

4 On the Scarcity of Simple Groups

P. Erdős

Denote by $f(x)$ the number of integers $n \leq x$ for which there is a simple group of order n . Dornhoff [2] proved that $f(x) = o(x)$ and Dornhoff and Spitznagel [3] proved that (c_1, c_2, \dots) denotes suitable positive absolute constants)

$$(1) \quad f(x) < c_1 x \left[\frac{\log \log \log x}{\log \log x} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Denote by $f_1(x)$ the number of integers $n < x$ for which there is a non-cyclic simple group. We are going to prove the following sharper result.

Theorem 1.

$$f_1(x) < \frac{x}{\exp \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + o(1) \right) (\log x \log \log x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)}$$

Denote by $P(u)$ the greatest prime factor of u . Let $u_1 < u_2 < \dots$ be the sequence of all integers which have a divisor $t_i | u_i$, $t_i > 1$, $t_i \equiv 1 \pmod{P(u_i)}$. Let $v_1 < v_2 < \dots$ be the sequence of all integers such that for every $p | v_i$ there is a divisor $t_i(p)$ of v_i satisfying $t_i(p) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, $t_i(p) > 1$. Clearly every v is a u . Thus $U(x) \geq V(x)$ ($U(x) = \sum_{u_i < x} 1$, $V(x) = \sum_{u_i < x} 1$).

It follows from classical results on non-cyclic simple groups that if there is a non-cyclic simple group of order n then n is

a v_i . For if $p^\alpha | n$, $p^{\alpha+1} \nmid n$ then the number of Sylow subgroups 229

$t(\alpha, p)$ of order p^α must be a divisor of n ; further $t(z, p) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and if the group is non-cyclic we must have $t(z, p) > 1$.

Instead of Theorem 1 we prove $(f_1(x) \ll V(x) \ll U(x))$ and

$$(2) \quad U(x) < \frac{x}{\exp\left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + o(1)\right)(\log x \log \log x)^{1/2}\right)}$$

Denote by $\psi(x, y)$ the number of integers not exceeding x all whose prime factors are $\leq y$. Put $y^2 = x$ and assume $z < 4y^{3/2} \log y$. A theorem of de Bruijn then states that [1]

$$(3) \quad \psi(x, y) < c_2 x (\log x)^2 \exp(-z \log z - z \log \log z + c_3 z).$$

Now we are ready to prove (2). We split the integers $u_i < x$ into two classes. In the first class are the integers $u_i < x$ all whose

prime factors are less than $\exp\left(\left(\frac{\log x \log \log x}{2}\right)^{1/2}\right) = I(x)$, and in the second class are other u 's. $U_i(x)$ ($i = 1, 2$) denotes the number of u 's not exceeding x of the i -th class. By (3) we have by a simple computation $\left(z = \left(\frac{2 \log x}{\log \log x}\right)^{1/2}, \log z = \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) \log \log x\right)$

$$(4) \quad U_1(x) < \psi(x, I(x)) < x \exp\left(\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + o(1)\right)(\log x \log \log x)^{1/2}\right).$$

Now we estimate the number of u 's of the second class $U_2(x)$. We evidently have

$$(5) \quad U_2(x) < \sum_{p \geq I(x)} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{x}{p(t p + 1)} \right] < \sum_{p \geq I(x)} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{x}{p(t p + 1)}$$

$$< x \sum_{p \geq I(x)} \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t} < c_4 x \log x \sum_{p \geq I(x)} \frac{1}{p^2} < c_4 x \log x / I(x)$$

Now since $U(x) = U_1(x) + U_2(x)$, (4) and (5) implies (2) and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.

With a little more trouble we can prove

$$\text{Theorem 2. } U(x) = \frac{x}{\exp\left((1+o(1))(2 \log x \log \log x)^{1/2}\right)}$$

We only outline the proof of Theorem 2. It is easy to see that

$$(6) \quad U(x) < \sum_p \sum'_t \psi\left(\frac{x}{p(tp+1)}, p\right)$$

where the dash indicates that the summation is extended over all integers $t > 1$ for which all prime factors of $tp + 1$ are less than or equal to p .

Using (3) we can deduce from (6) by a somewhat intricate computation that

$$(7) \quad f_1(x) < U(x) < \frac{x}{\exp\left((1+o(1))(2\log x \log \log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}.$$

To prove the opposite inequality we first observe that

$$(8) \quad U(x) > (1+o(1)) \sum_p \sum'_t \psi\left(\frac{x}{p(tp+1)}, p\right)$$

The proof of (8) is somewhat cumbersome and we suppress it. De Bruijn [1] proved that the right side of (3) also gives a lower bound for $\psi(x, y)$ (for a different value of c_3). From this fact and from (8) a simple computation gives

$$(9) \quad U(x) > \frac{x}{\exp\left((1+o(1))(2\log x \log \log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}.$$

Using (6) and (8) it perhaps should be possible to give an asymptotic formula for $U(x)$, but I have not succeeded in doing this.

I can prove that for $x > x_0$

$$(10) \quad f_1(x) \leq V(x) < \frac{x}{\exp\left(\sqrt{2} + c_5\right) (\log x \log \log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

The proof of (10) is not quite simple and we suppress it. Further I can prove

$$(11) \quad V(x) > \frac{x}{\exp\left(c_6 (\log x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log \log x\right)}.$$

I do not know which of these estimates is closer to the true order of $V(x)$.

It seems likely that $f_1(x) < x^{1-c_7}$ but (11) shows that the method used in this paper cannot be used to improve our estimate for $f_1(x)$ very much.

REFERENCES

1. N. G. de Bruijn, *On the number of uncancelled elements in the sieve of Eratosthenes*, Indig. Math. 12 (1950), 247-250, see also *On the number of positive integers $\leq x$ and free of prime factors $> y$* , *ibid.*, 13 (1951), 50-60.
2. L. Dornhoff, *Simple groups are scarce*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (1968), 692-696.
3. L. Dornhoff and E. L. Spitznagel Jr., *Density of finite simple group orders*, Math. Zeitschrift, 106 (1968), 175-177.