

# Solutions to Ireland, Rosen “A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory”

Richard Ganaye

September 18, 2019

## Chapter 1

**Ex 1.1** *Let  $a$  and  $b$  be nonzero integers. We can find nonzero integers  $q$  and  $r$  such that  $a = qb + r$  where  $0 \leq r < b$ . Prove that  $(a, b) = (b, r)$ .*

*Proof.* Notation : if  $a, b$  are integers in  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $a \wedge b$  is the non negative greatest common divisor of  $a, b$ , the generator in  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  of the ideal  $(a, b) = a\mathbb{Z} + b\mathbb{Z}$ .

Let  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

- If  $d \mid a, d \mid b$ , then  $d \mid a - qb = r$ , so  $d \mid b, d \mid r$ .
- If  $d \mid b, d \mid r$ , then  $d \mid qb + r = a$ , so  $d \mid a, d \mid b$ .

$$\forall d \in \mathbb{Z}, (d \mid b, d \mid r) \iff (d \mid a, d \mid b).$$

If  $a = bq + r$ , the set of common divisors of  $a, b$  is equal to the set of common divisors of  $b, r$ .

As  $a \wedge b$  is the smallest positive element of this set, so is  $b \wedge r$ , we conclude that  $a \wedge b = b \wedge r$ . □

**Ex 1.2** *If  $r \neq 0$ , we can find  $q_1$  and  $r_1$  such that  $b = q_1r + r_1$ , with  $0 \leq r_1 < r$ . Show that  $(a, b) = (r, r_1)$ . This process can be repeated. Show that it must end in finitely many steps. Show that the last nonzero remainder must equal  $(a, b)$ . The process looks like*

$$\begin{array}{ll} a = bq + r, & 0 \leq r < b \\ b = q_1r + r_1, & 0 \leq r_1 < r \\ r = q_2r_1 + r_2, & 0 \leq r_2 < r_1 \\ \vdots & \\ r_{k-1} = q_{k+1}r_k + r_{k+1}, & 0 \leq r_{k+1} < r_k \\ r_k = q_{k+2}r_{k+1} & \end{array}$$

*Then  $r_{k+1} = (a, b)$ . This process of finding  $(a, b)$  is known as the Euclidian algorithm.*

*Proof.* The Euclidian division of  $b$  by  $r$  gives  $b = q_1r + r_1, 0 \leq r_1 < r$ . The result of exercise 1.1 applied to the couple  $(b, r)$  shows that

$$b \wedge r = r \wedge r_1.$$

Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . While the remainders  $r_i, i \leq N$ , are not equal to 0, we can define the sequences  $(q_i), (r_i)$  by

$$r_{-1} = a, r_0 = b, \quad r_{i-1} = q_{i+1}r_i + r_{i+1}, \quad 0 \leq r_{i+1} < r_i \quad 0 \leq i \leq N$$

If no  $r_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ , is equal to 0, we can continue this construction indefinitely. So we obtain a strictly decreasing sequence  $(r_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive numbers : it is impossible. Therefore, there exists an index  $k$  such as  $r_{k+2} = 0$ , this is the end of the algorithm.

$$\begin{array}{ll} a = bq + r, & 0 \leq r < b \\ b = q_1r + r_1, & 0 \leq r_1 < r \\ r = q_2r_1 + r_2, & 0 \leq r_2 < r_1 \\ \vdots & \\ r_{k-1} = q_{k+1}r_k + r_{k+1}, & 0 \leq r_{k+1} < r_k \\ r_k = q_{k+2}r_{k+1}, & r_{k+2} = 0 \end{array}$$

From exercise 1,  $r_{i-1} \wedge r_i = r_i \wedge r_{i+1}, 0 \leq i \leq k$ , so

$$a \wedge b = b \wedge r = \dots = r_k \wedge r_{k+1} = r_{k+1} \wedge r_{k+2} = r_{k+1} \wedge 0 = r_{k+1}.$$

The last non zero remainder is the gcd of  $a, b$ . □

**Ex 1.3** Calculate (187, 221), (6188, 4709), (314, 159).

*Proof.* With direct instructions in Python, we obtain :

```
>>> a, b = 187, 221
>>> print("q = ", a//b); a, b = b, a%b; print(a,b)
q = 0
221 187
>>> print("q = ", a // b); a, b = b, a%b; print(a,b)
q = 1
187 34
>>> print("q = ", a // b); a, b = b, a%b; print(a,b)
q = 5
34 17
>>> print("q = ", a // b); a,b = b, a%b; print(a,b)
q = 2
17 0
```

This gives the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} 187 &= 0 \times 221 + 187 \\ 221 &= 1 \times 187 + 34 \\ 187 &= 5 \times 34 + 17 \\ 34 &= 2 \times 17 + 0 \end{aligned}$$

So  $187 \wedge 221 = 17$ .

With the same instructions, we obtain

$$6188 = 1 \times 4709 + 1479$$

$$4709 = 3 \times 1479 + 272$$

$$1479 = 5 \times 272 + 119$$

$$272 = 2 \times 119 + 34$$

$$119 = 3 \times 34 + 17$$

$$34 = 2 \times 17 + 0$$

$$6188 \wedge 4709 = 17.$$

Finally

$$314 = 1 \times 159 + 155$$

$$159 = 1 \times 155 + 4$$

$$155 = 38 \times 4 + 3$$

$$4 = 1 \times 3 + 1$$

$$3 = 3 \times 1 + 0$$

$$314 \wedge 159 = 1.$$

The Python script which gives the gcd is very concise :

```
def gcd(a,b):
    a, b = abs(a), abs(b)
    while b != 0:
        a, b = b, a % b
    return a
```

□

**Ex 1.4** Let  $d = (a, b)$ . Show how one can use the Euclidean algorithm to find numbers  $m$  and  $n$  such that  $am + bn = d$ . (Hint: In Exercise 2 we have that  $d = r_{k+1}$ . Express  $r_{k+1}$  in terms of  $r_k$  and  $r_{k+1}$ , then in terms of  $r_{k-1}$  and  $r_{k-2}$ , etc.).

*Proof.* With a slight modification of the notations of exercise 2, we note the Euclid's algorithm under the form

$$r_0 = a, r_1 = b, \quad r_i = r_{i+1}q_{i+1} + r_{i+2}, \quad 0 < r_{i+2} < r_{i+1}, \quad 0 \leq i < k, \quad r_k = q_{k+1}r_{k+1}, \quad r_{k+2} = 0$$

We show by induction on  $i$  ( $i \leq k+1$ ) the proposition

$$P(i) : \exists (m_i, n_i) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, \quad r_i = am_i + bn_i.$$

•  $r_0 = a = 1.a + 0.b$ . Define  $m_0 = 1, n_0 = 0$ . We obtain  $r_0 = am_0 + bn_0$ , then  $P(0)$  is true.

$r_1 = b = 0.a + 1.b$ . Define  $m_1 = 0, n_1 = 1$ . We obtain  $r_1 = am_1 + bn_1$ , then  $P(1)$  is true.

- Suppose for  $0 \leq i < k$  the induction hypothesis  $P(i)$  et  $P(i+1)$  :

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &= am_i + bn_i, & m_i, n_i &\in \mathbb{Z}, \\ r_{i+1} &= am_{i+1} + bn_{i+1}, & m_{i+1}, n_{i+1} &\in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $r_{i+2} = r_i - r_{i+1}q_{i+1} = a(m_i - q_{i+1}m_{i+1}) + b(n_i - q_{i+1}n_{i+1})$ .

If we define  $m_{i+1} = m_i - q_{i+1}m_{i+1}$ ,  $n_{i+1} = n_i - q_{i+1}n_{i+1}$ , we obtain  $r_{i+2} = am_{i+2} + bn_{i+2}$ ,  $m_{i+2}, n_{i+2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $P(i+2)$ .

- The conclusion is that  $P(i)$  is true for all  $i, 0 \leq i \leq k+1$ , in particular  $r_{k+1} = am_{k+1} + bn_{k+1}$ , that is

$$a \wedge b = d = am + bn,$$

where  $m = m_{k+1}, n = n_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . □

**Ex 1.5** Find  $m$  and  $n$  for the pairs  $a$  and  $b$  given in Ex 1.3

*Proof.* From exercises 1.3, 1.4, we know that the sequences  $(r_i), (m_i), (n_i)$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 &= a, r_1 = b \\ m_0 &= 1, m_1 = 0 \\ n_0 &= 0, n_1 = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and for all  $i < k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i+2} &= r_i - q_{i+1}r_{i+1} \\ m_{i+2} &= m_i - q_{i+1}m_{i+1} \\ n_{i+2} &= n_i - q_{i+1}n_{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

and for all  $i$

$$r_i = m_i a + n_i b.$$

This gives the direct instructions in Python :

```
>>> a,b = 187, 221
>>> r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1 = a,b,1,0,0,1
>>> q = r0//r1;
>>> q = r0//r1; r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1 = r1, r0 -q*r1,m1, m0 -q*m1, n1, n0 - q*n1
>>> print(r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1)
221 187 0 1 1 0
>>> q = r0//r1; r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1 = r1, r0 -q*r1,m1, m0 -q*m1, n1, n0 - q*n1
>>> print(r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1)
187 34 1 -1 0 1
>>> q = r0//r1; r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1 = r1, r0 -q*r1,m1, m0 -q*m1, n1, n0 - q*n1
>>> print(r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1)
34 17 -1 6 1 -5
>>> q = r0//r1; r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1 = r1, r0 -q*r1,m1, m0 -q*m1, n1, n0 - q*n1
>>> print(r0,r1,m0,m1,n0,n1)
17 0 6 -13 -5 11
```

So

$$17 = 187 \wedge 221 = 6 \times 187 - 5 \times 221.$$

Similarly

$$17 = 6188 \wedge 4709 = 121 \times 6188 - 159 \times 4709.$$

$$1 = 314 \wedge 159 = -40 \times 314 + 79 \times 159.$$

We obtain the same results with the following Python script :

```
def bezout(a,b):
    """input  : entiers a,b
       output : tuple (x,y,d),
       (x,y) solution de ax+by = d, d = pgcd(a,b)
    """
    (r0,r1)=(a,b)
    (u0,v0) = (1,0)
    (u1,v1) = (0,1)
    while r1 != 0:
        q = r0 // r1
        (r2,u2,v2) = (r0 - q*r1,u0 - q*u1,v0 - q*v1)
        (r0,r1) = (r1,r2)
        (u0,u1) = (u1,u2)
        (v0,v1) = (v1,v2)
    return (u0,v0,r0)
```

□

**Ex 1.6** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Show that the equation  $ax + by = c$  has solutions in integers iff  $(a, b) | c$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d = a \wedge b$ .

- If  $ax + by = c, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , as  $d | a, d | b, d | ax + by = c$ .
- Reciprocally, if  $d | c$ , then  $c = dc', c' \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

From Prop. 1.3.2.,  $d\mathbb{Z} = a\mathbb{Z} + b\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $d = au + bv, u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $c = dc' = a(c'u) + b(c'v) = ax + by$ , where  $x = c'u, y = c'v$  are integers.

Conclusion :

$$\exists (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, ax + by = c \iff a \wedge b | c.$$

□

**Ex 1.7** Let  $d = (a, b)$  and  $a = da'$  and  $b = db'$ . Show that  $(a', b') = 1$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $d \neq 0$  (if  $d = 0$ , then  $a = b = 0$ , and  $a', b'$  are any numbers in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and the result may be false, so we must suppose  $d \neq 0$ ).

As  $d = am + bn, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, d = d(a'm + b'n)$ , so  $1 = a'm + b'n$ , which proves  $a' \wedge b' = 1$ .  
conclusion : if  $d = a \wedge b \neq 0$ , and  $a = da', b = db'$ , then  $a' \wedge b' = 1$ .

□

**Ex. 1.8** Let  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  be a solution to  $ax + by = c$ . Show that all solutions have the form  $x = x_0 + t(b/d)$ ,  $y = y_0 - t(a/d)$ , where  $d = (a, b)$  and  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $a \neq 0, b \neq 0$ .

Let  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  be a solution to  $ax + by = c$ .

If  $(x, y)$  is any solution of the same equation,

$$\begin{aligned} ax + by &= c \\ ax_0 + by_0 &= c, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$a(x - x_0) = -b(y - y_0),$$

so

$$\frac{a}{d}(x - x_0) = -\frac{b}{d}(y - y_0).$$

Let  $a' = a/d, b' = b/d$  : from ex. 1.7, we know that  $a' \wedge b' = 1$ .

As  $a'(x - x_0) = -b'(y - y_0)$ ,  $b' \mid a'(x - x_0)$ , and  $b' \wedge a' = 1$ , so (Gauss' Lemma : prop. 1.1.1)  $b' \mid x - x_0$ .

There exists  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x - x_0 = tb'$ . Then  $a'tb' = -b'(y - y_0)$ . As  $b \neq 0, b' \neq 0$ , so  $a't = -(y - y_0)$  :

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x_0 + t(b/d) \\ y &= y_0 - t(a/d) \end{aligned}$$

Reciprocally,  $a(x_0 + t(b/d)) + b(y_0 - t(a/d)) = ax_0 + by_0 = c$ .

Conclusion : if  $a \neq 0, b \neq 0$ , and  $ax_0 + by_0 = c$ ,

$$ax + by = c \iff \exists t \in \mathbb{Z}, x = x_0 + t(b/d), y = y_0 - t(a/d).$$

□

**Ex. 1.9** Suppose that  $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$  and that  $(u, v) = 1$ . If  $u \mid n$  and  $v \mid n$ , show that  $uv \mid n$ . Show that this is false if  $(u, v) \neq 1$ .

*Proof.* As  $u \mid n$ ,  $n = uq, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $v \mid n = uq$ , and  $v \wedge u = 1$ , so (Gauss' lemma : prop. 1.1.1),  $v \mid q : q = vl, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n = uvl : uv \mid n$ .

If the case  $u \wedge v \neq 1$ , we give the counterexample  $6 \mid 18, 9 \mid 18$ , but  $6 \times 9 \nmid 18$ . □

**Ex. 1.10** Suppose that  $(u, v) = 1$ . Show that  $(u + v, u - v)$  is either 1 or 2.

*Proof.* Let  $d = (u + v) \wedge (u - v)$ . Then  $d \mid u + v, d \mid u - v$ , so  $d \mid 2u = (u + v) + (u - v)$  and  $d \mid 2v = (u + v) - (u - v)$ . So  $d \mid (2u) \wedge (2v) = 2(u \wedge v) = 2$ . As  $d \geq 0$ ,  $d = 1$  or  $d = 2$ . □

**Ex. 1.11** Show that  $(a, a + k) \mid k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d = a \wedge (a + k)$ . As  $d \mid a, d \mid (a + k)$ ,  $d \mid k = (a + k) - a$ .

Conclusion :  $a \wedge (a + k) \mid k$ . □

**Ex. 1.12** Suppose that we take several copies of a regular polygon and try to fit them evenly about a common vertex. Prove that the only possibilities are six equilateral triangles, four squares, and three hexagons.

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be the number of sides of the regular polygon,  $m$  the number of sides starting from a summit in the lattice,  $\alpha$  the measure of the exterior angle,  $\beta$  the measure of the interior angle (in radians) ( $\alpha + \beta = \pi$ ).

Then  $\alpha = 2\pi/n$ ,  $\beta = \pi - 2\pi/n$ .

$m\beta = 2\pi$ ,  $m(\pi - 2\pi/n) = 2\pi$ ,  $m(1 - 2/n) = 2$ , so

$$\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad m > 0, n > 0. \quad (1)$$

As this equation is symmetric in  $m, n$ , we may suppose first  $m \leq n$ .

In this case  $1/m \geq 1/n$ , so  $2/n \leq 1/2$  :  $n \geq 4$ .

If  $n > 6$ ,  $1/n < 1/6$ ,  $1/m = 1/2 - 1/n > 1/2 - 1/6 = 1/3$ , so  $m < 3$ ,  $m \leq 2$  :  $m = 1$  or  $m = 2$ .

