

# Analytic Number Theory

## Lecture 2

Mariusz Mirek  
Rutgers University

Padova, March 13, 2025.

Supported by the NSF grant DMS-2154712,  
and the CAREER grant DMS-2236493.

# Arithmetic functions

## Definition

An arithmetic function is a map  $f : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , i.e., a sequence of complex numbers, although this viewpoint is not very useful.

## Examples of arithmetic functions

- ▶ The constant **1** and the identity **Id** functions are defined respectively by

$$\mathbf{1}(n) := 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Id}(n) := n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

- ▶ The Dirac delta function  $\delta_m$  is defined as follows

$$\delta_m(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We shall abbreviate  $\delta_1$  to  $\delta$ .

- ▶ The divisor function  $\tau(n)$  is the number of positive divisors of  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,

$$\tau(n) := \#\{d \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : d \mid n\} = \sum_{d \mid n} 1.$$

Some authors also use the notation  $d(n)$  for the divisor function.

## Examples of arithmetic functions

- ▶ More generally, the sum of powers of divisors is defined by

$$\sigma_k(n) := \sum_{d|n} d^k, \quad \text{where } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Observe that  $\tau(n) = \sigma_0(n)$ , and we abbreviate  $\sigma_1$  to  $\sigma$ .

- ▶ The Euler totient function  $\varphi$  is defined by

$$\varphi(n) := \#\{m \in [n] : (n, m) = 1\} = \sum_{m \in [n]} \delta((n, m)).$$

- ▶ The function  $\omega$  is defined as follows:  $\omega(1) = 0$  and  $\omega(n)$  counts the number of distinct prime factors of  $n$  for all  $n \geq 2$ .
- ▶ The function  $\Omega$  is defined as follows:  $\Omega(1) = 0$  and  $\Omega(n)$  counts the number of prime factors of  $n$  with multiplicities for all  $n \geq 2$ .
- ▶ The Liouville function  $\lambda$  is defined as follows

$$\lambda(n) = (-1)^{\Omega(n)}.$$

# Examples of arithmetic functions

- ▶ The Möbius function  $\mu(n)$  is defined as follows

$$\mu(n) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1, \\ (-1)^k & \text{if } n \text{ is the product of } k \text{ distinct primes,} \\ 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is divisible by the square of a prime.} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ The von Mangoldt function  $\Lambda(n)$  is defined as follows

$$\Lambda(n) := \begin{cases} \log p & \text{if } n = p^k \text{ is a prime power,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Clearly, sums and products of arithmetic functions are still arithmetic functions.

$$(f + g)(n) := f(n) + g(n) \quad \text{and} \quad (f \cdot g)(n) := f(n) \cdot g(n).$$

- ▶ The other ways of multiplying arithmetic functions, such as Dirichlet convolution, will be discussed shortly.

# Rings

## Definition

A ring is defined as a set  $\mathbb{K} := (\mathbb{K}, +, \cdot)$  equipped with two binary operations, commonly denoted as addition  $+$ , and multiplication  $\cdot$ , such that

- (i)  $(\mathbb{K}, +)$  is an abelian group, meaning that:
  - ▶ There exists an additive identity  $0 \in \mathbb{K}$  such that  $a + 0 = 0 + a = a$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ .
  - ▶ For every  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ , there exists an additive inverse  $-a \in \mathbb{K}$  such that  $a + (-a) = 0$ .
  - ▶ Addition is commutative:  $a + b = b + a$  for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{K}$ .
  - ▶ Addition is associative:  $(a + b) + c = a + (b + c)$  for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}$ .
- (ii)  $(\mathbb{K}, \cdot)$  is a monoid under multiplication, meaning that:
  - ▶ Multiplication is associative:  $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$  for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}$ .
  - ▶ There exists a multiplicative identity  $1 \in \mathbb{K}$  such that  $a \cdot 1 = 1 \cdot a = a$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ .
- (iii) Multiplication is distributive with respect to addition, meaning that:
  - ▶ For all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}$ , the following hold:

