

1. Suppose that  $n > 2$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_{\varphi(n)}$  is a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ . Show that

$$c_1 + c_2 + \cdots + c_{\varphi(n)} \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

For each  $1 \leq i \leq \varphi(n)$ , the integer  $c_i$  is relatively prime to  $n$ . Hence,  $-c_i$  is also relatively prime to  $n$  and since  $c_1, \dots, c_{\varphi(n)}$  is a reduced residue system modulo  $n$ , there must exist a  $j$  with  $1 \leq j \leq \varphi(n)$  so that  $c_j \equiv -c_i \pmod{n}$ . Note that we cannot have  $j = i$  since if we did, we would have  $2c_i \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  implying that  $2 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  since  $c_i$  is relatively prime to the modulus  $n$ . This is a contradiction since  $n > 2$ .

Therefore, for each  $1 \leq i \leq \varphi(n)$ , there exists a  $j \neq i$  so that  $c_i + c_j \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $c_{2k+1} + c_{2k+2} \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  for each  $0 \leq k \leq \frac{\varphi(n)}{2} - 1$ . But this immediately implies that

$$(c_1 + c_2) + (c_3 + c_4) + \cdots + (c_{\varphi(n)-1} + c_{\varphi(n)}) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

2. Suppose that  $a$  and  $b$  are relatively prime integers greater than 1. Show that  $a^{\varphi(b)} + b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 1 \pmod{ab}$

Since  $(a, b) = 1$ , Euler's theorem implies that  $a^{\varphi(b)} \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$  and  $b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$ . Moreover,  $a^{\varphi(b)} \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$  and  $b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 0 \pmod{b}$ . Hence,  $a^{\varphi(b)} + b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$  and  $a^{\varphi(b)} + b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$ . Since  $a$  and  $b$  are relatively prime, we can apply Sun-Tsu's theorem to acquire

$$a^{\varphi(b)} + b^{\varphi(a)} \equiv 1 \pmod{ab}$$

3. Find all positive integers  $n$  such that  $\varphi(n) = 12$ . Be sure to prove that you have found all solutions.

Let  $n = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_g^{e_g}$  where  $p_1, \dots, p_g$  are distinct primes and  $e_1, \dots, e_g \geq 1$ . Suppose further that  $\varphi(n) = 12$ . Then we can conclude that

$$(p_1 - 1)p_1^{e_1 - 1} \cdots (p_g - 1)p_g^{e_g - 1} = \varphi(n) = 12$$

As a consequence, if for any  $i$ ,  $e_i > 1$ , then we must have  $p_i \mid 12$ . This means that the only prime divisors of  $n$  which can have exponents greater than 1 are 2 and 3. Now suppose that some  $p_i$  is neither 2, nor 3. Then  $p_i - 1$  must divide 12 so  $p_i = 5$ ,  $p_i = 7$ , or  $p_i = 13$ . We now have the following cases.

Case 1: The largest prime factor of  $n$  is 13.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $p_1 = 13$ . We have already shown that 13 cannot have an exponent greater than 1, so we must have  $e_1 = 1$ . In this case, we conclude that

$$12 = \varphi(13p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g}) = 12\varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$$

and so  $1 = \varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$ . The only integers with  $\varphi(k) = 1$  however are  $k = 1$  and  $k = 2$ , so we conclude that the only possibilities in this case are  $n = 13$  or  $n = 26$ .

Case 2: The largest prime factor of  $n$  is 7.

Without loss of generality,  $p_1 = 7$ . We have already seen that 7 cannot have an exponent larger than 1, so  $e_1 = 1$  and  $12 = \varphi(7 \cdot p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g}) = 6\varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$ . As a consequence,  $2 = \varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$ . The only integers  $k$  with  $\varphi(k) = 2$  are  $k = 3$ ,  $k = 4$ , and  $k = 6$ , so the only possible values of  $n$  are 21, 28, and 42.

Case 3: The largest prime factor of  $n$  is 5.

Without loss of generality,  $p_1 = 5$ . We have already seen that 5 cannot have an exponent larger than 1, so  $e_1 = 1$  and  $12 = \varphi(5 \cdot p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g}) = 4 \cdot \varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$ . As a consequence,  $3 = \varphi(p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$ . Since  $\varphi(k)$  is always even for every integer  $k$ , there are no possible values of  $n$  in this case.

Case 4: The only prime factors of  $n$  are 2 and 3.

In this case,  $n = 2^a \cdot 3^b$  for some  $a, b \geq 0$ , so

$$12 = \varphi(n) = 2^{a-1} \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{b-1} = 2^a \cdot 3^{b-1}$$

Hence,  $a = b = 2$  so  $n = 36$ .

These are all of the possible cases, so the only values of  $n$  with  $\varphi(n) = 12$  are 13, 21, 26, 28, 36, and 42.

