

SOLUTIONS FOR PROBLEM SET 3

KANNAN SOUNDARARAJAN

1. Suppose first that n is square-free. Then the RHS is simply

$$-\sum_{ap=n} \mu(a) \log p = \mu(n) \sum_{p|n} \log p = \mu(n) \log n,$$

as desired.

Suppose now that n is divisible by the square of two different primes. Then the LHS is zero, and so is the RHS because if we write $n = ab$ then $\Lambda(b) = 0$ unless b is a prime power, and in that case $\mu(a) = 0$ because a will be divisible by the square of a prime.

Lastly suppose that $n = p^k m$ where $k \geq 2$ and m is square-free with $p \nmid m$. Here the LHS is zero, and the RHS equals

$$-\mu(m)\Lambda(p^k) - \mu(pm)\Lambda(p^{k-1}) = -\mu(m) \log p + \mu(m) \log p = 0.$$

Having exhausted all cases, we are done.

2. Let m and n be coprime integers, and let h denote $f * g$. We wish to show that h is multiplicative; that is, $h(mn) = h(m)h(n)$. Note that if d is a divisor of mn then d may be written uniquely as $k\ell$ where $k|m$ and $\ell|n$. Conversely given $k|m$ and $\ell|n$ there corresponds the unique divisor $k\ell$ of mn . Thus

$$h(mn) = \sum_{d|mn} f(d)g(mn/d) = \sum_{k|m} \sum_{\ell|n} f(k\ell)g\left(\frac{m}{k} \frac{n}{\ell}\right).$$

Since f and g are multiplicative, and $(k, \ell) = 1$ and $(m/k, n/\ell) = 1$ we see that the above equals

$$\sum_{k|m} f(k)g(m/k) \sum_{\ell|n} f(\ell)g(n/\ell) = h(m)h(n).$$

Thus the convolution of two multiplicative functions is multiplicative.

The convolution of two completely multiplicative functions need not be completely multiplicative. Let 1 denote the function $1(n) = 1$ for all integers n . Then the function 1 is completely multiplicative, but $(1 * 1)(n)$ is the divisor function $d(n)$ which is not completely multiplicative.

3. As hinted in the problem let us try and use multiplicativity. The LHS of the stated identity is a multiplicative function. The RHS is the

convolution of two multiplicative functions: the divisor function, and the function $g(d)$ which is 0 unless d is a square, and equals $\mu(k)$ if $d = k^2$. By problem 2 the convolution of g with the divisor function is multiplicative, and so the RHS is multiplicative also. Therefore it suffices to check this identity when n is the power of a prime; say $n = p^k$ with $k \geq 1$. In this case the LHS equals 2. Let us compute the RHS. If $k = 1$ then we easily see that it equals 2, while if $k \geq 2$ it equals

$$d(p^k) + \mu(p)d(p^{k-2}) = (k+1) - (k-2+1) = 2$$

also. This proves our identity.

From our identity we obtain that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} 2^{\omega(n)} = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d^2 m = n} \mu(d) d(m) = \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{m \leq x/d^2} d(m).$$

In the inner sum over m we use the asymptotic formula established in class:

$$\sum_{m \leq z} d(m) = z \log z + (2\gamma - 1)z + O(\sqrt{z}).$$

Thus we find that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} 2^{\omega(n)} = \sum_{d \leq \sqrt{x}} \mu(d) \left(\frac{x}{d^2} \log \frac{x}{d^2} + (2\gamma - 1) \frac{x}{d^2} + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{x}}{d}\right) \right).$$

First we dispense with the error term above: it is

$$O\left(\sqrt{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{1}{d}\right) = O(\sqrt{x} \log x),$$

as desired. As for the main term this may be written as

$$(x \log x + (2\gamma - 1)x) \sum_{d \leq \sqrt{x}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} - x \sum_{d \leq \sqrt{x}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \log d^2.$$

In the first term above we extend the sum to infinity, and so the first term gives

$$(x \log x + (2\gamma - 1)x) \left(\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}\right) \right) = \frac{6}{\pi^2} (x \log x + (2\gamma - 1)x) + O(\sqrt{x} \log x).$$

We also extend the sum in the second term to infinity and we get

$$-x \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (2 \log d) + O\left(x \sum_{d > \sqrt{x}} \frac{\log d}{d^2}\right) = Cx + O(\sqrt{x} \log x),$$

for some constant $C = -2 \sum_d (\log d) \mu(d) / d^2$. Putting everything together we obtain the stated result.

