

COUNTING COPRIME PAIRS IN RANDOM SQUARES

JOSÉ L. FERNÁNDEZ AND PABLO FERNÁNDEZ

ABSTRACT. Extending the classical Dirichlet’s density theorem on coprime pairs, in this paper we describe completely the probability distribution of the number of coprime pairs in random squares of fixed side length in the lattice \mathbb{N}^2 . The limit behaviour of this distribution as the side length of the random square tends to infinity is also considered.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Dirichlet density theorem, coming all the way from [5], claims that the proportion of coprime pairs in $\mathbb{N}_n \times \mathbb{N}_n$ converges to $6/\pi^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \#\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : 1 \leq a, b \leq n \text{ and } \gcd(a, b) = 1\} = \frac{6}{\pi^2}.$$

Informally (or formally), this theorem claims that the probability that $\gcd(i, j) = 1$, for a point (i, j) chosen at random and “uniformly” in \mathbb{N}^2 , is $6/\pi^2$. ($\#A$ means “number of elements of the set A ”. Here and hereafter, for integer $n \geq 1$, we denote $\mathbb{N}_n := \{1, \dots, n\}$.)

The distribution of coprime pairs appear to be quite regular throughout the lattice \mathbb{N}^2 . This is reflected, for instance, in the fact that for a variety of random walks in \mathbb{N}^2 , almost surely and asymptotically, the average time that the walker has coprime coordinates is again $1/\zeta(2)$, see, for instance, [4] for (regular) random walks and [10] for the so called Pólya walks. See also Section 5 in [9].

Motivated by this anticipated regularity, in this note, instead of drawing at random a point $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and checking whether it is a coprime pair or not, we select at random a whole (square) *window of fixed side length* $M \geq 1$, that is, a square of $M \times M$ lattice points, and count the number of coprime pairs within that window. Our aim is to study the probability distribution of this counting function. The case $M = 1$ would correspond to Dirichlet’s setting.

Fix an integer $M \geq 1$, the side length of the window. For $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we let $Z_M(a, b)$ denote the number of coprime pairs (i, j) within the square of side M that ‘starts’ from the point (a, b) , i.e., so that

$$a + 1 \leq i \leq a + M \quad \text{and} \quad b + 1 \leq j \leq b + M.$$

Thus, for $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we have that


$$Z_M(a, b) = \#\{(i, j) : a + 1 \leq i \leq a + M, b + 1 \leq j \leq b + M \text{ and } \gcd(i, j) = 1\}.$$

Notice that the point (a, b) is not exactly the south-west corner of the square. See Figure 1. The function Z_M takes values in $\{0, \dots, M^2\}$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11K65, 11N36, 11A51.

Key words and phrases. Visible points in squares, Dirichlet’s density theorem, coprime numbers.

Both authors are partially supported by Fundación Akusmatika.

FIGURE 1. The $M \times M$ window with base point (a, b) .

In [16], Sugita and Takanobu undertook the study of the function Z_M , and proved that the limit

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \#\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : Z_M(a, b) = r\}$$

exists for any r such that $0 \leq r \leq M^2$.

From a probabilistic point of view (see Section 2.2 for details), this means that the (random) variable Z_M restricted to \mathbb{N}_n^2 converges in distribution, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to a (random) variable Z_M^* which takes values in $\{0, \dots, M^2\}$. The counting variable Z_M^* is a sum of M^2 Bernoulli variables, each of parameter $1/\zeta(2)$, which are not independent and actually have an interesting correlation structure, see Section 4.

(The existence of the limit distribution Z_M^* is also discussed in Theorem 1.1 of the paper [15] of Martineau.)

Sugita and Takanobu rather considered the *normalized* version U_M of Z_M given by

$$U_M = M \left(\frac{Z_M}{M^2} - \frac{6}{\pi^2} \right),$$

and verified that the characteristic function of U_M restricted to \mathbb{N}_n^2 converges pointwisely, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{a, b \geq 1}^n e^{-ix U_M(a, b)} \quad \text{exists and it is finite for any } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Their very elegant argument is framed within the compactification of \mathbb{Z} given by the ring of finite integral adeles.

In this paper, we show directly, with tools from *elementary number theory and basic probability theory*, that the limit (1.2) exists for any r such that $0 \leq r \leq M^2$, and provide *formulas* for the probability distribution of the limit variable Z_M^* (see Theorem 3.4).

We will also study the correlation structure of the summands of the counting function Z_M^* , to obtain estimates of its variance which imply some limiting behaviour of Z_M^* as the side length M of the window tends to ∞ : the variable Z_M^*/M^2 tends in probability to the constant $1/\zeta(2)$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$, see Theorem 5.2.

The *contents of this paper* are organized as follows. Section 2 contains some required background on probability and divisibility, on arithmetic functions, and on the inclusion/exclusion principle. In Section 3, we study the probability distribution of the variable Z_M and of its limit Z_M^* , while Section 4 is devoted to study the correlation structure

of Z_M^* . Finally, Section 5 discusses the limiting behaviour of Z_M^* as the side length M of the window tends to infinity and poses a few additional questions.

2. NOTATION AND SOME BACKGROUND

2.1. Some notations. For integer $n \geq 1$, we write \mathbb{N}_n to abbreviate $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and \mathbb{N}_n^2 to shorten $\mathbb{N}_n \times \mathbb{N}_n$. For $x > 0$, $\lfloor x \rfloor$ and $\{x\}$ denote, respectively, the floor (integer part) of x and the fractional part of x , such that $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$.

For a pair of nonnegative integers a and b , not both 0, the greatest common divisor $\gcd(a, b)$ of a and b is the largest nonnegative integer which divides both a and b . Thus $\gcd(a, 0) = a$, for integer $a \geq 1$. We shall find it convenient to follow the convention that $g(0, 0) = 0$.

For integers $d \geq 1$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $r_d(a)$ the remainder of dividing a by d , or alternatively, the residue of $a \bmod d$. We also denote by I_d the function in \mathbb{N} given by $I_d(n) = 1$ if $d \mid n$, and 0 otherwise, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The sets of all primes numbers is denoted by \mathcal{P} . The notations \prod_p , or $\prod_{p \geq M}$, etc., are short for $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$, $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}, p \geq M}$, etc.

For a finite set B , we denote with $\#B$ (or with $|B|$) the number of elements of B .

If Ω is a certain reference set and A is a subset of Ω , by $\mathbf{1}_A$ we denote the indicator function of A , i.e., the function in Ω such that $\mathbf{1}_A(\omega) = 1$, if $\omega \in A$, and $\mathbf{1}_A(\omega) = 0$, if $\omega \in \Omega \setminus A$. Observe that $\mathbf{1}_{A \cap B} \equiv \mathbf{1}_A \cdot \mathbf{1}_B$.

In a generic probability space, we use $\mathbf{P}(A)$ to denote the probability of the event A , and $\mathbf{E}(X)$ and $\mathbf{V}(X)$ to denote expectation and variance of a random variable X . Also, $\mathbf{cov}(X, Y)$ and $\rho(X, Y)$ will denote, respectively, covariance and correlation coefficient of the random variables X and Y .

Some additional notations for arithmetic functions will be introduced in Section 2.4.

2.2. Probability and divisibility. For each $n \geq 1$, we let \mathbf{P}_n be the equidistributed probability in \mathbb{N}_n^2 , thus, if $B \subset \mathbb{N}_n^2$, then $\mathbf{P}_n(B) = |B|/n^2$. For a set $B \subset \mathbb{N}^2$, we abbreviate and write $\mathbf{P}_n(B) = \mathbf{P}_n(B \cap \mathbb{N}_n^2)$. Also, $\mathbf{E}_n(X)$ and $\mathbf{V}_n(X)$ denote expectation and variance of a random variable X defined in \mathbb{N}_n^2 , and $\mathbf{cov}_n(X, Y)$ and $\rho_n(X, Y)$ denote covariance and correlation coefficient of the random variables X and Y defined in \mathbb{N}_n^2 . We also abbreviate $\mathbf{E}_n(X) = \mathbf{E}_n(X \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}_n^2})$ and $\mathbf{V}_n(X) = \mathbf{V}_n(X \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}_n^2})$ for X defined in the whole of \mathbb{N}^2 , and analogously for $\mathbf{cov}_n(X, Y)$ and $\rho_n(X, Y)$ for X and Y defined in the whole of \mathbb{N}^2 .