If  $m = 1$ ,  $n < 0$  : it is impossible. If  $m = 2$ ,  $1/n = 0$  : also impossible. Therefore  $n \leq 6$  :  $4 \leq n \leq 5$ . If  $n = 4$ ,  $m = 4$ . if  $n = 5$ ,  $n = 10/3$  : impossible. if  $n = 6$ ,  $m = 3$ . Using the symetry, the set of solutions of (1) is

$$S = \{(3, 6), (6, 3), (4, 4)\},$$

corresponding with the usual lattices composed of equilateral triangles, squares or hexagons.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.13** Let  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Define the greatest common divisor  $d$  of  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s$  and prove that there exist integers  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s$  such that  $n_1m_1 + n_2m_2 + \dots + n_sm_s = d$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $(n_1, \dots, n_s) = n_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + n_s\mathbb{Z}$  is principal, so there exists an unique  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $d \geq 0$  such that

$$n_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = d\mathbb{Z} \quad (d \geq 0).$$

We define

$$d = \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_s) \iff n_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = d\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } d \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

The characterization of the gcd is

$$d = \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_s) \iff$$

$$(i) \ d \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

$$(ii) \ d \mid n_1, \dots, d \mid n_s \quad (4)$$

$$(iii) \ \forall \delta \in \mathbb{Z}, (\delta \mid n_1, \dots, \delta \mid n_s) \Rightarrow \delta \mid d \quad (5)$$

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Indeed, if we suppose (1), then  $d \geq 0$ , and  $n_1 = n_1 \cdot 1 + n_2 \cdot 0 + \dots + n_s \cdot 0 \in n_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = d\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $d \mid n_1$ . Similarly  $d \mid n_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$  so (i)(ii) are true. if  $\delta \mid n_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , as  $d = n_1m_1 + \dots + n_sm_s$ ,  $m_1, \dots, m_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $\delta \mid d$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose that  $d$  verify (i)(ii)(iii). From (ii), we see that  $n_i\mathbb{Z} \subset d\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , so  $n_1\mathbb{Z} + \dots + n_s\mathbb{Z} \subset d\mathbb{Z}$ .

As  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a principal ring, there exists  $\delta \geq 0$  such that  $n_1\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = \delta\mathbb{Z}$ .  $n_i \in n_1\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + n_s\mathbb{Z}$  so  $n_i \in \delta\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ :  $\delta \mid n_1, \dots, \delta \mid n_s$ . From (iii), we deduce  $\delta \mid d$ . As  $\delta\mathbb{Z} \subset d\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $d \mid \delta$ , with  $d \geq 0, \delta \geq 0$ . Consequently,  $d = \delta$  and  $n_1\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = d\mathbb{Z}, d \geq 0$ , so  $d = \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_s)$ .

At last, as  $n_1\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + n_s\mathbb{Z} = d\mathbb{Z}$ , there exist integers  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s$  such that  $n_1m_1 + n_2m_2 + \cdots + n_sm_s = d$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.14** Discuss the solvability of  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_rx_r = c$  in integers. (Hint: Use Exercise 13 to extend the reasoning behind Exercise 6.)

*Proof.* Let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Note  $\gcd(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r) = a_1 \wedge a_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_r$ . The following result generalizes Ex. 6 :

$$\exists(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r, a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_rx_r = c \iff a_1 \wedge a_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_r \mid c.$$

Let  $d = a_1 \wedge a_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_r$ .

- If  $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_rx_r = c$ , as  $d \mid a_1, \dots, d \mid a_r, d \mid a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \cdots + a_rx_r = c$ .
- Reciprocally, if  $d \mid c$ , then  $c = dc', c' \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

As  $d\mathbb{Z} = a_1\mathbb{Z} + a_2\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + a_r\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $d = a_1m_1 + a_2m_2 + \cdots + a_rm_r, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ .  $c = dc' = a_1(m_1c') + \cdots + a_r(m_rc') = a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_rx_r$ , where  $x_i = m_ic', i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.15** Prove that  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  is the square of another integer iff  $\text{ord}_p(a)$  is even for all primes  $p$ . Give a generalization.

*Proof.* Suppose  $a = b^2, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $\text{ord}_p(a) = 2 \text{ord}_p(b)$  is even for all primes  $p$ .

Reciprocally, suppose that  $\text{ord}_p(a)$  is even for all primes  $p$ . We must also suppose  $a > 0$ . Let  $a = \prod_p p^{a(p)}$  the decomposition of  $a$  in primes. As  $a(p)$  is even,  $a(p) = 2b(p)$  for an integer  $b(p)$  function of the prime  $p$ . Let  $b = \prod_p p^{b(p)}$ . Then  $a = b^2$ .

With a similar demonstration, we obtain the following generalization for each integer  $a \in \mathbb{Z}, a > 0$  :

$$a = b^n \text{ for an integer } b \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ iff } n \mid \text{ord}_p(a) \text{ for all primes } p. \quad \square$$

**Ex. 1.16** If  $(u, v) = 1$  and  $uv = a^2$ , show that both  $u$  and  $v$  are squares.

*Proof.* Here  $u, v \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ .

For all primes  $p$  such that  $p \mid u$ ,  $\text{ord}_p(u) + \text{ord}_p(v) = 2 \text{ord}_p(a)$ . As  $u \wedge v = 1$  and  $p \mid u, p \nmid v$ , so  $\text{ord}_p(v) = 0$ . Consequently,  $\text{ord}_p(u)$  is even for all prime  $p$  such that  $p \mid u$ . From Exercise 1.15, we can conclude that  $u$  is a square. Similarly,  $v$  is a square.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.17** Prove that the square root of 2 is irrational, i.e., that there is no rational number  $r = a/b$  such that  $r^2 = 2$ .

*Proof.* Suppose there exists  $r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0$  such that  $r^2 = 2$ . Then  $r = a/b, a \in \mathbb{N}^*, b \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . With  $d = a \wedge b, a = da', b = db', a' \wedge b' = 1$ , so  $r = a'/b', a' \wedge b' = 1$ , so we may suppose  $r = a/b, a > 0, b > 0, a \wedge b = 1$  and  $a^2 = 2b^2$ .

$a^2$  is even, then  $a$  is even (indeed, if  $a$  is odd,  $a = 2k + 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}, a^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$  is odd).

So  $a = 2A, A \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $4A^2 = 2b^2, 2A^2 = b^2$ .



With the same reasoning,  $b^2$  is even, then  $b$  is even :  $b = 2B, B \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $2 \mid a, 2 \mid b$ ,  $2 \mid a \wedge b$ , in contradiction with  $a \wedge b = 1$ .

Conclusion :  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.18** Prove that  $\sqrt[n]{m}$  is irrational if  $m$  is not the  $n$ -th power of an integer.

*Proof.* Here  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Suppose that  $r = \sqrt[n]{m} \in \mathbb{Q}$ . As  $r \geq 0$ ,  $r = a/b, a \geq 0, b > 0, a \wedge b = 1$ , and  $r^n = m$ , so  $a^n = mb^n$ .

For all primes  $p$ ,  $n \operatorname{ord}_p(a) = \operatorname{ord}_p(m) + n \operatorname{ord}_p(b)$ , so  $n \mid \operatorname{ord}_p(m)$ .

From Ex. 1.15, we conclude that  $m$  is a  $n$ -th power.

Conclusion : if  $m \geq 0$  is not the  $n$ -th power of an integer,  $\sqrt[n]{m}$  is irrational.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.19** Define the least common multiple of two integers  $a$  and  $b$  to be an integer  $m$  such that  $a \mid m, b \mid m$ , and  $m$  divides every common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ . Show that such an  $m$  exists. It is determined up to sign. We shall denote it by  $[a, b]$ .

*Proof.* As  $a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z}$  is an ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a principal ideal domain, there exists a unique  $m \geq 0$  such that  $a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m\mathbb{Z}$ . So by definition,

$$m = [a, b] \iff a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } m \geq 0.$$

We may note also  $[a, b] = a \vee b$ .

characterization of lcm :

$$\begin{aligned} m = a \vee b &\iff \\ (i) \quad m &\geq 0 \\ (ii) \quad a &\mid m, b \mid m \\ (iii) \quad \forall \mu \in \mathbb{Z}, (a &\mid \mu, b \mid \mu) \Rightarrow m \mid \mu \end{aligned}$$

( $\Rightarrow$ ) By definition,  $m \geq 0$ .  $m \in m\mathbb{Z} = a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $a \mid m$  and  $b \mid m$  : (ii) is verified. If  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$  is such that  $a \mid \mu, b \mid \mu$ , then  $\mu \in a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $m \mid \mu$  : (iii) is true.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose that  $m$  verifies (i),(ii),(iii). Let  $m'$  such that  $a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m'\mathbb{Z}, m' \geq 0$ . We show that  $m = m'$ .

As  $m' \in a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $a \mid m', b \mid m'$ , so from (iii)  $m \mid m'$ . From (ii), we see that  $m \in a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m'\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $m' \mid m, m \geq 0, m' \geq 0$ . The conclusion is  $m = m'$  and  $a\mathbb{Z} \cap b\mathbb{Z} = m\mathbb{Z}, m \geq 0$ , so  $m = a \vee b$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.20** Prove the following:

- (a)  $\operatorname{ord}_p[a, b] = \max(\operatorname{ord}_p(a), \operatorname{ord}_p(b))$ .
- (b)  $(a, b)[a, b] = ab$ .
- (c)  $(a + b, [a, b]) = (a, b)$ .

*Proof.* (a) Let  $a = \varepsilon \prod_p p^{a(p)}, b = \varepsilon' \prod_p p^{b(p)}, \varepsilon, \varepsilon' = \pm 1$ , and

$$m = \prod_p p^{\max(a(p), b(p))}.$$

Then

- (i)  $m \geq 0$ .

- (ii) As  $a(p) \leq \max(a(p), b(p))$ ,  $p^{a(p)} \mid p^{\max(a(p), b(p))}$ , so  $a \mid m$ . Similarly,  $b \mid m$ .  
 (iii) If  $\mu = \varepsilon'' \prod_p p^{c(p)}$  is a common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ , then for all primes  $p$ ,  $a(p) \leq c(p)$ ,  $b(p) \leq c(p)$ , so  $\max(a(p), b(p)) \leq c(p)$ , so  $m \mid \mu$ .  $m$  verifies the characterisation of lcm :

$$m = a \vee b = \prod_p p^{\max(a(p), b(p))}.$$

So  $\text{ord}_p[a, b] = \max(\text{ord}_p(a), \text{ord}_p(b))$ .

(b) Similarly, we prove that

$$a \wedge b = \prod_p p^{\min(a(p), b(p))}.$$

As  $\max(a, b) + \min(a, b) = a + b$ , we obtain

$$(a \vee b)(a \wedge b) = |ab|.$$

Second proof (without decompositions in primes) :

Let  $d = a \wedge b$ . If  $d = 0$ , then  $a = b = 0$  and  $(a \vee b)(a \wedge b) = ab$ .

Suppose now that  $d \neq 0$ . There exist integers  $a', b'$  such that

$$a = da', b = db', a' \wedge b' = 1.$$

Let  $m = da'b' : a = da' \mid m$  and  $b = db' \mid m$ . If  $\mu$  is a common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ , then  $d \mid \mu$ , and  $a' \mid \mu/d, b' \mid \mu/d$ . As  $a' \wedge b' = 1$ ,  $a'b' \mid \mu/d$  (see Ex.1.9). so  $m = da'b' \mid \mu$ .

$|m|$  verifies the characterization of lcm (Ex. 1.19), so  $a \vee b = |m| = |da'b'| = |ab|/d$ .

Conclusion :  $(a \vee b)(a \wedge b) = |ab|$ .

(c) Let  $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $\delta \mid a, \delta \mid b$ , then  $\delta \mid a + b$  and  $\delta \mid a \vee b$ .

Reciprocally, suppose that  $\delta \mid a + b, \delta \mid a \vee b$ .

Let  $a', b' \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $a = da', b = db', a' \wedge b' = 1$ . Then  $a \vee b = da'b'$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\mid d(a' + b'), \\ \delta &\mid da'b'. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first relation by  $b'$  and  $a'$ , we obtain :  $\delta \mid da'b' + db'^2, \delta \mid da'^2 + da'b'$ . As  $\delta \mid da'b'$ , we obtain :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\mid db'^2 \\ \delta &\mid da'^2 \end{aligned}$$

As  $a'^2 \wedge b'^2 = 1$ ,  $\delta \mid d(a'^2 \wedge b'^2) = d$ , so  $\delta \mid a, \delta \mid b$ .

The set of divisors of  $a, b$  is the same that the set of divisors of  $a + b, a \vee b$ , so

$$(a + b) \wedge (a \vee b) = a \wedge b.$$

□

**Ex. 1.21** Prove that  $\text{ord}_p(a+b) \geq \min(\text{ord}_p a, \text{ord}_p b)$  with equality holding if  $\text{ord}_p a \neq \text{ord}_p b$ .

*Proof.* As  $a \wedge b \mid a+b$ ,  $\text{ord}_p(a \wedge b) \leq \text{ord}_p(a+b)$ , so  $\min(\text{ord}_p(a), \text{ord}_p(b)) \leq \text{ord}_p(a+b)$ .

Suppose  $\text{ord}_p(a) \neq \text{ord}_p(b)$ , The problem being symmetric in  $a, b$ , we may suppose  $\alpha = \text{ord}_p(a) < \beta = \text{ord}_p(b)$ . So there exist  $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} a &= p^\alpha q, \quad p \nmid q \\ b &= p^\beta r, \quad p \nmid r \quad \alpha < \beta \end{aligned}$$

Then  $a+b = p^\alpha(q + p^{\beta-\alpha}r)$ , where  $p \nmid q + p^{\beta-\alpha}r$  (as  $p \mid p^{\beta-\alpha}$  and  $p \nmid q$ ).

So  $\text{ord}_p(a+b) = \alpha = \min(\text{ord}_p(a), \text{ord}_p(b))$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.22** Almost all the previous exercises remain valid if instead of the ring  $\mathbb{Z}$  we consider the ring  $k[x]$ . Indeed, in most we can consider any Euclidean domain. Convince yourself of this fact. For simplicity we shall continue to work in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* We can adapt all the preceding proofs to the Euclidean domain  $k[x]$ . The only difference is that the units in  $\mathbb{Z}$  are  $\pm 1$ , and the units in  $k[x]$  are the elements of  $k^*$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.23** Suppose that  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$  with  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For example,  $3^2 + 4^2 = 5^2$  and  $5^2 + 12^2 = 13^2$ . Assume that  $(a, b) = (b, c) = (c, a) = 1$ . Prove that there exist integers  $u$  and  $v$  such that  $c-b = 2u^2$  and  $c+b = 2v^2$  and  $(u, v) = 1$  (there is no loss in generality in assuming that  $b$  and  $c$  are odd and that  $a$  is even). Consequently  $a = 2uv$ ,  $b = v^2 - u^2$ , and  $c = v^2 + u^2$ . Conversely show that if  $u$  and  $v$  are given, then the three numbers  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  given by these formulas satisfy  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ ,  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $d = x \wedge y \wedge z$ . If  $d = 0$ , then  $x = y = z = 0$ . If  $d \neq 0$ , and  $a = x/d, b = y/d, c = z/d$ , then  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ , with  $a \wedge b \wedge c = 1$ . If a prime  $p$  is such that  $p \mid a, p \mid b$ , then  $p \mid c^2$ , so  $p \mid c$  (as  $p$  is a prime). Then  $p \mid a \wedge b \wedge c = 1$ : this is impossible, so  $a \wedge b = 1$ , and similarly  $a \wedge c = 1, b \wedge c = 1$ .

If  $a, b$  are odd, then  $a^2 \equiv b^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , so  $c^2 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ . As the squares modulo 4 are 0, 1, this is impossible. As  $a \wedge b = 1$ ,  $a, b$  are not both even, so  $a, b$  are not of the same parity. Without loss of generality, we may exchange  $a, b$  so that  $a$  is even,  $b$  is odd, and then  $c$  is odd.

$a^2 = c^2 - b^2 = (c-b)(c+b)$ , so

$$\left(\frac{a}{2}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{c-b}{2}\right) \left(\frac{c+b}{2}\right).$$

where  $a/2, (c-b)/2, (c+b)/2$  are integers.