$$a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c$$

$$(a + b) \cdot c = a \cdot c + b \cdot c$$

## Examples of rings

- ▶ We say that a ring  $\mathbb{K}$  is commutative, if it satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) and additionally

$$xy = yx \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{K}.$$

- ▶ The sets  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  are examples of commutative rings. The set  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$  of  $2 \times 2$  matrices with complex coefficients and the usual matrix addition and multiplication is a noncommutative ring.
- ▶ Let  $\mathbb{K}$  and  $\mathbb{L}$  be rings with multiplicative identities  $1_{\mathbb{K}}$  and  $1_{\mathbb{L}}$ , respectively. A map  $f : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$  is called a ring homomorphism if  $f(x+y) = f(x)+f(y)$  and  $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{K}$ , and  $f(1_{\mathbb{K}}) = 1_{\mathbb{L}}$ .
- ▶ An element  $a$  in the ring  $\mathbb{K}$  is called a unit or invertible element if there exists an element  $x \in \mathbb{K}$ , (which in fact is unique), such that

$$ax = xa = 1.$$

Then  $x$  is called the inverse for  $a$  and is denoted by  $a^{-1}$ .

- ▶ The set  $\mathbb{K}^{\times}$  of all units in  $\mathbb{K}$  forms a multiplicative group, called the group of units in the ring  $\mathbb{K}$ .
- ▶ A field is a commutative ring in which every nonzero element is a unit. For example, the rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$ , and complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  are fields. The integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  form a ring but not a field, and the only units in the ring of integers are  $\pm 1$ .

# Dirichlet convolutions

## Definition

The Dirichlet convolution  $f \star g$  is defined by

$$(f \star g)(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right),$$

where the sum is over all positive divisors  $d$  of  $n$ . Dirichlet convolution occurs frequently in multiplicative problems in elementary number theory.

## Theorem

*The set  $\mathbb{A} := (\mathbb{A}, +, \star)$  of all complex-valued arithmetic functions, with addition  $+$  defined by pointwise sum and multiplication  $\star$  defined by Dirichlet convolution, is a commutative ring with additive identity  $0$  and multiplicative identity  $\delta$ , which is the Dirac delta at  $1$ . Furthermore, if  $f(1) \neq 0$ , then  $f$  is invertible.*

## Proof.

Let  $\mathbb{D}(n) := \{d \in [n] : d \mid n\}$  be the set of all positive divisors of  $n$ .

$$(f \star g)(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \sum_{d|n} f\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)g(d),$$

since the mapping  $\mathbb{D}(n) \ni d \mapsto n/d \in \mathbb{D}(n)$  is one-to-one.

## Proof

- Now let  $f, g$  and  $h$  be three arithmetic functions and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Then

$$((f \star g) \star h)(n) = \sum_{d|n} (f \star g)(d) h\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \sum_{d|n} \sum_{c|d} f(c) g\left(\frac{d}{c}\right) h\left(\frac{n}{d}\right),$$

and

$$(f \star (g \star h))(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) (g \star h)\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) \sum_{c|(n/d)} g(c) h\left(\frac{n}{cd}\right).$$

Setting  $e = cd$  in the last inner sum gives

$$(f \star (g \star h))(n) = \sum_{e|n} \sum_{d|e} f(d) g\left(\frac{e}{d}\right) h\left(\frac{n}{e}\right) = ((f \star g) \star h)(n)$$

establishing the associativity.

- We also have

$$(\delta \star f)(n) = \sum_{d|n} \delta(d) f\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = f(n).$$



## Proof

- Finally, we prove the invertibility by constructing inductively the inverse  $g$  of an arithmetic function  $f$  satisfying  $f(1) \neq 0$ . The function  $g$  is the inverse of  $f$  if and only if  $(f \star g)(1) = 1$  and  $(f \star g)(n) = 0$  for all  $n > 1$ . This is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} f(1)g(1) = 1, \\ \sum_{d|n} g(d)f\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = 0 \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

- Since  $f(1) \neq 0$ , we have  $g(1) = f(1)^{-1}$  by the first equation. Now let  $n > 1$  and assume that we have proved that there exist unique values  $g(1), \dots, g(n-1)$  satisfying the above equations. Since  $f(1) \neq 0$ , the second equation above is equivalent to

$$g(n) = -\frac{1}{f(1)} \sum_{\substack{d|n \\ d \neq n}} g(d)f\left(\frac{n}{d}\right),$$

which determines  $g(n)$  in a unique way by the induction hypothesis, and this definition of  $g(n)$  shows that the equations above are satisfied, which completes the proof. □

# Multiplicative functions

## Definition

Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be an arithmetic function.