Observe that for primes p and q (different or not),

$$\#\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : p \mid a \text{ and } q \mid b\} = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n}{q} \right\rfloor,$$

and thus that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : p \mid a \text{ and } q \mid b\}) = \frac{1}{pq}.$$

In general, for any integers u and v , we have that

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : r_p(a) = u \text{ and } r_q(b) = v\}) = \frac{1}{pq}.$$

The following elementary lemma describes the asymptotic independence in \mathbb{N}^2 of (joint) divisibility by different primes, which is general enough to cover the needs of this paper.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{q_1, \dots, q_R\}$ be a finite collection of distinct primes. Consider integers u_1, \dots, u_R and v_1, \dots, v_R such that $0 \leq u_j, v_j < q_j$, for $j = 1, \dots, R$ (which play the role of*

collections of residues). Let

$$\Gamma_j = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : r_{q_j}(a) = u_j \text{ and } r_{q_j}(b) = v_j\}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, R.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^R \Gamma_j \right) = \prod_{j=1}^R \frac{1}{q_j^2} = \prod_{j=1}^R \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\Gamma_j) \right).$$

For $1 \leq S < R$, we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^S \Gamma_i \mid \bigcap_{j=S+1}^R \Gamma_j \right) = \prod_{i=1}^S \frac{1}{q_i^2}.$$

Proof. The first statement follows directly from the Chinese remainder theorem and (2.1). The second, concerning conditional probability, follows since, from the first statement, we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^S \Gamma_i \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{j=S+1}^R \Gamma_j \right) \right) = \prod_{i=1}^S \frac{1}{q_i^2} \prod_{j=S+1}^R \frac{1}{q_j^2},$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{j=S+1}^R \Gamma_j \right) = \prod_{j=S+1}^R \frac{1}{q_j^2}. \quad \square$$

2.3. Inclusion/exclusion arguments. We shall resort a number of times to arguments of inclusion/exclusion type; we record next the classical principle of inclusion/exclusion, and a few variants.

For $t \geq 1$, let A_1, \dots, A_t be subsets of a finite set Ω . Let \mathbf{P} be a probability measure on the set Ω (over all subsets of Ω). Then the inclusion/exclusion principle reads

$$\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^t A_j \right| = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t} |A_j| - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} |A_i \cap A_j| + \dots + (-1)^{t+1} |A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_t|$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{P} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^t A_j \right) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t} \mathbf{P}(A_j) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} \mathbf{P}(A_i \cap A_j) + \dots + (-1)^{t+1} \mathbf{P}(A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_t).$$

We collect now convenient variations of the inclusion/exclusion principle: the Schuette–Nesbitt formula, the Waring formula, and the generating function approach, which relate, for a given r , the subset of Ω where a point lies in (exactly) r of the subsets A_j with the set of points lying in at least on s of the A_j , for each s . These variations are widely used, for instance, in actuarial science. See [11] and [12, p. 89] for further details.

Let C be the counting function of the A_j , i.e.,

$$C = \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{1}_{A_j}.$$

Lemma 2.2 (Schuette–Nesbitt). *With the notations above, for each integer r such that $0 \leq r \leq t$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\{C=r\}}(\omega) &= \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \left[\sum_{\substack{J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}, \\ |J|=s}} \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{1}_{A_j}(\omega) \right] \\ &= \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \left[\sum_{\substack{J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}, \\ |J|=s}} \mathbf{1}_{\bigcap_{j \in J} A_j}(\omega) \right], \quad \text{for each } \omega \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations, Lemma 2.2 gives the so-called Waring’s formula:

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbf{P}(C = r) = \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}, \\ |J|=s}} \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcap_{j \in J} A_j\right),$$

See, for instance p. 106 in Feller’s book [6].

For the counting variable $C = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{A_j}$, we have that

$$\binom{C}{2} = \frac{C(C-1)}{2} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbf{1}_{A_j},$$

and, in general,

$$\binom{C}{s} = \frac{C(C-1) \cdots (C-s+1)}{s!} = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{A_{i_1}} \cdots \mathbf{1}_{A_{i_s}}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq s \leq t.$$

(Notice that, for $s = 0$, we understand $\binom{C}{0} \equiv 1$ and also, consistently, that an empty intersection is the whole set: $\bigcap_{j \in \emptyset} A_j = \Omega$.) Thus,

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right) = \sum_{\substack{J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}, \\ |J|=s}} \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcap_{j \in J} A_j\right), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

and Waring’s formula (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{P}(C = r) = \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right).$$

Lemma 2.3 (Inclusion/exclusion principle and probability generating functions). *With the notations above,*

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{r=0}^t \mathbf{P}(C = r) z^r = \sum_{s=0}^t (z-1)^s \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right), \quad \text{for } |z| < 1.$$

Proof. It follows from a direct change of order of summation:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=0}^t \mathbf{P}(C = r) z^r &= \sum_{r=0}^t \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right) z^r \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^t \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right) \sum_{r=0}^s (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} z^r = \sum_{s=0}^t (z-1)^s \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{C}{s}\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

If the A_j are *exchangeable events* with respect to the probability \mathbf{P} , in the sense that for any $J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$ the probability $\mathbf{P}(\bigcap_{j \in J} A_j)$ depends only on $|J|$, and if we define $\alpha(s) = \mathbf{P}(\bigcap_{j \in J} A_j)$, for any $J \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$ with $|J| = s$ and $s \in \{0, \dots, t\}$, then (2.3) and (2.4) reduce to

$$\mathbf{P}(C = r) = \sum_{s=r}^t (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{t}{s} \alpha(s), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq t.$$

and

$$\sum_{r=0}^t \mathbf{P}(C = r) z^r = \sum_{s=0}^t \binom{t}{s} (z-1)^s \alpha(s), \quad \text{for } |z| < 1,$$

respectively.

2.4. Some results on arithmetic functions. An arithmetic function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is termed *multiplicative* if $f(1) = 1$ and $f(n \cdot m) = f(n) \cdot f(m)$ for coprime n and m , i.e., when $\gcd(n, m) = 1$. If $f(n \cdot m) = f(n) \cdot f(m)$ holds for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, then f is termed *completely multiplicative*. The multiplicative arithmetic function f is called *strongly multiplicative* if $f(p^a) = f(p)^a$ for all prime numbers p and all natural numbers a .

For a multiplicative arithmetic function f which is bounded (or simply, such that $|f(n)| = O_\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon)$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$), its associated Dirichlet series $L_f(s)$ admits an Euler product representation of the form

$$L_f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{f(p)}{p^s} + \frac{f(p^2)}{p^{2s}} + \dots \right), \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } \Re s > 1,$$

that reduces, in case f is strongly multiplicative, to

$$(2.5) \quad L_f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 + f(p) \frac{1}{p^s} \frac{1}{1 - 1/p^s} \right), \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } \Re s > 1.$$

The (*Dirichlet*) *convolution* $f \star g$ of two arithmetic functions f and g is given by

$$(f \star g)(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) g(n/d) \quad \text{for } n \geq 1.$$

For bounded arithmetic functions f and g , their Dirichlet convolution can be bounded by $|(f \star g)(n)| \leq Cd(n)$, where $d(n)$ counts the number of divisors of the integer $n \geq 1$, and thus $|(f \star g)(n)| = O_\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, according to Theorem 315 in [13]. The Dirichlet series of their convolution is the product of the individual Dirichlet series: $L_{f \star g}(s) = L_f(s) \cdot L_g(s)$, for $s \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re s > 1$.

The Möbius function μ is the multiplicative arithmetic function defined by $\mu(1) = 1$, and, for $n \geq 2$, by

$$(2.6) \quad \mu(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is square-free and has an even number of prime factors,} \\ -1, & \text{if } n \text{ is square-free and has an odd number of prime factors,} \\ 0, & \text{if } n \text{ is not square-free.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that $|\mu(n)| = 1$, if n is square free, and that $|\mu(n)| = 0$, otherwise.

Recall that the Dirichlet series L_μ of the Möbius function μ , and the Riemann zeta function, $\zeta(s)$, are related by

$$L_\mu(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s} \right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(s)}, \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } \Re s > 1;$$

in particular, we have that

$$(2.7) \quad L_\mu(2) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^2} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \approx 0.6079 \dots$$

The so called Feller–Tornier constant¹, denoted here by \mathbf{F} , is given by

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{F} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right) \approx 0.3226 \dots$$

2.4.1. Inclusion/exclusion principle and Möbius function. We are going to encounter a few times the following situation: a finite set Ω endowed with a probability measure \mathbf{P} defined for all subsets of Ω , a collection of subsets $A_p \subset \Omega$ indexed with prime numbers $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and a function β so that $\mathbf{P}(A_p) = \beta(p)$ for any prime p , $\mathbf{P}(A_p \cap A_q) = \beta(pq)$ for any pair of distinct primes, and so on.

