

Counting terms U_n of third order linear recurrences with $U_n = u^2 + nv^2$

EMIL-ALEXANDRU CIOLAN
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn
Regina Pacis Weg 3
D-53113 Bonn, Germany
calexandru92@yahoo.com

FLORIAN LUCA
School of Mathematics
University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag 3, Wits 2050, South Africa
florian.luca@wits.ac.za

PIETER MOREE
Max Planck Institut für Mathematik
Vivatsgasse 7
D-53111 Bonn, Germany
moree@mpim-bonn.mpg.de

June 11, 2015

Abstract

Given a recurrent sequence $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ we consider the problem of counting $\mathcal{M}_U(x)$, the number of integers $n \leq x$ such that $U_n = u^2 + nv^2$ for some integers u, v . We will show that $\mathcal{M}_U(x) \ll x(\log x)^{-0.05}$ for a large class of ternary sequences. Our method uses many ingredients from the proof of Alba González and the second author [1] that $\mathcal{M}_F(x) \ll x(\log x)^{-0.06}$, with \mathbf{F} the Fibonacci sequence.

1 Introduction

If \mathcal{M} is a set of real numbers and x a positive real number x , we put $\mathcal{M}(x) = \mathcal{M} \cap [1, x)$. Given a recurrent sequence $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ we put

$$\mathcal{M}_U = \{n : U_n = u^2 + nv^2 \text{ for some integers } u, v\}. \quad (1)$$

Let $\mathbf{F} := \{F_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the Fibonacci sequence given by $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$ and

$$F_{n+2} = F_{n+1} + F_n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

Some results concerning Fibonacci numbers which can be represented by certain positive definite quadratic forms in two variables appear in [10]. In [2] it was shown that if $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ is a prime, then $F_p = u^2 + pv^2$ for some integers u and v . It follows from the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions that $\#\mathcal{M}_F(x) \gg x/\log x$. In [1] it was shown that

$$\#\mathcal{M}_F(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{0.06}}.$$

In this paper we use the method from [1] to study the analogous problem for certain third order linearly recurrent sequences $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ of integers. Assume that $U_0, U_1, U_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and that

$$U_{n+3} = a_1U_{n+2} + a_2U_{n+1} + a_3U_n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0,$$

where $\Psi_U(X) = X^3 - a_1X^2 - a_2X - a_3 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. Let

$$\Psi_U(X) = (X - \alpha)(X - \beta)(X - \gamma)$$

be the factorization of Ψ_U over the complex numbers. We assume that $a_3 \neq 0$. Let \mathbb{K} be the splitting field of Ψ_U over \mathbb{Q} and G be its Galois group. We assume that the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (i) G contains a transposition (as a subgroup of S_3).
- (ii) Either $a_3 = \pm 1$ and $\Psi_U(X)$ is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} , or

$$\Psi_U(X) = (X - a)(X^2 + bX + c), \quad \text{where } a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{\pm 1\} \quad \text{and } c = \pm 1.$$

- (iii) The ratio of any two roots of $\Psi_U(X)$ is not a root of unity.

In case $\Psi_U(X)$ is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} , its constant coefficient is $a_3 = \pm 1$ and G is a transitive subgroup of S_3 . Condition (i) ensures that this group cannot be isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$, therefore it must be S_3 . This is equivalent to the condition that the discriminant of $\Psi_U(X)$, which is

$$a_1^2a_2^2 + 4a_2^3 - 4a_1^3a_3 - 18a_1a_2a_3 - 27a_3^2,$$

is not the square of an integer. In case $\Psi_U(X)$ is not irreducible over \mathbb{Q} , then the combination of conditions (i) and (ii) above ensures that $\Psi_U(X)$

has exactly one integer root a which is not ± 1 , and the other two roots are quadratic units. In that case, \mathbb{K} is a quadratic field and the nonidentity element of G fixes a and switches the other two roots, so this can be regarded as a transposition in S_3 .

We give two examples of sequences satisfying our conditions, formulate our main result, and then give three examples for which the conclusion of our theorem do not hold and compare them with (i), (ii) and (iii) above.

Recall that the Tribonacci sequence $\mathbf{T} := \{T_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is defined as $T_0 = T_1 = 0, T_2 = 1$ and

$$T_{n+3} = T_{n+2} + T_{n+1} + T_n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

In this case, $\Psi_T(X) = X^3 - X^2 - X - 1$ is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} and its Galois group is S_3 . So, our result applies to the Tribonacci sequence. Another sequence to which it applies is the sequence \mathbf{U} of numbers of the form $U_n = 2^n + F_n$, where $\{F_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the Fibonacci sequence. This is ternary recurrent with characteristic polynomial

$$\Psi_U(X) = (X - 2)(X^2 - X - 1),$$

which satisfies the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii).

Theorem 1. *Assume that $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a ternary recurrent sequence satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). Then the following estimate holds*

$$\#\{n \leq x : U_n = u^2 + nv^2 \text{ for some integers } u, v\} \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{0.05}}.$$

Note that the conditions of the theorem depend only on the characteristic polynomial of U . Thus if $a \geq 0$ is an integer and we ask for the number of solutions of $U_{n+a} = u^2 + nv^2$ the estimate above also holds. More informally, we could say that our result is robust under relabelling of the sequence.

While conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) can perhaps be weakened, some conditions have to be imposed on $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in order to conclude that the set of positive integers n such that $U_n = \square + n\square$ is of density zero. Indeed, consider the three examples

$$U_n = 2^n + n, \quad U_n = 4^n + 2^{n+1} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad U_n = 5F_n^2 - 4.$$

In the first case, $U_n = \square + n\square$ for all n even. In the second case, $U_n = \square$ holds for all $n \geq 0$. In the third case, $5F_n^2 - 4 = L_n^2 = \square$ holds for all odd n , where $\{L_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the companion sequence of the Fibonacci sequence given

by $L_0 = 2$, $L_1 = 1$ and $L_{n+2} = L_{n+1} + L_n$ for all $n \geq 0$. Thus, in all the above cases $U_n = \square + n\square$ holds for a positive proportion of n , where in the last two cases the second \square (which multiplies n) is zero. Note that for the first two sequences

$$\Psi_U(X) = (X - 2)(X - 1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_U(X) = (X - 4)(X - 2)(X - 1),$$

respectively, so that $\Psi_U(X)$ factors completely over \mathbb{Q} and in the first case it even has a double root, whereas for the third sequence, we have

$$\Psi_U(X) = (X + 1)(X^2 - 3X + 1),$$

for which $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$, so condition (i) is satisfied, but the integer root a of $\Psi_U(X)$ is -1 .

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

2 Preliminary results

As we said, our method closely follows [1]. However, there are differences. An important ingredient in [2] was played by the *order of appearance* in the Fibonacci sequence. For a fixed n , this is denoted by $z(n)$ and is defined as the smallest positive integer k such that $n \mid F_k$. For a prime p , $z(p)$ is a divisor of $p - 1$ or of $p + 1$ according to whether p is a quadratic residue modulo 5 or not, except for $p = 5$ for which $z(5) = 5$. Further, Lemma 1 in [1] shows that the set of primes $\{p : z(p) < y\}$ is of order of magnitude $O(y^2/\log y)$. In turn, this result was used together with a result of Ford from [7] (current Lemma 4) in order to ensure that most primes p have $z(p)$ much larger than \sqrt{p} . This in turn was used together with a result of Shparlinski from [11] to argue that for such p , a set of asymptotic density 1/2 of all the positive integers m has the property that F_m is a quadratic residue modulo p while the numbers m from the remaining set of asymptotic density 1/2 have the property that F_m is not a quadratic residue modulo p . In the process, we also needed to eliminate numbers m such that F_m is a multiple of p ; that is, multiples of $z(p)$.

In this section, we carry out the necessary modifications to the above scheme for the particular case of the sequence $\mathbf{U} := \{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). The main difference with the argument from [1] is that we do

not work with *all large primes* p , but only with large primes p for which the characteristic polynomial $\Psi_U(X)$ of \mathbf{U} has exactly one root modulo p , which is a subset of relative density $1/2$ of all the primes because of condition (i) and the Chebotarev density theorem, cf. [12]. What we need about such primes p is that, for most of them, a set of asymptotic density one half of all the positive integers n has the property that U_n is a quadratic residue modulo p and the remaining half of the positive integers n have the property that U_n is not a quadratic residue modulo p . This will follow from Shparlinski's result mentioned above provided that the other conditions stated in (i), (ii) and (iii) are fulfilled. Afterwards, the method from [1] can be applied with minor modifications.

If $\Psi_U(x)$ has distinct roots α, β and γ , by the theory of linear recurrences we can write

$$U_n = c_\alpha \alpha^n + c_\beta \beta^n + c_\gamma \gamma^n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2)$$

for some coefficients $c_\alpha, c_\beta, c_\gamma$ in \mathbb{K} . We put $\Gamma := \max\{|\alpha|, |\beta|, |\gamma|\}$.

An important result that we use is due to Beukers [3]. Recall that a non degenerate linear recurrence \mathbf{V} is a linear recurrence of integers whose characteristic polynomial has distinct roots whose ratios are not roots of unity.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathbf{V} := \{V_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a linearly recurrent sequence of order 3 whose values are rational integers. Then there are at most 6 values of n such that $V_n = 0$.*

The following result is an analogue of Lemma 2.1 in [1]. For an arbitrary function f satisfying $f(p) \geq 2$, we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{f(p), U}$ the set

$$\{p : U_{pm_i} \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \text{ for } m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_7 \text{ and } m_7 - m_1 \leq f(p)\}. \quad (3)$$

Lemma 2. *The estimate*

$$\#\mathcal{P}_{y, U} \ll \frac{y^3}{\log y} \quad (4)$$

holds for all $y \geq 2$.

Proof. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}_{y, U}$. Let π be any prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$ dividing p . We let $i_j = m_j - m_1$ for $j = 1, \dots, 7$. Thus, $0 = i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_7 \leq y$. Then $(c_\alpha \alpha^{pm_1}, c_\beta \beta^{pm_1}, c_\gamma \gamma^{pm_1})^T$ is orthogonal to $(\alpha^{pi_j}, \beta^{pi_j}, \gamma^{pi_j})$ for all values of

$j = 1, \dots, 7$ in the three dimensional vector space over the finite field $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}/\pi$. For positive integers $r < s$ put

$$D(r, s) = \det \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \alpha^r & \beta^r & \gamma^r \\ \alpha^s & \beta^s & \gamma^s \end{vmatrix}.$$

In particular, $D(r, s) \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$ for all pairs $(r, s) = (pi_j, pi_k)$ and $1 \leq j \leq k \leq 7$. By Fermat's Little Theorem, we get that $D(r, s) \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$ for all $(r, s) = (i_j, i_k)$ and $1 \leq j \leq k \leq 7$. By Lemma 1, we shall deduce that there exist $r < s \in \{i_2, \dots, i_7\}$ such that $D(r, s) \neq 0$. More precisely, assume say that $D(i_2, s) = 0$ for $s \in \{i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6, i_7\}$. Let $(c_1, c_2, c_3)^T \in \mathbb{K}^3$ be any nonzero vector orthogonal to both $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(\alpha^{i_2}, \beta^{i_2}, \gamma^{i_2})$. Such a vector exists and is unique up to scalar multiplications because the linear map $T : \mathbb{K}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{K}^2$ of matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \alpha^{i_2} & \beta^{i_2} & \gamma^{i_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank exactly 2 in view of condition (iii) and the fact that $i_2 > 0$, which together imply that $(\alpha^{i_2}, \beta^{i_2}, \gamma^{i_2})$ is not parallel to $(1, 1, 1)$. Since all vectors $(\alpha^{i_j}, \beta^{i_j}, \gamma^{i_j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, 7$ are linear combinations of $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(\alpha^{i_1}, \beta^{i_1}, \gamma^{i_1})$, we get that

$$c_1 \alpha^{i_j} + c_2 \beta^{i_j} + c_3 \gamma^{i_j} = 0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, 7.$$