- ▶ The function  $f$  is said to be multiplicative if  $f(1) \neq 0$  and if, for all positive integers  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $(m, n) = 1$ , we have

$$f(mn) = f(m)f(n).$$

- ▶ The function  $f$  is completely multiplicative if  $f(1) \neq 0$  and if the condition

$$f(mn) = f(m)f(n)$$

holds for all positive integers  $m$  and  $n$ .

- ▶ The function  $f$  is strongly multiplicative if  $f$  is multiplicative and if  $f(p^\alpha) = f(p)$  for all prime powers  $p^\alpha$ .

## Remark

The condition  $f(1) \neq 0$  is a convention to exclude the zero function from the set of multiplicative functions. Furthermore, it is easily seen that if  $f$  and  $g$  are multiplicative, then so are  $fg$  and  $f/g$  with  $g \neq 0$  for the quotient.

# Additive functions

Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be an arithmetic function.

- ▶ The function  $f$  is said to be additive if for all positive integers  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $(m, n) = 1$ , we have

$$f(mn) = f(m) + f(n).$$

- ▶ The function  $f$  is completely additive if the condition

$$f(mn) = f(m) + f(n)$$

holds for all positive integers  $m$  and  $n$ .

- ▶ The function  $f$  is strongly additive if  $f$  is multiplicative and if  $f(p^\alpha) = f(p)$  for all prime powers  $p^\alpha$ .

# Additive and multiplicative functions: simple criterium

## Lemma (Exercise, prove it!)

Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be an arithmetic function.

- (i)  $f$  is multiplicative if and only if  $f(1) = 1$  and for all  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$ , where the  $p_i$  are distinct primes, we have

$$f(n) = \prod_{j \in [r]} f(p_j^{\alpha_j}).$$

- (ii)  $f$  is additive if and only if  $f(1) = 0$  and for all  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$ , where the  $p_i$  are distinct primes, we have

$$f(n) = \sum_{j \in [r]} f(p_j^{\alpha_j}).$$

## Theorem

If  $f, g : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are multiplicative, then so is  $f \star g$ .

# Proof

- ▶ Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two multiplicative functions and let  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  be such that  $(m, n) = 1$ .
- ▶ Note that each divisor  $d$  of  $mn$  can be written uniquely in the form  $d = ab$  with  $a \mid m$ , and  $b \mid n$  and  $(a, b) = 1$ .
- ▶ Hence,

$$(f \star g)(mn) = \sum_{d \mid mn} f(d) g\left(\frac{mn}{d}\right) = \sum_{a \mid m} \sum_{b \mid n} f(ab) g\left(\frac{mn}{ab}\right).$$

- ▶ Since  $f$  and  $g$  are multiplicative and  $(a, b) = (m/a, n/b) = 1$ , we infer that

$$(f \star g)(mn) = \sum_{a \mid m} \sum_{b \mid n} f(a) f(b) g\left(\frac{m}{a}\right) g\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) = (f \star g)(m) (f \star g)(n)$$

as required. □

## Examples

- ▶ The functions  $\mathbf{1}$ ,  $\text{Id}$ ,  $\delta$  are completely multiplicative, whereas  $\log$  and  $\Omega$  are strongly additive and consequently the function  $\lambda$  is completely multiplicative.
- ▶ Since  $\tau = \mathbf{1} \star \mathbf{1}$ ,  $\sigma = \mathbf{1} \star \text{Id}$  and  $\sigma_k = \mathbf{1} \star \text{Id}^k$  and both  $\mathbf{1}$  and  $\text{Id}$  are completely multiplicative, so are  $d$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_k$ .
- ▶ It is easily seen that, for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , we have

$$\omega(mn) = \omega(m) + \omega(n) - \omega(m, n),$$

since in the sum  $\omega(m) + \omega(n)$ , the prime factors of  $(m, n)$  have been counted twice. This implies the additivity of  $\omega$ .

