

**Math 539—Group Work #4**

Tuesday, February 4, 2020

1. The goal of this problem is to find the average value of  $n/\phi(n)$ . (Note that there's no reason the answer should be the reciprocal of the average value of  $\phi(n)/n$ .)

(a) Find an explicit formula for the arithmetic function  $h$  that has the property that

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

for all positive integers  $n$ .

(b) For the function  $h$  from part (a), prove that

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{h(d)}{d} = \prod_p \left( 1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \right) + O_\varepsilon(x^{-1+\varepsilon})$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . (You may use the following fact:  $\phi(n) \gg_\varepsilon n^{1-\varepsilon}$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .)

(c) Prove that the average value of  $n/\phi(n)$  is  $\zeta(2)\zeta(3)/\zeta(6)$ .

(a) The function  $n/\phi(n)$  is multiplicative (being the quotient of two multiplicative functions), and so we know that the function  $h$  will also be multiplicative (since, by Möbius inversion,  $h(n) = \mu(n) * \frac{n}{\phi(n)}$  is the convolution of two multiplicative functions). Therefore it suffices to calculate  $h(p^r)$  for prime powers  $p^r$ . From the Möbius inversion formula,

$$\begin{aligned} h(p^r) &= \sum_{d|p^r} \mu(d) \frac{p^r/d}{\phi(p^r/d)} \\ &= \mu(1) \frac{p^r}{\phi(p^r)} + \mu(p) \frac{p^{r-1}}{\phi(p^{r-1})} + \mu(p^2) \frac{p^{r-2}}{\phi(p^{r-2})} + \cdots + \mu(p^r) \frac{1}{\phi(1)} \\ &= \frac{p^r}{\phi(p^r)} - \frac{p^{r-1}}{\phi(p^{r-1})} + 0 + \cdots + 0 = \begin{cases} 1/(p-1), & \text{if } r = 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$h(n) = \begin{cases} \prod_{p|n} \frac{1}{p-1}, & \text{if } n \text{ is squarefree,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = \frac{\mu^2(n)}{\phi(n)}.$$

(b) Suspecting that the left-hand side actually converges as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , we look at the tail of the series: for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$0 \leq \sum_{d > x} \frac{h(d)}{d} = \sum_{d > x} \frac{\mu^2(d)/\phi(d)}{d} < \sum_{d > x} \frac{1}{d\phi(d)} \ll_\varepsilon \sum_{d > x} \frac{1}{d^{2-\varepsilon}} \ll_\varepsilon \frac{1}{x^{1-\varepsilon}}.$$

In particular, the tail tends to 0 as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and therefore the infinite series  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(d)}{d}$  converges; since all its terms are nonnegative, it converges absolutely, and therefore (since  $\frac{h(d)}{d}$  is multiplicative) we can write it as its Euler product

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(d)}{d} = \prod_p \left( 1 + \frac{h(p)}{p} + \frac{h(p^2)}{p^2} + \cdots \right) = \prod_p \left( 1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)} + 0 + \cdots \right).$$

Putting the pieces together, we see that indeed

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{h(d)}{d} = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(d)}{d} + O\left(\sum_{d > x} \frac{h(d)}{d}\right) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) + O_{\varepsilon}(x^{-1+\varepsilon}).$$

(c) By our convolution method,

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{n}{\phi(n)} = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} h(d) = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{d} \right\rfloor = \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{h(d)}{d} + O\left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d)\right).$$

This error term is

$$\frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{\phi(d)} \ll_{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{1}{x^{1-\varepsilon}} \ll_{\varepsilon} \frac{1}{x} x^{\varepsilon} = o(1),$$

while the main term, by part (b), is

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{h(d)}{d} = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) + o(1);$$

therefore the average value of  $n/\phi(n)$  is the infinite product above. Finally, the factor in that product can be rewritten as

$$\frac{p^2 - p + 1}{p(p-1)} = \frac{(p^2 - p + 1)(p+1)}{p(p-1)(p+1)} = \frac{p^3 + 1}{p(p^2 - 1)} = \frac{(p^3 + 1)(p^3 - 1)}{p(p^2 - 1)(p^3 - 1)} = \frac{p^6 - 1}{p(p^2 - 1)(p^3 - 1)},$$

and so the average value in question is

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

(For the record, the average value of  $\phi(n)/n$  is  $6/\pi^2 \approx 0.607927$ , while  $\zeta(2)\zeta(3)/\zeta(6) \approx 1.94360$  is greater than  $\pi^2/6 \approx 1.64493$ .)

Side comment: we saw in class that  $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$ , and it turns out that  $\zeta(6) = \pi^6/945$ . (Later this semester you'll learn how to prove these identities.) But the number  $\zeta(3)$  is more mysterious. It wasn't until 1978 that Apéry proved that  $\zeta(3)$  is irrational (and thus  $\zeta(3)$  is sometimes called Apéry's constant); and while we don't expect  $\zeta(3)/\pi^3$  to be rational, I think that's still an open problem.

(continued on next page)

2.