This means that $\mathbf{V} := \{V_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, whose Binet formula is given by

$$V_n = c_1 \alpha^n + c_2 \beta^n + c_3 \gamma^n,$$

has the property that $V_n = 0$ for 7 different values of n . This contradicts Lemma 1, except that we have to check for the condition that V_n has integer values. Since (c_1, c_2, c_3) is parallel to the cross product of $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(\alpha^{i_2}, \beta^{i_2}, \gamma^{i_2})$, we get that

$$(c_1, c_2, c_3) = \lambda(\gamma^{i_2} - \beta^{i_2}, \alpha^{i_2} - \gamma^{i_2}, \beta^{i_2} - \alpha^{i_2})$$

for some nonzero scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$. We already know that $V_0 = c_1 + c_2 + c_3 = 0$. Computing V_1 and V_2 , we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \lambda(\alpha(\gamma^{i_2} - \beta^{i_2}) + \beta(\alpha^{i_2} - \gamma^{i_2}) + \gamma(\beta^{i_2} - \alpha^{i_2})), \\ V_2 &= \lambda(\alpha^2(\gamma^{i_2} - \beta^{i_2}) + \beta^2(\alpha^{i_2} - \gamma^{i_2}) + \gamma^2(\beta^{i_2} - \alpha^{i_2})). \end{aligned}$$

Looking at the expressions multiplied by λ in the right-hand side above, we see that the permutations (123) and its square leave both V_1 and V_2 unchanged, whereas the transpositions (12), (23), (13) change V_1 and V_2 to their negatives. This shows that putting Δ for the discriminant of \mathbb{K} , we get that both in the case when \mathbb{K} has degree 6 and $G = S_3$, as well as in the case when \mathbb{K} has degree 2 and $G = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, we have that $V_n\sqrt{\Delta}$ is an integer for $n = 0, 1, 2$. Hence, by induction on n using the third order linear recurrence for \mathbf{V} , we get that $V_n\sqrt{\Delta}$ is an integer for all $n \geq 0$, so Lemma 1 (due to Beukers) indeed applies and tells that we cannot have $V_n = 0$ for 7 values of n .

It then follows that there exist $r < s$ in $\{i_2, \dots, i_7\}$ such that $D(r, s) \neq 0$. But $\pi \mid D(r, s)$. Further, notice that $D(r, s)^2$ is an integer since it is obviously an algebraic integer and any conjugation from \mathbb{K} just permutes the columns of the determinant whose value is $D(r, s)$, therefore it will not change the square of it. Thus, $p \mid D(r, s)^2$. Hence,

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{y,U}} p \mid \prod_{\substack{0 < r < s \leq y \\ D(r,s) \neq 0}} D(r, s)^2.$$

Since clearly $|D(r, s)| \ll \Gamma^{2s}$, we get that

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{y,U}} p \ll \prod_{1 \leq r < s \leq y} \Gamma^{4s} < \Gamma^{4y^3},$$

so

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{y,U}} \log p \ll y^3. \tag{5}$$

Put $t := \#\mathcal{P}_{y,U}$ and denote by p_1, p_2, \dots all the consecutive primes. By the prime number theorem (or Chebyshev's estimates), we have

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{y,U}} \log p \geq \sum_{p \leq p_t} \log p \gg p_t \gg t \log t,$$

and hence $t \log t \ll y^3$, which implies the desired estimate (4). \square

For an integer n denote by $P(n)$ the largest prime factor of n with the convention that $P(0) = P(\pm 1) = 1$. Given a positive real number y , a positive integer n is called *y-smooth* if $P(n) \leq y$. We need the following well-known bound from the theory of smooth numbers. Put

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

The following is Theorem 1 of Chapter III.5 in [13].

Lemma 3. *The estimate*

$$\Psi(x, y) \ll x \exp(-u/2)$$

holds for all $x \geq y \geq 2$ with $u = \log x / \log y$.

Better (sharper) bounds for $\Psi(x, y)$ hold when y is not too small with respect to x (see, for example, the corollary to Theorem 3.1 in [4]).

We shall need some information concerning the number of divisors of shifted primes which are in a given interval. Namely, let

$$H(x, y, z) = \#\{n \leq x : d \mid n \text{ for some } d \in (y, z)\},$$

and for a given non-zero integer λ put

$$P(x, y, z; \lambda) = \#\{p \leq x : d \mid p + \lambda \text{ for some } d \in (y, z)\}.$$

The following result appears as Theorem 6 in [7].

Lemma 4. *If $100 \leq y \leq x^{1/2}$, and $2y \leq z \leq y^2$, then*

$$H(x, y, z) \asymp xu^\delta (\log(2/u))^{-3/2},$$

where u is defined implicitly by $z = y^{1+u}$ and

$$\delta = 1 - \frac{1 + \log \log 2}{\log 2} = 0.086071 \dots$$

Furthermore, let $1 \leq y \leq x^{1/2}$, and $y + (\log y)^{2/3} \leq z \leq x$. The following estimate holds

$$P(x, y, z; \lambda) \ll_\lambda \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}. \quad \square$$

We shall only need Lemma 4 for $\lambda \in \{\pm 1\}$.