- ▶ The Möbius function  $\mu(n)$  is multiplicative. Indeed,  $\mu(1) = 1$  and for all prime powers  $p^\alpha$ , we also have

$$\mu(p^\alpha) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So that, if  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$  where the  $p_i$  are distinct primes, we have

$$\mu(p_1^{\alpha_1}) \cdots \mu(p_r^{\alpha_r}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^r, & \text{if } \alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_r = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence  $\mu(p_1^{\alpha_1}) \cdots \mu(p_r^{\alpha_r}) = \mu(n)$  as desired.

# Properties of Möbius function

- ▶ We intend to prove the following identity  $\mu \star \mathbf{1} = \delta$ , i.e.

$$(\mu \star \mathbf{1})(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \delta(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n = 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } n > 1. \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Now since  $\mu$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  are multiplicative, so is the function  $\mu \star \mathbf{1}$  by the previous theorem and hence  $(\mu \star \mathbf{1})(1) = 1 = \delta(1)$  is true for  $n = 1$ .
- ▶ Besides, it is sufficient to prove  $\mu \star \mathbf{1} = \delta$  for prime powers by the previous lemma, which is easy to check. Indeed,

$$(\mu \star \mathbf{1})(p^\alpha) = \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha} \mu(p^j) = \mu(1) + \mu(p) = 1 - 1 = 0 = \delta(p^\alpha)$$

as asserted.

- ▶ Using the identity  $\mu \star \mathbf{1} = \delta$ , we deduce

$$g = f \star \mathbf{1} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad g \star \mu = f \star (\mathbf{1} \star \mu) = f.$$

This relation is called the Möbius inversion formula.

# Möbius inversion formula

The Möbius inversion formula is a key part of the estimates of average orders of certain multiplicative functions.

## Theorem (Möbius inversion formula)

*Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two arithmetic functions. Then we have*

$$g = f \star \mathbf{1} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad f = g \star \mu$$

*Equivalently, by expanding Dirichlet's convolution, we have*

$$g(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d) \Longleftrightarrow f(n) = \sum_{d|n} g(d) \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \quad \text{for all } \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

## Lemma

*For every  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ , one has*

$$\varphi(p^\alpha) = p^\alpha - p^{\alpha-1}.$$

## Proof.

The desired conclusion follows from the observation that

$$[p^\alpha] \setminus \{m \in [p^\alpha] : (m, p^\alpha) = 1\} = \{p, 2p, \dots, p^{\alpha-1}p\}. \quad \square$$



## Euler's totient function

- Euler's totient function is multiplicative and  $\varphi = \mu \star \text{Id}$ . Indeed, since  $\mu \star \mathbf{1} = \delta$ , then we have

$$\sum_{d|(m,n)} \mu(d) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (m,n) = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(n) &= \sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ (m,n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{m \leq n} \sum_{d|(m,n)} \mu(d) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{m \leq n \\ d|m}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \left[ \frac{n}{d} \right] = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \frac{n}{d} = (\mu \star \mathbf{1})(n), \end{aligned}$$

which proves that  $\varphi$  is multiplicative, as are both  $\mu$  and  $\mathbf{1}$ .

- By the previous lemma, we have

$$\varphi(p^\alpha) = p^\alpha - p^{\alpha-1} = p^\alpha \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right),$$

and by the multiplicativity we obtain

$$\varphi(n) = n \prod_{\substack{p|n \\ p \in \mathbb{P}}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

## Further properties of multiplicative functions

### Theorem

*If both  $g$  and  $f \star g$  are multiplicative, then  $f$  is also multiplicative.*

### Proof.

We shall assume that  $f$  is not multiplicative and deduce that  $h = f * g$  is also not multiplicative.

