

On the uniformity of distribution of Farey fractions

Vilius STAKĖNAS

Vilnius University, Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics
Naugarduko 24, LT-03225 Vilnius, Lithuania
e-mail: vilius.stakenas@mif.vu.lt

Abstract. Let \mathcal{F}_x be the set of nonnegative rationals $\frac{m}{n}$ with $0 < n \leq x$ and $(m, n) = 1$. For some fixed interval $I \subset (0; +\infty)$, $I = (\lambda_1; \lambda_2)$ let $F(u|x, I) = \#(\mathcal{F}_x \cap (\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + u(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))) / \#(\mathcal{F}_x \cap I)$. The paper deals with the estimation of discrepancy $|F(u|x, I) - u|$, $0 \leq u \leq 1$.

Keywords: Farey fractions, uniform distribution.

Introduction

Let x be some positive integer. We denote by \mathcal{F}_x the set of nonnegative rationals $\frac{m}{n}$ with $0 < n \leq x$ and $(m, n) = 1$. For some interval $I \subset (0; +\infty)$ let us denote $\mathcal{F}_x^I = \mathcal{F}_x \cap I$. If $I = [0; 1]$ the finite sequence of all numbers from \mathcal{F}_x^I , arranged in ascending order, is called the Farey sequence of order x . It is known [2,4] that some conjectures about the uniformity of distribution of Farey sequence are equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis. The following theorem is proved and discussed in [2,4].

THEOREM 1. *Let $\rho_1 < \dots < \rho_N$ be the Farey sequence of order x , here $N = \#\mathcal{F}_x^{[0;1]}$, $\rho_N = 1$. Then the Riemann hypothesis is equivalent to the statement: the estimate*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{i}{N} - \rho_i \right)^2 = O(x^{-1+\epsilon}), \quad x \rightarrow \infty$$

holds with an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$.

For the following development of the topic see, for example, [3].

For a moment let $I = [0; 1]$ and

$$D_x = \sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \left| \frac{\#(\mathcal{F}_x^I \cap [0; u])}{\#\mathcal{F}_x^I} - u \right|.$$

H. Niederreiter showed in [5] that with some absolute constants c_1 and c_2 the estimate

$$\frac{c_1}{x} \leq D_x \leq \frac{c_2}{x} \tag{1}$$

holds. More than two decades later this result was improved unexpectedly by F. Dress, who proved that indeed

$$D_x = \frac{1}{x},$$

see [1].

The purpose of this note is to establish the estimates like (1) for the discrepancies related to some subsets of \mathcal{F}_x .

Definitions and results

Let $I = (\lambda_1; \lambda_2) \subset (0; \infty)$; the interval I may depend on x . We denote $|I| = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$. Define the distribution function by

$$F(u|x, I) = \#(\mathcal{F}_x^I \cap (\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + u(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))) / \#\mathcal{F}_x^I, \quad 0 \leq u \leq 1.$$

THEOREM 2. *For all $x \geq 1$ and I the following estimate holds:*

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} |F(u|x, I) - u| \ll \frac{1}{|I| \cdot x}.$$

The constant in \ll is absolute.

As a corollary we get immediately, that if $|I| \cdot x \rightarrow \infty$ with $x \rightarrow \infty$, then $F(u|x, I)$ converges weakly to the distribution function $F(u) = u$, $0 \leq u \leq 1$.

THEOREM 3. *If $I = (\lambda_1; \lambda_2)$, $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 > 1/x$ and $\lambda_1 = a/b$ is a rational number; $(a, b) = 1$, then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} |F(u|x, I) - u| \geq \frac{1}{b|I| \cdot x}.$$

The proof of this statement is straightforward. With an arbitrary $m/n \in \mathcal{F}_x^I$

$$\frac{m}{n} - \lambda_1 \geq \frac{1}{bn} \geq \frac{1}{bx},$$

hence the interval $(\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + 1/(bx)) = (\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + u(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))$, with $u = 1/(b|I|x)$ contains no numbers from \mathcal{F}_x^I . It follows then that $F(u|x, I) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $J = (\alpha; \beta)$ be some interval of nonnegative real numbers and

$$S(n, J) = \#\left\{\frac{m}{n}: (m, n) = 1, \frac{m}{n} \in J\right\}, \quad V(n, J) = \#\{m: \alpha n < m < \beta n\}.$$