Now we shall introduce a special set of primes which is important for our arguments. We let

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{p : \Psi_U(x) \text{ has exactly one root modulo } p\}. \quad (6)$$

If p is sufficiently large and is in \mathcal{Z} , then its Frobenius, regarded as an element of G , is in the conjugacy class of the transpositions $\{(12), (23), (13)\}$ when $G = S_3$ and is the only nonidentical element of G (which is a transposition of S_3) when $\Psi_U(X)$ has an integer root a and \mathbb{K} is quadratic. So, in either case, the Frobenius of such a p is in a conjugacy class of index 2 in G . It

is now an immediate consequence of the Chebotarev Density Theorem, cf. [12], that \mathcal{Z} contains asymptotically half of the primes, that is,

$$\#\mathcal{Z}(x) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{2 \log x} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

For lack of a better notation, we write α for the unique root of $\Psi_U(X)$ modulo p and put β and γ for the remaining two roots of $\Psi_U(X)$. In case $\Psi_U(X)$ has an integer root a , then certainly $\alpha = a$. Modulo p , we have

$$\alpha^p \equiv \alpha \pmod{p}, \quad \beta^p \equiv \gamma \pmod{p}, \quad \gamma^p \equiv \beta \pmod{p}.$$

Thus, if $n = pm$, where $p \in \mathcal{Z}$, then using (2), we get on putting

$$V_m = c_\alpha \alpha^m + c_\beta \gamma^m + c_\gamma \beta^m, \quad \text{that}$$

$$U_n \equiv c_\alpha (\alpha^p)^m + c_\beta (\beta^p)^m + c_\gamma (\gamma^p)^m \equiv V_m \pmod{p}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $\mathbf{V} := \{V_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ is a linearly recurrent sequence satisfying the same recurrence relation as \mathbf{U} but it is defined only modulo p . The above formula is the analogue of Lemma 2.5 in [1]. Next we need to understand the periods of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} modulo p for $p \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Definition 1. *The period $t(p)$ is the smallest positive integer k such that $U_n \equiv U_{n+k} \pmod{p}$ for all $n \geq 0$ (or, $V_m \equiv V_{m+k} \pmod{p}$ for all $m \geq 0$, respectively). Let $k := k(p)$ be the minimal positive integer such that all three congruences*

$$\alpha^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}, \quad \beta^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}, \quad \gamma^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \quad (8)$$

hold.

Note that $k(p)$ is a period of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} . Hence, $t(p)$ divides $k(p)$. For large p , we have in fact that $t(p) = k(p)$. Since we need a precise form of this statement including a precise way to quantify “all sufficiently large p ” for the case where we only work with the subsequence $\{U_{c+dn}\}_{n \geq 0}$ of \mathbf{U} , we record such a statement below.

Lemma 5. *For each positive integer d and uniformly in $c \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$, the number of primes p such that the period of $\{U_{c+dn}\}_{n \geq 0}$ modulo p is not the smallest positive integer $k := k(p, d)$ with*

$$\alpha^{dk} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}, \quad \beta^{dk} \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{dk} \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \quad (9)$$

is $O(d/\log d)$, where the implied constant depends at most on \mathbf{U} . We have $k(p, d) = k(p)/\gcd(k(p), d)$.

Proof. We assume p is sufficiently large so that it does not divide the discriminant of $\Psi_U(X)$ and the numbers c_α , c_β and c_γ are defined and nonzero modulo any prime ideal π of $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{K}$ dividing p . Clearly, the period is the smallest k such that $U_{c+d(n+k)} \equiv U_{c+dn} \pmod{p}$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots$. Writing the above congruences down using the Binet formulas we get that

$$c_\alpha \alpha^c (\alpha^{dk} - 1) \alpha^{dn} + c_\beta \beta^c (\beta^{dk} - 1) \beta^{dn} + c_\gamma \gamma^c (\gamma^{dk} - 1) \gamma^{dn} \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}.$$

Hence, the vector $(c_\alpha \alpha^c (\alpha^{dk} - 1), c_\beta \beta^c (\beta^{dk} - 1), c_\gamma \gamma^c (\gamma^{dk} - 1))^T$ is orthogonal to $(\alpha^{dn}, \beta^{dn}, \gamma^{dn})$ in the finite field $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{K}/\pi$ of characteristic p . We need to bound the number of primes p such that that the above vector is not the zero vector. To do so note that if the above vector is not the zero vector, then taking $n = 0, r, s$, we get that $D(rd, sd) \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi}$. By the argument from Lemma 2, there exist $1 \leq r < s \leq 6$ such that $D(rd, sd) \neq 0$. Hence, using Lemma 1 (due to Beukers), we find that $p \mid D(rd, sd)^2$. So, the primes p for which one of the congruences (9) fails must divide the nonzero integer

$$\prod_{\substack{1 \leq r < s \leq 6 \\ D(rd, sd) \neq 0}} D(rd, sd)^2$$

and therefore their product also divides the above nonzero integer. The size of the above integer is at most $\Gamma^{O(d)}$. Hence, the number of such primes is $O(d/\log d)$ by the argument from the conclusion of the proof of Lemma 2.

The final assertion is obvious. \square

Let $\text{ord}_p(\bullet)$ denote the order of p function defined either on $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ or on some finite extension of it.

Lemma 6. *Assume that $p \in \mathcal{Z}$ is sufficiently large. Then*

(i) $\text{ord}_p(\alpha) \mid p - 1$ and $\text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma) \mid p + 1$.

(ii) Let $k(p)$ and $t(p)$ be as in Definition 8 and $t(p) = k(p)$, then

$$\text{ord}_p(\alpha) \text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma) \mid 2t(p) \mid 8 \text{ord}_p(\alpha) \text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma) \mid 8(p-1)(p+1). \quad (10)$$

Proof. (i) We will deal only with the case $\alpha\beta\gamma = 1$, as the argument in case $\alpha\beta\gamma = -1$ is similar. Since $\alpha^p \equiv \alpha \pmod{p}$, we have that $\text{ord}_p(\alpha) \mid p - 1$. Since $\beta^p \equiv \gamma \pmod{p}$, it follows that $\beta^{p+1} \equiv \beta\gamma \equiv \alpha^{-1} \pmod{p}$ and the same conclusion is reached with β replaced by γ . Thus, $\beta^{p+1} \equiv \gamma^{p+1} \pmod{p}$, or $(\beta/\gamma)^{p+1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Thus, $\text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma) \mid p + 1$. This finishes (i).