In this case, the inclusion/exclusion principle as in (2.2), combined with the codifying properties of the Möbius function, gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\Omega \setminus \bigcup_p A_p\right) &= 1 - \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcup_p A_p\right) = 1 - \sum_p \mathbf{P}(A_p) + \sum_{p < q} \mathbf{P}(A_p \cap A_q) - \dots \\ &= 1 - \sum_p \beta(p) + \sum_{p < q} \beta(pq) - \dots = \sum_{\substack{h \geq 1, \\ \text{square free}}} \mu(h)\beta(h) = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mu(h)\beta(h), \end{aligned}$$

which we register as

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbf{P}\left(\Omega \setminus \bigcup_p A_p\right) = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mu(h)\beta(h).$$

2.4.2. Cesàro’s identity. The following standard identity, named after Cesàro, see [3], is useful when dealing with sums over gcds.

Lemma 2.4 (Cesàro’s identity). *If f is any arithmetic function, and for integers $A, B \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq A, 1 \leq j \leq B} f(\gcd(i, j)) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (f \star \mu)(k) \left\lfloor \frac{A}{k} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{B}{k} \right\rfloor.$$

Actually, the sum on the right extends just up to $k \leq \min\{A, B\}$.

If we apply Lemma 2.4 with $A = B = n \geq 1$ and with the function $f = \delta_1$, which is given by $\delta_1(k) = 1$ if $k = 1$, and 0 otherwise, then, since $\delta_1 \star \mu \equiv \mu$, we obtain that

$$\#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i, j) = 1\} = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(k) \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor^2.$$

Using that $\lfloor n/k \rfloor = n/k - \{n/k\}$, a simple estimate shows that

$$\#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i, j) = 1\} = n^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{k^2} + O(n \ln n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, by (2.7), we have that

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i, j) = 1\} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{k^2} + O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(\frac{\ln n}{n}\right), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

¹In some instances, the Feller–Tornier constant is defined as $(1 + \mathbf{F})/2$, with value $\approx 0.6613 \dots$

and, thus, that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i, j) = 1\} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}.$$

This observation is the Dirichlet density theorem anticipated in (1.1).

We shall need the following variation of Dirichlet's limit:

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i+k, j+l) = 1\} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}, \quad \text{for any } (k, l) \in \mathbb{N}^2.$$

To verify (2.10), maintain (k, l) fixed and let B_n denote

$$B_n = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : 1 \leq i \leq k+n, 1 \leq j \leq l+n \text{ and } \gcd(i, j) = 1\}.$$

Now

$$|B_n| = \sum_{m \geq 1} \mu(m) \left\lfloor \frac{k+n}{m} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{l+n}{m} \right\rfloor,$$

and arguing as above, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} |B_n| = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}.$$

Finally, from the double inequality

$$|B_n| - (k(l+n) + (k+n)l) \leq \#\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : \gcd(i+k, j+l) = 1\} \leq |B_n|,$$

we deduce (2.10).

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Fix first integers $C, D \geq 1$ and define, for every prime p , the set A_p given by

$$A_p = \{1 \leq i \leq C, 1 \leq j \leq D : p \mid i \text{ and } p \mid j\}.$$

We have that $|A_p| = \lfloor C/p \rfloor \lfloor D/p \rfloor$, and that $|A_p \cap A_q| = \lfloor C/(pq) \rfloor \lfloor D/(pq) \rfloor$ for primes p, q , etc. From (2.9), with equidistributed probability, we obtain that

$$\#\{1 \leq i \leq C, 1 \leq j \leq D : \gcd(i, j) = 1\} = CD - \left| \bigcup_p A_p \right| = \sum_{h \geq 1} \mu(h) \left\lfloor \frac{C}{h} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{D}{h} \right\rfloor.$$

Now, using the above with $C = \lfloor A/m \rfloor$ and $D = \lfloor B/m \rfloor$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq A, 1 \leq j \leq B} f(\gcd(i, j)) &= \sum_{m \geq 1} f(m) \#\{1 \leq i \leq A, 1 \leq j \leq B : \gcd(i, j) = m\} \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 1} f(m) \#\{1 \leq \tilde{i} \leq A/m, 1 \leq \tilde{j} \leq B/m : \gcd(\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}) = 1\} \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 1} f(m) \sum_{h \geq 1} \mu(h) \left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor A/m \rfloor}{h} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor B/m \rfloor}{h} \right\rfloor = \sum_{m \geq 1} f(m) \sum_{h \geq 1} \mu(h) \left\lfloor \frac{A}{mh} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{B}{mh} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{A}{k} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{B}{k} \right\rfloor \sum_{m, h \geq 1, mh=k} f(m) \mu(h) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (f \star \mu)(k) \left\lfloor \frac{A}{k} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{B}{k} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

We have used that if n, m and k are integers, then $\lfloor \lfloor n/m \rfloor / k \rfloor = \lfloor n/(mk) \rfloor$. \square

2.4.3. *An auxiliary arithmetic function.* In Section 4, the function Υ , which we are about to introduce, will be used to codify the correlation structure of the counting function of coprime pairs in windows.

The arithmetic function Υ is defined by

$$(2.11) \quad \Upsilon(1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon(n) = \prod_{p|n} \frac{1 - 1/p^2}{1 - 2/p^2}, \quad \text{for } n \geq 2.$$

The first few values of the function $\Upsilon(n)$ are

$$(2.12) \quad 1, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{8}{7}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{24}{23}, \frac{12}{7}, \frac{48}{47}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{8}{7}, \frac{36}{23}, \frac{120}{119}, \frac{12}{7}, \frac{168}{167}, \frac{72}{47}, \frac{192}{161}, \dots$$

As all factors in the product defining $\Upsilon(n)$ are greater than 1, we have the bounds

$$(2.13) \quad 1 < \Upsilon(n) < \prod_p \frac{1 - 1/p^2}{1 - 2/p^2} = \frac{1}{\zeta(2) \cdot \mathbf{F}} \approx 1.88426 \dots, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2,$$

where \mathbf{F} is the Feller–Tornier constant from (2.8).

By convention, we extend Υ and define $\Upsilon(0) = 1/(\zeta(2) \cdot \mathbf{F})$

The function Υ is strongly multiplicative, due to its very definition (2.11). Therefore, by (2.5), its associated Dirichlet series L_Υ is given by

$$L_\Upsilon(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Upsilon(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1 - 1/p^2}{1 - 2/p^2} \frac{1}{p^s} \frac{1}{1 - 1/p^s} \right), \quad \text{for any } s \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } \Re s > 1.$$

In particular, for $s = 2$, we have that

$$(2.14) \quad L_\Upsilon(2) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1 - 1/p^2}{1 - 2/p^2} \frac{1}{p^2} \frac{1}{1 - 1/p^2} \right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2) \mathbf{F}}.$$

2.4.4. *The convolution $\Upsilon \star \mu$.* We shall appeal to the convolution $\Upsilon \star \mu$ of the function Υ with the Möbius function μ . Notice that the function $\Upsilon \star \mu$ is multiplicative. For prime p ,

$$(\Upsilon \star \mu)(p) = \sum_{d|p} \mu(d) \Upsilon(p/d) = \mu(1) \Upsilon(p) + \mu(p) \Upsilon(1) = \Upsilon(p) - 1 = \frac{1}{p^2 - 2},$$

while for a prime power p^k with $k \geq 2$,

$$(\Upsilon \star \mu)(p^k) = \sum_{d|p^k} \mu(d) \Upsilon(p^k/d) = \mu(1) \Upsilon(p^k) + \mu(p) \Upsilon(p^{k-1}) = \Upsilon(p)(\mu(1) + \mu(p)) = 0,$$

using that Υ is strongly multiplicative. Thus,

$$(2.15) \quad (\Upsilon \star \mu)(1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\Upsilon \star \mu)(n) = |\mu(n)| \prod_{p|n} \frac{1}{p^2 - 2}, \quad \text{for each } n \geq 2.$$

Recall that $|\mu(n)| = 1$ if n is square free, and is 0 otherwise. The convolution $(\Upsilon \star \mu)$ is a non-negative function, and in fact we have the bounds

$$(2.16) \quad |\mu(n)| \frac{1}{n^2} \leq (\Upsilon \star \mu)(n) \leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{F}} |\mu(n)| \frac{1}{n^2}, \quad \text{for any } n \geq 2.$$

This follows from rewriting (2.15) as

$$(\Upsilon \star \mu)(n) = \frac{|\mu(n)|}{n^2} \prod_{p|n} \frac{p^2}{p^2 - 2}, \quad \text{for any } n \geq 2,$$

and from observing that

$$1 < \prod_{p|n} \frac{p^2}{p^2-2} < \prod_p \frac{p^2}{p^2-2} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{F}}, \quad \text{for any } n \geq 2.$$

Notice that both inequalities in (2.16) are sharp: the constants 1 and $1/\mathbf{F}$ can not be improved; just take (big) prime numbers for the left inequality, and primorials for the right inequality.