Evidently, $V(n, J) = n|J| + \theta(n, J)$, here $|\theta(n, J)| \leq 1$. The quantity $V(n, J)$ is equal to the number of fractions $k/d \in J$, $(k, d) = 1$, $d|n$. Consequently,

$$V(n, J) = \sum_{d|n} S(d, J).$$

We have then $V(n, J) = S(n, J) * \mathbb{1}(n)$, where $*$ means the Dirichlet convolution and $\mathbb{1}(n) = 1$. Then $S(n, J) = V(n, J) * \mu(n)$, i.e.,

$$S(n, J) = \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) V(d, J).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{F}_x^J &= \sum_{n \leq x} S(n, J) = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) V(d, J) \\ &= |J| \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) d + \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \theta(d, J). \end{aligned}$$

Because of

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) d = \varphi(n),$$

we have

$$\#\mathcal{F}_x^J = |J| \sum_{n \leq x} \varphi(n) + \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \theta(d, J). \quad (2)$$

Let us use (2) with $J = I$ and $J = I_u = (\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + u(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1))$:

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{F}_x^I \cdot |F(u|x, I) - u| &= |\#\mathcal{F}_x^{I_u} - u \cdot \#\mathcal{F}_x^I| \\ &= \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) (\theta(d, I_u) - u\theta(d, I)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We denote $\theta_d = \theta(d, I_u) - u\theta(d, I)$ and rewrite the sum as

$$R = \sum_{d \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \theta_d = \sum_{d \leq x} \theta_d \sum_{n \leq x/d} \mu(n).$$

We have now

$$R \ll \sum_{d \leq x} \left| M\left(\frac{x}{d}\right) \right|, \quad \text{where } M(u) = \sum_{n \leq u} \mu(n).$$

We use in what follows the estimate $|M(u)| \ll u \exp\{-c\sqrt{\log u}\}$, where $c > 0$, $u \geq 2$, which follows from the law of prime number distribution. Then

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \left| M\left(\frac{x}{d}\right) \right| \ll x + \sum_{1 \leq d \leq x/2} \left| M\left(\frac{x}{d}\right) \right| \ll x + \sum_{1 \leq d \leq x/2} \frac{x}{d} \exp\{-c\sqrt{\log(x/d)}\}$$

$$\ll x + x \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor \log(x/2)/\log 2 \rfloor} \sum_{x/2^{m+1} < d \leq x/2^m} \frac{1}{d} \exp\{-c\sqrt{m}\} \ll x.$$

We have proved that

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} |F(u|x, I) - u| \ll \frac{x}{\#\mathcal{F}_x^I}. \quad (3)$$

Let us take $J = I$ in (2) and use the equality

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \varphi(n) = \frac{3}{\pi^2} x^2 + O(x \log x), \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Applying for the remaining term the same arguments as before for R we arrive to

$$\#\mathcal{F}_x^I = \frac{3}{\pi^2} \cdot |I| \cdot x^2 \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{1}{|I| \cdot x}\right) \right\}.$$

Take $c_1 > 0$ sufficiently large, such that $|I| \cdot x > c_1$ implies $\#\mathcal{F}_x^I > |I| \cdot x^2/5$. Then it follows from (3) that there exists some absolute constant c_2 such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} |F(u|x, I) - u| \leq \frac{c_2}{|I| \cdot x},$$

if $|I| \cdot x > c_1$. If we take $c_2 > c_1$, then this estimate holds trivially as $|I| \cdot x \leq c_1$, too. The Theorem 2 is proved.

Many thanks to the referee for locating almost all misprints and omissions in the first draft of the paper.

References

1. F. Dress. Discr panance des suites de Farey. *J. Th or. Nombres Bordeaux*, 11(2):345–367, 1999.
2. J. Franel. Les suites de Farey et le probl me des nombres premiers. *G ttinger Nachrichten*, 201(1):198–201, 1924.
3. S. Kanemitsu and M. Toshimoto. Farey series and the Riemann hypothesis. *Acta Arithmetica*, LXXV(4):351–374, 1996.
4. E. Landau. Bemerkungen zu der vorstehender Abhandlung von Herrn Franel. *G ttinger Nachrichten*, 201(1):202–206, 1924.
5. H. Niederreiter. The distribution of Farey points, *Mathematische Annalen*. 201(1):341–345, 1973.

REZIUM 

V. Stak nas. Farey trupmenų skirstinio tolygumas

Tegu \mathcal{F}_x  ymi neneigiamų trupmenų $\frac{m}{n}$ aibė,  ia $0 < n \leq x$ ir $(m, n) = 1$. Intervalui $I \subset (0; +\infty)$, $I = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ apibrė kime $F(u|x, I) = \#(\mathcal{F}_x \cap (\lambda_1; \lambda_1 + u(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)))/\#(\mathcal{F}_x \cap I)$. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami nuokrypio $|F(u|x, I) - u|$, $0 \leq u \leq 1$, iver iai.

Raktiniai  od iai: Farey trupmenos, tolygusis skirstinys.