(a) Prove that  $\sum_{m \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (m,n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{d} \right\rfloor^2$ . Hint: what does  $\sum_{d|(m,n)} \mu(d)$  equal?

(b) Write down the rigorous definition of what a number theorist refers to as “the probability that two randomly chosen positive integers are relatively prime to each other”, and calculate it.

(c) A lattice point (in the plane) is a point  $(x, y)$  such that both  $x$  and  $y$  are integers. A lattice point is visible from the origin if the line segment between it and the origin contains no other lattice points besides the endpoints. What is “the probability that a randomly chosen lattice point in the plane is visible from the origin”? (Note: in the plane, not in the first quadrant.)

(d) Generalize part (c) to lattice points in three-dimensional space; in  $k$ -dimensional space.

(a) Following the hint, we can write

$$\sum_{m \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (m,n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{m \leq x} \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|(m,n)} \mu(d) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ d|m}} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d|n}} 1 = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{d} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{x}{d} \right\rfloor$$

as desired.

(b) Presumably we should sample two positive integers  $m$  and  $n$  independently and uniformly from the integers up to  $x$ , calculate the probability that they are coprime as a function of  $x$ , and take the limit as  $x$  goes to  $\infty$ . That finite probability is exactly

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{[x]^2} \sum_{m \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (m,n)=1}} 1 &= \frac{1}{[x]^2} \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left\lfloor \frac{x}{d} \right\rfloor^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{[x]^2} \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left( \frac{x}{d} + O(1) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{[x]^2} \left( x^2 \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O \left( x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{|\mu(d)|}{d} + \sum_{d \leq x} |\mu(d)| \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{x^2}{[x]^2} \left( \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O \left( \sum_{d > x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \right) \right) + O \left( \frac{x}{[x]^2} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{|\mu(d)|}{d} + \frac{1}{[x]^2} \sum_{d \leq x} |\mu(d)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\mu(d) \ll 1$ , and  $[x] \gg x$  for  $x \geq 1$  (confirm!), this probability becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x^2}{[x]^2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O \left( \sum_{d > x} \frac{1}{d^2} + \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{x^2} \sum_{d \leq x} 1 \right) &= \frac{x^2}{[x]^2} \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} + O \left( \frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x} \log x + \frac{1}{x^2} x \right) \\ &= \frac{x^2}{[x]^2} \frac{6}{\pi^2} + O \left( \frac{\log x}{x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The limit of this expression as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  is  $6/\pi^2$ .

(Along the way we saw that the difference between  $[x]$  and  $x$  was insignificant in this calculation, since  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ; therefore in practice we usually start such calculations with  $1/x$  or  $1/x^2$  instead of  $1/[x]$  or  $1/[x]^2$ .)

- (c) We will use the fact that the lattice point  $(m, n)$  is visible from the origin if and only if  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  (confirm!). After some reflection, we choose to sample lattice points uniformly from the square with vertices  $(\pm x, \pm x)$ , which contains  $(2\lfloor x \rfloor + 1)^2$  lattice points. We therefore want to calculate

$$\frac{1}{(2x + 1)^2} \sum_{\substack{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ |m|, |n| \leq x \\ \gcd(m,n)=1}} 1 = \frac{1}{(2x + 1)^2} \left( 4 \sum_{1 \leq m \leq x} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq x \\ \gcd(m,n)=1}} 1 + 4 \right),$$

since the counts for the four quadrants are identical (greatest common divisors ignore signs) and there are precisely 4 lattice points on the two axes that are visible from the origin. Using part (b) it is easy to check that the limit of this expression as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  equals  $6/\pi^2$ .

(The regions from which these lattice points are sampled can be thought of as a fixed shape, namely the square with vertices  $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$ , which is then dilated by a factor of  $x$ . One can start with other fixed shapes instead and dilate them in the same way; under some conditions—certainly using a convex neighborhood of the origin is sufficient, although that can be loosened quite a bit—the proportion of lattice points that are visible from the origin will still tend to  $6/\pi^2$ . Research has been done on the quality of the error term in these asymptotic formulas; you can see [a paper some colleagues and I wrote](#) for some results in this vein, along with a few pointers to the more fundamental results.)

- (d) The method of part (a) generalizes quickly to

$$\sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_k \leq x \\ (n_1, \dots, n_k) = 1}} 1 = \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_k \leq x} \sum_{d|(n_1, \dots, n_k)} \mu(d) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n_1 \leq x \\ d|n_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{n_k \leq x \\ d|n_k}} 1 = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left[ \frac{x}{d} \right]^k.$$

The method of part (b) then gives

$$\frac{1}{x^k} \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left[ \frac{x}{d} \right]^k = \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^k} + O\left( \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{|\mu(d)|}{d^{k-1}} \right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(k)} + O\left( \frac{1}{x} \right)$$

(the error term valid when  $k \geq 3$ ). Therefore the “probability” that a random lattice point in  $\mathbb{Z}^k$  is visible from the origin turns out to be  $1/\zeta(k)$ .