2.4.5. *Averages of Υ .* We consider now the average of $\Upsilon(\gcd(i, j))$ for $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2$. Using Lemma 2.4, we have that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) = \sum_{k=1}^n (\Upsilon \star \mu)(k) \left[\frac{n}{k} \right]^2, \quad \text{for any } n \geq 1.$$

Writing $[n/k] = n/k + \{n/k\}$, and using the bound (2.16) and the values of $L_\Upsilon(2)$ from (2.14) and $L_\mu(2)$ from (2.7), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) &= n^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\Upsilon \star \mu)(k)}{k^2} + O(n) = n^2 L_{\Upsilon \star \mu}(2) + O(n) \\ &= n^2 L_\Upsilon(2) L_\mu(2) + O(n) = n^2 \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} + O(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{E}_n(\Upsilon \circ \gcd) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad \text{for } n \geq 1,$$

and, in particular,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(\Upsilon \circ \gcd) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}.$$

For $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1]$, using that Υ is a positive function, we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [\alpha n], \\ 1 \leq j \leq [\beta n]}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \alpha n, \\ 1 \leq j \leq \beta n}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq [\alpha n] + 1, \\ 1 \leq j \leq [\beta n] + 1}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)),$$

and arguing as above, we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \alpha n, \\ 1 \leq j \leq \beta n}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) = (\alpha\beta) \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}.$$

More generally, for any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in (0, 1]$ such that $\alpha > \gamma$ and $\beta > \delta$,

$$(2.17) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{\gamma n \leq i \leq \alpha n, \\ \delta n \leq j \leq \beta n}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) = (\alpha - \gamma)(\beta - \delta) \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}.$$

The next lemma shows how well distributed the values $\Upsilon(\gcd(i, j))$ are. See [7] for further connections between equidistribution and coprimality.

Lemma 2.5. *If f is a continuous function in the square $[0, 1]^2$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i/n \leq 1, \\ 0 \leq j/n \leq 1}} f\left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right) \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) = \left[\frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} \right] \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) dx dy.$$

(The i, j in the sum above are integers.) This lemma claims that the sequence of probability measures λ_n in the square $[0, 1]^2$ given by

$$\lambda_n := \frac{1}{\Lambda_n} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i/n \leq 1, \\ 0 \leq j/n \leq 1}} \delta_{(i/n, j/n)} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)),$$

where $\delta_{(x, y)}$ denotes the point mass distribution at $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$, and where

$$\Lambda_n = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i/n \leq 1, \\ 0 \leq j/n \leq 1}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)),$$

converges weakly, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to the Lebesgue measure in the square $[0, 1]^2$.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Fix an integer $k \geq 1$. The i, j in the sums below are always integers. Denote, for integer $n > k$,

$$A_n := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i/n \leq 1, \\ 0 \leq j/n \leq 1}} f\left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right) \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)).$$

For integers u and v such that $0 \leq u, v < k$, denote

$$A_n(u, v) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{u/k \leq i/n \leq (u+1)/k, \\ v/k \leq j/n \leq (v+1)/k}} f\left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right) \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)).$$

Let

$$\phi(u, v) = \max \left\{ f(x, y) : \frac{u}{k} \leq x \leq \frac{u+1}{k} \text{ and } \frac{v}{k} \leq y \leq \frac{v+1}{k} \right\}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq u, v < k,$$

and

$$B_n(u, v) = \phi(u, v) \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{u/k \leq i/n \leq (u+1)/k, \\ v/k \leq j/n \leq (v+1)/k}} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)).$$

Because Υ is a positive function, we have that $A_n(u, v) \leq B_n(u, v)$ for each u and v . On account of (2.17), we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n(u, v) = \phi(u, v) \frac{1}{k^2 \zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}.$$

Since

$$A_n \leq \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u < k, \\ 0 \leq v < k}} A_n(u, v) \leq \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u < k, \\ 0 \leq v < k}} B_n(u, v),$$

we have that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u < k, \\ 0 \leq v < k}} \phi(u, v).$$

This last inequality is valid for any integer $k \geq 1$, and so from

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq u < k, \\ 0 \leq v < k}} \phi(u, v) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) dx dy,$$

(by definition of the Riemann integral), we deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) dx dy.$$

Analogously, one obtains that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \geq \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 f(x, y) dx dy. \quad \square$$

The following particular example of the lemma above, with $f(x, y) = (1-x)(1-y)$, will be used later in this paper:

$$(2.18) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i/n \leq 1, \\ 0 \leq j/n \leq 1}} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{j}{n}\right) \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}.$$

3. COUNTING COPRIME PAIRS IN WINDOWS

In this section, we study the distribution of the variable Z_M which counts coprime pairs in square windows of fixed side length M to obtain Theorem 3.4, the main result of this paper.

3.1. Indicator of coprime pairs. We denote by \mathcal{V} the set of points (n, m) in \mathbb{N}^2 such that $\gcd(n, m) = 1$, that is, so that (n, m) is a coprime pair. Points of \mathcal{V} are frequently called *visible points* (from the origin $(0, 0)$), see, for instance, [14].

We denote the indicator function of \mathcal{V} by V , so $V(n, m) = 1$ if $\gcd(n, m) = 1$, and $V(n, m) = 0$ otherwise. We can write the function V as

$$(3.1) \quad V(a, b) = \prod_p (1 - I_p(a) I_p(b)) \quad \text{for } a, b \geq 1.$$

Recall that $I_p(n) = 1$ if the prime p divides n , and $I_p(n) = 0$ otherwise. For each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, all but a finite number of factors in the above expression are equal to 1. In fact, $V(a, b) = 1$ if and only all factors are 1, or equivalently, if no prime p divides both a and b .

In probabilistic terms, and using the notation of Section 2.2, equation (1.1), Dirichlet's density theorem, translates into

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(V) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{V}) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}.$$

3.2. Counting coprime pairs in windows. Fix a side length $M \geq 1$, and denote by \mathcal{K}_M the square $\mathcal{K}_M = \{1, \dots, M\}^2$ in \mathbb{N}^2 .

For each point $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, the window $\mathcal{W}_M(a, b)$ in the lattice \mathbb{N}^2 is the translation by (a, b) of the square \mathcal{K}_M , that is,

$$\mathcal{W}_M(a, b) = \{a + 1, \dots, a + M\} \times \{b + 1, \dots, b + M\} = (a, b) + \mathcal{K}_M.$$

See again Figure 1.

We denote with Z_M the function defined in \mathbb{N}^2 which at each (a, b) gives the number of coprime pairs within the window $\mathcal{W}_M(a, b)$, i.e.,

$$(3.3) \quad Z_M(a, b) = \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{W}_M(a, b)} V(i, j).$$

We prefer to write Z_M in the form

$$(3.4) \quad Z_M(a, b) = \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M} V(a + k, b + l),$$

so as to display the function Z_M as the sum of the M^2 functions

$$(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mapsto V(a + k, b + l),$$

with (k, l) running over the square \mathcal{K}_M . In principle, we have that $0 \leq Z_M(a, b) \leq M^2$, although the maximum value of Z_M is usually quite smaller than M^2 ; see Section 3.4.2.

Remark 3.1. The case $Z_M(a, b) = 0$ would correspond to a M -window which is *fully invisible* (from the origin), in the sense that all points of the window have coordinates that are not coprime. There are explicit constructions of arbitrarily large ‘invisible’ squares; see, for instance, Theorem 5.29 in Apostol’s book [1], or [14]. See also Section 5 in [9] for some related questions.

