

Proposition. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $d|n$. Then the cardinality of the following set

$$\{a \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq a < n, \gcd(a, n) = d\}$$

 is equal to $\varphi\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)$.

Proof. $\gcd(a, n) = d \Rightarrow a = d \cdot b$ for $b, e \in \mathbb{Z}$.
 $n = d \cdot e$

$\gcd(b, e) = 1$ (otherwise $\gcd(b, e) = f > 1$
 $f|b, f|e \Rightarrow f|a, f|n$
 contradiction)

$$0 \leq a < n \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq db < n \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq b < \frac{n}{d} = e$$

Therefore b belongs to

$$\{b \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq b < e, \gcd(b, e) = 1\} = B$$

Check that any $b \in B$ gives us $a = d \cdot b$ from the initial set. - Ex.

Therefore the cardinalities of both sets coincide

$$\Rightarrow \#\{a \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq a < n, \gcd(a, n) = d\} = \varphi(e) = \varphi\left(\frac{n}{d}\right).$$

Proof 2 (of $\sum_{d|n} \varphi(d) = n$):

Denote by $N_d := \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq a < n, \gcd(a, n) = d\}$
 where d is taken over all divisors of n .

Then $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ is a disjoint union of N_d 's.

Therefore

$$n = \sum_{d|n} |N_d| = \sum_{d|n} \varphi\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \text{ (by Proposition)}$$

$$= \sum_{e|n} \varphi(e)$$



§10.6. Möbius Inversion Formula.

Given multiplicative function f we can construct another multiplicative F by

$$F(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d).$$

Main Q: Given $F(n)$ can we restore $f(n)$?

A: Yes! (with help of Möbius Inversion Formula).

For small n :

$$F(1) = f(1) \Rightarrow f(1) = F(1)$$

$$F(2) = f(1) + f(2) \Rightarrow f(2) = F(2) - F(1)$$

$$F(3) = f(1) + f(3) \Rightarrow f(3) = F(3) - F(1)$$

$$F(4) = f(1) + f(2) + f(4) \Rightarrow f(4) = F(4) - F(1) - (F(2) - F(1)) \\ = F(4) - F(2).$$

Recall: Möbius function $\mu(n)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} (-1)^d & \text{if } n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_d \text{ and all } p_i \text{'s are distinct primes} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise (i.e. } n \text{ is not square-free).} \end{cases}$$

Proposition: $\mu(n)$ is multiplicative

I.e. for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ we have $\mu(mn) = \mu(m)\mu(n)$.

Proof. If m is not square-free (i.e. square of some prime p divides m) then neither is mn .

$$\Rightarrow \mu(mn) = 0 = \underbrace{\mu(m)}_{=0} \mu(n)$$

The same is true if n is not square-free. Consider the case

$$m = p_1 p_2 \dots p_d$$

$$n = q_1 q_2 \dots q_r$$

where all $p_1, \dots, p_d, q_1, \dots, q_r$ are distinct primes. (since $\gcd(m, n) = 1$).

$$\mu(mn) = (-1)^{d+r} = (-1)^d \cdot (-1)^r = \mu(m)\mu(n).$$



Q: if $f(n) = \mu(n)$, what is $F(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)$?

Try small n :

$$F(1) = \mu(1) = 1$$

$$F(2) = \mu(1) + \mu(2) = 1 + (-1) = 0$$

$$F(3) = \mu(1) + \mu(3) = 1 + (-1) = 0$$

$$F(4) = \mu(1) + \mu(2) + \mu(4) = 1 + (-1) + 0 = 0$$

Proposition: $F(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)$ ~~is given by~~
can be computed by the following formula:

$$F(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n=1 \\ 0 & \text{if } n>1. \end{cases}$$

Proof: Both sides are multiplicative
therefor it is sufficient to check the equality
for $n = p^k$, p prime, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

$$\text{Then } F(n) = \underbrace{\mu(1)}_1 + \underbrace{\mu(p)}_{-1} + \underbrace{\mu(p^2)}_0 + \dots + \underbrace{\mu(p^k)}_0 = 0 \quad \square$$

Example: $n = 12$. The divisors of n are 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12

$$\underbrace{\mu(1)}_1 + \underbrace{\mu(2)}_{-1} + \underbrace{\mu(3)}_{-1} + \underbrace{\mu(4)}_0 + \underbrace{\mu(6)}_1 + \underbrace{\mu(12)}_0 = 0.$$