(ii) Let $L = \text{lcm}[\text{ord}_p(\alpha), \text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma)]$. Since by assumption $t(p) = k(p)$, it follows that $\alpha^L \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $(\beta/\gamma)^L \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. In particular, $t(p)$ is a multiple of L . Now assume that $\alpha^L \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $(\beta/\gamma)^L \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Thus, $\beta^L \equiv \gamma^L \pmod{p}$. If $\alpha\beta\gamma = \pm 1$, then

$$1 \equiv (\alpha\beta\gamma)^{2L} \pmod{p} \equiv \beta^{4L} \pmod{p}.$$

If $\beta\gamma = \pm 1$, then

$$1 = (\beta\gamma)^{2L} \pmod{p} = \beta^{4L} \pmod{p}.$$

Hence, in either case $\beta^{4L} = 1$. Similarly, we have $\gamma^{4L} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ in these two cases. This shows that $t(p) \mid 4L$. We now only need to understand the relation between L and the product of $\text{ord}_p(\alpha)$ and $\text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma)$. By (i), we have that $\text{ord}_p(\alpha) \mid p-1$ and $\text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma) \mid p+1$. Since $\text{gcd}(p-1, p+1) = 2$, we get that $L = \text{ord}_p(\alpha)\text{ord}_p(\beta/\gamma)/D$, where $D \in \{1, 2\}$. Now (ii) is clear. \square

In view of the above results, we introduce two other sets of primes which are similar to the sets $\mathcal{P}_{y,U}$ defined before Lemma 2.1 in [1]. Namely, for a real number $y \geq 2$ let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_y &= \{p : p \mid N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha^k - 1) \text{ for some } k \leq y\}, \\ \mathcal{L}_y &= \{p : p \mid N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}((\beta/\gamma)^k - 1) \text{ for some } k \leq y\}, \end{aligned}$$

where N denotes the norm. The following result can be proved in the same way as Lemma 2.1 in [1]. Suppose Ψ_U satisfies condition (ii) of Theorem 1 and has an integer root a . The reason that we need to ensure that $a \neq \pm 1$ is related to the proof of the result below (especially the estimate for $\#\mathcal{K}_y$), since of course if $a = \pm 1$ and $y \geq 2$, then \mathcal{K}_y contains all the primes.

Lemma 7. *We have*

$$\max\{\#\mathcal{K}_y, \#\mathcal{L}_y\} \ll \frac{y^2}{\log y}.$$

Recall that a ‘‘multiplier’’ modulo p is a residue class λ modulo p such that for some n we have $\alpha^n \equiv \beta^n \equiv \gamma^n \equiv \lambda \pmod{p}$. The multipliers form a multiplicative group in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. In our case, recall that either $\Psi_U(X)$ is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} , in which case $a_3 = \pm 1$, or $\Psi_U(X)$ has a root a and the product of the other two roots is ± 1 . Hence, either $\alpha\beta\gamma = \pm 1$, or $\beta\gamma = \pm 1$. We thus get that any multiplier λ satisfies $\lambda^3 \equiv (\alpha\beta\gamma)^n \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$ in the first case, and $\lambda^2 \equiv (\beta\gamma)^n \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$ in the second case, so the group of multipliers has at most 6 elements.

Given an arithmetic progression $c \pmod{d}$, we denote by $t_{c,d,p}$ the period of the sequence $(V_{c+dn})_{n \geq 0}$ modulo p . By Lemma 5 we have the equality $t_{c,d,p} = t(p)/\gcd(d, t(p))$, except for a set of primes p of cardinality $O(d/\log d)$. We record this as the first part of the next lemma. The second part of it follows from the bound on in [6, p. 86] and is based on results from [11].

Lemma 8. *Assume that $c \geq 0$, $d > 0$ are integers. Then*

(i) $t_{c,d,p} = t(p)/\gcd(d, t(p))$ with $O(d/\log d)$ exceptions.

(ii) We have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{t_{c,d,p}} \left(\frac{V_{c+dk}}{p} \right) \ll p.$$

In fact the result given in [6, p. 86] together with our remark that the group of multipliers for $\{V_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ has at most 6 elements shows that the implied constant in the above Vinogradov symbol \ll can be taken to be 6.

3 The proof of Theorem 1

We begin by discarding several subsets of integers $n \in [1, x)$ which on removal make our problem easier to deal with. We proceed along the lines of [1] with the same choice of parameters so we will only make the arguments explicit in case there are new ideas involved.

Recall the definition (1) of \mathcal{M}_U . To simplify notation we omit the subscript U on \mathcal{M}_U and just write \mathcal{M} . We write \mathcal{M}_1 , \mathcal{M}_2 and so on for subsets of \mathcal{M} . Let x be a large positive real number. Put $y_1 = \exp(\log x / \log \log x)$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_1(x) = \{n \leq x : P(n) \leq y_1\}.$$

By Lemma 3, we have

$$\#\mathcal{M}_1(x) = \Psi(x, y_1) \ll x \exp(-u/2) = \frac{x}{(\log x)^{1/2}}. \quad (11)$$

Here, $u = \log x / \log y_1$. Next let $z_1 = (\log x)^3$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ to be fixed later. Put

$$\mathcal{M}_2(x) = \{n \leq x : p^2 \mid n \text{ for some prime } p > z_1^\kappa\}.$$

Note that

$$\#\mathcal{M}_2(x) \leq \sum_{z_1^\kappa \leq p \leq x^{1/2}} \frac{x}{p^2} \leq x \sum_{m \geq z_1^\kappa} \frac{1}{m^2} \ll \frac{x}{z_1^\kappa} = \frac{x}{(\log x)^{3\kappa}}. \quad (12)$$