The following explicit formula for $Z_M(a, b)$ can be obtained by means of the inclusion/exclusion principle. Compare with Theorem 5 in [16].

Lemma 3.2 (A formula for $Z_M(a, b)$). *For $M \geq 1$ and $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$,*

$$(3.5) \quad Z_M(a, b) = \sum_{d \geq 1} \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_d(a)}{d} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_d(b)}{d} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. Fix $M \geq 1$. For $d \geq 1$, let

$$C_M^{(d)}(a, b) = \{(i, j) \in (a, b) + \mathcal{K}_M : d \mid i \text{ and } d \mid j\}.$$

Now,

$$Z_M(a, b) = M^2 - \left| \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} C_M^{(p)}(a, b) \right|.$$

The union above is in fact a finite union, since for $p > a + M$, the set $C_M^{(p)}(a, b)$ is empty. Observe that, for prime p ,

$$|C_M^{(p)}(a, b)| = \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_p(a)}{p} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_p(b)}{p} \right\rfloor,$$

and that, for primes p and q ,

$$|C_M^{(p)}(a, b) \cap C_M^{(q)}(a, b)| = |C_M^{(pq)}(a, b)| = \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_{pq}(a)}{pq} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_{pq}(b)}{pq} \right\rfloor,$$

and so on. Thus, (3.5) follows by (2.9) of Section 2.4.1. \square

Going back to the probabilistic setting in \mathbb{N}_n^2 , the random variable Z_M is a sum of M^2 Bernoulli variables, see (3.4). Each one of them has, asymptotically as $n \rightarrow \infty$, parameter $1/\zeta(2)$, by Dirichlet’s result (3.2). All this readily gives, for the mean of Z_M , that

$$(3.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(Z_M) = \frac{M^2}{\zeta(2)}.$$

But for the *actual distribution* of Z_M , observe that those Bernoulli variables are not independent; in fact, they exhibit an interesting correlation structure, see Section 4.

Our main interest here is to show that for each $M \geq 1$, the random variable Z_M in $(\mathbb{N}_n^2, \mathbf{P}_n)$ converges in distribution, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to a random variable Z_M^* taking values in $\{0, 1, \dots, M^2\}$, i.e., to prove that the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r) =: \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r)$$

exists for each r such that $0 \leq r \leq M^2$ and that $\sum_{r=0}^{M^2} \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r) = 1$.

The analysis in the following Sections 3.3 and 3.4 will provide, see Theorem 3.4, an *explicit* and *computable* formula for $\mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r)$ for each $M \geq 1$ and all $0 \leq r \leq M^2$.

3.3. Splitting the square \mathcal{K}_M . There is a natural interaction between the side length M of the square \mathcal{K}_M and divisibility properties of the points within the window $\mathcal{W}_M(a, b)$. The (simple) reason is that a prime $p \geq M$ cannot divide simultaneously $a + k$ and $a + k'$ if $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. So, it will be most convenient to separate, for each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, the points of \mathcal{K}_M into two classes, as follows.

Fix $M \geq 1$ and define

$$P_M := \prod_{p < M} p,$$

with $P_1 = P_2 = 1$. We shall assign, to each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, a pair of complementary subsets, $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$ and $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$, within the square \mathcal{K}_M .

We denote by $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$ the subset of \mathcal{K}_M which consists of those pairs $(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M$ such that both $a + k$ and $b + l$ are divisible by some prime $p < M$:

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{B}_M(a, b) = \bigcup_{p < M} \{(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M : a + k \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \text{ and } b + l \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\}.$$

The set $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$ is just the complement of $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$ in \mathcal{K}_M

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{A}_M(a, b) := \mathcal{K}_M \setminus \mathcal{B}_M(a, b).$$

Notice that $\mathcal{B}_1(a, b) = \mathcal{B}_2(a, b) = \emptyset$, and also that, accordingly, $\mathcal{A}_1(a, b) = \mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2(a, b) = \mathcal{K}_2$.

It is a relevant fact that the sets $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$ and $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$ depend only on the *collection* of (pairs of) residues $\{(r_q(a), r_q(b)) : q \in P_M\}$, and thus, because of the Chinese remainder theorem, ultimately depend only on the pair of residues

$$(3.9) \quad R_M(a, b) := (r_{P_M}(a), r_{P_M}(b)),$$

Thus, there are P_M^2 different possibilities for the sets $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$ (and for the corresponding sets $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$).

We denote by $\Phi_M(a, b)$ the size of $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$:

$$\Phi_M(a, b) = |\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)|.$$

Arguing with the inclusion/exclusion principle as in (2.9), we obtain that

$$(3.10) \quad \Phi_M(a, b) = \sum_{1 \leq d | P_M} \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_d(a)}{d} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{M + r_d(b)}{d} \right\rfloor.$$

The sum above extends to the divisors d of P_M .

It is always the case, although far from sharp, that $\Phi_M(a, b) \leq M^2 - \lfloor (M - 1)/2 \rfloor^2$.

As mentioned before, $\Phi_1(a, b) = 1$ and $\Phi_2(a, b) = 4$ for all $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$.

For $M = 3$, we have that $P_3 = 2$ and that

- $\Phi_3(a, b) = 8$ if both a and b are even, i.e., if $R_3(a, b) = (0, 0)$;
- $\Phi_3(a, b) = 5$ if both are odd, i.e., if $R_3(a, b) = (1, 1)$;

- $\Phi_3(a, b) = 7$ if one is even and the other is odd, i.e., if $R_3(a, b)$ is $(1, 0)$ or $(0, 1)$.

We depict the four possible configurations of \mathcal{A}_3 and \mathcal{B}_3 in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. The four possible configurations of \mathcal{A}_3 . The white squares represent the points of $\mathcal{A}_3(a, b)$; the blue (horizontally lined) squares, points of $\mathcal{B}_3(a, b)$, have both coordinates even. On top, we have noted (a, b) modulo 2, and below each configuration, we have written the corresponding value of $\Phi_3(a, b)$, ranging from 5 to 8.

For the case $M = 4$, with $P_4 = 6$, Figure 3 displays the 36 possible configurations.

For fixed s , such that $0 \leq s \leq M^2$, we denote with $\xi(M, s)$ the (arithmetic) average of the binomial coefficients $\binom{\Phi_M(u, v)}{s}$:

$$(3.11) \quad \xi(M, s) = \frac{1}{P_M^2} \sum_{0 \leq u, v < P_M} \binom{\Phi_M(u, v)}{s}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq M^2.$$

Of course, $\xi(M, 0) = 1$. As we shall see later, in (3.26), the value of $\xi(M, 1)$, which is the average value of $\Phi_M(u, v)$, is

$$\xi(M, 1) = \frac{1}{P_M^2} \sum_{0 \leq u, v < P_M} \Phi_M(u, v) = M^2 \prod_{p < M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

3.4. Distribution of the window coprime counting variable. Fix $M \geq 1$. We use now the splitting of Section 3.3 to simplify the definition of $Z_M(a, b)$ from the expression (3.4) to

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_M(a, b) &= \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M} V(a + k, b + l) = \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{B}_M(a, b)} V(a + k, b + l) + \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{A}_M(a, b)} V(a + k, b + l) \\ &= \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{A}_M(a, b)} V(a + k, b + l) = \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{A}_M(a, b)} \prod_p (1 - I_p(a + k) I_p(b + l)) \\ &= \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{A}_M(a, b)} \prod_{p \geq M} (1 - I_p(a + k) I_p(b + l)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used (3.1) and the very definitions of $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b)$ and $\mathcal{B}_M(a, b)$. Notice also how this shows that the maximum possible value of $Z_M(a, b)$ is $\Phi(a, b)$, and not M^2 .

3.4.1. Conditioning upon residues modulo P_M . We now fix a pair (u, v) of residues modulo P_M , with $0 \leq u, v < P_M$,

Fix $n \geq 1$. Recall, from (3.9), that $R_M(a, b)$ denotes the pair $(r_{P_M}(a), r_{P_M}(b))$ of residues of (a, b) modulo P_M . We are going to condition upon

$$(3.13) \quad \Omega_n(u, v) = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : R_M(a, b) = (u, v)\}.$$

There are a total of P_M^2 different $\Omega_n(u, v)$, which form a partition of \mathbb{N}_n^2 .