- ▶ Since  $f$  is not multiplicative, there exist positive integers  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  with  $(m, n) = 1$  such that

$$f(mn) \neq f(m)f(n).$$

We choose  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  for which the product  $mn$  is as small as possible.

- ▶ If  $mn = 1$ , then  $f(1) \neq f(1)f(1)$  so  $f(1) \neq 1$ . Since

$$h(1) = f(1)g(1) \neq 1,$$

this shows that  $h$  is not multiplicative.

- ▶ If  $mn > 1$ , then we have

$$f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$$

for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  with  $(a, b) = 1$  and  $ab < mn$ .

# Proof

- ▶ Except that in the sum defining  $h(mn)$ , we separate the term corresponding to  $a = m$  and  $b = n$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned}h(mn) &= \sum_{\substack{a|m, b|n \\ ab < mn}} f(ab)g\left(\frac{mn}{ab}\right) + f(mn)g(1) \\&= \sum_{\substack{a|m, b|n \\ ab < mn}} f(a)f(b)g\left(\frac{m}{a}\right)g\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + f(mn) \\&= \left(\sum_{a|m} f(a)g\left(\frac{m}{a}\right)\right)\left(\sum_{b|n} f(b)g\left(\frac{n}{b}\right)\right) - f(m)f(n) + f(mn) \\&= h(m)h(n) - f(m)f(n) + f(mn).\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Since  $f(mn) \neq f(m)f(n)$ , this shows that  $h(mn) \neq h(m)h(n)$ , so  $h$  is not multiplicative. This contradiction completes the proof. □

## Further properties of multiplicative functions

### Theorem

*If  $g$  is multiplicative, then so is  $g^{-1}$ , its Dirichlet inverse. In particular, the set of all multiplicative functions forms a multiplicative group with multiplication defined by the Dirichlet convolution.*

### Proof.

This follows from the previous theorem since both  $g$  and  $g \star g^{-1} = \delta$  are multiplicative. Hence  $g^{-1}$  is also multiplicative. □

### Theorem

*If  $f$  is multiplicative, then we have*

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu(d)f(d) = \prod_{p|n} (1 - f(p)).$$

### Proof.

Let  $g(n) := \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)f(d)$ . This function is multiplicative, so to determine  $g(n)$  it suffices to compute  $g(p^\alpha)$ . We have

$$g(p^\alpha) = \sum_{d|p^\alpha} \mu(d)f(d) = f(1) - \mu(p)f(p) = 1 - f(p). \quad \square$$

# Multiplicative functions at infinity

## Theorem

*Let  $f$  be a multiplicative function. If*

$$\lim_{p^k \rightarrow \infty} f(p^k) = 0,$$

*as  $p^k$  runs through the sequence of all prime powers, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) = 0.$$

## Proof.

► Since

$$\lim_{p^k \rightarrow \infty} f(p^k) = 0,$$

it follows that there exist only finitely many prime powers  $p^k$  such that  $|f(p^k)| \geq 1$ .

► We can define

$$A = \prod_{p^k: |f(p^k)| \geq 1} |f(p^k)|.$$

► Then  $A \geq 1$ .

## Proof

- ▶ Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and choose a sufficiently large integer  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that for every  $p^k > N$  we have

$$|f(p^k)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{A},$$

- ▶ If  $n = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} p^{v_p(n)}$  then

$$f(n) = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} f(p^{v_p(n)}) = \prod_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P} \\ p^k \leq N}} f(p^{v_p(n)}) \prod_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P} \\ p^k > N}} f(p^{v_p(n)}).$$

- ▶ If  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  is sufficiently large then there is at least one factor in the second product and consequently

$$\prod_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P} \\ p^k > N}} |f(p^{v_p(n)})| < \frac{\varepsilon}{A}.$$

- ▶ On the other hand, the first factor is at most  $A$  and we conclude that

$$|f(n)| \leq A \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{A} = \varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof.