If  $d \mid (c-b)/2$  and  $d \mid (c+b)/2$ , then  $d \mid c = (c+b)/2 + (c-b)/2$ , and  $d \mid b = (c+b)/2 - (c-b)/2$ , so  $d \mid a \wedge b = 1$ . This proves

$$\left(\frac{c+b}{2}\right) \wedge \left(\frac{c-b}{2}\right) = 1.$$

Using Ex. 1.16, we see that  $(c+b)/2$  and  $(c-b)/2$  are squares: there exist  $u, v$  such that

$$c-b = 2u^2, c+b = 2v^2, \quad u \wedge v = 1.$$

$(a/2)^2 = u^2v^2$ , and we can choose the signs of  $u, v$  such that  $a = 2uv$ . Then  $b = v^2 - u^2, c = v^2 + u^2$ . There exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$  ( $\lambda = d$ ) such that  $x = 2\lambda uv, y = \lambda(v^2 - u^2), z = \lambda(v^2 + u^2)$ .

Conversely, if  $\lambda, u, v$  are any integers,  $(2\lambda uv)^2 + (\lambda(v^2 - u^2))^2 = \lambda^2(4u^2v^2 + v^4 + u^4 - 2u^2v^2) = \lambda^2(v^4 + u^4 + 2u^2v^2) = (\lambda(u^2 + v^2))^2$ .

Conclusion : if  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \iff \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists (u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2, u \wedge v = 1,$$

$$\begin{cases} x = 2\lambda uv \\ y = \lambda(v^2 - u^2) \\ z = \lambda(v^2 + u^2) \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{cases} x = \lambda(v^2 - u^2) \\ y = 2\lambda uv \\ z = \lambda(v^2 + u^2) \end{cases}$$

□

**Ex. 1.24** Prove the identities

(a)  $x^n - y^n = (x - y)(x^{n-1} + x^{n-2}y + \dots + y^{n-1})$

(b) For  $n$  odd,  $x^n + y^n = (x + y)(x^{n-1} - x^{n-2}y + \dots + y^{n-1})$

*Proof.* Let  $R$  any commutative ring, and  $x, y \in R$ .

a) Let

$$S = \sum_{i=0}^n x^{n-1-i} y^i.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} xS &= \sum_{i=0}^n x^{n-i} y^i = x^n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x^{n-i} y^i \\ yS &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x^{n-1-i} y^{i+1} = \sum_{j=1}^n x^{n-j} y^j \quad (j = i + 1) \\ &= y^n + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x^{n-i} y^i. \end{aligned}$$

So  $xS - yS = x^n - y^n$ ,

$$x^n - y^n = (x - y) \sum_{i=0}^n x^{n-1-i} y^i = (x - y)(x^{n-1} + x^{n-2}y + \dots + x^{n-1-i}y^i + \dots + y^{n-1}).$$

b) If we substitute  $-y$  by  $y$ , we obtain

$$x^n - (-1)^n y^n = (x + y) \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i x^{n-1-i} y^i.$$

If  $n$  is odd,

$$x^n + y^n = (x + y) \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i x^{n-1-i} y^i = (x + y)(x^{n-1} - x^{n-2}y + \dots + (-1)^i x^{n-1-i} y^i + \dots + y^{n-1}).$$

□

**Ex. 1.25** If  $a^n - 1$  is a prime, show that  $a = 2$  and that  $n$  is a prime. Primes of the form  $2^p - 1$  are called Mersenne primes. For example,  $2^3 - 1 = 7$  and  $2^5 - 1 = 31$ . It is not known if there are infinitely many Mersenne primes.

*Proof.* Suppose  $n > 1$ ,  $a \geq 0$ , and  $a^n - 1$  is a prime. As  $0^n - 1 = -1$ ,  $1^n - 1 = 0$  are not primes,  $a \geq 2$ .

As  $(a^n - 1) = (a - 1)(a^{n-1} + \cdots + a^i + \cdots + 1)$ ,  $a - 1$  is a factor of the prime  $a^n - 1$ , so  $a - 1 = 1$  or  $a - 1 = a^n - 1$ .

As  $a \geq 2$ , and  $n > 1$ ,  $a = a^n$  is impossible, so  $a = 2$ .

If  $n \geq 2$  wasn't prime, then  $n = uv$ ,  $1 < u < n$ ,  $1 < v < n$ , and

$$2^n - 1 = 2^{uv} - 1 = (2^u - 1)(2^{u(v-1)} + \cdots + 2^{ui} + \cdots + 1).$$

with  $1 = 2^1 - 1 < 2^u - 1 < 2^n - 1$ .  $2^n - 1$  has a non trivial factor : this is impossible, so  $n$  is a prime.

Conclusion : if  $a^n - 1$  ( $a \geq 0$ ,  $n > 1$ ) is a prime, then  $a = 2$  and  $n$  is a prime.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.26** If  $a^n + 1$  is a prime, show that  $a$  is even and that  $n$  is a power of 2. Primes of the form  $2^{2^t} + 1$  are called Fermat primes. For example,  $2^{2^1} + 1 = 5$  and  $2^{2^2} + 1 = 17$ . It is not known if there are infinitely many Fermat primes.

*Proof.* If  $a = 1$ ,  $a^n + 1$  is a prime. Suppose  $a > 1$ , and  $n > 1$ . If  $a$  was odd,  $a^n + 1 > 2$  is even, so is not a prime. Consequently, if  $a^n + 1$  is prime,  $a > 1$ , then  $a$  is even.

Write  $n = 2^t u$ , where  $u$  is odd.

If  $u > 1$ , then, from Ex. 24(b), we obtain

$$a^n + 1 = a^{2^t u} + 1 = (a^{2^t} + 1) \sum_{i=0}^{u-1} (-1)^i a^{i2^t}.$$

So  $1 < a^{2^t} + 1 < a^n + 1$ , and  $a^{2^t} + 1$  is a non trivial factor of  $a^n + 1$ , in contradiction with the hypothesis.

Conclusion : if  $a^n + 1$  is a prime ( $a > 1$ ,  $n > 1$ ),  $a$  is even and  $n$  is a power of 2.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.27** For all odd  $n$  show that  $8 \mid n^2 - 1$ . If  $3 \nmid n$ , show that  $6 \mid n^2 - 1$ .

*Proof.* As  $n$  is odd, write  $n = 2k + 1$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then

$$n^2 - 1 = (2k + 1)^2 - 1 = 4k^2 + 4k = 4k(k + 1).$$

As  $k$  or  $k + 1$  is even,  $8 \mid n^2 - 1$ .

$(n - 1)n(n + 1) = n(n^2 - 1)$ , product of three consecutive numbers, is a multiple of 3.

As  $3 \nmid n$ , and 3 is a prime,  $3 \wedge n = 1$ , so  $3 \mid n^2 - 1$ .

$$3 \nmid n \Rightarrow 3 \mid n^2 - 1.$$

(This is also a consequence of Fermat' Little Theorem.)

As  $n$  is odd,  $n^2 - 1$  is even.  $3 \mid n^2 - 1$ ,  $2 \mid n^2 - 1$  and  $2 \wedge 3 = 1$ , so  $6 \mid n^2 - 1$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.28** For all  $n$  show that  $30 \mid n^5 - n$  and that  $42 \mid n^7 - n$ .

*Proof.* If we want to avoid Fermat's Little Theorem (Prop. 3.3.2. Corollary 2 P. 33), note that

$$\begin{aligned}(n-2)(n-1)n(n+1)(n+2) &= n(n^2-1)(n^2-4) \\ &= n^5 - 5n^2 + 4n \\ &= n^5 - n + 5(-n^2 + n)\end{aligned}$$

As the product of 5 consecutive numbers is divisible by 5,

$$5 \mid n^5 - n.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}2 \mid (n-1)(n+1) &= n^2 - 1 \mid n^4 - 1 \mid n^5 - n \\ 3 \mid (n-1)n(n+1) &= n(n^2-1) \mid n(n^4-1) = n^5 - n\end{aligned}$$

As 2, 3, 5 are distinct primes,  $2 \times 3 \times 5 = 30 \mid n^5 - n$ .

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}(n-3)(n-2)(n-1)n(n+1)(n+2)(n+3) &= n(n^2-1)(n^2-4)(n^2-9) \\ &= n(n^4-5n^2+4)(n^2-9) \\ &= n^7 - 14n^5 + 49n^3 - 36n \\ &= n^7 - n + 7(-2n^5 + 7n^3 - 5n)\end{aligned}$$

As the product of 7 consecutive numbers is divisible by 7,

$$7 \mid n^7 - n.$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}2 \mid (n-1)(n+1) &= n^2 - 1 \mid n^6 - 1 \mid n^7 - n \\ 3 \mid (n-1)n(n+1) &= n(n^2-1) \mid n(n^6-1) = n^7 - n\end{aligned}$$

As 2, 3, 7 are distinct primes  $2 \times 3 \times 7 = 42 \mid n^7 - n$ . □

**Ex. 1.29** Suppose that  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$  and that  $(a, b) = (c, d) = 1$ .

If  $(a/b) + (c/d) = \text{an integer}$ , show that  $b = \pm d$ .

*Proof.* If  $\frac{a}{b} + \frac{c}{d} = n \in \mathbb{Z}$  ( $a \wedge b = c \wedge d = 1$ ), then  $ad + bc = nbd$ , so  $d \mid bc$ ,  $d \wedge c = 1$ , which implies  $d \mid b$ . Similarly  $b \mid d$ . Then  $d = \pm b$ . □

**Ex. 1.30** Prove that  $H_n = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{n}$  is not an integer.

*Proof.* Let  $s$  such that  $2^s \leq n < 2^{s+1}$  ( $s = \lfloor \frac{\ln n}{\ln 2} \rfloor \geq 1$ ).

$$H_n = \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n a_i}{n!}, \quad \text{where } a_i = \frac{n!}{i} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let  $k = \text{ord}_2(n!)$ . We will show that  $\text{ord}_2(a_i)$  is minimal for  $i_0 = 2^s$ , where  $\text{ord}_2(a_{i_0}) = k - s$ , and that this minimum is reached only for this index  $i_0$ .

Indeed, each  $i$  such that  $2 \leq i \leq n$  can be written with the form  $i = 2^t q, 2 \nmid q$ . Then  $i = 2^t q \leq n < 2^{s+1}$ , so  $2^t < 2^{s+1}, t < s+1, t \leq s$ , which proves

$$\text{ord}_2(a_i) = k - t \geq k - s = \text{ord}_2(a_{i_0}).$$

Moreover, if  $\text{ord}_2(a_i) = \text{ord}_2(a_{i_0})$ , then  $k - t = k - s$ , so  $s = t$ .

$i = 2^s q, 2 \nmid q$ . If  $q > 1$ , then  $i \geq 2^{s+1} > n$  : it's impossible. So  $q = 1$  and  $i = 2^s = i_0$ .

Using Ex 1.21, we see that

$$\text{ord}_2 \left( \sum_{i=2}^n a_i \right) = \text{ord}_2(a_{i_0}) = k - s < k = \text{ord}_2(n!).$$

So

$$H_n = \frac{2^{k-s}Q}{2^k R} = \frac{Q}{2^s R},$$

where  $Q, R$  are odd integers.  $H_n$  is a quotient of an odd integer by an even integer :  $H_n$  is never an integer.  $\square$

**Ex. 1.31** Show that 2 is divisible by  $(1+i)^2$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

*Proof.*  $(1+i)^2 = 1 + 2i - 1 = 2i$ , so  $2 = -i(1+i)^2$  is divisible by  $(1+i)^2$ . (As  $i$  is an unit, 2 and  $(1+i)^2$  are associate.)  $\square$

**Ex. 1.32** For  $\alpha = a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  we defined  $\lambda(\alpha) = a^2 + b^2$ . From the properties of  $\lambda$  deduce the identity  $(a^2 + b^2)(c^2 + d^2) = (ac - bd)^2 + (ad + bc)^2$ .

*Proof.* For all complex numbers  $\alpha, \beta$ ,  $|\alpha\beta| = |\alpha||\beta|$ , so

$$\lambda(\alpha\beta) = \lambda(\alpha)\lambda(\beta).$$

If  $\alpha = a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i], \beta = c + di \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , then  $\alpha\beta = (ac - bd) + (ad + bc)i$ , so

$$(a^2 + b^2)(c^2 + d^2) = (ac - bd)^2 + (ad + bc)^2.$$

$\square$

**Ex. 1.33** Show that  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  is a unit iff  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ . Deduce that 1, -1,  $i$ , and  $-i$  are the only units in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha = a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

• If  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ , then  $\alpha\bar{\alpha} = 1$ , where  $\bar{\alpha} = a - bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , so  $\alpha$  is an unit.

• Reciprocally, if  $\alpha$  is an unit, there exists  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  such that  $\alpha\beta = 1$ , then  $\lambda(\alpha)\lambda(\beta) = 1$ , where  $\lambda(\alpha), \lambda(\beta)$  are positive integers, hence  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ .

So  $\alpha = a + ib$  is an unit of  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  if and only if  $a^2 + b^2 = 1$ . In this case,  $|a|^2 \leq 1$ ,  $a \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ . If  $a = 0, b = \pm 1$ , and if  $a = \pm 1, b = 0$ , so the only units of  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  are 1,  $i, -1, -i$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.34** Show that 3 is divisible by  $(1 - \omega)^2$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ .

*Proof.* As  $\omega^3 = 1, \bar{\omega} = \omega^2$ , and  $1 + \omega + \omega^2 = 0$ ,  
 $|1 - \omega|^2 = (1 - \omega)(1 - \omega^2) = 1 + \omega^3 - \omega - \omega^2 = 3$ , so

$$3 = (1 - \omega)(1 - \omega^2).$$

Consequently,

$$3 = (1 - \omega)(1 - \omega^2) = (1 + \omega)(1 - \omega)^2 = -\omega^2(1 - \omega)^2.$$

3 is divisible by  $(1 - \omega)^2$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  (as  $-\omega^2$  is a unit, 3 and  $(1 - \omega)^2$  are associated. 3 is not irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ ).  $\square$

**Ex. 1.35** For  $\alpha = a + b\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  we defined  $\lambda(\alpha) = a^2 - ab + b^2$ . Show that  $\alpha$  is a unit iff  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ . Deduce that  $1, -1, \omega, -\omega, \omega^2$ , and  $-\omega^2$  are the only units in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ .

*Proof.* If  $\alpha = a + b\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ , using  $1 + \omega + \omega^2 = 0$  and  $\bar{\omega} = \omega^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\bar{\alpha} &= (a + b\omega)(a + b\omega^2) \\ &= a^2 + b^2 + ab(\omega + \omega^2) \\ &= a^2 + b^2 - ab \\ &= \lambda(\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\lambda$  is a multiplicative function.

- If  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ , then  $\alpha\bar{\alpha} = 1$ , where  $\bar{\alpha} = a + b\omega^2 = (a - b) - b\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ , so  $\alpha$  is a unit.
- Reciprocally, if  $\alpha$  is a unit, there exists  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  such that  $\alpha\beta = 1$ , then  $\lambda(\alpha)\lambda(\beta) = 1$ , where  $\lambda(\alpha), \lambda(\beta)$  are positive integers, so  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\alpha) = 1 &\iff a^2 - ab + b^2 = 1 \\ &\iff (2a - b)^2 + 3b^2 = 4 \end{aligned}$$

$3b^2 \leq 4$ , so  $b = 0$  or  $b = \pm 1$ .

If  $b = 0$ , then  $a = \pm 1$ ,  $\alpha = 1$  or  $\alpha = -1$

If  $b = 1$ , then  $(2a - 1)^2 = 1, 2a - 1 = \pm 1 : a = 0$  or  $a = 1$ ,  $\alpha = \omega$  or  $\alpha = 1 + \omega = -\omega^2$ .

If  $b = -1$ , then  $(2a + 1)^2 = 1, 2a + 1 = \pm 1 : a = 0$  or  $a = -1$ ,  $\alpha = -\omega$  or  $\alpha = -1 - \omega = \omega^2$ .

So

$$\lambda(\alpha) = 1 \iff \alpha \in \{1, \omega, \omega^2, -1, -\omega, -\omega^2\}.$$

The set of units of  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  is the group of the roots of  $x^6 - 1$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 1.36** Define  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  as the set of all complex numbers of the form  $a + b\sqrt{-2}$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Show that  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  is a ring. Define  $\lambda(\alpha) = a^2 + 2b^2$  for  $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{-2}$ . Use  $\lambda$  to show that  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  is a Euclidean domain.



*Proof.* Note  $\sqrt{-2} = i\sqrt{2}$ , and  $A = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$ .