FIGURE 3. The 36 possible configurations of \mathcal{A}_4 , labelled with the values of (a, b) modulo 6, and the corresponding values of $\Phi_4(a, b)$, that in this case range from 9 to 12. As before, the white squares represent the points of $\mathcal{A}_4(a, b)$, and the blue (horizontally lined) squares correspond to points with both coordinates even; but now the red squares (vertically lined) have both coordinates divisible by 3. Some squares, of course, belong to both categories.

Using Lemma 2.1, we see that

$$(3.14) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\Omega_n(u, v)) = \frac{1}{P_M^2}, \quad \text{for each } 0 \leq u, v < P_M.$$

For all $(a, b) \in \Omega_n(u, v)$ we have that $\mathcal{A}_M(a, b) = \mathcal{A}_M(u, v)$, since $R_M(a, b) = (u, v)$, that is, $a \equiv u \pmod p$ and $b \equiv v \pmod p$ for all prime $p > M$. Consequently, we have that $\Phi_M(a, b) = \Phi_M(u, v)$ if $(a, b) \in \Omega_n(u, v)$.

We apply now Lemma 2.2. Take, in the notation used there, $\Omega_n(u, v)$ as Ω , the function Z_M as the counting function C and $\Phi_M(u, v)$ as t . Then, for any $(a, b) \in \Omega_n(u, v)$ and for r such that $0 \leq r \leq \Phi_M(u, v)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.15) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_M=r\}}(a, b) &= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \prod_{(k, l) \in H} \prod_{p \geq M} (1 - I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l)). \\
&= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \prod_{p \geq M} \prod_{(k, l) \in H} (1 - I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that, if $(k, l) \neq (k', l') \in \mathcal{K}_M$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&[1 - I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l)] [1 - I_p(a+k') I_p(b+l')] \\
&= 1 - I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l) - I_p(a+k') I_p(b+l'),
\end{aligned}$$

because the term $I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l) I_p(a+k') I_p(b+l')$ vanishes. This is so since if $k \neq k'$, then $I_p(a+k) I_p(a+k') = 0$, because the prime $p \geq M$ does not divide $k - k'$, and analogously, if $l \neq l'$, then $I_p(b+l) I_p(b+l') = 0$.

Using this observation, we may rewrite (3.15) as follows: for any $(a, b) \in \Omega_n(u, v)$ and for r such that $0 \leq r \leq \Phi(u, v)$,

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_M=r\}}(a, b) = \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \sum_{(k, l) \in H} I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l)\right).$$

Now, for each $p \geq M$, the function $(a, b) \mapsto 1 - \sum_{(k, l) \in H} I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l)$ takes only the values 0 and 1. For if $p \geq M$, then p may divide at most one $a+k$ with $1 \leq k \leq M$ (and also at most one $b+l$ with $1 \leq l \leq M$). Thus this function is the indicator function of a certain subset in \mathbb{N}^2 , which we denote by $B_H^{(p)}$:

$$(3.17) \quad \mathbf{1}_{B_H^{(p)}}(a, b) = 1 - \sum_{(k, l) \in H} I_p(a+k) I_p(b+l).$$

With this new notation, we may finally rewrite, for any $(a, b) \in \Omega_n(u, v)$ and for r such that $0 \leq r \leq \Phi(u, v)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.18) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_M=r\}}(a, b) &= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \prod_{p \geq M} \mathbf{1}_{B_H^{(p)}}(a, b) \\
&= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)}\}}(a, b).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that for each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2$, the above products (or the above intersections) are actually products/intersections of finitely many terms/sets, since for $p > n + M$, we have $I_p(a + k) I_p(b + l) = 0$, for any $(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M$.

Regarding these $B_H^{(p)}$, we have the following key lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v)$ such that $|H| = s$, we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) = \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2} \right).$$

Proof. This argument is modeled upon the proof of Theorem 5 in [2]. Fix $M \geq 1$ and a pair (u, v) such that $0 \leq u, v < P_M$. Consider the sets $\Omega_n(u, v)$ and $\mathcal{A}_M(u, v)$ defined in (3.13) and (3.8), respectively.

Now fix a subset H of $\mathcal{A}_M(u, v)$ of size $|H| = s$. Observe first that for $p \geq M$, and using the definition of $B_H^{(p)}$ in (3.17),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_n(\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) &= \mathbf{E}_n \left(\sum_{(k, l) \in H} I_p(\cdot + k) I_p(\cdot + l) \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) \\ &= \sum_{(k, l) \in H} \mathbf{E}_n(I_p(\cdot + k) I_p(\cdot + l) \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) \\ (3.19) \quad &= \sum_{(k, l) \in H} \mathbf{P}_n(\{a, b \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : a + k \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, b + l \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)). \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\Omega_n(u, v)$ is defined in terms of residues modulo the primes $q < M$, while the prime p defining $B_H^{(p)}$ is $p \geq M$, Lemma 2.1 gives that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) = \frac{s}{p^2}.$$

Analogously, for any distinct primes p_1, \dots, p_R , all $\geq M$, we have that

$$(3.20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^R (\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p_i)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) = s^R \prod_{i=1}^R \frac{1}{p_i^2}.$$

Take $N > M$, and observe that

$$\mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{M \leq p \leq N} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) = \mathbf{P}_n \left(\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus \bigcup_{M \leq p \leq N} (\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right).$$

From (3.20) and the inclusion/exclusion principle stated in (2.2), and as already discussed in Lemmas 2.4 and 3.2, we deduce that

$$(3.21) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{M \leq p \leq N} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) = \prod_{M \leq p \leq N} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2} \right).$$

As this holds for any $N > M$, we deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n \left(\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v) \right) \leq \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2} \right).$$

For an inequality with \liminf in the opposite direction, we argue as follows. For $k, l \leq M$, we have that

$$\#\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : a + k \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, b + l \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\} \leq \#\{(c, d) \in \mathbb{N}_{n+M}^2 : p \mid c \text{ and } p \mid d\},$$

and so,

$$\mathbf{P}_n(\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 : a + k \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, b + l \equiv 0 \pmod{p}\} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left[\frac{n+M}{p} \right]^2 \frac{1}{1/P_M^2}.$$

This (rather crude) estimate is enough for our purposes. Now, going back to (3.19), we find that for some constant C_M , depending on M , and for $p \geq M$,

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbf{P}_n(\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) \leq C_M \frac{s}{p^2}.$$

For $N > M$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcap_{M \leq p \leq N} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) - \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{p \geq M} (\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) - \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{M \leq p \leq N} (\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{p > N} (\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) \leq \sum_{p > N} \mathbf{P}_n((\mathbb{N}_n^2 \setminus B_H^{(p)}) \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) \leq C_M s \sum_{p > N} \frac{1}{p^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where (3.22) was used in the last inequality. Thus, we can deduce, using (3.21), that, for $N > M$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) \geq \prod_{M \leq p \leq N} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right) - C_M s \sum_{p > N} \frac{1}{p^2},$$

and conclude, upon letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n\left(\bigcap_{p \geq M} B_H^{(p)} \mid \Omega_n(u, v)\right) \geq \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right),$$

which finishes the proof. \square

3.4.2. Probability distribution of Z_M^* . We derive now the probability distribution of Z_M^* by means of Lemma 3.3.

From Lemma 3.3 and the expression (3.18), we deduce, for each (u, v) such that $0 \leq u, v < P_M$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r \mid \Omega_n(u, v)) &= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \sum_{\substack{H \subset \mathcal{A}_M(u, v) \\ |H|=s}} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right) \\ &= \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{\Phi_M(u, v)}{s} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from total probability and (3.14), we finally conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r) \\ &= \frac{1}{P_M^2} \sum_{0 \leq u, v < P_M} \sum_{s=r}^{\Phi_M(u, v)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{\Phi_M(u, v)}{s} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{P_M^2} \sum_{0 \leq u, v < P_M} \sum_{s=r}^{M^2} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{\Phi_M(u, v)}{s} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Part of the conclusion is that each of the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r)$ exists; the other, of course, is the precise values of those limits. The values of these limits define the probability distribution of a variable Z_M^* with values in $\{0, \dots, M^2\}$.

The sum of the above probabilities as r runs from $r = 0$ to $r = M^2$ is 1, as it should, simply because $\sum_{r=0}^s (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} = 0$, unless $s = 0$, in which case it is 1.