Next we let

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{P}_{p^{1/4}, U},$$

where the set \mathcal{Z} is defined in (6) and $\mathcal{P}_{p^{1/4}, U}$ in (3). By Lemma 2, we know that

$$\#\mathcal{P}(x) \leq \#\mathcal{P}_{x^{1/4}, U} \ll \frac{x^{3/4}}{\log x}.$$

Put

$$\mathcal{M}_3(x) = \{n \leq x : p \mid n \text{ for some } p \in \mathcal{P} \text{ with } p \geq z_1\}.$$

The number of $n \leq x$ which are multiples of p is $\lfloor x/p \rfloor \leq x/p$. Summing up over all the possibilities for p , we get, by partial summation,

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{M}_3(x) &\leq \sum_{\substack{z_1 \leq p \leq x \\ p \in \mathcal{P}}} \frac{x}{p} = x \int_{z_1}^x \frac{d\#\mathcal{P}(t)}{t} = x \left(\frac{\#\mathcal{P}(t)}{t} \Big|_{z_1}^x + \int_{z_1}^x \frac{\#\mathcal{P}(t)}{t^2} dt \right) \\ &\ll x \left(\frac{\#\mathcal{P}(x)}{x} + \int_{z_1}^x \frac{dt}{t^{5/4}} \right) \ll x \left(\frac{1}{x^{1/4} \log x} + \left(-\frac{4}{t^{1/4}} \Big|_{t=z_1}^{t=x} \right) \right) \\ &\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{3/4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Next we define the set

$$\mathcal{M}_4(x) = \{n \leq x : n \notin \mathcal{M}_3(x), p \mid \gcd(n, U_n) \text{ for some } p \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ with } p > z_1\}.$$

If $n \in \mathcal{M}_4(x)$, then $p \mid \gcd(n, U_n)$ for some prime $p \in \mathcal{Z}$ with $p > z_1$. Write $n = pm$. Further we have, $U_n = U_{pm} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Since $p \notin \mathcal{P}_{p^{1/4}, U}$, it follows that each interval of the form $[1 + p^{1/4}\ell, p^{1/4}(\ell + 1)]$ contains at most 6 of the m_i 's for all integers $\ell \geq 0$. The m_i 's for which $\ell = 0$ (so $m_i \leq p^{1/4}$) give us a total of at most $6\pi(x) = O(x/\log x)$ possibilities for n . The remaining ones give a total of at most

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \mathcal{P} \\ p > z_1}} \frac{6x}{p^{5/4}} \ll x \sum_{p > z_1} \frac{1}{p^{5/4}} \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{3/4}}$$

possibilities. Hence,

$$\#\mathcal{M}_4(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{3/4}}. \quad (14)$$

Assume for the moment that $n \leq x$ is in $\mathcal{M}(x) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{M}_i(x)$. Thus we can write

$$U_n = u^2 + nv^2 \quad (15)$$

for some integers u and v (depending on n). For large x we have $y_1 > z_1$, so, since $n \notin \mathcal{M}_3(x)$, there is some prime $p > z_1$ such that $p \mid n$. Since $n \notin \mathcal{M}_2(x) \cup \mathcal{M}_4(x)$, it follows that $p \parallel n$ and $p \nmid U_n$. Assume for now that $p \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then writing $n = pm$, we have $\gcd(m, p) = 1$ and $U_n \equiv V_m \pmod{p}$ by (7). Reducing equation (15) modulo p , we get

$$U_n \equiv u^2 \pmod{p}$$

and $p \nmid u$. Thus,

$$1 = \left(\frac{U_n}{p} \right) = \left(\frac{V_m}{p} \right).$$

We conclude from this argument that whenever we have a representation of n of the form $n = mp$, with $p > z_1$, then V_m is a quadratic residue modulo p . In order to use this information efficiently, we remove some more integers $n \leq x$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_5(x) = \{n \leq x : n \notin \mathcal{M}_2(x) \text{ and there is } q > z_1^\kappa, q \mid \gcd(k(p_1), k(p_2)) \\ \text{for } p_1 \neq p_2 \text{ both in } \mathcal{Z} \text{ with } p_1 p_2 \mid n, \\ \text{or } q \mid \gcd(n, k(p)) \text{ for some } p \mid n \text{ with } p \in \mathcal{Z}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $n \in \mathcal{M}_5(x)$. Observe that if x is large, then q is large, so the condition $q \mid k(p)$ together with the condition that $p \in \mathcal{Z}$ implies $q \mid p \pm 1$. Hence, either $q \mid n$ and $q \mid p \pm 1$ for some $p > z_1$ with $p \in \mathcal{Z}$, or there are p_1, p_2 both in \mathcal{Z} dividing n such that $q \mid \gcd(p_1 \pm 1, p_2 \pm 1)$. All this follows from Lemma 6. In either case, the argument from [1] applies and gives

$$\#\mathcal{M}_5(x) \ll \frac{x(\log \log x)^2}{(\log x)^{3\kappa}}. \quad (16)$$

For a prime p write $k(p) = a_p b_p$, where $P(a_p) \leq (\log p)^3$ and b_p has only prime factors larger than $(\log p)^3$. Let $z_2 = \exp(18(\log \log x)^2)$ and put

$$\#\mathcal{M}_6(x) = \{n \leq x : a_p > z_2 \text{ for some prime } p \mid n\}.$$

The argument from [1] applies and gives

$$\#\mathcal{M}_6(x) \ll x \log x \left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^3} + \frac{1}{(\log x)^3} \int_{z_2}^x \frac{dt}{t} \right) \ll \frac{x}{\log x}. \quad (17)$$