Let  $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{-2}, \beta = c + d\sqrt{-2} \in A$  :

- $1 = 1 + 0\sqrt{-2} \in A$ .
- $\alpha - \beta = (a + b\sqrt{-2}) - (c + d\sqrt{-2}) = (a - c) + (b - d)\sqrt{-2} \in A$ .
- $\alpha\beta = (a + b\sqrt{-2})(c + d\sqrt{-2}) = (ac - 2bd) + (ad + bc)\sqrt{-2} \in A$ .

So  $A$  is a subring of  $(\mathbb{C}, +, \times) : \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  is a ring.

Let  $z = a + ib\sqrt{-2}$  any complex number. Let  $a_0, b_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $|a - a_0| \leq 1/2, |b - b_0| \leq 1/2$  (it suffice to take for  $a_0$  the nearest integer of  $a : a_0 = \lfloor a + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$ ). Let  $z_0 = a_0 + ib_0\sqrt{-2}$ .

As  $\lambda(z) = z\bar{z} = a^2 + 2b^2$ , then

$$\lambda(z - z_0) = (a - a_0)^2 + 2(b - b_0)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} + 2 \times \frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{4} < 1.$$

Conclusion : for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , there exists  $z_0 \in A$  such that  $\lambda(z - z_0) < 1$ .

Let  $(z_1, z_2) \in A \times A, z_2 \neq 0$ . We apply the preeceding result to the complex  $z_1/z_2$  : there exists  $q \in A$  such that  $\left| \frac{z_1}{z_2} - q \right| \leq 1$ . Let  $r = z_1 - qz_2$ . Then  $z_1 = qz_2 + r, \lambda(r) < \lambda(z_2)$ .

So  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  is a Euclidean domain. □

**Ex. 1.37** Show that the only units in  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  are 1 and  $-1$ .

*Proof.* As in Ex. 35, we prove that  $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{-2}$  is an unit if and only if  $\lambda(\alpha) = 1$ , i.e.  $a^2 + 2b^2 = 1$ . As  $2b^2 \leq 1, b = 0$ , and  $a^2 = 1$ . So the only units are 1 and  $-1$ . □

**Ex. 1.38** Suppose that  $\pi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  and that  $\lambda(\pi) = p$  is a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Show that  $\pi$  is a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Show that the corresponding result holds in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$ .

*Proof.* If  $\pi = \alpha\beta$ , where  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , then  $p = \lambda(\pi) = \lambda(\alpha)\lambda(\beta)$ . As  $p$  is a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\lambda(\alpha) \geq 0, \lambda(\beta) \geq 0, \lambda(\alpha) = 1$  or  $\lambda(\beta) = 1$ , so (Ex.1.33)  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  is an unit. Consequently,  $\pi$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ . As  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is a PID,  $\pi$  is a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  (Prop. 1.3.2 Corollary 2).

As  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2}]$  are Euclidean domains, the same result is true in these principal ideals domains. □

**Ex. 1.39** Show that in any integral domain a prime element is irreducible.

*Proof.* Let  $R$  an integral domain, and  $\pi$  a prime in  $R$ .

If  $\pi = \alpha\beta, \alpha, \beta \in R$ , a fortiori  $\pi$  divides  $\alpha\beta$ . As  $\pi$  is a prime,  $\pi$  divides  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$ , say  $\alpha$ , so there exists  $\xi \in R$  such that  $\alpha = \xi\pi$ , so  $\pi = \xi\pi\beta, \pi(1 - \xi\beta) = 0$ . As  $A$  is an integral domain, and  $\pi \neq 0$  by definition,  $1 = \xi\beta$ , so  $\beta$  is an unit. If  $\pi = \alpha\beta, \alpha$  or  $\beta$  is an unit, so  $\pi$  is irreducible. □

## Chapter 2

**Ex 2.1** Show that  $k[x]$ , with  $k$  a finite field, has infinitely many irreducible polynomials.

*Proof.* Suppose that the set  $S$  of irreducible polynomials is finite :  $S = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$ .

Let  $Q = P_1P_2 \cdots P_n + 1$ . As  $S$  contains the polynomials  $x - a, a \in k, \deg(Q) \geq q = |k| > 1$ . Thus  $Q$  is divisible by an irreducible polynomial. As  $S$  contains all the

irreducible polynomials, there exists  $i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ , such that  $P_i \mid Q = P_1 P_2 \cdots P_n + 1$ , so  $P_i \mid 1$ , and  $P_i$  is an unit, in contradiction with the irreducibility of  $P_i$ .

Conclusion :  $k[x]$  has infinitely many irreducible polynomials. As each polynomial has only a finite number of associates, there exists infinitely many monic irreducible polynomials.  $\square$

**Ex. 2.2.** Let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t \in \mathbb{Z}$  be primes and consider the set of all rational numbers  $r = a/b$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that  $\text{ord}_{p_i} a \geq \text{ord}_{p_i} b$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ . Show that this set is a ring and that up to taking associates  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t$  are the only primes.

*Proof.* Let  $R$  the set of such rationals. Simplifying these fractions, we obtain

$$r \in R \iff \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists q \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}, r = \frac{p}{q}, q \wedge p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t = 1.$$

- $1 = 1/1 \in R$ .
- if  $r, r' \in R$ ,  $r = p/q, r' = p'/q'$ , with  $q \wedge p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t = 1, q' \wedge p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t = 1$ . then  $qq' \wedge p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t = 1$ , and  $r - r' = \frac{pq' - qp'}{qq'}$ ,  $rr' = \frac{pp'}{qq'}$ , so  $r - r', rr' \in R$ .

Thus  $R$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

If  $r = a/b \in R$  is an unit of  $R$ , then  $b/a \in R$ , so  $\text{ord}_{p_i} a = \text{ord}_{p_i} b$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, t$ . After simplification,  $r = p/q$ , with  $p \wedge p_1 \cdots p_t = 1, q \wedge p_1 \cdots p_t = 1$ , and such rationals are all units.

$p_i, 1 \leq i \leq t$ , is a prime : if  $p_i \mid rs$  in  $R$ , where  $r = a/b, s = c/d \in R$ , then there exists  $u = e/f \in R$  such that  $rs = p_i u$ , with  $b, d, e$  relatively prime with  $p_1, \dots, p_t$ . Then  $acf = p_i bde$ . As  $p_i \wedge f = 1$ ,  $p_i$  divides  $a$  or  $c$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $p_i$  divides  $r$  or  $s$  in  $R$ .

If  $r = a/b \in R$ , with  $b \wedge p_1 \cdots p_t = 1$ ,  $a = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t} v, v \in \mathbb{Z}, k_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, t$ . So  $r = up_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ , where  $u = v/b$  is an unit.

Let  $\pi$  be any prime in  $R$ . As any element in  $R$ ,  $\pi = up_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}, k_i \geq 0, u = a/b$  an unit.  $u^{-1}\pi = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ , so  $\pi \mid p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$  (in  $R$ ). As  $\pi$  is a prime in  $R$ ,  $\pi \mid p_i$  for an index  $i = 1, \dots, t$ . Moreover  $p_i \mid p$ , so  $p_i$  and  $\pi$  are associate.

Conclusion: the primes in  $R$  are the associates of  $p_1, \dots, p_t$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 2.3** Use the formula for  $\phi(n)$  to give a proof that there are infinitely many primes.

[Hint: If  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t$  were all the primes, then  $\phi(n) = 1$ , where  $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t$ .]

*Proof.* Let  $\{p_1, \dots, p_t\}$  the finite set of primes, with  $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_t$ , and  $n = p_1 \cdots p_t$ . By definition,  $\phi(n)$  is the number of integers  $k, 1 \leq k \leq n$ , such that  $k \wedge n = 1$ . From the existence of decomposition in primes, if  $k \geq 1$ ,  $k = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ , where  $k_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, t$ . So  $k \wedge n = 1$  if and only if  $k = 1$ . Thus  $\phi(n) = 1$ . The formula for  $\phi(n)$  gives  $\phi(n) = (p_1 - 1) \cdots (p_t - 1) = 1$ . As  $p_i \geq 2$ , this equation implies that  $p_1 = p_2 = \cdots = p_t = 2$ , so  $t = 1$ , and the only prime number is 2. But 3 is also a prime number : this is a contradiction.

Conclusion : there are infinitely many prime numbers.  $\square$

**Ex. 2.4** If  $a$  is a nonzero integer, then for  $n > m$  show that  $(a^{2^n} + 1, a^{2^m} + 1) = 1$  or 2 depending on whether  $a$  is odd or even.

*Proof.* Let  $d = a^{2^n} + 1 \wedge a^{2^m} + 1$ . Then  $d \mid a^{2^n} + 1, d \mid a^{2^m} + 1$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} a^{2^n} &\equiv -1 \pmod{d} \\ a^{2^m} &\equiv -1 \pmod{d} \end{aligned}$$

As  $n > m$ ,  $2^{n-m}$  is even, so

$$-1 \equiv a^{2^n} = (a^{2^m})^{2^{n-m}} \equiv (-1)^{2^{n-m}} \equiv 1 \pmod{d}.$$

$-1 \equiv 1 \pmod{d}$ , then  $d \mid 2$  ( $d \geq 0$ ). Thus  $d = 1$  or  $d = 2$ .

If  $a$  is even,  $a^{2^n} + 1$  is odd, so  $d = 1$ .

If  $a$  is odd, both  $a^{2^n} + 1, a^{2^m} + 1$  are even, so  $d = 2$ . □

**Ex. 2.5** Use the result of Ex. 2.4 to show that there are infinitely many primes. (This proof is due to G. Polya.)

*Proof.* Let  $F_n = 2^{2^n} + 1, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We know from Ex. 2.4 that  $n \neq m \Rightarrow F_n \wedge F_m = 1$ . Define  $p_n$  as the least prime divisor of  $F_n$ . If  $n \neq m, F_n \wedge F_m = 1$ , so  $p_n \neq p_m$ . The application  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, n \mapsto p_n$  is injective (one to one), so  $\varphi(\mathbb{N})$  is an infinite set of prime numbers. □

**Ex. 2.6** For a rational number  $r$  let  $\lfloor r \rfloor$  be the largest integer less than or equal to  $r$ , e.g.,  $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \rfloor = 0$ ,  $\lfloor 2 \rfloor = 2$ , and  $\lfloor 3 + \frac{1}{3} \rfloor = 3$ . Prove  $\text{ord}_p n! = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^3} \right\rfloor + \dots$ .

*Proof.* The number  $N_k$  of multiples  $m$  of  $p^k$  which are not multiple of  $p^{k+1}$ , where  $1 \leq m \leq n$ , is

$$N_k = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^{k+1}} \right\rfloor.$$

Each of these numbers brings the contribution  $k$  to the sum  $\text{ord}_p n! = \sum_{k=1}^n \text{ord}_p k$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_p n! &= \sum_{k \geq 1} k \left( \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^{k+1}} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} k \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor - \sum_{k \geq 1} k \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^{k+1}} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} k \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor - \sum_{k \geq 2} (k-1) \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p} \right\rfloor + \sum_{k \geq 2} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor = 0$  if  $p^k > n$ , so this sum is finite. □

**Ex. 2.7** Deduce from Ex. 2.6 that  $\text{ord}_p n! \leq n/(p-1)$  and that  $\sqrt[p]{n!} \leq \prod_{p \leq n} p^{1/(p-1)}$ . (The original statement  $\prod_{p|n} p^{1/(p-1)}$  was modified.)

*Proof.*

$$\text{ord}_p n! = \sum_{k \geq 1} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p^k} \right\rfloor \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{n}{p^k} = \frac{n}{p} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p}} = \frac{n}{p-1}$$

The decomposition of  $n!$  in prime factors is

$n! = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$  where  $\alpha_i = \text{ord}_{p_i} n! \leq \frac{n}{p_i - 1}$ , and  $p_i \leq n$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} n! &\leq p_1^{\frac{n}{p_1-1}} p_2^{\frac{n}{p_2-1}} \cdots p_k^{\frac{n}{p_k-1}} \\ \sqrt[n]{n!} &\leq p_1^{\frac{1}{p_1-1}} p_2^{\frac{1}{p_2-1}} \cdots p_k^{\frac{1}{p_k-1}} \\ &\leq \prod_{p \leq n} p^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \end{aligned}$$

(the values of  $p$  in this product describe all prime numbers  $p \leq n$ .) □

**Ex. 2.8** Use Exercise 7 to show that there are infinitely many primes.

*Proof.* If the set  $\mathbb{P}$  of prime numbers was finite, we obtain from Ex.2.7, for all  $n \geq 2$ :

$$\sqrt[n]{n!} \leq C = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} p^{\frac{1}{p-1}},$$

where  $C$  is an absolute constant.

Yet  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n!} = +\infty$ . Indeed

$$\ln(\sqrt[n]{n!}) = \frac{1}{n}(\ln 1 + \ln 2 + \cdots + \ln n)$$

As  $\ln$  is an increasing function,

$$\int_{i-1}^i \ln t \, dt \leq \ln i, \quad i = 2, 3, \dots, n$$

So

$$\int_1^n \ln t \, dt = \sum_{i=2}^n \int_{i-1}^i \ln t \, dt \leq \sum_{i=2}^n \ln i = \sum_{i=1}^n \ln i$$

Thus

$$\ln(\sqrt[n]{n!}) \geq \frac{1}{n} \int_1^n \ln t \, dt = \frac{1}{n}(n \ln n - n + 1) = \ln n - 1 + \frac{1}{n}$$

As  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln n - 1 + \frac{1}{n} = +\infty$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln(\sqrt[n]{n!}) = +\infty$ , so  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n!} = +\infty$ .

So there exists  $n$  such that  $\sqrt[n]{n!} \geq C$ : this is a contradiction.  $\mathbb{P}$  is an infinite set. □

**Ex. 2.9** A function on the integers is said to be multiplicative if  $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$  whenever  $(a, b) = 1$ . Show that a multiplicative function is completely determined by its value on prime powers.

*Proof.* Let the decomposition of  $n$  in prime factors be  $n = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ ,  $p_1 < \cdots < p_t$ . As  $p_i^{k_i} \wedge p_j^{k_j} = 1$  for  $i \neq j$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, t$ ,

$$f(n) = f(p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}) = f(p_1^{k_1}) \cdots f(p_t^{k_t})$$

(by induction on the number of prime factors.)

So  $f(n)$  is completely determined by its value on prime powers. □

**Ex. 2.10** If  $f(n)$  is a multiplicative function, show that the function  $g(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)$  is also multiplicative.

*Proof.* If  $n \wedge m = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(nm) &= \sum_{\delta|nm} f(\delta) \\ &= \sum_{d|n, d'|m} f(dd') \end{aligned}$$

Actually, if  $d|n, d'|m$ , so  $\delta = dd'|nm$ , and reciprocally, if  $\delta|nm$ , as  $n \wedge m = 1$ , there exist  $d, d'$  such that  $d|n, d'|m$ , and  $\delta = dd'$ .

If  $d|n, d'|m$ , with  $n \wedge m = 1$ , then  $d \wedge d' = 1$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} g(nm) &= \sum_{d|n} \sum_{d'|m} f(d)f(d') \\ &= \sum_{d|n} f(d) \sum_{d'|m} f(d') \\ &= g(n)g(m) \end{aligned}$$

$g$  is a multiplicative function. □

**Ex. 2.11** Show that  $\phi(n) = n \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)/d$  by first proving that  $\mu(d)/d$  is multiplicative and then using Ex. 2.9 and 2.10.

*Proof.* Let's verify that  $\mu$  is a multiplicative function.

If  $n \wedge m = 1$ , then  $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_l^{a_l}, m = q_1^{b_1} \cdots q_r^{b_r}$ , where  $p_1, \dots, p_l, q_1, \dots, q_r$  are distinct primes. Then the decomposition in prime factors of  $nm$  is  $nm = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_l^{a_l} q_1^{b_1} \cdots q_r^{b_r}$ . If one of the  $a_i$  or one of the  $b_j$  is greater than 1, then  $\mu(nm) = 0 = \mu(n)\mu(m)$ . Otherwise,  $n = p_1 \cdots p_l, m = q_1 \cdots q_r, nm = p_1 \cdots p_l q_1 \cdots q_r$ , and  $\mu(nm) = (-1)^{l+r} = (-1)^l (-1)^r = \mu(n)\mu(m)$ . So

$$\frac{\mu(nm)}{nm} = \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \frac{\mu(m)}{m}.$$

that is,  $n \mapsto \frac{\mu(n)}{n}$  is a multiplicative function.