Theorem 3.4. *With the notations above, including that recorded in (3.11), we have for $M \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq M^2$ that*

$$(3.23) \quad \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r) = \sum_{s=r}^{M^2} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \xi(M, s) \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right).$$

Thus, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the variable Z_M in the probability space $(\mathbb{N}_n^2, \mathbf{P}_n)$ converges in distribution to the random variable Z_M^* with probability mass function given by (3.23). As we have already pointed out, the case $M = 1$ is Dirichlet's density theorem: the variable Z_1^* is a Bernoulli variable with success parameter $\mathbf{P}(Z_1^* = 1) = \prod_p (1 - s/p^2) = 1/\zeta(2)$.

The formula in (3.23) give the following probabilities, rounded to two decimal places, for the case $M = 2$:

r	0	1	2	3	4
$\mathbf{P}(Z_2^* = r)$	0.21%	6.59%	43.00%	50.20%	–


The values for the case $M = 3$ are:

r	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$\mathbf{P}(Z_3^* = r)$	0.00%	0.02%	0.48%	4.74%	16.21%	24.41%	35.20%	17.71%	1.23%	–


And for the case $M = 4$,

r	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
$\mathbf{P}(Z_4^* = r)$	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.27%	2.37%	10.67%
r	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
$\mathbf{P}(Z_4^* = r)$	25.83%	35.68%	22.18%	2.99%	–	–	–	–	


In all these tables, a dash “–” means probability (exactly) 0: not attainable values. These are the graphical representations of the mass functions for $M = 3, 4, 5$ in a common range $\{0, 1, \dots, 25\}$:



Mass function of Z_3^* .



Mass function of Z_4^* .



Mass function of Z_5^* .

For the mean of Z_M^* we have, using (3.6), that

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(Z_M^*) &= \sum_{r=0}^{M^2} r \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r) = \sum_{r=0}^{M^2} r \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{r=0}^{M^2} r \mathbf{P}_n(Z_M = r) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(Z_M) = \frac{M^2}{\zeta(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the probability generating function $G_{Z_m^*}$ of Z_M^* , we obtain immediately from (3.23) and the binomial theorem the following. See also Lemma 2.3.

Corollary 3.5. For $|z| \leq 1$,

$$(3.25) \quad G_{Z_m^*}(z) := \sum_{r=0}^{M^2} \mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r) z^r = \sum_{s=0}^{M^2} (z-1)^s \xi(M, s) \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right).$$

For $z = 1$, both sides of the expression (3.25) of the probability generating function of Z_M^* give 1. Differentiating $G_{Z_m^*}(z)$ and evaluating at $z = 1$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_M^*) = \xi(M, 1) \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right),$$

and so, (3.24) yields

$$(3.26) \quad \xi(M, 1) = M^2 \prod_{p < M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

In general, by repeated differentiation of $G_{Z_m^*}(z)$, we get, for the factorial moments,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(\binom{Z_M^*}{s}\right) &= \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{1}{s!} (Z_M^* (Z_M^* - 1) \cdots (Z_M^* - s + 1))\right) = \xi(M, s) \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{M^2}{\zeta(2)} \frac{\xi(M, s)}{\xi(M, 1)} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq M^2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.6. For each M , it appears that $\Phi_M(a, b)$ takes few different values concentrated around its mean value $\xi(M, 1)$ given by (3.26).

For example, we have that $\xi(3, 1) = 6.8$, while the values of $\Phi_3(a, b)$ range from 5 to 8; for $M = 4$, $\xi(4, 1) = 10.7$, and $\Phi_4(a, b)$ takes values between 9 and 12. See Figures 2 and 3.

Assume for the sake of the argument that $\Phi_M(a, b)$ were to be constantly the integer $\xi(M, 1)$. If this were the case, then we would have, from (3.11),

$$\xi(M, s) = \binom{\xi(M, 1)}{s}, \quad \text{for each } s \geq 0,$$

and thus, plugging this into (3.23), the probability $\mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r)$ would be, approximately,

$$\sum_{s=r}^{\xi(M, 1)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{\xi(M, 1)}{s} \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq M^2.$$

Further, approximate

$$\prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{s}{p^2}\right) \approx \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^s, \quad \text{for each } s \geq 0,$$

and denote

$$q_M := \prod_{p \geq M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

With all this, for $0 \leq r \leq M^2$, $\mathbf{P}(Z_M^* = r)$ would be, approximately,

$$\sum_{s=r}^{\xi(M, 1)} (-1)^{s-r} \binom{s}{r} \binom{\xi(M, 1)}{s} q_M^s,$$

and then Z_m^* would follow a binomial distribution with $\xi(M, 1)$ repetitions and success probability q_M .

Or better, since $\xi(M, 1)q_M = M^2/\zeta(2)$ (see (3.26)), we could expect the variable Z_M^* to be relatively close to a Poisson distribution with parameter $M^2/\zeta(2)$, with closeness depending upon the factorization of M .

4. COPRIMALITY CORRELATION STRUCTURE

This section is devoted to study the correlation structure between the random variables that register coprimality of pairs of points in \mathbb{N}^2 . This will be used later to obtain estimates of the variance of Z_M^* .

Lemma 4.1. *For $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and integers $i, j \geq 0$, we have that*

$$V(a, b) V(a+i, b+j) = \prod_{p \mid \gcd(i, j)} (1 - I_p(a) I_p(b)) \prod_{p \nmid \gcd(i, j)} (1 - I_p(a) I_p(b) - I_p(a+i) I_p(b+j)).$$

Proof. It follows from writing

$$\begin{aligned} V(a, b) V(a+i, b+j) &= \prod_p (1 - I_p(a) I_p(b)) (1 - I_p(a+i) I_p(b+j)) \\ &= \prod_p (1 - I_p(a) I_p(b) - I_p(a+i) I_p(b+j) + I_p(a) I_p(b) I_p(a+i) I_p(b+j)), \end{aligned}$$

and from observing that if $p \mid i$ then $I_p(a) = I_p(a+i)$, and that if $p \nmid i$ then $I_p(a) I_p(a+i) = 0$, and analogously for b and j . \square

For $i, j \geq 0$ fixed, consider $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}_n^2 \mapsto V(a, b) V(a+i, b+j)$; it follows from Lemma 4.1, that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(V(\cdot, \cdot) V(\cdot+i, \cdot+j)) = \prod_{p \mid \gcd(i, j)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) \prod_{p \nmid \gcd(i, j)} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right) = \mathbf{F} \Upsilon(\gcd(i, j)).$$

In general, and analogously, we have the following.

Proposition 4.2. *For $i, j \geq 0$ and $k, l \geq 0$, we have that*

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(V(\cdot+k, \cdot+l) V(\cdot+i, \cdot+j)) = \mathbf{F} \Upsilon(\gcd(|i-k|, |j-l|)).$$

Consequently, for the coefficient of correlation, we find that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n(V(\cdot+k, \cdot+l), V(\cdot+i, \cdot+j)) \\ &= \frac{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F} \Upsilon(\gcd(|i-k|, |j-l|)) - 1}{\zeta(2) - 1} =: \rho(i, j, k, l). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\gcd(0, 0) = 0$ and that $\Upsilon(0) = 1/(\mathbf{F}\zeta(2))$, and observe that (4.1) gives that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(V(\cdot+k, \cdot+l) V(\cdot+k, \cdot+l)) = \mathbf{F} \Upsilon(0) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)},$$

as we already know, see (2.10).

On account of the bounds for the function Υ in (2.13), we see that all the (limit) coefficients of correlation $\rho(i, j, k, l)$ defined in (4.2) satisfy

$$\frac{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F} - 1}{\zeta(2) - 1} \leq \rho(i, j, k, l) \leq 1.$$

This (somewhat mysterious) lower bound, with numerical value ≈ -0.19694 , is attained when $\Upsilon(1) = 1$ is plugged into (4.2), that is, when $\gcd(|i-k|, |j-l|) = 1$; and this happens with probability $1/\zeta(2) \approx 60.79\%$. The second most likely value is ≈ 0.4799 , and

occurs when Υ takes the value $3/2$. This happens (see (2.11), and also the list of values in (2.12)) when $\gcd(|i-k|, |j-l|)$ is a power of 2. As the probability that $\gcd(a, b) = k$, for integers a and b , is $1/(k^2\zeta(2))$, a quick calculation gives that the value ≈ 0.4799 is taken with probability $1/(3\zeta(2)) \approx 20.26\%$.

In fact, as we verify next, the (asymptotic) *average correlation* is 0.

Proposition 4.3.