4. For which integers  $n \geq 2$  does  $\varphi(n) \mid n$ ?

Suppose that  $\varphi(n) \mid n$  and write  $n = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_g^{e_g}$  for distinct primes  $p_1, \dots, p_g$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_g > 0$ . In particular, order the  $p_i$  so that  $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_g$ . Moreover, under the assumption that  $\varphi(n) \mid n$ , we find that

$$p_1^{e_1-1} p_2^{e_2-2} \cdots p_g^{e_g-1} (p_1 - 1) \cdots (p_g - 1) \mid p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_g^{e_g}$$

and so in fact,

$$(p_1 - 1) \cdots (p_g - 1) \mid p_1 \cdots p_g$$

In particular,  $p_1 - 1 \mid p_1 \cdots p_g$ . If  $p_1 - 1 > 1$ , this is a contradiction because  $p_1 - 1 < p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_g$ . Hence,  $p_1 - 1 = 1$ , so  $p_1 = 2$ .

If 2 is the only prime factor of  $n$ , then we note that

$$\varphi(n) = \varphi(2^{e_1}) = 2^{e_1-1} \mid 2^{e_1} = n$$

as desired.

Now suppose that  $n$  has more than 1 prime factor. We have already shown that it must be the case that  $p_1 = 2$ . Now  $p_2 - 1 \mid 2 \cdot p_2 \cdots p_g$ . Since  $p_2 - 1 < p_2 < p_3 < \cdots < p_g$ , we must have  $p_2 - 1 \mid 2$  and so  $p_2 = 3$ .

If 2 and 3 are the only prime factors of  $n$ , then we note that

$$\varphi(n) = 2^{e_1-1} \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{e_2-1} = 2^{e_1} \cdot 3^{e_2-1} \mid 2^{e_1} \cdot 3^{e_2} = n$$

as desired.

Now suppose for sake of contradiction that  $n$  has more than 2 prime factors. We have already shown that it must be the case that  $p_1 = 2$  and  $p_2 = 3$ . Now,  $p_3 - 1 \mid 2 \cdot 3 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_g$ . Since  $p_3 - 1 < p_3 < \cdots < p_g$ , we must have  $p_3 - 1 \mid 6$ , i.e.  $p_3 = 7$ . However, this is impossible because

$$\varphi(2^{e_1} 3^{e_2} 7^{e_3} p_4^{e_4} \cdots p_g^{e_g}) = 2^{e_1-1} \cdot 2 \cdot 3^{e_2-1} \cdot 6 \cdot 7^{e_3-1} \cdot \varphi(p_4^{e_4} \cdots p_g^{e_g}) = 2^{e_1+1} \cdot 3^{e_2} \cdot 7^{e_3-1} \cdot \varphi(p_4^{e_4} \cdots p_g^{e_g})$$

and so  $\varphi(n)$  is divisible by  $2^{e_1+1}$ , but  $n$  is not. Hence,  $n$  cannot have more than 2 prime factors.

Therefore, the only  $n$  for which  $\varphi(n) \mid n$  are the integers  $n = 2^a 3^b$  where  $a \geq 1$  and  $b \geq 0$ .

5. (Extra Credit—and don't use the internet for this one) Prove that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) = \infty$

Recall that for a sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$  if for every  $M > 0$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  so that for all  $n > N$ , we have  $a_n \geq M$ .

We first claim that for any  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , there are only finitely many  $n \geq 2$  with  $\varphi(n) = M$ . To see this, suppose that  $n = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_g^{e_g}$  for distinct primes  $p_1, \dots, p_g$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_g > 1$ . Then

$$M = \varphi(n) = p_1^{e_1-1} \cdots p_g^{e_g-1} (p_1 - 1) \cdots (p_g - 1)$$

In particular, for any  $1 \leq i \leq g$ ,  $p_i - 1 \mid M$  and so  $p_i \leq M + 1$ . There are only finitely many primes less than  $M$  so any  $n$  with  $\varphi(n) = M$  can have only finitely many prime factors.

Moreover, for any  $1 \leq i \leq g$ ,  $p_i^{e_i-1} \mid M$ , so  $p_i^{e_i-1} \leq M$ . Taking logs on both sides and using the fact that  $p_i \geq 2$ , we find that

$$e_i - 1 \leq \frac{\log M}{\log p_i} \leq \frac{\log M}{\log 2}$$

so there are only finitely many possible values of the exponent  $e_i$ . Since there are finitely many possible prime factors of any  $n$  with  $\varphi(n) = M$  and there are finitely many possible exponents on those prime factors, there can be only finitely many values of  $n$  which satisfy  $\varphi(n) = M$ .

Now we show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) = \infty$ . Fix an  $M > 0$  and let  $M' = \lceil M \rceil$ . Then set

$$S = \{n > 0 : \varphi(n) \leq M'\}$$

Observe that

$$S = \bigcup_{k=1}^{M'} \{n > 0 : \varphi(n) = k\}$$

Since we now see that  $S$  is the finite union of finite sets, it follows that  $S$  is finite. In particular,  $S$  has a maximal element, say  $N$ . Now observe that by the definition of  $S$ , if  $n > N$ , then  $\varphi(n) > M' \geq M$ . But this is exactly what it means for  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(n) = \infty$ .