From Ex. 2.10,  $n \mapsto \sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)}{d}$  is also a multiplicative function, and so is  $\psi$ , where  $\psi$  is defined by

$$\psi(n) = n \sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)}{d}.$$

To verify the equality  $\phi = \psi$ , it is sufficient from Ex. 2.9 to verify  $\phi(p^k) = \psi(p^k)$  for all prime powers  $p^k, k \geq 1$  ( $\phi(1) = \psi(1) = 1$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(p^k) &= p^k \sum_{d|p^k} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \\ &= p^k \left( \frac{\mu(1)}{1} + \frac{\mu(p)}{p} \right) \end{aligned}$$

(The other terms are null.)

So

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

Thus  $\phi = \psi$  : for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\phi(n) = n \sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)}{d}.$$

□

**Ex. 2.12** Find formulas for  $\sum_{d|n} \mu(d)\phi(d)$ ,  $\sum_{d|n} \mu(d)^2\phi(d)^2$ , and  $\sum_{d|n} \mu(d)/\phi(d)$ .

*Proof.* As  $\mu, \phi$  are multiplicative, so are  $\mu\phi, \mu^2\phi^2, \mu/\phi$ . We deduce from Ex. 2.10 that the three following functions  $F, G, H$  are multiplicative, defined by

$$F(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)\phi(d), G(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)^2\phi(d)^2, H(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)/\phi(d),$$

so it is sufficient to compute their values on prime powers  $p^k, k \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} F(p^k) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \mu(p^i)\phi(p^i) \\ &= \phi(1) - \phi(p) = 1 - (p-1) = 2-p \end{aligned}$$

So  $F(n) = \sum_{p|n} (2-p)$ .

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} G(p^k) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \mu(p^i)^2\phi(p^i)^2 \\ &= \phi(1)^2 + \phi(p)^2 = 1 + (p-1)^2 = p^2 - 2p + 2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H(p^k) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \mu(p^i)/\phi(p^i) \\ &= 1/\phi(1) - 1/\phi(p) = 1 - 1/(p-1) = (p-2)/(p-1) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 2.13** Let  $\sigma_k(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^k$ . Show that  $\sigma_k(n)$  is multiplicative and find a formula for it.

*Proof.* As  $n \mapsto n^k$  is multiplicative, then so is  $\sigma_k$  (Ex. 2.10).

• Suppose  $k \neq 0$ .

If  $n = p^\alpha$  is a prime power ( $\alpha \geq 1$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k(p^\alpha) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha} p^{ik} \\ &= \frac{p^{(\alpha+1)k} - 1}{p^k - 1} \end{aligned}$$

- if  $k = 0$ ,  $\sigma_0(n)$  is the number of divisors of  $n$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_0(p^\alpha) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha} 1 \\ &= \alpha + 1\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion : if  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_t^{\alpha_t}$  is the decomposition of  $n$  in prime factors, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_0(n) &= (\alpha_1 + 1) \cdots (\alpha_t + 1), \\ \sigma_k(n) &= \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{p_i^{(\alpha_i+1)k} - 1}{p_i^k - 1} \quad (k \neq 0).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 2.14** If  $f(n)$  is multiplicative, show that  $h(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)f(d)$  is also multiplicative.

*Proof.* We show first that the Dirichlet product  $f \circ g$  of two multiplicative functions  $f, g$  is multiplicative. Suppose that  $n \wedge m = 1$ . If  $d | n, d' | m$ , so  $\delta = dd' | nm$ , and reciprocally, if  $\delta | nm$ , as  $n \wedge m = 1$ , there exist  $d, d'$  such that  $d | n, d' | m$ , and  $\delta = dd'$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(f \circ g)(nm) &= \sum_{\delta|nm} f(\delta)g\left(\frac{nm}{\delta}\right) \\ &= \sum_{d|n, d'|m} f(dd')g\left(\frac{nm}{dd'}\right) \\ &= \sum_{d|n} \sum_{d'|m} f(d)f(d')g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)g\left(\frac{m}{d'}\right) \\ &= \sum_{d|n} f(d)g\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \sum_{d'|m} f(d')g\left(\frac{m}{d'}\right) \\ &= (f \circ g)(n)(f \circ g)(m)\end{aligned}$$

Applying this result with  $g = \mu$ , we obtain that  $n \mapsto h(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)f(d)$  is multiplicative, if  $f$  is multiplicative. □

**Ex. 2.15** Show that

$$(a) \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)\nu(d) = 1 \text{ for all } n.$$

$$(b) \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)\sigma(d) = n \text{ for all } n.$$

*Proof.* Here  $\nu = \sigma_0, \sigma = \sigma_1$ .

- (a) From the Möbius Inversion Theorem, as  $\nu(n) = \sum_{d|n} 1 = \sum_{d|n} I(d)$ , where  $I(n) = 1$  for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$1 = I(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)\nu(d).$$

- (b) From the same theorem, as  $\sigma(n) = \sum_{d|n} d = \sum_{d|n} \text{Id}(d)$ , where  $\text{Id}(n) = n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$n = \text{Id}(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \sigma(d).$$

□

**Ex. 2.16** Show that  $\nu(n)$  is odd iff  $n$  is a square.

*Proof.* • If  $n = a^2$  is a square, where  $a = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ , then  $\nu(n) = (2k_1 + 1) \cdots (2k_t + 1)$  is odd.

• Reciprocally, if  $n = q_1^{l_1} \cdots q_r^{l_r}$  is odd, then  $(l_1 + 1) \cdots (l_r + 1)$  is odd. So each  $l_i + 1$  is odd, and then  $l_i$  is even, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ :  $n$  is a square. □

**Ex. 2.17** Show that  $\sigma(n)$  is odd iff  $n$  is a square or twice a square.

*Proof.* • Note that for all  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\sigma(2^r) = 1 + 2 + 2^2 + \cdots + 2^r = 2^{r+1} - 1$  is always odd.

If  $p \neq 2$ ,  $\sigma(p^{2k}) = 1 + p + p^2 + \cdots + p^{2k}$  is a sum of  $2k + 1$  odd numbers, so is odd.

So if  $n = a^2$ , or  $n = 2a^2$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\sigma(n)$  is odd.

• Reciprocally, suppose that  $\sigma(n)$  is odd, where  $n = p_1^{k_1} p_2^{k_2} \cdots p_t^{k_t}$ , with  $p_1 = 2 < p_2 < \cdots < p_t$ . Then

$$\sigma(n) = (2^{k_1+1} - 1) \frac{p_2^{k_2+1} - 1}{p_2 - 1} \cdots \frac{p_t^{k_t+1} - 1}{p_t - 1}$$

is odd. Then each  $\frac{p_i^{k_i+1} - 1}{p_i - 1} = 1 + p_i + \cdots + p_i^{k_i}$  ( $i = 2, \dots, t$ ) is odd. As each  $p_i^j$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, k_i$  is odd, the number of terms  $k_i + 1$  is odd, so  $k_i$  is even ( $i = 2, \dots, t$ ). Thus  $n$  is a square, or twice a square. □

**Ex. 2.18** Prove that  $\phi(n)\phi(m) = \phi((n, m))\phi([n, m])$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p_1, \dots, p_r$  the common prime factors of  $n$  and  $m$ .

$$\begin{aligned} n &= p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r} q_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots q_s^{\lambda_s} \\ m &= p_1^{\beta_1} \cdots p_r^{\beta_r} s_1^{\mu_1} \cdots s_t^{\mu_t} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \lambda_j, \mu_k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq s, 1 \leq k \leq t$  (the formula  $\phi(p^\alpha) = p^\alpha - p^{\alpha-1}$  is not valid if  $\alpha = 0$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} n \wedge m &= p_1^{\gamma_1} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r} \\ n \vee m &= p_1^{\delta_1} \cdots p_r^{\delta_r} q_1^{\lambda_1} \cdots q_s^{\lambda_s} s_1^{\mu_1} \cdots s_t^{\mu_t}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_i = \min(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ ,  $\delta_i = \max(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$  ( $\gamma_i \geq 1, \delta_i \geq 1$ ),  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(n \wedge m) &= \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i-1}) \\ \phi(n \vee m) &= \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\delta_i} - p_i^{\delta_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^s (q_i^{\lambda_i} - q_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^t (s_i^{\mu_i} - s_i^{\mu_i-1}) \end{aligned}$$



As  $\alpha_i + \beta_i = \min(\alpha_i, \beta_i) + \max(\alpha_i, \beta_i) = \gamma_i + \delta_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(n)\phi(m) &= \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\alpha_i} - p_i^{\alpha_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^s (q_i^{\lambda_i} - q_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\beta_i} - p_i^{\beta_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^t (s_i^{\mu_i} - s_i^{\mu_i-1}) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^r \left[ p_i^{\alpha_i+\beta_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^2 \right] \prod_{i=1}^s (q_i^{\lambda_i} - q_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^t (s_i^{\mu_i} - s_i^{\mu_i-1}) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^r \left[ p_i^{\gamma_i+\delta_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^2 \right] \prod_{i=1}^s (q_i^{\lambda_i} - q_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^t (s_i^{\mu_i} - s_i^{\mu_i-1}) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^r (p_i^{\delta_i} - p_i^{\delta_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^s (q_i^{\lambda_i} - q_i^{\lambda_i-1}) \prod_{i=1}^t (s_i^{\mu_i} - s_i^{\mu_i-1}) \\
&= \phi(n \wedge m) \phi(n \vee m)
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 2.19** Prove that  $\phi(nm)\phi((n, m)) = (n, m)\phi(n)\phi(m)$ .

*Proof.* With the notations of Ex. 2.18,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(nm) &= \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\alpha_i+\beta_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right) \prod_{i=1}^s q_i^{\lambda_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \prod_{i=1}^t s_i^{\mu_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_i}\right) \\
\phi(n \wedge m) &= \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\gamma_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
(n \wedge m)\phi(n)\phi(m) &= \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{\gamma_i} \prod_{i=1}^r \left[ p_i^{\alpha_i+\beta_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^2 \right] \prod_{i=1}^s q_i^{\lambda_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \prod_{i=1}^t s_i^{\mu_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_i}\right) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^r \left[ p_i^{\alpha_i+\beta_i+\gamma_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right)^2 \right] \prod_{i=1}^s q_i^{\lambda_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i}\right) \prod_{i=1}^t s_i^{\mu_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{s_i}\right) \\
&= \phi(nm)\phi(n \wedge m)
\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion :

$$(n \wedge m)\phi(n)\phi(m) = \phi(nm)\phi(n \wedge m).$$

□

**Ex. 2.20** Prove that  $\prod_{d|n} d = n^{\nu(n)/2}$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$$

the decomposition of  $n$  in prime factors.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\prod_{d|n} d\right)^2 &= \prod_{d|n} d \prod_{d|n} d \\
&= \prod_{d|n} d \prod_{\delta|n} \frac{n}{\delta} \quad (\delta = n/d) \\
&= n^{\nu(n)} \prod_{d|n} d \prod_{d|n} \frac{1}{d} \\
&= n^{\nu(n)}
\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion :

$$\prod_{d|n} d = n^{\frac{\nu(n)}{2}}.$$

□

**Ex. 2.21** Define  $\wedge(n) = \log p$  if  $n$  is a power of  $p$  and zero otherwise. Prove that  $\sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \log d = \wedge(n)$ . [Hint: First calculate  $\sum_{d|n} \wedge(d)$  and then apply the Möbius inversion formula.]

*Proof.*

$$\begin{cases} \wedge(n) &= \log p & \text{if } n = p^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ &= 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_t^{\alpha_t}$  the decomposition of  $n$  in prime factors. As  $\wedge(d) = 0$  for all divisors of  $n$ , except for  $d = p_j^i, i > 0, j = 1, \dots, t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{d|n} \wedge(d) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_1} \wedge(p_1^i) + \cdots + \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_t} \wedge(p_t^i) \\
&= \alpha_1 \log p_1 + \cdots + \alpha_t \log p_t \\
&= \log n
\end{aligned}$$

By Möbius Inversion Theorem,

$$\wedge(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \log d.$$

□

**Ex. 2.22** Show that the sum of all the integers  $t$  such that  $1 \leq t \leq n$  and  $(t, n) = 1$  is  $\frac{1}{2}n\phi(n)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $n > 1$  (the formula is false if  $n = 1$ ).

$$\text{Let } S = \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n, t \wedge n = 1} t = \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t.$$

Using the symmetry  $t \mapsto n - t$ , as  $t \wedge n = 1 \iff (n - t) \wedge n = 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
2S &= \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t + \sum_{1 \leq s \leq n-1, (n-s) \wedge n = 1} n - s \quad (s = n - t) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, (n-t) \wedge n = 1} n - t \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} t + \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} n - t \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n-1, t \wedge n = 1} n \\
&= n \operatorname{Card}\{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid 1 \leq t \leq n - 1, t \wedge n = 1\} \\
&= n\phi(n)
\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion :

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n, t \wedge n = 1} t = \frac{1}{2}n\phi(n).$$

(See another interesting proof in Adam Michalik's paper.)

□

**Ex. 2.23** Let  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  and let  $\psi(n)$  be the number of  $f(j), j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , such that  $(f(j), n) = 1$ . Show that  $\psi(n)$  is multiplicative and that  $\psi(p^t) = p^{t-1}\psi(p)$ . Conclude that  $\psi(n) = n \prod_{p|n} \psi(p)/p$ .

*Proof.* My interpretation of this statement is that  $\psi(n)$  is the number of  $j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , such that  $(f(j), n) = 1$  (if  $f$  is not one to one, we may obtain a different value).

Let  $A_n = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq j \leq n \mid f(j) \wedge n = 1\}$  : then  $\psi(n) = |A_n|$ . If  $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^d a_k x^k$ , note  $f_n(x) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})[x]$  the polynomial  $f_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n [a_k]_n x^k$  (here, we represent the class of  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  by  $[j]_n$ ). We can write without inconvenient  $f = f_n$ .

Let  $B_n = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \mid f(a) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*\}$ , where  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$  is the group of invertible elements of  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ .

Then  $u : A_n \rightarrow B_n, j \mapsto [j]_n$  is a bijection.

Indeed  $u$  is well defined : if  $j \in A_n, f(j) \wedge n = 1$ , so  $f([j]_n) = [f(j)]_n \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$ .

$u$  is injective :  $[j]_n = [k]_n$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq n$  implies  $j = k$ .

$u$  is surjective : if  $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  verifies  $f(a) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*$ , let  $j$  the unique representative of  $a$  such that  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then  $f(j) \wedge n = 1$ , so  $u(j) = a$ .

Thus

$$\psi(n) = |B_n|, \text{ where } B_n = \{a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \mid f(a) \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^*\}.$$

Suppose  $n \wedge m = 1$ . Let

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} B_{nm} & \rightarrow B_n \times B_m \\ [j]_{nm} & \mapsto ([j]_n, [j]_m) \end{cases}$$

•  $\varphi$  is well defined :  $[j]_{nm} = [k]_{nm} \Rightarrow j \equiv k \pmod{nm} \Rightarrow (j \equiv k \pmod{n}, j \equiv k \pmod{m}) \Rightarrow ([j]_n, [j]_m) = ([k]_n, [k]_m)$ .

•  $\varphi$  is injective : if  $\varphi([j]_{nm}) = \varphi([k]_{nm})$ , then  $[j]_n = [k]_n, [j]_m = [k]_m$ , so  $n \mid j - k, m \mid j - k$ . As  $n \wedge m = 1, nm \mid j - k$  so  $[j]_{nm} = [k]_{nm}$ .

•  $\varphi$  is surjective : if  $(a, b) \in B_n \times B_m$ , there exist  $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq m$ , such that  $a = [j]_n, b = [k]_m$ . From the Chinese Remainder Theorem, there exists  $i \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq i \leq n$ , such that  $i \equiv j \pmod{n}, i \equiv k \pmod{m}$ . Then  $\varphi([i]_{nm}) = ([i]_n, [i]_m) = ([j]_n, [k]_m) = (a, b)$ .

Finally,  $\psi(nm) = |B_{nm}| = |B_n| |B_m| = \psi(n)\psi(m)$ , if  $n \wedge m = 1$  :  $\psi$  is a multiplicative function.

The interval  $I = [1, p^t]$  is the disjoint reunion of the  $p^{t-1}$  intervals  $I_k = [kp+1, (k+1)p]$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, p^{t-1} - 1$ , so  $\psi(p^t) = \sum_{k=0}^{p^{t-1}-1} \text{Card } C_k$ , where  $C_k = \{j \in I_k \mid f(j) \wedge p^t = 1\} = \{j \in I_k \mid f(j) \wedge p = 1\}$ .