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^4} \sum_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathcal{K}_N} \rho(i, j, k, l) = 0.$$

Proof. For integer N , consider

$$(4.4) \quad A_N := \sum_{(k,i),(l,j) \in \mathcal{K}_N} \Upsilon(\gcd(|i-k|, |j-l|)).$$

Classify now $(k, i) \in \mathcal{K}_N$ according to whether $k < i$, $k = i$, or $k > i$, and the same with (l, j) , to obtain that

$$A_N = \frac{N^2}{\zeta(2)} + 4 \left(N \sum_{c=1}^N (N-c) \Upsilon(c) + \sum_{1 \leq c, d \leq N} (N-c)(N-d) \Upsilon(\gcd(c, d)) \right).$$

Recall, (2.13), that the function Υ satisfies $1 \leq \Upsilon(n) \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(2)\mathbf{F}}$, for any $n \geq 1$. Therefore, we have that

$$N \sum_{c=1}^N (N-c) \Upsilon(c) \leq \frac{1}{\zeta(2)\mathbf{F}} N^3,$$

and thus,

$$(4.5) \quad A_N = 4 \sum_{1 \leq c, d \leq N} (N-c)(N-d) \Upsilon(\gcd(c, d)) + O(N^3).$$

As shown in (2.18), we have that

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq c, d \leq N} \left(1 - \frac{c}{N}\right) \left(1 - \frac{d}{N}\right) \Upsilon(\gcd(c, d)) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

and thus, from (4.5),

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{A_N}{N^4} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2 \mathbf{F}}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Recalling the definition in (4.2), this gives (4.3), as announced. \square

5. BEHAVIOUR AS THE SIZE OF THE WINDOW TENDS TO ∞

5.1. Asymptotic behaviour of the variance. We already know, see (3.24), that

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_M^*)^2 = \frac{M^4}{\zeta(2)^2}.$$

We shall now use the results from the previous section to obtain that the variance of Z_M^* is $o(M^4)$, as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 5.1. *With the usual notations,*

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}((Z_M^*)^2)}{\mathbf{E}(Z_M^*)^2} = 1.$$

and so,

$$(5.2) \quad \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{V}(Z_M^*)}{\mathbf{E}(Z_M^*)^2} = 0.$$

Proof. Since

$$Z_M(a, b) = \sum_{(k, l) \in \mathcal{K}_M} V(a + k, b + l),$$

we have that

$$Z_M(a, b)^2 = \sum_{(k, l), (i, j) \in \mathcal{K}_M} V(a + k, b + l) V(a + i, b + j),$$

and thus, arguing as in (3.24), using (4.1) and that $(k, l), (i, j) \in \mathcal{K}_M$ simply means that $1 \leq k, l, i, j \leq M$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}((Z_M^*)^2) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_n(Z_M^2) = \sum_{(k, l), (i, j) \in \mathcal{K}_M} \mathbf{F} \Upsilon(\gcd(|i - k|, |j - l|)) \\ &= \mathbf{F} \sum_{(k, i), (l, j) \in \mathcal{K}_M} \Upsilon(\gcd(|i - k|, |j - l|)) = \mathbf{F} A_M, \end{aligned}$$

using the notation of (4.4) in the last equality. Finally, thanks to (4.6),

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}((Z_M^*)^2)}{\mathbf{E}(Z_M^*)^2} = \frac{\zeta(2)^2}{M^4} \mathbf{F} A_M \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square$$

5.2. Asymptotic distribution. For $M \geq 1$, let Y_M^* be the variable

$$Y_M^* = \frac{Z_M^*}{M^2}$$

which registers the average number of coprime pairs in a random window of side length M .

We have that $\mathbf{E}(Y_M^*) = 1/\zeta(2)$, see once more (3.24), and, because of Proposition 5.1, that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{V}(Y_M^*) = 0$. Chebyshev's inequality gives immediately the following.

Theorem 5.2. *The random variable Y_M^* tends, in probability, to the constant $1/\zeta(2)$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$.*

One could expect a result of asymptotic normality, as $M \rightarrow \infty$, for a (convenient) normalization of the variable Y_M^* . For instance, one could consider the variables U_M^* , $M \geq 1$, given by

$$U_M^* = M \left(Y_M^* - \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \right).$$

(Observe that this normalization suggests that the variance of Z_M^* is of the order of M^2 .)

But, as observed by Sugita and Takanobu in [16], and numerical experiments readily confirm, the behaviour of U_M^* may depend of the arithmetical properties of M . In Theorem 6 of [16], Sugita and Takanobu obtain a description of the limit points (not a unique one) of the sequence $(U_M^*)_{M \geq 1}$ in some L^2 space of the adelic framework.

5.3. Further questions. Here are a few questions to understand further the peculiar dependence upon M of the distribution of Z_M^* or of U_M^* .

(1) Is it the case that $\mathbf{V}(Z_M^*) = O(M^2)$, with an absolute O , improving Proposition 5.1, and as suggested by Theorem 6 in [16]?

(2) Are the normalized variables U_M^* approximately a standard normal variable, for an appropriate sequence of sizes M tending to ∞ ?

(3) Recall Remark 3.6. Does the total variation distance between Z_M^* and a Poisson variable with parameter $M^2/\zeta(2)$, depend upon the prime factorization of M ?

(4) Recall, from Remark 3.1, that for each M , there are M -windows which are fully “invisible”: all points of the window have coordinates that are not coprime, that is, $Z_M(a, b) = 0$. These invisible windows are rare, though. In the same vein as the previous question, one would expect $\mathbf{P}(Z_M = 0)$ to be comparable to $e^{-M^2/\zeta(2)}$.

(5) A number of possible and natural extensions of the results of this paper could be explored. For instance, to higher dimensions, where one would have to distinguish between fully coprime tuples and pairwise coprime tuples (and also intermediate notions of coprimality, see Section 4 of [9], or [8]). And instead of the proportion of coprime pairs, one could consider the average gcd of the pairs in the random square or other moments of gcds within the square.

REFERENCES

- [1] Apostol, T. M.: *Introduction to analytic number theory*. Undergrad. Texts Math., Springer, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.
- [2] Cai, J.-Y. and Bach, E.: [On testing for zero polynomials by a set of points with bounded precision](#). In *Computing and combinatorics COCOON 2001*, pp. 473–482. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. 2108, Springer, Berlin, 2001.
- [3] CESÀRO, E.: [Étude moyenne du plus grand commun diviseur de deux nombres](#). *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (2)* **13** (1885), 233–268.
- [4] Cilleruelo, J., Fernández, J. L. and Fernández, P.: [Visible lattice points in random walks](#). *European J. Combin.* **75** (2019), 92–112.
- [5] DIRICHLET, P. G. L.: [Über die Bestimmung der mittleren Werthe in der Zahlentheorie](#). In *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften con 1849*, 69–83.
- [6] Feller, W.: *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. I*. Third edition. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1968.
- [7] Fernández, J. L. and Fernández, P.: [Equidistribution and coprimality](#). Preprint 2013, arXiv: [1310.3802](#).
- [8] Fernández, J. L. and Fernández, P.: [Random index of codivisibility](#). Preprint 2013, arXiv: [1310.4681](#).
- [9] Fernández, J. L. and Fernández, P.: [Divisibility properties of random samples of integers](#). *Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A Mat. RACSAM* **115** (2021), no. 1, article no. 26, 35 pp.
- [10] Fernández, J. L. and Fernández, P.: [Some arithmetic properties of Pólya’s urn](#). *Electron. J. Comb.* **30** (2023), no. 2, article no. P2.11, 32 pp.
- [11] Gerber, H. U.: [A proof of the Schuette–Nesbitt formula for dependent events](#). *Actuarial Research Clearing House* **1** (1979), 9–10.
- [12] Gerber, H. U.: *Life insurance mathematics*. Third edition, Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [13] Hardy, G. H. and Wright, E. M.: *An introduction to the theory of numbers*. Sixth edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [14] Herzog, F. and Stewart, B. M.: [Patterns of visible and nonvisible lattice points](#). *Amer. Math. Monthly* **78** (1971), 487–496.
- [15] Martineau, S.: [On coprime percolation, the visibility graphon, and the local limit of the GCD profile](#). *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **27** (2022), article no. 8, 14 pp.
- [16] Sugita, H. and Takanobu, S.: [The probability of two integers to be co-prime, revisited –on the behavior of CLT-scaling limit](#). *Osaka J. Math.* **40** (2003), no. 4, 945–976.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN.
Email address: `jose Luis.fernandez@uam.es`, `jlfernandez@akusmatika.org`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN.
Email address: `pablo.fernandez@uam.es`