Next let $z_3 = \exp((\log x)^\kappa)$. We next will discard positive integers n having a prime factor $p > z_3$ for which $k(p)$ is “small” in a sense that will be made more precise below. Put $c = 20\kappa^{-2}$ and define the following sets of primes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_1 &= \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{K}_{p^{1/2}/\log p}; & \mathcal{R}_1 &= \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{L}_{p^{1/2}/\log p}; \\ \mathcal{Q}_2 &= \left\{ p : d \mid p-1 \text{ and } d \in \left[\frac{p^{1/2}}{\log p} < z(p) < p^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log p)^2) \right] \right\}; \\ \mathcal{R}_2 &= \left\{ p : d \mid p+1 \text{ and } d \in \left[\frac{p^{1/2}}{\log p} < z(p) < p^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log p)^2) \right] \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We need estimates for the counting functions of $\#\mathcal{Q}_1(t)$, $\#\mathcal{Q}_2(t)$, $\#\mathcal{R}_1(t)$ and $\#\mathcal{R}_2(t)$. For $\#\mathcal{Q}_1(t)$, we have

$$\#\mathcal{Q}_1(t) \leq \#\mathcal{Q}_{t^{1/2}/\log t} \ll \frac{t}{(\log t)^3}, \quad (18)$$

by Lemma 7 with $y = t^{1/2}/\log t$. A similar inequality holds for $\#\mathcal{R}_1(t)$. For $\#\mathcal{Q}_2(t)$, we first deal with $\mathcal{Q}_2 \cap [t/2, t]$. Let p be a prime in $\mathcal{Q}_2 \cap [t/2, t]$ and t be large. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p^{1/2}}{\log p} &> \frac{t^{1/2}}{2^{1/2} \log(t/2)} > \frac{t^{1/2}}{2 \log t}; \\ p^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log p)^2) &< t^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log t)^2).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from this that if p is in \mathcal{Q}_2 , then $p-1$ has a divisor in the interval (y, z) , where $y = t^{1/2}/(2 \log t)$ and $z = t^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log t)^2)$. The argument from [1] based on estimates from [7] gives

$$\#(\mathcal{Q}_2 \cap [t/2, t]) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \{\pm 1\}} P(t, y, z, \lambda) \ll \frac{H(t, y, z)}{\log t} \ll \frac{t}{(\log t)^{1+\delta}}, \quad (19)$$

with δ as in Lemma 4. Replacing t by $t/2$, then by $t/4$, etc. and summing the above estimates (19), we get

$$\#\mathcal{Q}_2(t) \ll \frac{t}{(\log t)^{1+\delta}}, \quad (20)$$

as in [1]. A similar argument holds with \mathcal{Q}_2 replaced by \mathcal{R}_2 (just change $p-1$ to $p+1$). Comparing estimate (20) with (18), we get that if we put $\mathcal{Q}_3 = \mathcal{Q}_1 \cup \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{R}_3 = \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2$, then

$$\#\mathcal{Q}_3(t) \leq \#\mathcal{Q}_1(t) + \#\mathcal{Q}_2(t) \ll \frac{t}{(\log t)^{1+\delta}},$$

and a similar estimate holds with \mathcal{Q} replaced by \mathcal{R} . Next we consider

$$\mathcal{M}_7(x) = \{n \leq x : \text{there exists } p > z_3, p \in \mathcal{Z}, p \mid n, p \in \mathcal{Q}_3 \cup \mathcal{R}_3\}.$$

The argument from [1] now applies and gives

$$\#\mathcal{M}_7(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{\kappa\delta}}. \quad (21)$$

We next fix $\lambda \in (0, (1 - \kappa)/2)$ to be determined later, put $K = \lfloor \lambda \log \log x \rfloor$, $y_2 = \exp(\log x / (\log \log x)^2)$, $\mathcal{I} = (z_3, y_2)$ and

$$\omega_{\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z}}(n) = \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z} \\ p \mid n}} 1.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{M}_8(x) = \{n \leq x : n \notin \mathcal{M}_2(x), \omega_{\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z}}(n) < K\}.$$

We now follow [1]. The only difference is in the estimate of the sum

$$S = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z}} \frac{1}{p} = \left(\frac{1 - \kappa}{2} \right) \log \log x - \log \log \log x + O(1),$$

which is by a factor of $1/2$ smaller than the analogous sum S in [1]. The presence of the factor $1/2$ is due to the fact that we only work with primes $p \in \mathcal{Z}$, a subset of relative density $1/2$ in the set of all primes. Following [1] and/or invoking Theorems 08 and 09 in [9], we get

$$\#\mathcal{M}_8(x) \ll \frac{x(\log \log x)^{O(1)}}{(\log x)^\mu}, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\mu = \left(\frac{1 - \kappa}{2} \right) - \lambda \log \left(\frac{e(1 - \kappa)}{2\lambda} \right).$$

Let $n \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^8 \mathcal{M}_i(x)$. Write $n = Pm$, where $P = P(n)$. Fix m . The main idea is that now n has K representations of the form $n = p_i m_i$, where $p_i \in \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z}$. Say $n = p_i m_i$, where $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_K$ are the first (smallest) prime factors of n in $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{Z}$ which exist because $n \notin \mathcal{M}_8(x)$. As in [1], cf. the first sentence following (16) in the present paper, we write $k(p_i) = a_{p_i} b_{p_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ and conclude that $\gcd(b_{p_i}, b_{p_j}) = 1$ for $i \neq j$ both in $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ because $n \notin \mathcal{M}_5(x) \cup \mathcal{M}_6(x)$. Further, by Lemma 6 and using the fact that the p_i are all sufficiently large for x sufficiently large,

we get that the equalities $t(p_i) = k(p_i)$ hold for all $i = 1, \dots, K$. Hence, $k(p_i) = \delta(p_i) \text{ord}_{p_i}(\alpha) \text{ord}_{p_i}(\beta/\gamma)$, where $\delta(p_i) \in \{1/2, 1, 2\}$. We keep the notations from [1], where

$$U(m) = \text{lcm}[t(p_1), \dots, t(p_K)] \quad \text{and} \quad V(m) = \text{lcm}[a_{p_1}, \dots, a_{p_K}],$$