As  $f(j) \wedge p = 1 \iff f(j - kp) \wedge p = 1$ , the application  $v : C_k \rightarrow C_0, j \mapsto j - kp$  is well defined and is bijective, so  $|C_k| = |C_0| = \psi(p)$ . Thus  $\psi(p^t) = p^{t-1} \text{Card } I_0 = p^{t-1} \psi(p)$  :

$$\psi(p^t) = p^{t-1} \psi(p).$$

If  $n = \prod_{p|n} p^{t(p)}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(n) &= \prod_{p|n} \psi(p^{t(p)}) \\ &= \prod_{p|n} p^{t(p)-1} \psi(p) \\ &= n \prod_{p|n} \frac{\psi(p)}{p} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 2.24** Supply the details to the proof of Theorem 3.

As Adam Michalik, I suppose that there is a misprint, we must prove Theorem 4 :

Let  $k$  a finite field with  $q$  elements.

$\sum q^{-\deg p(x)}$  diverges, where the sum is over all monic irreducible  $p(x)$  in  $k[x]$ .

*Proof.* Notations :

$\mathcal{P}$  : set of all monic polynomials  $p$  in  $k[x]$ .

$\mathcal{P}_n$  : set of all monic polynomials  $p$  in  $k[x]$  with  $\deg(p) \leq n$ .

$\mathcal{M}$  : set of all monic irreducible polynomials  $p$  in  $k[x]$ .

We must prove that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{M}} q^{-\deg p(x)}$  diverges.

•  $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}} q^{-\deg f}$  diverges :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{1}{q^{\deg f}} &= \sum_{d=0}^n \sum_{\deg(f)=d} \frac{1}{q^d} \\ &= \sum_{d=0}^n \frac{1}{q^d} \text{Card } \{f \in \mathcal{P} \mid \deg(f) = d\} \\ &= \sum_{d=0}^n \frac{1}{q^d} q^d = n + 1. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}} q^{-\deg f}$  diverges.

- $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}} q^{-2 \deg f}$  converges :

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}_n} q^{-2 \deg(f)} &= \sum_{d=0}^n \sum_{\deg(f)=d} \frac{1}{q^{2d}} \\
&= \sum_{d=0}^n \frac{1}{q^{2d}} \text{Card}\{f \in \mathcal{P} \mid \deg(f) = d\} \\
&= \sum_{d=0}^n \frac{1}{q^d} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{q}}
\end{aligned}$$

As any finite subset of  $\mathcal{P}$  is included in some  $\mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}} q^{-2 \deg f}$  converges.

- $\sum q^{-\deg p(x)}$  diverges :

Let  $\mathcal{P}_n = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{l(n)}\}$  the set of all monic irreducible polynomials such that  $\deg p_i \leq n$ . Let

$$\lambda(n) = \prod_{i=1}^{l(n)} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{q^{\deg(p_i)}}}.$$

For simplicity, we write  $l = l(n)$  for a fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(n) &= \prod_{i=1}^l \sum_{a_i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q^{a_i \deg p_i}} \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_1}} + \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_1}} + \dots\right) \times \dots \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_l}} + \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_l}} + \dots\right) \\
&= \sum_{(a_1, \dots, a_l) \in \mathbb{N}^l} \frac{1}{q^{\deg(p_1^{a_1} \dots p_l^{a_l})}}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the monic prime factors of any polynomial  $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$  are in  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , the decomposition of  $p$  is  $p = p_1^{a_1} \dots p_l^{a_l}$ , so

$$\lambda(n) \geq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_n} \frac{1}{q^{\deg p}} = n + 1.$$

So  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(n) = \infty$  : this is another proof that there exist infinitely many monic irreducible polynomials in  $k[x]$  (cf Ex. 2.1).

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \lambda(n) &= - \sum_{i=1}^{l(n)} \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_i}}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{l(n)} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mq^{m \deg p_i}} \\
&= \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_1}} + \dots + \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_{l(n)}}} + \sum_{i=1}^{l(n)} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mq^{m \deg p_i}}
\end{aligned}$$

Yet

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mq^{m \deg p_i}} &\leq \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q^{m \deg p_i}} \\ &= \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_i}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_i}}} \\ &= \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_i} - q^{\deg p_i}} \leq \frac{2}{q^{2 \deg p_i}} \end{aligned}$$

(the last inequality is equivalent to  $2 \leq q^{\deg p_i}$ ). So

$$\log \lambda(n) \leq \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q^{\deg p_{l(n)}}} + 2 \left( \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_{l(n)}}} \right).$$

As  $\frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q^{2 \deg p_{l(n)}}}$  is less than the constant  $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{P}} q^{-2 \deg f}$ , if  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{M}} q^{-\deg p(x)}$  converges, then  $\log \lambda(n) \leq C$ , where  $C$  is a constant, so  $\lambda(n) \leq e^C$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , in contradiction with  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(n) = \infty$ .

Conclusion :  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{M}} q^{-\deg p(x)}$  diverges.  $\square$

**Ex. 2.25** Consider the function  $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/n^s$ .  $\zeta$  is called the Riemann zeta function. It converges for  $s > 1$ . Prove the formal identity (Euler's identity)

$$\zeta(s) = \prod_p (1 - 1/p^s)^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* We prove this equality, not only formally, but for all complex value  $s$  such that  $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$ .

Let  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $f(n) = \frac{1}{n^s}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .

$f$  is completely multiplicative :  $f(mn) = f(m)f(n)$  for  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .

Moreover  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)$  is absolutely convergent for  $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$ . Indeed, If  $s = u + iv$ ,  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $|f(n)| = |n^{-s}| = |e^{-s \log(n)}| = |e^{-u \log(n)} e^{-iv \log(n)}| = e^{-u \log(n)} = \frac{1}{n^u}$ , so  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f(n)| = 1/n^u$  converges if  $u = \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$ .

With these properties of  $f$  ( $f$  multiplicative and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)$  absolutely convergent), we will show that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = \prod_p (1 + f(p) + f(p^2) + \cdots).$$

Let  $S^* = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f(n)| < \infty$ , and  $S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) \in \mathbb{C}$ . For each prime number  $p$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f(p^k)|$  converges (this sum is less than  $S^*$ ), so  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(p^k)$  converges absolutely. Thus, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , the two finite products

$$P(x) = \prod_{p \leq x} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(p^k), \quad P^*(x) = \prod_{p \leq x} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |f(p^k)|$$

are well defined.

If  $p, q$  are two prime numbers, as  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f(p^i), \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f(q^j)$  are absolutely convergent,  $(f(p^i)f(q^j))_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$  is sommable, so the sum of these elements can be arranged in any order :

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f(p^i) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(q^k) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2} f(p^i)f(q^j) = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2} f(p^i q^j).$$

If  $p_1, \dots, p_t$  are all the prime  $p \leq x$ , repeating  $t$  times these products, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) &= \prod_{p \leq x} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(p^k) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} f(p_1^{i_1}) \cdots \sum_{i_t=0}^{\infty} f(p_t^{i_t}) \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_t) \in \mathbb{N}^t} f(p_1^{i_1} \cdots p_t^{i_t}) \\ &= \sum_{n \in \Delta} f(n), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta$  is the set of integers  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  whose prime factors are not greater than  $x$ . Let  $\overline{\Delta} = \mathbb{N}^* \setminus \Delta$  : this is the set of numbers  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that at least a prime factor is greater than  $x$ . So

$$P(x) = \sum_{n \in \Delta} f(n) = S - \sum_{n \in \overline{\Delta}} f(n).$$

Then

$$|P(x) - S| \leq \sum_{n \in \overline{\Delta}} |f(n)| \leq \sum_{n \geq x} |f(n)|.$$

So  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} P(x) = S$ , that is

$$\prod_p \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(p^k) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n).$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} &= \prod_p \left( 1 + \frac{1}{p^s} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p^{ks}} + \cdots \right) \\ &= \prod_p (1 - 1/p^s)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 2.26** Verify the formal identities:

$$(a) \quad \zeta(s)^{-1} = \sum \mu(n)/n^s$$

$$(b) \quad \zeta(s)^2 = \sum \nu(n)/n^s$$

$$(c) \quad \zeta(s)\zeta(s-1) = \sum \sigma(n)/n^s$$

*Proof.* Without any consideration of convergence :

(a)

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta(s) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(m)}{m^s} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(m)}{m^s} \\
&= \sum_{n,m \geq 1} \frac{\mu(m)}{n^s m^s} \\
&= \sum_{u=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m|u} \mu(m) \frac{1}{u^s} \quad (u = nm) \\
&= \sum_{u=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{u^s} \sum_{m|u} \mu(m) \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed,  $\sum_{m|u} \mu(m) = 1$  if  $u = 1$ , 0 otherwise. So

$$\zeta(s)^{-1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mu(n)/n^s.$$

(b)

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta(s)^2 &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^s} \\
&= \sum_{n,m \geq 1} \frac{1}{(nm)^s} \\
&= \sum_{u \geq 1} \sum_{n|u} \frac{1}{u^s} \\
&= \sum_{u \geq 1} \frac{1}{u^s} \sum_{n|u} 1 \\
&= \sum_{u \geq 1} \frac{1}{u^s} \nu(u)
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\zeta(s)^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\nu(n)}{n^s}.$$

(c) For  $\text{Re}(s) > 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta(s)\zeta(s-1) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n^s} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m^{s-1}} \\
&= \sum_{m,n \geq 1} \frac{m}{(nm)^s} \\
&= \sum_{u \geq 1} \left( \sum_{m|u} m \right) \frac{1}{u^s} \\
&= \sum_{u \geq 1} \frac{\sigma(u)}{u^s}
\end{aligned}$$



So

$$\zeta(s)\zeta(s-1) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sigma(n)}{n^s}.$$

□

**Ex. 2.27** Show that  $\sum 1/n$ , the sum being over square free integers, diverges. Conclude that  $\prod_{p < N} (1 + 1/p) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $e^x > 1 + x$ , conclude that  $\sum_{p < N} 1/p \rightarrow \infty$ . (This proof is due to I.Niven.)

*Proof.* Let  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^*$  the set of square free integers.

Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Every integer  $n$ ,  $1 \leq n \leq N$  can be written as  $n = ab^2$ , where  $a, b$  are integers and  $a$  is square free. Then  $1 \leq a \leq N$ , and  $1 \leq b \leq \sqrt{N}$ , so

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \leq \sum_{a \in S, a \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq b \leq \sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{ab^2} \leq \sum_{a \in S, a \leq N} \frac{1}{a} \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \sum_{a \in S, a \leq N} \frac{1}{a}.$$

So

$$\sum_{a \in S, a \leq N} \frac{1}{a} \geq \frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n}.$$

As  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$  diverges,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a \in S, a \leq N} \frac{1}{a} = +\infty$ , so the family  $(\frac{1}{a})_{a \in S}$  of the inverse of square free integers is not summable.

Let  $S_N = \prod_{p < N} (1 + 1/p)$ , and  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_l$  ( $l = l(N)$ ) all prime integers less than  $N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} S_N &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_1}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_l}\right) \\ &= \sum_{(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_l) \in \{0,1\}^l} \frac{1}{p_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots p_l^{\varepsilon_l}} \end{aligned}$$

We prove this last formula by induction. This is true for  $l = 1$  :  $\sum_{\varepsilon \in \{0,1\}} 1/p_1^{\varepsilon} = 1 + 1/p_1$ .

If it is true for the integer  $l$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_1}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_l}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_{l+1}}\right) &= \sum_{(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_l) \in \{0,1\}^l} \frac{1}{p_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots p_l^{\varepsilon_l}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_{l+1}}\right) \\ &= \sum_{(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_l) \in \{0,1\}^l} \frac{1}{p_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots p_l^{\varepsilon_l}} + \sum_{(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_l) \in \{0,1\}^l} \frac{1}{p_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots p_l^{\varepsilon_l} p_{l+1}} \\ &= \sum_{(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_l, \varepsilon_{l+1}) \in \{0,1\}^{l+1}} \frac{1}{p_1^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots p_l^{\varepsilon_l} p_{l+1}^{\varepsilon_{l+1}}} \end{aligned}$$

So it is true for all  $l$ .

Thus  $S_N = \sum_{n \in \Delta} \frac{1}{n}$ , where  $\Delta$  is the set of square free integers whose prime factors are less than  $N$ .

As  $\sum 1/n$ , the sum being over square free integers, diverges,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S_N = +\infty$  :

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{p < N} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) = +\infty.$$

$e^x \geq 1 + x, x \geq \log(1 + x)$  for  $x > 0$ , so

$$\log S_N = \sum_{k=1}^{l(N)} \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{p_k} \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{l(N)} \frac{1}{p_k}.$$

$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \log S_N = +\infty$  and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} l(N) = +\infty$ , so

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{p < N} \frac{1}{p} = +\infty.$$

□

### Chapter 3

**Ex. 3.1** Show that there are infinitely many primes congruent to  $-1$  modulo 6.

*Proof.* Let  $n$  any integer such that  $n \geq 3$ , and  $N = n! - 1 = 2 \times 3 \times \cdots \times n - 1 > 1$ .

Then  $N \equiv -1 \pmod{6}$ . As  $N + 2, N + 3, N + 4$  are composite, every prime factor of  $N$  is congruent to 1 or  $-1$  modulo 6. If every prime factor of  $N$  was congruent to 1, then  $N \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ : this is a contradiction because  $-1 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ . So there exists a prime factor  $p$  of  $N$  such that  $p \equiv -1 \pmod{6}$ .

If  $p \leq n$ , then  $p \mid n!$ , and  $p \mid N = n! - 1$ , so  $p \mid 1$ . As  $p$  is prime, this is a contradiction, so  $p > n$ .

Conclusion :

for any integer  $n$ , there exists a prime  $p > n$  such that  $p \equiv -1 \pmod{6}$ : there are infinitely many primes congruent to  $-1$  modulo 6. □

**Ex. 3.2** Construct addition and multiplication tables for  $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* More a latex exercise than a mathematical one.

$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$  :

+	0	1	2	3	4	×	0	1	2	3	4
0	0	1	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	2	3	4	0	1	0	1	2	3	4
2	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	2	4	1	3
3	3	4	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	4	2
4	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	4	3	2	1

$\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$ :

+	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	×	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	0	2	4	6	0	2	4	6
3	3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	0	3	6	1	4	7	2	5
4	4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4
5	5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	5	2	7	4	1	6	3
6	6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	6	4	2	0	6	4	2
7	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

$\mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z}$  :

+	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	×	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	6	8
3	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	0	3	6	9	2	5	8	1	4	7
4	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	0	4	8	2	6	0	4	8	2	6
5	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5
6	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	0	6	2	8	4	0	6	2	8	4
7	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0	7	4	1	8	5	2	9	6	3
8	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	0	8	6	4	2	0	8	6	4	2
9	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Python code to generate the latex code to create such an array :

n= 10

```
print('$')
ligne = '\\begin{array}{c|'+ n*'c|'+ '}'
print(ligne)
ligne='\\times'
for j in range(n):
    ligne += ' & ' + str(j)
ligne += '\\\\'
ligne += '\\\\'
ligne += ' \\hline'
print(ligne)
for i in range(n):
    ligne = str(i)
    for j in range(n):
        ligne += ' & ' + str((i * j) % n)
    ligne += '\\\\'
    ligne += '\\\\'
    print(ligne)
print('\\\\end{array}')
print('$')
```

□

**Ex. 3.3** Let  $abc$  be the decimal representation for an integer between 1 and 1000. Show that  $abc$  is divisible by 3 iff  $a + b + c$  is divisible by 3. Show that the same result is true if we replace 3 by 9. Show that  $abc$  is divisible by 11 iff  $a - b + c$  is divisible by 11. Generalize to any number written in decimal notation.

*Proof.* Let  $n = \overline{abc}$  the decimal representation of  $n$ .