# Estimates for the divisors function

## Theorem

*For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that*

$$\tau(n) \leq C_\varepsilon n^\varepsilon$$

## Proof.

- ▶ Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The function  $f(n) = \frac{\tau(n)}{n^\varepsilon}$  is multiplicative.
- ▶ In view of the previous theorem, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{p^k \rightarrow \infty} f(p^k) = 0$$

for every prime number  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ .

- ▶ Since  $\tau(p^k) = k + 1$ , we observe that

$$f(p^k) = \frac{\tau(p^k)}{p^{k\varepsilon}} = \frac{k+1}{p^{k\varepsilon/2}} \frac{1}{p^{k\varepsilon/2}}.$$

- ▶ Since  $\frac{k+1}{p^{k\varepsilon/2}}$  is bounded, the desired conclusion follows. □

# Estimates for the Euler totient function

## Theorem

For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that

$$C_\varepsilon n^{1-\varepsilon} \leq \varphi(n) < n.$$

## Proof.

The upper bound is clear. For the lower bound, we will proceed similarly to the previous theorem.

- ▶ Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The function  $f(n) = \frac{n^{1-\varepsilon}}{\varphi(n)}$  is multiplicative.
- ▶ It suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{p^k \rightarrow \infty} f(p^k) = 0$$

for every prime number  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ .

- ▶ Since  $\varphi(p^k) = p^k - p^{k-1}$  and  $\frac{p}{p-1} \leq 2$  for every  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{p^{k(1-\varepsilon)}}{\varphi(p^k)} = \frac{p^{k(1-\varepsilon)}}{p^k - p^{k-1}} = \frac{p}{p-1} \frac{p^{k(1-\varepsilon)}}{p^k} \leq \frac{2}{p^{\varepsilon k}}.$$

- ▶ The last term tends to 0 as  $p^k \rightarrow \infty$ , and the theorem follows. □



## von Mangoldt function

The von Mangoldt function is an example of a function that is neither multiplicative nor additive.

### Lemma

For every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  we have

$$(\Lambda \star \mathbf{1})(n) = \sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d) = \log n.$$

### Proof.

- ▶ The theorem is true if  $n = 1$  since both sides are 0. Therefore, assume that  $n > 1$  and write  $n = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\alpha_i}$ . Then

$$\log n = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \log p_i.$$

- ▶ The only nonzero terms in the sum  $\sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d)$  come from those divisors  $d$  of the form  $p_k^m$  for  $m \in [a_k]$  and  $k \in [r]$ . Hence, we have

$$\sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{m=1}^{a_i} \Lambda(p_i^m) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{m=1}^{a_i} \log p_i = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \log p_i = \log n. \quad \square$$

# Properties of the von Mangoldt function

## Theorem

If  $n \geq 2$ , we have

$$\Lambda(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log \frac{n}{d} = - \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log d.$$

## Proof.

- ▶ We know that  $(\Lambda \star \mathbf{1})(n) = \sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d) = \log n$ . So inverting this formula by using the Möbius inversion formula, we obtain

$$\Lambda(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log \frac{n}{d} = \log n \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) - \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log d,$$

which simplifies to

$$\Lambda(n) = \delta(n) \log n - \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log d.$$

- ▶ Since  $\delta(n) \log n = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , the proof is complete.

## Derivation

Recall that a derivation on a ring  $\mathbb{K}$  is an additive homomorphism  $D : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  such that

$$D(xy) = D(x)y + xD(y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{K}.$$

### Theorem

*Let  $L(n) = \log n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Pointwise multiplication by  $L(n)$  is a derivation on the ring of arithmetic functions  $\mathbb{A}$ .*

### Proof.

- If  $d \mid n$ , then  $L(n) = L(d) + L\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)$ . We must prove that

$$L \cdot (f \star g) = (L \cdot f) \star g + f \star (L \cdot g) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathbb{A}.$$

- We have

$$\begin{aligned} L \cdot (f \star g)(n) &= \sum_{d \mid n} L(n) f(d) g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \\ &= \sum_{d \mid n} (L \cdot f)(d) g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) + \sum_{d \mid n} f(d) (L \cdot g)\left(\frac{n}{d}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired result.