4. (a) As noted in the problem either $n \leq m$ or $m \leq n$, and when $m = n = 1$ both possibilities occur. Therefore, by symmetry, our sum is

$$-1 + 2 \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ (m,n)=1}} 1 = -1 + 2 \sum_{n \leq x} \phi(n).$$

(b). Note that $\phi(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)n/d = \sum_{dm=n} \mu(d)m$. Therefore

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \phi(n) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{m \leq x/d} m.$$

The inner sum over m is easily seen to be $(x/d)^2/2 + O(x/d)$. Therefore our sum is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O\left(x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{1}{d}\right) &= \frac{x^2}{2} \left(\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \right) + O(x \log x) \\ &= \frac{3}{\pi^2} x + O(x \log x). \end{aligned}$$

(c). This is just a matter of interpretation: If m and n are chosen randomly from the interval $[1, x]$ then the probability that they are coprime is exactly the LHS of problem (a) divided by x^2 , and from (a) and (b) this is $= 6/\pi^2 + O((\log x)/x)$.

5. Note that $n/\phi(n)$ is a multiplicative function, and so is $\mu(d)^2/\phi(d)$. Thus by problem 2 both sides of the identity to be proved are multiplicative. Therefore we need only check that they match for prime powers p^k with $k \geq 1$. Note that in this case the LHS equals

$$\frac{p^k}{\phi(p^k)} = \frac{p}{p-1}.$$

The RHS equals

$$1 + \frac{1}{\phi(p)} = 1 + \frac{1}{p-1} = \frac{p}{p-1}.$$

This verifies our identity.

Using our identity and interchanging summations we obtain that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{n}{\phi(n)} = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{\phi(d)} = \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{\phi(d)} \left[\frac{x}{d} \right] = \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{\phi(d)} \left(\frac{x}{d} + O(1) \right).$$

First let us handle the error term above which is $O(\sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d)^2/\phi(d))$. Now we suspect that $\phi(d)$ is usually about size d (after all the problem is to show that it's average value is c , and in any case in class we showed

that $\phi(n)/n \geq (e^{-\gamma} + o(1))/\log \log n$ and this explains why we may expect the error term to be $O(\log x)$. To prove this rigorously note that

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{\phi(d)} \leq \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{\mu(p)^2}{\phi(p)}\right),$$

because when we expand the RHS out we get the sum of $\mu(n)^2/\phi(n)$ for all n that are composed only of primes below x , and certainly every $n \leq x$ is included in this. Therefore the error term is

$$O\left(\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right)\right) = O\left(\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}\right) = O(\log x),$$

by Mertens's theorem. If you didn't find this trick but got an error term of $O(\log x \log \log x)$ using our result from class, that's good enough for me!

Now look at the main term which is $x \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d)^2/(d\phi(d))$. We extend the sum over d to all integers, and define c to be the value of $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \mu(d)^2/(d\phi(d))$. Note that the series converges because $\phi(d) \gg d/\log \log d$ from class. The error involved in extending the sum is

$$O\left(x \sum_{d > x} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{d\phi(d)}\right) = O\left(x \sum_{d > x} \frac{\log \log d}{d^2}\right) = O(\log \log x),$$

by using our lower bound for $\phi(n)$, and I'll leave you to justify the final step. We could be more careful and in fact $\sum_{d > x} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{d\phi(d)} = O(1/x)$ but it doesn't matter.

We have now established that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{n}{\phi(n)} = cx + O(\log x),$$

with

$$c = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{d\phi(d)}.$$

It remains lastly to verify that this value of c equals $\zeta(2)\zeta(3)/\zeta(6)$. To see this note that $\mu(d)^2/(d\phi(d))$ is multiplicative and therefore we may write

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)^2}{d\phi(d)} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{\mu(p)^2}{p\phi(p)}\right) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right).$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\zeta(2)\zeta(3)}{\zeta(6)} &= \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^3}\right)^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^6}\right) = \prod_p \frac{(1 + 1/p^3)}{(1 - 1/p^2)} \\ &= \prod_p \frac{p^3 + 1}{p(p^2 - 1)} = \prod_p \frac{p^2 - p + 1}{p(p - 1)} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p - 1)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The fact that the algebra works out nicely is simply a matter of good fortune, and doesn't mean anything!