As  $10 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ,  $10^3 \equiv 10^2 \equiv 10 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \mid n &\iff 10^3a + 10^2b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\ &\iff a + b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \end{aligned} \qquad 3 \mid a + b + c$$

As  $10 \equiv 1 \pmod{9}$  the same demonstration is true for the result

$$9 \mid n \iff 9 \mid a + b + c.$$

Similarly,  $10 \equiv -1 \pmod{11}$ , and  $10^2 \equiv 1, 10^3 \equiv -1$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} 11 \mid n &\iff 10^3 a + 10^2 b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{11} \\ &\iff a - b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{11} \end{aligned}$$

More generally, let  $n = \overline{a_l a_{l-1} \dots a_0}$  is the decimal representation of  $n$ .  
 $10^n \equiv 1 \pmod{9}$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} 9 \mid n &\iff \sum_{k=0}^l a_k 10^k \equiv 0 \pmod{9} \\ &\iff \sum_{k=0}^l a_k \equiv 0 \pmod{9} \\ &\iff 9 \mid a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_n \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 3.4** Show that the equation  $3x^2 + 2 = y^2$  has no solution in integers.

*Proof.* If  $3x^2 + 2 = y^2$ , then  $\bar{y}^2 = \bar{2}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ .

As  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$  is a complete set of residues modulo 3, the squares in  $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$  are  $\bar{0} = \bar{0}^2$  and  $\bar{1} = \bar{1}^2 = (\bar{-1})^2$ , so  $\bar{2}$  is not a square in  $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ :  $\bar{y}^2 = \bar{2}$  is impossible in  $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ .

Thus  $3x^2 + 2 = y^2$  has no solution in integers. □

**Ex. 3.5** Show that the equation  $7x^2 + 2 = y^3$  has no solution in integers.

*Proof.* If  $7x^2 + 2 = y^3$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $y^3 \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$  (so  $y \not\equiv 0 \pmod{7}$ )

From Fermat's Little Theorem,  $y^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$ , so  $2^2 \equiv y^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$ , which implies  $7 \mid 2^2 - 1 = 3$ : this is a contradiction. Thus the equation  $7x^2 + 2 = y^3$  has no solution in integers. □

**Ex. 3.6** Let an integer  $n > 0$  be given. A set of integers  $a_1, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}$  is called a reduced residue system modulo  $n$  if they are pairwise incongruent modulo  $n$  and  $(a_i, n) = 1$  for all  $i$ . If  $(a, n) = 1$ , prove that  $aa_1, aa_2, \dots, aa_{\phi(n)}$  is again a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a_1, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}$  a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ .

- As  $a \wedge n = 1$  and  $a_i \wedge n = 1$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \phi(n)$ , then  $aa_i \wedge n = 1$ .
- As  $a \wedge n = 1$ , there exists  $a' \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $aa' \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . then

$$aa_i \equiv aa_j \Rightarrow a'aa_i \equiv a'aa_j \pmod{n} \Rightarrow a_i \equiv a_j \pmod{n}.$$

So  $i \neq j \Rightarrow a_i \not\equiv a_j \Rightarrow aa_i \not\equiv aa_j$ :

$aa_1, \dots, aa_{\phi(n)}$  a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ .

Note that  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}\}$  is a reduced residue system modulo  $n$  if and only if  $\{\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \dots, \bar{a}_{\phi(n)}\} = U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ . □

**Ex. 3.7** Use Ex. 2.6 to give another proof of Euler's theorem,  $a^{\phi(n)} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$  for  $(a, n) = 1$ .

*Proof.* The proof is more clear if we stay in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ .

Let  $P = \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x$

(if  $\{a_1, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}\}$  is a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ , then  $\bar{P} = \prod_{i=1}^{\phi(n)} a_i$ .)

Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $a \wedge n = 1$ , then  $b = \bar{a} \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ , and

$$\psi \begin{cases} U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) & \rightarrow & U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \\ x & \mapsto & bx \end{cases}$$

- $\psi(x) = \psi(x') \Rightarrow bx = bx' \Rightarrow b^{-1}bx = b^{-1}bx' \Rightarrow x = x'$  so  $\psi$  is injective.
  - Let  $y \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ . If  $x = b^{-1}y$ , then  $\psi(x) = bb^{-1}y = y$ , so  $\psi$  is surjective.
- $\psi$  is a bijection, so

$$\prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} bx = \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x,$$

that is

$$b^{\phi(n)} \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x = \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x.$$

As  $\prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x$  is invertible,

$$b^{\phi(n)} = 1.$$

That is  $\bar{a}^{\phi(n)} = 1$  : for all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $a \wedge n = 1$ , then  $a^{\phi(n)} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . □

**Ex. 3.8** Let  $p$  be an odd prime. If  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ , show that there is a unique  $b_k$  in this set such that  $kb_k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . Show that  $k \neq b_k$  unless  $k = 1$  or  $k = p-1$ .

*Proof.* • existence.

As  $p$  is prime and  $1 \leq k \leq p-1$ ,  $k \wedge p = 1$ , so there exist  $\lambda_k, \mu_k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\lambda_k p + \mu_k k = 1$ . Let  $b_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$  such that  $b_k \equiv \mu_k \pmod{p}$ . Then  $kb_k \equiv 1$ , and  $b_k \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , so  $1 \leq b_k \leq p-1$ .

• unicity. If  $kb_k \equiv kb'_k \pmod{p}$ , where  $b_k, b'_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ , then  $p \mid k(b'_k - b_k)$ , and  $p \wedge k = 1$ , so  $p \mid b'_k - b_k$ .  $b'_k \equiv b_k$ , and  $b_k, b'_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ , so  $b_k = b'_k$ .

If  $p$  is a prime number, and  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ , there is a unique  $b_k$  in  $\{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$  such that  $kb_k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .

If  $k = b_k$ , then  $k^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , so  $p \mid (k-1)(k+1)$ , and  $p$  is a prime, thus  $p \mid k-1$  or  $p \mid k+1$ , that is  $k \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$ . As  $1 \leq k \leq p-1$ ,  $k = 1$  or  $k = p-1$  (and  $1^2 \equiv (p-1)^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ ). □

**Ex. 3.9** Use Ex. 3.8 to prove that  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ . (misprint corrected)

*Proof.* Each element  $k$  in the product  $p!$  can be associated with its inverse  $b_k$  modulo  $k$ , except 1 and  $p-1$ , which are their own inverse, so

$$p! \equiv 1 \times (p-1) \equiv -1 \pmod{p}.$$

□

**Ex. 3.10** If  $n$  is not a prime, show that  $(n-1)! \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ , except when  $n = 4$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $n > 1$  is not a prime. Then  $n = uv$ , where  $2 \leq u \leq v \leq n-1$ .

• If  $u \neq v$ , then  $n = uv \mid (n-1)! = 1 \times 2 \times \cdots \times u \times \cdots \times v \times \cdots \times (n-1)$  (even if  $u \wedge v \neq 1$ !).

• If  $u = v$ ,  $n = u^2$  is a square.

If  $u$  is not prime,  $u = st$ ,  $2 \leq s \leq t \leq u-1 \leq n-1$ , and  $n = u'v'$ , where  $u' = s, v' = st^2$  verify  $2 \leq u' < v' \leq n-1$ . As in the first case,  $n = u'v' \mid (n-1)!$ .

If  $u = p$  is a prime, then  $n = p^2$ .

In the case  $p = 2$ ,  $n = 4$  and  $n = 4 \nmid (n-1)! = 6$ . In the other case  $p > 2$ , and  $(n-1)! = (p^2-1)!$  contains the factors  $p < 2p < p^2$ , so  $p^2 \mid (p^2-1)!, n \mid (n-1)!$ .

Conclusion : if  $n$  is not a prime,  $(n-1)! \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ , except when  $n = 4$ . □

**Ex. 3.11** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}$  be a reduced residue system modulo  $n$  and let  $N$  be the number of solutions to  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . Prove that  $a_1 \cdots a_{\phi(n)} \equiv (-1)^{N/2} \pmod{n}$ .

*Proof.* If  $n = 2$ , then  $N = 1$  and the result is false. So we suppose  $n > 2$ .

Let  $H$  the subset of  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  of all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x^2 = 1$  :

$$H = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \mid x^2 = 1\}$$

(here  $1 = \bar{1}$ ).

$H \subset U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ , and  $x \in H, y \in H \Rightarrow x^2 = y^2 = 1 \Rightarrow (xy^{-1})^2 = 1 \Rightarrow xy^{-1} \in H$ , so  $H$  is a subgroup of  $(U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}), \times)$ , and  $N = \text{Card } H$ .

Each  $x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $x \notin H$  can be paired with its inverse  $x^{-1}$ , and  $xx^{-1} = 1$ , so

$$P := \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x = \prod_{x \in H} x.$$

If  $x \in H, -x \in H$ .

• If  $n$  is odd, each  $x = \bar{a} \in H$  ( $a \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq a \leq n-1$ ) satisfy  $-x \neq x$  : otherwise  $2a \equiv 0 \pmod{n}, 2a = kn, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . As  $0 < 2a = kn < 2n$ , then  $k = 1$ , and  $n = 2a$  is even, which is in contradiction with the hypothesis.

So we each  $x \in H$  can be paired with  $-x$  in the product  $P$ , and  $x(-x) = -1$ , so

$$P = \prod_{x \in H} x = (-1)^{N/2}.$$

• If  $n$  is even, if  $x = \bar{a} \in H$  ( $a \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq a \leq n-1$ ) satisfy  $x = -x$ , then  $0 < a = k\frac{n}{2} < n$ , so  $a = \frac{n}{2}$ , and  $x = \overline{\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)}$  is the only element in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x = -x$ .  $\bar{2}x = \bar{0}$ , and  $x \in H$ , so  $\bar{2}x^2 = \bar{0}, \bar{2} = \bar{0}$  : since  $n > 2$ , this is impossible, so  $x \neq -x$  for all  $x \in H$ , and  $\prod_{x \in H} x = (-1)^{N/2}$ .

Conclusion : if  $n > 2$ ,

$$\prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x = (-1)^{N/2}.$$

If  $a_1, \dots, a_{\phi(n)}$  is a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ , then  $\overline{a_1 \cdots a_{\phi(n)}} = P = \prod_{x \in U(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})} x = (-1)^{N/2}$ , so

$$a_1 \cdots a_{\phi(n)} \equiv (-1)^{N/2}.$$

□

**Ex. 3.12** Let  $\binom{p}{k} = \frac{p!}{k!(p-k)!}$  be a binomial coefficient, and suppose  $p$  is prime. If  $1 \leq k \leq p-1$ , show that  $p$  divides  $\binom{p}{k}$ . Deduce  $(a+b)^p \equiv a^p + b^p \pmod{p}$ .

*Proof.*  $p \mid p! = k!(p-k)!\binom{p}{k}$ .

If  $1 \leq k \leq p-1$ , then for each  $i, 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq i < p$ , so  $i \wedge p = 1$ . Thus  $(\prod_{i=1}^k i) \wedge p = 1, k! \wedge p = 1$ . Similarly,  $p-k < p$ , so  $(\prod_{i=1}^{p-k} i) \wedge p = 1, (p-k)! \wedge p = 1$ . Thus  $p \wedge k!(p-k)! = 1$ , and  $p \mid p! = k!(p-k)!\binom{p}{k}$ , so  $p \mid \binom{p}{k}$ .

Finally, from binomial formula

$$\begin{aligned} (a+b)^p &= a^p + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \binom{p}{k} a^k b^{p-k} + b^p \\ &\equiv a^p + b^p \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 3.13** Use Ex. 3.12 to give another proof of Fermat's theorem,  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  if  $p$  does not divide  $a$ .

*Proof.* If we make the induction hypothesis

$$\mathcal{P}(k) \iff \forall (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k, (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k)^p \equiv a_1^p + a_2^p + \dots + a_k^p$$

(which is true for  $k=1, k=2$ ) then, from induction hypothesis and the case  $k=2$  already proved in Ex 3.12,

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k + a_{k+1})^p &= ((a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k) + a_{k+1})^p \\ &\equiv (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k)^p + a_{k+1}^p \pmod{p} \\ &\equiv a_1^p + a_2^p + \dots + a_k^p + a_{k+1}^p \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

so  $\mathcal{P}(k) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(k+1)$  :

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*, \forall (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k, (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_k)^p \equiv a_1^p + a_2^p + \dots + a_k^p.$$

If we apply this result to the particular case  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_k = 1$ , we obtain

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}^*, k^p \equiv k \pmod{p}.$$

and  $(-k)^p \equiv -k^p \equiv -k \pmod{p}$  (even if  $p=2$ ), and  $0^p = 0$ , so

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, k^p \equiv k \pmod{p}.$$

If  $p \nmid a, a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $p \wedge a = 1$ , and  $p \mid a^p - a = a(a^{p-1} - 1)$ , so  $p \mid a^{p-1} - 1, a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  : this is another proof of Fermat's theorem. □

**Ex. 3.14** Let  $p$  and  $q$  be distinct odd primes such that  $p-1$  divides  $q-1$ . If  $(n, pq) = 1$ , show that  $n^{q-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{pq}$ .

*Proof.* As  $n \wedge pq = 1, n \wedge p = 1, n \wedge q = 1$ , so from Fermat's Little Theorem

$$n^{q-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{q}, \quad n^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

$p-1 \mid q-1$ , so there exists  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $q-1 = k(p-1)$ . Thus

$$n^{q-1} = (n^{p-1})^k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

$p \mid n^{q-1} - 1, q \mid n^{q-1} - 1$ , and  $p \wedge q = 1$ , so  $pq \mid n^{q-1} - 1$  :

$$n^{q-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{pq}.$$

□

**Ex. 3.15** For any prime  $p$  show that the numerator of  $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{p-1}$  is divisible by  $p$ .

*Proof.* As the result is false for  $p = 2$ , we must suppose  $p > 2$ , so  $p$  is odd.

$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{p-1} = \frac{N}{D}$ , where

$$N = (p-1)! + \frac{(p-1)!}{2} + \dots + \frac{(p-1)!}{p-1}, \quad D = (p-1)!.$$

From Wilson's theorem,  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ , so in the field  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\overline{N} = (-\overline{1})(\overline{1}^{-1} + \overline{2}^{-1} + \dots + \overline{p-1}^{-1}).$$

As the application  $\varphi : (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^* \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*, x \mapsto x^{-1}$  is bijective (it's an involution),

$$\overline{1} + \overline{2}^{-1} + \dots + \overline{p-1}^{-1} = \overline{1} + \overline{2} + \dots + \overline{p-1} = \overline{p} \times \overline{\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)} = \overline{0}.$$

So  $p \mid N$ , and  $p \wedge (p-1)! = 1$ , that is  $p \wedge D = 1$ . Thus  $p$  divides the numerator of the reduced fraction of  $N/D$ . □

**Ex. 3.16** Use the proof of the Chinese Remainder Theorem to solve the system  $x \equiv 1 \pmod{7}, x \equiv 4 \pmod{9}, x \equiv 3 \pmod{5}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m_1 = 7, m_2 = 9, m_3 = 5, m = m_1 m_2 m_3 = 315, n_1 = m/m_1 = m_2 m_3 = 45, n_2 = m_1 m_3 = 35, n_3 = m_1 m_2 = 63$ .

If  $r_1 = 13, s_1 = -2$ , then  $r_1 m_1 + s_1 n_1 = 13m_1 - 2m_2 m_3 = 13 \times 7 - 2 \times 45 = 1$ ,  
so  $e_1 = s_1 n_1 = -2 \times 45 = -90$  verifies

$$e_1 = -90, \quad e_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}, e_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{9}, e_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}.$$

If  $r_2 = 4, s_2 = -1$ , then  $r_2 m_2 + s_2 n_2 = 4 \times 9 - 1 \times 35 = 1$ ,  
so  $e_2 = s_2 n_2 = -35$  verifies

$$e_2 = -35, \quad e_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{7}, e_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{9}, e_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}.$$

If  $r_3 = -25, s_3 = 2$ , then  $r_3 m_3 + s_3 n_3 = -25 \times 5 + 2 \times 63 = 1$ ,



so  $e_3 = s_3 n_3 = 2 \times 63 = 126$  verifies

$$e_3 = 126, \quad e_3 \equiv 0 \pmod{7}, e_3 \equiv 0 \pmod{9}, e_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}.$$

Let  $x_0 = e_1 + 4e_2 + 3e_3 = 148$  : then

$$x_0 = 148, \quad x_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}, x_0 \equiv 4 \pmod{9}, x_0 \equiv 3 \pmod{5}.$$

If  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  is any solution of the system, then  $7 \mid x - x_0, 9 \mid x - x_0, 5 \mid x - x_0$ , with  $7 \wedge 9 = 7 \wedge 5 = 9 \wedge 5 = 1$ , so  $m = 315 \mid x - x_0$  :

$$x = 148 + k 315, k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and all these integers are solutions of the system.  $\square$

**Ex. 3.17** Let  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  and  $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_t^{a_t}$ . Show that  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  has a solution iff  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$  has a solution for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ .

*Proof.* If  $x$  is such that  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ , as  $p_i^{a_i} \mid n$ ,  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ .

Reciprocally, let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t$  such that

$$f(x_1) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_1^{a_1}}$$

...

$$f(x_t) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_t^{a_t}}$$

As  $p_i^{a_i} \wedge p_j^{a_j} = 1$  if  $i \neq j$ , the Chinese Remainder Theorem gives an integer  $x$  such that  $x \equiv x_i \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ . As  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ ,  $f(x) \equiv f(x_i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ . So  $p_i^{a_i} \mid f(x)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , where  $p_i^{a_i} \wedge p_j^{a_j} = 1$  if  $i \neq j$ , then  $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_t^{a_t} \mid f(x)$  :  $x$  is a solution of  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ .

Conclusion :  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  has a solution iff  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$  has a solution for  $i = 1, \dots, t$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 3.18** For  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , let  $N$  be the number of solutions to  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  and  $N_i$  be the number of solutions to  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ . Prove that  $N = N_1 N_2 \cdots N_t$ .

*Proof.* Note  $[x]_n$  the class of  $x$  modulo  $n$ . Let  $S$  the set of solutions in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  of  $f(\bar{x}) = 0$ , and  $S_i$  the set of solutions in  $\mathbb{Z}/p_i^{a_i}\mathbb{Z}$  of  $f(\bar{x}) = 0$ .

(We designate with the same letter the polynomial  $f$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  or its reduction in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}[x]$ .)

Let

$$\varphi : \begin{cases} S & \rightarrow S_1 \times S_2 \times \cdots \times S_t \\ [x]_n & \mapsto ([x]_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x]_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x]_{p_t^{a_t}}) \end{cases}$$

•  $\varphi$  is well defined : if  $x \equiv x' \pmod{n}$ , then  $x \equiv x' \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , so  $([x]_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x]_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x]_{p_t^{a_t}}) = ([x']_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x']_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x']_{p_t^{a_t}})$ . Moreover, we proved in Ex 3.17 that  $[x]_n \in S \Rightarrow [x]_{p_i^{a_i}} \in S_i$ .

•  $\varphi$  is injective : if  $([x]_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x]_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x]_{p_t^{a_t}}) = ([x']_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x']_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x']_{p_t^{a_t}})$ , then  $p_i^{a_i} \mid x' - x$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , so  $n \mid x' - x$  and  $[x]_n = [x']_n$ .

•  $\varphi$  is surjective : if  $y = ([x_1]_{p_1^{a_1}}, [x_2]_{p_2^{a_2}}, \dots, [x_t]_{p_t^{a_t}})$  is any element of  $S_1 \times S_2 \times \cdots \times S_t$ , there exists from Chinese remainder theorem  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $x \equiv x_i \pmod{p_i^{a_i}}$ . Then  $\varphi([x]_n) = y$  (see Ex. 3.17).

In conclusion, a  $\varphi$  is bijective,  $N = |S| = |S_1 \times S_2 \times \cdots \times S_t| = N_1 N_2 \cdots N_t$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 3.19** If  $p$  is an odd prime, show that 1 and  $-1$  are the only solutions of  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p^a}$ .

*Proof.*

$$x^2 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^a} \iff p^a \mid (x-1)(x+1).$$

Let  $d = (x-1) \wedge (x+1) : d = 1$  or  $d = 2$ .

• If  $d = 1$ , then  $x$  is even (if not,  $x-1$  and  $x+1$  are even, and  $2 \mid d$ ). As  $p^a \mid (x-1)(x+1)$  and  $(x-1) \wedge (x+1) = 1$ , then  $p^a \mid x-1$ , or  $p^a \mid x+1$ , that is

$$x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p^a}.$$

• If  $d = 2$ , then  $x$  is odd, and

$$p^a \mid 4 \frac{x-1}{2} \frac{x+1}{2}.$$

As  $p$  is an odd prime,  $p \nmid 4$ , so  $p \mid \frac{x-1}{2} \frac{x+1}{2}$ , where  $\frac{x-1}{2} \wedge \frac{x+1}{2} = 1$ , hence  $p^a \mid \frac{x-1}{2} \mid x-1$  or  $p^a \mid \frac{x+1}{2} \mid x+1$  :

$$x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p^a}.$$

$\{-1, 1\}$  is the set of roots of  $x^2 - 1$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z}$ . □

**Ex. 3.20** Show that  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$  has one solution if  $b = 1$ , two solutions if  $b = 2$ , and four solutions if  $b \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* Consider the equation  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ .

• If  $b = 1$ ,  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \iff 2 \mid (x-1)(x+1) \iff x \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  : one solution.

• If  $b = 2$ , as  $0^2 \equiv 2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ ,  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \iff x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{4}$  : two solutions.

• Suppose  $b \geq 3$ . The equation has 4 solutions  $1, -1, 1 + 2^{b-1}, -1 + 2^{b-1}$ .

Indeed,  $(\pm 1)^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ , and

$$(1 + 2^{b-1})^2 = 1 + 2 \cdot 2^{b-1} + 2^{2b-2} = 1 + 2^b(1 + 2^{b-2}) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b},$$

and similarly  $(-1 + 2^{b-1})^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ .

These solutions are incongruent modulo  $2^b$  :

$1 \not\equiv -1 \pmod{2^b}$  and  $1 + 2^{b-1} \not\equiv -1 + 2^{b-1} \pmod{2^b}$  (if not,  $2^b \mid 2$ , so  $b \leq 1$ ).

$1 + 2^{b-1} \equiv -1 \pmod{2^b} \iff 2^b \mid 2 + 2^{b-1} = 2(1 + 2^{b-2})$  : so  $2 \mid 2^{b-1} \mid (1 + 2^{b-2})$ , this is impossible because  $1 + 2^{b-2}$  is odd ( $b \geq 3$ ). With the same argument,  $-1 + 2^{b-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ .  $1 + 2^{b-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$  implies  $2^b \mid 2^{b-1}$ , so  $2 \mid 1$  : this is a contradiction, so  $1 + 2^{b-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ , and also  $-1 + 2^{b-1} \not\equiv -1 \pmod{2^b}$ . There exist at least 4 solutions.

We show that these are the only solutions :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b} \Rightarrow x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{2^{b-1}}.$$

Indeed, if  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ ,  $2^b \mid (x-1)(x+1)$ , where  $d = (x-1) \wedge (x+1) = 2$ .

As in Ex.3.19, if  $d = 1$ , then  $2^b \mid x-1$  or  $2^b \mid x+1$ , a fortiori  $x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{2^{b-1}}$ .

If  $d = 2$ , then  $x$  is odd, and  $2^b \mid 4 \frac{x-1}{2} \frac{x+1}{2}$ , so  $2^{b-2} \mid \frac{x-1}{2} \frac{x+1}{2}$ , with  $\frac{x-1}{2} \wedge \frac{x+1}{2} = 1$ , so  $2^{b-2} \mid \frac{x-1}{2}$  or  $2^{b-2} \mid \frac{x+1}{2}$ , that is  $2^{b-1} \mid x-1$  or  $2^{b-1} \mid x+1$  :  $x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{2^{b-1}}$ .

(Alternatively, we can prove this implication by induction.)

Hence every solution of  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2^b}$ ,  $b \geq 3$  is such that  $x = \pm 1 + k2^{b-1}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  : there exit only four such value in the interval  $[0, 2^b[$ , namely  $1, -1 + 2^{b-1}, 1 + 2^{b-1}, -1 + 2^b$ .

Conclusion : if  $b \geq 3$ , the roots of  $x^2 - 1$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/2^b\mathbb{Z}$  are  $\bar{1}, -\bar{1}, \bar{1} + \bar{2}^{b-1}, -\bar{1} + \bar{2}^{b-1}$ . □

**Ex. 3.21** Use Ex. 18-20 to find the number of solutions to  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n = 2^{a_0} p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_k^{a_k}$  the decomposition in prime factors of  $n > 1$  ( $p_0 = 2 < p_1 < \cdots < p_k, a_0 \geq 0, a_i > 0, 1 \leq i \leq k$ ). Let  $N$  the number of solutions of  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ , and  $N_i$  the number of solutions of  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p_i}, i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ . From Ex.3.18, we know that  $N = N_0 N_1 \cdots N_k$ , where (Ex. 3.19),  $N_i = 2, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , and (Ex.3.20),  $N_0 = 1$  if  $a_0 = 1$  (or  $a_0 = 0$ ),  $N_0 = 2$  if  $a_0 = 2$ ,  $N_0 = 4$  if  $a_0 \geq 3$ .

Conclusion : the number of solutions of  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ , where  $n = 2^{a_0} p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_k^{a_k}$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} N &= 2^k && \text{if } a_0 = 0 \text{ or } a_0 = 1 \\ N &= 2^{k+1} && \text{if } a_0 = 2 \\ N &= 2^{k+2} && \text{if } a_0 \geq 3 \end{aligned}$$

□

**Ex. 3.22** Formulate and prove the Chinese Remainder Theorem in a principal ideal domain.

**Proposition.** Let  $R$  a principal ideal domain, and  $m_1, \dots, m_t \in R$ . Suppose that  $(m_i, m_j) = 1$  for  $i \neq j$  (that is  $(m_i) + (m_j) = (1), m_i R + m_j R = R$ ). Let  $b_1, \dots, b_t \in R$  and consider the system of congruences:

$$x \equiv b_1 \pmod{m_1}, x \equiv b_2 \pmod{m_2}, \dots, x \equiv b_t \pmod{m_t}.$$

This system has solutions and any two solutions differ by a multiple of  $m_1 m_2 \cdots m_t$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_t$ , and  $n_i = m/m_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ .

As  $(m_1, m_i) = (1)$ , we can find  $u_i, v_i \in R$  such that  $m_1 u_i + m_i v_i = 1, i = 2, \dots, t$ .

So  $1 = \prod_{i=2}^t (m_1 u_i + m_i v_i) = m_1 u + (m_2 \cdots m_t) v$  for some elements  $u, v \in R$ , thus  $(m_1, n_1) = (m_1, m_2 m_3 \cdots m_t) = (1)$ , and similarly  $(m_i, n_i) = 1$ . So there are  $r_i, s_i \in R$  such that  $r_i m_i + s_i n_i = 1$ . Let  $e_i = s_i n_i$ . Then  $e_i \equiv 1 \pmod{m_i}$  and  $e_i \equiv 0 \pmod{m_j}$  for  $j \neq i$ .

Set  $x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^t b_i e_i$ . Then we have  $x_0 \equiv b_i e_i \equiv b_i \pmod{m_i}$  and so  $x_0$  is a solution.

Suppose that  $x_1$  is another solution. Then  $x_1 - x_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{m_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , in other words  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t$  divide  $x_1 - x_0$ , with  $(m_i, m_j) = 1$  : from lemma 2 generalized to principal rings,  $m$  divides  $x_1 - x_0$ . □

This result can be generalized to any commutative ring, not necessarily a PID (see S.LANG, Algebra):

**Proposition.** Let  $A$  a commutative ring. Let  $\mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_n$  be ideals of  $A$  such that  $\mathfrak{a}_i + \mathfrak{a}_j = A$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Given elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$ , there exists  $x \in A$  such that  $x \equiv x_i \pmod{\mathfrak{a}_i}$  for all  $i$ .

**Ex. 3.23** Extend the notion of congruence to the ring  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  and prove that  $a + bi$  is always congruent to 0 or 1 modulo  $1 + i$ .

*Proof.* If  $a, b, c$  are in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  we say that  $a \equiv b \pmod{c}$  if there exists  $q \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$  such that  $a - b = qc$ .

As  $i \equiv -1 \pmod{1 + i}, a + bi \equiv a - b \pmod{1 + i}$ .

$(1 - i)(1 + i) = 2$ , so  $2 \equiv 0 \pmod{1 + i}$ .

If  $a - b$  is even,  $a - b = 2k, k \in \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}[i]$ , so  $a - b \equiv 0 \pmod{1+i}$ .

If  $a - b$  is odd,  $a - b = 2k + 1, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $a - b \equiv 1 \pmod{1+i}$ .

Conclusion : for all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ ,  $z \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{1+i}$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 3.24** Extend the notion of congruence to the ring  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  and prove that  $a + b\omega$  is always congruent to  $-1, 0$  or  $1$  modulo  $1 - \omega$ .

*Proof.* Same definition of congruence in  $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  as in Ex. 3.23.

$\omega \equiv 1 \pmod{1 - \omega}$ , so  $a + b\omega \equiv a + b \pmod{1 - \omega}$ .

$0 = 1 - \omega^3 = (1 - \omega)(1 + \omega + \omega^2)$ , with  $1 - \omega \neq 0$ , so  $1 + \omega + \omega^2 = 0$ . Hence  $3 \equiv 0 \pmod{1 - \omega}$ .

$a + b \equiv 0, 1, -1 \pmod{3}$ , so  $a + b \equiv 0, 1, -1 \pmod{1 - \omega}$

For all  $z \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ ,  $z \equiv 0, 1, -1 \pmod{1 - \omega}$ .  $\square$

**Ex. 3.25** Let  $\lambda = 1 - \omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ . If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$  and  $\alpha \equiv 1 \pmod{\lambda}$ , prove that  $\alpha^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{9}$ .

*Proof.*  $\alpha \equiv 1 \pmod{\lambda}$ , so  $\alpha = 1 + \beta\lambda, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ .

$\bar{\lambda} = 1 - \omega^2 = (1 - \omega)(1 + \omega) = -\omega^2(1 - \omega) = -\omega^2\lambda$  (so  $\bar{\lambda}$  and  $\lambda$  are associate).

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^3 - 1 &= (\alpha - 1)(\alpha - \omega)(\alpha - \omega^2) \\ &= (\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 1 + \lambda)(\alpha - 1 + \bar{\lambda}) \\ &= (\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 1 + \lambda)(\alpha - 1 - \omega^2\lambda) \\ &= \beta\lambda(\beta\lambda + \lambda)(\beta\lambda - \omega^2\lambda) \\ &= \lambda^3\beta(\beta + 1)(\beta - \omega^2) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(\beta + 1)(\beta - \omega^2) &\equiv \beta(\beta + 1)(\beta - 1) \pmod{\lambda} \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

since  $\beta \equiv 0, 1, -1 \pmod{\lambda}$  (see Ex. 3.24).

So  $\lambda^4 \mid \alpha^3 - 1$ .

As  $\lambda\bar{\lambda} = (1 - \omega)(1 - \omega^2) = 1 - \omega - \omega^2 + \omega^3 = 3$ , then  $\lambda\bar{\lambda} = -\omega^2\lambda^2 = 3$ , so  $\lambda^2$  and  $3$  are associate :  $\lambda^2 = -\omega\lambda^2$ . So  $9 = (-\omega^2\lambda^2)^2 = \omega\lambda^4$ , so  $9 \mid \omega^2 9 = \lambda^4 \mid \alpha^3 - 1$ .

For all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ ,

$$\alpha \equiv 1 \pmod{\lambda} \Rightarrow \alpha^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{9}.$$

$\square$

**Ex. 3.26** Use Ex. 25 to show that  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$  are not zero and  $\xi^3 + \eta^3 + \zeta^3 = 0$ , then  $\lambda$  divides at least one of the elements  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\xi, \eta, \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\xi^3 + \eta^3 + \zeta^3 = 0$ .

With a reductio ad absurdum, suppose that  $\lambda \nmid \xi, \lambda \nmid \eta, \lambda \nmid \zeta$ .

From Ex. 3.24,

$$\xi \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{\lambda}, \eta \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{\lambda}, \zeta \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{\lambda},$$

and from Ex.3.25,

$$\xi^3 \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{9}, \eta^3 \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{9}, \zeta^3 \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{9},$$

As  $\pm 1 \pm 1 \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{9}$ , this is a contradiction.

Conclusion : if  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$  are not zero and  $\xi^3 + \eta^3 + \zeta^3 = 0$ , then  $\lambda$  divides at least one of the elements  $\xi, \eta, \zeta$ .

(consequence : if  $x^3 + y^3 + z^3 = 0$ ,  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $3 \mid xyz$  : this is the first case of Fermat's theorem for the exponent 3.)  $\square$