# The Selberg identity

## Theorem

For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  we have

$$\Lambda(n) \log n + \sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d) \Lambda\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \log\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)^2.$$

Equivalently, we have  $L \cdot \Lambda + \Lambda \star \Lambda = \mu \star L^2$ .

## Proof.

- ▶ Observe that  $\Lambda \star \mathbf{1} = L$ .
- ▶ Thus by the previous theorem we have

$$L^2 = L \cdot (\Lambda \star \mathbf{1}) = (L \cdot \Lambda) \star \mathbf{1} + \Lambda \star (L \cdot \mathbf{1}).$$

- ▶ Since  $\Lambda \star \mathbf{1} = L$ , we obtain

$$L^2 = (L \cdot \Lambda) \star \mathbf{1} + \Lambda \star \Lambda \star \mathbf{1}.$$

- ▶ Multiplying the last identity by  $\mathbf{1}^{-1} = \mu$ , which follows from the Möbius inversion formula, we obtain the desired bound. □

# Dirichlet series

In view of the multiplicative properties of certain arithmetic functions, we use Dirichlet series rather than power series in analytic number theory.

## Definition

Let  $f \in \mathbb{A}$  be an arithmetic function. The formal Dirichlet series of a variable  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  associated to  $f$  is defined by

$$D(s, f) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^s}.$$

Here, we ignore convergence problems, and  $D(s, f)$  is the complex number equal to the sum when it converges.

## Examples

- ▶  $D(s, \delta) = 1$ .
- ▶ Presumably, the most important example of a Dirichlet series is the Riemann zeta function

$$D(s, \mathbf{1}) = \zeta(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}.$$

# Importance of the Dirichlet convolution

## Proposition

Let  $f, g$  and  $h$  be three arithmetic functions. Then

$$h = f \star g \iff D(s, h) = D(s, f) \cdot D(s, g).$$

## Proof.

We have

$$D(s, f) \cdot D(s, g) = \sum_{k, m=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(k)g(m)}{(km)^s} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \sum_{d|n} f(d)g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(f \star g)(n)}{n^s},$$

which completes the proof. □

## Remark

The set  $\mathbb{D} := (\mathbb{D}, +, \cdot)$  of formal Dirichlet series with addition  $+$  and multiplication  $\cdot$  defined respectively by

$$D(s, f) + D(s, g) = D(s, f + g), \quad \text{and} \quad D(s, f) \cdot D(s, g) = D(s, f \star g),$$

forms a commutative ring with additive identity 0 and multiplicative identity 1, which is isomorphic to the ring of arithmetic functions  $\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{A}, +, \star)$  via the mapping  $\mathbb{A} \ni f \mapsto D(s, f) \in \mathbb{D}$ .

# Dirichlet series for multiplicative functions

## Proposition

*Let  $f$  be an arithmetic function. Then  $f$  is multiplicative if and only if*

$$D(s,f) = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(p^k)}{p^{sk}} \right).$$

*The above product is called the Euler product of  $D(s,f)$ .*

## Proof.

Expanding the product we obtain a formal sum of all products of the form

$$\frac{f(p_1^{a_1}) \cdots f(p_r^{a_r})}{(p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_r^{a_r})^s},$$

where  $p_1, \dots, p_r$  are distinct prime numbers,  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ .

- ▶ By multiplicativity, the numerator can be written as  $f(p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_r^{a_r})$ .
- ▶ The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic implies that the products  $p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_r^{a_r}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with all natural numbers.

This gives a formal proof of the desired identity. □

## Examples

- ▶ By the previous proposition  $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{-1}$ , hence

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s},$$

which implies  $\mu \star \mathbf{1} = \delta$ .

- ▶ Taking logarithm we obtain

$$\log \zeta(s) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{-1} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{kp^{ks}}$$

- ▶ By formal differentiation, we have

$$-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log p}{p^{ks}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s}.$$

- ▶ On the other hand, we have

$$-\zeta'(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log n}{n^s}.$$

- ▶ Thus  $\Lambda = \mu \star \log$  and consequently  $\Lambda \star \mathbf{1} = \log$ .