and hope that the reader will not confuse these notations with U_m , or V_m , respectively. We then get that $V(m)$ is “small”, namely

$$V(m) \leq 4 \exp(18\lambda(\log \log x)^3).$$

We shall work with $\{V_{c+dn}\}_{n \geq 0}$ where $d = V(m)$ and $0 \leq c < d$ will be chosen later. There is a further nuisance here which was not present in the problem treated in [1], in that it might be possible that $t_{c,d,p} \neq t(p)/\text{gcd}(t(p), d)$ for one of the primes $p = p_1, \dots, p_K$ which we are working with. But Lemma 8 tells that, for each fixed d , the number of such primes p is at most $O(d)$. Put $z_4 = \exp(18(\log \log x)^3)$ and note that $V(m) < z_4$ for all sufficiently large x . Put \mathcal{Q}_4 for the set of primes $p > z_3$ such that $t_{c,d,p} \neq t(p)/\text{gcd}(t(p), d)$ for some pair (c, d) with $d < z_4$ and $c \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$. Then

$$\#\mathcal{Q}_4 \ll \sum_{d \leq z_4} d \ll z_4^2.$$

So, letting

$$\mathcal{M}_9(x) = \{n \leq x : p \mid n \text{ for some } p > z_3 \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{Q}_4\},$$

we get that

$$\#\mathcal{M}_9(x) \leq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{Q}_4} \frac{x}{p} \ll \frac{x \#\mathcal{Q}_4}{z_3} \ll \frac{x z_4^2}{z_3} \ll \frac{x}{\log x}. \quad (23)$$

From now on, we work in $\mathcal{M}_{10}(x) = \mathcal{M}(x) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^9 \mathcal{M}_i(x)\right)$. We also fix the residue class c of P modulo $d = V(m)$. We now use the fact that $mP = m_i p_i$ and $\left(\frac{V_{m_i}}{p_i}\right) = 1$. This puts m_i in certain residue classes modulo

$$t(p_i)/\text{gcd}(t(p_i), V(m)) = b_{p_i}$$

(analogous to formula (3.23) in [1]), where this last formula holds because $n \notin \mathcal{M}_9(x)$. In our case, we have, by Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} b_{p_i} &\geq \frac{\text{ord}_{p_i}(\alpha) \text{ord}_{p_i}(\beta/\gamma)}{8a_{p_i}} \geq \frac{(p_i^{1/2} \exp(c(\log \log z_3)^2))^2}{8z_2^2} \\ &> p_i \exp(2(\log \log x)^2). \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality is the analogue of (3.22) in [1]. Now the current Lemma 8, together with the argument from [1], shows that the analogue of estimate (3.24) from [1] also holds in our situation. Next the argument from [1] based on the Chinese Remainder Theorem leads to the conclusion that

$$\#\mathcal{M}_{10}(x) \ll \frac{x(\log \log x)^2}{(\log x)^{\lambda \log 2}}. \quad (24)$$

On comparing the upper bounds (11), (12), (13), (14), (16), (17), (21), (22), (23) and (24) we get that

$$\#\mathcal{M}(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{\min\{\kappa\delta, \nu, \lambda \log 2\}}}.$$

In order to minimize this upper bound we choose κ and λ in such a way that $\kappa\delta = \nu = \lambda \log 2$. Thus, $\lambda = \kappa\delta / \log 2$, and we get

$$\kappa\delta = \left(\frac{1 - \kappa}{2} \right) - \frac{\kappa\delta}{\log 2} \log \left(\frac{e(1 - \kappa) \log 2}{2\kappa\delta} \right).$$

Solving we get $\kappa = 0.600541$ with $\lambda = 0.07452\dots$. Note that $\lambda < (1 - \kappa)/2$ as we required at the outset. The final exponent on the logarithm in the saving over the trivial bound $\#\mathcal{M}(x) \leq x$ is $\kappa\delta = 0.0516894\dots$, which leads to the desired conclusion.

Acknowledgements.

This work was done while F. L. visited the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Bonn in April 2015. This author thanks this institution for its hospitality and support.

References

- [1] J. J. Alba González and F. Luca, “On positive integers n such that $F_n = x^2 + ny^2$ ”, *Contemporary Mathematics*, AMS, Vol. **587** (2013), 95–109.
- [2] J. J. Alba González, P. Berrizbeitia and F. Luca, “On the formula $F_p = u^2 + pv^2$ ”, *Internat. J. Number Theory* **11** (2015), 185–191.
- [3] F. Beukers, “The zero-multiplicity of ternary recurrences”, *Compositio Math.* **77** (1991), 165–177.

- [4] E. R. Canfield, P. Erdős and C. Pomerance, “On a problem of Oppenheim concerning ‘Factorisatio Numerorum’”, *J. Number Theory* **17** (1983), 1–28.
- [5] P. Erdős and C. Pomerance, “On the normal number of prime factors of $\phi(n)$ ”, *Rocky Mtn. J. Math.* **15** (1985), 343–352.
- [6] G. Everest, A. van der Poorten, I. Shparlinski and T. Ward, *Recurrence sequences*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [7] K. Ford, “The distribution of integers with a divisor in a given interval”, *Ann. Math.* **168** (2008), 367–433.
- [8] C. A. Gómez and F. Luca, “The zero multiplicity of third-order linear recurrences associated to the Tribonacci sequence”, *Indag. Math.* **25** (2014), 579–587.
- [9] R. R. Hall and G. Tenenbaum, *Divisors*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [10] D. Savin, “Fibonacci primes of special forms”, *Notes on Number Theory and Discrete Math.* **20** (2014), 10–19.
- [11] I. E. Shparlinski, “Distribution of nonresidues and primitive roots in recurrent sequences”, *Mat. Zametki* **24** (1978), 603–613.
- [12] P. Stevenhagen and H. W. Lenstra, “Chebotarëv and his density theorem”, *Math. Intelligencer* **18** (1996), 26–37.
- [13] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.