Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **103** (2021), 174–175
doi:10.1017/S0004972720000349

CORRECTION TO 'NOTE ON SUMS INVOLVING THE EULER FUNCTION'

SHANE CHERN

In my paper 'Note on sums involving the Euler function' [3], the estimate of the auxiliary function (with $\delta = 0$ or 1),

$$\mathfrak{S}^*_\delta(x, N) := \sum_{N<n\leq 2N} \frac{\phi(n)}{n}\psi\left(\frac{x}{n+\delta}\right),$$

relies on a result due to Huxley [4], which is recorded as Theorem 6.40 in Bordellès' book *Arithmetic Tales* [1]. It was recently pointed out by Bordellès that there is a typo in his book: the assumption '$T \geq M$' is mistakenly written as '$T \geq 1$'. Hence, the corrected statement of [1, Theorem 6.40] (which is Lemma 2.1 of my paper) should read as follows.

Lemma 2.1*. Let $r \geq 5$, $M \geq 1$ be integers and suppose $f \in C^r[M, 2M]$ is such that there exist real numbers $T \geq M$ and $1 \leq c_0 \leq \cdots \leq c_r$ such that, for all $x \in [M, 2M]$ and all $j \in \{0, \ldots, r\}$,

$$\frac{T}{M^j} \leq |f^{(j)}(x)| \leq c_j \frac{T}{M^j}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{M<n\leq 2M} \psi(f(n)) \ll (MT)^{131/416}(\log MT)^{18627/8320}.$$

This change, in consequence, affects my result significantly by creating a flaw in [3, Proposition 2.2]. In [3], I seek to apply Lemma 2.1* to [3, Equation (2.1)] which states

$$\mathfrak{S}^*_\delta(x, N) = \sum_{k\leq 2N} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \sum_{N/k<\ell\leq 2N/k} \psi\left(\frac{x}{k\ell+\delta}\right).$$

It turns out that, with the correct assumption '$T \geq M$', the inner summation cannot be covered by Lemma 2.1* when $k \ll N^2/x$. Such k's exist when $N \gg \sqrt{x}$.

Since [3, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2] rely closely on Proposition 2.2, the proofs of the two theorems are therefore invalid. It is also worth mentioning that the reason why

Huxley’s result is suitable for the Dirichlet divisor problem for $\sum_{n\le x}\tau(n)$ is that the Dirichlet hyperbola principle allows us to shorten the summation to the range $n \le \sqrt{x}$. Such an argument does not work for my problems.

My Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 were motivated by [2]. In particular, Theorem 1.2 was intended to serve as a partial answer to [2, Question 2.2]: *Is it true that*

$$\sum_{n\le x}\phi\left(\left[\frac{x}{n}\right]\right)=\frac{x\log x}{\zeta(2)}+o(x\log x)\quad\text{as } x\to\infty? \tag{1}$$

Recently, a stronger result was proved by Zhai [5]. In fact, it was shown in [5, Theorem 2] that the error term in (1) could be further refined as $O(x(\log x)^{2/3}(\log\log x)^{1/3})$.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Olivier Bordellès for pointing out the typo in his book and for some helpful conversations.

References

[1] O. Bordellès, *Arithmetic Tales*, translated from the French by Véronique Bordellès, Universitext (Springer, London, 2012).
[2] O. Bordellès, L. Dai, R. Heyman, H. Pan and I. E. Shparlinski, ‘On a sum involving the Euler function’, *J. Number Theory* **202** (2019), 278–297.
[3] S. Chern, ‘Note on sums involving the Euler function’, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **100**(2) (2019), 194–200.
[4] M. N. Huxley, ‘Exponential sums and lattice points. III’, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **87**(3) (2003), 591–609.
[5] W. Zhai, ‘On a sum involving the Euler function’, *J. Number Theory* **211** (2020), 199–219.

SHANE CHERN, Department of Mathematics, Penn State University,
University Park, PA 16802, USA
e-mail: shanechern@psu.edu