k]} &= \sum_{p^2[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{p^2[a^k, b^k]} \\ &\leq \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{pq[a^k, b^k] \leq x, p \neq q \\ p|a, p|b}} \frac{1}{pq[a^k, b^k]} &= \sum_{p^{k+1}q[a^k/p^k, b^k/p^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{p^{k+1}q[a^k/p^k, b^k/p^k]} \\ &\leq \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p^{k+1}} \sum_{[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{[a^k, b^k]} \sum_{q \leq x} \frac{1}{q} \\ &\ll \log \log x, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{pq[a^k, b^k] \leq x, p \neq q \\ p|a, p \nmid b}} \frac{1}{pq[a^k, b^k]} = \sum_{\substack{p^{k+1}q[a^k/p^k, b^k] \leq x, p \neq q \\ p|a, p \nmid b}} \frac{1}{p^{k+1}q[a^k/p^k, b^k]} \ll \log \log x.$$

Therefore, we have proved

$$S_7 = \sum_{pq[a^k, b^k] \leq x} \frac{1}{pq[a^k, b^k]} + O(\log \log x).$$

119 Now Equation (31) holds when we apply Lemma 2.2 with $A = pq$, $B = [a^k, b^k]$, $g(A) = 1/A$,
 120 and $h(B) = 1/B$, Lemma 2.5, and Lemma 2.6.

By similar arguments we can prove

$$S_8 = O(x \log \log x). \quad (35)$$

From (31) and (35) we know

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k^2(n) = \frac{\zeta^3(k)}{\zeta(2k)} x (\log \log x)^2 + O(x \log \log x). \quad (36)$$

Combining (36) and (15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \leq x} (\omega_k(n) - \zeta(k) \log \log x)^2 \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k^2(n) - 2\zeta(k) \log \log x \cdot \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_k(n) + \zeta^2(k) x (\log \log x)^2 \\ &= \frac{\zeta^3(k)}{\zeta(2k)} x (\log \log x)^2 - 2\zeta^2(k) x (\log \log x)^2 + \zeta^2(k) x (\log \log x)^2 + O(x \log \log x) \\ &= \frac{\zeta^3(k) - \zeta^2(k)\zeta(2k)}{\zeta(2k)} x (\log \log x)^2 + O(x \log \log x), \end{aligned}$$

121 which completes the proof of Equation (16).

122 Acknowledgments

123 This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.
 124 12288201). The second author's research is partially supported by the Fundamental Re-
 125 search Funds for the Central Universities, Nankai University (Grant No. 63221040) and the

126 National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12201313). The third author
127 is partially supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation under grant number
128 2021TQ0350.

129 References

- 130 [1] William D. Banks and Igor E. Shparlinski. Prime numbers with Beatty sequences.
131 *Colloq. Math.*, 115(2):147–157, 2009.
- 132 [2] Jonathan Bayless, Paul Kinlaw, and Jared Duker Lichtman. Higher Mertens constants
133 for almost primes. *J. Number Theory*, 234:448–475, 2022.
- 134 [3] Raghavendra N. Bhat. Distribution of square-prime numbers. *Missouri J. Math. Sci.*,
135 34(1):121–126, 2022.
- 136 [4] Magdalena Bănescu and Dumitru Popa. Asymptotic evaluations for some double sums
137 in number theory. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 11(7):2073–2085, 2015.
- 138 [5] Magdalena Bănescu and Dumitru Popa. A multiple Abel summation formula and
139 asymptotic evaluations for multiple sums. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 14(4):1197–1210,
140 2018.
- 141 [6] Alina Carmen Cojocaru and M. Ram Murty. *An introduction to sieve methods and
142 their applications*, volume 66 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge
143 University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- 144 [7] Stephan Ramon Garcia and Ethan Simpson Lee. Unconditional explicit Mertens’ theo-
145 rems for number fields and Dedekind zeta residue bounds. *Ramanujan J.*, 57(3):1169–
146 1191, 2022.
- 147 [8] Daniel A. Goldston, Sidney W. Graham, Apoorva Panidapu, Janos Pintz, Jordan Schet-
148 tler, and Cem Y. Yıldırım. Small gaps between almost primes, the parity problem, and
149 some conjectures of Erdős on consecutive integers II. *J. Number Theory*, 221:222–231,
150 2021.

- 151 [9] Henryk Iwaniec and Emmanuel Kowalski. *Analytic number theory*, volume 53 of *Amer-*
152 *ican Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society,
153 Providence, RI, 2004.
- 154 [10] I. Kátai. Distribution of digits of primes in q -ary canonical form. *Acta Math. Hungar.*,
155 47(3-4):341–359, 1986.
- 156 [11] J. C. Lagarias and A. M. Odlyzko. Effective versions of the Chebotarev density theorem.
157 In *Algebraic number fields: L-functions and Galois properties (Proc. Sympos., Univ.*
158 *Durham, Durham, 1975)*, pages 409–464. Academic Press, London, 1977.
- 159 [12] Jared Duker Lichtman. Mertens’ prime product formula, dissected. *Integers*, 21A(Ron
160 Graham Memorial Volume):Paper No. A17, 15, 2021.
- 161 [13] Dumitru Popa. A double Mertens type evaluation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 409(2):1159–
162 1163, 2014.
- 163 [14] Dumitru Popa. A triple Mertens evaluation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 444(1):464–474,
164 2016.
- 165 [15] I. I. Pyateckĭĭ-Šapiro. On the distribution of prime numbers in sequences of the form
166 $[f(n)]$. *Mat. Sbornik N.S.*, 33(75):559–566, 1953.
- 167 [16] Tianfang Qi and Su Hu. Multiple Mertens evaluations. *arXiv e-prints*, page
168 arXiv:1909.10930, September 2019.
- 169 [17] Gérald Tenenbaum. *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, volume
170 163 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence,
171 RI, third edition, 2015.
- 172 [18] Gérald Tenenbaum. Generalized Mertens sums. In *Analytic number theory, modular*
173 *forms and q -hypergeometric series*, volume 221 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages
174 733–736. Springer, Cham, 2017.

175 [19] Gérald Tenenbaum. Generalized Mertens sums. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1910.02781,
176 September 2019.